Laura and Sandra Via, eds. *Gender, War and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives.* Praeger, 2010

# Introduction

*Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via*

During World War II, the United States' success in driving the Japanese out of Baguio, the mountainous summertime capital of the Philippines, was credited to the indigenous Igorot women led by "a wizened old lady," Aning Andao (Gray 1945). With Aning, "pretty young girls and a few pregnant matrons" went "where the bulldozers have not gone and the trucks cannot go," hauling supplies through gunfire, where "men dropped their loads and scattered; the women, undisturbed, plodded on in a long single file to the front" (Gray 1945).

Ayat Akras was a Palestinian political journalist who had lost two family friends in the conflict between Palestine and Israel (Victor 2003). One "was killed by Israeli soldiers while he was planting a bomb" (Rubin 2002, 16), and "the second was a child playing with Legos in his home" (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007, 80; Victor 2003, 206). Ayat promised that she was going to "fight instead of the sleeping Arab armies who are watching Palestinian girls fighting alone" right before martyring herself in a Jerusalem supermarket, killing 2 and injuring 29, in March of 2002 (Patkin 2004).

In April 1918, the *New York Times* announced Mrs. Lindley Z. Murray's establishment of the National Tennis Women's War Relief Association, established for women to play charity tennis matches around the United States to fund "maintaining feminine physicians as workers in France" ("Women Plan" 1918).

Etsumi Tarihori, "a gray-haired, frail-looking woman" in Okinawa "spends bone-chilling January nights in a sleeping bag on a sidewalk outside the entrance to the U.S. consulate" (Allen 2003). She engages in "a round-the-clock protest" of the U.S. war in Iraq and has led the Okinawan

women's peace movement for years. As David Allen relates, "she's been there every Friday for 76 weeks as a protest against the U.S. military presence on Okinawa," inspired by an incident when a U.S. soldier raped a Japanese woman (Allen 2003).

Sgt. Steve William Lisette Peterson, a member of Britain's elite 16 Air Assault Brigade, "ran away from the Army in a desperate attempt to come to terms with his homosexuality" because "he feared being dismissed, and the reaction of his fellow soldiers if he told them about his sexuality" ("Gay Soldier" 2007). His commanding officers assured journalists that, since he told his fellow soldiers about his homosexuality, "there has been no reaction against him whatsoever," but Sgt. Peterson, aware of the many anti-gay policies and hate crimes in militaries around the world, had reason to be afraid ("Gay Soldier" 2007).

Tabitha, now 18, "runs a group for former girl soldiers, knitting and performing plays about their military lives" (McFerran 2007). She was 11 years old when she was abducted by the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) with her older sister. Tabitha was beaten "uncountable" times, and her sister was forced to be a "wife" of an SPLA officer and was impregnated (McFerran 2007). Tabitha and her sister Anna learned to do as they were told, "or the consequences would be terrible" (McFerran 2007). Since they have been free of the SPLA, Tabitha reports that "for the former girl soldiers, any hope of a 'normal' life is problematic. After their time in the army, they are often considered unfeminine and aggressive, making them poor prospects as wives" (McFerran 2007). Tabitha runs a group for former girl soldiers because their needs as women are often more complicated than the needs addressed in the supposedly gender-neutral disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) process.

Houston, Texas, resident Sybil Roberts had a nephew serving in the U.S. military in the Persian Gulf as it ejected Iraq from Kuwait in 1991. Sybil was "so angered by antiwar protesters at her door carrying petitions that she wrapped the columns on the porch of her...rowhouse with yellow satin, and planted a sign in her lawn that read 'we support our troops' on one side and 'down with protesting' on the other" (Stanley 1991). She argued that it was unpatriotic for women to protest against wars other women's sons were risking their lives to fight.

In 1998, amid intensifying Lebanese assaults on the Israel Defense Force's (IDF) Paamonit observation post coinciding with personnel cuts by the IDF, Gal, an Israeli woman soldier, was left to keep watch over southern Lebanon and northern Israel (Levinson 1998). Gal expressed worry about her own morale and that of her fellow soldiers in the face of increasing death tolls, explaining that "nobody wants to die and nobody wants to fight" (Levinson 1998).

Aning, Ayat, Lindley, Etsumi, Steve, Tabitha, Anna, Sybil, and Gal lived in different times, in different parts of the world, and through different conflicts. They also played different roles in those conflicts. Some



were peace activists, like the better-known women at Greenham Common (Junor and Howse 1995) or of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Bussey 1965). Others supported war efforts from home, much like the American World War II icon Rosie the Riveter (Colman 1998). Others provided logistical support and health care in battle-torn areas, comparable to Clara Barton and the Red Cross (Barton 1898). Still others were active participants—soldiers (Addis, Russo, and Sebesta 1994), members of rebel groups (Luciak 2001), or terrorists (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007).

What these nine people share—across time, place, culture, religion, and sex—is that they lived in (different) worlds where gendered militarism pervades social and political life. While gender relations and conflict in global politics have changed dramatically over the past century, war-making still relies on gendered constructions and images of the state, state militaries, and their role in the international system. These gendered ideologies and images, as well as heavily skewed national budgets devoted to military expenditures, make militarism a stronger and stronger force in global politics and everyday life.

## GENDER

The conventional wisdom is that sex is a biological phenomenon—some people are biologically men and other people are biologically women.[1] Gender is assumed to be directly related to, and map onto, sex—men are masculine and women are feminine. Feminists, however "have questioned the conventional assumption that gender differences (and subordination) are rooted in biological differences between women and men" (Sjoberg 2006a, 32). Instead, feminists have argued that gender is social characteristics only *presumed* to be related to perceived membership in the biological categories of male and female. Characteristics traditionally associated with masculinity include strength, protection, rationality, aggression, public life, domination, and leadership. On the other hand, weakness, vulnerability, emotion, passivity, privacy, submission, and care have been traditionally associated with femininity.

The distinction between traits associated with masculinity and traits associated with femininity is not a value-neutral one. Instead, characteristics associated with masculinity are valued over characteristics associated with femininity in social and political life. Manliness is prized whereas femininity is undesirable. As such, to "*feminize* something or someone is to directly subordinate that person, political entity, or idea, because values perceived as feminine are lower on the social hierarchy than values perceived as neutral or masculine" (Sjoberg 2006a, 34). As Catherine MacKinnon (1993) has argued, "feminization is something that can happen to anyone. It is only that we assume it is natural to happen to people identified as women."

Even though gender is divisible into masculinities and femininities (definable as stereotypes, behavioral norms, expectations, and rules assigned to men and women), it does not follow that gender-based expectations for human behavior are constant across time and place. Instead, the content of gender categories changes over time, place, culture, religion, and a host of other factors. While "the exact content of genders shifts with various and shifting socio-political contexts, gender subordination (defined as the subordination of femininities to masculinities) remains a constant feature of social and political life across time and space" (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007, 6, citing Risman 2005). Social classification and treatment based on perceived membership in a gender class is called *gendering*. In global politics, gendering does not remain constant in content or result, but always involves assumed traits not on the basis of an individual's characteristics but instead on assumed group characteristics (Skapoulli 2004).

Genders, then, are sets of discourses that shape, construct, and give meaning to social and political life. The distinction that gender(s) are a set of discourses rather than one discourse indicates that genders are experienced differently in different contexts and cultures. Still, the fact that genders are variable, discursive, and socially constructed does not make them or their social implications any less real. Instead, "people live gender and gendering across time, space, and culture" (Stoller and Nielsen 2005). In this interpretation, expectations of behavior based on gender are "both a product and producer of history" (Connell 1995, 81).

Gender-based categorizations and expectations are evident in a number of the brief stories discussed at the beginning of this introduction. Tabitha tells a story of the difficulty she and other former child soldiers had in reintegrating into Sudanese society, because their military experiences made people perceive them as aggressive and unfeminine where women were expected to be passive and innocent. Sgt Peterson, on the other hand, struggled with the possible consequences of his not measuring up to specific expectations about what a (military) man should be. Ayat Akras, on the other hand, in explaining her choice to engage in self-martyrdom implies that she would not have to do so if Palestinian and other Arab men were fulfilling their obligations as men to protect Palestinian societies. Each of these stories either asserts or implies a set of expected standards for behavior based on gender that is socially expected of people assumed to be men or women.

## WAR

A number of scholars have recognized that gender-based expectations of human behavior have long been central to narratives justifying or explaining wars (e.g., Huston 1983). Jean Elshtain (1987) identified that war histories are often told in terms of brave, selfless, "just warrior" men



defending or saving pure, innocent, naïve "beautiful soul" women. For example, the Trojan War is often told in terms of a just warrior (Odysseus) saving a kidnapped, innocent woman (Helen) from her aggressive, foreign captor (Paris). One of the largest and most important wars in Greek mythology was fought for and over an innocent woman. Helen was at once the justification for the war and the innocent who needed saving from it—the *casus belli* and a civilian.

Feminist scholars have identified similar gender-based stories in the justificatory narratives for the World War I (Elshtain 1987, 6), the Cold War (Enloe 1989), the First Gulf War (Enloe 1993), the conflict in the former Yugoslavia (Zalewski 1995), the conflict between Russia and Chechnya (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007), and the "war on terror" in Afghanistan (Stabile and Kumar 2005) and Iraq (Eisenstein 2004). As Cynthia Enloe commented about the First Gulf War, "the U.S. intervention in the Gulf would be harder to justify if there were no feminized victim" (1993, 166). This is a sentiment Krista Hunt echoed about the United States' 2001 invasion of Afghanistan (2002).

Both gender relations and war have changed since the mythical Trojan War, and even since feminist scholars recognized and defined the gender-stereotypical content of the just warrior and beautiful soul tropes in the 1980s. Mary Kaldor coined the term "new wars," arguing that warfare in the 21st century is distinct from past wars in its goals, fighting methods, and sources of financing. The "new wars," according to Kaldor, are about identity politics, fought with gruesome violence, and they are more decentralized than war in the era of world wars between state actors (Kaldor 2006, 6–10). They are, instead of purely interstate conflicts, "a mixture of war, organized crime, and massive violations of human rights. The actors are both global and local, public and private" (Kaldor 2006, 12).

At the same time wars have been changing, gender roles *in wars* have been changing. For example, women have always played some (generally unacknowledged) role in the making and fighting of wars, but women's representation in state militaries (Addis, Russo, and Sebestia 1994), guerilla groups (Luciak 2001), and terrorist organizations (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007; Alison 2009) has increased exponentially in recent years. Though they remain a minority in all of these organizations and are often prohibited from taking on certain roles of leadership or direct combat, women have been more active in the "new" wars of the 21st century than in any documented time throughout history.

At the same time women have been de facto integrated into war fighting in the post–Cold War era, attention to the impacts of armed conflict on women and girls has increased in the policy world. For example, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 mandates that women participate in the making and keeping of peace in the international arena. The adoption of such a policy[2] represents both symbolic and actual progress in redressing gender inequities around the world. Still, armed conflict

rages around the world, and women are disproportionately affected by the making and fighting of wars.

It remains a puzzle to some scholars and policy makers why the situation of women around the world is not improving exponentially with their integration into war fighting and the proliferation of policies meant to protect them. Feminist scholars have argued that the disconnect between woman-friendly policies and results in women's lives is twofold. First, although women are being included in different areas of global politics with greater frequency, their needs *as women* often remain unconsidered and unaddressed. In other words, women are being integrated into a world that remains defined and shaped by men's interests and needs. Second, attempts to better the situation of women often do not pay attention to the gendered nature of the structures of government and economics that remain in place even when women are formally included.

In no area of global politics are these problems more evident than in the realm of armed conflict. More than 20 years ago, Betty Reardon (1985) identified the "war system," a cycle of violence that at once relies on and perpetuates the oppression of women. Many feminist scholars have observed the continuity of gender subordination in the realm of war and conflict. Women's needs *as women* are often not understood in international conflict. For example, for the first years of the United Nations sanctions regime on Iraq, Iraqi women had difficulty finding ways to buy prenatal vitamins and baby milk on the black market because they were not seen as basic needs and exempted from the embargo (Vickers 1993). The second point, the gendered nature of the structures that remain in place from before women's integration, is equally challenging. Cynthia Enloe pointed out that women's integration into state and other military groups does not change the gender basis of those groups' identities and expectations (2000). In other words, women who join war fighting and peacemaking do not do so in armies or negotiations that are suddenly gender neutral because they are willing to include women. Instead, they join groups whose terms, premises, and behavioral norms are already defined in terms of the masculine values that they have prized before the inclusion of women.

These gender-based difficulties about the nature and structure of war can also be found in the earlier stories. Tabitha needed to create a program to take care of the needs of former girl soldiers because the supposedly gender-neutral DDR process did not take account of the social challenges that women as women faced in reintegrating into normal social life. Sybil Roberts struggled with the question of whether women's gender roles affect how they could or should think about the First Gulf War.[3] The reporter who wrote about Etsumi Tarihori featured both her age and her gender in dramatizing her protests against the war in Iraq. Tarihori's involvement in protesting the war in Iraq was not directly gender related, but she'd become involved in the Okinawan peace movement



because of a gender-based concern: rape committed by soldiers stationed in Okinawa.

## MILITARISM

Though war is an essential condition of militarism—the apex, the climax, the peak experience, the point of all the investments, training, and preparation—militarism is much, much broader than war, comprising an underlying system of institutions, practices, values, and cultures. Militarism is the extension of war-related, war-preparatory, and war-based meanings and activities outside of "war proper" and into social and political life more generally. Peterson and Runyan (1999, 258) explain that "militarization refers to processes by which characteristically military practices are extended into the civilian arena—as when businesses become dependent on military contracts, clothing fashions celebrate military styles, or toys and games embody military activities." Peterson and Runyan's definition captures an important part of militarism, but a conceptual extension helps us see its pervasiveness. Instead of envisioning militarism as the extension of military practices into civilian life, it is possible to see it as the blurring or erasure of distinctions between war and peace, military and civilian.

Scholars cognizant of the impacts of war and militarism on women, like Betty Reardon who is cited earlier, have always argued that the artificial construction of boundaries between "war" (one day) and "not war" (the next day) do not represent the political realities or the humanitarian situations in conflict zones. Instead, as Chris Cuomo (1996, 31) has explained, war is best seen as a process or continuum rather than a discrete event. Where an event has a starting point and an ending point, militarism pervades societies (sometimes with more intensity and sometimes with less) before, during, and after the discrete event that the word "war" is usually used to describe. Because of this, "the spatial metaphors used to refer to war as a separate, bounded sphere indicate assumptions that war is a realm of human activity vastly removed from normal human life" (Cuomo 1996, 30).

Instead, many scholars have argued, war and militarization are a part of what has come to be normal human life. Militarism is pervasive in the political operations of states and the daily lives of people all around the world. As shown earlier, Ayat Akras grew up knowing only conflict between Israel and Palestine. Tabitha and Anna were abducted by a rebel fighting force before they were teenagers. Lindley Murray militarized exhibition tennis matches. Etsumi Tahihori's story is one of struggle with the impact of the presence of a foreign military base in her country. Sgt. Peterson's military career is the source of much of his anxiety about whether he can safely "come out" as a homosexual man or not. Gal sits, daily, alone with her gun, in a dangerous outpost looking over a volatile place in the conflict between Israel and Lebanon. Sybil Roberts feels the

impact of militarization on her family—both as she embraces her nephew and supports the war for him.

Feminists have pointed out that this militarism that pervades global politics is not gender neutral, "natural or automatic" (Enloe 1993, 246). As Cynthia Enloe has explained, "militarization occurs because some people's fears are allowed to be heard, while other people's fears are trivialized and silenced" (1993, 246). Specifically, "the militarization of any nationalist movement occurs through the gendered workings of power" (Enloe 1993, 246). In the gendered process of militarization, "men are under constant pressure to prove their manhood by being tough, adversarial, and aggressive.... In one highly legitimated and organized institution within most societies, men not only can, but—to be successful—*must* prove their masculinity" (Peterson and Runyan 1999, 118). This institution is the military, where the functioning of the military-industrial or military-civilian[4] complex needs men to be willing to kill and die on behalf of their state to prove their manhood *and* "women to behave *as the gender women*" (Enloe 1983, 212, emphasis added). In other words, "women must be properly subservient to meet the needs of militaries" (Peterson and Runyan 1999, 118).

The impacts of militarization on women's lives have been demonstrated in the lives of Korean camptown prostitutes (Moon 1998), immigrant domestic workers in Malaysia (Chin 1998), women soldiers in the First Gulf War (Enloe 1998), the U.S. military women accused of prison abuse at Abu Ghraib (Sjoberg 2007), the Sri Lankan tourism industry (Enloe 1989), and many other places around the world. Militarization is gendered in its aims (competitive power-over), its means (the military industrial complex), its language (of strength and domination), and its impacts (which disproportionately and negatively affect women).

A closer look at some of the brief stories that open this chapter show the intersection of gender, war, and militarism. Sgt. Peterson's concern about living up to ideal/typical images of (straight) militarized masculinity can be seen as intimately related to the gender relationships involved in war-justificatory narratives and the structured set of gender-role rules required to sustain militarism even in times where there are not immediate security threats to the nation housing the military in question. The undertones of the *Time* magazine journalist's report about Aning and her fellow Irogot women are all about gender and militarism. The descriptions of the "wizened old lady" with "pretty young girls and a few pregnant matrons" highlight the oddity of seeing women active in a war zone, even if they are doing tasks very similar to the work they would have been doing if a war were not being fought in their midst. Also, the author makes a point of highlighting that the women carried more, made more trips, and were less easily distracted than the men employed to transport goods to the troops in the mountains, implying at once that there was a deficit in militarized masculinity and that women were better at the "women's work" of moving supplies while men were better suited for the fighting going on at the top of the mountain. The battle of Baguio, according to Gray, required both men and women to win—but both needed to be fulfilling their traditional gender roles. In these stories, as in the situations analyzed throughout this book, gender, war, and militarism are inscribed on individuals' lives and on the larger picture of global politics and global conflict.



## FEMINIST APPROACHES

Certainly, the term "feminism" has many meanings—at least as many meanings as it has claimants, speakers, and writers.[5] Just as there are many different women and many different femininities, there are many different feminisms. The contributors to this book do not always share the same definition of feminism or the same interpretation of gender. They do, however, share some epistemological and methodological commitments that make them "feminist approaches" and connect them for the purpose of this volume.

The first commitment these chapters share is some sense of the *function* if not the *content* of feminism. Spike Peterson (1999, 37) described a need for gender-based analysis: "if all experience is gendered, analysis of gender identities is an imperative starting point for the study of political identities and practice." The function of feminist theory, in this description, is to provide empirical information about how the world works that would not be available without using gender as a category of analysis. Feminists claim that we know more about global politics when we ask questions about women and gender. Sarah Brown (1988, 472) points out a second element of feminist scholarship: that it is "fundamentally a political act of commitment to understanding the world from the perspective of the socially subjugated." Putting these elements together, we can describe the function of feminism as "a political theory that coexists with and interacts with a political movement dedicated to eradicating the problems that women experience because of their sex" (Sjoberg 2006a, 43; Ruddick 1989, 234). The chapters in this book theorize about politics and politicize theory.

The second commitment these chapters share is a way of asking questions. Feminist scholars in International Relations (IR) have often described their commonalities in terms of looking through gendered lenses. Jill Steans details:

> To look at the world through gender lenses is to focus on gender as a particular kind of power relation, or to trace out the ways in which gender is central to understanding international processes. Gender lenses also focus on the everyday experiences of women as *women* and highlight the consequences of their unequal social position. (Steans 1998, 5)

Lenses serve as filters "to foreground some things and background others" in political theory and political life (Peterson and Runyan 1999, 1).

These chapters share foregrounding concerns that come from gendered personal experiences of people who live gender, war, and militarism intermeshed with gender-aware readings of state- and system-level problems in global politics.

Finally, the feminist approaches in this volume share an understanding that the gendered system of war and militarism that the authors study individually and collectively is, though it is pervasive and far-reaching, ultimately fungible. Many of the disciplines the writers in this volume are rooted in describe this sort of theoretical perspective differently. In political science, our disciplinary home, Robert Cox (1986) laid out the distinction between problem solving and critical theory. Problem-solving theory studies the world *as it is* without asking questions about the normative content of that world or its potential for change. Critical theory, on the other hand, engages in the dual task of considering what is wrong with the world *and acting* to correct those wrongs. In those terms, the feminist project is critical theory: the feminist approaches in this book look at the intersections of gender, war, and militarism with a normatively critical eye, looking for possible alternatives that are better for the individuals they study and the global political arena as a whole.

## GENDER, WAR, AND MILITARISM: FEMINIST APPROACHES

The feminist approaches in this volume look at two interconnected issues in the complex matrix of gender, war, and militarism: the impacts of war and militarism on people (especially but not limited to women) and the gendered construction of war and militarism, linked to systems of power and inequality based on race, class, nation, and so on.

Generally, investigating and assessing the impacts of war and militarism on women reveals that women are disproportionately affected by almost every aspect of the "war system" (Reardon 1985). Always masculinist endeavors, war and militarism have significant, distinctive, and heart-wrenching effects on women. Women are the majority of civilian casualties of war, before, during, and after the conflict. They are the primary targets of those who use rape and forced pregnancy as weapons of war. They make up the majority of refugees displaced from homes, farms, and sources of livelihood. Women also experience hardship and discrimination as members of state militaries and insurgent groups, which often replicate and exaggerate social inequalities.

Examining the gendered construction of war and militarism includes explorations of how militarism requires and produces gender inequality; how militarism generates gendered roles, ideologies, and expectations in times of war and conflict; the ways media outlets deploy gender in reporting and generating support for war; and the gendered elements of post-conflict reconstruction. These analyses show that gender is a linchpin not



only of how war and militarism affect people but also of the very existence of the war system.

Seventeen chapters in five sections focus on gender, war, and militarism, varying "hot spots" of recent or current conflict: Bosnia, El Salvador, Iraq, Israel, Sierra Leone, Sudan, the Pacific Islands, the European Union (EU), and the United States. These analyses reveal that, although it takes different forms, gendering is a constant feature of 21st-century militarism.

The book opens with Section I, "Gender, Militarization, and Security," which features chapters exploring the conceptual relationships between gender, war, and militarism. V. Spike Peterson demonstrates that "thinking through intersectionality" allows us to see that militarism in the 21st century as intimately related to a presumption of heteronormative hypermasculinity, where not only women but minorities and other men who do not meet idealized images of the just warrior are devalorized through feminization. Stephanie Anderson explores the salience of feminization at the state level, as her chapter explains the EU's need to build a (redundant and ineffectual) military structure in terms of attempting to shed a feminized (and therefore devalorized) image as a soft power in international politics. In Chapter 3, Sandra Via explores the interplay of economic globalization and globalized militarisms, showing that the neoliberal ideology that permeates many of the processes of globalization reifies gendered ideas about war and militarism.

With these conceptual frameworks laid out, Section II turns to examining how gendered understandings of war and militarism are deployed in times of conflict. Denise Horn, in her chapter, "Boots and Bedsheets: Constructing the Military Support System in a Time of War," explores past and current strategies used by the U.S. military to inculcate loyalty among military spouses as a concerted strategy of indoctrination and control to maintain troop loyalty in the field. Studying intersections of gender(ed) violence, militarization, and resistance worlds away in a conflict in the pacific island of Bougainville, Ronni Alexander demonstrates that militarization has been used as a tool for the cultural governance of identity and maintenance of gender stratification. Tami Jacoby's Chapter 6 begins by looking at how women are affected by and react to militarism and then turns to women's participation in the structures of militarized violence. Jacoby explores the battle in Israel for women's "right to fight," which has become a key issue in advocacy for women's legal equality of opportunity there. Building on a tradition of feminist theory that analyzes "full citizenship" as connected to the image of a citizen-warrior willing to take up arms for his (or, in this case, her) state, Jacoby weaves a complicated web of feminist theory, women's peace activism, and intransigent conflict to analyze arguments for women's right to fight in the Israeli defense force. The women (and girls) in Susan Shepler's chapter, on the other hand, need to define what life is like after fighting for soldiers, some of whom fought willingly, many more of whom were abducted or forced into military

service. The tale Shepler tells of sex, violence, discrimination, and heartache for girls associated with the fighting forces in Sierra Leone shows the complexity and intricacy of the interweavings of gender, war, and militarism in conflict situations.

Section III moves from the deployment of gender in times of conflict to analyses of a gender-specific weapon of war: rape. As the authors of this section explain, wartime rape is something that happens almost exclusively to people of the female sex, and exclusively to people feminized by their enemies. Sondra Hale tells of rape as at once a cultural identifier, an erasure of cultural difference, and a tool of cultural destruction in the ethnocidal conflicts in Darfur and the Nuba Mountains in Sudan. Chapters by Elisabeth Jean Wood and Megan Gerecke look to explain motivations for and variations in wartime rape over different conflicts and different times. Inspired by the World War II rape narrative *A Woman in Berlin*, Liz Kelly argues for a continuum approach to sexual violence and war, where, instead of separating (normal) rape and wartime rape, war and peace, scholars and legal experts could look at a continuum of sexual violence transposed onto a continuum of global conflict to see the links between gender, war, and militarism in daily life and "high" politics.[6]

Section IV then moves from what happens in war to what happens in the aftermath of war when war is seen as an event. These three chapters show both the essential continuity of war and post-war militarism, as well as some of the unique challenges of the processes of reconstruction, reconciliation, and peacemaking for women. In Chapter 12, Catia Confortini examines the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and its efforts to address and transform the issue of disarmament into an ongoing women's peace movement. In Gwyn Kirk's chapter, aptly titled "When Is War Over?," the author explores women's stories of healing and rebuilding after the war in El Salvador to critically question the inherited notion of the war as an event with a clean start and ending and to show the disproportionate effects of the conflict (before, during, and after) on women. Sigal Ben-Porath looks through gendered lenses at the process and meaning of post-conflict forgiveness, reconciliation, and trust-building.

The fifth and final section, "Texts and Contexts for Gender, War, and Militarism," analyses texts surrounding gender, war, and militarism for what they tell us about the "real world" of war and the gendered portrayals of that world. In Chapter 15, R. Charli Carpenter demonstrates that Bosnian "war babies" are represented in gendered ways in the global print media. She recognizes three tropes in these stories: of the rapes as part of an ethnic/nationalist conflict, of the raped women as victims of childbirth, and of the babies as the product of an uncivilized culture in need of neo-imperial humanitarian intervention. Examining a different set of texts a world away, Laura Sjoberg's Chapter 16 finds gendered framings of idealized militarized masculinities and femininities in the U.S. military in media presentations of the "hero stories" of four soldiers who



fought the "war on terror" in Afghanistan or Iraq. In Chapter 17, Deborah Cohler finds another set of narratives, where female masculinity, gay sex, and gay identities shaped and were shaped by the discourses of war, fear, and nationalist identity on the United States "homefront" in the "war on terror." Together, the chapters in the fifth section show the inseparability of representation and reality in the complex webs of gender, war, and militarism in the 21st century.

The volume concludes with reflections on what these accounts of gender, war, and militarism from five continents, numerous different contexts, and all stages of the war process tell us about the gendered nature of war and militarism amid "new wars" with "new" women fighters, transposed on age-old gender stereotypes and subordinations.

## NOTES

1. This too is oversimplified, given that many people are neither classifiable as biologically male nor biologically female, but instead as transgendered, intersex, and so on.
2. And its replication around the world, in policies in the EU, the World Bank, the International Monetary fund, and the U.S. government.
3. Replicating the question of the gender gap, where scholars have observed that women throughout 20th-century warfare were more opposed to making and fighting wars than men were, though the "gender gap" narrowed as the century closed.
4. The military-industrial or military-civilian complex militarizes those who are not in uniform—civilians. The military-industrial complex organizes an economy and the production of goods around defense weapons, while also centralizing the occupations of civilians, such as engineers and scientists, around a corporate culture of defense (Peterson and Runyan 1999; Enloe 2007).
5. In common International Relations (IR) parlance alone, there's liberal feminist IR, constructivist feminist IR, critical feminist IR, postcolonial feminist IR, poststructuralist feminist IR, and postmodern feminist IR (Tickner and Sjoberg 2006).
6. High politics refers to the traditional sites of power in global politics, such as state governments and international organizations, as opposed to the "low" politics of everyday life with which most feminist work is concerned. Many of the chapters in this book serve as critiques of the continued interest in this dichotomy in IR and Security Studies.