

Feminism's Influence on Peace History

Frances Early

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the influence of interdisciplinary feminist scholarship on the evolution of peace history as a field. The author argues that feminist perspectives have helped to transform the way we study and understand women and gender in relation to war and peace in historical and contemporary times.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette dissertation étudie l'influence que le savoir féministe interdisciplinaire a eu sur l'évolution de l'histoire de la paix comme domaine. L'auteure affirme que les perspectives féministes ont aidé à transformer la façon d'étudier et de comprendre les femmes et les sexes en relation avec la guerre et la paix dans l'histoire et dans l'époque contemporaine.

When Barbara Roberts died two years ago at the age of fifty-five, the historical profession lost a remarkable talent. Barbara's scholarship spanned and greatly enhanced the fields of immigrant and labour history, women's history, and peace history. Her productive and creative pursuit of innovative research topics crossed perceived field and disciplinary boundaries. Simply put, Barbara was a pioneer.

This issue of Atlantis honours Barbara's scholarly legacy. Our respected colleague died in the midst of researching broadly conceived comparative topics on women's peace history. We hope that the first essay in this issue, "Feminism's Influence on Peace History," helps to focus renewed attention on the scholarly significance of Barbara's work as contextualized in a richly varied and increasingly transnational field. Feminist perspectives on the histories of peace and war in Canada and elsewhere retain their relevance as we enter a new and dangerously violent century.

Over the past three decades feminist scholars in a variety of disciplines have produced an impressive body of work on war and peace history. A rich treasure trove of empirical studies now demonstrates the centrality of women as agents of change in same-gender and mixed-gender national and transnational peace movements from the early nineteenth century to the present. Theoretical works debate the root causes of war and have contributed

much to our understanding of the roles that overt forms of oppression and covert systemic violence play in sustaining militarism and warrior societies. There is no question in the minds of feminist scholars that this new literature is exciting and important. But has it achieved respectability outside of feminist circles? Or to rephrase the question with a narrower focus and in a more positive fashion for the purposes of this essay: how has feminist war and peace scholarship influenced peace history?

To begin to answer this question we need first to appreciate that peace history and feminist scholarship share a common origin: both emerged in a self-conscious way in the tumultuous 1960s. The heady, politically-charged climate of this decade witnessed the rising power of a global movement against Cold War nuclearism and a parallel struggle against the US prosecution of the Vietnam War and, in North America, the rebirth of the Women's Movement. As feminist and peace history scholar Sandi Cooper has remarked, "More than many areas of academic study...women's history [and] peace research in history [live] in an intimate relationship with political realities of the moment."¹

In North America, we date the formal commencement of peace history with the founding in 1964 of the Conference on Peace Research in History (CPRH, now called the Peace History Society), perhaps placing peace history just a few years ahead of women's history in institutional

development.² This group of scholars and scholar activists was led by historians and its members were predominantly men. Interestingly, however, the few women who became early leaders in CPRH were mostly scholar activists whose commitment to feminism and the development of women's history was unwavering. The key individuals in this group were Berenice Carroll, Blanche Wiesen Cook, and Sandi Cooper. Thus, from the outset, research in peace history benefitted from a feminist perspective.

In their beginnings, peace history and women's history shared other attributes. Practitioners sought not only to recover the hidden histories of their respective subject matters (e.g., peace movements and their leaders, women's contributions to and roles in peace societies), but also to identify in the practice of doing history and in societal values and institutional arrangements the underlying reasons for the near invisibility of both peace and women in the historical record. Hence, peace history and women's history researchers embraced empiricism and theory-building as necessary and interconnected tasks. Further, as each field developed, scholarship became transdisciplinary; peace historians and women's historians established journals, university programs (peace studies, women's studies), and research projects that transcended established disciplinary boundaries. Scholars in these emergent fields laboured with purpose and flair on the margins of the academy, and this positioning helped to build group solidarity and encouraged rather grand collaborative research projects.³

Commonalities aside, by the 1970s, historians of women (who often were women themselves) were unlikely to be aligned primarily with the field of peace history, although there were notable exceptions to this pattern. Instead, the women's history project was, to paraphrase Gerda Lerner, "the majority [finding] its past." Methods and concepts in women's history favoured a separatist approach to understanding the past lives of women, an "outsider" narrative that featured women either as victims of male-dominant structures (including, in some cases, an appreciation of the interrelatedness of patriarchal arrangements, class divisions, and racism) or as rebels against or resisters to societal subordination. Because a liberal (or egalitarian) feminist sensibility helped to frame

the writing of North American women's history in its early stages, projects that identified women seeking to integrate into mainstream society (via, for instance, the suffrage campaign, trade union organizing, or civil rights activism) held sway. Moreover, with peace history still in its infancy (with fewer practitioners), feminist historians did not, at first, seek to find the women of peace narratives. Instead, in line with egalitarian feminist premises, they turned with alacrity to writing contributory history on women's roles in the military, national liberation struggles, and wars.⁴

Although feminist historians were slow to discover the potential for writing women into peace history, once begun, the progress has been rapid. In the United States, the pioneering scholarship of Blanche Wiesen Cook, Berenice Carroll, and Barbara Steinson - undertaken in the 1970s and early 1980s on women's involvement in nineteenth- and twentieth-century peace movements - stirred a second and larger generation of women's peace historians to enrich the narrative of women's separatist activism.⁵ Thanks to the work of scholars Harriet Hyman Alonso, Amy Swerdlow, Linda Schott, Carrie Foster, Dee Garrison, Anne Marie Pois, Susan Zeiger, and others, the history of the US women's peace movement has been effectively presented.⁶ Further, Canadian scholars have been active and creative participants in developing a rich literature on women's antiwar activism. The scholarship of Barbara Roberts and Thomas Socknat, in particular, has demonstrated that peace work among Canadian women in the Great War and interwar period owed much to a uniquely Canadian socialist-feminist tradition that awaits full rendering by historians.⁷ As well, feminist scholars of European women's history such as Sandi Cooper, Nadine Lubelski-Bernard, Sybil Oldfield, Jo Vellacott, Jill Liddington, and Rosemary Cullen Owens have made progress in narrating women's achievements in modern peace movements on the continent and in Great Britain and Ireland, and a separatist women's peace tradition is being recorded in other areas of the world, too.⁸

The new literature produced by second-generation women's peace historians has revealed that the so-called postfeminist era following the First World War witnessed the flowering of an international women's peace movement that linked pacifist ideals to a larger world movement for

women's and human rights. Recently, women's history scholar Leila Rupp has published a nuanced study of the international women's movement up to the Second World War that reinforces this peace history theme. As her scholarship shows, the most prestigious and effective separatist peace organization, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF, founded in 1919), was also the most influential transnational women's organization in the interwar period.⁹

One topic that feminist peace historians have studied with some care concerns the practical and ideological reasons for the interwar separatist women's peace movement structure. Separatism was a strategy that insured women peace advocates could avoid male dominance within their organizations; separatism also created an intellectual climate among theoretically-minded pacifist women that encouraged an ongoing critique of patriarchy, as such. Members of women's peace groups up to 1939 in North America and in European countries shared a social-feminist or maternal-feminist belief that women's life experiences were radically different from men's; as the "mother half of humanity" - society's nurturers and moral guardians - they felt the need to exploit this perceived difference on behalf of peace. Stressing men's rather than women's responsibility for social violence, militarism, and war, pacifist-minded women from the era of the First World War to contemporary times have tended to idealize women as peacemakers and deprecate men as warriors. Nonetheless, feminist peace historians have taken pains to point out that in the modern period pacifist women have been in the minority; the vast majority of women - including most feminists - have supported their country's call to arms, and the moral mother has been a defender of war more often than a pacifist critic of war.

Paying tribute to the scholarship of these second generation women's peace historians, Sandi Cooper notes that their findings help us appreciate the extended reach of women's political work: "Over the past century, 'motherist' arguments altered the course of peace movement programs, helped push toward the creation of the welfare state, attacked the nuclear preparedness politicians, and even produced independent women's peace societies - before and after the First World War."¹⁰ Cooper reminds us that feminist scholars have been

especially sensitive to the importance of "grounding peace in social movements and political climates."

Overlapping with this body of women's peace movement narrations is the collective work of interdisciplinary feminist scholars who have been focused on building feminist theory in relation to women/gender, militarism, war, and peace. Particularly relevant to feminist peace history scholars are the insights of Jean Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe, Betty Reardon, and Elise Boulding; they argue convincingly that war and peace are gendered processes.¹¹ These respected theorists propose that historically the social construction of gender (manliness, womanliness) has been central to militarism, warmaking, and peacemaking. Elshtain has shown that man the "just warrior" and woman the "beautiful soul" or "moral mother" who nurtures soldiers and uncritically supports war have been dominant cultural images in Western societies, and that this symbolism has served to legitimize and promote war. Reinforcing Elshtain's argument, Enloe has demonstrated that despite some women's military participation in social revolutions and war - in both historical and contemporary times - the warrior/nurturer dichotomy has held firm. Betty Reardon's work has offered compelling evidence of the interrelatedness of patriarchy and war as social systems. In counterpoint to theorists who connect gender systems primarily to warmaking, Elise Boulding presents an alternative theme: the resistant and "inventive" tradition of peacemaking among women from diverse societies in modern times. Boulding shows that peace-minded women have subverted the beautiful soul construct to suit their vision of a world without war. In line with feminist theorists of women's social and moral development such as Carol Gilligan and Sara Ruddick, Boulding argues that "women's knowledge and experience worlds have equipped them to function creatively as problem-solvers and peacemakers in ways that men have not been equipped by their knowledge and experience worlds."¹²

This interdisciplinary gendered approach to militarism, war, and peace parallels a new initiative in women's history that has significant implications for peace history. Since the early 1980s, we have seen a shift in the field of women's history from a focus on women in history to the history of gender. Louise Newman, in a probing essay published in 1991, notes that gender history

examines "how gender operates through specific cultural forms," while women's history examines "why specific groups of women share certain experiences."¹³ Newman argues that gender history and women's history must be viewed as complementary approaches. "The challenge," she argues, is "to analyse how changes in the representation of cultural forms relate to changes in experiences that specific groups of people construct for themselves. The point of such an enterprise would be to develop the skills and perceptions that might enable us to manipulate cultural forms in ways that would alter our understandings of past experience, as well as our political commitments for the future."¹⁴ Newman's suggestion that feminist historians seek to combine gender history practice with the more established approach of women's history has resonated with what we might call the third generation of peace historians. Since the early 1990s, new gendered studies of women's (and men's) relation to war and peace have appeared, and their authors are moving peace history to new terrain.

Some gender historians link their scholarly endeavours with the longstanding goal of peace historians to understand the causes of war and the prerequisites for peace; they concur with more established peace historians that the historical record must be more inclusive of peace and related social justice movements, and they stress the efficacy of many social change movements in modern history.¹⁵ Such scholars have been influenced by feminist theorizing around war and peace issues, and they have often been trained (or have trained themselves) in postmodern methods of analysis. They have resisted the poststructuralist tendency to locate power and oppression solely within the operation of language but hold a perception that symbolic systems of meaning are never neutral and exist as sites of power and legitimation for specific groups. Members of this third generation of peace historians most likely would agree with Louise Newman that the scholarly enterprise must be "explicitly political in its attempt to specify how oppression is perpetuated and experienced, as well as how it may be resisted and escaped."¹⁶

Gender history studies on topics related to peace (and war) history are diverse, but they all share an appreciation that cultural representation of

sexual difference in conjunction with meanings individuals derive from social experiences are powerful influences on intellectual and political discourse and affect in complex ways the goals and outcomes of social change movements. Particularly insightful within this emerging body of work is scholarship that explores the state's attempt to manipulate wartime and postwar gender systems (especially the language of gender) to maximize social cohesion and to discourage or quash dissent.¹⁷

Feminist scholars who choose to explore aspects of peace history through the lens of gender history have been influenced by postmodern thought to look sceptically upon the notion that historians can write history "*wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*." Nonetheless, while aware of the incompleteness of linear narratives and the contingency of historical truths, feminist gender scholars who pursue topics related to peace history believe that they can apprehend aspects of people's lives and arrive at some valuable insights. And, as three recent feminist studies of leading twentieth-century peace advocates attest, a new genre of historical writing, the feminist biography, offers an innovative and creative method for further explorations into a gendered peace history.

The meaning of women's peace advocacy in relation to their own experiences and in relation to broad social movement history is a main theme in Margaret Hope Bacon's study of American WILPF leader Mildred Scott Olmsted (1890-1990), Deborah Gorham's examination of English feminist writer and pacifist spokesperson Vera Brittain (1893-1970), and Barbara Roberts's work on feminist-socialist activist and Canadian women's peace movement founder Gertrude Richardson (1875-1946).¹⁸ Each biographer brings her own slant to her subject, but all three authors set themselves the difficult feminist task of writing about one woman's life without the public/private split so common in the traditional biography. Bacon was able to work collaboratively with Olmsted before her death, thereby creating a set of stimulating conversations between them, and two voices are reflected in the biography; Gorham benefited from the existence of extensive public (published) and private autobiographical sources on Brittain and analyzed these writings ingeniously; and Roberts, with neither of these methodological

advantages, possessed the temerity, skill, and indefatigable energy to piece together Richardson's life story from numerous scattered sources across two continents. These biographies are engaging and political: the authors believe that writing about and coming to understand another individual's life - albeit incompletely - helps us to understand our own lives and times better. Roberts views Richardson's commitment to feminism, peace, and social justice as an "ethic of risk," a notion that one must maintain belief in the path as well as in the identified idealized goals of a particular social movement; this concept also brings added dimension to the lives of Olmsted and Brittain and helps us to think more clearly about other mostly anonymous women of previous epochs who have struggled in unheralded ways for feminist, peace, and social justice goals.

Set against a backdrop of one strain of postmodern theory that insists that we can never know the past or really comprehend the complexity of "the decentred subject," the feminist biography of the sort discussed here renews confidence in the historian's craft. Gorham, for one, counsels feminist historians to hold suspect theories that deny "the reality of human subjectivity." She quotes Adrienne Rich's dictum that feminism "takes women seriously." Amplifying this point and in light of her own research on Brittain, Gorham states:

For much of history, patriarchy has denied women's subjectivity by constructing woman as "other." Feminism, in contrast, asserts women's claim to selfhood, but this claim is still fragile and incomplete and it is risky for feminists to embrace theories that question the legitimacy of the transcendent self or of experience...It is because Vera Brittain took herself seriously that the nature and the development of her feminist consciousness is worthy of close examination.¹⁹

The varied approaches to studying women, gender, war, and peace I have outlined represent but the tip of the iceberg in terms of recognizing feminism's influence on peace history. It is noteworthy that in the last few years the Peace History Society (PHS) has committed itself to exploring the borders of this new scholarship,

notably by sponsoring panels at conferences.²⁰ Many of the papers that have been presented at these gatherings are now in print or are forthcoming.²¹ Two PHS conferences, in particular, might be noted here: "Peace and War Issues: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity," held at Rutgers University (1994), and "Peace and War Issues: Gender, Race, Identity, and Citizenship," convened at the University of Texas at San Antonio (1997). Selected papers from these conferences have been published as special issues of *Peace & Change: A Journal of Peace Research*.²² Perusal of other recent publications reveals that peace history is now linked in the minds of many of its practitioners to feminist theory, race studies, issues of ethnicity and citizenship, liberation struggles, and transnational social protest movements.

As noted at the beginning of this essay, feminist scholars and peace historians have always benefitted from and been influenced by interdisciplinarity; they have also embraced both empiricism and theory-building as twin aspects of their work. Of late, intellectually rewarding dialogues and cooperative projects have developed among and between not only feminist researchers and peace historians but also diplomatic and international historians, historians of ethnicity and race, "new" military historians, and peace studies scholars trained in diverse disciplines, notably political science, sociology, anthropology, literature, and philosophy.²³ Today it is difficult to know where to break the flow, where to place disciplinary or field boundaries. According to historian Emily Rosenberg, delimiting boundaries is just what we do not want to do. In a provocative essay entitled "Walking the Borders," Rosenberg suggests that research must be concerned with analysing systems of power, but that because "universalized systems and supposed objectivity have worked, in the past, to create the discourses of hegemonic power...[scholarship] may need to be localized, partial, and contextual."²⁴ The large view is crucial but needs to be grounded in evidence-based research:

Calls for a broad, international sweep will miss the mark unless they also adopt peripheral vision and challenge the abstract assumptions, such as progress, modernization, destiny, and

internationalism, upon which dominant systems of power have rested. If borders are seen as frontier areas that delineate and separate lines of power and discursive fields, we should linger at the intersections, walking the borders to analyze things from the outside in.²⁵

Over the past several decades, feminist scholars have served this "outside in" function for peace history. They have lingered at intersections, and, while walking the borders, they have welcomed others to join their journey, mostly with good grace. Unquestionably, the feminist perspective has expanded, recast, and, indeed, transformed the practices and concepts of peace history. But the story is not over; it never is.

ENDNOTES

1. Sandi Cooper, "Commentary: The Subversive Power of Peace History," *Peace & Change* 20.1 (1995): 62.
2. For the North American origins of peace history as a distinct field of scholarly endeavour in the decades preceding the founding of CPRH, see Lawrence S. Wittner, "Merle Curti and the Development of Peace History," *Peace & Change* 23.1 (1998): 74-82.
3. For peace history see, for example, the impressive 360-volume reprint series, *The Garland Library of War and Peace*, eds. Blanche Wiesen Cook, Sandi Cooper, and Charles Chatfield (New York: Garland, 1971-1983), and *Biographical Dictionary of Modern Peace Leaders*, ed. Harold Josephson (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985); for women's history, see particularly *Black Women in United States History*, ed. Darlene Clark Hine (New York: Carlsen, 1990); and *Handbook of American Womens History*, ed. Angela Howard Zophy (New York: Garland, 1990).
4. Epitomizing this vein of study is the recently published overview by Linda Grant De Pauw, *Battle Cries and Lullabies: Women in War from Prehistory to the Present* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998).
5. Blanche W. Cook, "The Woman's Peace Party: Collaboration and Non-Cooperation in World War I," *Peace & Change* 1.1 (1972): 36-42; and *Crystal Eastman on Revolution* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Berenice A. Carroll, "The Outsiders: Comments of Fukuda Hideko, Catherine Marshall and Dorothy Detzer," *Peace & Change* 4.3 (1977): 23-26; and "Feminist Politics and Peace," in *The Role of Women in Conflict and Peace: An Interdisciplinary Symposium*, ed. Dorothy McGuigan (Ann Arbor: Center for Continuing Education, University of Michigan, 1977): 61-70; and Barbara Steinson, *American Women's Activism in World War I* (New York: Garland, 1982). These authors built upon the monograph by Louise Degan, *The History of the Woman's Peace Party* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1939). Also relevant is the survey study by two participants, Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Pioneers for Peace: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 1915-1965* (London: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom British Section, 1980).
6. Harriet Alonso, *The Women's Peace Union and the Outlawry of War 1921-1942* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1990; rep. ed. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997); and *Peace as a Women's Issue: A History of the US Movement for World Peace and Women's Rights* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Amy Swerdlow, *Women Strike for Peace: Traditional Motherhood and Radical Politics in the 1960s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Linda K. Schott, *Reconstructing Women's Thoughts: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Before World War II* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Carrie A. Foster, *The Women and the Warriors: The US Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1946* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995); Dee Garrison, "Our Skirts Gave Them Courage: The Civil Defense Protest Movement in New York City, 1955-1961," in *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1990*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994); Anne Marie Pois, "The Politics and Process of Organizing for Peace: The United States Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1919-1939" (PhD dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1988); and Susan Zeiger, "Finding a Cure for War: Women's Politics and the Peace Movement in the 1920s," *Journal of Social History* 24.1 (1990): 69-86.
7. Barbara Roberts, *Why Do Women Do Nothing to Stop the War? Canadian Feminist Pacifists and the Great War, 1914-18*, Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women Papers 13 (1985), and "Women's Peace Activism in Canada," in *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics*, ed. Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989): 276-308. In *Up and Doing: Canadian Women and Peace*, eds. Janice Williamson and Deborah Gorham (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1989), see especially Randi Warne, "Nellie McClung and Peace," 35-47; Barbara Roberts, "Women Against War, 1914-1918: Francis Beynon and Laura Hughes," 48-65; and Tom Socknat, "For Peace and Freedom: Canadian Feminists and the Interwar Peace Campaign," 66-88. See, as well, Kay MacPherson and Meg Sears, "The Voice of Women: A History," in *Women in the Canadian Mosaic*, ed. Gwen Matheson (Toronto: Peter Martin, 1976): 71-89; Terry Crowley, "Ada Mary Courtice: Pacifist, Feminist and Educational Reformer in Early

Twentieth-Century Canada," *Studies in History and Politics* 1 (1980): 75-116; Veronica Strong-Boag, "Peace-Making Women: Canada 1919-1939," and Deborah Gorham, "Vera Brittain, Flora MacDonald Denison and the Great War: The Failure of Non-Violence," in *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ruth Roach Pierson (London: Croom Helm, 1987): 170-91 and 137-48; Frances H. Early, "The Historic Roots of the Women's Peace Movement in North America," *Canadian Woman Studies* 7.4 (1986): 43-48; Special Peace Issue of *Atlantis* 12. 2 (1987); Lucille Marr, "If you want peace, prepare for peace," Hanna Newcombe, Peace Researcher and Peace Activist," *Ontario History* 84.4 (1992): 263-81; Beverly Boutilier, "Women and Peace in Interwar Canada: The Case of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom" (Masters thesis, Carleton University, 1988); and Christine Ball, "History of the Voice of Women: The Early Years" (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1994). On socialist women, especially in relation to trade unionism, see Linda Kealey, *Enlisting Women for the Cause: Women, Labour, and the Left in Canada, 1890-1920*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

8. Sandi Cooper, "The Work of Women in Nineteenth Century Continental European Peace Movements," *Peace & Change* 9.4 (1984): 11-28, and "Women's Participation in European Peace Movements: The Struggle to Prevent World War I," in *Women and Peace*, ed. Pierson, 51-74; Nadine Lubelski-Bernard, "The Participation of Women in the Belgian Peace Movement (1830-1914)" in *Women and Peace*, ed. Pierson, 76-89; Sybil Oldfield, *Women Against the Iron Fist: Alternatives to Militarism, 1900-1989* (Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Jo Vellacott, "Feminist Consciousness and the First World War," in *Women and Peace*, ed. Pierson, 114-36; Jill Liddington, *The Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain Since 1820* (London: Virago, 1989; rep. ed. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991); and Rosemary Cullen Owens, "Women and Pacifism in Ireland, 1915-1932," in *Women & Irish History*, ed. Maryann Gialanella Valiulis and Mary O'Dowd (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1997) 220-38 & 326-31. Useful for identifying emerging global perspectives on women's peace advocacy and struggles during wartime are: *Images of Women in Peace & War: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Sharon MacDonald, Pat Holden, and Shirley Ardener (London: Macmillan, 1987; rep. ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); and *The Women & War Reader*, ed. Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin (New York and London: New York University Press, 1998).

9. Leila Rupp, *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1997). For an insightful elaboration on this theme, see Jo Vellacott, "A Place for Pacifism and Transnationalism in Feminist Theory: The Early Work of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom," *Women's History Review* 2.1 (1993): 23-56.

10. Cooper, "Commentary," p. 61.

11. These scholars and others have published extensively on this topic. See particularly, Jean Elshtain, *Women & War* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarisation of Women's Lives*, 2nd ed. (London: Pandora Press; New York: Unwin Hyman, 1988); Betty A. Reardon, *Sexism and the War System* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1985); and Elise Boulding, "Feminist Inventions in the Art of Peacemaking: A Century Overview," *Peace & Change* 20.4 (1995): 408-38.

12. Boulding, "Feminist Inventions," pp. 410, 412. See, as well, Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982); and Sara Ruddick, "Maternal Thinking" and "Preservative Love and Military Destruction: Some Reflections on Mothering and Peace," in *Mothering: Essays in Feminist Theory*, ed. Joyce Trebilcock (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allenheld, 1984): 213-30 & 231-62.

13. Louise Newman, "Critical Theory and the History of Women: What's at Stake in Deconstructing Women's History," *Journal of Women's History* 2.3 (1991): 59.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

15. Useful in this context is the published forum "Why Peace History?" in which a number of leading peace historians participated. While quite contrasting, and, at times, contentious, views were expressed in this debate, contributors would all agree to what I have noted are the generalized aims of the peace historian. See "Special Issue: Peace History Forum," *Peace & Change* 20.1 (1995).

16. Newman, "Critical Theory and the History of Women," 59.

17. Pioneering scholarship in this area includes: Susan Kingsley Kent, *Making Peace: The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993); Frances H. Early, *A World Without War: How U.S. Feminists and Pacifists Resisted World War I* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997); Kathleen Kennedy, *Disloyal Mothers and Scurrilous Citizens: Women and Subversion During World War I* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999); Margaret Higonnet, et al., *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); Geoffrey S. Smith, "National Security and Personal Isolation: Sex, Gender, and Disease in the Cold-War United States," *International History Review* 14.2 (1992): 307-37; Linda Schott, "Jane Addams and William James on Alternatives to War," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54. 2 (1993): 241-54; Susan Zeiger, "She Didn't Raise Her Boy to be a Slacker: Motherhood, Conscription, and the Culture of the First World War," *Feminist Studies* 22.1 (1996): 7-39; Marlene Epp, "The Memory of Violence: Soviet and East European Mennonite Refugees and Rape in the Second World

War," *Journal of Women's History* 9.1 (1997): 58-87; and Deborah Gorham, "'They Use Real Bullets:' An American Family's Experience of the Second World War. A Fragment of Memoir," *Women's History Review* 6.1 (1997): 5-28. See, as well, Rachel Goossen, *Women Against the Good War: Conscientious Objection and Gender on the American Homefront, 1941-1947* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

18. Margaret Hope Bacon, *One Woman's Passion for Peace and Freedom: The Life of Mildred Scott Olmsted* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Deborah Gorham, *Vera Brittain: A Feminist Life* (Oxford and Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1996); and Barbara Roberts, *A Reconstructed World: A Feminist Biography of Gertrude Richardson* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996).

19. Gorham, *Vera Brittain*, p. 266.

20. Pertinent are: the American Historical Association panel, "Gender Roles and Nuclear Disarmament Activism," Seattle, Washington, January 1998; and two panels at the Eleventh Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Rochester, New York, June 1999: "Women, Gender and Peace Activism in the 1950s and 1960s" and "How Gender Shapes Peace Research in History: The Theme and Its Variations." The PHS has been sponsoring sessions on women/gender topics at international congresses, too, including, most recently, a panel on women and world peace at the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference, The Hague, May 1999.

21. Consult, for example, Lawrence S. Wittner, "Gender Roles and Nuclear Disarmament Activism, 1954-1965," *Gender & History* 12.1 (April 2000): 197-222.

22. For Rutgers conference papers, see *Peace & Change* 20.4 (1995); and for San Antonio conference papers, see *Peace & Change* 23.4 (1998).

23. In addition to sources already cited, refer, for example, to special issues of scholarly journals: "Feminism and Peace," *Hypatia*, 9.2 (1994); "Rethinking Women's Peace Studies," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 23.3 and 23.4 (1995); "Twentieth-Century Women in Wartime," *International History Review* 19.1 (1997); and "Sex, Race and Diplomacy," *International History Review* 20.4 (1998). Two review essays merit attention, as well: Frances Early, "New Directions in the Gendered Study of Peace, Social Violence, Militarism, and War," *Journal of Women's History* 6.1 (1994): 75-86; and Sandi Cooper, "'Managing' Women in War and Peace," *International History Review* 20.4 (1998): 904-19.

24. Emily Rosenberg, "Walking the Borders," in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, ed. Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 35.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 27.