

Many important studies by women and men in the last few years depict a link between sexuality and national/ international conflicts.

Gender and Violence in Lebanon and Yugoslavia

Evelyne Accad

The connection between admired masculinity and violent response to threat is a resource that governments can use to mobilize support for war.

It has become a matter of urgency for humans as a group to undo the tangle of relationships that sustains the nuclear arms race. Masculinity is part of this tangle. It will not be easy to alter. The pattern of an arms race, i.e. mutual threat, itself helps sustain an aggressive masculinity.

Bob Connell, "Masculinity, Violence and War."

I would like to examine some of the connections between issues of gender violence and illustrate them with specific examples from Lebanon and Yugoslavia. Both countries have, in the last few years, experienced some of the most dramatic forms of war and violence. I would also like to consider peace as an alternative, more specifically: non-violence and social change, peace activism, human rights, disarmament, international peace organizations, various resistance and peace movements as they are expressed in the spe-

cific geographical areas of this study. Hybridity and plurality are also seen as real alternatives to violence. For this presentation, I refer, extensively, to the issue of *Mediterranean Peoples on Yugoslavia (Peuples Méditerranéens: Yougoslavie / Logiques de l'Exclusion, no. 61, oct-déc. 1992)*. It contains articles by women and men from Yugoslavia establishing the connection between gender, violence and war, in addition to my own work on *Sexuality and War: Literary Masks of the Middle East* (New York, New

York University Press, 1991).

Many important studies by women and men in the last few years depict a link between sexuality and national/international conflicts. For example, Jean-William Lapierre sees a "deep connection between masculine predominance and the importance of war." (1) According to him, most civilizations are based on conquest and war. The importance of hunting, then of war in social existence, in economic resources, in cultural models (which valorize the warrior exploits), are at the roots of masculine domination and of women's oppression." (2) He explains how in so-called "modern" societies, politics, industry, business, are always a kind of war where one (mostly men, and sometimes women imitating men's behavior) must be energetic and aggressive to be powerful. It is not only capitalist societies which "carry war like clouds carry the storm, but productivism in all its forms, including the so-called 'socialistic' one. In all societies in which economy and politics re-

quire a spirit of competition (while its ethic exalts it) women are oppressed."(3) In her preface to a compilation of articles on "Women's Struggles and National Liberation", Miranda Davies states that "as they begin to recognize and identify the specific nature of their double oppression, many women in the Third World realize that, when needed, they may join guerrilla movements, participate in the economy, enter politics and organize trade unions, but at the end of the day they are still seen as women, second-class citizens, inferior to men, bearers of children, and domestic servants"(4). And Zarana Papic in "Ex-citizen of Ex-Yugoslavia," (5) notices how women's condition in ex-Yugoslavia worsened because of the war. Their absence from all decisions, even those directly concerning themselves, such as abortion and other rights, is dramatically noticeable. In the elected parliaments, they make up 13% in Slovenia, 4.5% in Croatia, 4% in Montenegro, 3.3% in Macedonia, 2.9% in Bosnia Herzegovina, and 1.6% in Serbia. On the other hand, they have become mothers of refugees by the thousands. And Helke Sander in "A Male War to the Extreme,"(6) remarks that women in the Yugoslav war are not organized, their opinion is not taken into account, they do not express their views and are not represented politically.

Nationalism is a difficult notion about which much is written. In both East and West, old and modern concepts, nationalism is a complex com-

ponent of revolutionary discourse. It can move among all the various facets of political power. For example, nationalism in one extreme form can be fascism. In "Fascisme et mystification misogynne," Therese Vial-Mannessier gives us a summary of Maria-Antonietta Macciocchi's analysis of fascist ideology in Italy from and throughout the feminine universe. The collective irrational is at work in all human groups. Conscious and unconscious forces led the masses to fascism from a transcendence of the individual ego into total allegiance to the Italian Nation. First victims of this racism, women adhered to it through a masochism ready for all possible sacrifices.

While nationalism has been necessary for the young Arab states gaining their autonomy from colonialism, it nevertheless, like fascism, "reclaimed many of the most patriarchal values of Islamic traditionalism as integral to Arab cultural identity as such."(7) Mai Ghousoub in "Feminism--or the Eternal Masculine--in the Arab world," states that "the political rights of women, nominally granted by the national state, are in practice a dead letter. Thus, they are military dictatorships of one kind or another, in which the suffrage has no meaning. "Her analysis explains how:

Colonialism was lived by the Arabs not simply as a domination or oppression, but as a usurpation of power. The principal victims of this complex were to be Arab women. For the cult of a grandiose past, and the

'superiority of our values to those of the West', inevitably led to a suffocating rigidity of family structures and civil codes. Everywhere, under the supposedly modernizing regimes of 'national revolution', the laws governing the domestic and private sphere -- marriage, divorce, children --continue to be based on the Shari'a. The justification of this relentlessly retrograde nexus is always the same.

Helke Sander notices how in Yugoslavia, the strongest and dominant parties express extreme forms of nationalistic ideology, which reject other models." They are activists, traditionalist, patriarchal, sexist in their programs, their models of organization, their language, their accents, their omissions, their blind spots." (p. 208) Civil society is the first victim of this *totalitarian domineering nationalistic ideology*. Ex-Yugoslavia which used to be, like Lebanon -- a country where various ethnic, cultural, religious groups lived in tolerance and relative autonomy and harmony compared to their neighbors--has become a country in which human rights, and specially women's rights are threatened. Women are looked at almost exclusively as reproductive bodies. "We are, she says, in presence of the primitive scene which destroys and pushes away all notion of women's freedom because men are on the battlefields and women with their children are elsewhere sheltered from the shooting."(pp. 209-210) Sander goes on to explain how the incredible irrationality at work is a rational manipulation to accept the dom-

(1) Jean-William Lapiere et Anne-Marie de Vilaine, "Femmes: une oppression millénaire," **Alternatives Non-Violentes: Femmes et Violences**, (no. 40) p. 21.

(2) *Ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 22.

(4) Miranda Davies, **Third World Women: Second Sex** (London: Zed, 1983) p. iii.

(5) Zarana Papic, "Ex-citoyennes dans l'Ex-Yugoslavie," **Yugoslavie, Logiques de L'Exclusion/Peuples Méditerranéens** no 61, oct-déc. 1992, p. 207.

(6) Helke Sander, "Une Guerre de Males à l'Extrême," **Yugoslavie, Logiques de L'Exclusion/Peuples Méditerranéens** no 61, oct-déc. 1992, p. 201.

(7) Mai Ghousoub, "Feminism--or the Eternal Masculine--in the Arab World," **New Left Review**, 161, London, p. 8.

Women
 were used
 in national
 liberation
 struggles--
 Algeria,
 Iran,
 Palestine,
 only to be
 sent back
 to their
 kitchens
 after
 "independ-
 ence"
 had been
 gained.

inant exclusive nationalistic ideology. She asserts that all "nationalism with their political, military strategies are built and depend on aggressive, dominant masculinity turned towards violence... all ideologies and nationalistic strategies are founded on that type of aggressive masculine, sadistic, 'virile' to the degree of crime; it is the main source of recruitment of males capable of committing all imaginable and unimaginable atrocities." (p. 210) And Rada Ivekovic asserts "the fundamental hypothesis that radical nationalism is a mechanism of binary oppositions which, in the long term, invariably leads to war. Because women are less anguished about their internal frontiers and the limits of their bodies, they are more peaceful concerning outside (political) frontiers, all this having to do with identity and the way the subject (the one who acts) is built. Women are biologically and socially more open to the acceptance of the Other in themselves (the sexual act and pregnancy)." (p. 189)

Other analyses see nationalism as closely connected to national economy. Thus, it is given a transnational dimension through multinational corporate domination. A whole issue of *Peuples Méditerranéens* is devoted to these relations. It questions whether we are witnessing "The End of the National?"--title of the issue--(8) moving into the era of the transnational? Is a world polity conceivable? What is the connection between development and consumption as a new way of relating to the

world, the urban as a universal form, the intensification of migrant workers and the national? What do the State, the nation and their specific articulation of the previous Capitalist period of development become? Isn't a new bipartition of the world, crossing all social formations, substituting the old center/periphery division? Several authors answer these questions and bring to light some important aspects of the national. In "From a transnational order to a world polity?" Paul Vieille sees the nation -- a solidarity group led by a State aiming at defending the interests of its members against other NationStates --being replaced by transborder solidarities, such as Moslems, disinherited, poor, the urban masses of the periphery. This transnational is not yet structured but works in the feelings and imagination of the masses. The role of a State is no longer to organize a nation against other nations, but to manage the relations between the fractions of the periphery and the transnational. Whether we, or the Third World countries, want it or not, this is what is happening now. The national works against the transnational, the national remains the geographic space, the social symbolic of movements struggling against transnational economy.

In the Middle East and elsewhere, nationalism and feminism have never mixed very well. Women were used in national liberation struggles -- Algeria, Iran, Palestine, to name only a few -- only to be sent back to their kitchens after "independence" had been gained.

(9) As Monique Gadant expressed in her Introduction to *Women of the Mediterranean*:

Nationalism asked of women a participation that they were quick to give, they fought and were caught in the trap. For nationalism is frequently conservative, even though it appears to be an inevitable moment of political liberation and economic progress in which women need to advance along the path to their own liberation...What does it mean for women to be active in political organizations? The example of Algerian women is there to remind all women that participation does not necessarily win them rights. From the point of view of those women contributors who have grown up after a war of liberation, everything is still to be done.(10)

It would seem that we need to redefine nationalism rather than dismiss it as a corruptive force. In the case of Lebanon and Yugoslavia, countries mosaic in ethnic groups and religions, what political entity could help bring them unity? If nationalism were to mean belief in one's country as an entity to be loved for itself, left to develop and flourish outside of selfish interests, if it meant love for the earth without ownership and possession. If all the various parties trying to dominate small pieces of territory were to unite under this love, I believe we could move toward a solution. And this is where I see feminism and nationalism blending.

To those who believe that it is utopia to think that the two, feminism

and nationalism, can ever mix. I would like to suggest first, that it has never been tried since sexuality has never been conceptualized as being at the center of the problem. Second, if an analysis of sexuality and sexual relations is truly incorporated into revolutionary struggles, then nationalism can be transformed into more revolutionary strategies. If women were to demand their rights, a transformation of values and roles in the family at the beginning of national struggles, and if national struggles were conceived with different aims that do not perpetuate domination and ownership, we would move toward a different concept of revolution. If this is utopia, I gladly go along with Jean-William La-pierre's beautifully expressed concept of the role of utopia in general, and more specifically in social life. He convincingly says that "utopia is the exploration of the possible."⁽¹¹⁾

How is sexuality articulated and mixed in the violence and wars we have witnessed and are witnessing in Lebanon and Yugoslavia? Arab society in general, and Lebanese in particular, have always taken pride in the *za'im* (leader, chief, hero). The *za'im* is the macho man par excellence. Not only does he embody all the usual masculine values of conquest, domination, competition, fighting, and boasting, but also that of *shatara* (cleverness). *Shatara* means to succeed and get what one wants, even through lying and perfidy. *Za'im* and *shatara* are concepts much valued in tribal society. The Lebanese war has trans-

formed the *za'im* into the *askari* (military-man). The *askari* has technical training, and his goal is the "self-preservation" of his group. In addition to his military role and his economic-social function, he played and continues to play a role that is violently destructive of his country, and therefore of his sexuality. He uses weapons of war to destroy and seize control of one region or group. He participates in looting to benefit his clientele or family and to extend the range of his influence. Given the extension of his influence, he builds a system of wealth distribution and gains even more power. Material goods and gains are obtained through his gun and other war arsenals. It is a "primitive" system and a viciously destructive cycle, rather than a self-preserving one. The more men desire omnipotence and control of others, the more weapons are used. The means of conquest are given a value in proportion to their success. The gun, the machine-gun, the cannon -- all masculine sexual symbols which are extensions of the phallus -- are put forward and used to conquer and destroy. For Adam Farrar, there is a kind of *jouissance* (means pleasure in a sexual sense, has no equivalent word in English) in war:

One of the main features of the phenomenology of war is the unique intensity of experience. War experience is exactly the converse of alienation. In war, the elimination of all the norms of intersubjectivity produces, not alienation, but the most intense jouissance. The machining of

events on the plane of intensity (to use the Deleuzian image), the form of desire, is utterly transformed. Power no longer consists in the capacity to redeem the warrants of communicative intersubjectivity. It consists in the ability of the spear, the sword, the gun, napalm, the bomb etc. to manifest 'in a blast of sound and energy and light' (or in another time, in the blood of a severed limb or a disembowelled body), the merest 'wish flashing across your mind like a shadow'. (12)

Farrar continues, quoting an article by William Broyles in *Esquire* entitled "Why Men Love War," that it is at some terrible level, for men, the closest thing to what childbirth is for women: the initiation into the power of life and death.⁽¹³⁾

Elisabeth Badinter makes the same connection between the experience of childbirth and war:

The word ponos, designating endured pain, applies as much to a young man learning to harden himself as to the pains of childbirth. In this struggle, the woman inverts certain signs of virility. 'In order to confront war and to gain access to the status of citizen, the Greek man buckles up; while a woman in labor, on the contrary, loosens her belt..... Nevertheless, even reversed, the sign connecting maternity to combat is there.' In both cases, man and woman suffer and risk death. Enough to raise themselves to the same level of transcendence. Enough to make the resemblance win over the differences. Across two activities ap-

- (8) *Peuples Méditerranéens* (Paris, 1986, nos 35-36). See in particular "The double aspect of the transnational category," by Yann Moullet-Boutang, p. 5; "The production of dictatorships in the Third World," by Laënnec Hurbon, p. 13; "The national metaphor: from independence to alienation," by Hele Beji, p. 27; "Transnationalization and the reinforcement of the State order," by René Gallissot, p. 49; "The disappointments of the International New Economic Order and economic transnationality," by Serge Latouche, p. 83; "Human rights, the transnational order and women," by Christine Fauré, p. 179; and "From a transnational order to world polity?" by Paul Vieille, p. 309.
- (9) See Davies' *Third World: Second Sex*. "The Role of Women in National Liberation Movements," pp. 61-96, in particular Soraya Antonius' "Fighting on Two Fronts: Conversations with Palestinian Women", p. 63; "The Experience of Armed Struggle," pp. 97-124; "After the Revolution," pp. 125-172, in particular "Iranian Women: The Struggle Since the Revolution," by the London Iranian Women's Liberation Group, p. 143; and "An Autonomous Women's Movement?" pp. 173-194, in particular "Why an Autonomous Women's Movement?", by the Paris Latin American Women's Group, p. 175.
- (10) Monique Gadant, "Introduction," *Women of the Mediterranean* (London: Zed, 1986) p. 2.
- (11) Lapiere, "Femmes: une oppression millénaire," *Alternatives Non Violentes: Femmes et Violences*, No. 40, printemps 81, p. 25.
- (12) Adam Farrar, "War, Machining Male Desire," *War/Masculinity* (ed. Paul Patton, Ross Poole, Sydney: Intervention) p. 66.
- (13) *Ibid.*, p. 61.

René
Girard,
when
analyzing
the
relation-
ship
between
violence
and
religion,
saw that
the roots
went back
to
sexuality.

parently opposed, men and women live a common experience which unites them in the same concept of Humanity rather than isolating them in their sexual specificity.(14)

What Badinter does not pick up is the fundamental difference between creating life in the act of childbirth and destroying it in that of war. Relating the two within a human concept is not a valid explanation. Even if the two experiences could be brought together, they would divide rather than unite man and woman.

The meaning and importance given to a military weapon and to the sexual weapon are equal. Man uses his penis like he uses his gun: to conquer, control, and possess. The whole macho society must be unveiled and condemned because in the present system, one tries to obtain material goods and territory, not in order to enjoy them, not out of need, but to enlarge one's domain and authority. Similarly, sexual relations in Arab societies in particular, are not built on pleasure, tenderness or love, but on reproduction, the preservation of girl's virginity (so-called 'honor' of the family), the confinement and control of women for greatest male prestige, and the overestimation of the penis. Lapierre has shown that this phenomenon exists in almost all civilizations, and that hunting followed by war is at the root of women's oppression.(15) And Bob Connell sees a relationship between masculinity, violence and war. He says it is not by chance that the great majority of soldiers are men. Thus, 20 million,

of the 22 million people under arms in the world in 1976, were men. "Most of the police, most of the prison warders, and almost all the generals, admirals, bureaucrats and politicians who control the apparatus of coercion and collective violence. Most murderers are men. Almost all bandits, armed robbers, and muggers are men; all rapists, most domestic bashers; and most people involved in street brawls, riots and the like."(16) But such connection should not be attributed to biology because it would absolve masculine responsibility, i.e. men's violence associated to some human "destiny". It should rather be seen as part of social and cultural factors.

It is very important that much of the actual violence is not isolated and individual action, but is institutional. Much of the poofster-bashing is done by the police; much of the world's rape is done by soldiers. These actions grow readily out of the 'legitimate' violence for which police forces and armies are set up... The state uses one of the great discoveries of modern history, rational bureaucratic organization, to have policy-making centralized and execution down the line fairly uniform. Given this, the state can become the vehicle of calculated violence based on and using hegemonic masculinity. Armies are a kind of hybrid between bureaucracy and masculinity.(17)

For Connell, it becomes a matter of urgency to analyze and understand how masculinity is entangled in all that threatens the survival of humanity. "Vi-

olence is not just an expression; it is a part of the process that divides different masculinity from each other. There is violence within masculinity; it is constitutive."(18)

Susan Brownmiller in *Against Our Will* has shown how rape is a conscious tactic of warfare. (19) Michel Foucault has written a great deal on the connection between death, sex, violence and male sexuality.(20) Wilhelm Reich has analyzed how repressed sexuality based on authoritarian family patterns is at the root of sadistic murders, perversions, psychological problems, social and political conflicts.(21) And Farrar notices that: "War is a paradigm of masculinist practices because its pre-eminent valuation of violence and destruction resonates throughout other male relationships: relationships to other cultures, to the environment and, particularly, to women. If the 'masculinism' of war is the explanation for its intractability, then we must follow this path to its conclusion, wherever that may be."(22)

Wars are no longer fought in the name of a ruler to be defended; they are fought in the name of the existence of us all; entire populations are raised up to mutually kill each other in the name of the necessity for them to live. Massacres have become vital. Sex well deserves death. It is in this sense, but strictly historical one notices that sexuality is today crossed by the death instinct.(23)

Zarana Papic notices how in ex-Yugoslavia men who fight (and are terribly

frightened by it) are not individuals but belong to a nationalistic, aggressive, criminal community. In order to be accepted by this "nation," they must kill as many people as possible, notably those who belong to the other "nation." It is a masculinity belonging to a community that looks up to the great chief, i.e. the father who best knows what the community needs:

This tribal patriarchy (at war with its greatest enemy), puts women in their resigned roles of mothers, wives, and keepers of refugee children. Some of them have identified with the 'great cause' and have been part of the battles, the shooting, the military life style. They have been accepted as such, as equal to the warriors; often, they are also media stars. But the most obvious is that in these tragic times, women are completely without importance and invisible, except in their roles as mothers and wives. They are not seen nor heard as possible subjects with a right to say what they think, and a voice in the events. War is a man's world.(24)

René Girard, when analyzing the relationship between violence and religion, and examining how it is expressed in various human groups which often need a scapegoat to avoid annihilation, saw that the roots went back to sexuality:

The close connection between sexuality and violence, common inheritance of all religions, leans on an impressive body of convergence. Sexuality frequently starts in concert with violence, and in its

immediate manifestations: kidnappings, rapes, deflorations, sadisms, etc., and in its far away consequences.(25)

Issa Makhlouf, in his impressive analysis of the Lebanese tragedy which he sees as a collective fascination with death and destruction, describes Lebanese males as thirsty for killing:

War is a feast, a kind of total drunkenness, an orgy. War unveils the joy of destroying, of annihilating, of killing to the bitter end.

They feel like giants, because for a time they have gone beyond what could not be transgressed: death. Through killing, they compensate for their own fear of death...They kill because they are afraid, an immense fear without any object. They kill to exorcise it.(26)

Throughout the ages, men have been fascinated with war. At some very deep level, it has been for them a way to prove their existence, an expression, according to Adam Farrar of "male desire." (27) Desire as closely linked to sexuality and the death instinct has been studied by famous (Freud, Lacan to name only a few) and lesser known authors. Sexuality being connected to war, oppression, power, aggressiveness was also analyzed by a great many authors ranging from Reich, Bataille, Foucault, Laborit and Girard. More recent works are by men linking masculinity and war (Connell, Farrar, Poole, among others) to the whole body of feminist writing (Reardon, Dworckin, Barry, Enloe, Woolf, Brownmiller, Badinter, Houston, Chod-orow,



Showalter, Hi-gonnet, among others). How these issues can be articulated in today's societies and what avenues can be found for non-violence and peace has been the work of a number of other writers, such as de Vilaine, Waring, Morgan, Charara, Ben Ghadifa, Corm, Duvignaud, Lapierre, Mu-ller, Mendel, and others.

The difference between the male theorists--Lacan, Freud, and Bataille among others--and the feminist ones--Brownmiller, Dworckin, and Reardon among others--is that the connection between sexuality and violence of the men does not indicate a need to change men, women, objectification, or the dominant/submissive sexuality. In fact they celebrate it, while the women and a whole recent body of Australian male theorists--Connell, Farrar and Poole--want to change these conditions of female oppression and male domination.

A body of male Lebanese authors and their male

(14) Elisabeth Badinter, *L'un est l'autre: Des relations entre hommes et femmes* (Paris: Editions Odile Jacob, 1986) p. 245.

(15) Lapierre, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

(16) Bob Connell, "Masculinity, Violence and War," *War/Masculinity*, op. cit., p. 4.

(17) *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

(18) *Ibid.*, p. 8.

(19) Susan Brownmiller, *Against our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York: Bantam, 1976)

(20) See in particular Michel Foucault, "Tales of Murder," *I, Pierre Rivière* (Penguin, 1978)

(21) Wilhelm Reich, *L'irruption de la morale sexuelle* (Paris: Payot, 1972, first published in German in 1932).

(22) Farrar, in *War/Masculinity*, op. cit., p. 59.

(23) Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité*.

(24) Zarana Papic, op. cit., p. 211.

(25) René Girard, *La violence et le sacré*.

(26) Issa Makhlouf, *Beyrouth ou la fascination de la mort*.

(27) Farrar, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

Rada Ivekovic, develops the notion of mixity concerning Yugoslavia says that symbolically, women, more than men, represent a space of meeting, and mixing.

characters all seem to concur that death and destruction are an expression of or a substitute for sexuality and a fear of women. They live a schizophrenia, torn between East and West, tradition and modernity. War comes as a liberation from this tension, a cure to the sickness they are in.

Are there any solutions/actions to violence and war? Have they been expressed theoretically? And have any been tried? In Lebanon, disarming all the various fighting factions as a way -- immediate and efficient -- to remedy, seemed obvious but not sufficient to get at the roots of the problems. Disarmament on an international level and the stop of the sale of weapons worldwide could equally bring immediate unforeseen results.

In Lebanon, peace marches, hunger strikes, sit-ins, petitions, appeals to international and national peace organizations, conferences and talks between the various communities were ventured. They brought about some relief and hope. Lebanese women and some men were very active in this domain. Lebanese women often stood between the guns and tried to stop the kidnappings. Wafa' St-ephan documented how "they tried to appease the fighters by paying visits to refugee camps and military headquarters and putting flowers in the nozzles of guns."(28) Women one day tried to eliminate the militia checkpoints where people were being kidnapped. Going from East Beirut to West Beirut, from Phalangist check-

point to Progressive checkpoint, they were speaking in the name of spouses, mothers, and sisters. They wanted the butchery to stop. They had built homes, but contrary to what an Arab proverb says about boy's positive contribution to home and country, the sons had started destroying the homeland.(29) The women blocked the passageways dividing the two sides of the capital, organized all night sit-ins, and stormed into local TV stations to interrupt the news in order to have their demands broadcast.(30)

Numerous delegations were sent to various conferences throughout the world and to the United Nations. Numerous vigils, sit-ins, conferences, peace marches were organized inside and outside the country. Accad personally witnessed and participated in one of the actions for peace on May 6, 1984, when she taught at the Beirut University College and participated in the activities of the Institute for Women's Studies in the Arab World of the , located in West Beirut. The action was initiated by Iman Khalifeh, a young woman from the Institute who worked in the nursery school of the College. She woke up one day, telling herself: "Enough! Enough of this useless butchery!" She worked with the population of both sides of the city. The march was to carry as its sole slogan: "No to war, no to the 10th year of war! Yes to life!" It was to unite both sides of the city at the only cross-point, known as the Museum passage or demarcationline. Thousands of people were to participate. Unfortunately, the march

was stopped by a "blind" shelling (the word "blind" in Lebanon designates any shelling which does not appear to have precise aims or targets, but which according to many studies knows exactly what and why it is hitting) which resulted in many victims--dead and wounded--on both sides. Iman has declared: "I was not introducing an original thought--it was not a new idea. But it was the cry of the "silent majority" voiced aloud by a people that suffered and endured nine years of ugly war and by a people who carried no arms to defend themselves but struggled to avoid death, violence and ruin in order to live, to build and to continue to be."(31)

Another significant march was that of the handicapped, organized and carried out by Laure Moghaizel, a woman lawyer and activist in the Non-Violence movement and human rights in Lebanon, during the summer of 1987. Asked what she meant by non-violence in an interview, Moghaizel replied:

I am not a pacifist. I am revolted, revolted against injustices and violence. This is why I use the term non-violent. There is a nuance. Pacifism is a form of passivity which Non-violence is not. It is a movement which wants peace and which is making itself known through an opposition of unconditional disarmament... Non-violence is a struggle and who says struggle also says activity, dynamism...It is a political action sustained and energetic which refuses to exercise violence. But it should not be confused with love for the other. We are not in the era of Love. When

there is conflict, there is struggle. Non-violence is a theory very little known in Lebanon.(32)

She went about explaining the origins of the movement with Gandhi and Martin Luther King--to cite only the well-known names--and the differences and similarities in Lebanon. They were ready to suffer but martyrdom is not the aim of non-violence. Their objective consisted in eliminating violence through non-violence. With dialogue, persuasion, they hoped to modify the actions of human beings.

These are some of the positive actions at work in Lebanon. They may appear weak, simple and utopian in front of the destructive and violent forces of politics and of History. But History has also shown that the actions of a Gandhi or a Martin Luther King did have an impact on society and on the world. The theoretical framework for the change we are proposing, lies in a blend of nationalism, feminism and non-violent active struggles.

If nationalism--in the way I have already defined it--could unite all the various factions under a common aim and belief for the existence and the survival of their country, it could move towards a real solution. But if nationalism remains at a sexist stage, and does not transcend ownership and possession as final goals, the cycle of violence will be repeated itself. In Lebanon, both nationalism and feminism--in a femi-humanist way to be defined--are necessary: nationalism in order to unite Lebanon,

and feminism in order to change the values upon which social relationships and thus unity, are created and formed. The work must begin at the most personal levels: with changes in attitudes and behavior toward one's mate, family, sexuality, and ultimately one's community and society. From such a personal beginning, at least some of the internal conflicts might work towards resolution. With a stronger nationhood, rather than possession and domination, the strength of Lebanon might be able to push out the external influences.

What we will formulate is a radical change, a whole system to be rethought and conceptualized. To use Betty Reardon's words:

What I am advocating here is a new world order value, reconciliation, and perhaps even forgiveness, not only of those who trespass against us, but primarily of ourselves. By understanding that no human being is totally incapable of the most reprehensible of human acts, or of the most selfless and noble, we open up the possibilities for change of cosmic dimensions. Essentially this realization is what lies at the base of the philosophy of nonviolence. It we are to move through a disarmed world to a truly nonviolent one, to authentic peace and justice, we must come to terms with and accept the other in ourselves, be it our masculine or our feminine attributes or any of those traits and characteristics we have projected on enemies and criminals, or heroes and saints.(33)

People's attitude must

undergo profound transformations--radical changes in the way they perceive power and love:

The fundamental willingness to use violence against others on which warfare depends is conditioned by early training and continuous socialization in patriarchal society. All are taught to respect authority, that is, fear violence....Boys and men are encouraged to become more fierce, more aggressive when they feel fear. Fear in men is channeled into aggression, in women into submission, for such behaviors are necessary to maintain patriarchal authoritarianism. Aggression and submission are also the core of the basic relations between men and women, accounting, many believe, for women's toleration of male chauvinism. Some assert that these behaviors are the primary cause of all forceful exploitation, and account for perhaps the most significant common characteristic of sexism and the war system: rape.(34)

The notion of mixity, hybridity, creolization, however one wants to look at it, is also what could bring about a solution. Rada Ivekovic develops it concerning Yugoslavia. She says that symbolically, women, more than men, represent a space of mixture, meeting, mixing. It is this feminine principal created by women through mixing which is being attacked by those who want to purify their origins, "liberate" themselves from the Other, negate the Other.(35)

— Dr. Evelyne Accad,
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign

[28] Wafa Stephan, "Women and War in Lebanon," *Al-Raida* (Beirut University College, no. 30, 1984) p. 3.

[29] Polly-Charara, op. cit., p. 15.

[30] Stephan, op. cit., p. 3.

[31] Leila Abdo, "Iman Khalifeh receives 'Right to Livelihood Alternative Nobel Prize for Peace,'" *Alumni Bulletin* (Beirut University College, 1985) pp. 15-16.

[32] May Makarem, "Avec la non-violence Laure Moghalzel, l'autre visage du Liban," *L'Orient-Le Jour* (Beirut, March 16, 1988) p. 4.

[33] Betty Reardon, *Sexism and the War System* (New York/London: Teacher's College/Columbia University, 1985) p. 94.

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

[35] Ivekovic, op. cit., p. 191.