Gender Essentialisms, Politicalisation and Peace Activism in the Region of the Former Yugoslavia

Darija Žilić

In the early 1990s, the former Yugoslavia underwent a twofold transition – from socialism to capitalism, and from a multinational federation to a number of new (largely ethnically based) nations-states. These transitions were mediated by strong politics of ethnic and gender identities – women became denominators of differentiation at ethnic, cultural and political levels. The past decade in the former Yugoslavia has been marked by war, resulting in an ambiguous process for women. Whilst on the one hand women were directly affected by violence as its victims, they were also forced to assume more responsibilities in the home, both as heads of families and their providers. Therefore, in the turmoil of war, we have witnessed a twofold process – victimisation of women takes place (sexual abuse, for example) but also women's empowerment due to the questioning of gender related relations of power at a local but also a broader international level. And it was no other than feminist analyses of conflict that shed light on close ties between war, political economy, nationalism and dislocation with their various effects. Namely, the body, household, nation, state and economy represent places in which violence against people is possible in pronouncedly gender related ways.

Nationalists need myths and those myths are based on 'the birth of nation' and on 'our culture' as the oldest and the best, 'male' and 'heroic'. Overtaking the origins by male nationalists is present at 'national' as well as 'sexual' symbolic level and this through the demand for 'pure' origins and 'the birth

of nation' shaped by nationalist ideals. Rada Iveković, in her text entitled 'Unrepresentability of Female in Symbolic Economy: Women, Nation and War After 1989' points out that women's bodies are a confirmation of order and represent the lineage, nation, race and religion, thus assuring social symbolic order (2000:9). The notion of nation was most frequently iconographically linked to the female figure. Women's bodies represent the boundaries and territories to be defended, and women are also perceived as instruments of achieving 'pure lineage'. But, it is interesting that they cannot guarantee pure origins since they symbolically represent a blend, and blending has a negative connotation for nationalists. Namely, nationalist homogenisation is achieved through national 'brotherhood' as a feeling of unity for practical purposes, and through a father figure of the Father of the Nation. A basic principle of nationalism is exclusion of other that indicates negation of origins of others. It is a demand for purity and monism, national and sexual. The Father of the Nation or political leader is represented as a son, and philosophical reasons for identification of the nation with male figure are more profound and already known – in our masculine world, only male is universal, never female. Universalization is, on the other hand, as representation, another figure of thought that is directly linked to male power (but it should be pointed out that 'male' and 'female', in today's times of position of insecure gender identities, is equally imprecise in defining the epistemological concept). As Z. Einstein writes, regardless of whether the nation is spoken of as homeland or motherland, it is imagined as a brotherhood, never a sisterhood. Representing the nation, women's characters don't represent a female, but male collective, through which the realistic existence of women is erased from the domain of representation, and representations of women as cultural symbols of a community in question become fields of cultural and political struggle over her identity. It is thus women's duty to reproduce nation, and a woman who gives birth is a link between nature and nation as a family. Jean Behtke Elshtain wrote that ever since Christianity glorified love, mercy and forgiveness and placed them above other human virtues, woman waited at home for her man who went to war, and she also becomes a justification of man's going to war to begin with

(1982:32–35). Ethnologist Reana Senjković wrote about how women were used in the war propaganda of the 1990s – woman either personified nation, either as good (supporting war efforts of the nation inviting to mobilisation) or as wicked (leading her lovers to death), (2004:281–282).

This very issue will be discussed in this text, of how nationalism can use women, but also how women can deconstruct the 'national story', but in both cases still remain outside of history, out of great historic narratives. The examples will mostly be related to societies of states created after the fallout of SFRY.

When three years ago the second edition of the Centre for Women Victims of War of 1994 under the title 'Women Renew Their Memories' was published, the editor, activist Vesna Kesić, attempted in her afterword to give a political answer to the question of why women's and particularly feminist organisations, partake in peace initiatives and antiwar movements. She especially tries to avoid gender essentialism, assumptions that women are 'peace-loving by nature', because such explanations take us back to biological and patriarchal roles (2003:7). Kesić finds her answer in the fact that women are against war and nationalism because they are moral and political beings and because they are politically responsible – namely, feminists oppose wars because they are irrational and bring about irreparable material and human losses. Radical feminists, on the other hand, maintain that women oppose militarism by nature and that they are peace-loving because, for women, nurturing and feeding relations are fundamental, instead of those of destruction. They state that it is innate for women to be more peace-loving and are therefore morally superior to men, and arguments for this are found in practices and behaviour of the matriarchate past. It is my opinion that such a stance is not well grounded and that it is essentialist, but regardless of all, what is more important is that pacifism is ranked highly in the feminist agenda of priorities. Namely, feminist theories of peace advocate the notion that war technology and technology of social exploitation in general are destructive, and thus examines violence in personal, interracial, international relations and shows that violence is rooted in the ideology of masculinity. Still, it also needs to be said that essentialist explanations are not good interpretations of war either because they create

stereotypes (e.g. on the origins of wars – when it is suggested that wars stemmed from an ancient hatred). It is thus necessary to influence change, to change awareness, the role of women and all that because political action makes sense. When writing about links between gender and war, theoretician Nira Yuval-Davies says that the war is an experience that brings gender defined refugee status because as many as 80 percent of overall refugee population is constituted by women and children (2003:208). Rapes also come with war, but also the loss of the entire basis of their previous way of life. An interesting analysis of feminist stances on war was offered by a well renowned feminist activist, a professor-researcher at Department of Sociology of University of London, Cynthia Cockburn in her book 'The Space Between Us; Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflicts' (1999). She uses the achievements of three scientific fields; international relations in which spaces are finally opened for recognising contributions of women, peace studies and conflict studies, as well as political sociology and its contributions to democracy and identity. Along with the model of ethnic/national oppression, she sees 'gender regime' as one of the causes of wars, i.e. oppression of one gender over the other as a structure that spreads inequality and discrimination ad infinitum, fixes identity among eternal dualisms and is thus one of the causes of war. Through such a prism, we can see war as a 'continuity of violence from bedroom to battlefield, over our bodies and sense of self' (1998:8).

Feminist theory analyses women's role in the wars as determined by assigned gender roles socially allocated to women. Thus biological (essentialist) exclusion of women from war activities is preserved, and also used as a justification of a general division of labour between the sexes. Nataša Mrvić goes as far as to write that perceiving war from the perspective of women's experience is important because differentiation between the conquered and the winners is based on the difference between sexes (1998:128–129). The war intensifies marginalisation of women, makes them more helpless, victims of abuse, rape. At the time of war differences conditioned by different socialisations of work come to the fore – whilst men mostly worry about lack of information from the fronts, women are occupied with looking after the children – women are exposed to

changes of social status, even crises and the loss of their own integrity. Women become a marginal social group for which it becomes increasingly hard to be affirmed independently, but also head of the family. Thus they still remain in the domain of private. Namely, gender differences in political socialization rest on traditional patriarchal cultural patterns and widespread misconceptions and stereotypes that consider politics and public life to be areas reserved for men. It should be pointed out that Cockburn wrote about women's organisations in which there are women of mixed ethnicity. One of the examples is Medica-Centar for therapy of women in Zenica in central Bosnia, founded in 1993, that gathered a team of women gynaecologists, psychologists, with the purpose of helping women and children victims of rape and war conflicts. Bosnian Muslim, Croatian and Serbian women worked with the organisation.

However, I feel it is important to clarify the link between women and peace activism. Is it essentialist, and does it mean that women are predestined to be peacemakers or is it conditioned by some quite concrete reasons, or social circumstances? Thus activist Lepa Mlađenović pointed out in her text on Women in Black that she dare say that women from Belgrade constituted majority in early peace initiatives (2004:43–47). She doesn't explain it through a particular connection between women and peace activism, but through quite concrete reasons. Namely, women have the experience of doing unpaid work in volunteering, they deal with non-competitive activities, but it was also because the fact that, due to their gender position, they found it safer to act against the regime (they hadn't been drafted). She goes on to say that almost all peace initiatives in 1991, during the early year of such protests, were started by women and that they often had no support. Mlađenović also follows what happened after these peace initiatives turned into party related ones – that's when the men joined in, and peace activists begin to found non-governmental feminist organisations and organisations for social justice. Sonja Licht and Slobodanka Drakulić, writing on women's peace activism in the 1990s, established in the introduction to their analysis that in antiwar and peace activism throughout history women were very significant (2002:115–135). In the final years of Yugoslavia, women were already involved in feminism, some declared

themselves in such a way, and it is interesting how it is in that very former country that feminism had the most influence.

One of the prerequisites for action in the antiwar turmoil of the 1990s was that there still was a social-political context fairly present in the universities, because women still managed to be visible in social life. Women in the 1980s were enthusiastic to accept democratisation of the country, and in some fields and professions, such as, for example, journalism or organising new initiatives of the civil society, it was women who were the ones to mark the beginning of the process of democratisation. Another prerequisite is related to a strong feminist movement, particularly the final wave of it in the early 1970s – it shouldn't be forgotten that the first after-war feminist conference was held in Belgrade in 1978, where communist organisations and women's groups met within one day. The third prerequisite listed by Licht and Drakulić I consider to be very interesting and we could say that it is fairly neglected in the research, and is connected to, as we will mention again, being mixed. Namely, women felt the weight of the fallout of the country more, they had greater influence in their families, and it should be emphasised that there were as much as 5% of ethnically mixed marriages and that a danger was felt about what was going to happen to those families when a country does fall out. In late 1980s, there was a number of spontaneous developments of women's lobbies, women's parliaments, independent women's societies. No other but the afore mentioned ones were the organisers of first antiwar demonstrations. That's when movements of mothers in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia emerge. Mothers went to the parliament in Belgrade and demanded their sons to come back home from Yugoslav People's Army. This movement was used to a significant degree in order to deepen ethnic tensions. However, it is important to warn of the existence of nationalist women's groups in Croatia at the time of the war of 1991–1995. They provided complete support to national state projects and were welcomed by the state exactly as symbols of mothers or else as icons of the community. Đurđa Knežević, in her analysis of activities of such groups points out that 'mothers appear as ideal symbols for an authoritative community in which duties of individuals to the community prevail over their individual rights' (2004:79–86).

They provided support for these societies in various ways – by voting for parties carrying out nationalist projects, increasing the organising of activism oriented towards humanitarian aid to 'our cause' and 'our boys'. Knežević maintains that in the first years of that era of 1992–1995 there was mass political support from the government for nationalists. Politicians received them, the media covered their work, and Croatian women nationalists spread outside the borders of the nation so that as many as two tours of speech-making of Croatian women's groups were organised. It is necessary to mention that this support was given to them exclusively for political reasons. Namely, when the national state was stabilised, support and concrete assistance to those groups slowly goes missing. Thus the role they had in ethnic-national mobilisation slowly becomes erased. Apart from that, it goes without saying that their role turned into a background one, that they were only helping, while on the other hand the role of the state is put to the foreground, represented by a strong, dominant male figure that provides our boys with arms. It is my opinion that this example once again shows that even such women's nationalistic groups become marginalised in patriarchal communities, and different examples shouldn't even be mentioned in particular. A problem between women's and feminist groups is also of interest. Namely, some women activists do support the same traditional roles of mothers and guardians of the home.

One of important issues that needs to be analysed is linked to activities of women's groups, their links with donors. I would at this point particularly mention social scientist Elissa Helms who has done exquisite research in which through analysing the actions of women's groups in Bosnia she got some very interesting data (2004:185–205). Helms maintains that such gender essentialisms are supported by both nationalist parties and feminist groups, but also international donors. Namely, she notes that women's non-governmental organisations she encountered in Bosnia do use a form of gender essentialism in presenting themselves to local communities and international donors. And this relates to the very fact that they emphasise a positive role of women in an essentialist manner, presenting them as peacemakers and nurturers, and of fewer nationalist leanings than men, but also more prepared for dialogue

than men. Thus, women are essentialised, and that means they are limited to women's work (Richard Fox calls it 'affirmative essentialism' (1997:37) and that women's roles are thus fixed. A consequence of this is that it is positive for them to be in the public, but in a regulated way, and that they shouldn't undermine their connection to the household sphere that is still pronounced, and defining themselves as feminist is also avoided, because such explicit definition directly undermines the patriarchy that allow access into that so called men's political sphere. And it shouldn't be forgotten, as Anđelka Milić writes in her first analysis of the women's movement, that ultraconservative anti-propaganda of feminism commenced even before World War Two and put the 'battle against men' into the foreground of feminist engagement, i.e. imaginary 'conflict of the sexes', making the point that feminists thus endanger the very foundation of sociality, and that feminism as a whole represents a distorted teaching propagated by basically disoriented and amoral women (2004:94). It is interesting how women encounter difficult approaches in politics and thus often define their work as humanitarian because that casts away the political aspects of it, notes Helms. Women's groups whose activities she researched don't want to be political to begin with, and even if they do raise some so called women's issues, they are suggested that it should remain aside at least for the moment, because there are other more pressing matters. Along with it, they themselves marginalise these subjects and these issues in order to address the more important ones such as return of the refugees, war crimes trials, ethnic reconciliation. Therefore they consent to gender essentialism, and the deconstruction of patriarchy is moved to the side, as less important, even though it is the very base of both wars and conflicts. Thus gender roles of women remain untouched and they continue to identify themselves with motherhood and household and are removed from the formal political sphere. However, women are still essentialistically linked with peace because it is believed that, colloquially, 'there would not be a war had the women been in power'. In such an image, men are depicted as warriors who started these wars, and women, who hadn't been part of the conflict, as peacemakers. It is interesting that such a stance is also supported by international community. Namely, as Helms

writes, donors often support the stereotype according to which they believe that women are more capable of acting in an interethnic communication and in carrying out projects of ethnic reconciliation. In order to receive funds, these non-governmental groups use already tried discursive strategies. Namely, while connecting with refugees, they point out that these activities are not political, but humanitarian. It is necessary to note, writes Milić, that a large number of groups belong to the type of humanitarian activity anyway, which is not in the least surprising bearing in mind the degree of elementary level of imperilment of the population, particularly of women's populations. Such groups have a wide range of action, are not unaware of how political their activity really is, but are trying to not make it known clearly because they would thus symbolically enter the field of politics – such strategy was 'confessed' to Helms by a coordinator of a non-governmental organisation from Podrinje region. However, I believe that it should be pointed out that humanitarianism also represents an ideology trying to present itself as neutral, but is still the embodiment of certain political interests. In this way, citing humanitarianism, women are placed outside the political sphere of power and become entirely harmless. Of course, the question poses itself of how the participation of women can contribute to not only peace, but to the improvement of women's positions, or whether these essentialisms exclusively passivise women or do still have some positive, emancipating elements. Namely, women are having a hard time entering the scene of major politics as it is, so is this not a way for them to participate in a public sphere because maybe some activists will ultimately raise the issue of women's rights after all. In all Eastern European transition societies a process of re-patriarchalisation took place, 'return to family' and in a symbolic image mother is again presented as a housewife and father as a breadwinner. And it is important to state that this process is very much regressive because it contributed to undermining the heritage of socialist systems in which there has been a certain degree of democracy of gender relations. Thus women are marginalised in all parts of social life, and misogyny and sexism are particularly widespread at both political and cultural levels. Social context in transition is marked by gender hierarchy and gender segregated divisions of work

particularly in public life. And in all of that women remain on the sidelines, so that every form of public action of women should be seen from multiple aspects.

The question remains of whether feminists make a mistake when they easily discard the concept of motherhood because will motherhood then be left to be thrown to the jaws of nationalism that draws its symbolic power from it anyway, as we pointed out at the beginning of this text? Namely, the already mentioned Nira Yuval-Davis states that women disappear from public discourse because in the disputes on nation and nationalism women are placed in the private sphere anyway, a sphere not considered to be of political importance. This is paradoxical – on the one hand in national rhetoric women are defined through motherland and it is emphasised that the wars were being lead for the sake of 'women/children', and later in theoretical elaboration of nation and nationalism it is often resorted to giving all the importance to intellectuals and completely denying women. However, a problem that the feminist scene also encounters is also a matter of the public and thereby of being political. Namely, instead of acting in public and raising new issues and problems that were repressed by that same public, in such a way as to change social paradigm, a substitute for public is introduced, an enclosed community creating its own discourse and its own internal relations. In such a way a distance is again made from the political, because a turn is made towards the inside, it all becomes a sort of a private matter of individuals and the public becomes something outer, opposed, and is thus corresponded with in a specific way. Also, it needs to be stated that the problem of studying political socialisation from a gender perspective is paid very little attention to in the theoretical and practical repertory of humanities. Namely, almost all theoretical schools that examine the relations of politics and the individual are androcentric. When we speak of the connection between women's movement and political action, we also need to point out dilemma that appears therein.

Therefore, I emphasise that it is extremely important whether activists treat their group activity and affiliation as political, social or non-political. A relation to political structures in society is also of importance here. Whether it is about alternative political profilisation, cooperation with women politicians or about

activists becoming engaged professionally as well, and ultimately it is about whether women's groups need to get rid of non-formalised, semi-private discourse.

One of the most important subjects is feminists' stance on peace. Namely there are two fundamental feminist standpoints. Feminist theory analyses women's roles in the wars as determined by assigned gender roles imposed on women by society. There is an equal rights theory that has the standpoint of women and men having to be equal when it comes to their roles in the war. Opposing the war is a main part of another wave of feminism, so that structural and ideological links between militarism, war and patriarchy are researched. In the current feminist movement there are conflicts about women's participation in the war. On the one hand, women's pacifism is insisted on, and on the other it is considered that all social positions must be accessible to women, including those in the army and police. A fundamental pacifist stance is against shooting, but there is a dilemma about whether or not, if we say 'yes' to military actions, we face our own pacifist policies and thus betray peace politics. On the other hand, if we are against it, our stance seems idealistic and we cannot accept that in some situations it is not possible to justify it. The many layers of this issue were written about by Lepa Mlađenović when she analysed feminist policies in the antiwar movement in Belgrade. Feminist theory analyses both sources of women's resistance to militarism and the gender nature of militaristic values (2004:161). She pointed out the ways in which the army plants military spirit into the ideology of masculinity founded on a system of metaphors belittling all things female and glorifying all things male. Still, women's pacifism must not be shaded with essentialism, i.e. sentimentalised as an innate women's trait, because women have been and still are, not only pacifist, but militarist in their beliefs and activities. And it is also important to record the existence of women's peace activities, preserve memories, present them to the public and make them socially visible.

Sociologist Anđelka Milić in her research of the women's movement in Serbia and Montenegro carried out in 2002 notes that women are apt to act through forming a kind of women's ghetto, developing a spirit of exclusivity. She then particularly warns of self exclusive behaviour of women, i.e. the need to

deal with themselves, to enter severe mutual confrontations due to the slightest 'straying from the path' (2002:93–101). It definitely adds to enclosure that is sometimes a trait of actions of women's initiatives and groups, but there are some excellent examples of how to preserve remembrance of action in wartime circumstances.

The best example for it is the already mentioned collection of the Centre for Women Victims of War from Croatia. First we need to point out the context in which this group was created. At the beginning of the war there was a gap in the women's scene. Namely, feminist groups either disappeared at the time, or adhered to the newly created political options, meaning some of them agreed with the policies of governing ideology. There are as many as sixty women's groups active in Croatia at the time; in 1989 the Autonomous Women's House was founded, followed by the Centre for Women Victims of War in 1992 and Women's Infotheque. It is interesting that the latter never had a humanitarian profile that was specific for it at the time. This is an important point because, as has been emphasised earlier in the text, it was often the most important trait of women's groups. The beginning of the decade was marked by predominantly humanitarian work. When the Centre for Women Victims of War was founded in 1992, the principles of its actions were that women would be assisted and supported regardless of their origins, nationality or religion or any other part of female identity. In the latter half of the decade, organisations and initiatives emerged that turned to peacetime problems, so that a period began marked by diversification of work and raising issues and subjects that were no longer or not at all linked to the war and its consequences. Interests turned to systematisation of knowledge, organising gender studies in which peace work could be taught, which was written about in magazines as well. Namely, as Vesna Kesić wrote, peace and peacemaking have gained a great political importance nowadays, mostly under the pressure from international community, but the merits of women's groups who opposed the war and nationalism are still not talked about and are excluded from collective memory. Many have laid claims on women's activism, but they never gave it power in the political process. Women, it should also be mentioned, were never involved in peace talks, nor in talks on

preventing the war. Peace had not been established as a process throughout that also required an understanding the past, work on dealing with the past and manifold perspectives. However, it should be pointed out that, for example, women's groups from Croatia and the region initiated the first women's peace exchange and talks as early as in 1993 in Zagreb and in Geneva, then there is the first dialogue between feminists from Belgrade and Zagreb in 1995 in Istria, as well as many other meetings that are considered usual nowadays. This was at the time treated by the public as a 'traitors' activity', even though it was always about meetings of women whose basic motifs were to stop the war and violence and establish a peaceful and neighbourly coexistence with women from neighbouring countries. Thus the publication of the collection 'Women Renew Their Memories', ten years later, is an important project. In the collection we find various reports on when the Centre was opened, writings on the structure of the Centre, their mode of operation, followed by personal accounts, documents (various letters and press releases), and the list of all members, collaborators and supporters of the Centre for Women Victims of War and their publications. Personal accounts of how activists, after many years, self reflect are of particular importance and how they re-examine their states of doubt, crisis, burning out for the first time, all in order to provide a picture of an era and to present their work to the public. Personal testimonies of the interviewed women who have undergone the trauma of war are of great interest. Personally, I interpreted an interview I found in the collection of 1994, the account of Goga M. (The text 'Manifold ethnic identity – story of Goga M.' was published in the collection 'Tomizza and Us', Pučko otvoreno učilište Umag, 2001) and thereby encountered a multitude of dilemmas – how to approach the interviewee, do I have the right to interpret her account and the like.

Also, the importance of ethnographic research and interpretations need to be pointed out. Namely, ethnography as a sort of cultural criticism questions the position of culture in the times of war and conditions of war as an area in which cultural images of self, community, and territory is constructed as well as those of patriotism, solidarity and stances on the enemy. Such research is usually focused on the analyses of the material on everyday life in

war and exile, particularly the testimonial discourse and oral history that is still underestimated in the art of history. For this very reason such accounts are avoided as historical evidence, and we are lucky that anthropologists and ethnographers introduce them to the scientific realm and thus make the lives of women in the war visible too. Aida Bagić noted well that these accounts are not identical to memoirs, because they are 'fragments, mostly short accounts in which we open our own process of reminiscing' (2003:157).

Finally, a conclusion remains that the Centre was a place of political action of resisting the war and nationalism. It was also a place for activists to meet themselves, meet others; and connect with different accounts. The intention at the same time is not to provide an idyllic image of women's activism, but instead failures are also noted, such as the impossibility to reach consensus…

The ultimate goal of the project 'Women Renew Their Memories' is to renew the gender aspects of public reminiscences of women's participation in peace endeavours. As one of the editors, Vesna Kesić, stated, the purpose is to show how women were excluded from the memory of recent past, and are thus very easy to exclude from contemporary social and political processes as well. Thus a stable peace in the countries of the former Yugoslavia is not possible to achieve without the participation of women, because they are the carriers of memories of continual peace efforts. And we also need to warn once again that this is not about essentialism, but about speaking up about women's activism in the 1990s, to note the action of peace activists. We must point out that even the so called western feminists note activism from 'our parts'. In her already cited book 'The Space Between Us' Cynthia Cockburn presented the travelling exhibition 'Women Build Bridges'. Namely, she, in cooperation with women from various projects, photographed and interviewed women; these photographs were presented at an exhibition and it toured 18 countries and provoked great attention. Groups of women of various ethnic identities are most frequently presented in the photographs, photographed from various angles, and the photographs testify of their gestures, smiles, dialogues… This unique visual recording speaks directly about the process of living, shared re-examination,

unstoppable dialogue that is the only one to leave the space between us free and preserves memories, but also documents women's peace activism.

Bibliography:

Cynthia Cockburn: *The space between us: negotiating gender and national identities in conflict*, Zed Books, London-New York, 1999.

Jean Bethke Elshtain: Women as mirror and other; toward a theory of women, war and feminism, *Humanities in society* 32:29–44.

Richard G. Fox: «Gandhi and feminized nationalism in India» u: Brackettge F. Williams, ur., *Women out of Place: The Gender of agency and the Race of Nationality*, New York, Routledge, 1997.

Sonja Licht and Slobodanka Drakulić: When the word for peacemaker was a Woman; *War and gender in the former Yugoslavia*, *Womens studies, journal feminist theory*, editors: Jelisaveta Blagojević and Dušan Đorđević Mileusnić, Belgrade Womens Studies Center, 2002.

Lepa Mlađenović: «Feministička politika u antiratnom pokretu u Beogradu – Pucati ili ne pucati?», *Feministkinje pod paljbom, razmjena među ratnim zonama* (Feminist policies in the anti-war movement in Belgrade – To shoot or not to shoot?' Feminists in the line of fire, an exchange between war zones), Ženska infoteka, 2004.

Đurđa Knežević: Rod i nacionalizam u hrvatskom medijskom ratu, (Gender and nationalism in the media war in Croatia), ibid.

Elissa Helms: Rodni esencijalizmi i ženski aktivizam u poslijeratnoj Bosni (Gender essentialisms and women's activism in postwar Bosnia), ibid.

Anđelka Milić: *Ženski pokret na raskršću milenijuma – izvještaj o empirijskom istraživanju u Srbiji i Crnoj Gori* (Women's movement at the turn of millenia – a report on empirical research in Serbia and Montenegro), 2002. Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu, 2002.

Nira Yuval-Davis: "Nacionalistički projekti i rodni odnosi", *Treća*, magazine of Centre for Women's Studies, issue 1–2/vol. V/2003.

Rečnik osnovnih feminističkih pojmova (Dictionary of basic feminist terms), IP "Žarko Albulj"; Belgrade, 1999.

Reana Senjković: Domovina je ženskog roda, zbornik – *Između roda i naroda (Motherland is of feminine gender)*, ed. Renata Jambrešić Kirin and Tea Škokić, Centar for Women's Studies and Institute for Ethnology and Folkloristics, Zagreb, 2004.

Žene obnavljaju sjećanja, Centar za žene žrtve rata deset godina poslije, second expanded edition of the Collection of 1994, Centar za žene žrtve rata, Zagreb, 2003.