PEACE STUDIES PAPERS   Working Paper 9

FOURTH SERIES

in conjunction with

UNRISD
United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Gender Issues in Post-War Contexts:
A Review of Analysis and Experience,
and Implications for Policies

Donna Pankhurst

April 2007

UNIVERSITY OF
BRADFORD
MAKING KNOWLEDGE WORK

Previous Papers in this Series

Politics in the Next 50 Years: The Changing Nature of International Conflict
Paul Rogers, October 2000   *Working Paper 1*

Conflict Diamonds: Roles, Responsibilities and Responses
Michael Bourne, January 2001   *Working Paper 2.1*

Engendering the Field of Conflict Management: Why Gender Does Not Matter! Thoughts from a
Theoretical Perspective
Cordula Reimann, January 2001   *Working Paper 2.2*

Transforming Attitudes Towards the Tools of Violence: The Arms Exchange Programme in
Mendoza, Argentina
William H. Godnick, October 2001   *Working Paper 3*

European Security and Defence Policy: the rise of the military in the EU
Giovanna Bono, March 2002   *Working Paper 4*

Direct Action: A Threat to Democracy?
Michael Randle, May 2002   *Working Paper 5*

The Role of Non-State Actors in the European Small Arms Regime
Holger Anders, March 2003   *Working Paper 6*

The European Convention and Common Foreign and Security Policy: more defence, less scrutiny?
Giovanna Bono, March 2004   *Working Paper 7*

"Terrorists Prefer Diamonds". How Predation, State Collapse and Insurgence Have Fashioned the
International Exploitation of Sierra Leone's War Economy
 Greg Mitchell, March 2005   *Working Paper 8*

Staff and students are encouraged to contribute to this Working Paper Series from the
Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford. Anyone wishing to do so, please send
your paper to Neil Cooper: r.n.cooper@bradford.ac.uk

Gender Issues in Post-War Contexts:
A Review of Analysis and Experience,
and Implications for Policies

Donna Pankhurst

April 2007

Author's Note

This paper is a review of the debates, in academic literature and policy-circles, on gender issues and moments of 'post-conflict'.

Part I considers in broad terms how our analyses of women's varied situations at the moment of wars' endings do and do not feed into policy development. In particular it highlights the phenomenon of the 'post-conflict backlash against women' which is common, and is much analysed, but which is rarely anticipated either politically or in policy terms.

In Part II, a particular aspect of the post-conflict backlash phenomenon is in focus: that of violences against women committed by men, which are maintained, and which sometimes increase or appear for the first time when wars end. This phenomenon is also often mentioned in passing, but rarely receives much attention. Here the paper considers explanations that are put forward for such violence, and explores the explanatory value of the concept of masculinity.

The two sections of this paper are to be published by the end of 2007 as chapters in the following book:

> Donna Pankhurst (ed), *Gendered Peace. Women's Struggles for Post-War Justice and Reconciliation*, Routledge

This book arose from work commissioned by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development for a report, *Gender Equality. Striving for Justice in an Unequal World*, UNRISD 2005, which was intended to mark the passing of a decade since the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995. The book will be accompanied by three sister volumes drawn from this work, also published by Routledge. The volume contains case study chapters from various parts of the world and reviews the evolution of international law in strengthening women's rights in post-conflict settings.

From May 2007 the paper will be available at http://www.unrisd.org/

Further details may be obtained directly from Donna Pankhurst at d.t.pankhurst@bradford.ac.uk

Donna Pankhurst (PhD University of Liverpool, 1988) is Professor of Peacebuilding and Development at the Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, UK. In recent years she has researched in Africa on conflict, post- conflict settlements, and peacebuilding, particularly with a focus on gender issues.

Contents

PART I

GENDERED WAR AND PEACE

This book is concerned with what happens to women when wars officially end. Along with several other volumes[1] it recognises that women face particular difficulties at such "aftermath" moments which often have very strong continuities with what happened during wars, and with the nature of gender relations in society prior to armed conflict. At the international level remarkable progress has been made; in establishing women's legal rights; in the identification of sexual violence as a potential war crime, and even progress in some women's abilities to access such legal frameworks. Nonetheless, when faced with a post-war backlash from men and the state, women in highly varied cultural contexts tend to face distinct difficulties as they seek justice for crimes committed against them during and after wars; when they attempt to participate in "truth and reconciliation" endeavours, and when they attempt to re-build their lives. This book[2] explores how far we have come both through international frameworks and in particular countries, and examines the ways in which the endings of war still often bring highly gendered challenges for women which are themselves often violent.

Gendered war deaths and survival rates

An assessment of what happens to women when wars officially end logically begins with an assessment of the extent of mortality and injury as post-war legacies. Much has been written about women's experiences during wars and, after well over a decade of feminists' lobbying, there has been some success in a generalised recognition at the international level, that during wars women play key roles, carry heavy socio-economic burdens and themselves suffer casualties. Such a shift away from women being virtually invisible in conflict analyses has been facilitated by a common understanding that after the Cold War, war itself took on a different and distinct character, which intensified women's involvement. A key feature of so-called "new wars" is the lack of separation between the "war front" and the "home front" and, whilst it is possible to argue that some wars in previous decades and centuries could also be characterised in this way, the point is that the increased vulnerability of civilians has become commonplace. There are many publications which assert that

---

[1] Meintjes et al. 2001; Moser and Clark 2001; Turshen and Alidou 2000; El Bushra 2000; El Bushra 2004

[2] The following chapters are based on papers commissioned by UNRISD to contribute to *Gender Equality. Striving for Justice in an Unequal World*, UNRISD 2005: Walsh, Nowrojee, Manjoo, Luciak, Kandiyoti, Guhathakurta, Žarkov et al. and parts of this one.

civilian casualties in war are greater than military, and that women and children have become major casualties in war where once they were much less so (Giles and Hyndman 2004b:3, 4-5). Typical of these is Cockburn (2001:21), who cites the oft-quoted figure that 90 per cent of the casualties of today's wars are civilians.

This overarching realignment of the identity of war casualties as now being predominantly civilian, has sometimes led to the elision that women are victimised by war to a greater extent than men, because the majority of civilians are women, and when the populations of civilian women and children are added together, they outnumber male combatants. In the post-war context women survivors generally outnumber men and so it is also often said that women as a group bear the greater burdens for post-war recovery. An example of this is Turshen (2001b:58). Nonetheless it is the case that more men than women die directly from violence across the world in general, as well as directly from war (Pearce 2006; WHO 2002) and none of those who cite the 90 per cent civilian deaths figure, or who highlight the burdens of women, actually refute this directly, although there is certainly ambiguity in some accounts if they are not read with care.

Some confusion derives from the fact that we do not usually have anything like accurate data for war-related deaths, as recently demonstrated in the international disputes about deaths in Iraq (Davies 2006). Nonetheless, some analysts have undertaken careful statistical analysis of gender differentials,[3] and the calculations of Plűmper and Neumayer, 2005 show that more women than men die or suffer serious disease as a result of war:

> over the entire conflict period interstate wars, civil wars and internationalised
> civil wars on average affect women more adversely than men … we also find
> that ethnic wars and wars in 'failed' states are much more damaging to
> women than other civil wars (Plűmper and Neumayer 2005:3)[4]

Nonetheless the weak statistical base and previous assertions about women "bearing the brunt" of war, has already led to one major publication, by the Human Security Commission (HSC 2005) asserting that publications which allege that women "bear the brunt" of war[5] are misleading, citing Amnesty International (2004) in particular.

---

[3] For example, Stewart et al 2001: 93; Beaumont, 2006
[4] In addition Neumayer has also recently made the same case for the disproportionate effects on women of natural disasters (paper presented to Royal Geographical Association Conference, London, 2006, (*How Natural Disasters Between 1981 and 2002 Killed On Average More Women than Men*).
[5] The text in a box headed, "Men as Victims, Women as Warriors" (pp. 110-111), is in fact mostly devoted to challenging the common assertion repeated by Amnesty International, that "women and girls

The HSC alleges that in gender-aware approaches to conflict, "the huge costs that political violence imposes on males have been mostly ignored" (2005:111) and that the disproportionate suffering of women has been exaggerated. Men certainly do constitute the majority of battle-related deaths, a point which has never been questioned and is in fact emphasised in HSC's cited source of Plűmper and Neumayer (2005). Nonetheless, the evidence given by these latter authors and Stewart et al. (2001) for the longer term strongly contradicts the HSC assertions. The HSC report presents no evidence to show that this previous work is incorrect, and confuses data about the relative number of people who have to leave their homes. Some of this debate may be rooted in misunderstandings about the meaning of "casualty", "victim" and "bearing the burden", but the report's dramatic claim seems to go beyond the need for us to tie our analyses more closely to empirical data. In effect it stakes out an ideological position that itself does not accurately reflect the empirical evidence it cites.[6]

On balance then, the extent of women's war-related mortality remains controversial. Not surprisingly, more detailed data on the gender balance of survivors, and heads of household for instance, are also very difficult to generate and are often contested. Against this globally confusing backdrop, there are nonetheless common differences faced by women as a backlash against them occurs.

Post-war backlash against women

The post-conflict environment cannot be characterized as one in which life for women invariably returns to "normal" – even if a return to previous patterns of gender and social relationships, as if no war had occurred, were desirable or even possible. The upheaval of war, in which societies have been transformed and livelihood systems disrupted, in which women have assumed certain roles for the first time or come into contact with new ideas, has its own impact on intra-personal relationships and social expectations. Furthermore, evidence from gendered analyses of post-war situations in the former Yugoslavia, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Asia and elsewhere (Rehn and Sirleaf 2002) shows that women not only face a continuation of some of the aggression they endured during the war, but may also face new forms of violence. In the design of policies for post-war reconstruction, women's needs are

---

bear the brunt of armed conflicts fought today both as direct targets and as unrecognised "collateral damage" (Amnesty, 2004, cited in HSC, 2005: 110)

[6] Moreover the report contains no reflection on why the alleged inaccuracy in the literature occurred, or why there is still such a dramatically different set of experiences in war for women and men. Unsurprisingly it also offers no acknowledgement that the 40 per cent of child soldiers who are girls have a very different experience to their boy comrades.

often systematically ignored, and even deliberately marginalized. This may carry forward echoes of past situations and power relations, but there can also be a new edge of aggression against women.[7] Together, the continued and new forms of violence, and the attacks on women's newly-assumed rights and behaviours, constitute what frequently amounts to a post-war backlash against women.[8] Such a backlash seems to be very common across quite contrasting social, economic and geographical contexts, as has been reflected in a number of publications (for example, Meintjes et al. 2001) although the specifics seem to vary. Two key elements seem to be common: an "anti-women" discourse with associated restrictions on the life-choices of women regarding social, economic and political activity (El Bushra 2004; Meintjes et al. 2001b:12-14); and violence against women which continues above the level of pre-conflict violence, and sometimes at a higher level than during war itself.

The backlash discourse may be expressed through state institutions, the media and/or in everyday public and private language. It is often about "restoring" or "returning" to something associated with peace in the past, even where the change actually undermines women's rights to a more unequal situation than before the war – in effect to a balance of gender politics which is unambiguously in favour of men as a gender. It is also often accompanied by imagery of the culturally specific equivalent of Pierson's (1989) concept of a "beautiful soul", and strongly associates women with cultural notions of "tradition", motherhood, and peace, using new and old cultural norms (Turshen 2001a:80).[9]

Women can be targeted for having gained economic independence from men, for having been employed in "male" roles, or for having adopted urban and educated lifestyles in predominantly rural societies. There are calls for them to be forced "back" into kitchens and fields, even if they were not so occupied before the war (Cockburn 2004:40). It is sometimes unclear whether these outcries are spontaneous reactions from individual men, or whether they are orchestrated by the state or government.[10] In either case, at both social and individual levels there are forceful attempts to define

---

[7] Meintjes et al. 2001; Moser and Clark 2001; Turshen and Alidou 2000; El Bushra 2000; El Bushra 2004; Goldstein 2001:394-5 (summarises literature on aftermath of World War I); Cockburn 2004:41 (summarises literature on aftermath of liberation wars)

[8] Pankhurst 2003:11; Pankhurst and Pearce 1997; Meitjes et al. 2001:12; Turshen 2001a:84; De Abreu 2001: 82, Turshen and Twagiramariya 1998:105-7; Pillay, 2001:43

[9] which Turshen refers to as "retraditionalisation" in Africa

[10] Luciak, this volume ; De Abreu 1998 ; Jacobs and Howard 1987.

women's roles and rights as secondary to those of men,[11] and to restrict women's behaviour.

Protests by women against such behaviour are often castigated as being "Western-influenced" (Kandiyoti this volume; El Bushra 2004). In such an intense and sometimes violent moment, the state can bring to bear many of the policies used in "normal times" to intervene in gender politics, or weight the "sex war" in favour of men. The state becomes instrumental in enforcing controls over women's sexuality; fails to increase, or prevent a decline in, women's personal security; imposes legal, or supports social, restrictions on women's movement, access to housing, jobs and property (especially land), and marginalizes women's health needs. In many cases such official policy outcomes are reinforced by the practices of international organizations which do not actively seek the opinions of women or fail to promote their interests where this might be deemed "culturally insensitive". Women also commonly find their contributions to the war and peace efforts marginalized in both official and popular accounts of war, as happened in Europe immediately after the Second World War. There seems to be an attempt to deny that shifts in gender relations were required for women to take on their war-time roles, or that they will ever, by implication, actually be possible (Kelly 2000:62; Sideris 2001a:54).

Women Excluded From Post-War Planning

"It is really amazing", said one Kosovar woman … "that the international community cared only about Kosovar women when they were being raped – and then only as some sort of exciting story. We see now that they really don"t give a damn about us. What we see here are men, men, men from Europe and America, and even Asia, listening to men, men, men from Kosovo. Sometimes they have to be politically correct so they include a woman on a committee or they add a paragraph to a report. But when it comes to real involvement in the planning for the future of this country, our men tell the foreign men to ignore our ideas. And they are happy to do so – under the notion of "cultural sensitivity." Why is it politically incorrect to ignore the concerns of Serbs or other minorities, but "culturally sensitive" to ignore the concerns of women?"

Source: Rehn and Sirleaf 2002:125.

---

[11] Sideris 2001a: 67; Kelly 2000: 62; Pankhurst and Pearce 1997

Such backlash experiences were experienced with bitterness by women active in liberation struggles, for example in Algeria, Eritrea, Mozambique, Vietnam, and Zimbabwe; where some of the women concerned had even risen to senior military ranks (Luciak this volume; Sørenson 1998:37). Ilja Luciak's chapter summarises some of the fates of women in the post-war contexts of Central America. In El Salvador considerable social animosity and pressure was brought to bear on women who had challenged gender roles during conflict and those who wanted to continue to do so afterwards. This led to many of them choosing to be much less politically active and take a less public role. Political scandals resulting from the exposure of sexual abuse committed by Ortega and other senior members of FSLN in Nicaragua, and Noriega in Guatemala, revealed the extensive social support that remained for condoning the sexual abuse of girl children and the social abuse of women. Furthermore the dramatic and horrific rise in murders of women in Guatemala is seen to continue with impunity. The chapter concludes with the view that much of the resistance to change faced by women is itself reinforced, if not caused, by a backlash against the struggles for greater equality between women and men.

The chapter by Dubravka Žarkov, Rada Drezgić, and Tanja Djurić-Kuzmanović also illustrates some aspects of this backlash phenomenon. The authors look at the reproductive rights of women and how these changed in the dramatically shifting political context of the break up of Yugoslavia and its consequent wars and post-war aftermaths. They highlight a particular feature of the post-war backlash in the region as being the reduction of women's rights to abortion, as compared with the pre-war situation. As these were wars in which mass rape was a key weapon of war, this constitutes a form of violence against women having to bear the consequences of giving birth to children conceived under such horrific circumstances. They also highlight other difficult features for women in the aftermath relating to employment and possibilities for political action.

A second major feature of post-war backlash is that of violence targeted at women, and sexual assault in particular, which often continue above the level of pre-conflict violence, and sometimes at a higher level than during war itself. Women may also be arrested (Jacobs and Howard 1987) and murdered (Luciak, this volume) in this inflamed context of anti-women discourse. After wars officially end, women continue to be raped by soldiers, policemen, former combatants (both strangers and partners) and even peacekeepers[12] – those whose responsibility it is to safeguard and protect

---

[12] Walsh, this volume, Kandiyoti, this volume; Rehn and Sirleaf 2002; Väyrynen, 2001

them in the "at peace" environment. They may be attacked at home, on the way to collect water, to work in the fields, in the urban workplace and when they go to the police station for help. In camps for refugees and the displaced, and in areas were livelihood systems have collapsed, they continue to be forced to sell sex as a means of economic survival. In addition, it is normal for domestic abuse to increase in the post-war setting, both from partners returning home from the war, and from partners who remained at home.[13] Even though men also suffer from high crime rates, as a group they are also the main perpetrators (Pearce 2006). Men also kill each other in such tense post-war moments, and sometimes do in very great numbers, but it is also striking that sometimes their violence against women reaches extraordinary peaks which exceed those against men, such as in Guatemala (see Luciak, this volume).

In this difficult post-war situation, the differences between women often reassert themselves, especially in countries where women are divided by a strong ethnic or regional identity (Žarkov et al., this volume). New divisions can occur as a result of the different experiences women have endured, or their different allegiances, during the war; for example, whether they were on the side of "victors", "perpetrators", or "collaborators", and whether they have given birth to children of "the enemy" after rape. Such issues can determine who qualifies for aid and other support (Turshen 1998:9), as can women's marital status, and whether or not they still live with their husbands, or are widowed, abandoned or divorced. Marital status is highly significant in situations where women do not have strong legal rights (such as in land and property titles or access to credit), and tensions also exist between women over whether or how their children survived the war. These types of difference and tension between women make it very difficult for them to articulate common needs and this difficulty adds to the silencing effect of the backlash against them. They are subject to violence and censure if they do not want to return to old ways of living. The consequent increase in divorce adds to the overall post-war context of heightened gender tensions (El Bushra 2004). In the face of such difficulties, many women prioritize the restoration of peaceful relationships with men, rather than continue to fight for greater rights themselves.[14]

---

[13] Cheywa, et al. 2004; Rehn and Sirleaf 2002; Sørenson 1998; Turshen 2001a: 84
[14] Luciak, this volume; Sørensen 1998: 39; El Bushra 2003

> **Domestic violence increases after war**
>
> "Recent research indicates that many combatants have difficulty making the transition to peacetime non-violent behaviour after returning home. In the United States in 2002, four Special Forces soldiers at Fort Bragg in North Carolina killed their wives within a period of six weeks. Three of the four had recently returned from overseas duty in Afghanistan, although some commentators believe it is not the experience of conflict but the culture of violence and masculinity that permeates military forces that causes soldiers to be violent in civilian life. Studies in Cambodia in the mid-1990s indicated that many women - as many as 75 per cent in one study - were victims of domestic violence, often at the hands of men who have kept the small arms and light weapons they used during the war."
>
> **Source: Rehn and Sirleaf, Women, War and Peace, UNIFEM, 2002.**

Meghna Guhathakurta's chapter looks at the case of the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh, where a conflict between indigenous people and the state resulted in a Peace Accord, drawing on her own research and experience. She uses a framework which draws out the continuities between what happened during the conflict and the nature of the accord and its aftermath. The chapter gives an insight into the ways in which violence against women that was very much part of the conflict continued after the Peace Accord, and the difficulties women face in seeking justice for such violence.

The explanations offered for this post-war backlash violence are varied and often rather conjectural, and are reviewed in the final chapter of this volume. The rest of this chapter reviews first the political, then the socio-economic policy contexts in which women attempt to improve their post-war situations.

Post-war political context for women

Some wars end in an atmosphere pervasive with the desire to build a new type of society, particularly where some kind of liberation struggle was fought and won (Sørenson 1998:41-2; Turshen 2002:891-2). Where gender issues were raised as part of the political agenda of the conflict (for example, in South Africa); or where the situation of women received a lot of attention during the conflict (for example, Afghanistan), there may be a greater potential for improving women's legal rights beyond the pre-war situation. Where many women gained sufficient confidence to articulate their needs during the conflict, they may be more effective campaigners and activists. Where the post-war period heralds a greater openness to learning from

similar circumstances in other countries, governments may see more clearly the efficacy of supporting women. If unprecedented amounts of international funding become available, as is often the case in poor countries following a conflict, there may be external pressure for policies that support women, and funds may be directly available to women's organizations.

If women are to benefit from such opportunities, it is important to identify the strategies to promote and the issues to be given priority. These are bound to vary. Post-war contexts pose confusing dilemmas about the extent to which they require special approaches, or merely represent normal challenges for social and economic development. Where considerable devastation has been wrought to production and communication, and where large numbers of people have fled their homes, for instance, the need for "exceptional" approaches to macro-policies for "recovery", "rehabilitation", and "reintegration" is commonly perceived. In the political arena, there may likewise be "exceptional" requirements: for example, for voter registration and the establishment of machinery to hold elections, and increasingly for some kind of exceptional judicial or "truth and reconciliation" process.

Such exceptional and urgent activities may receive new streams of international funding and be given high priority by all parties, to be conceived and implemented outside any normal planning process. And in the immediate post-war stage, these exercises are even more difficult to implement effectively than usual since the state, so recently contested, is politically weak and its apparatus damaged or barely intact. Weakened state capacity tends to lead to outcomes that are detrimental to women's interests, thus adding to the cards stacked against them. In the absence of an effective state, the exercises in question are largely controlled and determined from outside the country, as part of what has become known as the "peace industry" (Pankhurst and Pearce 1997).

Post-war administrations face the challenge of trying to (re)-build respect for human rights and for rights-based behaviour in the population at large, among former fighters, members of the security forces, and in the justice system. Despite significant improvements, women are still able to access fewer political rights than men in the post-war context, as in most others. Nurturing a human rights culture in the post-war context is complicated because all too often many of the perpetrators of human rights abuses during the war are still at large; they may even be members of the

government, the police or the armed forces. Even where perpetrators are prosecuted, these tend to be a relatively small number despite the necessary legal framework and evidence against suspects being available (Walsh this volume; Brownmiller 1975:31-2). Furthermore, attempts to (re)-establish the rule of law in post-war contexts have proved to be extremely difficult in most places, even where extraordinarily large sums of money are invested, as was the case in Latin America (Seider 2003). The most common focus in immediate post-war situations is on the behaviour of the state, whether in a new or a changed form, to ensure that military and police personnel no longer act outside the law through arbitrary arrest, detention and torture. This attracts plaudits from the international community, even though achieving real change can remain elusive for many years. All too often however the (re)-establishment of some degree of law and order merely means that men are not suffering such serious abuse at the hands of those holding power.

Until relatively recently, women's rights in the post-war context seem to have been breached almost with complete impunity. In contexts where transitional systems of justice are used as part of a process to re-build the rule of law, women's human rights are not given priority. For instance, the police tend to operate with a strong gender bias, even where post-war reform and political change means that men are no longer subject to arbitrary arrest and torture (Kandiyoti, this volume). It is not uncommon for there to be immense post-war social pressure on women not to report abuse by men, particularly if the men are members of key political movements, the government, or where there is a shortage of men available for marriage. Where rape was widespread during war, and is not effectively prosecuted afterwards, it is extremely difficult to bring prosecutions for rape in the post-war setting, an issue that remains as much of a problem as when it was highlighted over a decade ago in the UN. Children's rights have been taken more seriously over the last decade, with the plight of former child soldiers receiving a great deal more attention and increasing international support, but the focus still remains on boys' war experience rather than girls. Many experiences of girls, such as sexual abuse by peacekeeping forces in Mozambique (Nordstrum 1997: 15-19), remain hidden.

Martha Walsh's chapter is an extensive review of the ways in which the definition and prosecution of gender-based violence in conflict have developed over the last decade. In spite of this serious situation, legal advances at the international level have been much greater than anticipated and we now have a consistent body of international jurisprudence that has established and re-affirmed rape as a war crime,

a crime against humanity and an element of genocide. Much has also been learned about the actual processes required for women to access such justice frameworks in the post-war context, and Walsh particularly highlights the lessons learned from the International Criminal Court for Yugoslavia. The International Criminal Court now has a sophisticated framework which recognises lessons from the difficulties experienced by women in the past and she suggests that it is important to acknowledge this great, and largely unexpected success, but also to keep in mind that for many women the ability to access such justice requires support from their nation state and the "legal literacy" and knowledge of processes available to them.

This chapter is followed by a detailed review of a decade of work by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda by Binaifer Nowrojee. She describes the attempts and failures to prosecute gender-based violence in this setting and suggests that some lessons were learned from this experience in the post-conflict setting of Sierra Leone. Nonetheless the main thrust of her review is the very poor way in which women survivors were treated in the justice processes, and the low priority given by the court to the prosecution of such crimes. She highlights the importance of acknowledgement and justice to the women survivors and the way in which in some cases their attempts to give evidence actually resulted in personal and material suffering on their return home.

Post-war truth processes, reconciliation, and women's stories

The linking of "truth" and "reconciliation" has become common in post-war contexts over the last decade. The most common understanding of "reconciliation" is that it is about restoring good relationships and involves some level of forgiveness; but different people mean different things, some focusing on what happens to individuals, some on groups, and some on society as a whole (Pankhurst 1997). There is considerable international and national discussion about whether and how reconciliation might be possible (Bloomfield 2004), but there has been virtually no discussion about "gender reconciliation". Women are often expected to identify themselves with reconciliation and peace-building interventions, in the same way as the idea of women's inherent peacefulness may be co-opted or deployed to reduce hostilities during war-time (Pankhurst 2003). Some of these interventions could be interpreted as being about reconciliation between women and men.

The issue of amnesty and truth-telling remains controversial; where amnesty is offered in return for truth-telling, the sense of being deprived of justice has the

potential to provoke further violence. For this reason, when the El Salvadorian Truth Commission released its report, the government passed an amnesty law within a few days, fearing that the findings could fuel further conflict. In general, Truth Commissions do not have the power to prosecute, although some of them do grant amnesty; the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission for example, was empowered to grant amnesty to individual perpetrators in exchange for testimony if they could prove that their crimes were politically motivated. However, this can also create problems for anyone who would prefer a prosecution.

There have been 25 Truth Commissions in different parts of the world since 1974. Official Truth Commissions (TCs) take many different forms, seeking sometimes to find out information about "the disappeared", as in Argentina, Uganda and Sri Lanka; at other times to work towards "truth and justice" as in Haiti and Ecuador, or "truth and reconciliation" as in Chile, South Africa, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, East Timor and Peru. The box summarizes the most common characteristics and purposes of TCs, but these are very difficult to achieve and most do not achieve them.

Four main characteristics of Truth Commissions

- They focus on the past, and often on the recent past, but are not ongoing bodies such as human rights commissions.

- They investigate a pattern of abuse over a set period of time rather than a specific event. The mandate of Truth Commissions is time-bound, and specifies the types of abuse the Commission can look at.

- Truth Commissions are usually temporary bodies, operating over an average period of six months to two years at the end of which they submit a report. Sometimes their time period can be extended if necessary.

- They are officially sanctioned, authorized and empowered by the State; also sometimes by armed opposition groups as part of a peace negotiation; in theory, this allows them access to information, and should also ensure that their recommendations and findings are taken seriously.

Source: Hayner, Priscilla B. (2001) *Unspeakable truths. Confronting State Terror and Atrocity*, Routledge, London: 14

Six main purposes of Truth Commissions

- To clarify and acknowledge truth.

- To respond to the needs and interests of victims / survivors.

- To contribute to justice and accountability.

- To outline institutional responsibility and recommend reforms.

- To promote reconciliation and reduce tensions resulting from past violence.

- To meet the rights of victims / survivors and society to the truth.

Source: Hayner, op cit: 28-31

Truth Commissions can also be created by NGOs. When the government of Brazil refused to institute a formal enquiry into human rights abuses under Brazil's military regime, the Archbishop of Sao Paulo was assisted by the World Council of Churches

in his own investigation. The Catholic Church in Guatemala also established a truth process (REHMI 1999).

The most common abuses under-reported to Truth Commissions are those suffered by women, as indeed are those least prosecuted. Rashida Manjoo's chapter shows that in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), although women constituted the majority of witnesses for acts of violence committed against others, only a few initially spoke about acts of sexual violence committed against themselves. After prompting from women activists, the TRC tried to create an enabling environment where women could feel safe to speak out; but even then few could find the words or courage to speak publicly of sexual violation. Some women-only hearings were then held, which many women regarded as successful in addressing the problem (Goldblat and Meintjes 1998:29).

In her chapter, Alessandra Dal Secco analyses three cases of post-conflict Truth and Reconciliation Commissions which have tried to take women's concerns seriously; Peru, Sierra Leone and East Timor. In the first case, as also described by Boesten, the determination to identify crimes against women was rather narrowly defined and has left many women's experiences unacknowledged. In the other two cases the commitment to take such issues seriously was there from the beginning and greater advances were made. Nonetheless Dal Secco identifies the risks in such approaches leading to definitions of women's war experiences being limited to sexual crimes and specifically rape.

Jelke Boesten's chapter focuses on the post-war processes in Peru and how they affect women who experienced sexual violence during the conflict between Shining Path guerrillas and government forces. A national Truth and Reconciliation Commission in this case did not have the power to prosecute or give immunity but was able, due to the diligence of particular individuals, to investigate the experiences of women who had survived such violence. The analysis shows once again that it is very difficult to get testimonies from women survivors, and that the precise definition of the crime dramatically affected the process of collecting evidence. Sexual violence against women did not even feature amongst the testimonies of some communities asked to talk about human rights abuses, even though it was very widespread. One particular aspect of the post-war context here is the social practice of women and their parents petitioning rapists to promise to marry their victims. Until 1997 rapists who married their victims were exempt from prosecution, as they still are in a number

of other Latin American countries, and there is still a strong social understanding that this act cancels out previous acts of sexual violence, depriving such women even of having the violence fully recorded, let alone having the right to prosecute.

The ideal of a gender-aware truth process is not only to avoid omitting the particular sufferings of women, but also to integrate into the conflict narrative their experiences as fighters, survivors of attack and torture, household managers and community leaders. To release such stories may require a different kind of truth process than a national commission. For example, in 2000 women's groups in Japan and neighbouring countries came together to hold a War Crimes Tribunal to look at the issue of sexual slavery by the Japanese army during the war (Walsh, this volume). Set up by women's groups, this Tribunal had no official status; but even though more than half a century had passed since they experienced being sexually abused, the women who came forward to testify felt keenly the need for public acknowledgement of what they had lived through. While reluctant to accept culpability, the Japanese government did eventually acknowledge the issue of sexual slavery, which had earlier been denied; however, the women's demand for compensation from the State was denied. A few women accepted compensation from a special private fund, but many refused; it was important to them that the Japanese State itself make reparations.

"Traditional" conflict resolution processes

In Africa, people are increasingly turning to local processes as a means of coming to terms with what happened during conflict. This coincides with a growing fashion among donors for promoting so-called "traditional" methods of conflict resolution (ending of organized violence) and post-conflict mediation and reconciliation. Significant funds are being applied to these processes, with multiple objectives and considerable confusion about whether justice, truth processes and/or reconciliation are being sought. These mechanisms include rituals, and transfers of property and labour (individual and collective), intended to achieve a range of outcomes including retribution, compensation, forgiveness, and building of trust. Some of these systems are in regular use; others are being resurrected from the memories of elderly people and re-invented; yet others are actually being invented from scratch. These activities may co-exist in the same country – even in the same communities; but they are increasingly being packaged under the rubric of peace-building, not least in order to access funding from international donors (Pankhurst 2002, 2003).

These processes tend to reflect highly gendered local political and power relations, and by no means belong to some value-free traditional culture. They are occurring at the same time as "retraditionalisation" in some African countries which is usually geared towards limiting women's rights (Turshen 2001a:80). Women are normally marginalized in practice and their needs not given any priority. Some even have cultural roots in such practices as exchanging women as wives between different groups by way of compensation and repairing community relations, as in Afghanistan (Kandiyoti, this volume). In post-war contexts, the revival of "traditional" practice can form part of the backlash process of putting women back "in their place". On the other hand, where gender awareness is incorporated, it can be used to help build a new society. A notable example of this is the use of *Gacaca* in Rwanda. The Rwandan government revived an old system of dispute-resolution that had largely fallen into disuse, to assist with hearing genocide cases. *Gacaca*, in its new form, has incorporated important roles for women. Amongst many other fundamental changes is the participation of women as judges; although it is too early to evaluate what difference this might make to the outcomes.

Civil and political participation

Where there is a perception that women "earned" new rights because of the roles they played during war-time, there may be a new awareness in the post-war environment of what women can contribute politically, and of the moral imperative to let this happen. The chances of such perceptions influencing political structures are greater where there is a conscious attempt to build a "new" society after a "liberation".[15] It is less likely when the post-war context is dominated by a political ideology that does not recognize women's contribution or potential for public life.[16] In Kashmir, northern India, for example, it is unlikely that women will anticipate a moment of liberation. There, years of syncretism and a healthy mix of Islamic, Hindu and Sufi traditions had ensured a liberal space for women in society. With the deepening of the conflict and the growing hold of fundamentalism among insurgents, the imposition of restrictions on women has forced them to submit to rigid patriarchal mores (Butalia 2001). Even in deeply conservative environments such as Kashmir or Somalia, however, there can also be recognition during war-time of the ways women exercise old forms of influence-as-power. In private, they may guide men's decisions; they may perform in public as singers or poets; they may give direction as elders or leaders in cultural activities; or act as informal negotiators whilst visiting kin or

---

[15] For example Nicaragua 1980s; Southern Africa in the 1970s and 1980s; South Africa in 1990s;
[16] Walsh, this volume; Kandiyoti, this volume; Sørensen, 1998

engaging in trade. From such gradual accretions of responsibility, the opportunity may emerge for basic legal and political rights to be developed in a post-war setting.

In the post-war situation, new constitutions and laws with radical provisions can come speedily into being; even though they initially exist only on paper, they may well be more progressive than if there had been no war or upheaval. For example, after the war of liberation in Zimbabwe, women's legal status was much improved. In Namibia women were given clear rights in the constitution, as they were in Eritrea. The establishment of formal legal rights for women is, however, only one step towards their being able to exercise them. In post-conflict settings, particularly where war has been prolonged, illiteracy is widespread and access to the law may be confined to a handful of the elite. So even if the population is aware of women's new rights they cannot easily be realized.[17] Moreover, the existence of such political rights does not protect women from the "backlash" described earlier.

Even where the political and legal apparatus is in place to allow women to take part in political life, their level of political participation tends to remain lower than men's. They may be discouraged by the educational requirements for voter registration, or the long distance needed to travel in order to vote, as shown in a number of elections. Practical or cultural constraints, or family and community pressure, can bar women from exercising their right to vote, or to stand for elections. Similarly, attempts to encourage civil society organizations to participate in public debate, or consult with government, may marginalize the views of women if they are dominated by men. Special activities to involve women may still be required, and may not be put in place even though they have long been proposed at international level (EC 1995).

Ilija Luciak's chapter looks at three countries in their Central American setting: El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua, and focuses on the efforts that women have made, both within their own countries and across this region, to take forward the political issues of the post-war context. In these countries a good number of women joined guerrilla struggles because they believed that this would help to bring social justice, and their presence also gave prominence to women's rights within that framework. Many other women were forced, or chose, to take on what he calls "counter-traditional roles" during wars. The expectation of social change at the point of a peace settlement was therefore very high.

---

[17] see Batezat, 1988 on Zimbabwe, Bentley 2004 on South Africa

The chapter evaluates the political strategies used by women's groups in the three countries. In El Salvador, the difficulties of building alliances and making tactical priorities around elections led to a reduction in the number of women elected after some initial success. In Nicaragua there was a greater success of getting women elected under the FSLN but this did not automatically lead to women's issues being taken more seriously, which only happened after the Sandinistas lost power and the women's movement developed more autonomously. The chapter then illustrates some of the common frustrations with having quotas for women candidates through what happened in Nicaragua. By the time of Guatemala's peace accord, coming last in 1996, women's groups had been successful in getting gender issues actually written into the accord, which had not been possible in the other two cases. That however was only the first step and many of them have still not been implemented.

The issue of how to increase women's representation in politics remains challenging. The Beijing Platform for Action called for a 30 per cent minimum representation of women in decision-making bodies; UN Security Council Resolution 1325 urges the appointment of women in peace processes and subsequent political structures. There have been some striking successes in using these international frameworks to increase the representation of women. In post-war settings in particular there are sometimes opportunities for pushing forward reforms and innovative approaches, where there is a coincidence between the desires of international donors and local women's groups.

Where women have gained stronger political voice through the experience of conflict, they may be able to leapfrog stages that elsewhere remain protracted. For instance in South Africa, the majority of ANC leaders at the transition to democracy were men, even though gender equality was much discussed. Women fought for representation and succeeded, with the result that the first parliament of the Government of National Unity was made up of 15 per cent women in the Senate and 24 per cent in the National Assembly (Sørenson 1998). Similarly in Eritrea, the government ensured that the post-war administrative system involved women; it was agreed that women would have a 30 per cent quota in regional and sub-regional councils and could contest any of the remaining 70 per cent of posts (Sørenson 1998). Even in Afghanistan, the Constitutional Loya Jirga ensured that at least 19 per cent of the 500 seats went to women, who actually gained 20 per cent, as described by Deniz Kandiyoti in this volume.

Sometimes measures to assist women's representation have been introduced post-war that would not be implemented in donor countries promoting this agenda (Rehn and Sirleaf 2002:81). For instance, the UK government supported the reservation of seats for women in local and national government structures in Uganda at the same time that the use of women's quotas for political parties was deemed illegal in the UK (Tamale 1999). Many such issues are felt across the world as women try to increase their engagement in formal politics, but in post-war societies where the conditions are ripe, change can happen at an unprecedented rate. Rwanda offers a very striking example. Here, elections to the national assembly in 2003 delivered 49 per cent of the seats to women, a higher proportion than in any OECD country. This does not indicate a Rwandese revolution in gender relations, but rather reflects the high proportion of women among genocide survivors. Nonetheless this massive change was by no means demographically inevitable, and will have consequences for political life in Rwanda that are as yet to early to judge.

Macro-economic and macro-social policies: implications for women
Macro-level policies for the post-war context tend to ignore what women are trying to do, unless they are intended to stop them doing it. For instance, many women continue with war-time economic strategies involving small-scale trade in the informal economy; such strategies tend to be ignored as being unsustainable or unimportant, rather than being evaluated as providing an important service, let alone the potential for successful business growth. In Mozambique, to take a case in point, the post-war government set up restrictions on the informal "grassroots economy", on which women had come to depend (Chingono 2001:116). Similarly women also often attempt to re-build primary education and primary health care services themselves as state services collapse; but these are not generally built on after war, but pushed aside in favour of bringing in qualified professionals, who tend to be men (Sørensen 1998).

Policy initiatives at the macro level need to build gender analysis into peace-building policy processes, alongside "special" policies specifically geared towards women; this has been accepted as appropriate by key international organizations for some time (EC 1996; UN 1995:para 141). At its simplest, a gender-aware approach requires applying the question: "Does this policy affect women and men differently?" If the answer is in the affirmative, then policy-makers need to explore what can be done to prevent or correct women's disadvantage (Elson 1998). Posing this question should lead in some cases to a complete re-think in the way a policy is developed and implemented; in others, relatively minor adjustments would be required. In post-

war emergency situations in poor countries, it may be difficult to apply a gender-aware approach. Not only are resources scarce, and infrastructure weak, but new governments are often constrained in their spending by the conditions of World Bank structural adjustment and bilateral loans, which place strict limitations on budgetary expenditure. A growing lobby supported by some eminent economists argues that such conditions ought to be loosened in post-war economies, since they severely undermine the chances of economic recovery. The needs of women and other vulnerable groups should be given a higher priority than macro-economic probity (Stewart and Fitzgerald 2001:240).

If there is political willingness to take the gender implications of policy seriously, the analytical tools already exist to undertake the necessary data collection, analysis, monitoring and evaluation. In some post-war environments, as was the case in Uganda after 1986, the political will to do this may be strong. Where such opportunities occur, it might be possible to develop some elements of a top-down gender-aware approach to a range of policies. It has now become usual in post-war circumstances to attempt a bottom-up approach of at least some support for women's organizations as the most obvious way to support women. International links between women's organizations have been expanded in recent years and are greatly facilitated by the IT revolution.

Such a positive political environment cannot by any means be guaranteed; indeed, in the atmosphere of backlash already described, the political will for changing gender relations may be completely absent, or at best ambivalent. For various reasons, women themselves may not be in a position to press for positive change. Deniz Kandiyoti's chapter shows how external donors have misunderstood the local cultures in Afghanistan, assuming that so-called traditions which oppress women are timeless when in fact they have a history of being contested and varying in intensity. In spite of a strong international commitment to improve the situation of women in the post-war context, women have a very difficult time in trying to fight poverty and protect their livelihoods while also being subject to violence from men, including those in official positions.

Nonetheless, the contrasting political post-war contexts mean that opportunities can arise. Some general economic and social policies have more acute implications for women than others and significant change could be supported by focusing on a few key areas. Specific contexts determine both what is possible and what ought to be

prioritized. For example, where the majority of the surviving population relies on agriculture as the main source of livelihood, land reform is often key. Where levels of urbanization and education are higher, employment issues are of far greater significance. In all contexts however, it is normal at the end of war to find women dominating the most marginalized sections of society. They are the returnees with access to the fewest resources, the ex-combatants who tend to be overlooked, the heads of household with least support. Women tend to predominate in the most stigmatized and disadvantaged groups: rape survivors, orphans, disabled people and widows (who may constitute up to 30 per cent of a post-war population [Sørensen 1998:38]). They generally tend to be the least well-trained and educated, whether in urban or rural areas, and have specific health needs that are overlooked.

Agriculture and land reform

Agricultural economies, where the majority of the population still mainly depends on cultivation and raising of livestock for their food supply, are normally characterized by a strong gender bias in favour of men. Women typically receive less of the income generated from their labour, and have less access to other people's labour and less control over their own, than men. Meanwhile, men are often accused of "wasting" farm incomes in times of social change, and particularly during conflict. As a result, many women seek opportunities to sell their labour to others for very poor returns, sometimes in secret, to guarantee some minimum resources for household needs (UNIFEM 2001; Sørenson 1998:20). In places where women are unable to get access to sufficient land to farm, as in Rwanda, Cambodia, Zimbabwe, and Sri Lanka, they hire themselves out as casual workers (Sørenson 1998:19).

During periods of violent conflict, agriculture becomes important as a source of food, even for people whose livelihoods were previously non-agrarian. Where men are away fighting, or are injured or dead, women often take up the burden of agricultural production even where they did not do this previously. War also disrupts established systems of land tenure. Men take land by force as social regulation breaks down and people move away from their homes into new areas. Landmines restrict the use of fields and grazing land, putting great pressure on the remaining accessible areas. Soldiers use land for camps, often killing wildlife and stripping vegetation and soil. Traders and soldiers negotiate tenure deals with local leaders for mining or natural resource extraction, as in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and even buy and sell land.

All this may take place without reference to local custom or law relating to ownership and use of land, which leaves a confused post-war land rights legacy. This happened in Mozambique, even though existing communal land tenure arrangements made the sale of land illegal (UNIFEM 2001:45-53). It is rare to find that there is agreement, let alone a written record, of land transactions during the war; nor a clear understanding as to who the rights should pass to in the event of the landholder's death. Previously accepted land tenure systems break down or become superseded because of new land shortages, the absence or removal of local leaders, and the collapse of local government institutions.

The more severe the land shortage, the more the pressure on women's rights. In many places women may be the majority of post-war adult survivors in the countryside, and there may also be many women-only households, as in Mozambique, desperate for land to grow food (Chingono 2001:95). Nonetheless, discriminatory legal practices, or entrenched social attitudes can still prevent them from taking possession of family lands.[18] In Rwanda, many men were killed during the genocide; but women were barred from claiming lands through inheritance under customary law, even though under the constitution they have the legal right to inherit. Some revisions were made to inheritance laws to try to address this problem, but these still do not provide women with secure tenure (UNIFEM 2001:38-44).

Many other examples can be cited to reinforce a picture of women's rights or access to land gained during conflict receding in the post-conflict period. The United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia found that many disputes arose over ownership of land at the village level, while the simultaneous breakdown of traditional systems of conflict resolution meant that women and children found themselves at the receiving end of heightened levels of violence (Curtis 1998). In post-war Eritrea, men protested against women having access to land even though the majority of households were probably headed by women. While in exile, Guatemalan refugees had given women a voice in political structures; on returning home, when women tried to claim equal rights to land, they were attacked by local people for having "overstepped the acceptable limits ... prescribed for women" (UNIFEM 2001:58-62).

---

[18] Meitjes et al 2001:16; Turshen 2001b:62-3; Cockburn 2001:26

At the end of a conflict, there is often pressure to "sort out" land tenure and land use from several directions. Land and agrarian reform may be seen as a means of speeding up the process of recovery and "normalization" – part of a modernization agenda that takes on a keener urgency in the post-war context. Many countries emerging from conflict in the last decade have predominantly agrarian economies; systems of land tenure are seen as central to recovery. The World Bank identifies certain types of land reform with a "market friendly environment", particularly in Africa, and promotes this model in post-conflict contexts. Land reform also figures as part of peace deals because land is often an issue in the conflict itself, even in wars that appear to be primarily about other issues (as in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Zimbabwe and Namibia). The nature of the land reform contained in the agreement reflects the view of what the post-conflict society should consist of and the future role of agriculture within it. It may involve negotiations with international donors expected to underwrite its costs, who are often themselves highly influential in determining the outcomes.

The land reform promoted by international lending organizations is almost universally in favour of privatized, individual land tenure arrangements. The outcome of land reforms with this principle at their core has universally been that women emerge with rights no stronger than previously, and frequently find them drastically reduced (Davison 1998). There are a few exceptions where an effort has been made to correct this imbalance – as in El Salvador – by building on existing, more flexible approaches which had more capacity to protect women's land rights; but in the post-war context none of these lessons are typically brought on board. Planners tend to ignore the fact that many men who have been fighting have not been farming for a long time, and those who joined military forces as boys have barely any farming skills at all. By contrast, women have been planning and managing scarce resources under difficult conditions, and are often better informed about the particular local ecological conditions and trading opportunities.

Where there is an attempt to codify and modernize previous systems of land use, there is a tendency to overlook the ways in which women accessed rights as daughters, aunts, wives, widows and mothers, and even as independent women where they are able to negotiate with local leaders, even if their access was typically more limited than that of men. New land titles tend to be granted almost exclusively to men (UNIFEM 2001; Davison 1998), and even where there is no legal impediment to women purchasing such rights, and women have the resources to do so, men in their families

and communities may actively discourage them from taking them up, as in Guatemala (UNIFEM 2001:63).

Even where women have some access in their own right, this is usually less secure than men's and often dependent on their marital status. There may also be a conscious prejudice on the part of planners involved in land allocations and titles, who may characterize rural women as poorly educated, more "backward" than men, and therefore not as able to take advantage of land reform opportunities. Inequalities are compounded by the fact that post-war rehabilitation of agriculture (usually involving the distribution of seeds, tools and livestock) is usually organized on a per household basis in which the man is always the head, even where it is clear that women's agricultural production is important for food security and small-scale business (Sørenson 1998:20; Chingono 1996).

Undermining women's land rights, and marginalizing them in agrarian reform is not likely to improve food security where women retain the main responsibility for meeting household food needs, especially where conflict has left them heads of households. Thus in post-war settings, the standard approach to land reform reinforces the likelihood of food insecurity. Land and agrarian reform can, on the other hand, be used to support women's post-war roles. The political significance of land reform and the strong donor influence in post-war situations ought to present positive opportunities; international donors have at their disposal many reports that highlight the potential dangers of undermining women's land rights and the advantages of supporting them. If the political context is one where it is widely acknowledged that women played key roles during the conflict as farmers, and as managers of household resources, donors could be reasonably expected to highlight the advantages of their continuing to do so, although they rarely do.

Women Losing Land: Post-War Land Reform in Africa and Latin America

MOZAMBIQUE from 1997: Women's relatively secure access to land under customary law was eroded by the social disruption of war. In the increasingly market-based economy women are more disadvantaged than men. The government encouraged people to "go back to the land", but with competition over the best land, the new political and business elites made claims on huge tracts of land, putting extra stress on smallholders. Women went back to farming food out of necessity, but have great difficulty inheriting land, even in matrilineal parts of the country, where control is still vested in men. The 1997 law stipulates that women have equal rights to men, but implementation is weak and long-standing local practices often work against women (UNIFEM 2001:45-53).

EL SALVADOR 1980-1992 need for land in El Salvador was ignored in post-war agreements, despite the efforts of women activists in the FMLN (Argueta, 1996, cited in Luciak, this volume). Subsequent reintegration programmes introduced a gender perspective and improved the situation for women, particularly ex-combatants. However, policy guidelines were subverted by local officials, denying women access to land. Land was allocated on a household basis with the title vested in the male household head; where women were assigned some land in their own right, it tended to be of poor quality. Extra requirements for receiving land included the ability to read and write as well as the possession of documentation such as birth certificates and voter registration cards. Women were among those unable to fulfil such requirements (Luciak this volume; Cockburn 2004:40).

GUATEMALA 1990s: Women had a say in the peace agreements which facilitated legislation promoting land rights for women returnees and ex-combatants, at least on paper. Nevertheless, the objectives set up in the Guatemalan Peace Accords were not backed up by clear guidelines for implementation (Luciak this volume; Cockburn 2004:40). Consequently, many women were not able to exercise their rights because of "traditional male structures" (UNIFEM 2001:66).

NICARAGUA 1990s: Deals were struck between Sandinistas and Contras over land that specifically excluded women's land ownership (Pankhurst and Pearce 1998:161).

Urban employment

The post-war context provides an opportunity for states to consider employment strategies afresh, rather than merely seeking to recover the pre-war situation and "reintegrate" returnees into a shattered economy. This is particularly important where towns and cities did not offer sufficient job opportunities before the war. Where wars are fought in the countryside, people tend to flee to urban areas, even while formal employment is severely constrained because of the disruptions of war. The public sector often collapses, creating problems similar to those in countries suffering retrenchment under public sector reforms. The private commercial sector also experiences difficulties due to the destruction of infrastructure, including transport, communications, currency controls, security, and other services (Stewart and Fitzgerald 2001).

As recovery takes place, a prolonged shortage of male workers (due to death or absence) may lead to women taking up key positions and becoming a significant part of the workforce. However, this is unusual; the norm is for returning men to take up the best employment opportunities – for which on average they have better education and training (Sørensen 1998). Cultural arguments about women's roles are often used to prevent them trying to enter the formal sector. In some cases women's legal rights of access to employment may actually be curtailed by the state in the post-war context (Kelly 2000:62). An ILO document confirmed that in Namibia, some 60 per cent of women remained unemployed even two years after they had returned to the country (Sørensen 1998).

Women ex-combatants, even where they have held very responsible positions during war, as in Eritrea, frequently find it harder than men to make a life in their rural homes and seek a living in town (Sørensen 1998:26). In the context of a backlash, they are particular targets for censure and may find getting work very difficult indeed. Cultural constraints or newly coined political versions of them also keep women away from employment. The lack of adequate childcare can also be an obstacle to taking up jobs, as female ex-combatants in Eritrea found (Sørensen 1998).

The informal economy

For women and men, earning in the aftermath of war often means relying on the informal economy. Women's peace-time employment is predominantly in the informal economy anyway, based on trade in vegetables from the countryside, cooked food,

beer, scarce goods from long-distance trade, and handicrafts. These goods offer relatively quick returns for small investment and do not require access to land. In war-ravaged societies where formal trade has not yet recovered – if it had ever developed – these activities may be keeping society provisioned. Women entrepreneurs are often able to meet local urban demands for cheap food which governments cannot provide.

In Somalia, for example, women have taken over men's traditional roles and sold livestock; in Mozambique, they took to marketing fruit, fish and vegetables, and beer. In many countries women take on long-distance and cross-border trade, as in Chad, Eritrea, and Sierra Leone (Sørensen 1998:20,22). A survey of Somali refugees carried out by UNHCR in 1994 notes that in the absence of men, women have become increasingly involved in economic activity, and have acquired a virtual monopoly of the barter trade in food, clothing and a number of other items (UNHCR 1994). Yet none of these trading and retailing activities tend to be supported by post-war governments.

As part of the post-war backlash against women, their retailing can actually be curtailed. Successful women may be socially castigated, their entrepreneurial activities treated as undesirable and even declared illegal. In Zimbabwe, women have created informal trade networks that span several countries in an attempt to supplement family incomes. However, this transgressing of social boundaries has resulted in their being branded as prostitutes and harassed at international borders (Cheater and Gaidzanwa 1996:191). As they have become more successful economically, male-dominated state institutions have brought in regulations to undermine them. An alternative approach would be to investigate such activities and identify ways to support their development: many women's businesses fail due to insufficient capital and skills in business management. Relief and development organizations increasingly seek to work with women in the post-war context and are also able to offer sources of income – either as direct employment or to support women's organizations. In the post-war countries of former Yugoslavia, women were very effective at coming together to establish new organizations so as to take advantage of this opportunity.

The last resort for women without other gainful employment is often prostitution. In post-war contexts formal and informal selling of sex flourishes, particularly where there is an international market, such as from international peacekeepers (Bedont 2005) and

international tourism (Sørenson 1998:24). Post-war countries may see very fast growth in the numbers of women involved, due to their lack of other opportunities, the presence of foreign, therefore moneyed, clients, and the degree of dislocation in social relationships. The dilemmas faced by post-war authorities in managing prostitution are therefore even more complex than usual. The most effective strategy for limiting the numbers of women involved would be to support their alternative endeavours in small-scale production and trade, through the provision of training and small loans, and to ensure that they are included in general opportunities for training and education appropriate for formal sector employment. This plea has featured in major reports for many years, but there are still many women finding that they have little choice but to risk their lives in this way. Even those who are lucky enough to undergo training or education have to find ways to eat in the meantime (Rehn and Sirleaf 2002).

Health, welfare and education

At the end of most wars, health services are very run-down and may even have collapsed entirely. Even where there have been valiant attempts to keep some kind of health provision going for children, that for adult civilians has usually been completely undermined. High morbidity and morality levels in a population from avoidable disease constitutes a serious development cost (Stewart and Fitzgerald 2001:236); however, expenditure on health has not yet been recognized by lending agencies as a high priority in considering the mechanisms for post-conflict reconstruction. Leading economists have called for public entitlements to health and education to be sustained during and after wars, particularly as primary health and education only take a fraction of social expenditure (Stewart and Fitzgerald 2001:237).

Virtually every report on women and conflict highlights the need for health programmes to be specifically geared towards women, including ex-combatants, as a pre-condition for social recovery. Nonetheless neglect of women's health needs during pregnancy, childbirth, and for rape injuries tends to be common, and this neglect has a multiplier effect on their difficulties in meeting the needs of dependants and other community members, as well as undermining their ability to participate in public life. Instead, women are subject to gender bias against their interests in the ways that many health and welfare policies work during "normal" times (Rehn and Sirleaf 2002:31-46). Injured women may not be able to access even the most basic elements of community support where they are stigmatized as a result of surviving their assaults, and/or being pregnant, and/or having HIV. It is still common for women (and child, especially girl) ex-

combatants to be relatively marginalized, if not completely neglected in such programmes (Farr 2003), in spite of this having been highlighted for nearly a decade.

One of the most challenging areas in post-war healthcare is the need to address psycho-social trauma. Alcoholism, anxiety, violent and aggressive behaviour, even suicide, are common as a result of war-time experiences and difficulty in coming to terms with the post-war situation. Trauma counselling receives insufficient attention, and where resources are available, may be poorly designed. Research suggests that the employment of western medical approaches to treat such problems, by focussing on the individual, are not appropriate for all cultural contexts. In many predominantly rural societies the ways in which people experience trauma not as isolated individuals, but within a socially constructed context; mean that support has to take this into account, if not actually be provided through social relationships. Awareness is growing that culturally specific healing processes can be more effective in such societies (Sørensen, 1998:34). Where women have roles in the rituals and practices associated with such healing, they could be given support.

Perhaps surprisingly, education is often seen by survivors of wars as a key part of recovery. This is partly because of a need to "return to normal", but also because people recognize that for children, and even adults, education can play an important role in conflict prevention. Women often attempt to re-establish primary education themselves during and after wars, rather than wait for the state to do it. In spite of having this high priority in people's minds, government spending on education is restricted by the same budgetary constraints as health and so rarely meets people's expectations.

In many countries, girls participate in education to a lesser degree than boys. Although this can be reversed during wars when boys may be away from home, the process of rehabilitating educational provision usually finds the proportion swing back again once boys return (Stewart et al. 2001:103). There are many ways in which unequal access to education reinforces gender inequalities and this is therefore a useful point of intervention to foster future positive change. The education of girls and women is vital if women are ever going to be able to participate effectively in peace negotiations, post-war planning and public life. Even where women are included in peace negotiations, they are at a strong disadvantage where they do not even have primary education while most other key players have been at least to secondary school.

Where peace education is taken seriously as part of the new curriculum, this frees women from what might be seen as a private responsibility (that of educating their children for peace) and makes of it a public activity in which men can also play a part. Where peace education also contains explorations of gender issues, this can have a long-term impact on the overall transformation of gender relations in ways connected and unconnected to war.

Conclusion

For more than a decade, the UN has proclaimed that women's needs deserve greater attention in the post-war context. Yet the problems, rights abuses and programme shortcomings documented in many old reports remain commonplace.[19] The plight of women during war, particularly the scale of their sexual violation, has attracted international attention, and is often used to characterize the barbarism of mankind or brutality of particular "enemy" groups. Women's roles in working to end conflicts are increasingly celebrated – even if other roles are downplayed. As a consequence, women participants in post-war peace-building have been thrust into unprecedented prominence by certain international organizations. Yet for all this visibility, women usually remain marginal, as a group or as individuals, in peace negotiations, in consultations about post-war strategies, and in the public life of post-war societies.

The persistent reluctance of many analysts and advisers to take on board lessons about gender analysis and its incorporation into policy processes in the post-war setting needs to be recorded, and further effort is needed to overcome this thoughtless, or deliberate, resistance. This can itself be seen as part of the backlash against women, helping to allow, if not facilitate, the playing out of intense gender politics in households, communities and the wider world. Feminist histories of conflicts, and feminist studies of development, provide a rich store of relevant experiences, both positive and negative. These have been collated and analysed for several years and comprise a significant literature; but they are still not taken sufficiently seriously by many of the key international actors in the context of post-war activity.

---

[19] For instance, see UN, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998

In the future it is to be hoped that international agencies and donors will be better prepared to take opportunities to put these lessons about how to mitigate injustices for women centre-stage when advising and supporting post-war recovery programmes – in political, governance, economic and social spheres alike. As more successes are achieved, it is also to be hoped that post-war governments will more readily see the advantages in developing polices that not only support women's efforts to survive, but enable them to fulfil their potential in helping rebuild their societies closer to the image of gender equality and to move further away from a "gendered peace".

PART II

POST-WAR BACKLASH VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN:
WHAT CAN 'MASCULINITY' EXPLAIN?

The chapters in this volume have illustrated that women often face common challenges in a wide range of locations emerging from war and violent conflict. In seeking justice for crimes committed against them during and after wars; in engaging with "truth and reconciliation" endeavours, and in attempting to re-build their lives they are often faced with the forces of constraint, if not attack, from men, from society and from the state.[20] In this final chapter I re-visit the phenomenon of the "post-war backlash", and its particular components of violence against women and restrictions on attempts to re-build their lives. Whilst the backlash phenomenon is commonly noted, it is rare for explanations to be offered. I then go on to consider such explanations as there are, and in particular consider the concept of masculinity and assess its potential explanatory power for post-war violence against women.

The concept of a backlash has been used in feminist writings for a long time as being integral to political processes: after women make political and socio-economic gains, at some point a backlash against these gains becomes likely, if not inevitable.[21] What is perhaps particular to a post-war backlash is the speed and dramatic force with which it can come. It often comes after periods of social change along with distressing and traumatic experiences for most people, but which happen just at the moment when everyone expects life to be improving. Of course, wars do not tend to suddenly stop even where there is an effective ceasefire, but for men there is usually quite quickly a change in levels of violence, particularly for combatants. For women by contrast there is sometimes a continuity of difficulties they faced during war, leading some observers to say there is no distinct aftermath to wars for women (Meintjes et al. 2001b:3), and this can also be combined with new forms of violence which together constitute a backlash against women, as described in Chapter One.

Violence against women often persists, or even increases beyond, pre-war levels and sometimes even beyond war-time levels. Rises in domestic violence are

---

[20] Women's violence has to some extent been hidden in non-war society (Segal, 1990: 260) and in conflict (Jacobs et al. 2000; Moser and Clark 2001; Turshen and Twagiramariya 1998). Nonetheless no one is arguing that it is not the case that men commit the bulk of violence and that violence from men to women far outweighs that in the other direction.
[21] For example, 'Change is never smooth, uniform, or free from contradiction and backlash' (Segal 1990:272; Segal 1999:117)

common, along with sexual violence in the locality, perpetuated by not only young men who are ex-combatants and gang members, for instance, but also employees of the local state, such as the police, and other young men, often with access to cheap guns,[22] which leads one commentator to remark:

> The overwhelming pervasiveness of violence against women points to collusion among societal forces that could well be described as a conspiracy to maintain the low status of women in society in order to lessen the perceived threat that one can only assume women must pose to men economically, socially, politically (Pillay 2001:43).

In this atmosphere, not surprisingly, it is difficult for women to hold men to account for human rights abuses committed against them during war. Sometimes processes make this difficult for women through "benign neglect" (Dal Secco, this volume; Manjoo, this volume), but in others it appears more deliberate (Nowrojee, this volume), where such activities are explicitly seen as unimportant. In this context many women seek reconciliation with men on terms that require them to give up socio-economic or political gains, as well as the pursuit of justice, for the sake of negotiating a manageable life (Luciak, this volume; El Bushra 2000).

The backlash phenomenon is mentioned in numerous reports and published works which are concerned with women or are written by feminists and even without an extreme backlash, there are sufficient examples documented for us to know that post-war issues will be different for women and men such as: voter registration, political party nomination, giving evidence in court, seeking employment, education, travel, for instance. Knowing that these challenges, and a political backlash, are likely in a post-war context means that allies of women need to promote special, targeted interventions to ameliorate these inequalities and injustices, but the phenomenon still tends to be ignored in policy circles. Such targeted approaches might in future coincide with imperatives for efficiency in supporting reconstruction efforts[23] but to date implementation of such measures is very slow indeed.[24]

Analytically it is challenging to consider which particular factors determine the nature (or even existence) of such a backlash. The following are probably key factors: the duration of conflict; type of warfare and military force; the degree and types of

---

[22] Kandiyoti, this volume; Cockburn 2001:18. Leave aside here the violence committed by UN peacekeepers, who are by definition coming from outside the community (Bedont 2005; Väyrynen, 2001)
[23] Bouta et al 2005 reviews gender, conflict and development with the World Bank's concerns in mind.
[24] See IRIN 2004 for many examples

violence; the degree and type of social change, including the extent of the participation of women in armed combat; the political agenda of government; the nature of involvement of the international community, and, perhaps crucially, what was socially "normal" in pre-war society with regard to gender relations. Yet there is no obvious pattern about what factors determine the timing or shape of a backlash, even women's rights and freedoms in pre-war society, and we do not share an understanding of why men behave differently towards women after wars, or why women are so often unable to resist (Meintjes et al. 2001). Perhaps future research will shed more light on this. It is certainly difficult to seek overarching explanations for something which is not uniformly expressed - in some countries the backlash appears very obviously and dramatically, and is accompanied by violence. In others it is more subtle, and there is a complex rather than obvious connection between what is done at the level of the state and what women experience in the workplace, street and household.[25]

Nonetheless it is not uncommon for people to conclude accounts such as those in this volume by calling for changes in the way women and men are socialised, as they see the root cause of problems for women in the aftermath or backlash as being something to do with the way "the construction of masculinity" takes place (for example Pillay 2001:41). This is also true of some writers within the development field who identify masculinity and gender relations as the root causes of gender inequalities in development.[26] The term "masculinity" is used with increasing frequency in the conflict / post-conflict literature and generally refers to prevailing cultural and social norms about men's behaviour. "Masculinity" has a simple explanatory appeal as being something to do with men, as distinct from women. In this context it tends to be talked of in the abstract, in a functionalist way, as if men have no agency; as inevitable; and with little possibility for positive change. Its use is not generally well-developed theoretically or conceptually; masculinity may refer to a discourse, men's actual behaviour, the cultural values of individuals and institutions etc. "Explanations" for a backlash are sometimes described as being an inevitable outcome of a "crisis of masculinity", but this phrase is given very different meanings by different authors, as I shall illustrate. The conflict / post-conflict literature also

---

[25] A recent backlash might be said to have occurred at the level of international discourse in the attack on 'the gender perspective on war' by the Human Security Centre's *Human Security Report* (2005) mentioned in the Introduction to this volume. Major gains have been made at the international level in giving recognition to the previously hidden and ignored impact of conflict and its long-term effects on women, and some clout given to the need to recognise this in post-war recovery planning and justice frameworks, and so perhaps we should have also expected a backlash at the international level.
[26] For example, Cleaver 2000, and in some other cross-cultural studies, for example Steans 1998: 81-103; Lentin 1997.

tends to ignore research which seeks to explain precisely why men commit violence against known women'[27] and sexual violence against other women. Such research is predominantly undertaken in the West, in non-war[28] locations, and is sometimes, but not always, located in discourses about "masculinity". In the next section I review key elements of this non-war research, and conceptual debates about masculinity, with a view to considering what insights it might give us into war and post-war contexts.

The study of men, masculinity and non-war violence against women

It is commonly stated in this body of work that although women do commit violent acts,[29] the vast majority of violence is committed by men, and a significant, albeit varied, proportion of that is committed against women. Stanko (2003) argues strongly against seeking overall explanations for all men's violences and instead proposes that we seek to understand the specificities of particular occurrences of violence. Such a position is reinforced by her earlier work which proposed that we should conceive of violence to include a very broad range of phenomena, such as an infliction of "emotional, psychological, sexual, physical, and/or material damage" (Stanko 1994: xiv). The World Health Organisation has argued that a key element in its use of such violence is the use of 'power, whether threatened or actual' (World Health Organisation, 2002: 5). Stanko and other writers[30] have expanded on this further to reach a definition which is very broad indeed, thereby making it less likely to find mono-causal explanations. Attempts to narrow down or to grade degrees of, violence are however almost impossible. Seeing violence as a continuum has some merit, but there is no common understanding of a rank order on such a continuum. Stanko gives a challenging example of how difficult this would be where teenage girls, who were themselves engaging in as well as being victims of violence, identified verbal abuse as being more intimidating than quite serious physical attack (Stanko 2003:7).

Perhaps the most in-depth study of men's violence to known women in the UK is Hearn (1998), which is based on detailed interviews with men convicted of such violence in Britain. He stakes out a position against seeking mono-causal explanations or even frameworks:

> There are many different explanations of men's violence to known women. Biological explanations may emphasize "hormonal patterns" and "aggression""

---

[27] The useful term 'known women' was coined by Hearn, 1998: 37-8

[28] I use this term, rather than 'peace', because that is somewhat of an oxymoron for the women enduring or being killed by such violence.

[29] Research in Sweden suggests that women are becoming more criminally violent and this is thought to lie behind a lower rate of 'date rape' compared to USA (Gill 2001: 411).

[30] For example Hearn 1998:15-17; Kelly 1998; Segal 1990:244-5

socio-biology may conceptualize violence in relation to "territory" and its
"defence"; psychology may introduce "personality types" or "disorders" and
"personal constructs"; psychoanalysis may hypothesize "projection" and
"displacement". Sociology, anthropology, political science and economics all
tend to use concepts that are grounded in interpersonal, collective,
institutional, structural or societal processes. These may include "poverty",
"stress", "alienation", sub-culture" and so on. With all of these explanations,
there are problems. Moreover, while it is quite possible to identify individual,
family, cultural, economic, structural and other causes or explanations of
violence, the search for a final or original cause may be futile (Hearn 1998:17)

And he insists in the conclusion to his study that multiple explanations must co-exist
(Hearn 1998:210) citing a useful comment from Goldner et al. (1990:345): "To say
violence, domination, subordination and victimization are psychological does not
mean they are not also moral, material or legal." Hearn helpfully suggests that a way
forward might lie in identifying different types of explanation for different types of
violence (1998:210) although this work has still to be done and so I offer a brief
review of relevant approaches below.

The most common biological explanation offered is probably the link between higher
testosterone levels and aggressive behaviour (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:11 cite
Clare 2000:22). The argument's weakness is in not being able to generalise; not all
males are aggressive and violent, and "men are not puppets of their hormones"
(Whitehead and Barrett 2005:15-16) and whilst being compelling to some, it is rarely
seen as the most important explanation in social science (Seifert 1999:146). Closely
linked to this perspective is what might be termed a socio-biological explanation,
which argues that men have evolved to be more aggressive than women as part of
the process of becoming socially dominant. Whilst this approach occasionally has
popular appeal, it does not sustain a position of support in social science (Seifert
1999:146-7; Lövkrona 2001:356-8).

Psychological and psychiatric explanations for violence are located in identity
formation and they too have sometimes resorted to a framework in which the
dominance and violence of men is taken as given. Nonetheless studies from within
these disciplines have shown that there are very strong patterns of correlation
between men who commit violence and specific life experiences, particularly those of
childhood. In trying to scale-up general explanations from individual case studies,
however, psychological / psychiatric frameworks have a challenge to explain why not
all men with similar backgrounds in similar circumstances commit violence against
women. Connell suggests nonetheless that there is more explanatory potential in
quite old psychoanalytical studies than has been developed so far in our
understanding of men's behaviour. He suggests that although the science is often

cast as a theory of the individual, it is much more like a social science because case studies are "all about relationships that constitute the person, the prohibitions and possibilities that emerge in that most extraordinary and complex of social processes, the raising of one generation of humans by another…" (Connell 1994:33-4). He summarizes the contributions thus:

> Freud's idea about the importance of castration anxiety, Adler's argument about overcompensation, Jung's suggestions about the gender dynamics of marriages, Horney's and Dinnerstein's arguments about the importance of boys' fears of the mother, the Frankfurt School's ideas about the impact of family power structure and societal alienation, Chodorow's ideas about emotional separation, Lacanian arguments about the oedipal ordering of symbolization, are all useful lines of thought. To treat one of them as the a priori framework for a theory of masculinity would be to misuse psychoanalysis … But deployed in the detail of cases … [including] collectivities and institutions … these ideas will greatly enrich understanding of the social dynamics. (Connell 1994:33)

In attempts to scale-up findings from individual cases, Connell (1994:29) describes how the Frankfurt School in exile from Germany in New York, published work which sought to understand fascism:

> The underlying idea was that fascist movement managed to tap hidden psychological pre-dispositions with roots in the emotional dynamics of childhood. The key pattern identified was a combination of conformity to authority from above and aggression toward those below. These traits were traced back to harsh and loveless parenting, dominance of the family by the father, sexual and emotional repression, and highly conventional morality.

The school also contrasted this with a "democratic character" which was an important breakaway to suggest that there was more than one type of masculinity. "The idea of multiple masculinities … finds a precise meaning, and some of its strongest evidence, in psychoanalysis" (Connell 1994:33).

Building on this historic legacy, Chodorow went on to develop a feminist perspective in psychoanalysis, which identified the importance of the process of mother-separation (1978) and, along with several other authors[31], argued that where women are the primary carers of children, "boys must define themselves in opposition to their mothers in order to become 'men', [and so] mother-raised men will develop a disproportionately 'oppositional' orientation within which connection with the other will be sacrificed to separation from the other" (Balbus 2002:211).

Chodorow has made a very influential contribution to understanding men's violence to women, but, as Balbus argues, her approach does not look at the quality or detail of parenting – either under normal patterns or to see the potential of co-parenting,

---

[31] cited in Balbus 2002:210

which more conventional psychoanalysis does (Balbus 2002:212). That the individual predisposition of men to commit violence is related to their upbringing is now generally supported (Hearn 1998:31) however. Psychological and psychiatric analyses also point to a link between male violence and childhood trauma, and in this way violence being reproduced between generations (Hearn 1998:26). Hearn sees this as opening the way to recognition of the "cycles of violence" and "cultures of violence" theses (Hearn 1998:26), although not all men, let alone people, respond to similar childhood traumas in the same way and so this also does not scale-up very simply. One problem with the "cycle of violence" thesis is that almost everyone can be defined as coming from a violent household if the definition of violence is sufficiently broad, as in Stanko's definition cited above. Further, studies do not tend to look at siblings from same household to see if they also commit violence, so it is still difficult to see explanations other than at the very general level.

There is a large body of work that concludes or implies that all men are potential rapists and commit domestic violence (including murder) in the absence of constraints to prevent them – not because of a biological predisposition to violence, or because of their individual circumstances, but because they have a dominant role to play in a patriarchal society *vis-à-vis* women and children. Dobash and Dobash's book (1979) was a path-breaker in this field. The authors looked at domestic violence and highlighted its often hidden yet high incidence, which included murder. They cited evidence from England and Wales 1885-1905 where over 50 percent of all murder victims were women with long-standing relationships with the male murderer (1979:15-16), and studies in the 1950s and 1960s which showed that it was husbands who committed the vast majority of women's murders.[32] Whilst a more common crime was assault committed by men on other men, at the time of writing, the extent of violence against women partners was not widely acknowledged, and was in fact the second most common violent offence in Scotland (Dobash and Dobash 1979:20). They argued against the prevailing assumption that the only reason women suffered more at men's hands was because they were weaker, but rather:

> …the correct interpretation of violence between husbands and wives conceptualizes such violence as the extension of the domination and control of husbands over their wives. This control is historically and social constructed. The beginning of an adequate analysis of violence between husbands and

---

[32] Dobash and Dobash 1979:17. This overall pattern still holds in the UK today, in that most 'partner' murders are committed by men on women, as graphically illustrated by The Guardian special report, 10 December 2005; and 42 per cent of all female victims of homicide in the UK are killed by a former or current partner (*The Guardian*, 4 October 2006). Furthermore the Council of Europe recently stated that domestic violence is the biggest cause of death and disability for all women in the EU under 44 years (*The Guardian*, 4 October 2006). Similar patters are seen elsewhere in the world (WHO, 2002: 92)

wives is the consideration of the history of the family, of the status of women therein, and of violence directed against them. (Dobash and Dobash 1979:15)

From studies undertaken in other parts of Europe they argued that such violence against wives was cross-cultural, and was part of the dominant culture, rather than part of a sub-culture as some writers had suggested (Dobash and Dobash 1979:22), "men who assault their wives are actually living up to cultural prescriptions that are cherished in Western society – aggressiveness, make dominance and female subordination – and they are using physical force as a means to enforce that dominance" (Dobash and Dobash 1979:24). Dobash and Dobash did acknowledge the importance of psychological studies of violence with regard to seeing the use of violence as a learned response (when coming from a violent family context, for instance), but explicitly rejected the conclusions of psychoanalysis which identified such behaviour as pathological or deviant, or identified the behaviour of the wife as being significant.(Dobash and Dobash 1979:22-3, 135).

Dobash and Dobash were writing within a feminist perspective which was developed by many authors[33] and which described how, within a system of capitalist patriarchy, all men are potentially, if not actually, violent to women, especially in the home, where violence is seen as a continuum of different behaviours and includes verbal aggression. While explicitly identifying a socio-political, rather than biological, cause, such perspectives regard the outcome of this particular social system as being that a person's sex determines their social location in terms of patriarchal domination backed up by violence. This perspective has also tended to downplay or even reject work on the psychologies of men, in relation to their personal and family upbringing, and instead emphasised the universal experience of men being part of a dominant group. Concurring with this overall view, but placing the explanatory weight somewhat differently, Hearn suggests in his conclusion that:

> Men's violence to women is not just a given structure; it is a structure, a process, a set of practical actions and an outcome of men's societal domination – of what may be called as a shorthand "patriarchy'. Such violence is a structure of patriarchal relations in itself; a patriarchal process and an outcome of other forms of patriarchal domination. For example, other patriarchal structures, such as heterosexuality, fatherhood, and the state (Hearn 1998) may all be *maintained* and sometimes intensified by men's violence (Hearn 1996:209, original emphasis).

In other words men's violence is an integral part of patriarchy but Hearn in this way avoids the tautology of saying that the existence of patriarchy explains the particular features of men's violence.

---

[33] For example, Brownmiller 1975; Dworkin 1982; Millet 1972

The importance of social context in differentiating men's likely behaviour was picked up by Segal (1990:241-242), who suggests that in concluding that all men are potentially rapists, Dobash and Dobash had misunderstood a much-cited study by Amir in the USA (Amir 1971, cited in Segal 1990:241-2). Amir did show that all the men in a study of rapists were apparently psychologically normal, and had girlfriends, but the majority were from poor, low status backgrounds. Segal (1990:245) goes on to argue that the interaction of social class and social stress – in the form of unemployment, underemployment, number of children, and social isolation, "all contribute to violence from men" (1990:255). Evidence from USA and UK shows that violence against women predominates in circumstances of poverty, but also where women gain economic independence and men are unemployed (Segal 1990:257). Furthermore, Segal identified wives' lack of resources to escape from a violent relationship as one of the serious issues that blocks its prevention (1990:256).

Seeking to explain the variety of men's behaviours led to both a re-visiting of psychological explanations and an attempt to combine this with focus on changes in what society expects of men. Segal suggests that in the 1950s absent fathers gave boys "role anxiety" which led to "a compensatory 'hypermasculinity', a fear of weakness, and a tendency towards delinquency and educational under-achievement" (1990:65) but by the 1960s there was much less pressure on roles. In other words what is introduced here is the notion of change. She emphasised that during the nineteenth century:

> Coleridge's intellectual and emotional earnestness … was soon competing
> with far harsher versions of middle class masculinity … English manliness
> based on 'toughness of muscle' and 'toughness of heart' in mid-Victorian
> England in which fighting became glorified. (Segal 1990:106)

So whilst we,

> cannot neatly periodise early and late-Victorian ideals of manhood (nor those
> of any other epoch), it is nevertheless evident that competition between
> competing ideals intensified with the increasing glorification of a more
> muscular, militaristic masculinity, in alliance with British imperialist expansion
> in the late Victorian era .. Shelley, Keats and even Shakespeare, were to be
> attacked as weak, morbid and effeminate. (Segal 1990:106-7)

She also points out that the prevalence of rape is not constant through history in the same countries; eighteenth century Massachusetts did not show increases in rape, even in war-time (Segal 1990:238), and there were calmer periods in UK and USA history. At the time of her writing, the rates in USA had risen to previously unprecedented levels, leading her to wonder, "might not rape be the deformed behaviour of men accompanying the destabilisation of gender relations … now at

their peak in modern America?"(Segal1990:240). This sense of social change causing changes in men's behaviour is picked up in more conceptual discussions about men and masculinity (Kimmel 1994:120). There would seem to be certain circumstances under which violence by men, particularly against women, increases. The example of Sweden suggests that such key moments may occur even in contexts of comparatively low male dominance.[34]

In addition to the possibilities that men's behaviour norms change over time, a conceptual framework where different masculinities co-exist has become more common. Not only is it accepted that there are different masculinities in different parts of the world (which themselves may change over time) but that in any one place there is such a thing as "hegemonic masculinity". Kimmel (1994:125) cites Connell's version of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1987), which does not mention violence, but then himself adds the comment, "Violence is often the single most evident marker of manhood. Rather it is the willingness to fight, the desire to fight" (Kimmel 1994:132). The attractiveness of this framework includes the fact that it allows intellectual space for individual men's behaviour to vary, but within an acknowledged context of common experience. Munn (2005) proposes that we see hegemonic masculinity as a standard against which others are judged – not as a set of values or behaviour norms that all men have to comply with or even agree to. This framework allows for the fact that idealized versions of manhood in western society never fit some men's experiences, for example in work, relations with women, sexual activity etc. (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:19 cite Jefferson 1994). They nonetheless may benefit from "the hegemonic project" and many are actively complicit with it, so it includes, "men who cheer at football matches on TV … [as well as] those who run out into the mud and take the tackles themselves" (Connell 2005:40-41).

The term hegemonic is obviously derived from Gramsci's conceptualisation of hegemony, as the outcome of social struggle between groups or classes to dominate; described by Connell (2005:38) as the "cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life", and that which is "culturally exalted" by others (Connell 2005:38). He argues for using the term in the singular (2005:38-39), as though it is universal and global; a conceptualisation which requires cultural dominance to coincide with the holding of power. But he also suggests (2005:47 footnote 15) that although others came to see hegemony in this way as functionalist, one may alternatively follow Gramsci more closely in seeing hegemony

---

[34] Lövkrona (2001:362) identifies one piece of research which suggests that 67 per cent of Swedish women have been abused by men, even though its publication prompted outrage and vociferous denial in public arenas.

as a site of struggle and potential change, and that, "hegemonic masculinity embodies a "currently accepted" strategy, and that at different times particular groups of men can be challenged and the basis for hegemony changed" (Connell 2005:39). In addition to hegemonic masculinity being open to change over time, people also conceive of it being accompanied simultaneously with subordinate, or marginal masculinities (for example Connell 2000:7; Whitehead and Barrett 2005:18), and, even "systems of masculinities", such as in colonial India (Enloe 2005). In expanding on such structures and systems, it is again difficult to avoid being functionalist; the subordinate and dominant masculinities seem to exist and relate to each other in order to support a specific patriarchal system (such as that of a colonial state), but that does not explain why they are precisely the way they are.

At this level of abstraction we are very far removed from what motivates some men to behave more or less violently to women. Furthermore the analysis almost completely eclipses women, who appear only as victims. On the face of it, such frameworks are limited in the same way as those which rely on the existence of patriarchy to explain everything. If we simply identify a package of masculine identities, behaviours and characteristics with actually existing, socially specific patriarchy (or, even more simplistically, see these as universal) then we quickly end up in a tautology which cannot explain anything. If we say that hegemonic masculinity is the way it is because that is the key way in which patriarchy is maintained and gender inequality perpetuated, this cannot explain how and why masculinities in fact vary in time and space, and even though it allows for the possibility of different experiences it cannot explain the variety.

Instead it can be useful to recognise that certain types of masculinities (in the sense of preferred and celebrated identities, behaviours and characteristics) do emerge in different societies at key moments and that these can be relational and therefore one or some can be dominant – in the sense of being the most commonly aspired to and valued. I have described how some writers consider that the nature of hegemonic masculinity changes at moments of great economic, political and social upheaval. The usefulness of this approach is that it allows one to see that there are multiple ways of being a man and that some may encourage or condone more violence against women than others. Also conceptually such work allows for change, although most examples in the West are about very long, slow processes of historic change, rather than the fast and dramatic change that can occur in war and post-war contexts.

Finally, the concept of "masculinity in crisis" has been used for a long time about western societies not at war, but is now being applied elsewhere, wherever "men become violent, or anti-social in other ways, as women become more liberated. In other words a form of backlash against social change" (Gill 2001:411). The expression tends to be used in a casual way, but as Whitehead and Barrett (2005:6) suggest, for many people the "crisis of masculinity" had become the defining characteristic of Western societies at the turn of the millennium; men seemed to be in crisis, because even if they do not resort to negative behaviour to women, they still "yearn to perform and validate their masculinity through "conquering the universe"…[and] the aggressive, dominant, emotionally repressed behaviour that such yearnings engender are increasingly seen as (self-) destructive, if not desirable". They suggest that three main reasons are usually given for men's crisis: 1) consumerism; 2) women's successful attacks on men's privileges; 3) widespread social disapproval of the old ways of behaving. They then critique these assumptions along these lines: 1) women are also subject to consumerism, and arguably more vulnerable; 2) men still dominate in the main bastions of power and openly challenge women's attempts to change this; 3) the "fashion" of masculinities is changing, but it always has been, and this does not stop masculinity retaining much of its previous character (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:7). Many men still "act dominant and "hard", deny their emotions, resort to violence as a means of self-expression, and seek to validate their masculinity in the public world of work rather than the private world of family and relationships" (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:7). They go on to point out that this behaviour is still lauded by many men and women, and therefore can hardly be said to be in danger of fundamental change.

Whitehead and Barrett also point out that the "crisis of masculinity" goes back to the eighteenth century in Europe, and has previously peaked at times of social concern about major issues such as "**possible war**, economic recession, rises in crime, educational underachievement, or the moral fabric of a nation" (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:8, my emphasis). At such moments, "what emerges, in fact, is a moral panic around men and masculinity, which can quickly turn into a backlash against women and feminism" (Whitehead and Barrett 2005:8, citing Lingard and Douglas 1999). This surely is a strong parallel with the ending of conflicts where gender roles for both have been altered and a new life is not perceived as better or good enough.

In conclusion, systemic explanations for men's violence and how masculinity is conceived, shaped and perpetuated are still common in the analysis of non-war, western societies, many of which make generalisations about all men's potential

capacity for violence against women. As not all men behave in the same way such overall explanations remain problematic. Over time, the dominant identity of men described as hegemonic masculinity, and men's behaviour with regard to violence, is seen to change, although it is not clear why, how, or whether such change is inevitable with specific shifts in circumstance. The same behaviour is sometimes described as "crisis of masculinity" and so the debate continues as to whether this should be regarded as normal / dominant behaviour or exceptional and a crisis reaction.

There are few examples discussed of how masculinity changes to make violence less prevalent, or less socially acceptable, and violence against women at home and in the street has become and remains very high in parts of non-war western society[35]. The specific social circumstances of men, and particularly those of childhood, and the ways these affect the psychologies of men, have been shown consistently in long-term studies to correlate with violent behaviour, even though violent behaviour is itself not pre-determined by such experiences. This important dimension is nonetheless often completely omitted from systemic explanations which do not readily account for processes of change in general behaviour and values over time.

The study of masculinity and violence in conflict / post-conflict settings

This section of the chapter reviews "explanations" for violence against women during and after wars. Accounts of all types of war-related violence tend to be based on what is said by victims/ survivors[36], witnesses and to a lesser extent, perpetrators, without following Hearn's warning of not taking these descriptions at face-value (Hearn 1998:213). Analyses on the whole are not well-grounded in theory or extensive empirical research, either with victims/survivors or perpetrators. They

---

[35] particularly in parts of the USA, for instance. One might debate whether the USA might be considered a 'non-war' context. Some might argue that poor inner-city areas have experienced periods of war-like violence, although in this case the nature and amount of violence does not indicate clear protagonists as most has been committed by and on poor young men living in the same areas. Technically the USA has been at war with other states most of the time since World War Two, but the battlefields have generally not been on US territory.

[36] There are interesting variations in the use of these terms. Post-holocaust literature tends to refer to victims as those who died, and survivors as those who did not. In post-WW2 France, it was 'victims' who brought cases of collaborators, (Lottman 1986:286-7). In Western psychotherapy, the term survivor is used to refer to, and claimed by, people who have reached a 'healthy' understanding of their experiences. It is common in Palestine to reject the term victim in favour of 'hero' (Bacic 2002:19). In South Africa the discourse around the TRC talked of victims of apartheid because that is what appeared in the TRC legislation (Hamber et al. 2000:18), and so 'victim/survivor' was adopted by those preferring the more positive term. Hamber has recently argued that there is a 'steady embrace of the concept of "victim" rather than it being something which is shunned' (2003:8), particularly in Northern Ireland (2003:18). By contrast, in Rwanda the local versions of these terms have taken on a highly politicised edge where survivor is officially sanctioned only for survivors of attempted genocide, and not for other forms of violence (Sasaki 2004). Also see discussion by Mani (2002:119-123).

therefore ignore, or tend to dismiss, psychological explanations derived from research in non-war settings and also ignore some key socio-political theories.

Moser (2001:38-40), for instance, summarises non-war explanations, and groups them into structural, institutional, inter-personal, individual categories. Insofar as she also considers that none of the non-war analyses is adequate alone she concurs with the broad approach taken by Hearn and others described above, but she only makes scanty use of this work and her summaries are somewhat misleading. She identifies as key from amongst these non-war explanations social/gender power relations and the fact that wives often have practical difficulties when trying to leave violent partners. Her position then is very similar to Dobash and Dobash, but even these latter authors noted the relevance of psychological explanations for understanding and explaining some elements of domestic violence, whereas Moser appears to dismiss them out of hand.

"During" and "after" war explanations for men's violence against women are often the same and, although such accounts often state that the explanation is social (such as in "constructions of masculinity"), they tend to assume that there is something distinct about war-related circumstances that lead to increased violence against women. At one level this seems self-evident as some forms of violence are almost completely absent outside the context of war. In examples where violence against women continues or even increases after wars end, the causes and meanings that observers give it may change. Sideris (2001b:144, 146-8) for instance, argues that war-time rape takes place in public whereas afterwards it may well continue but takes place in private, which suggests a different motivation and purpose. As a generalisation this may be the case, but such a distinction ignores the rape and other violence against women that takes place in private during war, and rapes and other violence that continue to occur in public afterwards. Other explanations of post-war violence are often rooted in the belief that the "aftermath of war" is a distinct social moment where some of the war-time dynamics continue (Meinjes et al. 2001). Below I review these explanations in the light of non-war analyses.

Perhaps the most common categorisation of rape and other violence against women civilians during wars is as "war booty"; it is accepted that the enemy's women are fair game. This is not really an explanation, but a description of the justification often given for such violence, and does not begin to analyse why men have the desire for such acts. It is also common for this justification, and wartime levels of violence

against women, to last after wars have officially ended. Seifert suggests that this often continues for one to two months after victory, giving the examples of Berlin in 1945 and Nanking in 1937 (Seifert 1999:147).

We might link the "war-booty" thesis with a set of other explanations which propose that such behaviour is often part of a deliberate military strategy intended to build the morale of soldiers, and to increase male bonding, together perhaps best described as a feature of "militarism". This is a persuasive analysis which has been researched and promoted most notably by Cynthia Enloe (1989, 1993, 1998, 2000, 2004) and picked up by many other writers,[37] although she is always careful not to over-simplify the issues. It is not sufficient as an explanation for all wartime violence against women though, as the incidence of rape tends to be higher with irregular, undisciplined armies, in wars where there is not a sharp division between military and civilian personnel (Turshen 2001b:12). A linked, but distinct, military strategy is to use violence against women, and particularly that of public rape, to undermine the enemy. Its success relies on strongly patriarchal social relations amongst enemy populations so that such acts not only harm "enemy women" but also undermine "enemy men" by demonstrating their inability to protect "their" women, [38] against "rape as a weapon of war".

A more general and highly pervasive assumption about men's violence against women during wars is that such violence, particularly sexual violence, is an inevitability if social constraints on men's behaviour are removed[39]. The assumption is that men will behave like this simply because their social dominance means they can. This "constraints removed" thesis is also said to explain partner-violence both at "the front" and in society. It is an extremely common assumption which appears in journalists' accounts as well as those of academics. Men's violent urges are seen as being biologically and socially driven to such an extent that men have no control over them, almost having the tag "natural". This bio-social connection between violence and sex[40] also has resonance with the Dobash and Dobash argument about non-war societies described above, where men are assumed to be violent against women when they are not restrained because they are the dominant group. The HSC report cited earlier (Human Security Centre 2005; see also Goldstein 2001) embraces this

---

[37] For example, De Abreu 1998: 92-3; Elshtain 1987; Seifert 1995:58; Cockburn 2001:22; Turshen 2001b: 12
[38] Enloe 2000:111; Seifert 1995:58; Seifert 1999:150-1; Cockburn 2001:22; Turshen 2001b:59
[39] Goldstein 2001; Human Security Centre 2005; Turshen 2001b:59
[40] Turshen 2001b: 12

assumption. It briefly describes the "rape as a weapon of war" thesis and then adds that, "even without official encouragement most wars involve a dramatic erosion in the norms that restrain anti-social behaviour in times of peace … there is often little to deter **individuals** from acting out their **violent desires"** (Human Security Centre 2005:109, emphasis added). Although the gender-neutral word, "individual" is used, it is clear from the context that the authors consider it inevitable that it is men who will have the desire to, and will actually, commit acts of sexual violence against women unless they are prevented from doing so. Not an uncommon stance in international reports, this also ignores, or at least down-plays, the increase in sexual violence against women perpetrated by men on the "same side". The position also ignores the testimonies of men who claim to commit such acts only under duress (Enloe 2004:117), and does not allow for the variety in men's attitudes and behaviour.

Such a view of the inevitability of sexual violence is also commonly expressed with regard to what happens after wars end, when the social constraints on men's behaviour often remain low, particularly in the absence of effective security sector reform, and controls may even be reduced where men are no longer subject even to military discipline. Over time this violent situation may come to be seen as normal rather than exceptional, with a generalised acceptance of a variety of forms of social violence, or a climate of violence developing (Sideris 2001b:142; Turshen 2001b12).

Explanations specifically for the post-war backlash and its violent elements tend to be made at a very general level, such as describing it as a "backlash of patriarchy" or re-assertion of patriarchy, particularly where women had achieved some temporary new freedoms during conflict periods.[41] Such explanations tend to be based on deductions that men are consciously seeking to regain lost power and have a need to assert themselves to the point of aggression – often where there is social acceptance of violence (Pillay 2001:39; Sideris 2001b:143-4). This approach chimes strongly with analyses of the West which consider long-term changes, such as the "crisis of masculinity" approach, and are vulnerable to the same criticisms.

Other commentators squarely attribute precisely the same violent behaviour to the psychological damage experienced by men (Krog 2001:212; Sideris 2001a:57, 59-60). In addition to there being a lack of social restraint, and a sense of violence as

---

[41] Kandiyoti, this volume; Meintjes et al. 2001; Turshen 2001a; Ibeanu 2001:199-204; Kesby 1996; Becker 2001: 225

being "normal", they also argue that the prior experience of committing sexual violence in war, as well as other violent experiences, stays with men and makes them more likely to commit post-war violence against women. Increases in post-war domestic violence also tend to be considered within this framework. Krog and Sideris (Krog 2001:212; Sideris 2001a:57, 59-60) both summarise many women's statements made about their own experiences when they, "reflected on cases of male ex-combatants involved in criminal activities, depression in men, increased rates of suicide amongst men post-war, and the expression of their anger and frustration in the domestic sphere" (Sideris 2001a:52).

Whilst many people take the view that emotional and psychological factors affect men's post-war behaviour (IRIN 2004), it is surprisingly difficult to draw strong conclusions from actual research in this area (Jones et al. 2002) and research suggests that no society in the world responds adequately to support men thought to be suffering in this way (Gabriel et al. 2002). When one considers the findings from non-war contexts about the importance of childhood trauma in causing violent behaviour later in life, and the high numbers of soldiers in today's wars who start their combat lives as children, the problem seems enormous. Yet the psychological effects of war (or childhood poverty, trauma or other experiences) on men do not appear in many people's explanations for why men commit violence against women, or as a priority in post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts. In the case of South Africa some action research has led to a re-thinking about the nature of post-traumatic stress disorder and the ways in which it might be treated (Hamber et al. 2000:35) but these findings have not been widely taken up.

Chodorow, who pioneered the understanding of men's psychology as being partly a function of their parenting, has developed her own work further to consider what it is about masculinity that is connected to violence in non-western societies. She locates the explanation for aggressive behaviour in psychodynamics, "Can we see cultural practices and processes as individuals writ large? Do we want to explain cultural violence [rape, killing, torturing] on the basis of collective child-rearing practices or infantile experiences of failures in recognition and intersubjectivity?" (Chodorow 2002:243). She makes the point that the language used in political ideologies that promote violent behaviour is similar to that used by psychoanalysts seeking explanations for aggression in individuals in their individual experiences: identity; badness of the other, humiliation and shame. Other factors she cites as relevant

include: father absence after defeat, hunger and emotionally unavailable mothers, and comments:

> Just as analysts find in someone who feels endangered and who has not been able previously to develop a reflective self … a flooding fragmentation and dissolution of boundaries intertwined with reactive aggression, so the breakdown of a totalitarian state, of a state symbolized in one leader … or the sudden withdrawal of a colonial power, may lead to a violent lawlessness, ethnic war, and brutal ethnic cleansing… (Chodorow 2002:246-7)

and she extends the analysis:

> Many projective ideologies (of nationalism, xenophobia, racial-ethnic hatred, and so forth) clearly support the view that identity is a psychosocial as well as an individual issue. Nonetheless if we were to analyze those individuals engaged in ethnic violence, we might well find that their individual unconscious fantasies involved not threats to self-separation, but fears, depressive anxiety, homosexual panic, defensive masculinity, identification with a soldier father, manic denial of survival, triumphant elation at survival, mourning a loss, or any number of fantasies. (Chodorow 2002:249)

This work is clearly an important development in attempting to combine the insights from very different analytical approaches, and perhaps points the way to further development. For instance Richards' work (Richards 1995) on Sierra Leonean "warboys" highlights child abuse through several generations as a major cause of their extremely violent behaviour. In the analysis of some post-conflict settings, the psychological dimension does appear, but with reference to the whole community, rather than to men in particular. Hamber comments, "In South Africa, the entire discourse of nation building was imbued with the pseudo-psychological construction on national healing, incorrectly implying that nations have collective psyches. The problematic results were that individual needs such as long-term healing and the desire for justice were, to a degree, subordinated to the collective drive to 'reconcile'"[42].

Returning to the social explanations for men's violence to women, an increasing number of writers use the term masculinity to describe patterns of male behaviour, and, as in the non-war literature, assume that this changes along with major social and political change. Several writers have argued that at times of socio-political tension prior to conflict, as well as during conflict itself, some types of masculinity come to be celebrated and actively promoted to a greater degree than others (El Bushra 2000:76, 80; Cockburn 1998:207, 2001:20). In some conflict situations, the more violent aspects of masculinity are played out in all aspects of men's lives to an

---

[42] Hamber 2003:14. Ignatieff 1998 also warns against assuming there is a national psyche *in The Warrior's Honour.* Arendt's warnings about conceptualising a 'sick society', rather than sick people, are also pertinent here; she sees this as being more likely to make people see violence as natural (and inevitable) rather than being politicised (Arendt, 1970: 75).

extreme degree, in what Hague calls a "hetero-national masculinity", with reference to the Serb and Bosnian Serb military (Hague 1997:55). Such a rise in nationalist or ethnic consciousness does not usually end with a peace agreement and so is still also part of the discourse of the aftermath.[43]

In addition to such changes in masculinity somehow being inevitable with war, some writers emphasise that this change is consciously sought and promoted by political leaders. Encouraging men to be more aggressive with the rise of nationalist or ethnic consciousness is here intended both to gain political support for the cause and to undermine "the other". Egotistical, aggressive, dominant behaviours are common features of such cultural definitions of masculinity, as is men's dominance over women (Byrne 1996:33). This manipulation of masculinity is often asserted in the literature but is rarely accompanied by analysis of how it happens. Women play key roles in affirming and encouraging all aspects of masculinities; as one of the main institutions for promoting one or other set of behaviours and values is that of the family – where women play a leading role in educating young people and indeed in encouraging adults to favour one or other set of attributes. In some cases this leads women to put great pressure on male relatives, including sons, to embrace violence, to "be brave", fight, stand up for the honour of your family/ nation etc – in effect "be a real man" (Pillay 2001:41; Munn 2005). Some writers are keen to avoid blaming women entirely for this phenomenon, stressing that this role has to be weighed against the role of other institutions which play key roles here, such as political parties, nationalist movements and age groups (El Bushra 2000). The actual processes of changing masculinities (as ideologies and discourses) seem to be the same as those that take place in non-war communities, but the detail of what we understand in non-war settings about individual men's psychologies, and how they will experience such pressures and react differently, has yet to be applied in conflict and post-conflict settings.

The type of behaviour such processes encourage or engender are described as "hyper-masculinity" by some (Boesten, this volume); aggression and uncontrolled virility being key features, but also accompanied by some rejection of modernity embodied in a sense of a "return to the warrior" or to the "essence" of a key group. Such ideology is also often accompanied with an undermining of women's rights by the state (Turshen 2001a). In contrast to the non-war literature the concept of hegemonic masculinity has not appeared so often (although Moser 2001:37 mentions

---

[43] Pillay 2001:41; 43; Žarkov et al. this volume; Luciak this volume

it), although it is increasing (for example Enloe 2005). In these uses masculinity is explicitly not seen as being in crisis but in the ascendancy and in a primary dominant phase. Used in this way the concept does not allow us to see easily or understand what happens to individual men (why they change) or the variety of men's responses. Segal (1990:121-2) highlights interesting examples of men who seem to personify a particularly violent form of hyper-masculinity, and yet who do not fit the corresponding stereotype in all their behaviour. She highlights Nazi camp supervisors in Auschwitz, Treblinka and Dachau who were gentle to their wives and a British army veteran of the Falklands war who was "completely without bravado". The concepts of masculinity, hyper-masculinity, hegemonic masculinity and crisis of masculinity, do not help us with understanding the variety of behaviour patterns.

The expression "crisis of masculinity" is nonetheless sometimes used with regard to war-torn societies, but just as with non-war societies is often very ambiguous. The aftermath of war is thought to have denied men key roles and identities which socially defined manhood in pre-war situations, and the frustration this causes leads them to be aggressive to their partners and/or other women (IRIN 2004:7): "Paradoxically although war is a male-dominated arena, men's identity might emerge from conflict even more damaged than women's. Many women gain strength from the experience of war … In my view, men feel threatened by this survival and so retreat into trying to reassert their manhood in the only area where this seems possible – in intimate relationships" (Sideris 2001b:52). It is important to note that this is a diametrically opposite argument from that which proposes that men's strengthened masculinities as combatants or as newly-aroused, defenders of national or ethnic identities are at the root of such aggression. Clearly there are parallels in Sideris' description with the way in which the "crisis of masculinity" is used in non-war societies that are going through major socio-economic change that tends to leave men with reduced security of employment, for instance. Once again such approaches do not easily allow for, let alone shed light on, the range of men's experiences and responses which actually may be very varied indeed.

In war and post-war contexts we have yet to develop a significant body of research about what men themselves say about their situations. One exception is Dolan who describes how the effects of conflict-related poverty and economic change have left men in Northern Uganda feeling no longer able to "be a man" in the same way as in the past. Dolan usefully distinguishes between the lived experience of men, which may be highly varied in peace time, but which in war-time often becomes closer to being uniform, and the lived expectations of men, that is, what they hope to be,

which could always be the same (Dolan 2002:77). Such an example may be seen to exemplify a situation where a hegemonic masculinity, as a set of idealised identities, behaviours and roles, is imagined and aspired to, but which is not achieved by most men (although Dolan does not use the term hegemonic). Dolan suggests that men commit new forms of violence against women because their masculinity (that is, their "proper" role in society) has been thwarted, and men are failing to achieve what they want or need to (Dolan 2000:78-9), ie. that which others might describe as the ideals of a hegemonic masculinity. This argument is also rooted in the socio-political frustration-aggression explanations for violence, as well as the "culture of violence" thesis, but does not explore the psychological dimensions which might explain the variety of responses from men to these pressures. Furthermore, in the post-conflict literature, the connection between the frustration-aggression 'explanation' for violence against women, and a hard-to-achieve set of roles is not couched in terms of a failure of most to achieve the ideals of a hegemonic masculinity.

A completely contrasting approach which takes on board the contingency of material context is put forward by Turshen (2001b:55, 60). Rather than being related to any psychological predisposition she argues that, in Africa at least, a key motivation for men to commit violence, particularly sexual violence, against women is direct personal material gain, suggesting that "Systematic rape and sexual abuse are among the strategies men use to wrest personal assets from women" (Turshen 2001b:55). Such material gain may include women's labour[44]; or land (Turshen 2001b:62-3) or other property (Turshen and Twagiramariya 1998:109) where women feel they have no choice but to give men whatever they request when faced with rape and other forms of assault and threat of further violence. She suggests that this motivation might be restricted to societies where gender relations are so unequal that women are not legally autonomous individuals (that is, where colonial and customary legal codes have combined) (Turshen 2001b:65). Perhaps an additional context is one of poverty, where access to very small amounts of property has great significance. Turshen gives us a careful analysis of the outcome of such violence in two African cases, but we do not have much information about men's motives, and are left to deduce this. It is worth noting that explanations offered for rape in other places, for example former Yugoslavia (Cockburn 1998:207), do not mention gaining access to property or labour as motives.

Finally, as we have seen, an element of explanation for the prevalence and persistence of domestic violence in non-war settings is the inability of women to get

---

[44] Pillay 2001:38; Turshen 2001b:61; De Abreu 2001: 92-4

away from violent men; a key constraint being access to resources; both financial, where they have few opportunities to earn independent income, but also social resources, in societies where there is a strong stigma about divorce and/or shortage of men, or issues of custody of children. All of these issues are also key in many post-war societies. Many women want to stay with their partners in spite of such violence because of the desire to get back to a previous situation where marriage and the family were important sites of affirmation, identity and economic resources (Turshen 2001b:80-1; El Bushra 2000:83). Staying with violent men does however, increase the overall chances of violence occurring again.

Conclusion

Current descriptions and analyses of men's violent behaviour towards women in war and post-war settings offer a variety of different approaches which have contrasting meanings. The issue of men's agency or responsibility is a theme that runs very unevenly through these accounts, with those at one extreme regarding such violence as cross-culturally uniform and inevitable, whether primarily from bio-social or socio-political phenomena, and at the other extreme holding men individually responsible for their bullying, deliberate claiming of social, political and economic advantage through the use of force against women. Furthermore there is an in-built confusion underlying many common analyses in the insistence that there is something distinct about war situations that makes men more likely to behave like this, even in the aftermath, but with little investigation into how precisely warfare impacts on men's thoughts, feelings, indeed psychology, which has this effect, and a marginalization of the findings from studies of men's violence against women in non-war settings.

Evidence from research in non-war settings suggests that men's violent behaviour towards women – known and otherwise – does seem to have some connection to early life experiences, as well as to witnessing, experiencing and committing other acts of violence. Hence perhaps it is not just the fact of war that causes men to behave in this way. This analysis does not lead to very optimistic or feasible strategies for future change. On the positive side, it does reinforce the view that such behaviour is not in any simple way biologically determined, and therefore the "constraints removed" thesis is less compelling, if one considers it to be founded on a biological or bio-social argument. Furthermore the fact that not all men behave in the same way, even when they have been through similar experiences, brings further into doubt that the correlation between participation in war, and violence against women signifies a simple causal relationship. We need to understand more about the men who do not resort to violence even when they have all the life experiences that

would lead us to expect them to. Many countries have seen the development of groups that involve men in working against men's violence against women[45], but they remain small-scale and are not generally given the mainstream support of governments or international organisations, and the lessons they reveal are not widely shared. A further, challenging example is offered by Pearce (2006) of El Salvadorian men changing their behaviour, once the guerrilla movement required them not to be violent to each other or to women.

Masculinity is a term in frequent use in the post-war literature and, along with its various refinements, is frequently brought into discussions of men's violences. There is astonishing slippage in much of this writing, however, between abstract and concrete levels of analysis, and therefore confusion about what precisely is being discussed. There is therefore a need for caution in using the terms "masculinity", "hegemonic masculinity/ies", and "hetero-masculinity" in seeking explanations for post-conflict violence of men against women. Greater specificity about the focus of analysis would develop the analysis of these contexts further. We tend not to use the term femininity when we analyse the situations of women, but are more precise about whether our focus is on women's various and contrasting social roles, identities, sources of and constraints on power and control, access to and use of own labour, for example, and how these change over time and are challenged, so our analyses of men surely deserves the same level of precision. Such a body of work in the study of men is still in development, I suggest, and its absence or weakness is sometimes masked by the use of the clumsy term masculinity.

Types of men's identity and behaviour are highly varied across space; not all wars are followed by the same type of backlash, and indeed not all wars see the same degree of sexual violence. We still understand little about which factors increase or decrease the likeliness of such behaviour becoming a deliberate, conscious part of a political-military project during war – the "rape as a weapon of war" thesis. The explanations for change in masculinities in non-war situations still remain obscure, as they do in post-war contexts, although we have a better understanding of how this happens in the former. Analysts have tended to take a functionalist view in seeing that a change might be in the "interests of patriarchy" and therefore concluding that this must be the explanation for change, with no explanation offered at all for the variety of men's behaviours and little sense of the potential agency of men.

---

[45] Boesten, this volume; Sideris 2001b:155; De Abreu 1998:81-2.

The predominantly unclear analysis and confused, over-generalised explanations for the behaviours of men in the post-war literature do not help us much in understanding the key processes at work, let alone in identifying strategies for reducing violence against women. In the context of such intense gender politics in war-torn societies the persistent reluctance of many analysts and advisers to take on lessons about gendering analysis and policy processes[46] has not been effectively challenged by our relatively weak analyses of men. If future research were to focus on a) the psychologies of violence and b) the lived experience of men who are not violent, we might begin to identify where and how societies may recover better, and how more women may have greater freedoms to seek justice and reconciliation on their own terms, freer from the fear of violence.

---

[46] A male reader for a recent piece of commissioned writing on this subject initially rejected a section of my draft about sexual violence and the backlash, not on the basis of insufficient evidence, but a belief that the account was 'too negative' and 'exaggerated'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR PART I

Afshar, Haleh & Deborah Eade (eds.) 2004. *Development, Women and War. Feminist Perspectives*, OXFAM, Oxford.

Amnesty International. 2004. *Lives Blown Apart: Crimes Against Women in Times of Conflict*, Amnesty International, London.

Batezat, Eleanor et al, 1998. "Women and Independence: The Heritage and the Struggle" In Colin Stoneman (ed.), *Zimbabwe's Prospects*, Macmillan.

Beaumont, Peter, 'Hidden victims of a Brutal Conflict: Iraq's Women', The Guardian*,*

8 October 2006.

Bedont, Barbara. 2005. "The Renewed Popularity of the Rule of Law: Implications for Women, Impunity, and Peacekeeping". In Mazurana et al (eds.), *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford.

Bentley, Kristina. 2004, 'Women's Human Rights and the Feminisation of Poverty in South Africa', *Review of African Political Economy*, 31, 100: 247-261.

Bloomfield, David (ed.) 2004. *Handbook on Reconciliation*, IDEA.

Bouta, Tsjeard, Georg Frerks and Ian Bannon. 2005, *Gender, Conflict and Development*, The World Bank / International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington DC.

Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will. Men, Women and Rape*. Simon and Schuster, New York.

Butalia, Urvashi. 2001. "Women and Communal Conflict: New Challenges for the Women's Movement in India". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C.Clark (eds.). *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence* Zed Books, London.

Cheater, Angela P. and Rudo B. Gaidzanwa. 1996. "Citizenship in Neo-Patrilineal States: Gender and Mobility in Southern Africa". *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2

Cheywa, Spindel, Elisa Levy and Melissa Connor. 2004. *With an End In Sight. Strategies from the UNIFEM Trust Fund to Eliminate Violence Against Women*, UNIFEM.

Chingono, Mark. 2001. "Mozambique: War, Economic Change and Development in Manica Province, 1982-1992". In Frances Stewart and Valpy Fitzgerald (eds.) *War and Underdevelopment*, Volume 2, Oxford University Press.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 2001. "The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C.Clark (eds.). *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence* Zed Books, London.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 2004. "The Continuum of Violence: A gender perspective on War and Peace". In Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman (eds.). *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones*, University of California Press, London.

Curtis, Grant. 1998. *Cambodia Reborn? The Transition to Democracy and Development*, Brookings Institution Press and UNRISD, Washington and Geneva.

Davies, Gavyn, 'How many Have Died in Iraq?', *The Guardian*, 19 October 2006.

Davison, Jean (ed.) 1998. Agriculture, Women and Land: the African Experience, Westview.

De Abreu, Alcinda António. 1998. "Mozambican Women Experiencing Violence". In Meredeth Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

EC (European Commission). 1996. The European Union and the Issue of Conflicts in Africa: Peacebuilding, Conflict Prevention and Beyond

EC (European Council). 1995. Integrating Gender Issues in Development Cooperation

El Bushra, Judy. 2000. "Transforming Conflict: Some Thoughts on a Gendered Understanding of Conflict Processes". In Susie Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson and Jennifer Marchbank (eds.). 2000. *States of Conflict. Gender, Violence and Resistance*, Zed Books, London.

El Bushra, Judy (2004), "Fused in Combat: gender Relations and Armed Combat". In Haleh Afshar and Deborah Eade (eds.) 2004. *Development, Women and War. Feminist Perspectives*, OXFAM, Oxford.

Elson, Diane. 1998. "Talking to the boys; gender and economic growth models". In Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson (eds.), *Feminist Visions of Development*, Routledge, London.

Giles, Wenona and Jennifer Hyndman (eds.). 2004a. *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones*. University of California Press, London.

Giles, Wenona and Jennifer Hyndman. 2004b. "Introduction. Gender and Conflict in a Global Context". In Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman (eds.) *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones*. University of California Press, London.

Goldblatt, Beth and Meintjes, Sheila. 1998. "South African Women Demand the Truth". In Meredeth Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

Goldstein Joshua S. 2001. *War and Gender*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hayner, Priscilla B. (2001) *Unspeakable truths. Confronting State Terror and Atrocity*, Routledge, London.

Human Security Centre. 2005. *The Human Security Report 2005.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Jacobs, Susie and Tracey Howard. 1987. "Women in Zimbabwe: Stated Policy and State Action" in Haleh Afshar (ed.), *Women, State and Ideology. Studies from Africa and Asia*, Macmillan, London.

Kelly, Liz. 2000. "Wars Against Women: Sexual Violence, Sexual Politics and the Militarised State". In Susie Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson and Jennifer Marchbank (eds.), *States of Conflict. Gender, Violence and Resistance*, Zed Books, London.

Mani, Rama. 2002. *Beyond Retribution. Seeking Justice in the Shadows of War*, Polity Press, Oxford.

Mazurana, Dyan, Anglela Raven-Roberts and Jane Parpart (eds.). 2005. *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping.* Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford.

Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). 2001a. *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation.* Zed Books, London.

Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen. 2001b. "There is No Aftermath for Women". In Sheila Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation* Zed Books, London.

Moser, Caroline and Fiona C. Clark (eds.). 2001. *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Zed Books, London.

Nordstrom. 1997. *Girls and Warzones. Troubling Questions*, Life and Peace Institute, Uppsala.

Pankhurst, Donna. 1997. "Issues of Justice and Reconciliation in Complex Political Emergencies", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 239-256.

Pankhurst, Donna and Jenny Pearce. 1998. "Engendering the Analysis of Conflict: Perspectives from the South". In Haleh Afshar (ed), *Women and Empowerment*, Routledge.

Pankhurst, Donna. 2002. "Making a Difference? The Inclusion of Gender into Conflict Management Policies". In Marianne Braig and Wölte (eds.), *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusion?*, Zed Books, London.

Pankhurst, Donna. 2003. "The 'Sex War' and Other Wars: Towards a Feminist Approach to Peacebuilding", *Development In Practice*, Vol. 13, Nos. 2 & 3, pp. 154-176.

Pearce, Jenny. 2006. "Bringing Violence 'Back Home': Gender Socialisation and the Transmission of Violence Through Time and Space". *Global Civil Society*. Sage, London.

Pierson, Roach R. 1989. "Beautiful Soul or Just Warrior: Gender and War", *Gender and History*, Vol.1, pp. 77-86.

Plumper and Neumayer. 2003. "The Unequal Burden of War: the Effect of Armed Conflict on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy".

Razavi, Shahra. 2005. *Land Tenure Reform and Gender Equity*, UNRISD Research and Policy Brief 4.

Rehn, Elisabeth and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. 2002. *Women, War and Peace, The Independent Experts' Assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's Role in Peace-building*, UNIFEM.

REMHI (Recovery of Historical Memory Project). 1999. *Guatemala. Never Again!*, Latin America Bureau.

Samuel, Kumudini. 2004. *Doing Peace Versus Talking Peace: Making Visible the Invisible*, UNRISD working paper.

Sideris, Tina. 2001a. "Problems of Identity, Solidarity and Reconciliation". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*. Zed Books, London.

Sideris, Tina. 2001b. "Rape in War and Peace: Social Context, Gender, Power and Identity". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Seider, Rachel. 2003. "Renegotiating "Law and Order": Judicial Reform and Citizen Responses in Post-War Guatemala", *Democratization*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (Winter).

Sørensen, Birgitte. 1998. *Women and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Issues and Sources*. War-Torn Societies Project Occasional Paper No.3, June, UNRISD.

Stewart, Frances and Fitzgerald, Valpy. Eds. 2001a. *War and Underdevelopment*, Oxford University Press.

Stewart, Francis, Huang, Cindy, & Wang, Michael, 'Internal Wars: An Overview of the Economic and Social Consequences', in Stewart, Frances and Fitzgerald, Valpy Eds. 2001a *War and Underdevelopment*, Oxford University Press: 67-103.

Stewart, Francis & Fitzgerald, Valpy. 2001b 'The Costs of War in Poor Countries:

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations', in Stewart, Frances and Fitzgerald, Valpy (eds) *War and Underdevelopment*, Oxford University Press: 225-245.

Tamale. Sylvia. 1999. *When Hens Begin to Crow*, Fountain Press, Kampala.

Turshen, Meredeth and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). 1998a. *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 1998b. "Women's War Stories". In Meredeth Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth and Ousseina Alidou. 2000. "Africa: Women in the Aftermath of Civil War". *Race and Class*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 81-92.

Turshen, Meredeth. 2001a. "Engendering Relations of State to Society in the Aftermath". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 2001b. "The Political economy of Rape: An analysis of Systematic Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women During Armed Conflict in Africa". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C. Clark (eds.). *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*, Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 2002, "Algerian Women in the Liberation Struggle and the Civil War: From Active Participants to Passive Victims". *Social Research*, Vol. 69, No. 3, pp. 889-911.

UN. 1995. *Platform for Action*, Beijing.

UN. 1996. *Report on the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace.*

UN. 1997. *Report of Expert Group Meeting on Adolescent Girls and Their Rights.*

UN. 1998. Commission for the Status of Women, *Resolution on Women and Armed Conflict.*

United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). 1994. "Women in Somalia", *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 2-3, p.8..

UNIFEM. 2001. *Women's Land and Property Rights in Situations of Conflict and Reconstruction.*

UNIFEM. *Not A Minute More: Ending Violence Against Women.*

Väyrynen, Tarja. 2001. "Gender and UN Peace Operations: The Confines of Modernity", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, 1, Spring, pp. 125-112.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR PART II

Adams, Rachel and David Savran (eds). 2002. *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Afshar, Haleh & Deborah Eade (eds.) 2004. *Development, Women and War. Feminist Perspectives*, OXFAM, Oxford.

Amir Menachim. 1971. *Patterns in Forcible Rape.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Arendt, Hannah. 1970. *On Violence*, Harvest Books, San Diego.

Bacic, Roberta. 2002. "Dealings with the Past: Chile – Human Rights and Human Wrongs", *Race and Class*, Vol. 44, 1, July- September, pp. 17-32.

Balbus, Albert. 2002. "Masculinity and the (M)other: Toward a Synthesis of Feminist Mothering Theory and Psychoanalytic theories of Narcism". In Judith Kegan Gardiner (ed.). *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory. New Directions*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Bart, Pauline B. and Eileen Geil Moran (eds). 1993. *Violence Against Women. The Bloody Footprints.* Sage, London.

Batezat, Eleanor et al 1998. "Women and Independence: The Heritage and the Struggle" In Colin Stoneman (ed.), *Zimbabwe's Prospects*, Macmillan.

Becker, Heike. 2001. " 'We want Women to Be Given an Equal Chance': Post-Independence Rural Politics of Northern Nambia". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Bedont, Barbara. 2005. "The Renewed Popularity of the Rule of Law: Implications for Women, Impunity, and Peacekeeping". In Mazurana et al (eds.), *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford.

Bouta, Tsjeard, Georg Frerks and Ian Bannon. 2005, *Gender, Conflict and Development*, The World Bank / International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington DC

Brod, Harry, and Michael Kaufman (eds.). 1994. *Theorizing Masculinities*. Sage Publishing, London and California.

Byrne, Bridget. 1996. "Towards a Gendered Understanding of Conflict". *IDS Bulletin*, 27, 3, pp. 31-40.

Chodorow, Nancy J. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. University of California Press, California.

Chodorow, Nancy J. 1994. *Femininities, Masculinities, Sexualities: Freud and Beyond*. University Press of Kentucky, Lexington.

Chodorow, Nancy J. 2002. "The Enemy Outside: Thoughts on the Psychodynamics of Extreme Violence With Special Attention to Men and Masculinity." In. Judith Kegan Gardiner (ed). *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory. New Directions*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Clare, Anthony. 2000. *On Men. Masculinity in Crisis*, Chatto & Windus, London.

Cleaver, Frances. 2000. "Man and Masculinities: New Directions in Gender and Development". In Frances Cleaver (ed.) *Masculinities Matter! Men, gender and Development*, Zed Books, London.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1998. *The Space between Us. Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict.* Zed Books, London.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 2001. "The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C.Clark (eds.). *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence* Zed Books, London.

Coltrane, Scott. 1994. "Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science". In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (eds.). *Theorizing Masculinities*, Sage Publishing, London and California.

Connell R.W. 1987 *Gender and Power*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Connell R.W. 1994. "Psychoanalysis on Masculinity". In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (eds.). *Theorizing Masculinities* Sage Publishing, London and California.

Connell R.W. 2000. 'Bodies, Intellectuals and World Society'. Watson, N. and Cunningham-Burley, S. eds. *Re-Framing the Body* Macmillan, London.

Connell R.W. 2002. "The History of Masculinity". In Rachel Adams and David Savran (eds.). *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Connell R.W. 2005. "The Social Organization of Masculinity". In Stephen M. and Frank J. Barrett (eds.) *The Masculinities Reader*. 2nd ed. Polity Press, Cambridge.

De Abreu, Alcinda António. 1998. "Mozambican Women Experiencing Violence". In Meredeth Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa.* Zed Books, London.

Dobash, R. Emerson and Russell Dobash. 1979. *Violence Against Wives. A Case Against the Patriarchy*. Open Books, London.

Dolan, Chris. 2000. "Collapsing maculiniites and Weak States – A Case Study of Northern Uganda". In Frances Cleaver (ed.) *Masculinities Matter! Men, gender and Development*, Zed Books, London.

Dworkin, Andrea. 1982. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women.* Women's Press, London.

EC (European Commission). 1996. The European Union and the Issue of Conflicts in Africa: Peacebuilding, Conflict Prevention and Beyon.d

EC (European Council). 1995. Integrating Gender Issues in Development Cooperation.

El Bushra, Judy. 2000. "Transforming Conflict: Some Thoughts on a Gendered Understanding of Conflict Processes". In Susie Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson and Jennifer Marchbank (eds.). 2000. *States of Conflict. Gender, Violence and Resistance*, Zed Books, London.

El Bushra, Judy. 2004. "Fused in Combat: gender Relations and Armed Combat". In Haleh Afshar and Deborah Eade (eds.) 2004. *Development, Women and War. Feminist Perspectives*, OXFAM, Oxford.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1987. *Women and War.* Basic Book, New York.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1993. *The Morning After. Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War.* University of California Press, Berkeley.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1998. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarisation of Women's Lives.* Pandora, London.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2000. *Maneuvers. The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. University of California Press, London.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2004. *The Curious Feminist.* University of California Press.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2005. Keynote speech at conference, *Hegemonic Masculinities in International Politics*, University of Manchester, May 2005.

Ferris, Elizabeth. 1993. *Women, War and Peace*, Life and Peace Institute, Research Report 14, Uppsala.

Gabriel, Roger and Leigh A. Neal. 2002. "Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Following Military Combat or Peace Keeping"*. British Medical Journal*, 324 pp. 340-341.

Gardiner, Judith Kegan (ed). 2002. *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory. New Directions*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Giles, Wenona and Jennifer Hyndman (eds.). 2004. *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones.* University of California Press, London.

Giles, Wenona and Jennifer Hyndman. 2004. "Introduction. Gender and Conflict in a Global Context". In Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman (eds.) *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones.* University of California Press, London.

Gill, Peter Edward. 2001. *Female Violence and Masculine Scripts: an Application of Social Learning and Scripting Theory to Interpersonal Violence.* Paper presented at Gender and Violence in the Nordic Countries conference, Køge, Denmark, 23-24 November 2001.

Goldstein Joshua S. 2001. *War and Gender*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Goldner, V., P. Penn, M. Sheinberg and G. Walker. 1990. "Love and Violence: Gender Paradoxes in Volatile Attachments". *Family Process*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 343-364.

Hague, Euan, 1997. "Rape, Power and Masculinity: The Construction of Gender and National Identities in the War in Bosnia-Herzegovina". In Ronit Lentin (ed.), *Gender and Catastrophe*, Zed Press, London.

Hamber, Brandon, Dineo Nageng and Gabriel O'Malley. 2000. "Telling it Like it is: Understanding the Truth and Reconciliation Commission from the Perspective of Survivors", *Psychology in Society*, Vol. 26, pp.18-42.

Hamber, Brandon. 2003. *Flying Flags of Fear: The Role of Fear in the Process of Political Transition.* Paper presented at the Risk, Complex Crises and Social Futures conference, Amman, Jordan, October 2003.

Hearn, Jeff. 1998. *The Violences of Men.* Sage Publishing, London.

Human Security Centre. 2005. *The Human Security Report 2005.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ibeanu, Okechukwu. 2001. "Healing and Changing: The Changing Identity of Women in the Aftermath of the Ogoni Crisis in Nigeria". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.), *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*. Zed Books, London.

Ignatieff, Michael. 1998. *The Warrior's Honor. Ethnic War and the Modern Conscience.* Chatto and Windus, London.

IRIN (United Nations Integrated Regions International Network). 2004. *Our Bodies – Their Battle Ground: Gender-Based Violence in Conflict Zones*. www.irinnews.org/webspecials/ September 2004.

Jacobs, Susie, Ruth Jacobson and Jennifer Marchbank (eds.). 2000. *States of Conflict. Gender, Violence and Resistance*, Zed Books, London.

Jefferson . 1994. "Theorizing Masculine Subjectivity". In T. Newburn and E. Stanko (eds.), *Just Boys Doing Business? Men, Masculinities and Crime*, Routledge, London.

Jones, Edgar, Robert Hodgins-Vermaas, Helen McCartney, Brian Everitt, Charlotte Beech, Denise Poynter, Ian Palmer, Kenneth Hyams and Simon Wessly. "Post-Combat Syndromes from the Boer War to the Gulf War: A Cluster Analysis of Their Nature and Attribution". *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 324, pp 321-329.

Kelly Liz. 1988. *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Kesby, Mike. 1996. "Arenas for Control, Terrains of Gender Contestation: Guerrilla Struggle and Counter-Insurgency Warfare in Zimbabwe, 1972-1980", *Journal of Southern African Studies,* Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 561-84.

Kimmel Michael S. 1994. "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity". In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities*. Sage Publishing, London and California.

Krog. Antjie. 2001. "Locked into Loss and Silence: Testimonies of Gender and Violence at the South Africa Truth Commission". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C.Clark (eds.), *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Zed Books, London.

Lentin, Ronit (ed.). 1997. *Gender and Catastrophe*. Zed Press, London.

Lottman, Herbert, R. 1986. *The People's Anger,* Hutchinson, London.

Lövkrona, Inger. 2001. *The Violent Man and Violent Men*. Paper presented at "Gender and Violence in the Nordic Countries" conference, Køge, Denmark, 23-24 November 2001

Mani, Rama. 2002. *Beyond Retribution. Seeking Justice in the Shadows of War*, Polity Press, Oxford.

Mazurana, Dyan, Anglela Raven-Roberts and Jane Parpart (eds.). 2005. *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping.* Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford.

Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). 2001. *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*. Zed Books, London.

Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen. 2001. "There is No Aftermath for Women". In Sheila Meintjes, Sheila, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation* Zed Books, London.

Millet, Kate. 1972. *Sexual Politics*, Abacus, London.

Moser, Caroline and Fiona C. Clark (eds.). 2001. *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Zed Books, London
.
Moser, Caroline. 2001. "The Gendered Continuum of Violence and Conflict: An Operational Framework". In Moser, Caroline and Fiona C. Clark. eds. *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Zed Books, London: 30-52.

Munn, Jamie. 2005. *Kosovar Identities – Gendered Realities of Life*?. Paper presented at Conference on Hegemonic Masculinities, University of Manchester, May 200.5

Pearce, Jenny. 2006. "Bringing Violence 'Back Home': Gender Socialisation and the Transmission of Violence Through Time and Space". *Global Civil Society*. Sage, London.

Pierson, Roach R. 1989. "Beautiful Soul or Just Warrior: Gender and War", *Gender and History*, Vol.1, pp. 77-86.

Pillay, Anu. "Violence Against Women in the Aftermath". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Rehn, Elisabeth and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. 2002. *Women, War and Peace, The Independent Experts' Assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's Role in Peace-building*, UNIFEM.

Richards, Paul. 1995. "Rebellion in Liberia and Sierra Leone. A Crisis of Youth?". In Furley, Oliver. *Conflict in Africa*. I.B.Tauris. London: 66-86.

Sasaki, Kazu. 2004. *Reconciliation and Justice in Post-Genocide Rwanda*, forthcoming PhD thesis, University of Bradford.

Segal, Lynne. 1990. *Slow Motion. Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*, Virago, London.

Segal, Lynne. 1999. *Why Feminism?.* Polity, Cambridge.

Seifert, Ruth. 1995. "War and Rape. A Preliminary Analysis".*Mass Rape.* In A. Stiglmayer (ed). *The War Against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina.* University of Nebraska Press, London.

Seifert, Ruth. 1999. "The Second Front: The Logic of Sexual Violence in Wars". In. Manfred B. Steger and Nancy S. Lind (eds.). *Violence and Its Alternatives.* Macmillan, London.

Sideris, Tina. 2001a. "Problems of Identity, Solidarity and Reconciliation". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation.* Zed Books, London.

Sideris, Tina. 2001b. "Rape in War and Peace: Social Context, Gender, Power and Identity". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Seider, Rachel. 2003. "Renegotiating "Law and Order": Judicial Reform and Citizen Responses in Post-War Guatemala", *Democratization*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (Winter).

Sørensen, Birgitte. 1998. *Women and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Issues and Sources.* War-Torn Societies Project Occasional Paper No.3, June, UNRISD.

Stanko, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Experience of Male Violence.* Routledge, London.

Stanko, Elizabeth. 1994. *Perspectives on Violence*, Quartet Books, London.

Stanko, Elizabeth. 2003. *The Meanings of Violence.* Routledge, London.

Steans, Jill. 1998. *Gender and International Relations*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Turshen, Meredeth and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). 1998. *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 1998. "Women's War Stories". In Meredeth Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds.). *What Women Do In Wartime. Gender and Conflict in Africa*. Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 2001a. "Engendering Relations of State to Society in the Aftermath". In Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay and Meredeth Turshen (eds.). *The Aftermath. Women in Post-conflict Transformation*, Zed Books, London.

Turshen, Meredeth. 2001b. "The Political economy of Rape: An analysis of Systematic Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women During Armed Conflict in Africa". In Caroline Moser and Fiona C. Clark (eds.). *Victims, Perpetrators Or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*, Zed Books, London.

Väyrynen, Tarja. 2001. "Gender and UN Peace Operations: The Confines of Modernity", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, 1, Spring, pp. 125-112.

Whitehead, Stephen M. and Frank J.Barrett (eds.) 2005. *The Masculinities Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2nd ed.

World Health Organisation. 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*. World Health Organisation: Geneva.