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Introduction

The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom’s ... Peace Research Newsletter, edited by Elise Boulding (wife of Kenneth Boulding and later to become an academic of considerable standing in her own right), served an important information function for international peace research in the early years, and also as a link to peace activists.

(Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand, 2014: 146)

Our project uses the above-quoted article reviewing the 50-year history of peace research as a jumping off point. Peace research as we know it today would not exist without the work of Elise Boulding. Yet, in this quote we see her framed primarily through her marital status and her connection to a male scholar. To see her introduced as “the wife of” in an article recounting the birth of peace research in the influential Journal of Peace Research (JPR) encouraged us to reflect on what and who has been marginalized in peace research and start tracing a genealogy of feminist engagements with peace that challenges and redefines the narrow boundaries of the discipline. This analysis, by a group of feminist scholars at different stages in their careers, develops the concept of wifesization to illustrate how feminist interventions have been reduced
to being appendages to the field, their contributions appropriated for its development but unworthy of mention as independent producers of knowledge.

Feminist scholars and activists have often been written out of our field, despite strong feminist presence in early peace research. Exclusionary and disciplining practices continue to define peace research to the detriment of a more robust and comprehensive analytical scholarship. Recovering neglected and marginalized feminist contributions to peace research, our article offers a new way of constructing the peace research canon that gives weight to long-standing, powerful and plural feminist voices, and offers new interventions to make peace scholarship more inclusive and ultimately richer. This article challenges patriarchal and Eurocentric disciplining processes regarding themes, methodologies, and contributors, exploring unruly archives to present the beginning of an alternative peace studies genealogy. It is also an internal feminist dialogue where we explore the challenges that alternative archives and knowledges from multiple locales pose to established white feminist peace scholarship. As scholars located in institutions in the US and Europe, we respond to Gurminder Bhambra’s (2017) call to “acknowledge the ways in which race has been fundamental to the configuration of the modern world,” including its construction and legitimation of knowledge systems.

After introducing the concept of wifesization, we offer several alternative accounts of how varied types of contributions to peace studies can move us toward a more inclusive and better field of peace research.
**Wifesization**

The policing of the boundaries of academic disciplines often operates through the feminization of those voices that challenge the epistemological and methodological assumptions of the dominant paradigms operating in a particular field. Feminist scholars have identified feminization as a process by which certain policies, groups, individuals, and theories are assigned feminine characteristics; it involves devaluing and making women’s contributions invisible vis-à-vis masculinized policies, groups, individuals, methodologies, and theories (e.g. the low politics, high politics distinction).

In this article we build on these insights about feminization, as well as draw inspiration from Maria Mies (1986, 45-46) whose term housewifization refers to an "exploitative social relation" where "the surplus-value-gathering labor by women is appropriated and consumed by others", to develop the notion of wifesization. Wifesization describes the process through which women’s contributions not only are devalued, dismissed or erased as the concept feminization points to, but through which women are positioned primarily as ‘appendages’ and ‘helpers’ of men, worthy of a ‘thank you’ note, but not considered autonomous producers of knowledge. Wifesization thus indicates an exploitative social relation where ‘the husband’, ‘the discipline’ or ‘the state’ insidiously appropriates women’s (feminist) knowledge and intellectual contributions.

Consequently, we find that some female (often feminist) contributors to early peace research have been incorporated into the discipline on unequal terms — like wives in a patriarchal household — their labor appropriated and consumed by the discipline without attribution or full recognition. Moreover, some marginalized people and knowledges have also been wifesized in this household, while some have historically been considered unworthy of inclusion, even on the margins (see Weber 1994). In the
patriarchal household, those who are totally ‘other’ are fully external, they do not belong. Wifesization thus operates through various hierarchies and exclusions: The feminist engagements with peace explored in this paper offer examples of wifesization, but on quite different terms, depending on the contributors’ locations in disciplinary value hierarchies.

Wifesization is socially constructed and relational; hence, its manifestation is context-specific and imbricated not just with disciplinary preferences, but also with social oppressions, such as racialized settler-colonialism or heterosexist and modernist assumptions about families. It continues to evolve over time and has adapted to different circumstances, depending on scholars’ gender, caste or race, their access to formal education, and their positionality in the global order, all of which shape the hierarchies of production. It also often replicates colonial relations, as Mies (1986, 15ff) has demonstrated with regard to housewifization, it is a targeted strategy to make labor cheap (to use Enloe’s term), by invisibilizing and flexibilizing women’s and/or feminized labor. Wifesization, thus, must also be read as a manifestation of deep-rooted patriarchal capitalist modes of expropriative production in academia and activism that position the one-third world (Boulding’s phrase) as the origin of all (relevant) knowledges. The field of peace research, it turns out, not only suffers from gender-bias, but also from methodological whiteness, since it fails to begin from the “racialized histories of colonialism and enslavement that continue to configure our present” (Bhambra, 2017: 227) and hence restricts a fuller understanding of the types of disciplines that can contribute to understanding conflict, violence, and peace (see also Howell & Richter-Montpetit 2019).
As such, while Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand’s (2014) wifesization of early feminist contributors to peace research and their conflation of feminist work with female authorship were the initial motivation for our collaborative writing and dialogic process, we are concerned more broadly with the disciplining effects of the exclusion of feminist knowledge production and the marginalization of scholarship from the two-thirds world, as well as of unruly methodologies, actors, and conceptions of peace. By employing the concept of wifesization to point to these various forms of expropriation and appropriation, we challenge peace research to consider alternative narratives of peace research’s past that might inspire new futures as well.

**Alternative Archives for Peace Research**

Challenging these disciplining practices described above, we explore alternative, hidden, or misunderstood archives to present an alternative and more robust genealogy for the field through five unconventional vignettes. Our quilt blocks offer a much broader ‘sample’ to expand the institutional and conceptual history of peace research. The contributions move beyond academics to include women’s activism, art, social reform – the everyday practices of unruly women’s lives.

Feminist scholars have used the metaphor of a patchwork quilt (Brown, 1989; Koelsch, 2012; Saukko, 2000) to analyze multiple, yet interconnected meaning-making

---

1 In their review of the history of *JPR*, Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand address what they call the ‘gender dimension’. While they give a very brief overview of key feminist contributions to IR/PR, they propose that a gender dimension would lead to a ‘concern with positive peace and extended concepts of security’ (2014:153). That they don’t find evidence for their hypothesis is a partially a reflection of their conflation of women with feminists and feminist research.
processes that connect individual life histories and structures of governance to wider cultural forces and phenomena. The quilting methodology allows us to weave together unique blocks from disparate sources without an attempt at blending them, leaving instead our own authorial stitches visible. Our methodological choice has, moreover, symbolic value, as quilting is a women’s activity, mostly conducted in domestic spaces. As quilts often consist of recycled materials, ours recovers previous labor by: (i) Elise Boulding; (ii) Berenice Carroll; (iii) Yogmaya Neupane; (iv) Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain; and (v) Indigenous Arctic Sámi art and activism productions. Like in the African American women’s quilts described by Brown (1989), in our quilt “symmetry comes through diversity” (924). We are not interested in a uniform colour scheme or an off-the-packet pattern - each vignette (authored by one among us, but collectively shaped) contributes something unique. The objective, and the challenge we set ourselves, is to start to imagine a feminist genealogy of peace research that brings wifesized and unruly perspectives into the canon and archives without establishing a new orthodoxy.

Elise Boulding - Mother of Peace Research and, Indeed, an Academic of Considerable Standing in her Own Right

I would carry a coffee pot down to the Center [for Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan] and serve coffee, and sit and listen, and take notes. I took notes on every speaker [who spoke about the scope of the field of conflict resolution]. I carefully wrote them up for the office - they are now in the archives at the University of Michigan

(Elise Boulding; in Mitchell, 2004)
Elise Boulding, described in the Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand (2014) as primarily the wife of Kenneth Boulding, completed a Master’s degree in Sociology before her five children were born. She was a homemaker caring for five young children when her husband Kenneth ran the Center for Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan in the 1950s. This vignette reveals her contribution to peace research was more significant than captured in the note quoted at the outset of this article.²

As part of a community of Quakers interested in peace, Elise Boulding attended every faculty seminar at the Center, taking notes that now constitute the archive of this early work in peace research.³ The Center had no staff: she thus volunteered to read and answer correspondence asking about its activities, eventually suggesting that a newsletter of broad distribution be created. Her husband and his colleagues rejected this proposal; thus, she contacted the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), where she had been an active participant on the committee supporting peace research: “[I] said, “Can our committee, on behalf of the League, support and write out - send out a newsletter about this new field that we’re supposed to be promoting?” They said, “Great. We’d love to do that”” (interview with Mitchell, 2004). Not just did this newsletter (sent via the Center but sponsored by WILPF’s committee on peace research) begin on Boulding’s initiative, the network she

² The above-quoted JPR article also offers a similar treatment of two of PRIOs founders, Ingrid Eide and Mari Holmboe Ruge, who was, like Elise Boulding, a key figure in the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom.

³ Notably, Kenneth Boulding and David Singer are listed as the authors of these notes in the World Cat database.
established was the seed that germinated eventually into the International Peace Research Association (Boulding, 1992a).

It is impossible to overstate Boulding’s contribution to the early days of establishing peace research in the U.S. in particular: She not only created and maintained networks and archives, she also translated key works such as Fred Polak’s *The Image of the Future* (1973), which deeply influenced her own work on the importance of utopias as well as the development of the field of futures studies (Boulding, 1989). In her 2004 interview with Chris Mitchell as part of the Parents of the Field Project at George Mason University, she recounted:

One day, I was sitting in the audience when there were a whole host of very serious senior scholars, including my husband, on the stage, and they were talking about the things we had to do to get disarmament. They were just talking about this, saying the same things I’ve felt over and over again, so I stood up and said, ‘Suppose we got disarmament. How would the world work? How would we be handling conflict?’ Not a single person on that panel, including my husband, felt they had any answer to that because they hadn’t thought in those terms.

This led her to begin her own work on imagining alternative, peaceful futures by holding workshops where participants were projecting 30 years into the future to ask: ‘If there are no more weapons, how is the world functioning?’ (Boulding, 1988, 1989). Revisiting this work at the end of the 1980s, Boulding wrote, ‘I am not exactly sure when it began to dawn on me that most of the peace movement activists I knew, from arms-controllers to out-and-out disarmers, did not in their hearts believe that a world
without armies was possible’ (1989: 74). Meanwhile, due to her work on utopian imagery in varied civilizational traditions, Boulding realized that ‘an inclination to visualize one’s own society in a future peaceable state was testified to in the literary and oral traditions of every major culture’ (1989: 74), yet this was almost completely lacking in ‘the privileged sectors of the industrialized world, both East and West’ (1989: 74). At the same time, it was clear to her ‘that the human capacity for imagining the good society is not lost, only weakened. It can be nurtured back to vigorousness, liveliness’ (1989: 81).

A key element of Boulding’s research to strengthen her understanding of what a weapons-free society would look like (and teaching it to others) was the knowledge she accumulated of peaceful societies and everyday behaviors (e.g., Boulding 1992b, 1996, 2000). Always a scholar-activist, in her key works — The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time (1992b) and Cultures of Peace: The Hidden History (2000) — ‘she makes a cogent plea for educators to get to know alternative histories, and for engendering some practical hope’ (Hutchinson & Milojevic, 2012: 152). In Cultures of Peace, Boulding specifically emphasized that the ‘recovery of hidden strengths of local cultures is one important aspect of peace building for this painful transitional period in contemporary history’ (2000: 92). After reviewing the practices of several contemporary communities, she proposed: ‘underneath the layers of violence each society, without exception has its peace behaviors, precious resources that can be available to bring about new and gentler forms of governance locally and on a larger scale in the next century’ (2000: 101).

These peace behaviors can be found:
In the recurring cycles, rhythms, and rituals of human celebration, with its feasting, singing, dancing, and sharing of gifts. In the reproductive cycles of human partnering, of birthing, of family maintenance as the years go by, and the completion of dying - in the cycles that bind people together across kin groups. In the succession of woundings and healings of human bodies as they move through life’s dangers in those cycles. In the labor to produce sustenance from the earth. In the daily rounds of trade, the barter and exchange of goods and services. And, perhaps most wonderful of all, in human play - the playing of games, the play of artistic creation, the play of the mind in the pursuit of knowledge. (2000: 101)

In short, Boulding found that our everyday lives are imbued with peace behaviors that we need to recognize and nurture as such. As Francis Hutchinson & Ivana Milojevic point out, “Boulding saw herself not as naively utopian but as a “practical idealist” or “practical futurist” [for whom the impracticality of peace] lies in a failure of social and moral imagination to envisage non-violent alternatives and to take practical, peace-building steps toward better tomorrows” (2012: 153). Her theoretical and practical work on peace as an everyday process, and the importance of women, the family, and communities in these processes that do and must take place locally, has been a key contribution to (feminist) peace research and also constitutes an undervalued contribution to conflict resolution.

So, yes, Elise Boulding was indeed an academic of considerable standing in her own right – not to mention someone who long created and maintained, we might say
quilted, connections that made the field as we now know it possible.\(^4\) When such key contributions are ‘forgotten’ - or wifesized as in the Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand (2014) piece, which does not even cite her work, peace research is poorer for it.

**Berenice Carroll, Feminist Peace Historian: A Close Reading of “The Cult of Power”**

In 1972, Berenice Carroll observed how, despite the lack of explicit concern with power, peace research in fact was preoccupied with ‘institutions, groups, or persons conceived to be powerful’ (Carroll, 1972: 585). Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand (2014) acknowledge Carroll’s contribution in a cursory way, only using it as a jumping-off point for their discussion, which ultimately aims at showing how ‘positive peace’ as well as broader understandings of violence were but a late, and ultimately short-lived fad in peace research. Not only does this brief acknowledgement miss Carroll’s most insightful points, but in doing so it makes her contribution to peace research an appendage — a wife — to what they deem is the most important — and ‘original’ — work done in their journal. Moreover, their wifesization of Carroll goes hand-in-hand with the erasure of the role of feminists as well as peace historians, including their explicit grounding in feminist and peace movements, in the genealogy of the field. It is on this feminist legacy, concerned also with broader social justice, that we want to center this vignette.

First, peace history can be seen as crucially important in the genealogy of peace research. Carrolls first engagement with the field was through the Committee on

\(^4\) Boulding also developed the U.S.’ first Peace Studies program at Dartmouth College, where she chaired the Sociology Department.
Peace Research in History (CPRH, now Peace History Society — PHS) when she was a lecturer in history at Rutgers University and Douglass College in the early 1960s. While historians of peace existed well before then (e.g., A.C.F. Beales and Merle Curti in the 1920s and 1930s), it was an impulse toward self-reflection as well as the recognition that peace research had to be both transdisciplinary and engaged in movement politics that drove some US historians to create CPRH. Women, and particularly feminists, were central to the establishment and early work of CPRH/PHS: Berenice Carroll, together with Blanche Wiesen Cook and Sandi Cooper, was one of them (Peace History Society, 2009). The three were, in fact, often the only women at the organization’s meetings when, Cooper later recalled, it was “originally amusing and then irritating...how the ‘boys’ frequently confused Berenice, Blanche, and Sandi (Cook, Carroll, and Cooper — too many shared initials among ‘the girls,’ as someone put it once)” (Cooper, 1999: 71-72). Much like Boulding at COPRED, the three women worked collaboratively on CPRH newsletters and conference proceedings. In 1972 Carroll joined Robert Brown to co-edit the first issue of Peace & Change, PHS’ official journal. In 1978, COPRED joined PHS to co-publish the journal, which remains in print today (but is not mentioned by Gleditsch et al.).

Second, Carroll’s major contribution in The Cult of Power revolves around the different meanings and uses of the word ‘power’ in scholarship. In both IR and peace research, she observes, power is defined and understood as ‘control, dominance, or influence’ (1972: 585) and is frequently associated with the military might of a sovereign state. At the same time, power is used more implicitly and imprecisely to measure status or rank along different indicators or capabilities (e.g., GNP, weapons systems, industrial capacity, consumption, natural resources, etc.). In this regard Carroll cleverly states:
The effect of confounding power, status, and capabilities in this way is seldom if ever to give or to recognize any inherent value in ‘capabilities.’ These are almost always seen as *instruments* or avenues to high rank in power or status (1972: 587-588).

Consequently, capabilities are degraded to become ‘*servants of power*, rather than... valuable as social goals other than those of power or status’ (1972: 588 emphasis mine). Linking this movement to insights about gendered hierarchies such as domination/submission, which associate the highly valued terms to masculinities and the lower ones to femininities, Carroll was beginning a reflection on gender as a symbolic system, and relating it to the world of peace research and international relations. In this system, power as “capabilities” is construed, not only as inferior to, but importantly as “servant” to the higher, masculinized world of power as dominance, worthy of attention solely insofar as they can be of use to the goals of ‘the powerful’. In our interpretation, Carroll’s articulation of power as domination pointed as well to the wifesization of other ways to conceptualize power. Carroll’s main concern in this article then is with peace research’s narrow (gendered) conception of power as dominance, and its related misconception that only ‘the powerful’ had agency (Carroll, 1972: 596).

For Carroll, this narrow conception of power resulted in the field’s almost exclusive focus on ‘institutions, groups and persons perceived to be powerful’ (1972: 593), that is the nation-state — particularly the superpowers — and its elites. Furthermore, Carroll’s intuition was that the preoccupation with those perceived as powerful was in fact a reflection of peace research’s own *identification* with the “powerful,” or with the
values of the “powerful” (that is, values or utilities which have high pay-off for topdogs)” (Carroll, 1972: 597 — emphasis in the original). While she noted the more obvious ways in which this identification functioned (e.g., peace researchers openly aligned with US interests and policies), she also noticed the not-so-obvious and more subtle ways in which identification with the powerful operated. She understood that an emphasis on the nation-state ‘reflect[ed] an acceptance’ of the nation-state system itself thus unmasking the normative project of what passed for realism: far from ‘being a recognition of “things as they are”’ (Carroll, 1972: 597), acceptance of the nation-state system contributed in fact to its perpetuation and naturalization. What is more: a focus on the nation-state ended up creating research questions that mattered for the nation-state and were ‘important for the powerful to know’ (1972: 598); scholars were thus accepting ‘the topdog’s definition of what is of value’ (1972: 599).

Ultimately, peace research’s cult of power resulted in the silencing of alternative conceptions of power and also, by extension, of those lacking power as dominance. As Carroll observed: ‘[t]o be without the power of dominance is perceived as being very nearly without the power to act at all, or at least as being without the power to act effectively’ (1972: 607). What Carroll was proposing was nothing short of an ontological and epistemological transformation of peace research, advocating that it shift toward ‘the allegedly powerless’ (1972: 607), those construed as servants to the powerful, rather than agents — and knowers — on their own right. It was they — as wifesized collectivities — who could open the field to different conceptions of power, multiple imaginings for the world, and pluralistic and transdisciplinary ways to conceptualize itself — quilting a new field in the process. For her, peace could be found in the emancipatory social movements of the time including the Black power
movement, the women’s movement, and the student movement. And of course, it can be found in the theory and practice of nonviolence (see Chenoweth & Stephan, 2012; Howes, 2009; Stiehm, 1972). But seeing it there, also requires a new understanding of whose knowledges count and how knowledges are acquired by seeking the intangible, the implied, the hidden labor and knowledge of those movements and ideas that are usually seen at best as ‘instruments’ or helpers of others. Carroll’s activist and feminist roots were instrumental to her practice of self-reflection about the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the field. Her insights on power remain key today, not least because they invoke a feminist curiosity about who and what is considered foundational and central, rather than at most a helpful servant to the field itself.

**Stitching Our Blocks**

We insert here an interruption, to mark a point in which the blocks in our quilt stand out in their heterogeneity. In our first blocks, we focused on feminists whose work is immediately recognizable as belonging to the household of peace research, even if only as appendages. In what follows, we add blocks from sites not usually considered as belonging, using our quilting methodology to weave together unique materials from disparate sources. As noted above, wifesization refers to the processes through which certain knowledges are exploited and consumed, some are systematically left out, and yet others are completely beyond the bounds. In the following three sections, we present further unruly archives of subjugated knowledge. These vignettes challenge us to imagine alternative feminist genealogies of peace research that draw on the rich archives from beyond recognizable academic spaces in the one-third world, challenging methodological and analytical whiteness (Crenshaw 1989; Bhambra 2017) and “white innocence” (Wekker 2016) also.
In this first section, we document the contributions of one of the first feminist thinkers of Nepal, Yogmaya Neupane. Neupane’s work is relevant to our argument in at least two ways. First, it illustrates the important contributions of oral traditions to peace research. Second, we show an example of the wifesization of two-thirds world’s knowledge in the practice of peace research, which sees modes of knowledge production from the two-thirds world as descriptive and non-academic. The labor they perform to create and reproduce the household of peace research is devalued and exploited. It can appear as a case study, but not as itself the foundation of new theory or concepts. This process has profound impacts on how peace is studied, taught and valued: even in countries where such knowledge originates, one-third-world-centric theories and ideas are imported, obscuring what is already known. Neupane’s story is one symbolic representation of many of such wifesized voices and contributions from around the world which are invaluable for peace research. We argue that this early feminist non-violent activist offers glimpses of a richer tradition and extends the scope of the current debates on the local turn and hybrid peace (McLeod 2015, Väyrynen 2019).

Yogmaya Neupane was born to a Brahmin family in the Eastern Hills of Nepal between 1860 and 1868 (Hutt, 2013). She was married when she was only about nine years old or even younger (Hutt, 2013). However, her husband died shortly after their marriage (Hutt, 2013). Facing discrimination after his death, Neupane escaped her husband’s home and went back to her parents’ house. She later fell in love with another man from the same village and ran away with him to India. This act was her
first defiance of social tradition, as widows were not allowed to remarry, and the Sati System (burning of a wife in her husband’s funeral pyre) was still in practice in Nepal (Aziz, 2001). It is believed that her second husband also died, she married for the third time in India, and had a daughter. However, she went back to Nepal with her daughter, without her husband, and decided to devote herself to an ascetic life – another break in social traditions (Aziz, 2001). She travelled around the country to learn from various religious gurus and then set up her Ashram in her own village, thus starting her non-violent movement (Aziz, 2001).

Although Neupane was illiterate, she gathered support by reciting her revolutionary poems and songs, known as ‘Bani’ or ‘Yogabani’. While Neupane was still alive, one of her devotees published the Sarvartha Yogabania, a collection of these oral poems and songs, in India in the early 1930s. The collection was banned in Nepal for 40 years (Hutt, 2013). Her story resurfaced only in the 1980s when an American anthropologist, Barbara Nimri Aziz, found out about her during her visit to the Arun Valley. By the time Aziz started researching for her 2001 volume, Neupane had become little more than a myth even in her own village, except among those who continue to follow her teachings. The Yogabani poems remain an important part of the oral tradition continued by her followers. Beyond the ‘case study’ of Nepal and Neupane, this oral tradition represents an important and overlooked source of knowledge for peace research and appears in the varied blocks of our quilt. Barbara Nimri Aziz (2001) has documented some of these poems:

Before I owned a caste
Belonging to Brahmin clan
No look, I have no caste.

Ho, I chucked it there in the hearth (Aziz, 2001: 60).

Even though Neupane herself was Brahmin, these verses challenge the Brahminic system and its practices as discriminatory not only to women but also to people from lower castes. Likewise, in the following verses, she demands justice from the authoritarian government, which was dominated by Brahmins and upper caste people:

Though I am a speck, I petition you
Be informed about our conditions
We have no benefits, no help
As long as there’s injustice, I’ll petition you (Aziz, 2001: 62).

Neupane formed the first Nari Samiti (women’s commission) in Nepal which, with 2,000 followers, started a non-violent movement against discriminatory practices, including polygamy, widow marriage, and child marriage. In addition to protesting regularly, they submitted 24 demands, which included the abolition of the Sati system, to Prime Minister Chandra Shamshar Rana (1901-1929), who eventually formally abolished the practice (Sangraula, 2011, Whelpton, 2005).

Prime Minister Juddha Shamsher Rana, who succeeded Chandra Shamshar Rana at his death, jailed Neupane and her followers for four months, ‘probably the first Nepali woman to be detained by government authorities to prevent her from leading an act of mass political rebellion’ (Chapagain b.s. 2064, as cited in Hutt, 2013: 391). When she was released, as a final revolt, she committed suicide with her 68 followers by leaping
into the Arun River on 14 July 1941 (Kathmandu Post, 2011; Sangraula, 2011). This collective suicide was as ‘an act of protest against the injustices of Nepal’s autocratic Rana government’ (Aziz, 1993, as cited in Hutt, 2013: 384). To understand the significance of this suicide as a collective revolt — rather than the act of a charismatic leader driving her followers to death — one needs to interpret it in the context of Hindu traditions. Killing Brahmins or being responsible for their death was seen as the biggest sin one could commit. In participating in collective suicide, Neupane and her followers were shaming the Prime Minister for not listening to them and expressing their resistance against an oppressive regime, forcing him to confront his responsibility for the collective suicide.

After her death, the government banned all conversations around Neupane (Aziz, 2001), a prohibition that unofficially continued even following the establishment of the first multi-party democracy in 1951. She was ‘thoroughly removed from Nepali historical consciousness’ (Aziz, cited in Hutt, 2013: 384), until she received some attention more recently thanks to the strong Nepali feminist movement. Michael Hutt (2013: 391) argues that, ‘Yogmaya’s life story is that of a woman who transgressed many of the social conventions of her day, particularly those that applied to women’. But Neupane’s fight was not only against the discrimination faced by women, but also against the social injustices faced by people from the lower castes. She fought against structural violence and social injustices using ‘everyday resistance’ as a tool for non-violence at a time when peace studies as an academic field was not yet formed. The discrimination she faced in her own life, as a woman, a young widow, and a person who had broken social rules, shaped her views about social injustices. She advocated for social reforms and gender equality with no knowledge of, or reliance on,
international declarations or “human rights” commissions’ (Aziz, 2001: xxv). Her movement can be seen as an early effort at feminist ‘consciousness raising’ (Aziz, 2001: 50) and as groundbreaking first feminist thoughts on intersectionality.

She has now become a role model and inspiration for many feminist scholars and activists in Nepal. However, despite increasing recognition of her contribution in recent years, she still faces wifesization at various levels. While her work is taught in a Women’s Studies program in Nepal, in peace studies one third world peace research dominates the curriculum. This aligns with a wider trend of wifesization of two third world theories and practices in peace studies curricula, as Wibben & Donahoe (2019) also document. Theories of non-violence continue to be imported from abroad while Nepali home-grown bottom-up contributions, such as Neupane’s, are not taken seriously as relevant to theory building and peace practices. Ultimately, Neupane embodies emancipatory and cosmopolitan aspirations, and exposes how ‘being silenced in one’s own account of one’s life is a kind of amputation that signals oppression’ (Lugones & Spelman, 1983: 573). Despite the ‘turn to the local’ in peacebuilding scholarship and practice, peace continues to be seen as something that needs to be done by experts and feminist contributions from non-academic spaces, especially in the two thirds world, remain wifesized.

Neupane raised important questions about structural violence as early as the 1920s and used non-violence as a tool for resistance against patriarchy and discrimination. However, systematic oppression and silencing by the Nepali state aiming to erase her entire existence, followed by wifesization from the discipline, mean that her teachings of non-violent movement, which could be an important contribution to the feminist
knowledge of peace research, have thus far remained only in the memories of her followers. If we inquired further about the work of others like Neupane, what might we learn?

Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain - Author of Satire and Science Fiction for Peace and Emancipation in Colonial India

Literature, like oral history, can be important to theorising a peaceful and just society, both as a source and as a subject of analysis. Yet, mainstream peace research considers literature at best marginal to its endeavours. Yes, literature is accepted to give the weary researcher nourishment and respite, like a good wife, but is seen as having little to do with the real business of making sense of the world. However, literature helps make strange seemingly naturalized social norms and structures and to imagine alternative futures without war, violence, or patriarchy. To challenge the wifesization of literature in peace research, we add to the quilt an early 20th century piece of feminist utopian writing that is notable for its description of a society without war – Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain’s novel *Sultana’s Dream*.

*Sultana’s Dream*, published in colonial India in 1905, paints a feminist, pacifist, science fiction utopia where the strict *purdah* (seclusion) of women is reversed. In Ladyland, it is the men who have been secluded to their homes and taken over care work, whereas women occupy streets, workplaces, government, and universities. Using the tools of satire, Rokeya exposes the many hypocrisies of a patriarchal social order. At the same time, *Sultana’s Dream* puts forward a recipe for social transformation: extension of education to all women at least until age 21; prioritizing science and innovation; a policy of non-aggression towards other nations; and investment in clean energy.
Born in 1880 to a Bengali Muslim landowner family in present day Bangladesh, Rokeya grew up in strict seclusion and — much like Neupane — was never able to access formal education. Rokeya’s older sister and brother gave her lessons in secret. Rokeya was married at the age of 16 to Syed Sakhawat Hossain, who became an important supporter of her quest for learning and social reform. Commenting on political events of the time, Rokeya wrote extensively both fiction and non-fiction to address her two main interests: the anti-colonial struggle and women’s emancipation.

In *Sultana’s Dream*, science and learning are the highest values, allowing the women of Ladyland (as well as their menfolk in the kitchens) to enjoy a high quality of life together with labor-saving technologies. Rokeya contrasts the women’s love of science with male obsession with war:

> While the women were engaged in scientific research [prior to the reversal of the purdah], the men of this country were busy increasing their military power. When they came to know that the female universities were able to draw water from the atmosphere and collect heat from the sun, they only laughed [...] and called the whole thing ‘a sentimental nightmare’! (Hossain, 1905/2005).

*Sultana’s dream* is often appreciated as an unabashed manifesto for women’s education, but it is also a notable description of a society without arms, a utopia of the kind Boulding suggested was lacking in arms control discussions. Using satire as her genre allows Rokeya to imagine a pacifist society where a holistic, positive peace is a lived reality. Her biting satire, as in the quote above, calls out not only the belittling of women’s efforts and achievements no matter how groundbreaking they are, but also
their appropriation, or wifesization, for the benefit of wider society. For example, the women’s scientific innovation is used to defend Ladyland against enemy attack without violence, defying the hyper-masculine obsession with military might, and its normalization through language.

In the novel, the women of Ladyland are able to use scientific innovations to curb an enemy attack without the need for an army and, with this success, they convince their menfolk to withdraw within four walls to uphold the separation of the sexes. Once women take over the public sphere in Ladyland, ‘crime and sin’ simply disappear. Peace in Ladyland is not just about a lack of aggression and violence; it is also inherently about a love of knowledge, the pursuit of scientific innovation, and a clean environment. ‘Utopia without war or crime, [Ladyland] is a place where horticulture is serious business, cooking is a pleasure, and science is used to serve humanity’ (Pereira, 2002, cited in Hasan, 2012: 187), rather than as a masculinized tool in the service of power-as-domination, as Carrol decried.

In addition to a strong belief in education and scientific modernisation as drivers of societal progress, Rokeya’s conception of peace is closely linked to the struggle for justice: there can be no peace without emancipation from the oppressive structures of patriarchy and colonialism. She critiqued divisions within the Indian independence movement and spoke against the rising communal tensions between Hindus and Muslims in her home state of Bengal. Rokeya resisted the relegation of women to the periphery of the movement for independence, what we here call wifesization, and in fact argued that India would achieve independence only once men and women worked
together to fight against the British rule. She makes direct reference to imperialism in *Sultana’s Dream*. The Queen of Ladyland explains to Sultana:

> We do not covet other people’s land, we do not fight for a piece of diamond though it may be a thousand-fold brighter than the koh-i-noor, nor do we grudge a ruler his peacock throne. We dive into the ocean of knowledge and try to find out the precious gems, which Nature has kept in store for us (Hossain, 1905/2005).

Rokeya realised that in order to counter European expansionism, Indians needed to stand united and resist communal violence. In the aptly named *Sugrihini* (“The Ideal Housewife”), also published in 1905 (Hossain, 2019), Rokeya “exhorts women as wives and mothers to influence their men and not court alienation amongst themselves, showing great confidence in the agency of women.” (Dutta, 2019: 15) Although *Sultana’s Dream* was written in English, she mostly wrote in Bengali. Although Urdu was her mother tongue and used widely among colonial India’s diverse Muslims, Rokeya wanted her writings to reach the secluded housewives of Bengal (Dutta, 2019). Rokeya believed that women had in themselves the power to challenge their oppression and to escape the boundaries of their privatized sphere and to escape the boundaries of their privatized sphere, rather than needing to be saved by male relatives or English missionaries, and thus she aimed much of her writing directly to them.

*Sultana’s Dream*, as well as Rokeya’s other writings (Hossain 2019; Akhtar and Bhowmik 2008), act as powerful reminders for contemporary peace researchers, activists and practitioners, that the absence of outward violence and war, without
justice, cannot equal peace. Rokeya’s work has typically not been read as a theorisation of peace. This is because her aim was not peace narrowly understood; it was liberation. The two freedoms - “the nation’s and that of its women - were equally essential and required unremitting struggle” (Dutta, 2019: 4). By comparing the oppression experienced by men (under colonialism) and women (under patriarchy), Rokeya illustrated the need for women’s emancipation in terms that would be universally applicable (Hossain, 1992). It is ironic that while many in the peace research community today accept, at least superficially, the importance of gender equality for peace and for justice, decolonising contemporary peacebuilding interventions and their study remains a much more divisive goal (Sabaratnam 2017).

Rokeya’s novel is a fictional pacifist, environmentalist utopia that raises many of the same insights that Galtung developed in his theory of positive peace several decades later. Both artistic outputs and critical scholarly theorising, while clearly distinct, can make important contributions towards our understanding of peaceful societies. Critical feminist IR and peace research scholars have in fact demonstrated the importance of engaging with forms of literature, poetry, art and popular culture to explore and theorise non-hegemonic, post-colonial conceptions of conflict and peace (e.g. Särmä, 2014; Jabri, 2012).

Important insights are lost when peace research is presented as a field strictly disciplined into competing academic institutions and methodological camps, their worth valued by journal publications, article citations and quantitative evidence of ‘impact on the field’. In this kind of household, there is little room for the gentle humour and sharp observations of Sultana’s Dream in making sense of the world. The risk with
such wifesization is that peace research may well end up - like the ill-fated men of
Ladyland - dismissing ground-breaking innovations from unlikely quarters as mere
“sentimental nightmares”, then appropriating them for patriarchal purposes. In the
process, however, the authority to make credible claims about peace, conflict and
politics is lost.

**Intersectional Arctic Indigenous Sámi Knowledge and Utopias Queering the Myth of White Nordic Women-friendly “Zone of Peace”**

Post-WWII Nordic countries are often narrated as simultaneously “women-friendly
welfare states” (Borchorst & Siim, 2008; Knobblock & Kuokkanen 2015; Lister, 2009),
and a sustained “zone of peace” (Archer & Joenniemi, 2003). Central to this Nordic
nation branding narrative is the claim of a successful integration of Sápmi, land of the
Sámi people, into the Nordic welfare states as a result of modernizing and
developmentalist post-war reconstruction efforts, and resource extraction.

This section weaves into our quilt pieces of co-created and co-laboured Sámi art
productions. It provocatively suggests, that peace and conflict studies needs to value
“fragments, bits and pieces of information found here and there” (hooks 1990, 155), if
it wishes to reverse settler-colonialist hierarchies of knowledge production and
theorising (see also Jauhola 2016a,b). Sámi knowledge and experience of wars,

---

5 In this piece the area and the language are spelled as Sápmiland and Sámi, the only
recognized indigenous people of Europe. Other possibilities are Sami, Sapmi, Sápmi, Sábme,
Saepmie, Saame, or Saami, depending on different Sámi languages and regions.
6 The concept of queer, as used here, is “essentially about the rejection of a here and now
and an insistence on potentiality of another world” (Muñoz 2009,1), but in Sámi terms.
conflicts and peace, has up until now has been side-lined in peace and conflict studies. Only recently, is such research and theorising enhanced with Sámi concepts and theorising on Sámi terms. This is the case, for example, of the use of the North Sámi concept "birget" (coping with) to theorize how Sámi both resisted and adapted to the occupation of Sápmi by German Nazis during the World War II (Evjen and Lehtola 2019); or of the analysis of Nordic state violence from the perspective of reindeer herding Sámi spatiality (du Plessis 2020).

Consequently, by engaging with Sámi demands for decolonization of knowledge production praxis, we suggest wifesization to be conceptualised as a process that not only concerns ‘women’ in peace research, but that is intersectional, i.e. “always already entwined with formations of racism, (dis)ability, class, citizenship and migration, (settler) colonialism and Indigeneity, and anti-Blackness” (Richter-Montpetit and Weber 2017). The pieces of Sámi quilt introduced here suggest that in settler colonial settings, such as Sápmi, wifesization consists of the erasure and devaluing of indigenous labour, knowledge, and culture, and thus, contributes towards indigenous dystopias.

For example, the idea of ‘Nordic zone of peace’ is built upon the racist illusion of a post-war ‘civilizing’ and modernizing mission. However, the ‘development’, i.e. assimilation of Sámi communities and experiences into the white Nordic heteronormative welfare state model is described by some Sámi the “end of Skolt Sámi world” (Feodoroff in Siljander 2013). In other words, ‘Nordic’ is constantly constructed as an innocent territory that has no part in the history of violent settler colonialism (Jauhola 2016, 337). Although Sámi Studies has been institutionalized in the Nordic
universities since the 1960s with a primary focus on methodological and political conflicts and difference between the Sámi and the dominant Nordic societies (Junkka-Aikio, 2016: 201), mainstream (peace) research remains untouched by this critique.\(^7\) Such theorization remains silent of the ongoing Sámi ethno-political mobilization and conflicts with the Nordic states especially via international law frameworks, such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and UN Human Rights Committee (Lehtola 2019, Valkonen 2009).

The rest of the piece weaves Sámi activist and art productions, introducing them to the reader as an invitation to get acquainted with Sámi archives of knowledge production and theorizing on war experience, conflict and peace, “not to represent or ‘know’ others but to support knowledges ‘discredited by dominant power orientations’” (Seppälä 2017, 10) — hence wifesized — and to explore potentialities for peace studies to attend to Sámi experience and knowledge (de Leon 2020).\(^8\) Firstly, Kaisa’s *Enchanted Forest (2015)*, a documentary film directed by Katja Gauriloff of her grandmother Kaisa’s oral history recordings, is a poetic journey into Sä’mmlaž\(^9\) cosmology and recovery of its matrilineal tradition and the experiences and traumas of WWII, during which Sä’mmlaž were dislocated from their indigenous territories and subjected to a civilizing and assimilating agenda by the Nordic and Russian states (Nyyssönen & Lehtola, 2016). This systematically destroyed Sä’ımmlaž indigenous cultural, social, political, and economic traditions, including that of oral knowledge transmission. Kaisa narrates these war experiences alongside Katja’s powerful

---

\(^7\) When searching the JPR and C&C archives with a keyword ‘indigenous’, our query found several hits, yet when using the more specific keywords ‘Sámi’ and ‘Sápmiland’, there were 0 hits.

\(^8\) See a recent attempt on Native cosmologies and ontologies in IR/security studies by Justin de Leon 2020 highlighting the importance of attending to Native cosmology and security ontology despite the lack of “war” (de Leon 2020, 45).

\(^9\) Often called as “Skolt Sámi”, in this article we use the name used by themselves in their own language.
animations: the Sä’mmlaž understanding that aurora borealis is the blood of the dead ones, still running in the underworld in the wounds of those who died. Kaisa’s story, reconstructed from the archive of Swiss Robert Crottet, is both an account of WWII and violence, an act of resistance to wifesization, appropriation of Sä’mmlaž war archives. With an oppositional gaze (hooks 2003) towards the camera and Crottet, and heartfelt laughter, Kaisa asks: “What stories? I have no stories to tell”.

Whereas the documentary intimately focuses on the subaltern experience and the violently abjected histories and experiences of the Sä’mmlaž, the other two productions discussed here focus on intersectional utopias that radically reject paternalistic attempts of wifesization, both by the colonial state, but also by indigenous communities themselves to define what one can be: “For me, having to choose whether to live my own life or to be just queer or just Sámi would be like choosing between water and air. I need both” (Timimie Märak in Yle Sapmi 2017). The theatre production Arctic Odyssey: Visions from the Edge of Ice by the art collective Ruska Ensemble, whilst narrating indigenous subversive futuristic agendas, also directly addresses the racist settler colonialist Arctic logics and heteronormative patriarchy of the Nordic states embedded in it. In the words of Anra Naw, “you only need a man for fifteen minutes. As it is for the regeneration of Chukchi culture and heritage”, this intersectional indigenous and queer utopia narrates Naw’s matrilineal dream to give birth to a new Chukchi future without attachment to that of a heteronormative state and family, or attachment to the role of a wife. The production further dismantles the violently formed state boundaries in the Arctic region by asking:
Who are we, inhabitants of the North? What does the world look like from various sides of the Arctic? How do we approach the future and its challenges? And above all: what do the northern peoples from the Alaskan shores to the Kamchatka peninsula have in common? (Ruska Ensemble 2013).

Finally, *Sjïdsàâbbar*, directed by Sä’ämmlaž Pauliina Feodoroff and performed in 2017 at Baltic Circle theatre festival, dramatizes a two-day village meeting inspired by the ancient Sä’ämmlaž form of self-governance. The play illustrates a combined form of indigenous community-building that is self-caring and healing in the face of the failure of the settler colonial states. The production focused on self-determination of indigenous rivers such as the moratorium *Ellos Deatnu!* (Long live river Deatnu!) established on the island of Čearretsuolu in the Finnish Sápmiland, discussing and disclosing forms of Sámi self-governance, and sustained strategies for decolonial resistance. Since the performance, three Sámi artists and activists Mihku Ilmara Jenni, Jalvvi Anna-Lissá Niillas and Čiskke Jovsset Biret Hánssa Outi have established a Moratorium Office that offers advisory services for self-determination and indigenization, and provides moratorium kits for declaring decolonized areas where colonizing laws do not apply.\(^{10}\)

We suggest that each of these art productions challenge individualized heteronormative, masculinized, and racialized settler-colonial Nordic ‘zones of peace’. Further, weaving the peace studies quilt anew through fragments of Sámi experiences, terms and affects, the productions demand addressing the legacies of racist and colonizing laws do not apply.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\) https://moratoriadoaimmahat.org/en/moratorium-office/
colonialist ideologies embedded in peace studies scholarship. “Sámi people are not plotting revenge, but demand justice” (Pauliina Feodoroff in Säkö, 2017). Sámi knowledge makes the ongoing “gendered societal and ecological crisis and cultural genocide” (Ruska Ensemble, 2013) visible simultaneously mediating intersectional “ways of being in the world and being-together” (Chambers-Letson et al 2019, xiv).

**Toward Feminist Genealogies of Peace Research**

In this article, we have stitched together a quilt made up of multiple blocks of variously excluded, silenced, neglected or coopted knowledges in peace research and its genealogy. Through the concept of wifesization, we have argued that peace research has variously appropriated women’s and/or feminist insights, as well as ignored important queer and indigenous contributions beyond the one-third world. Wives, even the metaphorical ones of the imagined household of peace research, have been written out when it comes to honoring all the various forms of labor involved in building the household of peace research. In this quilt, we have attempted to substantially value that unrecognized and unremunerated labor as intellectual work.

As our vignettes demonstrate, feminist engagements with peace face disciplining through wifesization at various levels. Some of the feminist contributions to the field have been incorporated into the household as unequal annexes. We see this in the case of Elise Boulding, where traditional patriarchal assumptions about women’s roles and informal labor have obscured her impact on the establishment of peace research. There is the non-recognition of individual scholars and their labor, but also of specific actions and ways of working, such as teaching, building networks, engaging with and as activists (the reproductive work of building and maintaining the field), which are
understood as inferior to the ‘real’ labor of doing research. Berenice Carroll’s insights on power challenged the field to its epistemological and ontological core, yet they are trivialized by Gleditsch, Nordkvelle & Strand (2014) and subordinated to the goal of presenting a discipline quite coherently concerned about war in the narrow sense.

Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain, Yogmaya Neupane, and Arctic Sámi Knowledges act as reminders of the plurality of feminisms, the varied traditions of knowledge production and dissemination, such as oral, poetic, dramatic and other forms, and the sites where we rarely venture. They also remind us of the need for one-third world white feminism to be critically examined for its own tendencies of wifesizing some contributions and its complicity with epistemic (and other) violence, including the violence of colonialism. The concept of wifesization as applied to these knowledges brings to light heteronormative, colonial, and capitalist assumptions about the structure of family and society in our scholarly activities.

This article is a first attempt at thinking through what building more complex and inclusive genealogies of peace research might involve, as well as what kinds of archives it should consult. We have pointed to possible venues both to recover and to rethink how peace research might be conceived going forward through an open-ended quilting process and through future-oriented utopias. Here multiplicity and divergence in approaches and contributors — the blocks in our quilt — disrupts temporal, geographical, and institutional assumptions about what can be counted as peace research. Thus openings are created to embrace a plethora of approaches that hold greater equanimity: for example, art and activism as forms of theorizing are essential to decolonizing academic knowledge production. The resulting picture is not a
coherent picture at all, but rather, like the process of quilting itself, an ongoing work of stitching together blocks that are continuously invented, found, and recovered.

Our alternative genealogies are not without tensions, given that we cover multiple sites and a variety of sources. We do not claim to speak with a singular voice — our aim was never to stitch a uniform quilt. Neither will the issues we have presented here be immediately resolved. The Feminist Peace Research Network (FPRN), the space where we began our collective reflections and the quilting of this piece, gave us the opportunity to bring forward this tradition of unruly wives. The FPRN is where many feminists are attempting to resist disciplining and exclusionary analyses and practices in the field of peace research (see also Confortini et al. forthcoming 2020, Wibben et al. 2019). The quilting work springing from this network attempts to remedy peace research’s narrow construction, as well as its methodological and normative whiteness, noting how exclusions have trickle-down effects, not just in terms of knowledge creation as we have shown, but also for example, for peacebuilding interventions/practices (e.g., MacLeod and O’Reilly, 2019; Väyrynen, 2019; Kappler and Lemay-Hébert, 2019; Partis-Jennings, 2019; Vaittinen et al. 2019; Julian et al., 2019; Baker, 2019). Holding these tensions, rather than resolving them, making space for a cacophony of voices (Sylvester 1995) and patchwork blocks, is essential to a fuller and better account of the field.
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