

University of Missouri, St. Louis

IRL @ UMSL

---

UMSL Global

---

1-1-1999

## Peacemakers in Conflict - Building Transnational Frameworks for Human Security Across Global Divides

Anna Christine Snyder

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/cis>



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Snyder, Anna Christine, "Peacemakers in Conflict - Building Transnational Frameworks for Human Security Across Global Divides" (1999). *UMSL Global*. 217.

Available at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/cis/217>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMSL Global by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact [marvinh@umsl.edu](mailto:marvinh@umsl.edu).

Occasional Paper No. 9904  
June, 1999

*Occasional Papers*

The Center for International Studies of the University of Missouri-St. Louis issues *Occasional Papers* at irregular intervals from ongoing research projects, thereby providing a viable means for communicating tentative results. Comments on these papers, therefore, are particularly welcome. *Occasional Papers* should not be reproduced or quoted at length without the consent of the author or of the Center for International Studies.

Peacemakers in Conflict:  
Building Transnational  
Frameworks for Human  
Security Across  
Global Divides

Anna Christine Snyder

**PEACEMAKERS IN CONFLICT: BUILDING TRANSNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS FOR  
HUMAN SECURITY ACROSS GLOBAL DIVIDES**

**Anna Christine Snyder  
The Theodore Lentz Post-Doctoral Fellow in  
Peace and Conflict Resolution Research,  
Center for International Studies  
Research Fellow, Department of Political Science  
University of Missouri-St. Louis  
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499**

**The author appreciates the support of the Center for International Studies and Department of  
Political Science at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and the Lentz Peace Research  
Association.**

Over the past twenty years, many Third World women have expressed both satisfaction and dissatisfaction regarding their collaboration with First World women, especially in conjunction with the series of UN World Conferences on Women that began in 1975. Feminist scholars tend to focus on the problems of power, difference, and representation that surface as the women determine priorities and strategies for global policy formation. White, middle class, First World women have been criticized for universalizing their experiences and speaking for others. Further, Western women of color and Third World feminists repeatedly raise conflicts around racism, self-determination, and post-colonialism (Marchand and Parapart, 1995; Mohanty, Russo and Torres, 1991; Davis, 1990).

Within transnational networks like the network of women developed through the UN conferences, conflicts over issue priorities and frames are not uncommon. One of the main challenges non-governmental organizations (NGOs) face in building transnational movements is that of developing a "common frame of meaning" among culturally, ethnically or ideologically diverse groups of people. Framing is defined as "the conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action." (McAdam et al. 1996, 6). Transnational networks of NGOs use these frames to help launch global campaigns intended to change the behavior of states and/or international organizations. According to Snow and Benford (1992) and Tarrow (1992) struggles over meaning tend to be a part of the early formation of advocacy networks. Later a collective action frame, such as the human rights frame, becomes part of the reservoir of symbols that movement activists draw upon.

During this process, some frames succeed and others fail and as a result, some issues and perspectives gain attention while others do not. This paper will explore conflicts that arise as transnational networks determine their priorities and how to frame them. The study is based on a two year qualitative study of women's peace NGOs at the 4th UN World Conference on Women (FWCW) held in Beijing China in 1995 and its preparatory conferences. I look at the success and failure of NGO representatives in challenging the frames that tended to dominate among the women's peace organizations. I conclude that challenging the dominant discourse involved a combination of strategy, identity formation, and strategic framing which are social movement tools typically used on a national level to mobilize NGO constituencies.

### Background to the Study

Peace has always been one of the three main themes at the UN World Conferences on Women, the first of which was convened in 1975 in Mexico City at the outset of the International Decade for Women. At the conferences, I was able to observe and interview peace activists at four preparatory conferences or "prepcoms" including regional prepcoms in Austria and Senegal, global prepcoms in New York, and then the FWCW in China. In addition, I traveled on the peace train sponsored by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which started in Helsinki, Finland and ended in Beijing for the conference.

The peace activists that I interviewed were members of three NGOs from three different regions. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) has 47 branches around the world but mainly European and North American membership. WILPF coordinated and participated in peace activities at all four UN World Conferences on Women and most of the preparatory conferences. The Sudanese Women's Voice for Peace (SWVP) was formed in 1994 by women, a number of them refugees, who felt they had to take leadership in bringing about

peace in the Sudan. Beneath Paradise was a network of indigenous women from the Pacific Islands who formed this coalition in preparation for the Beijing conference. Their representative was also employed by the NGO Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific (NFIP). The variation in their size, foci, geography of their activities, and access to financial resources reflected the diversity of the NGOs attending the conference itself.

These three NGOs were present at some of the preparatory conferences meaning that I could follow their participation through to the Beijing conference. At the conferences, members of the three organizations worked together on writing resolutions for the Platform for Action (UN), coordinated lobbying efforts, and planned activities together like the "peace tent" set up in Beijing where workshops on peace issues were held. It was during these collaborative events that I observed peace agendas and frameworks being constructed.

### Findings

The network of peace NGOs reached a managed consensus concerning global priorities, not a true consensus. A "false or managed consensus" results when "unitary procedure and assumptions of common interest create a communicative situation in which it is particularly difficult for people to disagree" (Mansbridge 1980, 15). The leadership of the peace caucus, a group set up to lobby on issues on women and armed conflict, chose to use consensus as their mode of decision-making because, ideally, it is a non-hierarchical process that avoids domination by groups or individuals. However, the leadership, which was primarily Western, tended to ignore contentious issues that arose within the group and failed to incorporate differences in contextual meaning in joint proposals. For example, at the first meeting of the peace caucus, as the women brainstormed for group priorities the leadership ignored the suggestion of a Palestinian woman to include land rights.

As a result, the caucus established a peace agenda based primarily on regional concerns of the Western NGOs rather than discussions carried on at the conference. The following chart (p.3) compares and contrasts NGO agendas to illustrate the masking of difference and to show the inadequacy of the consensus building procedure (The box marked flyer refers to the "consensus" document distributed by the peace caucus). The consensus document did not reflect significant regional variation such as the distinction between ending armed conflict in Africa and cutting Western military budgets by five percent.

The conflicts that developed reflected unease with the dominant agenda. The women of color involved with WILPF, the members of SWVP, and the Beneath Paradise representative, all felt that their concerns had been marginalized in some way. In some cases, the issue had been named as a priority but the representation of that issue contrasted so sharply from their own that they felt the issue had not been addressed.

Bell hooks (1997) maintains that shunning interaction where there is disagreement leads to confrontation. She emphasizes the need for women to come together in situations of ideological disagreement and work on interaction so that communication occurs (hooks, p.410). Little time, if any, was spent on discussing disagreements or even how to approach conflicting priorities in the peace caucus. Audre Lorde maintains that differences are often treated as insurmountable, or as if they do not exist, leading to voluntary isolation or false and "treacherous" connections. Afraid of the task of coming to an agreement given the significant regional variation and the time it would take to reach some kind of consensus, the peace caucus leadership chose to ignore the issues unlike their own. The resulting alliance was fragile. Lorde

(1997) cautions that the differences themselves do not divide women, but rather the refusal to recognize and examine those differences (p. 375-6).

#### Peace Issues with Different NGO Meanings

	Disarmament	Conflict Resolution and Women	Militarism
SWVP	Disarm warring parties as pre-requisite to cease-fire	Peace Negotiations	End to War
WILPF	Dismantle military industrial complex	Global Peace Institutes/ Intervention	Decrease Military Spending
BP	Denuclearization of French colonizers	Local Peace Movements	Withdrawal of French Military
Flyer	General and complete disarmament specifically nuclear weapons	Covered Everything	Military Budget Cuts and Peace is a human right

When their unique agendas were obscured under the guise of unity and/or representation, some of the women felt it necessary to resist by making public their disagreement. They “unmasked” the leveling of differences as defined by “the master” (Trinh T. Minh-ha 1997, 416). This paper examines the conflicts that arose after and during the structured agenda-setting process used in the women and peace sector of the FWCW. At the events surrounding the FWCW what recourse did the women have if they disagreed with the agenda put in place by other NGO representatives? What did NGOs do that came on the scene after the NY global prepcom had taken place and the agenda was set? Women involved in each of the three NGOs developed strategies to change the prevailing agenda/discourse. To what extent did their actions become a part of the agenda setting process? In the context of global agenda-setting, declaring difference was not enough for the NGOs. Their objectives were to gain support, build alliances for their issues, and develop frameworks that resonate with a transnational network.

Although the disputes described in this chapter focus primarily on agenda items at the conference, it is important to note that the contention took place within a political context, even though the focus of my analysis will not be the political or historical context of the disputes. The conflicts that became visible had long histories; they had gone on for decades, if not centuries, e.g. racism in First World countries, the civil war in the Sudan, and the French colonization of the Pacific islands. As a result, the conflicts were about more than the particular issue discussed. The power to define, to influence discourse and to shape events was also at stake. Participants’ identification as women had drawn them to the same conference to work together but as NGO representatives they competed for resources and for international attention.

### Conceptual Tools

To help understand and analyze the activities of the NGOs, I used six standard social movement tools. These six concepts, as outlined by John D. McCarthy, include: strategic framing processes; activist identities; mobilizing structures; resource mobilization; political opportunity structures; and repertoires of contention (1997, p.243). Each of these tools has been used to clarify the timing, spatial and social location, and success of social movements. These concepts were developed in the study of nationally focused movements working within First World democracies. Because much is still unknown about transnational NGO interaction, theorists are beginning to use the six conceptual tools in the analysis of transnational social movements.

Each of the six concepts put forward by McCarthy corresponded to factors that I found in my data. Strategic framing, activist identities and repertoires of contention were particularly important for my study.

1. On a national level, developing a strategic frame that is widely accepted is a lengthy process given the opposition from states, corporations, religious bodies and counter movements that activists encounter. At the transnational level, strategic framing processes are even more difficult. Movements must construct frames that resonate in diverse cultural settings by linking new mobilizing frames with existing cultural perspectives. Each of the NGOs included in my study attempted to frame their agenda in a way that would appeal to the norms and values of conference participants while consistent with their own constituency.

2. Social movement theory has focused on activist identities based on the assumption that the process of identity formation significantly shapes movement mobilization dynamics. Identity formation is integral and reciprocal to the process of creating mobilizing frames. Some social movement analysts maintain that new ways of post-materialist living foster the possibilities of, for example, new feminist and ecological identities. Others illustrate how state policies help to create common identities. At a transnational level, activist identity formation is affected by globalization processes such as increasing global integration characterized by increasing personal contact across state boundaries and through transnational communication. Although the participants at the FWCW gathered because they identified as women, their identities were multiple and layered. As they attempted to influence the peace agenda, the other facets of participants' multiple identities, e.g. indigenous, New Caledonian, black, refugee, became more salient. In order to attend to the richness of my data on identity, I used theoretical tools from theories other than about social movements. Currently there is much being written about identity so I had to draw on several fields. The chart below (p.5) illustrates some of the contributions of a number of theoretical arenas.

3. For national social movements, mobilizing structures refer to the organized everyday life patterns upon which movements build collective action from religious groups and neighborhood associations to workplace cliques and friendship groups. Rather than creating new social relationships and networks of communication, activists use previously existing structures and potentially, their pooled resources to facilitate mobilization. Transnational social movements also draw upon preexisting institutional structures, particularly INGOs and NGOs, co-opting their resources in their efforts to mobilize support. Although social movements are thought of as collaborative efforts, SMOs, both national and transnational, also tend to compete with one another for resources, constituents and legitimacy. During the FWCW, the NGOs utilized the everyday activities and events scheduled at the conference to tap into preexisting structures and

networks on an international level.

### Contributions to Identity Theory

	Resource Mobilization	New Social Movement	Social Conflict And Conflict Resolution	Feminist, Women of Color
Activist Identity	As activists create mobilizing frames, there is a reciprocal process of cognitive adoption of ever more sophisticated activist identities (p.247, McCarthy).	Collective identities must be forged and maintained, not taken as a given. (Melucci)	Multiple identities and lines of cleavage exist and are reconfigured as conflicts escalate or move towards settlement (Kriesberg)	There is a pretense to a homogeneity of experience covered by the word sisterhood that does not in fact exist. (p.1, Lorde in Spelman)

3. For national social movements, mobilizing structures refer to the organized everyday life patterns upon which movements build collective action from religious groups and neighborhood associations to workplace cliques and friendship groups. Rather than creating new social relationships and networks of communication, activists use previously existing structures and potentially, their pooled resources to facilitate mobilization. Transnational social movements also draw upon preexisting institutional structures, particularly INGOs and NGOs, co-opting their resources in their efforts to mobilize support. Although social movements are thought of as collaborative efforts, SMOs, both national and transnational, also tend to compete with one another for resources, constituents and legitimacy. During the FWCW, the NGOs utilized the everyday activities and events scheduled at the conference to tap into preexisting structures and networks on an international level.

4. In addition to mobilizing existing structures and networks, TSMOs, like national movement organizations, depend on resources for survival. At the local level, in-kind support and volunteer labor are more readily available than financial support. At the international level, the situation is reversed. TSMOs are unable to operate exclusively on locally based resources meaning that they are more dependent on stable sources of financial support than most SMOs. The NGOs included in my study varied enormously in the amount and kind of resources they were able to mobilize on behalf of their organizations.

5. The concept of political opportunity structure arises from study of labor/socialist movements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that were seen as collective responses to the development of the modern state. As nation states gained power and resources, movements tended to target state authorities with demands for social change (Tilly 1984; Tarrow 1995). Scholars emphasize two major ideas. First, the theory attempts to explain how the emergence of

a social movement is influenced by changes in the institutional structure of a national political system. Second, scholars try to account for the cross-national differences of comparable movements based on the political characteristics of the nation states from which the movements originate. In regards to transnational movements, some scholars maintain that as the authority of transnational governmental bodies increases, social movements will tend to become more transnational (Rucht, 1997). The UN, an institution of great interest to TSMOs, has not become a transnational authority equal to the state but as an intergovernmental organization it has increased in strength. Activists have increasingly organized transnational forums, such as the FWCW, that provide the opportunity to gain legitimacy and access to global media discourse. Beneath Paradise, the Sudanese Women's Voice for Peace (SWVP), and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) were clearly shaped by the changes in the political structures of their respective nation-states.

6. Movements can be characterized by the strategies and tactics they utilize, what are referred to as their repertoire of contention. Social movement analysts have found that movement strategies are contingent upon three variables: framing choices; movement organizational structural configurations; and political opportunity structures (Dalton 1994; McCarthy et al., 1991). Public education is the strategy most often used by TSMOs (McCarthy, p.257). Rucht maintains that transnational movements rarely use disruptive tactics weakening the impact of the movements. However, McCarthy points out that transnational protests have not been well documented and that media attention is unreliable as a source of data. In their efforts to change the conference agenda and gain international attention, the NGOs employed various strategies, including education, disruption, and protest.

Discussion of social movement concepts in relation to the conflicts expressed and conflict strategies used by the NGO representatives increases the understanding of the transnational frame building process utilized by the women at the FWCW. Challenges to the dominant peace agenda in the context of the UN conference were very difficult. The following chapter presents the background to each conflict, looks at the NGO responses, examines the outcomes and analyzes the disputes using McCarthy's conceptual tools.

### WILPF

#### Background of Conflict

WILPF's internal conflict over the issue of racism began in Helsinki, Finland at the WILPF Congress. The conference of approximately 200 was attended primarily by WILPF members but they had made an effort to reach out to non-members, particularly from Third World countries, so that although most of the participants were of European origin, there was a small number of women of color. From the beginning, Geraldine, a key actor in the conflict and a British woman of African descent, felt that she had less power and resources than WILPF members. The only reason she had been able to afford the trip was because she had been awarded a scholarship from WILPF. She took the offer to come to the WILPF Congress and the peace train aware that WILPF's membership was mostly white. From the start, she was afraid that her agenda would be undermined and racism would become invisible.

Geraldine was an experienced activist, particularly in the area of anti-racism. She was a professional organizer with a masters degree from a well-known university in London. She had given many workshops and presentations in her field. Well-informed, she knew where some of

the current "tough spots" were, like the definition of racism in a context where post-modern theory was deconstructing color.

Geraldine did not assume political solidarity with the WILPF women. Within this all-female context, Geraldine strongly identified with the racial aspects of her multi-layered identity. As bell hooks explains:

Conscious of the privileges white men as well as white women gain as a consequence of racial domination, black women were quick to react to the feminist call for sisterhood by pointing to the contradiction in the idea that we should join with women who exploit us to help liberate them." (1997, p.400)

Geraldine was open to working with WILPF on particular issues, but she was also prepared to do battle.

Despite her expertise as an activist, Geraldine was not aware that most of the agenda for the Beijing conference had already been set at the preparatory conferences which she had not attended. She assumed that if she could gain the support of a powerful INGO like WILPF, that she could influence the conference agenda through WILPF. Without access to correct information, she also thought that she would have access to government delegates at the FWCW without having gone through the accreditation process. Geraldine felt it was her task to represent the concerns of local and regional black organizations that she had worked with in Britain.

Very quickly, Geraldine found herself in conflict with WILPF over the organization's agenda. As she reflected on her experience in an interview, she made the distinction between racism from a black perspective in contrast to one informed by a white perspective:

In Helsinki, it was placed on the agenda in a very crude way. It was a debate on racism which was informed by white perspectives, and really there wasn't an attempt to think about black perspectives. It was really a very half-hearted attempt to look at the issues. That left me in position whereby I came into WILPF because of my work around combating racism and because of my experience of looking at that issue then I find myself almost directly in conflict with WILPF because of that.

Although racism was on the WILPF agenda, Geraldine did not feel that her perspective was represented from the very beginning of her contact with WILPF.

Geraldine's perception was based on two conclusions that she formed about WILPF. First, racism was not high on the list of WILPF priorities. She saw a token representation of racism in the literature but she noted little reference to it in the conference discourse. In addition, Geraldine noted that WILPF members assumed that the effects of racism are not as painful as, for example, nuclear radiation, a top priority for the organization. Second, she concluded that the occasional references to racism at the conference were based on a white perspective. Geraldine did not see her black constituency's issues reflected in the WILPF agenda. An agenda that reflected her concerns as a black woman would have dealt with police brutality, immigration and/or citizenship issues. Geraldine did not find what she was searching for on the WILPF agenda and decided to challenge the organization.

#### The WILPF Congress in Helsinki

Given that Geraldine was traveling alone with few resources under the auspices of a powerful organization she perceived herself to be in conflict with, her first strategy was to try to network and build support for her agenda one-on-one. At an early reception in Helsinki,

Geraldine passed around a petition protesting British police brutality in the strangling of a black woman. She was particularly interested in speaking with other women of color/black women present at the Congress. I joined her in a conversation on racism with an African member of WILPF, Georgia, who had been a member and leader in WILPF for many years, and her teenage daughter, Karen. Georgia spoke enthusiastically about WILPF's commitment to taking racism seriously. Specifically, the US branch had organized "undoing racism" workshops for all of its members. In addition, WILPF USA had formed allies locally with African American groups like the NAACP. The discussion turned to Geraldine's concern about prevailing definitions of ethnic conflict which maintain that racism is not based on color and her fear that confusing ethnic conflict with racism would undermine an anti-racist agenda.

The next day, Geraldine attended a workshop on racism, tribalism, and economics with a small group of young women of color, none of whom she knew previously. Geraldine, Karen, Daba, a WILPF intern in Geneva originally from Senegal, and Jo, a young woman from Hong Kong, had all decided to attend the workshop. The women had connected the evening before and had begun discussions related to race. The workshop was the only one offered on racism and the young women explained afterwards that they had wanted to help out in whatever way they could to make sure that the workshop went well.

Kay, the workshop leader, was a professor in economics at a German university although she originated from the USA. She told me later that she wished she had known that the group of young women of color would be attending—(she would never have offered the workshop given their expertise and standpoint). She felt Geraldine was more qualified than she to lead a workshop on racism. Kay had offered to lead a workshop on racism because no one else had taken the initiative. Her past experience with the mostly white WILPF membership had led her to believe that she would not encounter much resistance to her ideas. The majority of the workshop participants were white Europeans or European Americans although there were a couple of women from Korea and the Philippines.

Key to Kay's presentation was the term "otherness" and her interpretation of tribalism. She showed how Germans created "the other" based on bloodlines or German lineage, similar to tribes in Africa, and argued that economic factors can eliminate "isms" like racism, e.g. middle class and upper middle class people of color do not experience racism. She added that color becomes less important when ethnicity, another form of "otherism," comes into play.

Angry, Geraldine confronted Kay. She made it clear that she disagreed and described her frame, explaining to the workshop participants that she defined racism based on color. Color had been used to classify people during colonial times, she said, and it continued to be a way of separating people when "the pie got smaller." Racism was not just another form of "othering" or prejudice. She disagreed that economic status "changed" racism, insisting that money can "make it easier" but does not take away racism. Daba spoke as well, saying that tribalism was a uniquely African concept and she did not think it could be applied to the German situation as the circumstances were quite different. Furthermore, she said, with her voice raised, defining tribes in a negative light to illustrate the prejudice behind German lineage was insulting to African culture.

The participants discussed these issues for the remainder of the workshop session but Geraldine confided in me that evening that she had not felt heard. It was very discouraging to her to have to begin the conversation by defining racism, which seemed to her a basic and obvious concept. She changed her strategy.

The next day, the workshop continued—but under the leadership of the group of women of African descent who had attended the day before. The small group decided that they needed to educate the workshop participants about their view of racism and took over the leadership of the workshop. Kay assented. Geraldine, assisted mostly by Karen and Daba, talked and conducted discussions on topics like tools of racism, forms of individual racism, assimilation vs. anti-racism, immigration and the difference between prejudice and racism. Geraldine introduced the phrase “fortress Europe” to illustrate her points about the difficulty of obtaining citizenship for blacks in Europe. Some of the participants wanted to talk about anti-racist strategies and collaboration with women of color, but Geraldine insisted that they needed to understand racism in its various forms before they could strategize.

During the latter half of the session, Geraldine framed her point of view as a critique of postmodernism. She talked about how racism was “off the agenda” because race had been deconstructed. Postmodernism, she claimed, breaks down claims of institutional oppression so that only individual stories are legitimate. As an activist, she tried to hang on to collective experience. However, according to Geraldine, the concept of ethnic conflict has made racism invisible. When concept of ethnic conflict is applied, “there is just this dispute or that dispute,” and racism is no longer discussed. Then she went on to talk about specific examples of racism in Europe related to immigration and colonialization. By giving concrete examples of racism based on color, she hoped to persuade the group that her point of view was correct.

After Geraldine’s and her colleagues’ presentations, Kay restated her position on othering and tribalism. The ensuing conversation became more and more heated. Geraldine repeated her frame, stating again that racism is based on color. When Kay described tribalism in a European context again, Karen interrupted, saying she had “had it!” and left the room, crying. Daba and Geraldine followed and did not return. Karen’s walk-out was a powerful act that immediately disrupted the workshop and focused the group’s attention on the young women of color in a way that their debate had not.

Later, Geraldine and the other women in her group escalated the conflict, drawing it into a public arena. During plenary reports on the workshops, Geraldine, Daba, a young European American woman and I gave a report on the workshop. (Geraldine had approached me, asking me to be an ally by supporting their statements publicly. I agreed.) Kay conceded her authority as workshop leader to the group. In her statement, Geraldine stated her frame, “racism is based on color,” and implied that what had happened in the workshop was racist. After their plenary report, the group got many responses from the crowd. Some of them they described as racist, others as supportive. Geraldine mentioned to me that she had been called a “naughty girl” for speaking out. (By the end of the week, the woman who had called her this had apologized.)

The small group of women of color continued to build support for their frame, particularly among the young women at the WILPF Congress. The other young women attending the conference were particularly distressed about what had happened and discussed the conflict at length. During a parallel seminar set up for the younger participants (the Gertrude Baer Seminar), Geraldine built up her allies among the young women. The group managed to reach agreement on a definition of racism proposed by Geraldine. It read, “Racism is an international system of power that places one group superior and another inferior based on color.” Ellen, the former WILPF secretary general, visited the seminar briefly and listened sympathetically to what the conflict was about.

Next Geraldine and the young women in the Gertrude Baer Seminar reintroduced her frame to the WILPF plenary. The group proposed to the plenary that this definition be written into WILPF's mission statement. This time the WILPF leadership actively supported it. The WILPF plenary session debated the acceptance of the resolution into the mission statement. A number of speakers resisted the idea, suggesting it be tabled for further discussion. Others objected to the frame, complaining that it did not speak to the Jewish situation. Finally, Ellen made an impassioned speech supporting the proposal and the plenary voted in favor of the definition.

In the meantime, using the frame "the black agenda," Geraldine tried to put her constituency's issues on the WILPF agenda. It was proving to be a more difficult task than gaining acceptance for the definition of racism. Geraldine had arranged to meet with Anita to discuss the PfA, a meeting that I attended. Her questions for Anita included how could WILPF help her to put Black women's issues on the FWCW agenda? And was racism on the WILPF agenda? Anita responded by explaining that, at the FWCW, no wording would be added to the PfA. The delegates would only discuss whether or not to accept words that had been bracketed for further consideration. She added that Geraldine, representing a non-accredited NGO, would not have access to the government conference. Anita then stated that WILPF covers only peace issues, because nobody else was doing that work but she would support issues on racism in whatever way possible.

After this meeting, Geraldine told me she was "devastated" by what Anita had to say. She felt that blacks were excluded from the beginning. She would have no access to the government conference. It seemed to her that although white women were marginalized, they still had some access. She thought her best strategy would be to band together with other black women's groups.

Later, Geraldine attempted to disrupt the plenary session on her own in order to gain attention for the black agenda. Geraldine had followed the WILPF procedure for plenary proposals. However, her petition protesting police brutality was not printed up with the rest of the proposals for the WILPF plenary as she had been promised. Geraldine commented to me that "our agenda gets lost." She tried to intervene on stage as the proposals were covered in the plenary hall but she was told there was not enough time. Finally, a Philippine woman, who was on stage with the women presiding, stood up and read her petition aloud. Geraldine maintained that because she was Philippine, she had understood the importance of black issues. Geraldine was not as successful as an individual in disrupting the plenary as she had been with a small group.

Finally, after a WILPF plenary speech on building a new world order, Geraldine adopted a world order framework. Geraldine maintained that if WILPF was going to build a new world order then it must address racism:

In Helsinki, we had a debate on racism which was supposed to inform a broader debate about building a new and secure, dependable world or new world order and clearly if you're going to work towards building that world then clearly racism is a priority issue because it's an international system of racism which places the majority of world's people in the kind of social, economic, political position that they are in. So it's really important that that be on the agenda.

WILPF members did not disagree, but at the same time, this framework did not seem to generate action.

### The Peace Train

The setting changed dramatically as the women attending the WILPF Congress boarded the peace train to China and racism continued to be a contentious issue. The WILPF leadership had anticipated that the women on board would want to share information and discuss particular issues so they arranged for the train to carry two extra train cars to be used as workshop sites. The leadership had also chosen a WILPF member to coordinate requests for workshops on the train and set up a schedule. Discussions around racism took place in the small group workshops and one-on-one, because there were few, if any, possibilities for large groups to gather during the journey on the train.

During the train ride, WILPF leadership, especially Bettina, initiated and developed proactive strategies for dealing with the conflict rather than just responding as they had in Helsinki. Using their organizational power, WILPF made sure that there were many opportunities to discuss the topic of racism. WILPF's leadership encouraged Geraldine and others to give workshops on racism on the train. Bettina made a point of attending the workshop on fascism and racism led by Barrie, an African American woman, and stood by Geraldine's side to support her statements. Geraldine presented her workshop on racism in the European Union. An African American woman, Angela, led a workshop on bridge-building between women of different races. In addition, a women of color support group met regularly during the three week trip.

Not only had the setting changed but the players changed, too. Although the train participants were mostly white, many women of color from around the world, who had not been present for the WILPF Congress, now joined the peace train. Geraldine was no longer singled out because of her level of leadership, commitment, and expertise in the area of racism.

Conflict around racial issues continued to surface. For example, WILPF provided train passengers with the opportunity to speak for/about their regional concerns at the meetings with local women during the train stop-overs. At each stop, WILPF leadership asked women representing different regions of the world to speak on the panels addressing the women at the public forums organized by the local women's groups. WILPF varied the panel representation at each location. On one occasion, Angela was invited to be one of the speakers at the Parliament in Odessa, Ukraine, one of the train stops. This gave her the opportunity to gain visibility for her agenda and perspective.

Angela delivered what I thought was a finely crafted speech. She spoke about life as an African American woman in the US. However, as we left the Parliament building, I heard quite a few angry comments from white women about both the length and content of Angela's speech. A number of women, particularly the young women, were then upset at how their friend Angela was treated. In an interview, Sonali, a young British woman of Indian heritage, defended Angela. Sonali was surprised by the racism and cultural imperialism she had experienced on the train:

And then there's the kind of ignorance like Angela's speech. Now it was long, I admit. But it was a very direct, to the point speech about life for a woman of color in the United States or any country that is predominantly white but especially in the United States. And I heard things like what an egotistical woman she is. How dare she talk about the United States like that in a foreign country. How dare she, how can she go off saying things like that about white people or her society. How dare she take so much time. Who does she think she is. Things like that!

One person says to me, she was talking to me, “she’s preaching to the converted.” And I was just like, and a lot of these comments came from people that gave me my scholarship and I was just like. . . So I got back on my bus, that was to take us somewhere else, and I just started crying because I just did not know how I was supposed to respond when I get home and have to work with these women that can’t even acknowledge their own inherent role [in a racist society].

Given her financial reliance on the white women she was in conflict with, Sonali did not continue to confront them with her perspective on the significance of Angela’s talk or on their response to her speech.

WILPF members wanted to give Angela the chance to speak and appreciated the diversity that she represented. Part of the WILPF anti-racist agenda was to give voice and visibility to African Americans. However, once a “black” perspective became clear in a public setting, it was a source of conflict. Angela’s speech escalated the conflict around racism by heightening the difference between herself and her white US compatriots.

Angela challenged the assumptions and values of some white WILPF members. Her statements made some of the women uncomfortable because, on the one hand, it appealed to their sense of social justice but, on the other hand, it prioritized racism in a way that challenged their value system. Sonali gave an example of how Angela had questioned a WILPF member’s priorities earlier in on the journey:

Like one lady said to me about Angela. . . that she doesn’t think Angela is sympathetic towards the people that we have been visiting. And I said oh I don’t think so cause Angela is the one who always asks the question so how can we help you? Right? And so this woman said well you know we came out of this workshop where the women had been telling us about Chernobyl victims and children of the Chernobyl victims and how its really hopeless and I was telling Angela that our problems at home seem miniscule compared to the problems that they have here and Angela disagreed with me. And I was like well I do, too, cause our problems at home are just as big as the problems here. Our children our dying! And this woman said, but at least in the United States they have a possibility of bringing themselves out of it. I was just sitting, I was just kind of like, she did not say that, she did not make that comment, you know?

The woman Sonali spoke of felt that nuclear issues were more important than racism in the USA. When Angela contradicted the woman’s viewpoint, she was characterized as selfish for making her priorities and her racial identification known. This encounter illustrates again her anti-racist agenda is different from a “black” perspective.

Within the diverse context of the peace train, identities continued to splinter making multi-layered identities and loyalties evident. Once the peace train was underway, separate spaces formed with support groups for women of color. However, deciding who qualified as a “woman of color” was not a simple matter. Conflicts arose over the separate spaces. A number of women of color were shut out by other support group members. They did not qualify because they were not “black enough”. It was the women who were racially mixed that got caught in the complexity of “identity”.

Two women, both mixed racially, confided in me their hurt that they did not feel included in the group. One woman from the Netherlands told me that she was told she was “not black

enough" to be a member of the group. Confused and angry, she explained to me that she led women of color activities/support groups in the Netherlands. She went over her ethnic background with me, claiming at least five different heritages, one of which was Caucasian. Jo, who also had mixed racial heritage—Chinese and Italian American, was very hurt that she had not felt accepted in the women of color support group. She cried as she concluded that she was also "not black enough". Tonya, on the other hand, was frustrated that as a Guatemalan Indian she was included/grouped in with Hispanics from Central and South America. She explained to me that she identified herself as indigenous and did not want to be seen as Spanish.

These disagreements about racial identity remained individual complaints. None of the women mentioned above raised their concerns in a public setting. All of them spoke to me one-on-one about their feelings. Perhaps they felt quite isolated in this context. Nor did they wish to risk alienating their companions on the train.

Tensions around racism continued to mount and WILPF leadership responded once again, setting up a dialogue session in a park at a short stop-over in the Ukraine. The leadership of this group meeting included a couple of European American WILPF members and an Indian professor who facilitated the meeting. During the session, the train passengers had an opportunity to talk about some of the reasons why they were uncomfortable traveling with each other, racism being one of the main issues. Some of the women, like Angela and Sonali, were confrontational in this setting; others, like Geraldine, tried to be more diplomatic. Although the conflicts were not resolved, I had the impression that quite a few women thought the community meeting was helpful.

Finally, toward the end of the journey to China, the WILPF leadership, specifically Bettina, initiated meetings to expand WILPF's political priorities. Bettina invited a multi-cultural/multi-racial group to come together and define key areas that had emerged as the result of discussions on the peace train. Geraldine was particularly pleased with this strategy on the part of WILPF. According to Geraldine, "If WILPF is to rise to the task of building a new world order, they must restructure their priorities. Racism is the first part of that (restructuring)."

#### FWCW, Beijing

Once the train arrived in Beijing for the conferences, the setting and the actors changed again significantly. In the context of the NGO Forum, there were thousands of women from around the globe and white women were in the minority. Each day, there were hundreds of events, activities, or forums for the participants to choose from. It was nearly impossible to address the conference as a whole. In an effort to reach groups larger than the workshop forum, the most common event, some women would organize demonstrations and march across the Forum grounds. When the government conference began in Beijing those women who had access to the FWCW had to choose between Hairou and Beijing.

Although women of color were now the majority (Geraldine told me how much at home she felt now that she was part of the majority), some of the Western women of African descent felt that racism was not on the agenda at the conference. These women tried to raise the level of conflict, bringing their issues and frustration to public places. They networked with other NGO representatives at the Forum to build up their power and resources. Geraldine reported to me that a powerful caucus of women of color, two hundred strong, had started meeting together. At one point they took over one of the tents, stopping the designated program to carry on their own. It seemed to me that this group of women did not feel at home in the spaces created by/for their

white compatriots, nor did they feel at home in the spaces where their people of origin—mostly African—gathered. According to Geraldine, the group wanted their own “women of color” tent. Despite her frustration, meeting with so many exciting, powerful women to form their own space was an empowering experience. Geraldine left for Britain four days after she had arrived in Beijing.

Sue, an African American woman on the WILPF USA staff, approached me to talk about her perspective on the racial tensions. I had met Sue briefly in New York at the 1995 prepcom and did not see her again until we met in Beijing. Sue was angry that racism had been cut from the PfA except for three references. She was also disgusted that the daily NGO Forum newspaper carried so little coverage on racism after she had worked closely with them. As a result, she and other US women of color were working with the US government delegation to form an alternate group. The US delegation included an African American, Asian American and a Chicana whom they attempted to meet with separately from the white delegates in order to strengthen their lobbying power and make their objectives visible. Given their level of frustration at the NGO Forum, this group of women organized around their identity as US women of color and appealed to US government delegates along racial lines.

Some women of color made a statement in the NGO Briefing toward the end of the conference that they were “outraged” that racism had been cut from the PfA. Sue mentioned to me that they knew the PfA was impossible to influence at this point. In response to the lack of attention to racism in the PfA, Sue and other US women of color had revised and shortened the Declaration so that it could be used later in the US. The group also wrote up their own separate set of objectives.

Once the women arrived in Beijing, organizational change within WILPF was no longer the avenue for gaining attention for their agendas. Sue and Geraldine centered their work on the PfA and gathering support among NGO representatives. However, I asked Sue if she had appealed to WILPF for support of her concerns around racism. Sue was discouraged by the inconsistency of WILPF’s support. She said that she had spoken to Ellen and other WILPF leaders a number of times. They would “say one thing and do another,” she said. In her opinion, the organization had to “go beyond the rhetoric of structural violence.”

### Outcomes

Geraldine felt positive about the changes she and the small group of women of color had been able to make within WILPF as an organization. They had “started with nothing” and now she felt WILPF recognized the importance of looking at racism and making initial changes that needed to be made in that area. Racism was beginning to “creep up on the agenda.” They had changed the WILPF mission statement and started some rich conversations on a complex subject.

Geraldine reported to me in an interview that she felt the WILPF leadership had in some ways dealt with the racial conflict well. Most important, they did not run away from the conflict. Once tension rose, the leadership demonstrated a willingness to deal with the issues rather than covering it up. Ellen’s strong support for their proposal to include a definition of racism based on color in the mission statement had been critical for the proposal’s success. To Daba and Karen, the acceptance of their definition of racism by the assembly and the visible support of the WILPF leadership was very meaningful. However, Geraldine pointed out that the leadership was also responsible for “the fact that racism was not on the agenda in any real way.”

In addition to some optimism about initial changes, Geraldine also felt somewhat cynical. The progress that had been made within the organization was made at great personal expense to her and she wondered aloud whether this type of discussion would be maintained once the trip was over.

When the FWCW had ended, I asked Bettina in an interview about her reflections on the conflict around racism and the ensuing dialogue. She responded:

And with the political demands, I mean, you know, I haven't been through all the workshop reports but of what I heard, there were good workshops on the train.

And we will do our political work and follow this up, especially on racism because more detailed suggestions than we were able to get at the Congress because of this incident there. So that is something which we can integrate in our work. But WILPF did not have a bad program that was now changed completely by the train, it was our usual development.

Anna: They were issues you were already dealing with?

Bettina: Yes, fascism and racism.

From Bettina's perspective, the conversations that took place during the workshops contributed to the development of WILPF as an organization. They deepened the understanding of an issue, racism, that was already a priority.

#### Discussion

The Western women of color, particularly Geraldine, used tactics and frames that were strongly identity based. Many of them came alone as single delegates for their NGOs so their first step was to build up a small network of women of color. They used confrontation, often public confrontation, as well as disruption of planned activities. In addition, the women tried education and persuasive tactics in the many workshops they led or attended. At times, they separated themselves from the white women, forming support groups and caucuses. Finally, they went through the proper channels set up to introduce policy proposals. At each stage, they—Geraldine in particular—felt that the success and/or failure of their strategy was tied to their identity. That is, their ideas were accepted or opposed because of their identities.

The women of color used identity to gather support for their agenda, trying to call other women of color to unite around a common agenda. However, identities fluctuated as the women moved from one setting to another. In the setting of the WILPF Congress in Helsinki, women of color were a minority and some of them pulled together around common interests. On the train, many Third World women joined the group and the phrase "women of color" became more complex, even a source of tension. At the NGO Forum '95, women of color were in the majority but within this diverse, global context, the Western women of color found themselves identifying with their regional and national identities.

Geraldine and her allies used several different frames for her agenda, the most successful of which was anti-racism. In the context of WILPF, it was effective because WILPF leadership and members were committed to anti-racism, so that when Geraldine spoke of racism in public settings, it got the attention of the organization's members who then could be embarrassed or persuaded to make time for the issue. Many of the WILPF members and leadership saw themselves as anti-racist activists committed to eliminating racism, so that when Geraldine or others implied that WILPF actions might be racist, they tended to respond.

However, when their audience was more diverse and their target more diffuse, the anti-racism framework became more problematic. In China, the women of color lost interest in WILPF, one NGO among many, and it became much less clear who their adversary was. When the Western women were dominant/in the majority, Geraldine's frame provided some connection among the "diaspora," e.g. specifically First World and Third World women of color. When Third world women were in the majority, anti-racism was no longer effective as a strategic frame. Racism was not referred to within the context of the peace agenda. My informants felt the topic of racism had all but disappeared. I observed that in other global regions, racism was framed as imperialism, colonization, war, lack of health care or development.

Geraldine's slogan, "Racism is based on color," was her most effective frame. Although defining racism was very complex, Geraldine created a slogan that was clear and simple. The slogan worked to some extent—it was accepted by the WILPF plenary for their mission statement even though it was not a comfortable fit. There were so many different understandings of racism and the concepts around it—race, ethnicity, prejudice—that the WILPF members still disagreed among themselves as to the definition of racism. However, Geraldine was successful in initiating a rich discussion of issues that were very important to her and her constituency.

Geraldine attempted to educate WILPF members about academic debates around postmodernism but had little success in rallying support for changing an academic discourse with which they were completely unfamiliar. The new world order framework, on the other hand, was so familiar that it did not propose anything new to the WILPF membership. They simply nodded their assent.

The black agenda frame was not as effective but changing the agenda may have been a more difficult task than changing the mission statement. First, it was a new frame. Many of the WILPF members never seemed to understand the difference between anti-racism from a white perspective and anti-racism from a black perspective. Unfortunately, Geraldine was not successful in developing a frame that communicated the nuances successfully to her audience. Second, by framing her agenda as the "black agenda", she may have reinforced a perspective that her issues were local and/or identity-based, meaning that her frame had little international appeal. If she had framed the issues within, for example, a human rights abuse framework, a frame that was very prominent at the FWCW, she might have had more success.

Third, although Geraldine explained her priorities in her workshops in detail, in other settings, she would refer broadly to "the black agenda," leaving the listener curious and perhaps guilty but uninformed. She had coined the phrase "fortress Europe" to illustrate her points about the difficulty of obtaining citizenship for blacks in Europe, but without a detailed explanation, "fortress Europe" had little meaning. Forming a slogan that highlighted a few of her priorities, such as police brutality, citizenship, and economic justice might have made clear to her audience which issues were important to her constituency.

### SWVP

#### Background

SWVP faced unique challenges attending conferences along with government and NGO delegates with whom their people were at war. They developed strategies and frames accordingly. In general, SWVP members did their best to de-escalate conflict. Their people were at war; the situation had already escalated to the point of violence. SWVP members tried not to fan the fire in order to lower the tensions enough so that dialogue could take place. Instead of

protesting publicly, SWVP leaders avoided confrontation or making agreements that compromised their principles or goals. They focused on finding solutions for long-term problems rather than becoming caught up in the hatred.

The northern Sudanese delegates disliked the southern women criticizing the Sudanese government. They were also uncomfortable with the southern women representing themselves and their own interests. SWVP's very presence as a southern Sudanese NGO was a reminder to the northern women that many Southerners were demanding self-determination. However, the Sudanese government and northern Sudanese delegates did not represent the concerns of SWVP such as ending the civil war, self-determination, or opposition to Islamic governance (Sharia law). SWVP insisted on the right to represent themselves and quietly went about speaking on panels and in workshops at the conferences.

The Sudanese government delegates and some NGO delegates often tried to discredit SWVP and other southern Sudanese refugees who demanded the right to speak. During the conference in Senegal, at a meeting with a representative of the UN High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR), a refugee from southern Sudan complained that the Sudanese government delegate had told her she could not speak to the assembly because she was a refugee. She asked the UNHCR representative, "How can refugee women be heard at this UN conference?" to which UNHCR had no reply. If, as Sudanese refugees, they were able to obtain the proper papers to attend the conference, they then faced government and military delegates representing the state, who had difficulty even acknowledging their existence, much less allowing them to speak at the government conference. A UN agency like UNHCR had little power to intervene.

Some of the Northern women used their power to discredit SWVP presentations and to cajole them into making agreements based on northern terms. The SWVP was a small group of women far outnumbered by northern Sudanese attending the conferences. In addition, the northern women had the backing of the Sudanese state. Some of the northern women were interested in speaking with their southern colleagues about peace. However, their strategy was to develop a peace agreement with SWVP based on the terms of the state.

SWVP members developed their strategies for dealing with conflict in response to northern Sudanese provocation. They created three frames to reach out to the conference participants: a just peace, self-determination, and conflict resolution. SWVP members used their presentations on panels and in workshops, the meetings they attended, and talks with the media and individuals to introduce their frames. SWVP's main goals as an organization were to end the violence in their country and to establish the right to self-determination for their people. At the conferences, they hoped to gain international support for and involvement in their peacemaking efforts. SWVP specifically targeted Western and African NGOs that they thought might help them in the peace process. In addition, SWVP attempted to set up dialogue with northern Sudanese women who were also interested in an end to civil war.

### Senegal

The following incidents illustrate SWVP's strategy of de-escalation and the frames they adopted in Senegal. I returned to the peace tent after an event to find some of the SWVP women very upset. I asked what was happening. Lucia explained to me with a raised voice that the Sudanese government delegation claimed they did not need to negotiate with the southern Sudanese women because the President had announced that day that they had almost gotten rid

of all the Blacks (southern Sudanese). I was shocked and confused but Lucia brought it up again in her interview:

Actually we got the message even in Dakar now that the government says the Blacks remain very few and soon they will get rid of them. Their objective is to get out of the Black color in the Sudan.

Anna: They said that here at this conference?

Lucia: Yes, they said this in this conference and no respond, no reaction because we are here to make peace, to talk peace. We are not government delegation and we don't have access. And we don't want to confront ourselves but we want to address the real issues and these are some of the practical issues many people have here in this tent.

This incident illustrates the intense hatred and mistrust between the women. Lucia clearly stated that SWVP did not wish to confront the northern delegates who had restated the government's policy of genocide. Avoiding confrontation meant they were making "peace". They preferred to focus their attention on practical solutions for ending the war rather than grappling with the hatred.

SWVP presented their program a number of times on panels of peacemakers selected by the peace tent organizers. These panels attracted fairly diverse audiences including northern Sudanese. Each time SWVP spoke in this setting, they used a "just peace" frame. SWVP focused on how women had been silenced for 40 years during the conflict and emphasized the following needs: to have voice, particularly through the media; to identify the constraints of women's participation in the peace process; and to train women leaders in peacemaking. They called for peace with justice and spoke about the suffering of the displaced. SWVP finished by explaining their activities, which included a newsletter, workshops, peacekeeping activities, as well as cultural and traditional conflict resolution in order to promote peace at a local level. They supported a non-violent approach to peace. The SWVP speaker framed her presentation in terms of peacemaking and carefully avoided inflammatory language.

On one occasion, after the SWVP spoke about their situation in southern Sudan, a man from northern Sudan, a government delegate, spoke in disagreement. He claimed that for the past five years, southern Sudan had been exempt from the Sharia Law, a major source of contention in the civil war. In his opinion, the rebels and their demands for self-determination were to blame for the failure of the peace talks. Next he pointed out what progress women had made under the government, naming a southern Sudanese woman who was a governor and the female minister of peace who was also from southern Sudan. The government delegate stressed the need to be honest and sincere, implying that SWVP had not been. Then he noted that the "few people talking about self-determination were enjoying life outside the country," referring to the SWVP members who were refugees.

SWVP members did not confront him but as soon as he had finished, an angry woman who identified herself as from the Sudan, spoke up. She said that she would like to believe that the government of the Sudan was working hard for peace. However, the President has said that the way to end the war is to kill people. In the name of Islam, he imported guns to exterminate the people of the South. In her opinion, no country wanted Sharia Law because it made Africans fight. She had been forced to leave the country because she had talked about peace and her life had been threatened. She called for a "real peace, not silence." The governors the speaker had mentioned were appointed to deceive the people. She claimed they had no people to govern. She

ended her statement, voice raised and face red, saying the southern Sudanese want a referendum to decide for themselves.

The tension level was high and the facilitator took charge saying it was better to talk and not to keep things down. She did not discourage disagreement. However, again, the SWVP did not respond. It appeared that SWVP was trying to avoid tension. Not only did they not answer the accusations and counter-arguments but they were not the ones to raise the issue of self-determination.

My conversations with northern Sudanese women interested in making peace made clear why SWVP chose to frame their appeal in terms of peacemaking. For instance, I met and talked with a northern Sudanese woman, Zachara, who attended the peace caucus off and on during the global prepcom in New York 1995. As I mentioned earlier in the text, SWVP members were not present at this prepcom. Zachara, the president of the Sudanese Women's General Union, spoke extensively about the importance of peace in her country. The peace office, a branch of her large organization, negotiated with different factions, worked with displaced women and children, and promoted a culture of peace. Zachara was particularly proud of how they had persuaded women in a particular village to become peacemakers. She told the story of how the women would sing songs that "are very effective socially." After the death of a young man during a fight between two tribes, the women had sung songs of revenge. Another man was killed and the singers sang that the man murdered was an elder. However, when members of her organization had shown these women how useful and effective they could be for peace, the women began to change their tunes that in turn reversed the situation. They sang ballads for peace instead of for revenge.

In Beijing, I met Sayida, a leader in the women's section of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army, the northern Sudanese army which is supported by the Sudanese state. She felt that, as mothers, it was the duty of women to protect their families. She showed me a picture that she identified as victims of the war in Bosnia and said that it was the responsibility of women to see to it that this would never happen in the Sudan. She also pointed to a photo of the peace initiatives that the women's section of the army had participated in. They had not been successful but she stated very clearly that they were for peace. I asked her before leaving if she knew of the SWVP to which her answer was negative. Both of these northern Sudanese women saw themselves as peacemakers and responded to the idea of women bringing about peace in the Sudan.

During the conference in Senegal, many of the women speaking in the peace tent spoke of African women as peacemakers. They maintained that as women, as mothers, as educators, they held together the fabric of African society and were therefore better peacemakers than men. SWVP seemed to identify with this rhetoric. At the conference, they joined women peace activists from many African nations to form a federation of women's peace movements. Northern Sudanese women were not present at the meetings during which the federation was founded. Lucia reported later that forming the federation was the highlight of the conference for them.

SWVP's just peace frame contrasted sharply with their self-determination frame. In a UN radio interview, Rachel emphasized the injustices committed towards her people that justified a separate state. She explained to the interviewer that Northerners and Southerners were "completely different people" in terms of race, culture and religion. Since most of the development and the seat of the government was in the North, the South felt that they had been left behind. According to Rachel, "we were made into second class citizens." Furthermore, the

South was not consulted about what was happening when independence came to the Sudan. The Islamic Sharia Law was imposed on her people and a large number of Southern people suffered. "Their legs were amputated. Women were flogged in public, they were fined, they were killed," Rachel explained graphically.

Rachel maintained that it was becoming increasingly difficult for the two parts of the country to live together:

So we feel that it's better instead of crying for unity, which is not for the benefit of the people of south Sudan in particular because the war is raging in the area of south Sudan. We would like our people in south Sudan to be given the right to choose what type of state they want so that they are free. So we want a democratic solution to the problem so that the south Sudan can go its own way if its people so choose.

SWVP was advocating a referendum on self-determination for the people of southern Sudan. Rachel emphasized the need for democratic process in determining the fate of her people.

### Beijing

During the NGO Forum '95, SWVP members changed their strategy. Again, northern Sudanese women attacked SWVP publicly for calling attention to their concerns. This time, however, SWVP called for conflict resolution sessions between the Sudanese women, north and south. Instead of calling public attention to the attacks of their northern sisters, SWVP made public their conflict resolution attempts in an effort to get help from international NGOs represented in the peace tent.

Lucia explained to me that the conflict had taken place in the African regional tent. The northern Sudanese women were upset that the southern Sudanese women had taken the stage in the African tent and had spoken as black Sudanese. They had told SWVP publicly that they did not think it was appropriate to show that the Sudan is a diverse country. "But that's how it is!" Lucia exclaimed, "We are black." Apparently, some African women had offered to help their Sudanese sisters, but neither the facilitator nor the northern women had showed up at the appointed time.

I observed as Lucia announced to the women gathered in the peace tent (they were mostly African, attending reports from African peace activists) that the next day SWVP would hold a conflict resolution session. "You were there in the African tent," she appealed to the audience, "You saw what happened." When Lucia returned to her seat, she asked me personally to attend the conflict resolution meeting. Lucia made an open invitation to non-nationals, hoping to gain international support and involvement.

SWVP met with women from northern Sudan for conflict resolution sessions three times during the NGO Forum. Each time they announced the sessions publicly in the peace tent and invited everyone to come. During the session that I attended, the participants were almost entirely northern Sudanese. Few, if any non-nationals participated.

During the session many of the northern women talked of the need for peace in the Sudan. They spoke eloquently about how women were naturally good peacemakers because they were mothers. Women were better peacemakers than men, the northern women agreed among themselves. Rachel, irritated, pushed for concrete proposals. She called for a just peace. In response, a male government representative present fueled Rachel's anger by undermining her credibility. He insinuated that Rachel had no right to speak since she was no longer in the

country, and that she had left the Sudan of her own free will. Rachel confronted the male delegate, saying that she was upset that he said some refugees were just having fun outside of the country. The northern women tried to smooth over the conflict, denying that the minister had said anything that Rachel had accused him of. At the end of the session, someone summarized the proposals suggested, mentioning first the need to address the UN, and second, the decision to write a letter to the Sudanese government and the opposition, which would be delivered by her excellency, the minister for peace. The group decided to meet a third time.

This meeting was very frustrating for SWVP; Rachel told me afterwards how angry she was. There was much Rachel could have said to incite both the delegate and the other women whom she felt were insincere. Nevertheless, she restrained herself, criticizing the male delegate only for his personal jab at her as a refugee. In this context, SWVP stuck to their non-confrontative strategy of calling for a just peace and peace proposals. However, I learned later that the SWVP leadership had refused to sign the peace letter that the northern women had produced. The signed peace letter would have been a coup for the northern women, particularly for those employed by the state. However, SWVP did not agree to their terms and had left China without signing the letter.

The SWVP-initiated conflict resolution contrasted sharply with another Sudanese mediation session I attended that took place during a peace caucus meeting at the FWCW. In this case, the southern Sudanese refugee told a story of human rights abuse that she must have known would infuriate the northern Sudanese women present. She said her daughter had been kidnapped and sold into slavery. The refugee did not monitor her language carefully as SWVP had. A fight broke out that grabbed the attention of the peace caucus members. In the context of this international meeting, a team of women from four different countries formed spontaneously and offered to help the women out with their differences. The international team made sure that the northern women did not dominate or intimidate the southern Sudanese woman and the conversation was much more frank than the SWVP conflict resolution session.

In addition to the conflict resolution sessions, SWVP gave several workshops at the NGO Forum '95. I attended one of the last workshops they offered. The subject was genocide. Rachel showed a video on human rights violations and the Nuba who were being killed off or relocated. The workshop was not attended by the northern Sudanese women.

### Outcomes

SWVP members were particularly pleased with the results of their participation in the African Regional Conference. Lucia, in an interview, spoke about her satisfaction with SWVP participation:

Up to today, Monday, the 21st, I feel that we have spoken enough and we have done something. Our objective was to see that action must be taken. Our action panel has been done yesterday. We formed African Women's Peace movement and we set up our center which is networking for peace and we put it we must cooperate and collaborate with Femnet. Femnet is coordinating all the NGO women's activities in Africa and outside Africa. We feel that that is a place that our voice, our values could be strongly channeled outside and inside. And we formed, the women's peace movement formed a committee for the grassroots networking. This is based on the countries who have been here for peace and we

made very specific recommendations and made objectives and activities.

Lucia implied that she and the other SWVP members felt heard, contributed to the formation of an important coalition, made their proposals, and generally followed through on their objectives.

Eventually, SWVP's strategy made an impression on WILPF leadership, as they had hoped. Although WILPF members did not attend SWVP workshops or the conflict resolution sessions the Sudanese women set up in Beijing, they noticed the effort the Sudanese women were making to reconcile their differences. WILPF made sure that SWVP had space in the peace tent to conduct their conflict resolution meetings even though many groups were competing for that space. By the end of the conference, the WILPF leadership was interested in working with SWVP. They spoke about a desire to maintain contacts with women from Africa. Ellen, who was moved by the reconciliation efforts of the Sudanese women, suggested that WILPF organize a peace mission to the Sudan.

As a result of their participation in the conferences, SWVP was also able to make some contacts with sympathetic women from northern Sudan. SWVP and some of the northern Sudanese women seemed to have a strong desire for cooperation but a great deal of mistrust. In addition, the northern women talking about peace in the Sudan appeared to be operating in different circles than the SWVP. When I inquired, some of the women were aware of each other's NGOs but none of them had much contact. Through the conferences, SWVP made contact with the Sudanese Women's Union. SWVP reported to me that they had met with the Women's Union before the conference and they planned to continue their networking after the conference.

### Discussion

SWVP's strategy of de-escalation, e.g. avoidance and non-compliance, was linked both to the frames they developed and to their sense of identity. Their interpretation of their religious identity may have influenced their decision not to confront the northern government and NGO delegates. A "peaceful" strategy might also have been reinforced by one of their major financial backers, the Swedish Christian foundation, Life and Peace. Because I observed other southern Sudanese women confronting and challenging their adversaries, I cannot attribute SWVP's strategy to southern Sudanese culture. In addition, SWVP members were not long-time activists. They identified themselves as intellectuals and as such, may have felt that education was more important than confrontation.

All of the Sudanese women obviously identified very strongly with their religious and racial/ethnic backgrounds. Tension around Arab/Black African and Muslim/Christian divides is a major cause of the Sudanese civil war even though the dividing lines, particularly the racial classifications, are very complex (Deng, 1995). Nevertheless, SWVP was attempting to build connections with the women from the North based on gender. In a workshop on the Sudan, when Rachel was asked whether there was much difference between the Sudanese men and the women, she responded that there was not much difference because both men and women were oppressed. Rachel did say, however, that they were attempting dialogue so that they could reach common ground as women.

Given the circumstances, their sense of common identity was fragile. At the African regional conference, SWVP joined in the essentialist rhetoric proclaiming women to be natural or better peacemakers. They participated in the formation of the African Women's Peace

Federation. However, at the Forum in China, when the northern women began the conflict resolution sessions with the same rhetoric, it fell flat. Rachel felt the women as peacemakers frame reinforced the insincerity of the northern women because they spoke about an abstract identity as a way of avoiding discussion of concrete proposals for peace or the conflict that had erupted between them at the conference.

SWVP deliberately altered how they framed their issues, depending on their audience. When they were speaking to a general audience that might contain delegates from Northern Sudan, they spoke about the need for a "just peace" and emphasized their peace efforts with women. In contrast, when they spoke to an audience gathered specifically to hear their story, such as an SWVP workshop or a media interview, the SWVP spoke about the need for self-determination and an end to the genocide against their people. Self-determination and genocide were terms that could have been inflammatory and SWVP chose not to incite their northern colleagues. In the global setting of the NGO Forum '95, SWVP added to their strategy by calling for conflict resolution between the northern and southern women. It was their goal to attract international involvement and support for their attempt at peaceful negotiations.

A "just peace" was a widely-known frame applied to a new context, the Sudan. It appealed to both Western and African allies. It was language these allies were familiar with and would use themselves. In addition, the frame lent the Sudanese women an air of respectability and facilitated their acceptance into the peace circles. "Just peace" had meaning—peace was not acceptable at any price—but was generic enough to leave the listener unaware of a specific agenda. For this reason, it may have made northern Sudanese women uncomfortable but it did not incite them. It was a useful frame.

Self-determination, on the other hand, was much more controversial. Nevertheless, it communicated the SWVP agenda clearly in a way that a "just peace" did not. Self-determination was a particularly effective frame for grabbing the attention of international listeners who knew little about the situation or for rallying support among those who had already made a decision to support the southern Sudanese cause. For some, like the WILPF leadership, it posed a crisis. Through the prepcoms and the peace train, they had made more connections with women from the north of Sudan, who supported unity rather than self-determination. Although I noted references in WILPF literature condemning the foreign intervention and supporting the right of self-determination, the word may have also been perceived as synonymous with war. Furthermore, because women from both sides of the war were wanting to take part in the peace events, supporting SWVP may have been perceived as taking sides.

The third frame that the SWVP developed, conflict resolution, gained support from many different participants. Like "just peace" it was an old frame applied to a new situation. Conflict resolution was central to the mission of the peace tent and the organizers of the peace activities. As a result, conflict resolution appealed enormously to the SWVP's targeted audience, Western and African peace NGOs. Most of these women considered themselves to be peacemakers, as did some of the northern Sudanese women. The northern women advocating for an end to the war wanted to see themselves and to be seen as peacemakers. The northern women agreed to take part in the conflict resolution sessions under the watchful eye of the international community, setting the stage for the dialogue for which SWVP had advocated.

In the meantime, WILPF was impressed with SWVP's attempts at reconciliation and spoke of strengthening ties with the organization after the conference. Initially, WILPF was

cautious with their support. The conflict in the Sudan was not easily understood by potential Western allies. The religious basis for conflict—Arab vs. Christian/Animism—and the murky racial lines drawn in the civil war may have made it difficult for them to know how to support SWVP. Religions in themselves might not be perceived as bad and it might have been difficult for some Westerners, including myself, to distinguish the racial divides. However, eventually WILPF offered their support and the conflict resolution frame was effective in bringing SWVP closer to their goals.

### Beneath Paradise

#### Background

Madelaine's main tactic to gain attention for her agenda was conflict escalation. Her attempts to raise issues, particularly de-colonization, were largely ignored. The power differential was so great between France and New Caledonia that Madelaine was unable to initiate any kind of discussion with the French government delegates during the conferences. As a result, she resorted to open, public confrontation and embarrassment. The conflicts that she initiated became useful to her because she could then use them to gain more attention for her issues.

As a lone representative of three different NGOs, Madelaine had much ground to cover. Her goals were to stop French nuclear testing in her region, gain self-determination for her people, and end French militarization of New Caledonia. However, at the New York prepcom in 1995, neither the New Caledonian nor the French government delegates were speaking about these issues in the context of the Pacific Islands. Madelaine's main objective became to alter the conference discourse. She targeted New Caledonian and peace NGOs, NGO representatives in the indigenous and Asia Pacific caucuses, and the media, as well as the New Caledonian and French government representatives.

Madelaine developed a frame that focused attention on three issues: de-colonization, de-militarization, and de-nuclearization. It was important to her that all three issues be recognized—attention for one of the three concerns was not enough because they were inextricably connected. In an interview with UN radio, Madelaine responded to a question put to her on the relationship between colonization and militarization:

You cannot dissociate the militarization from the colonization. And as I say everywhere because people want to talk only about the militarization but not about colonization, hang on, it's not the angels who came and killed our people and the military is the main instrument of the power. And colonization they hear, they dictate, they say you do this, do that, and on. And when we don't do it, like what happened for example in New Caledonia or wherever, they send the army and we deal directly with the occupation of the army. We are fighting against the army.

Her effort to keep bringing colonization into the conference discourse was the core of her struggle in the conference settings.

Madelaine declared herself in opposition to anyone who did not support her political agenda as a whole, regardless of their identity. She was expecting a battle. She had attended the Nairobi women's conference in 1985 and had been ignored by the French government delegates. Madelaine was an experienced activist in many different arenas, from women's rights to the Kanak struggle for independence. She maintained that she was not afraid to confront anymore. It was the poverty, the suffering of her people that kept her going. "It makes me strong," she said, "What have I to lose?"

New York Prepcor, 1995

At the first meeting of the peace caucus at the global precom in New York City, Madelaine raised the issue of de-colonization only to be ignored. Madelaine's next action was to speak at a larger meeting, called the linkage caucus, which was set up to link activities between the various caucuses at the prepcor. Bettina and another prominent peace caucus member, Maude, were in line to speak at the microphone when I arrived. I then noticed that Madelaine had gotten in line. She told her story to the crowd, saying that she had talked about de-colonization as a peace issue in the peace caucus but it was not "taken up." She demanded "attention for her people." Maude was the first to start the applause after Madelaine spoke.

Publicly embarrassed, the peace caucus added a sentence about the need for self-determination and de-colonization to the peace caucus priorities. I noted its appearance in the flyer to be distributed around the conference stating the main peace caucus issues. Later, when a Canadian peace group offered to re-type the flyer, I noted that the sentence on de-colonization disappeared. However, it re-appeared in the statement the following day. There was some struggle but the statement remained in the list of peace caucus priorities for the remainder of the conference.

Because of her commitment to her agenda, Madelaine found herself not only in conflict with the peace caucus but the government delegates from New Caledonia and from France as well as NGO representatives from the Pacific Island region. She described disputes with all of them. Her political agenda was absolutely essential to the formation of her alliances. The many facets of her identity—national, gender, and/or racial identification—were important to her but so were her issues.

After a peace caucus meeting, Madelaine agreed to talk with me about her work. She seemed particularly interested that I was studying conflict between women. "You're studying conflicts between women? Very interesting, very good," she said. At the prepcor, she said, she was occupied by trouble with government delegates, intra-group conflicts and trying to get her issues on the agenda of the general session.

Madelaine began to talk about some of her conflicts. Her first concern was the composition of the New Caledonian government delegation at the prepcor. "They say they represent the Pacific," she said, "but they are elite women with privilege." Madelaine had confronted them in a regional meeting stating that they would have to represent themselves and no one else because they do not represent the Pacific peoples like she, Madelaine did. Madelaine explained to me that she had slept with, fought for, and listened to Pacific women. She had lost 19 family members in the fighting and many friends.

Madelaine complained that the New Caledonian delegates were not raising the issues important to her people. However, she felt that as a result of her actions the delegates were forced to deal with concerns like de-colonization. She was certain that the delegates from New Caledonia would not have talked about colonialism unless she had been there to raise the issue. Madelaine had been raising her issues in all public forums from the beginning of the prepcor.

In addition to the government delegates, Madelaine was also suspicious of NGO representatives from the Pacific Islands. Although she identified strongly as an indigenous woman and attended the indigenous caucus at the conference, she had conflicted feelings about some of the representatives. Madelaine told me she was unsure of another indigenous woman at the prepcor. She had told Madelaine that she also represented NGOs, leaving Madelaine

somewhat perplexed. She was not familiar with the NGOs, the cooperatives the woman mentioned, nor had she seen the NGO money. "I don't know where NGO money goes," she said, frustrated, "in their pockets?" She feared the NGOs were "just there to further their own purpose." Nevertheless, Madelaine did add that she was glad to see people around who "are like me."

Most important, Madelaine felt herself at odds with the French government. During the conference, I saw Madelaine in action as she confronted the French government delegates. I met Madelaine at a meeting set up for government delegates representing countries in the European Union to answer NGO questions. Madelaine was recognized by the chair. She asked the French delegates about their position on New Caledonia and Tahiti and de-colonization. She said that the peace caucus had taken up de-militarization and de-nuclearization issues but she hadn't seen those issues in the platform. In addition, she brought up the accreditation process, pointing out that the women from Tibet and from New Caledonia had been prevented from attending the conference. "Can you defend us?" she asked. She ended her "question" by calling attention to French immigration policies. The government, she said, was bringing in more and more French citizens to vote against the de-colonization referendum.

Madelaine finished and the French delegates conferred among themselves. Finally, one of the delegates responded to Madelaine's question saying that her concern is not of interest to large numbers of women. At the conference, they were looking at issues that were of interest to most women. She thought Madelaine's question was too general and too specific. They were concerned specifically with women's issues, and de-colonization in New Caledonia was not a women's issue.

I was shocked by this response from the French delegates, but Madelaine reported to me immediately afterwards that she thought it was good to raise the issue. "Let's not dream on," she said. She knew what their response would be and would now go and "make a big deal of the question." In other words, Madelaine would now use their response to draw attention to her issue in public settings at the conference. She left me and headed off to the Asia Pacific caucus.

The next day, I ran into Madelaine at breakfast at the NGO center across from the UN. I sat down and we began to talk. "You see why I don't identify with women, with feminism," she said. She clarified, saying there are big differences between her and "those French women." Clearly, Madelaine did not identify with the French women based on gender. Although she added that she was "used to them," she declared that she was going to announce the response of the government delegates at the peace caucus press conference. She was not going to let their answer go by.

After telling her story at the Asia Pacific caucus, Madelaine exposed the French response in a radio interview with UN radio and WBAI which she invited me to attend. During the radio interview, she explained the situation as follows:

But if you are with the idea of de-colonizing, demilitarizing for justice this is no way you will get anywhere as long as you are French. That's why I'm quite happy, that the other day I went to the briefing meeting, those French, European Union, whatever, and when the French started to speak about you know how wonderful they are here to try to look at compromise so everyone will have their place and then a consensus after that to gather everyone.

So I asked, where is our place? What did they think about militarization, colonization and militarization by them in the Pacific and nuclearization of course. And the response was that they are not here to talk about that. It is not a subject. It is exactly like Nairobi. They told me that in Nairobi. I wasn't surprised. And the people around are not interested which is horseshit because I had many people in that audience who came and signed the petition against Mauri. Not against the Mauri but for the Mauri but me personally, I'm taking that responsibility. So I was quite, not shocked but the more disgusted and the more determined that Kanaky has to be free, New Caledonia and Tahiti, of course.

She had had a history of mistrust with the French delegates. Although her agenda had been ignored in 1985, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> UN World Conference in Nairobi, she continued to raise the issue of de-colonization, using the French hypocrisy as a way to call attention to the subject.

Her next step was to publicize the French insult at the peace caucus press conference. A large crowd and TV crews had gathered to view the human rights caucus press conference, but most of them left when it was over, leaving a small group at the front of the room singing peace songs with the peace ribbons displayed in the background. Madelaine was one of the first to speak. She spoke briefly about the French nuclear testing in the Pacific Islands. She also spoke about how the French delegates had responded to her question on French de-colonization. Her statement was heard not only by the US press but by peace caucus members from around the globe, and Bella Abzug, a prominent figure at the conference who had been persuaded to stay after the human rights press conference.

Before Madelaine left the conference, she was filmed by CNN at a meeting set up by the indigenous caucus. Again, Madelaine highlighted the French hypocrisy. When the meeting facilitator asked Madelaine if she thought the situation would end, Madelaine said angrily that "white people are crying about people everywhere but what about the Kanak?" She commented that there is a lot of talk about Bosnia, which is good. But, she complained, these same people (whites/French) who show so much concern for Bosnia are hiding the suffering of her people. She emphasized that her people are killed because they talk about their rights.

### Beijing

Once the NGO Forum '95 began in Beijing, Madelaine's strategy changed. She was no longer the only representative from her umbrella organization. As Madelaine had hoped, there were at least 16 indigenous women present from the Pacific Island coalition. Furthermore, she and a number of other indigenous women were given the opportunity to speak at the large plenary sessions at the NGO Forum '95. The peace caucus arranged for a panel of speakers from the Pacific Islands to talk about the French nuclear testing. To some extent, it was no longer necessary to gain attention through public embarrassment. However, with a larger constituency present, Beneath Paradise organized a demonstration against the French nuclear testing the morning of the first explosion. The conflicts continued. Each time they publicly protested the French nuclear testing they connected the struggle against nuclear weapons to their struggle for independence.

When I arrived in Beijing, it was several days into the conference before I was able to make contact with Madelaine. In the meantime, one of the first plenary speakers at the NGO Forum '95, Winona LaDuke, a well-known Native American environmentalist, mentioned the French nuclear testing in the Pacific as she was discussing the effects of colonization and

imperialism on the planet. Her reference to the French testing was an indication of the networking among transnational indigenous and/or environmental movements.

Madelaine was invited to speak at a plenary session on peace at the NGO Forum '95 on the fifth day of the conference. This was quite an accomplishment, given the thousands of women leaders and activists present at the conference and competing for a chance to speak to the largest forum at the conference. Madelaine described the effects of colonization on the Pacific, speaking openly about the atrocities committed by the French military on Kanaky. Then she elaborated on nuclear testing:

Nuclear testing is militarism, and the French have decided that their military prowess is more important than our health and safety. But it is equally important to keep in mind that nuclear testing is inseparable from colonialism. The French keep French Polynesia as a colony in order to test their weapons because since the independence of Algeria in the 1960s they no longer can test them in the Sahara desert. This is what we mean to them: We are their testing ground. Without colonization there would be no nuclear testing. (p.167)

She placed part of the responsibility for the testing on the international community, which she described as complacent.

The next day, a group of women from the Pacific Islands spoke in the peace tent on French nuclear testing in the Pacific. Heidi, a WILPF member from the Pacific Islands, had coordinated the panel. Heidi was currently a member of Parliament but had had lost her job twice because of her outspoken views on French nuclear testing, including a position as a minister in the government. Heidi publicly thanked peace activists, particularly in Europe, for helping to stop the testing. She thought it was possible that this provocation by France could help to develop a stronger global moratorium on nuclear testing. When I inquired, Heidi said she gotten to know Madelaine through NFIP.

Heidi spoke again at a plenary session on Asia Pacific strategies using a frame similar to Madelaine's. When listing the issues important to the Pacific Islands, Heidi began with colonization and nuclear weapons. Like Madelaine, she emphasized that nuclear testing would not stop until colonization had been stopped. If one supported the ban on nuclear weapons testing in the Pacific, then, she stated emphatically, one must support the independence of the islands. She described the UN Convention on Small States and pointed out that the "instruments" for independence were already in place. What was needed was the commitment to implement them.

I finally met up with Madelaine the morning of the nuclear test and corresponding protest. It was a very important morning. Not only had a nuclear bomb been exploded that morning in the Pacific but U.S. First Lady Hillary Clinton was coming to the NGO Forum '95 to speak. The Beneath Paradise demonstration was held behind the hall where Mrs. Clinton was speaking and the wife of the French President, Madame Chirac, was accompanying Hillary on that day.

At the protest, about 15 indigenous women from the Pacific, accompanied by another 20 women from around the world, walked in a circle shouting, "Stop French Testing!" and holding colorful banners and umbrellas (it was raining). As I walked the circle, I noted that quite a few Japanese women, who had declared nuclear issues a priority, had joined the demonstration. They were joined by some peace caucus members once the peace caucus demonstration, also staged for Mrs. Clinton's benefit, had finished. The Beneath Paradise protest ended when two black

limousines, presumably carrying Hillary Clinton and Madame Chirac, slid through the crowd. Madelaine yelled "Fascist!" after the cars.

The demonstration did not receive much attention in the wake of Hillary Clinton's visit, but Ellen decided to bring the issue to the FWCW. WILPF composed a letter protesting the nuclear testing, but Ellen was not allowed to read it to the government assembly. A woman loudly supported her, insisting that she be given space to speak and soon people in the assembly began to clap. Ellen was finally given the chance to read the WILPF protest. People stood and applauded when she had finished.

The following is part of the text of the one page letter. It was one of three letters protesting French nuclear testing in the Pacific that I collected. In the letter, WILPF connects colonialism, racism, and nuclear testing:

In complete disregard of the wish of the majority of the world's peoples and of the majority of its own citizens, the French Government undertook a nuclear weapons test in the early morning of 6 September 1995. This is the first in a series of announced tests. We, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, urge the French Government to have the courage to reverse its decision and to renounce any further testing.

We particularly protest the testing by France in the land and seas that is the home of the Polynesian people, a people that has fought for its independence from France for more than thirty years. We consider the nuclear test in this region a colonial and racist act. We call on France to respect the human rights, the well-being and interests of all people in the entire region.

The WILPF letter was not only read in the government assembly but WEDO declared it had been accepted by acclaim at the NGO Plenary Briefing session.

### Outcomes

Although I did not note a public response from the French delegates, I did notice that women in both the non-governmental and the governmental sectors began to speak about Madelaine's three issues as a result of her actions. The nuclear concern was given much more attention than de-colonization but both issues were acknowledged. Specifically, Madelaine played a part in the acceptance of a proposal relating to de-colonization, self-determination and women into the PFA. Her strategy of public visibility and confrontation worked particularly well within the context of the New York prepcom.

Following her public confrontation with the peace caucus, her issues were raised briefly at the peace caucus even though Madelaine herself did not appear. Maude, who had attended the linkage caucus, mentioned that people in the Pacific were very concerned with nuclear issues. Someone else said that nuclear disarmament and de-colonization had been taken up by the Group of 77 who had raised the issue in the general session. Later that week, I heard an African American woman speak up for Pacific Island issues in a caucus on racism. The African American speaker talked about the importance of educating themselves about particular issues. She mentioned specifically that "we need to know more about our sisters in the Pacific who have had trouble with nuclear testing."

Moreover, the peace caucus made more of an attempt to include Madelaine in its activities. After the initial peace caucus confrontation over de-colonization, Madelaine returned. This time when she brought up her agenda, some of the women, particularly a Canadian woman,

acknowledged her, encouraged and supported her verbally. Both the Canadian and a Nigerian woman supported her in her effort to talk about the Mauri. Anita asked her to chair a meeting. When I asked Madelaine what she thought of the peace caucus, she replied that they were "doing okay". She was particularly pleased with the invitation to speak at the peace caucus press conference.

Madelaine was quite successful in getting the attention of the press. During the prepcom, she was interviewed on two radio stations and CNN, not to mention the peace caucus press conference. Madelaine pursued every opportunity to gain visibility; everywhere Madelaine went, she brought up her agenda. Not only was she an outspoken leader, but she tapped into the resources of the transnational movements she was a part of as well as the urgency of current events happening in the Pacific. In addition, it was clear to many that France's nuclear testing in the Pacific was morally wrong. All of these factors contributed to Madelaine's success with the media in the USA.

Moreover, she and other Beneath Paradise members were successful in rallying the support of NGOs around the French nuclear testing at the FWCW. Quite a few women joined their demonstration, particularly women representing Japanese and North American NGOs. Three letters protesting the French testing in three languages were addressed to the government assembly from international NGOs. By the end of the FWCW, WILPF had decided to use their power and resources to support the Beneath Paradise anti-nuclear agenda.

### Discussion

Madelaine used strategies designed to generate conflict and draw the attention of large groups. Her strategy of causing embarrassment and exposing hypocrisy would have been ineffective in small homogeneous groups. She wanted her complaints out in the open where they could be discussed. She raised her three issues in every forum she attended and if she did not receive at least a token recognition of Beneath Paradise priorities, she tended to challenge those in charge.

Madelaine had a pre-packaged frame, a slogan that she repeated over and over again. The three d's—de-colonization, de-nuclearization, and demilitarization—were short and easy to remember and to understand. Madelaine made concrete, specific regional claims. Although she framed her issues in general terms that could be understood globally, Madelaine lobbied specifically for ending French nuclear testing in her region and for the independence of New Caledonia.

Madelaine's frame built on familiar concepts that were not normally combined. She inserted de-colonization into the Western women's peace agenda, which prioritized de-nuclearization and de-militarization. The campaign against nuclear weapons was very important to WILPF, one of their highest priorities. Militarization was the word that WILPF members used to describe their own regional problems. Colonization did not resonate as strongly as nuclearization or militarization but the Western women were familiar with it in an abstract manner and knew immediately that they were against it. Moreover, when Madelaine pointed out that the peace caucus had ignored her concerns about colonization, they could be embarrassed because they knew they should have supported her.

De-colonization was not new to Madelaine's targeted audience but it was not ordinarily combined with de-nuclearization in a Western context. She had to confront and embarrass the

peace NGOs in order to expand their frame. Her tactics were similar with the New Caledonian and French government delegates. The frame did not resonate at all with the French delegates, but Madelaine had not expected that. She publicized their resistance to her frame to reinforce her de-colonization agenda. Her struggle, then was to keep de-colonization on the peace caucus and conference agenda. She insisted that in her context, the three issues were inextricably connected.

Unlike the civil war in the Sudan, the conflict in the Pacific Islands appeared to be clear cut—a classic case of oppressor/oppressed. France, the big colonial superpower, was oppressing New Caledonia, the tiny island in the Pacific. It was clearly unjust that France would use the Pacific Islands as its nuclear testing grounds, displacing whole peoples, polluting their land and water, and damaging their health for generations to come. Finally, racial lines seemed clearly drawn with the white French and the indigenous Kanak. The “enemy” was visible to Western eyes. The frame based on familiar symbols and the clearly marked enemy both facilitated international support of Madelaine’s issues.

When it came to identity, Madelaine made it very clear that anyone who did not support her political agenda was her adversary, regardless of their identity. She participated in the indigenous caucus but questioned the credibility of the only other NGO delegate from her region because the NGO delegate from Fiji did not openly talk about the three D’s. Madelaine participated in the Asia Pacific caucus, but she publicly challenged and cajoled her national government delegates until they finally began to discuss the three D’s. She spoke fondly of how she had bonded with a female comrade in jail as they spoke about discrimination against women in the independence movement. However, after the French government delegates had told her publicly that colonization and nuclear issues were not women’s issues, she said to me, “You see why I don’t call myself a feminist.” “I have nothing in common with those women.” Madelaine identified strongly with her people involved in the New Caledonian independence movement. Anyone else, including any of her own people, male or female, was suspect unless s/he embraced Madelaine’s political agenda.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, challenging the dominant agenda and discourse was difficult and complex. By using their repertoires of contention, appealing to activist identities, and experimenting with various strategic frames, the women involved with the three NGOs had limited success in changing the agenda. However, all of the women drew closer to their goals in the process. The data gathered about the three NGOs and their experiences affirms that McCarthy’s conceptual tools are helpful in the analysis of transnational social movements. Analysis of the conflicts and their actions using social movement theory provides further information about transnational movement dynamics.

By comparing and contrasting the successes and frustrations surrounding the NGO framing strategies, this study contributes to the understanding of transnational frame bridging, that is, the linking of new mobilizing frames with existing cultural materials. The women of color affiliated with WILPF used a frame of “anti-racism” that built on the values of the white Western women and at the same time bridged the different experiences of some of the Third World women affiliated with WILPF. Further, Geraldine developed a slogan, “racism is based on color,” that communicated effectively within the anti-racism frame. Like Madelaine’s frame, the three D’s, it was short and to the point. In addition, both slogans used some concepts familiar to their target audiences. Under pressure, the frame was accepted by WILPF.

While the white First World women were dominant in numbers (e.g. at the New York Prepcorn and WILPF preliminary activities), anti-racism worked as a mobilizing frame for women who identified as women of color and white women. Everyone was against racism. However, within the context of the FWCW, the frame was no longer a rallying point for a broad spectrum of activists. Colonialism, imperialism, self-determination, development, and human rights were all examples of regional or global frames involving racism that motivated larger numbers of conference participants. As such, the anti-racism frame is an example of a frame that lost power in a highly diverse and global setting.

In contrast, Geraldine's "black agenda" frame did not resonate in either context. It was so localized and identity-based that it did not appeal to the white Western women or the women of color who lived outside of Britain. Nor did it communicate a specific agenda effectively. Nevertheless, Geraldine and the Western women of color were not alone in their concern about racism. SWVP and Beneath Paradise also spoke about racism as a core issue. It would have been interesting to see what the impact would have been had the three organizations targeted each other and been able to create a joint frame around racism. Unfortunately, although they were all present at the NGO Forum '95, the women most likely never even met.

SWVP's "just peace" frame was useful as a compromise frame that would hint at issues without inciting anger and would presumably build connections. However, it is an example of a frame that did not mobilize the targeted audience. Perhaps it was too general or too familiar to motivate action.

The self-determination frame bridged across cultures with the potential to draw together peoples who identified with struggles for independence and/or self-determination of their ethnic/racial group. However, developing allies through this frame was complicated for SWVP, because the civil war was difficult for outsiders to grasp. The international media had given little attention to the civil war in the Sudan as compared to Somalia, Rwanda, etc. Some outsiders would be cautious in their support until they had decided where they stood on the issue of self-determination for the southern Sudanese. Although the frame itself mobilized few people or resources, the frame did communicate the SWVP goal effectively.

"Conflict resolution" resonated with diverse populations, serving to mobilize or engage quite a few people. With a push (the conflict), the idea of conflict resolution mobilized Sudanese NGOs, the Sudanese military personnel, even the government delegate. Moreover, potential Western allies, uncertain how to respond to calls for self-determination, were interested in supporting conflict resolution. Resolving conflicts peacefully was one of the highest values of the women taking part in the peace activities at the conference. Under the watchful eye of the international community, the conflict resolution frame was successful in mobilizing northern Sudanese women and eventually in engaging Western allies.

Madelaine's frame was effective for a number of reasons. First, as a slogan, it communicated quickly and effectively. It was also easy to remember. Second, the frame combined concepts that were already part of an existing frame—de-nuclearization and de-militarization—with a concept that was not unfamiliar, that is, de-colonization. As such, with some pressure, the frame was accepted by Madelaine's target constituency. Third, the frame was not quite as identity-based as some of the other frames focusing instead on issues. It mobilized women in the highly diverse settings of the FWCW.

Discussion of strategic framing at the conferences leads to some tentative conclusions about NGO repertoires of contention in transnational contexts. The most successful frames would not have been effective without the pressure tactics used by the NGO representatives. The data on the NGO strategies contradicts Rucht's (1997) speculation that transnational movements do not tend to use disruptive tactics. Although the three organizations used a variety of strategies, including education, two of the three were willing to disrupt, confront and embarrass. Normally, it is difficult for transnational movements to organize demonstrations; however, within the context of the conferences, their international constituencies were already present. Demonstrations abounded, particularly those organized through WILPF and Beneath Paradise.

Activist identity formation was also a significant factor in shaping frames and strategies, affirming the assumption that identity is key in mobilizing dynamics on a transnational level as well as the national level. The transnational activist identity "woman" served to bring the women together. However, as conflicts arose, particularly around agendas, other aspects of their multiple-layered identities became more salient. Some of the women defined themselves in opposition to each other and attempted to organize around their difference. In a group without men, whose presence might help define the collective identity "woman," the category splintered. In-group differences were heightened. National and sub-national identities were reinforced. My findings also contribute to the theory that identities are defined and transformed in conflict (Kriesberg, 1982). At the conferences, the women's sense of identity shifted as the setting and actors changed and the conflicts unfolded.

Even some sub-categories shifted. For example, the category of women of color changed meaning at the NGO Forum '95 and FWCW, where white women were in the minority. What does it mean to be a woman of color in a diverse international context? Who belongs and who does not? As a result, the mobilizing strength of the strategic frame changed as well. Further, the activist identity essentializing women as peacemakers was useful to the African women until it was challenged by the strong racial/religious identification in the Sudanese war. Nevertheless, it did help to mobilize the Sudanese women around the conflict resolution frame so that they were actually willing to speak to each other.

As a result of the conflicts and the ensuing identity definition and redefinition, the transnational activist identity "woman" was reinforced. The women activists involved in my study tended to identify with women from other groups to the extent that it was empowering to them, that is, it drew them closer to their goals. There were enough positive outcomes from activities at the conference that all of the women would continue their transnational activism as women. Geraldine, generally, felt that WILPF had responded well to the conflict over racism and was pleased with the actions she had taken. Bettina, on the other hand, was happy with what WILPF had learned as an organization through their contact with one another. Rachel and Lucia were satisfied with their own performance at the conferences and with some of the new international contacts they had made even though the conflict resolution attempts with the Sudanese women were frustrating. Madelaine saw that she made a difference in the conference discourse, gained international allies and media attention and would probably attend the next UN World Conference on Women if she thought it would be useful to her struggle.

## Resources

- Dalton, Russel J. 1994. *The Green Rainbow: Environmental Groups in Western Europe*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1990. *Women, Culture, and Politics*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hooks, bell. 1997. "Sisterhood: Political Solidarity between Women." In *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Kriesberg, Louis. 1982. *Social Conflicts*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lorde, Audre. 1997. "Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference." In *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Lorde, Audre. 1988. In *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*, by Elizabeth V. Spelman. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. 1980. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. Chicago: University Press.
- Marchand, Marianne H. and Jane L. Parpart, eds. 1995. *Feminism/Postmodernism/ Development*. New York: Routledge.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer Zald. 1996. "Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes—Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements." In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John D. 1997. "The Globalization of Social Movement Theory." In *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, edited by Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield and Ron Pagnucco. Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press.
- McCarthy, John D., David Britt, and Mark Wolfson. 1991. "The Institutional Channeling of Social Movements in the Modern State." In *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 13:45-76. Greenwich, Conn: JAI.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

- Minh-ha, Trinh T. 1997. "Not Like You/Like You: Postcolonial Women and the Interlocking Questions of Identity and Difference." In *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra, Russo, Ann, and Torres, Lourdes, eds. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rucht, Dieter. 1997. "Limits to Mobilization: Environmental Policy for the European Union." In *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, edited by Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield and Ron Pagnucco. Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Tarrow, Sydney. 1995. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1992. "Mentalities, Political cultures, and Collective Action Frames: Constructing Meanings Through Action." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1984. "Social Movements and National Politics." In *Statemaking and Social Movements: Essays in History and Theory*, edited by Charles Bright and Susan Harding. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.