

Chapitre 17/Chapter 17
**GLOBALIZATION, MILITARISM AND TERRORISM:
MAKING CONNECTIONS WITH PATRIARCHY AND
COLONIZATION¹**

Rhonda Hammer

Thesis: *In this article, I explore the relationship of militarism and what I call “family terrorism” and theorize a multiplicity of forms of local and globalized violence. I employ critical, dialectical feminist theories that present broad perspectives on terrorism, militarism, alienation and colonization while highlighting their connections with patriarchalism.*

Militarism couldn't get along with just men's willingness to earn their manhood credentials by soldiering; it required women to accept particular assumptions about mothering, marriage, and unskilled work. And if women began to question either the naturalness or the wisdom of such ideas, then militarism relied on public policies to limit women's ability to act on their skepticism (Cynthia Enloe, 1993, 253).

Cynthia Enloe's words touch upon the heart of the complexities, paradoxes and multidimensional nature of contemporary global terrorisms and militarisms that punctuate the world we live in. Moreover, the multiple realities of women, children and the elderly in regards to the debilitating consequences of terror and militarism are too often underemphasized in discussions of globalization. Examinations of relations between terrorism, militarism, and patriarchy seem to be 'unfashionable' and even unthinkable within most popular and many theoretical domains. Yet many critical scholars and activists argue that patriarchalism is fundamental for understanding globalization, terrorisms and colonization, and helping produce resistance movements against these forms of oppression.

In this paper, I employ critical and dialectical anti-racist feminist theories that present broad perspectives on terrorism and militarism grounded in patriarchal violence and domination. Thus, I hope to address dimensions of terrorism neglected in many current discussions. I also argue for critical global feminist approaches to war and militarization which draw on colonization theories that emphasize the patriarchal nature of terrorism which finds much of its foundations in the familial relations of the so-called domestic sphere and in the public domain and globalized world of neo-liberal capitalism. Hence, I propose the need for the kinds of radical shifts in thinking and praxis that embrace a globalized coalition politics that identifies difference and solidarity, in a dialectical, both/and fashion that provides an epistemology of social justice. Instead of one-sided approaches to problems like terrorism or violence against women, “We can,” as Shahrzad Mojab puts it, “instead, adopt a dialectical approach which recognizes the individuality and particularity of each woman and each feminist movement, each within its specific historical context, but at the same time acknowledges that, even in their uniqueness, they share common struggles against capitalist and precapitalist patriarchy” (1988, 27).

Such critical feminist and anticapitalist perspectives must be especially cognizant of the hierarchical nature of a multiplicity of patriarchal relations which include pathological families,

overt and covert segregated communities, governments and businesses, nation states, fundamentalist religious ideologies, and contemporary forms of militarism. These forms of oppression, many argue, are provoking genocidal terrorist policies directed primarily at women, children, and the elderly. I want in this study to indicate connections between the key terms of Globalization; Patriarchalism and Family Terrorism; Alienation and Colonization; and Militarism. Since most of these concepts evoke contested and sometimes ambiguous meanings, due to the complex and often multidimensional experiences they attempt to describe, I will provide brief analytical explications of them and indicate connections between patriarchy, family terrorism, militarism, and colonization which are often overlooked in many analyses.

GLOBALIZATION

"The concept of globalization," as Carmen Luke reminds us, "is contested, overused and trapped in dangerous dualism" (2001, 24). Rather, than employing globalization in a vulgar essentialist or bifurcated manner, I attempt to employ it in a dialectical sense. Hence, I don't reduce it solely to the neo-liberal political economic paradigmatic component, that, according to Robert McChesney, refer to "the policies and processes whereby a relative handful of private interests are permitted to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize personal profit" (McChesney, 1999,7). The International Forum of Globalization (IFG) identifies the WTO (World Trade Organization) which was established in 1994, "as a blueprint for the global hegemony of the largest corporation in the US, Japan, Germany, France, the UK, Italy, and Canada. To support needless consumption in these dominant countries, most other nations must export goods and services while their people lack the financial means to obtain even the most basic necessities" (Dellinger, 2003: 6). Indeed, the economic consequences of these kinds of policies have provoked "a massive increase in social and economic inequality, a marked increase in severe deprivation for the poorest nations and peoples of the world, a disastrous global environment, an unstable global economy and an unprecedented bonanza for the wealthy" (McChesney, 1997, 7). For example, over 800 million people are starving in the world (Eisenstein, 1998, 1). According to UNICEF, "one out of 6 or 47 million children are living in poverty" in industrial nations, 11.6% of those children live in the USA," while 600 million children in developing countries live in abject poverty."² It is estimated that about "14 million children die each year from hunger-related diseases" (Dellinger, 2003, 5).³

It is hardly surprising that starvation in Afghanistan, since the terror war that followed the 9-11 bombings in 2001, has escalated with thousands of new widows and orphaned children joining the ranks (LA Times, Jan 7, 2002). Likewise in Iraq, the Bush/Blair "wars against terrorism" appear to be inscribed by global corporate politics of greed. For example, one of the most insidious dimensions of contemporary globalization, especially in relation to terror wars is the lucrative and debilitating escalation of the international drug trade. Since the coalition invasion of Afghanistan the production of opium, has escalated to "3,600 tons annually" (Rahshid, 2004, 5). The United Nations investigations of the drug trade from Afghanistan found that "one-half of all drugs trafficked from Afghanistan pass through Central Asian countries such as Kyrgyzstan." The drug route has led to a growing number of heroin and opium addicts in Kyrgyzstan, which is estimated to be well over 100,000 people. According to Dr. Valentina Kirichenko, director of the National AIDS center in the capital, Bishkek: "The lack of clean needles and treatment programs, coupled with the intense aversion to testing, is said to be why the number of HIV-infected drug addicts keeps rising" (Boothe, 2003). Indeed, Bush Juniors' claims of liberation for "women of cover" (sic) is laughable given that: "Although the United

States and the United Nations hailed the defeat of the Taliban as a 'liberation' for the Afghan people, the reality is otherwise – especially for women. Most people are afraid to speak out against those in power for fear of physical retribution (Nanji, 2003).

Moreover, violence against women and children has been intensifying dramatically in Iraq since the Bush/Blair military intervention and occupation of April 2003. One commentator notes: "Amid surging crime in postwar Baghdad, sexual violence and abductions of women appear to be increasing. But with police stations focused on bombing threats, no one is counting the women being attacked" (Khalil, 2004). Further: Millions of women have found themselves living under ...de facto house arrest since the coalition forces claimed Baghdad in April. They have been forced into this situation by a menacing triple threat that has emerged since the war: First, Saddam Hussein threw open the doors to his prisons in October 2002, releasing criminals onto Iraq's tightly policed streets. Then came the fall of the regime and the concomitant crumbling of law enforcement. And now, the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) is treating a growing human rights crisis for women as an extracurricular issue at best, leaving women at the mercy of thugs on the streets and the religious parties that have rushed into the political vacuum (Sandler, 2003, 11).

In fact, Alexander Cockburn describes these kinds of destructive practices as the "Terrorism of Everyday Life," at the most elemental level, which he argues are aimed at "the weakest in our midst: no money for food, for shelter, for the kids..." In these ways, he asserts, "do we nourish the next generation of Enemy Combatants..."(2002, 9). In this context, one need recognize the escalation of what Gore Vidal (2002) and Howard Zinn (Dec. 2001) describe as perpetual illegal wars and "crimes against humanity"(ibid. 8). These necessarily encompass burgeoning transnational criminal activities which includes the odious increase in what has been identified as one of the fastest-growing organized criminal global activities: Trafficking in Human Beings. Needless to say, the majority of these human beings are women and children, according to UNICEF, Amnesty International, and the U.S. Congress, to name a few. An International Rights group, "Anti-Slavery International" reported to the United Nations session on slavery, in March, 2002, that there were at least 27 million people forced into slavery in the world today. These figures are growing, due in large part to the escalating poverty, and sexual exploitation and forced labour of children." (Reuters in Metro Today, May 27, 2002). Yet, fantastically, "the world's 475 billionaires are now worth as much as the bottom half of humanity (Dellinger, 2003, 6).

Citing 1997 statistics, Zillah Eisenstein points out that corporations are displacing countries in this brave new world, and that "of the worlds largest one hundred economies, fifty-one are corporations not countries"(1998, 1). "The five hundred biggest corporations account for 70 percent of world trade" (ibid.). Moreover, "women and girls represent approximately 60 percent of the billion or so people earning one dollar a day or less" (ibid.)

Yet, at another level, globalization has manifested a grassroots and technological revolution in communications, which has the potential for new kinds of democratic process which can and does provides counter-hegemonic information to a growing concerned and activist audience. Within this context, new computer technologies are also assisting and provoking the development of organizations that challenge the system of global neo-liberalism, colonization, dictatorial powers, and terrorist practices. Indeed, insurgent forms of globalization involves the formation of powerful social movements that are proactive rather than reactive" such as feminism, environmentalism, human rights (often working within NGO's) and anti neo-liberal trans-capitalism movements (Castells, 1997, 107). Lata Mani describes the development of a "multi-platform social justice movement, challenging war and repression within and beyond the borders of the US" (2003, 1).

Yet, we cannot forget that resistance to globalization has also helped construct, what Castell's describes, as "reactive" movements, who often disseminate cyber-hate propaganda, and mobilize antimodernist groups. Moves towards commercialization and restrictive practices may also define the future of the new global technologies which could neutralize their applications for progressive reform and struggle. Interrogations of these contradictory and multi-leveled processes does, however, reveal foundational relations associated with patriarchal familial terrorist values and practices.

PATRIARCHALISM AND FAMILY TERRORISM

Terrorist attacks on the U.S. and elsewhere and the militarist response by the Bush administration dramatized the centrality of globalization and the dangers and vulnerabilities of the entire world to destructive violence. These events have provoked widespread discussions which have circulated problematic and restricted definitions of terrorism which conceal and ignore its multidimensionality in regards to violation of individual and global human rights, including multiple forms of violence directed at massive numbers of disenfranchised peoples, especially women, children and the elderly. Moreover restricted definitions of terrorism generally fail to recognize that it often finds its basis in patriarchal codes which permeate and organize a variety of political, social, economic and cultural relations of everyday life.

Indeed, critical scholars like Manuel Castells emphasize that it is "analytically, and politically essential" to recognize "the roots of patriarchalism in the family structure" (1997, 134). "Patriarchalism, he contends, is a founding structure of all contemporary societies" and is characterized "by the institutionally enforced authority of males over females and their children in the family unit" (ibid.). This authority is exercised through the permeation of the entire economic, political and social organization of society by patriarchalism. Hence "interpersonal relationships and thus personality, are marked, as well, by domination and violence originating from the culture and institutions of patriarchalism" (ibid). Yet it is the patriarchal family, Castells argues, which shields recognition of the 'sheer domination' of patriarchalism.

Hence, to recognize the ideological nature of family terrorism and patriarchal violence combats popular myths regarding feminisms anti-male bias and demonstrates that critical feminists have always recognized that "men were not the problem, that the problem was patriarchy, sexism, and male domination" (hooks, 2000a, 67). It is, however, essential to recognize that patriarchal tendencies "vary in surprising ways across cultures. Patriarchy does not come in 'one size fits all'" (Enloe, 1993, 5)

Thus, deleterious effects of patriarchal values and beliefs about men, in a variety of cultural, localized and global environments has been a significant part of critical feminisms. Because violence is systemic and hierarchal, rigid bifurcated descriptions of gender violence must be negated and retranslated into a more complex, and contextual analysis of violence at a variety of levels.

It is in this sense that I have developed the expression "family terrorism." I employ it to provoke a dialectical shift in addressing issues of violence against women, children and the elderly which is far more extensive and interrelated to social, political and economic dimensions (which necessarily includes relations of gender, race, ethnicity, class and sexuality) than conventional thinking about what violence or abuse of women and children usually signifies. A discussion of the effectiveness of this polysemic term, "family terrorism," which is mediated by patriarchalism, for understanding a multiplicity of social, political, psychic and economic relations is especially necessary within this context.

Family terrorism in its first sense, reveals and critiques the problematic nature of such inept ideological descriptions as "domestic violence" or its latest incarnation "intimate partner abuse" -- which even further neutralizes and reduces the real complexity of relationships it is allegedly delineating. According to bell hooks 'domestic violence' has been used to cover up the severity and systematic nature of family terrorism. She argues that it is "a 'soft' term which suggests it emerges in an intimate context that is private and somehow less threatening, less brutal, than the violence that takes place outside the home" (2000, 62). Moreover, she is one of a number of feminists who is concerned with the abuse and neglect of children and discusses this within a contextual framework which includes the roles of women in terrorizing and/or neglecting their children and the contexts, in which they take place. It is in this sense that bell hooks' employment of the term "patriarchal violence" is especially appropriate. As hooks explains it: "The term 'patriarchal violence' is useful because unlike the more accepted phrase 'domestic violence' it continually reminds the listener that violence in the home is connected to sexism and sexist thinking, to male domination" (2000, 61-2).

The patriarchal abuse of children and elderly, as well as the escalating nature of global violence against women and children, must therefore be understood as a systemic, familial mediated process. For example, Linda Gordon points out that even "a mother who might never be violent but who teaches her children, especially her sons, that violence is an acceptable means of exerting social control, is still in collusion with patriarchal violence" (ibid. 64). She clarifies the relationship of patriarchal violence to parental violence and women's role as collaborator and/or colonizer in this relationship. And Riane Eisler further argues, that human society finds much of its basis in relationships between female and male parents and their children. Many of our first lessons about human relations take place within the private realm. "This is where people first learn to respect the rights of others to freedom from violence, cruelty, oppression, and discrimination -- or where they learn violence, cruelty, oppression and discrimination" (2000). She asserts that you must examine the context of hate and terror, which involves a dialectical analysis. Although bell hooks reminds us that: "Clearly most women do not use violence to dominate men (even though small numbers of women batter the men in their lives) but lots of women believe that a person in authority has the right to use force to maintain authority" (hooks, 2000, 64).

Given that violence, abuse and/or terrorism against children and teenagers is escalating, especially given transnational globalization's emphasis on the commoditization of people (primarily women and children), current "politics of greed," and rising government cut-backs including the downsizing and dismantling of the so-called welfare state in much of the over-developed and developed first-world, it is mandatory that many feminism's expand upon their definitions of family violence. For example, the Amnesty International, [Children's Report for the 2000 Campaign To Stamp out Torture](#) provides us with a shocking pronouncement on the global state of family terrorism, specifically violence against children.

...violence against children is endemic: children are tortured by the police or security forces; detained in appalling conditions; beaten or sexually abused by parents, teachers or employers; maimed, killed or turned into killers by war

Some are victims many times over, first of the chronic poverty and discrimination that renders them vulnerable to torture and ill-treatment, then to the injustice and impunity that allows it to continue unpunished (www.stoptorture.org).

The systemic nature of family violence is further established by the escalating rate of violence against the elderly. In the United States, for example: "The National Elder Abuse Incidence Study (NEAIS) found that an estimated total of 550 thousand elderly persons experienced

abuse, neglect and/or self-neglect in domestic settings in 1996.... Abusers are more likely to be male and family members, especially adult children” (Soto-Aqino, Congressional Research Service, 1999, 2).

Indeed, the notion of patriarchalism, and familial relations which operate in all dimensions of human life, as well as the escalation of family terrorisms, which is hardly restricted to the so-called domestic sphere, necessitate a further examination of these socio-political, economic and psychological dimension within a context of colonization and alienation.

ALIENATION and COLONIZATION

The employment of colonization theory, which is applied by many critical global feminists to dissect terror relations which take place at local/global levels, provides for a deeper understanding and analyses of the complexities and multidimensional nature of family terrorism. Translating from classic works on colonization, illuminates the multifarious relationships of violence and terror, especially those directed against women, children, and the elderly. In reality, colonization is not just restricted to physical deprivation, legal inequality, economic exploitation, and classiest, racist and sexist unofficial or official assumptions. Sandra Bartky identifies a pathological dimension which is essential to the process of colonization and terrorisms that Frantz Fanon, described as 'psychic alienation' (Bartky, 1990, 22). As Bartky puts it: “ To be psychologically oppressed is to be weighed down in your mind; it is to have a harsh dominion exercised over your self-esteem. The psychologically oppressed become their own oppressors; they come to exercise harsh dominion over their own self-esteem. Differently put, psychological oppression can be regarded as the 'internalization of intimations'” (Bartky, 1990, 22).

Yet alienation, as Marx and Hegel point out, is hardly restricted to the psychological domain. In fact Fanon's concept of alienation, which can be generally described as the alienation of humans from their own potentialities -- is close to Marx's analysis in his Early Texts" (Zehar, 1974, 13ff.). Indeed, Fanon's method, which interrogates the relations of colonial societies under the aspect of alienation, has been characterized as 'a synthesis of the sociological, psychological and Marxian concepts" (cited in Zehar, 1974, 14ff). In fact, many translations of colonization and alienation theory and praxis understand that "alienation, has a political objective; the intellectual alienation of the colonized," which is evident in their identification with inferiorized stereotypes (Zahar, 1974, 15).

It is deplorable that the complexities of intellectual and/or psychological states of the mind-set of peoples, involved in the pathologies of colonization and terrorisms, are often subordinated or ignored in many analytical discussions of these kinds of relations. Understandings of patriarchal family terrorisms, as individualized, nationalized and globalized relations, necessitate recognition of this most sophisticated dimension of colonization. Indeed, these pathological characteristics of colonization and its role in family terrorisms reveal the complexities involved in what is often called a “master/slave dialectic.”⁴ Moreover, the distinctions between patriarchal codes and values and erroneous essentialized behaviors of a generalized 'class of men' become even more apparent when discussed within the context of colonization as an elaborate process which usually involves colonizer, colonized, and collaborator. In relation to women and children's situations, for example, critical global feminists, like Cynthia Enloe maintain that:

To describe colonization as a process that has been carried on solely by men overlooks the way male colonizers' success depended on some women's complicity. Without the willingness of 'respectable' women to see that colonization offered them an opportunity for adventure, or a new chance of financial security or moral commitment, colonization would have been even more

problematic" (Enloe, 1989, 16).

Moreover, colonization cannot be addressed in simplistic manichean, reductionist terms, that essentializes men as oppressors and women as oppressed, or to infer that all women suffer the same degrees of subordination; for women can be both colonizer and colonized and can be instruments of family terrorism against children, the elderly as well as instruments of colonization in relation to other women and even men. Hence, colonization is a dialectical set of hierarchical relations which involves class, race, ethnicity, gender (sexuality), age, nationalism and other determinations, which are often interconnected and multiple. In such a context, an economically and socially just feminist politics, framed by decolonizing theory and practice, as Chandra Talapade Mohanty suggests: "would require a clear understanding that being a woman has political consequences in the world we live in; that there can be unjust and unfair effects on women depending on our economic and social marginality and/or privilege. It would require recognizing that sexism, racism, misogyny, and heterosexism underlie and fuel social and political institutions of rule and thus often lead to a hatred of women (and supposedly justified) violence against women" (2003, 3)

It is in this sense that a critical dialectical feminist approach expands upon the notions and realities of battery, terrorization and abuse of women and children to include relations of state, cultural and global terrorism of women and children in the forms of the feminization of poverty, hunger, exploited labor and slavery, prostitution and the sex trade, arguing that these are expansive forms of the ideology of family terrorism, especially given that family members, cultural communities and the family of the state are actively involved in these kinds of atrocities. Moreover, as many critical feminists argue violence against men -- especially during war -- is often mediated through the abuse, murder, rape and torture of familial women and children of the enemy.

FAMILY TERRORISM AND MILITARISM

For example, the gender politics and relationship between localized and globalized family terrorism, alienation and colonization, is rarely discussed in terms of violence against women and children in relationship to militarism. Yet violence against women, by men, escalates during conditions of war, and many experts argue that modern or contemporary wars, are in themselves acts of terrorism. For example, Howard Zinn argues that: "Terrorism and war have something in common. They both involve the killing of innocent people to achieve what the killers believe is a good end" (2001: 16). "Collateral damage," as it is now euphemistically called, has been extensive in contemporary wars, especially within the latest war against terror in Afghanistan (Herold, 2002). Indeed, as Julie Mertis and Jasmina Tesanovic demonstrate "the startling fact in contemporary warfare, 95 percent of the casualties are civilians, the majority of them women and children (Waller and Rycenga, 2001, xvii). Moreover, they claim that: "Families constitute primary sites of belonging to various groups: to the family as an assumed biological entity; to geographically identifiable, racially segregated neighborhoods conceptualized as imagined families; to so-called racial families codified in science and law; and to the U.S. nation-state conceptualized as a national family" (ibid.)

These kinds of patriarchal family values are especially consequential in comprehending, critiquing and countering "nationalist, communalist and religious fundamentalist social movements which have emerged all over the world" which, as Meredith Tax argues, have moved into "the power vacuum created as local elites have been overwhelmed by the new global financial ruling class" (1999, 24). It is within this translation of the patriarchal family to the "localized, national or globalized family" that violence, torture and rape of women and girls are better understood and

situated. In fact, many critical feminists have associated patriarchal familial attitudes and violence with militarism. Moreover, a number of feminist studies demonstrate increases and changes in modes of family violence during wars and wartimes (Kestic, 2001, 26). As Kestic notes: “ The forms of violence inflicted against women in wars vary in form, scale, and intensity from killing, rape, torture, forced impregnation, body searches at checkpoints, imprisonment, settlement in concentration camps and refuges, and forced prostitution to verbal insults and degradation, psychological suffering for losses, and the burden of responsibility that women carry as survivors” (Kestic, 2001, 25). The 2004 report, by Amnesty International states that “The abuse of women in armed conflict is rooted in a global culture of discrimination that denies women equal status with men. Social, political and religious norms identify women as the property of men, conflate women’s chastity with family honor and identity, and legitimize the violent appropriation of women’s bodies for individual gratification or political ends” (<http://www.amnestyusa.org/stop-violence/fact-sheets>, 2004). Moreover, there are also U.S. studies that show that women who are partnered with soldiers face higher risks of abuse and murder AND that soldiers “terrorize their partners in unique ways...” (Lutz and Elliston, 2002). Indeed, Amnesty International in its 2004 report “launched a two-year worldwide campaign to Stop Violence Against Women,” which has included the release of new data on “sexual and physical abuse of troops, spouse and partners perpetrated by members of America’s armed forces” (March 5, 2004, <http://www.amnestyusa.org/women/document.do?>)

Zillah Eisenstein argues that "war rape is sexualized violence that seeks to terrorize, destroy, and humiliate a people through its women" (1996: 59). For Eisenstein, "...genocidal rape has its own horrors. It takes place in isolated rape camps, with strict orders from above to either force the woman's exile or her death. Rape is repeatedly performed as torture; it is used to forcibly impregnate; it is even used to exterminate. Women in the camps are raped repetitively, some as many as thirty times a day for as long as three consecutive months. They are kept hungry, they are beaten and gang-raped, their breasts are cutoff, and stomachs split open (Eisenstein, 1996, 59)

Yet, even under these conditions, women cannot be perceived as universal in that, as Enloe reminds us, rape in war is often structured by class, ethnic and racial "inequalities between women" (1993, 168). The commoditization and colonization of different women, become evident in that the rape of these women, in times of war, upheaval or political disputes "represents conquered territories" (Eisenstein, 1996, 41).

In other words, women and girls are treated as possessions of husbands, fathers, sons, brothers, etc and their violation, torture and murder is intended to demoralize and humiliate their enemy. Not to forget that boys and men are wounded, killed and often tortured in these kinds of contexts, the women's mediating role finds its basis in that the external enemy is imagined to other men, men who would defile or denigrate the nation" (Enloe, 1993, 239) This was also the strategy of the Japanese, during World War II, when they "conscripted" at least 200,000 girls and women from Korea, China, Taiwan, Indonesia and the Philippines as sex slaves or "comfort women." Countless impoverished Asian girls and women were snatched from their homes to serve Japanese soldiers, who beat, raped and murdered them. Some were recruited to by force, coercion, and deception into sexual slavery from 1931-1945.⁵ It would be absurd to deny the elements of family violence involved in these kinds of militaristic outrages and sometimes genocide, especially given that the Japanese recorded these sex slaves as "ammunition," and refused to even acknowledge that its military ran the program until 1993" (ibid.). Hardly exclusive to the Japanese, Enloe demonstrates that these kinds of pathological relations are widespread. She argues that kidnapping,

enslavement and rape has been “a part of many wars, not all of them nationalist” (1993, 240). And, Enloe reminds us that: “We cannot completely understand any war — its causes, its paths, its consequences — unless male soldiers’ sexual abuse of women [and children] on all sides is taken seriously, described accurately, explained fully, and traced forward as well as backward in time” (ibid).

In the context of on-going and escalating terror wars that appear to characterize global realities, the term family terrorism is appropriate in view of the nature of the devastating effects of patriarchal violence and war on women and children. Moreover, this notion becomes especially apt given that certain forces are appearing to restrict the meaning of the term “terrorism” to exclude particular western actions, as well as different dimensions of patriarchal violence and terror. It is imperative that the dialectical relationship between personal, familial, individual/group, organizational, religious/ethnic, national, state and global terrorisms be analyzed and discussed in academic and public forums. Hence, it is within this contestatory field that feminists need to better address and begin to further develop critical definitions and studies of militarism, war, and terrorism which goes beyond identifying it as purely individual and collective crimes, but as products of specific social relations like globalization and patriarchy.

References

- Bartky, Sandra. 1990. Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression. New York: Routledge.
- Boothe, Karen Louise. “Stigma, Sex Bias Fuel AIDS in Kyrgyzstan.” womensenewstoday@womensenews.org, November, 30, 2003.
- Capachietti, Andrea. “Women and Children in War.” Presentation, Women’s Studies 10 Course, UCLA, March, 2003.
- Castells, Manuel. The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. Volume II: The Power of Identity. Blackwell Publishers Inc.: Malden, Mass., 1997
- Cockburn, Alexander. "Terrorism as Normalcy." The Nation, July 1, 2002, 9).
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. Profit Over People. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Dellinger, David. “From Misery to Hope.” Toward Freedom. Winter, 2003, Vol. 51, No.3, 4-6.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1996. Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Conflicts in the 21st. Century. New York: Routledge.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1998. Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism and the Lure of Cyberfantasy. New York: New York University Press.
- Eisler, Riane. 2000. “The Devastating Link Between Intimate and International Terrorism.” <http://www.partnershipway.org/html/subpages/articles/saivarticle.htm>.
- Enloe, Cynthia, 1990. Banana Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia, 1993. The Morning After: Sexual Politics and the End of the Cold War. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, Linda. 1988. Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence -- Boston 1880-1960. New York: Viking.
- Freire, Paulo. 2001. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum.
- Hammer, Rhonda. 2002. Antifeminism and Family Terrorism: A Critical Feminist Perspective. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publications.

- hooks, bell. 2000. Feminism Is For Everybody: Passionate Politics. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.
- Luke, Carmen. 2001. Globalization and Women in Academia: North/West-South/East. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kesic, Vesna. 2001. "From Reverence to Rape: An Anthropology of Ethnic and Genderized Violence." In Frontline Feminisms: Women, War, and Resistance. Edited by Marguerite R. Waller and Jennifer Rycenga. New York: Routledge, 23-36.
- Khalil, Ashraf. 2004. "Rape, Abductions on Rise in Baghdad." Jan. 30, 2004, <http://www.women'snews.org/article.cfm?aid=1688>
- Kojeve, Alexandre. 1969. Introduction To The Reading of Hegel. New York: Basic Books.
- Mani. Lata. "Turning the Tide." Toward Freedom. Winter, 2003, Vol. 51, No.3, 1;10.
- McChesney, Robert W. 1999. "Introduction." In Noam Chomsky. Profit Over People. New York: Seven Stories Press, 7-16.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Mojab, Shahrzad. 1998. "'Muslim' Women and 'Western' Feminists: The Debate on Particulars and Universals." Monthly Review/ December, 19-30.
- Nanji, Meena. "Afghan Women Remain Stifled." Los Angeles Times, December, 28.
- Rashid, Ahmed. "Rebuilding Afghanistan", The Nation, January 26, 2004, 4-5.
- Rycenga, Jennifer and Waller, Margerite. 2001. "Introduction." In Frontline Feminisms: Women, War, and Resistance. Edited by Marguerite R. Waller and Jennifer Rycenga. New York: Routledge, xiii-xxvii
- Sandler, Lauren. 2003. "Women Under Siege." The Nation, December, 29, 2003, 11-15.
- Vidal, Gore. Perpetual War For Perpetual Peace: How We Got To Be So Hated. New York: Thunder Mouth Press, 2002
- Zahar, Renate. Tr: Willfred F. Feiser. Frantz Fanon: Colonialism and Alienation. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Notes

¹ In this paper, I am drawing upon studies in my book Antifeminism and Family Terrorism: A Critical Feminist Perspective (Hammer 2002).

² See www.sustreport.org/news/poverty.html; www.tufts.edu/publications/hunger/pub/paradox_of_our_times/highlights; www.wsws.org/articles/2002/ap2002/chil-a22.shtml.

³ "According to the UN food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the number of chronically hungry people in the world **declined** steadily during the 1970s and 80s, but has been steadily **increasing** for about a decade. The US Department of Agriculture estimates that, by 2008, two-thirds of the people in sub-Saharan Africa will be undernourished, along with 50 percent of those in Asia. In a world where a few enjoy unimaginable wealth, tow hundred million children under five are underweight for lack of food....This human tragedy isn't confined to poor countries. Even the US, 6.1 million adults and 33 million children experience outright hunger. Some 10 percent of US households, or about 31 million children experience outright hunger. Some 10 percent of US households, or about 31 million people, don't have access to enough food to meet their basic needs" (Dellinger, 2003, 5; emphasis mine.).

4. The master-slave dialectic finds its' foundations in the work of 19th century philosopher, GW Hegel. It has been employed and translated from in many critical scholarship which attempts to understand the complexities of power relations and relations of domination and subordination. Alexandre Kojève provides for an indication of Hegel's interpretation, and explains that a seminal aspects of this relationship is characterized by the needs of the dominant member to be recognized by the slave as the master. To do so

He must overcome him 'dialectically,' That is, he must leave him life and consciousness, and destroy only his autonomy. He must overcome the adversary only insofar as the adversary is opposed to him and acts against him. In other words, he must enslave him (Kojève, 1969: 15).

⁵ K. Connie Kang, LA Times, July 22, 2001).

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Rhonda Hammer is a Research Scholar at the UCLA Center for the Study of Women and lectures in Women's Studies and Education at UCLA. Much of her research and writings concentrate on violence against women and children. Her publications include Antifeminism and Family Terrorism: A Critical Feminist Perspective (Rowman and Littlefield, 2002).

