

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Sisterhood, Ideology, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Formulating Policy on the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the 1960s and 1970s

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1703r4tc>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 14(0)

Author

Materson, Lisa G.

Publication Date

1994

Copyright Information

Copyright 1994 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Sisterhood, Ideology, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Formulating Policy on the Arab-Israeli Conflict During the 1960s and 1970s

LISA G. MATERSON

EXAMINATIONS OF SISTERHOOD—whether they emphasize the universal or exclusive bonds of women—have studied the development of ties among women within national borders and distinct cultures.¹ How are we to understand women's communities within a trans-national and cross-cultural context? Historian Nancy Hewitt has recently called for "a more 'global' analysis" of sisterhood. However, Hewitt's analysis ultimately examined women's communities within national or cultural entities, as she called for sensitivity in comparing diverse sisterhoods. Hewitt cautioned North American scholars against the transference of Western models of understanding sisterhood in studying "what appear to be structurally similar bonds among women [of other cultures] who often embrace quite different sometimes opposing ideologies and values."² Yet, how are we to understand the formation of relationships and the limitations of these relationships *between* women of different nationalities and cultures?

International organizations of women are one framework in which these relationships have been cultivated. One such organization is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (hereafter referred to as either the WILPF or the League). Prevailing theories of sisterhood assume that the categories of nation and culture inherently segregate women from different parts of the world and preclude the formation of any shared sense of identity. Yet, a study of the WILPF's history shows that significant bonds did in fact develop among women of various countries and cultures and that a trans-national and cross-cultural analysis of sisterhood can proceed by other than a comparative method. This essay will demonstrate a shared sense of identity that was based not on national, cultural, racial, gender or economic factors, but instead on

common political ideology and goals.

The WILPF's efforts to formulate policy on the Arab-Israeli conflict during the 1960s and 1970s tested the WILPF's sense of community and proved that ideology is a factor capable of unifying women across the bonds of nation, culture, race, gender, or class. The movement had national sections in both Lebanon and Israel. Initially, the Israel section's dedication to the League ideology of internationalism and goal of world peace led to its integration into the WILPF community. In subsequent years, as I will discuss in this essay, Israeli members increasingly rejected League ideology and goals and instigated a bitter conflict with the Lebanon section. Despite Israeli members' cultural affinity with the majority of League members in Europe and North America, the ties that once bound the section to the WILPF community weakened with the group's renunciation of League ideology and aims. Ultimately, the WILPF International Executive Committee expelled the Israel section. In contrast, Lebanese members did not begin with a cultural affinity with the majority of League members. However, the Lebanon section's commitment to WILPF ideology and aims created a sense of solidarity with sister members and ensured the group's continuing participation in the movement.

League Ideology and Structure: The Bonds of Community

At the outset of World War I, members of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) were divided over how the organization should react to the war. Nationalism triumphed among those members who supported the war effort in their respective countries.³ Others, however, opposed the war and considered the IWSA to be an international forum in which women from both belligerent and neutral nations could work together toward ending the conflict. As a result of this split, the German branch of the IWSA withdrew its invitation for the International Suffrage Congress scheduled to take place in Berlin in 1915. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the IWSA, decided to cancel the Congress altogether.⁴

Several IWSA members who opposed the war disagreed with Catt's decision. These members viewed the cancellation as a missed opportunity for women to overcome the growth of nationalism and militarism and work together toward higher common goals, peace and international cooperation. Among those who disagreed with Catt's decision was Aletta Jacobs, an activist in the Dutch suffrage movement. Emphasizing the possibility that women of various nationalities could unite in the face of a nationalist conflict, Jacobs explained:

But I thought at once, just because there is this terrible war the women must come

together somewhere, some way, just to show that women of all countries can work together even in the face of the greatest war in the world. Women must show that when all Europe seems full of hatred they can remain united.⁵

Therefore, with the help of several colleagues and despite the war, Jacobs organized an international women's conference without the IWSA's approval.⁶

With Jane Addams presiding and women from America and eleven European countries attending, the International Congress of Women at the Hague opened on April 18, 1915.⁷ The Congress adopted twenty resolutions, among which was the establishment of a permanent international women's organization devoted to promoting world peace, the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace (ICWPP).

The Congress reconvened four years later in Zurich, simultaneously with the Versailles Peace Talks of 1919. During the Zurich Congress, members changed the name of the ICWPP to the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. More importantly, members formalized the movement's organizational structure. They established an International Executive Committee (with headquarters in Geneva), which presided over but worked in conjunction with national sections. While a national section was somewhat independent, its actions were coordinated with those of the International Executive Committee and the other national sections by the requirement that all members adhere to the resolutions of the International Congresses and to the League's constitution.⁸ Thus, the goal of this working structure was to create an international organization that was more than a federation of separate national sections.

At the Zurich Congress, members wrote the movement's constitution, which set forth the League's fundamental ideology and goals.⁹ Point one of the "Aims and Principles" section of the constitution states:

The League aims at bringing together women of different political and philosophical tendencies united in their determination to study, make known, and help abolish the political, social, economic, and psychological causes of war, and to work for a constructive peace.¹⁰

Point two proclaims:

The primary objectives of the League are the achievement of total and universal disarmament, the abolition of violence and other means of coercion for the settlement of all conflicts, the substitution in every case of some form of peaceful settlement, and the

strengthening of the United Nations and its family of Specialized Agencies, for the prevention of war, a sustainable environment, the institution of international law, and for the political, social, and economic cooperation of all peoples."

These two points reveal the basic ideology and dual goals of the WILPF: world peace and "internationalism."

The founders defined internationalism as the overcoming of the nationalist tendencies that separate and create conflict among peoples, in order to achieve higher common goals of humanity, such as world peace. As Jacobs asserted, "If we can bring women to feel that internationalism is higher than nationalism, then they won't stand by governments, they'll stand by humanity."¹³

Many of the founding members viewed women as uniquely qualified to commit themselves to internationalism. They maintained that women, as the bearers of life, have an innate ability to put aside nationalism, an ideology that creates war and thus contributes to the destruction of life, in favor of internationalism, an ideology that prevents or stops war and thus preserves life. Moreover, they believed that a sense of community could develop among women of different countries based not on common national experiences, but instead on a shared commitment to abolishing the conflict that often emerges from these separate national experiences. Thus, the early members not only formed an organization devoted to ensuring continuous world peace, but they also created a framework in which the idea of internationalism as a force capable of uniting women above the bonds of nation could be put into practice.

In addition to their devotion to internationalism and abolishing the sources of war, early members shared similar economic, cultural, and gender experiences. Although composed of women of different nationalities, the early WILPF was almost exclusively a European and North American, middle- to upper-class movement. Among the founding members were Aletta Jacobs (Dutch), Rosika Schwimmer (Hungarian), Jane Addams (American), Rosa Manus (Dutch), and Emily Greene Balch (American). Although in themselves not sufficient factors to create bonds among women, early members' similar economic resources and common European and North American origins, as opposed to non-Western backgrounds, facilitated the formation of relationships among them.

Along with their economic and cultural backgrounds, the majority of founders shared the experience of war. The European women had lived in war-torn Europe, and many American and European members had sent male relatives to war. Additionally, the founding members developed a sense of solidarity based on their common lack of political rights in their respective nations and commit-

ment to achieving women's suffrage.¹³ The majority of these women were active in the international suffrage movement and asserted that women's suffrage would help end war: with the vote, women would finally have a voice in government and thus in international politics.¹⁴

In the decades following the WILPF's establishment, the organization initiated discussions on colonialism and conflicts outside Europe, such as those in Asia and the Middle East.¹⁵ Moreover, beginning in the 1950s, the League endeavored to diversify its composition from an almost exclusively European and North American membership to a truly international movement that included women from outside Europe and North America.¹⁶ Among those national sections outside Europe and North America that the League admitted during the decades of the 1950s to 1970s were Israel and Lebanon. Israel was admitted as a national section in 1953 and Lebanon in 1962.¹⁷

The majority of Israeli members were European and North American immigrants to Israel. Thus, the introduction of Israeli women into the movement did not challenge the League's predominantly European and North American composition. However, the entrance of Lebanese members—as well as Latin American, African, and Asian members—marked a change in the WILPF's composition.¹⁸ Although from one of the most Westernized countries in the Arab world, Lebanon section members represented a culture, with its Muslim and Arab heritage, that was distinctly different from that of Europe and North America.¹⁹

As the WILPF evolved from an organization composed almost exclusively of North American and European women to one that included women from non-European and non-North American societies, the similar cultural experiences which facilitated relationships in the early WILPF became increasingly obsolete. As the organization diversified, League structure and members' shared commitment to internationalism and achieving world peace became the sole bases of the WILPF community's bonds. Among those factors which reinforced members' dedication to League ideology and goals were the movement's constitution and common organizational vocabulary and history. The League forums which provided opportunities for members to formulate WILPF policy and get to know one another were also central to members' sense of solidarity.

The constitution served as an institutional guide outlining for members the movement's fundamental purpose. Members referred to the goals and ideology set forth in the constitution's "Aims and Principles" section in determining the League's composition. New members were admitted on the basis of their commitment to this ideology. Moreover, the constitution established that the International Executive Committee could expel members from the community if

they violated these aims and principles. As will be seen, the International Executive Committee relied on such constitutional guidelines in its decision to disband the Israel section. Ironically, dissension within the community reinforced members' shared sense of identity: by settling such conflicts through references to the League's basic goals and ideology, members re-acknowledged their bond based on common objectives.

At the International Executive Committee Meetings and International Congresses, members also used the "Aims and Principles" as a guide in determining specific WILPF policy and action. For example, point one of the "Aims and Principles" identifies a primary League objective as abolishing the social and psychological sources of war. Toward this end, in 1961 the International Executive Committee established an Education Committee. The Education Committee worked with national sections to challenge textbooks and media programs which propagated derogatory stereotypes; to stop the manufacture of war toys; to initiate contacts with organizations and schools with ideals similar to those of the WILPF; to support literacy programs; and to promote adult education which taught "the machinery of [g]overnment," "the rights and duties of the citizen," and women's rights.²⁰ Such efforts created a sense among members that they held a bond with women throughout the world who acknowledged and were working toward the same goals.

Members developed a shared organizational vocabulary that further emphasized their impression of belonging to a community.²¹ In their examination of the IWSA, the WILPF's parent organization, Mineke Bosch and Annemarie Kloosterman assert the importance of such a common vocabulary in providing cohesion to an organization composed of women of many nationalities:

In the framework of the IWSA, suffragists all over the world managed to develop common ways of thinking and formulating their thoughts. This becomes clear, for instance, from the letters exchanged by Aletta Jacobs and Rosika Schwimmer. In spite of the totally different social and political situations in the Netherlands and Hungary, these two were able to describe all kinds of events in similar terms. The common language encouraged a feeling of solidarity, and indeed created that feeling.²²

IWSA members often used metaphors comparing suffrage work to war or the movement to an empire of women.²³

As was the case in the IWSA, the League's shared organizational vocabulary informed members' feelings of solidarity by helping them to transcend their national differences and forge "common ways of thinking and formulating their thoughts."²⁴ The use of this organizational vocabulary, referred to hereafter as

“WILPF-speak,” emphasized members’ dedication to League ideology and goals. An unspoken commitment to achieving world peace and an assumed understanding of internationalism was expressed in WILPF-speak when members referred to the “WILPF-tradition,” “WILPF-spirit,” “WILPF aims and principles,” and “WILPF way of thinking.” Thus, in describing Sarah Nyrienda, a participant in a seminar attended by Israeli members, to headquarters’ secretary Elizabeth Tapper in 1963, Israel section Chairman Hannah Bernheim-Rosenzweig portrayed Nyrienda as “a wonderful woman whose way of thinking is, by nature, the WILPF way.”²⁵ Clearly, Bernheim-Rosenzweig assumed that Tapper held a common understanding of this “WILPF way” of thinking without explicitly articulating it.

WILPF-speak was characterized not only by undefined references to a “WILPF way” of thinking or spirit, but also by the use of quotes from the “Aims and Principles” in day-to-day communications. For example, in a 1974 letter to Lebanon section Chairman Anissa Najjar, Finland section Chairman Anna Rantanen paraphrased from point two of the “Aims and Principles.” In explaining her contention that the League should examine the influence of the American Jewish community on U.S. Middle East policy, Rantanen asserted, “Here the League has an opportunity of *studying and making known the causes of war* [emphasis added]. A complex but not impossible task.”²⁶

The perception not only of working in unity toward a better future but also of sharing a common past informed members’ sense of community. In his examination of nationalism, Benedict Anderson, who asserts that “all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact...are imagined,” endeavors to distinguish those factors contributing to one’s “imagined” impression of belonging to the “community” of a nation-state and feeling of solidarity with fellow citizens (citizens that one does not know and may never meet). Among these “community-building” factors is the identification with a shared history—real or imagined.²⁷ While WILPF members were of different nationalities, they also identified with a common organizational history. The actions of the WILPF’s founders, such as Jane Addams, remained important precedents for their successors. For example, in celebration of the centenary of Addams’ birth in 1960, the League opened a home for displaced persons from World War II. Members modeled this home on Hull House, the settlement house Addams founded to aid American immigrants.²⁸

Equally as important to the community’s bonds as the “Aims and Principles,” the League’s common goals and projects, WILPF-speak, and a shared organizational history were the forums which the WILPF provided for women of various nationalities to interact. These forums included the circulars, the League’s

organ, *Pax et Libertas*, official correspondence, and opportunities to meet in person at international gatherings and during the peace missions. It was through these forums that the WILPF community came to life: members exchanged and debated viewpoints, worked together in shaping the League's goals and direction, and got to know one another on a personal basis.²⁹

Kay Camp, a U.S. section member since World War II and International President from 1974 to 1980, remembers the excitement of attending the International Congresses and Executive Committee Meetings: "I returned from such meetings really thrilled to have met such remarkable, intelligent, and humane women from so many different countries."³⁰ In the various formal sessions of these gatherings, members developed specific WILPF policies and actions. Discussions took place not only in the formal sessions but also in informal settings in the hours between and after meetings. These informal settings—meal-times, coffee breaks, tourist excursions, and planned and spontaneous social events—provided several opportunities for members to become acquainted with one another on a more personal level.³¹ Naomi Marcus, a U.S. section member since the 1950s and member of the International Executive Committee during the late 1960s and early 1970s, recalls fondly how she got to know four sister International Executive Committee members while they were stranded together in Paris on their way to a meeting.³²

Despite these various mechanisms that created a shared sense of identity among members by continually reaffirming their commitments to achieving world peace and to the ideology of internationalism, the movement was still vulnerable to conflict. Such a crisis emerged in the mid-1960s as a result of the Israel section's growing nationalism. Israeli members' increasing support for their government's militarism tested the bases of the community's ties.

A Challenge to the Community's Bonds:

The Emergence of the Israel Section's Nationalism

The admission of the Lebanon section in 1962 not only diversified the community's predominantly European and North American composition but also complicated League discussions of the Arab-Israeli conflict. For the first time, these discussions included a continuous Arab voice. Lebanese members pushed the League to deal with many of the "hard issues" relating to the region and introduced a view often critical of Israeli policy. As such, Lebanese members provided an alternative perspective on the Middle East to that which had guided League discussion in the past. As Catherine Foster asserts in her comprehensive study of the WILPF, because of the Holocaust and the League's large Jewish membership, the International Executive Committee and most

national sections were reluctant to criticize Israeli policy during the 1950s and early 1960s.³³ U.S. section leaders, in particular, feared that a position critical of Israel would drive out a significant proportion of their section's large Jewish membership and would eliminate the American Jewish community's important contributions to the peace movement.³⁴

As the League's only national section in the Middle East until 1962, Israeli members' reluctance to criticize their government also influenced the tone of WILPF discussions of the region during the 1950s and early 1960s. Although section members did not explicitly praise their government's military policies and discriminatory treatment of Palestinian citizens of Israel, they rarely criticized such policies. In a few cases, section members admonished their government for its dealings with Palestinian citizens. For example, upon learning in 1962 of Jewish children harassing Palestinians in Jerusalem, the Israel section urged the Israeli Ministry of Education to revise the school curricula in order to discourage such incidents of harassment and discrimination.³⁵ Similarly, in 1964 following what the government called "accidental" shootings of Palestinians by Israeli border patrols, the section entreated the Prime and Defense Ministers to impress upon the army increased restraint and "the greatest regard for human life."³⁶ Beyond such reprobations, however, the section generally avoided open criticism of its government.

Despite Israeli members' reluctance to criticize the Israeli government, their commitment to internationalism guided the section during the 1950s and early 1960s as they welcomed Arab members into the League, women whose views on the Arab-Israeli conflict diverged from their own. For example, in 1958 the Israel section founded a discussion group of Jewish and Palestinian students at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and in 1959 a short-lived group of Palestinian women in Nazareth emerged as part of the Israel section. Israeli members also encouraged the League to form national sections in Arab countries.³⁷

Thus, the Israel section responded positively to the presence of two Lebanese women at the 1961 International Executive Committee Meeting in London and the subsequent enrollment of one of these women, Wadia Khartabil, in the WILPF as an international member.³⁸ A December 1961 Israel section circular indicates the group's initial receptiveness to the inclusion of Arab women in the League. In the circular, Hannah Bernheim-Rosenzweig, a founding member of the Israel section and its chairman from the late 1950s to 1975, described for sister section members the events of the 1961 Executive Committee Meeting and announced the "welcome news" of the presence of these two Arab women at the meeting.³⁹ Bernheim-Rosenzweig's reflections of the meeting seemed to demonstrate the Israel section's flexibility and openness to criticism.

Bernheim-Rosenzweig explained:

At the London Executive Meeting, when your Chairman handed in her report on the Middle East, Mrs. Khartabil took exception to the fact that an Israeli had given a report on the region. Your Chairman agreed with her and expressed the hope that, in 1962 at the Congress, two reports would be given, one by our Arab member, one by the Israel section.⁴⁰

Bernheim-Rosenzweig's circulars during 1961 and 1962 also indicated an eagerness to initiate open and constructive dialogue with Lebanese WILPF members. In the same December 1961 circular, Bernheim-Rosenzweig encouraged her sister section members to attend the 1962 International Congress in Assilomar, California in order to promote the section's relationship with the new Arab member and others. She asserted, "We must meet our Arab friends personally, if we want to achieve our goal: peaceful cooperation."⁴¹ Furthermore, her next circular of May 1962 was addressed not to fellow Israel section members, but instead to "Arab WILPF members."⁴² In this 1962 circular, Bernheim-Rosenzweig happily informed Khartabil and other potential Lebanese members of her section's enrollment of a Palestinian member. She concluded:

So now, with the first international Arab member enrolled in London last summer and our first National member in Israel, the ice is broken and there is hope for mutual friendship and co-operation at least among the women of the Middle East.⁴³

The Israel section circulars directly following the 1962 International Congress demonstrated the section's continued enthusiasm after the Congress admitted Lebanon as a national section.⁴⁴

The language that Bernheim-Rosenzweig used in these 1961 and 1962 circulars is particularly instructive of the Israel section's initial good-will toward the Lebanon section. For example, in the December 1961 circular, Bernheim-Rosenzweig referred to the Lebanese women as "our Arab friends." Then, in her May 1962 circular, she described her "hope for mutual friendship" and "friendly discussion."⁴⁵ This hope of establishing ties of friendship was also reflected in the Israel section's initial concern over Lebanese members' personal lives. For example, after the 1963 death of Khartabil's son, the Israel section immediately sent a letter of condolence.⁴⁶

Not only did the Israel section express its hope for mutual cooperation and the establishment of personal bonds with Lebanese members, but also the sec-

tion, at first, was able to work with its sister Middle East section in formulating WILPF policy on the Arab-Israeli conflict. For example, a 1964 edition of *Pax et Libertas* described the Middle East sections' cooperation at the 1964 International Executive Committee Meeting:

Both the Israeli and the Lebanese members voted for the resolution and were commended for the restraint and the kindly way they had dealt with each other in spite of the very real differences that still exist between their two countries. It is one of the most important and encouraging features of the WILPF that it is able to bring together for frank discussion those who hold deeply felt but differing views.⁴⁷

Both sections helped to pass a resolution which called upon the U.N. to guarantee the security of and aid in the social and economic development of the region; to initiate direct negotiations between the states involved in the conflict, "which would include a settlement of the refugee problem"; and to demand regional disarmament. They also agreed on the creation of a special committee to focus on the Arab-Israeli conflict (the committee consisted of one representative from each Middle East section and two additional representatives from the International Executive Committee).⁴⁸

Beginning in the mid-1960s, however, the Israel section began to abandon its commitment to internationalism, which had previously guided the group's interactions with Lebanese members, in favor of an intransigent nationalist ideology. The group's nationalism was in part a response to the Lebanon section's influence on the League's Middle East policy, which resulted in an increased willingness among International Executive Committee members to criticize Israel.

Since their entrance into the WILPF, Lebanese members had provided a counter-perspective on the Arab-Israeli conflict to that of the Israel section and the League's significant Jewish membership. In their correspondence with International Executive Committee members, at international gatherings, and in the pages of *Pax et Libertas*, Lebanese members were often critical of Israeli policy and pushed the League to form specific positions on several of the region's controversial issues. The Lebanon section urged the League to oppose Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, condemn Israeli bombardments of South Lebanon, and support the right of both the Palestinians to a homeland and the PLO to function as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people in any negotiations.⁴⁹ Demonstrating the group's commitment to League ideology and goals, the Lebanon section often used WILPF-speak in these appeals. Quoting from point one of the "Aims and Principles," Lebanon section

Chairman Anissa Najjar asserted to International Chairman Edith Ballantyne that such difficult issues "should be discussed in accordance with the aims of WILPF to *'study, make known and help abolish the political, economic and psychological causes of war, and to work for a constructive peace'*".⁵⁰

As a result of such efforts by the Lebanon section and the continuing tensions between Israel and the Arab states, the International Executive Committee endeavored to produce specific positions on these issues and recommendations for the conflict's resolution. Meeting at the Hague for the 1965 International Congress, members resolved to send a fact-finding mission to the Middle East. Johanne Reutz-Gjermoe of Norway and Ingrid Lindstrom of Sweden conducted the mission just weeks before the outbreak of the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war, visiting Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Israel, and the Gaza Strip.⁵¹

In their mission report, Reutz-Gjermoe and Lindstrom recommended that the League urge the U.N. to send peace-keeping forces to preserve the post-war demarcation lines and seek Soviet and American cooperation in securing safe passage for all nations through the Suez Canal, imposing an arms embargo, and aiding the region's social and economic development. They also called for Arab recognition of Israel's right to exist, Israeli acknowledgment of a settlement acceptable to the Palestinian refugees, and Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza.⁵² Responding to Reutz-Gjermoe and Lindstrom's recommendations and the dramatic change in the region's status quo as a result of the war, the International Executive Committee produced its first resolution explicitly demanding a reversal of Israeli military action. International Executive Committee members called upon Israel to withdraw from the territories occupied during the war in return for a settlement acceptable to both Israel and the Palestinian refugees.⁵³ Three years later at the 1970 International Congress in India, the League reaffirmed its disapproval of Israeli military policy with an additional resolution demanding the cessation of Israel's continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.⁵⁴

As League discussions increasingly focused on Israel's contributions to the region's tensions and as WILPF members outside the Middle East, especially the International Executive Committee, demonstrated a greater willingness to question Israeli aggressions and policies toward the Palestinians, Israel section members began to feel embattled within the movement. They recognized the Lebanon section's pressure on the League to take a stand more critical of Israel as a significant factor in the WILPF's changing approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Although they initially had welcomed Arab members into the League, Israeli members began to perceive the Lebanon section as a threat. In their correspondence with the International Executive Committee during the late

1960s and throughout the 1970s, Israeli members questioned the sincerity of the Lebanon section's commitment to WILPF principles and even urged the League to expel Lebanese members. They asserted that the Lebanon section worked not for a peaceful resolution of the region's problems but instead for Israel's destruction. For example, in a 1969 letter to Phoebe Cusden, a British section member and editor of *Pax et Libertas*, Bernheim-Rosenzweig described Khartabil as "the leader of a group of women who style themselves as 'Palestinian Refugees' and have the one and only aim: to work for the destruction not only of the land of Israel but also of its people." She concluded by explaining, "I shall put the question to our Executive whether a woman with such an aim can be permitted to be a member of the WILPF."⁵⁵

Attempting to forestall the League's changing approach to the Middle East, Israeli members came to the defense of their government. They protested even the slightest criticism of Israel by the International Executive Committee and endeavored to convince Committee members of the propriety of Israel's military policy. For example, when in 1969 International Chairman Elise Boulding urged both the Lebanon and Israel sections to support peacemakers in their respective countries "whose voices cannot be heard just now because the military response has the upper hand," Bernheim-Rosenzweig responded by defending her government's military policy.⁵⁶ She insisted that the government was in fact the voice of peace in Israel:

The Israel Section has been closely watching the events and has usually found good reason to be proud of the Government's actions as well as of the attitude of our people, especially the Army...Whenever we feel the Section should re-act [*sic*] to any step by the Government or the Army, they themselves make amends so swiftly that we are left no reason to express our dissatisfaction. On the contrary, we have reason to praise them.⁵⁷

In their efforts to dispel International Executive Committee members' concerns over Israeli military policy, the Israel section also began a propaganda campaign around the mid-1960s. Israeli members started using various WILPF forums—official correspondence, *Pax et Libertas*, and the circulars—to refute Lebanon section statements which they perceived as anti-Israel and to distribute information to WILPF members around the world, but particularly to the International Executive Committee, which they believed presented a "true" analysis of the Arab-Israeli conflict. In their arguments, Israeli members disputed Palestinian claims to land in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza. They portrayed Arabs as an oil-rich, unreasonable people who had created the Palestin-

ian refugee problem and then were unwilling to help the refugees. In contrast, Israel, they asserted, was the savior and civilizer of the Palestinians living under its control, offering them democracy and freedom and rescuing them from the autocratic and unenlightened rule of Arab governments.⁵⁸ Such arguments in turn elicited responses from the Lebanon section.

By the late-1960s, the two sections were embroiled in a battle of words aimed at winning the hearts and minds of League members outside the Middle East. An examination of 1974 correspondence exemplifies the exchanges between the two sections. Following the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war, the International Executive Committee, at the request of the Israel section, entreated the Syrian government to release a list of prisoners of war and agree to their exchange for prisoners held in Israel.⁵⁹ Anissa Najjar responded to the International Executive Committee's statement in a 1973 letter to International Chairman Edith Ballantyne, which was then published in a 1974 edition of *Pax et Libertas*. Najjar contended that the statement sent to the Syrian government reflected the League's one-sided approach to the conflict. She argued that while showing concern for Israeli prisoners of war, the League had consistently ignored the plight of Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails. She asserted that "while agreeing whole-heartedly with your humanitarian sentiments, it would, we feel, be a more credible sentiment if it directs itself equally to people of all races, colours, and creeds."⁶⁰ She also reminded Ballantyne of several U.N., Amnesty International, and Red Cross reports on Israel's mistreatment of Palestinian prisoners.

Israel section member Malka Shulewitz responded with a letter to the editor. Shulewitz objected to Najjar's suggestion of Israeli mistreatment of Palestinian prisoners and described as a "farce" the U.N.'s Special Committee on the Treatment of Prisoners in the Occupied Territories mentioned in Najjar's letter. In a particularly vitriolic statement, she implied that Najjar's concern over Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails demonstrated Najjar's support of terrorism. Shulewitz wrote, "Presumably, the criminal terrorists who murdered 18 men, women and children over breakfast at Kiryat Shmona some weeks ago, would, if they had remained alive, been considered heroes and 'civilian prisoners' by Mrs. Najjar." She continued by arguing that "If Mrs. Najjar was really concerned about the plight of the remaining Arab refugees, she would ask why some of the billions of oil revenue of the Arab feudal sheikhs is not used on their (the refugees') behalf."⁶¹ To refute Arab claims to Israeli land, Shulewitz then rehashed the events surrounding the creation of Israel. She wrote about the 1947 U.N. partition plan, which called for the creation of both a Palestinian and Jewish state but was rejected by Arab rulers, and described the events of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, in which several Arab nations declared war on Israel

following the latter's declaration of statehood. Finally, Shulewitz concluded by quoting from a Lebanese journal article which maintained that West Bank Palestinians preferred life under Israeli rule to that under Jordanian control.⁶²

The war of words between the two Middle East sections was not reserved for official correspondence, *Pax et Libertas*, and the circulars. Confrontation also characterized the face-to-face interactions between Israeli and Lebanese members at International Executive Committee Meetings and Congresses. Prior to the 1970 International Congress in New Delhi, India, the Lebanon section proposed three resolutions for League consideration: demanding Israel's adherence to the U.N. resolution supporting the return to their homes of 400,000 refugees from the June 1967 war; protesting Israeli mistreatment of civilians in the West Bank and Gaza and torture of Palestinian prisoners as reported by Amnesty International and the U.N. Human Rights Commission; and calling for Israel to withdraw from the West Bank and Gaza and cease the construction of settlements in these territories.⁶³ Bernheim-Rosenzweig implored the International Executive Committee to drop the Lebanese resolutions from the Congress agenda.⁶⁴ The International Executive Committee refused Bernheim-Rosenzweig's request.

At the Congress, when the League initiated discussions on the three Lebanon section resolutions and a U.S. section resolution (which demanded Israel's withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza and the initiation of negotiations aimed at creating a Palestinian homeland next to Israel), a bitter debate ensued between Lebanese and Israeli representatives over the resolutions' contents.⁶⁵ Describing the debate for sister section members in a January 1971 circular, Israeli representative Nelly Lehmann recalled, "the youngest member of the Lebanese Section...got up and made a flaming speech of accusation...When she was through [Israeli representative] Mrs. Morris got up and could outdo her with her arguments...I think that nobody can be stronger than [her] case and that ours was the stronger one."⁶⁶ As a result of this confrontation, the commission directing the discussion dropped all four resolutions. In their place, the commission eventually passed a resolution which called for Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza. Both the Lebanese and Israeli representatives abstained from voting on this compromise resolution.⁶⁷

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Israel section's nationalism and the tensions it precipitated with Lebanese members significantly impeded the League's ability to formulate policy on the Middle East. The Lebanon and Israel sections, but particularly Israeli members, often bogged-down discussions on the region with unproductive and emotional arguments. Although eager to produce specific recommendations for resolving the area's problems, In-

ternational Executive Committee members found themselves paralyzed by the conflict between the two sections and unable to move beyond the 1967 and 1970 resolutions.

Efforts To Maintain the WILPF Community's Integrity

By the late 1960s, the International Executive Committee became increasingly frustrated with the continuing conflict between the Lebanon and Israel sections and the League's inability to create policy on the Middle East. In a July 1970 correspondence, International Executive Committee member Naomi Marcus complained to Ballantyne about the "emotional outbursts and self-righteous smugness" that made "objective, intelligent discussion difficult."⁶⁸ Ballantyne also expressed her concern over the confrontations' debilitating effect on League treatment of the region. In a 1972 letter to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Ballantyne described the movement's basic dilemma: "It seems to me that with regard to the Middle East conflict we have difficulty in clarifying our position on proposals aimed at creating the conditions for negotiations... The challenge for the League is to find a way to break free of the circular arguments so that negotiations can come about."⁶⁹

International Executive Committee members recognized the Israel section's nationalism as the primary factor behind the Middle East sections' poor relationship and began to question the sincerity of Israeli members' commitment to League ideology and goals. For example, International Executive Committee member Dorothy Hutchinson expressed her disapproval of the Israel section's unwillingness to "rise above nationalism."⁷⁰ Similarly, in her report to the 1970 International Congress on the 1967 Middle East mission, Johanne Reutz-Gjermoe directed League attention to Israeli members' support of the West Bank and Gaza occupation.⁷¹

Lebanese members also raised questions about the Israel section's unswerving support of its government's militarism. Part of a Lebanese resolution proposed for the 1974 International Congress called for League condemnation of Israeli bombardments of civilian populations in South Lebanon. In a correspondence to the International Executive Committee, Bernheim-Rosenzweig denied such attacks and demanded that the Committee drop the Lebanese resolution from the Congress agenda.⁷² As in 1970, the Committee once again refused her request. In response to Bernheim-Rosenzweig's letter, Lebanese members reported to the International Executive Committee another Israeli attack on civilians in South Lebanon and asserted, "The Israeli section may perhaps like to add this latest outrage against civilians to its already long list of 'regrets' about civilian casualties." Lebanese members asked, "When will the Israeli sec-

tion stop 'regretting' and start really working for [p]eace ? Does the Israeli section really represent the forces working for peace and human rights in Israel ?"⁷³

Attempting to pull the League out of its paralysis with respect to the Middle East and to maintain the WILPF community's integrity, the International Executive Committee made several efforts to temper Israeli members' nationalism and thus decrease tensions between the Lebanon and Israel sections. International Executive Committee members relied on those factors that, by emphasizing the WILPF goal of world peace and ideology of internationalism, were integral to the League's sense of community: the "Aims and Principles"; WILPF-speak; League history; and the forums that provided opportunities for members to exchange viewpoints and get to know one another, such as the correspondences, international gatherings, and peace missions.

As Lebanese and Israeli members were engaged in a bitter debate over Israeli air raids in South Lebanon in 1969, International Chairman Elise Boulding attempted to reconcile the two sections. Lebanese members were criticizing Israeli policy as militant and expansionist and calling for League support of a U.N. resolution condemning the raids. In contrast, Israeli members were arguing that such strikes were necessary retaliations for terrorist attacks in Northern Israel and demanding a League protest of the U.N. resolution.⁷⁴

In an effort to get Lebanese and Israeli members to work together at breaking the cycle of violence, Boulding wrote a joint letter to the two sections. In her appeal, Boulding reminded Lebanese and Israeli members of their shared League history by entreating them to use the precedent of internationalism set by the WILPF's founding members as a model for dealing with a highly nationalist conflict:

The women who founded our organization came together to work for peace at a time when their husbands were killing each other on the battlefields of Europe. It is not often in history that human beings [*sic*] have been able to respond to threats to their national and cultural identities by affirming allegiance to the higher principle of peace, freedom, justice and love for all man. Nevertheless, the WILPF was founded in the belief that it was possible to invite this higher allegiance even in the face of a frightening increase in nationalist feelings on the world scene.⁷⁵

Boulding concluded her appeal with a dramatic invocation of the familiar vocabulary of WILPF-speak. Quoting from point two of the "Aims and Principles," she reminded both sections, but especially the Israel section, of the League's fundamental purpose. Boulding maintained, "If the WILPF principle of *the substitution* in every case of *some form of peaceful settlement for violent means*

of coercion [emphasis added] has no concrete application in this situation, then we should disband the WILPF today."⁷⁶

The official correspondence between two members, Ballantyne and Bernheim-Rosenzweig, was particularly crucial to the International Executive Committee's efforts to maintain the WILPF community's integrity and push forward League discussion on the Middle East. Their correspondence lasted from 1969, when Ballantyne assumed the position of International Chairman, until at least 1975, when Bernheim-Rosenzweig resigned from her position as Chairman of the Israel section. Although the correspondence concerned official WILPF business, these letters had a personal flavor to them.⁷⁷ Letters frequently opened or closed with updates on one another's personal lives.

Both often expressed their affection for each other. For example, after their first in-person meeting at the 1969 International Executive Committee Meeting in Cret Berard, Bernheim-Rosenzweig described to Ballantyne her sense of connection stemming from their similar experiences in Nazi Europe. Bernheim-Rosenzweig had fled Germany for Palestine as a result of the Nazi persecution of Jews, while Ballantyne was a Sudetan refugee from the German invasion of Czechoslovakia who had immigrated to Canada.⁷⁸ Bernheim-Rosenzweig explained, "When I think of you it always seems to me that we have much in common—probably because of a similar fate. This has created the feeling that I have known you for a long time."⁷⁹ And in a 1970 correspondence, after learning that Bernheim-Rosenzweig had been hospitalized for an operation, Ballantyne wrote, "I would like to come and cheer you up. You are such a marvelously gorgeous person. I have found souvenirs of our meeting last summer in the beautiful garden at Cret-Berard, and I am looking forward to walking with you at Helsinger. You must come!"⁸⁰

It is uncertain whether this friendly rhetoric reflected, masked, shaped or distorted the true nature of Ballantyne and Bernheim-Rosenzweig's relationship.⁸¹ Regardless, such discourse aided Ballantyne in her efforts to maintain the WILPF community's integrity. By creating an atmosphere of friendship, Ballantyne was able to breach the unattractive subjects of the Middle East sections' poor relationship and Israeli members' nationalism while avoiding, at first, a total rift between the International Executive Committee and the Israel section. For example, in a 1974 letter to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Ballantyne asked that the Israel section help the WILPF move beyond the state of confrontation which plagued the League's treatment of the region. She urged Israeli members to stop contesting every statement made by the Lebanon section and to avoid focusing on each new act of violence. Instead, Ballantyne beseeched Israeli members to address the underlying issues of the Arab-Israeli conflict and ini-

tiate an open and constructive dialogue with the Lebanon section:

We in the WILPF should be able to get down to the root causes of all this violence and try to help to eliminate them. I honestly see no point anymore in denouncing first one and then another act of violence, if it cannot be followed up by constructive action...It is also the responsibility of all us in the WILPF to find a way out of the vicious circle in which, it seems to me we are turning...It seems to me developments in the Middle East have gone far beyond discussion at this level, and we need to make an effort to catch up with them.⁸³

Although such appeals by International Executive Committee members during the late 1960s and early 1970s did not result in a total rift between the Committee and Israeli members, the Committee was unsuccessful in its efforts to temper the section's nationalism. Israeli members continued to express their unequivocal support for their government's militarism. Responding to denunciations of Israel's protracted West Bank and Gaza occupation by the Lebanon section and League members outside the Middle East, Bernheim-Rosenzweig asserted that West Bank and Gaza Palestinians had actually benefited from the Israeli military presence. In a 1973 letter to Ballantyne, Bernheim-Rosenzweig asked, "Do the members really not know that the Israel Military Administration is performing an admirable job? Do you know any other case in history where a military administration did so much for the welfare of the people under their [*sic*] control?"⁸³

Bernheim-Rosenzweig responded similarly to Ballantyne's 1974 appeal to Israeli members to help the League focus on the Arab-Israeli conflict's underlying issues. In her entreaty, Ballantyne was distressed over Israeli air raids on civilians in South Lebanon.⁸⁴ Bernheim-Rosenzweig reacted that the Israeli Army would "never attack 'innocent villages'."⁸⁵ According to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, the air raids were necessary retaliations against terrorists who had invaded such villages and driven out the civilian populations. Bernheim-Rosenzweig argued that, as in the occupied territories, the military was actually helping the people of South Lebanon by protecting them from the threats and violence of terrorists:

It is not the Israel Army which terrorizes the villagers. On the contrary, whenever Israeli soldiers passed through the border villages on their way to terrorist bases, they were welcomed by the Lebanese farmers as liberators, and they knew perfectly well that no harm would come to them to say nothing of "terrorizing" by the Israelis.⁸⁶

The International Executive Committee tried once again in 1975 to engender a sense of community between the Israel and Lebanon sections and to repair its own seriously deteriorated relationship with Israeli members. In 1975 Ballantyne and Libby Frank, a U.S. section member and Chair of the Middle East Committee, conducted WILPF's fifth mission to the Middle East, visiting Lebanon, Syria, and Israel. In preparing for the mission, Frank suggested to sister Committee members that rather than merely undertaking a "fact-finding" mission, as had been decreed at the 1974 International Congress in England, she envisioned the mission's purpose as "building bridges" between Lebanese and Israeli members and between the two Middle East sections and League members outside the Middle East. Frank explained in a 1974 letter to International Executive Committee members:

I think we should not make an attempt to "fact find," but to try to build up the kind of relationship that has been built between the U.S. section of the WILPF and the Soviet Women's Committee. That is a wonderful and continuing relationship, yet when it started several years ago, I am sure it was very difficult. This will be more difficult. But the WILPF is uniquely qualified to try to open up these kinds of doors.⁸⁷

In order to create ties between Lebanese and Israeli members, Frank, Ballantyne, and British section member Brenda Bailey proposed that the mission focus less on the political issues which separated the Middle East sections and more on the "apolitical" factors which unified them.⁸⁸ Frank, Ballantyne, and Bailey hoped that the mission would help Lebanese and Israeli members identify their shared experiences, such as living and raising children under war conditions, and learn about each other's daily lives and personal aspirations.⁸⁹ Frank, Ballantyne, and Bailey also were optimistic that Ballantyne and Frank could assist Lebanese and Israeli members to discern "areas of common purpose," such as improving the position of women and the education and child care systems in their respective nations.⁹⁰

The mission did not produce many of the results envisioned by the International Executive Committee. Although Ballantyne and Frank addressed such "apolitical" issues in their meetings with Israeli and Lebanese members, discussions focused more on politics—boundaries, prisoners, terrorism, and Israel's raids on South Lebanon. Ultimately, Ballantyne and Frank were unsuccessful in their efforts to "scatter a few seeds of reconciliation" between the Israel and Lebanon sections. As Frank explained in her mission report, "Discussion with our Lebanese and Israeli members indicates a very wide gap in attitude and approach between them."⁹¹ Furthermore, rather than repair the relationship

between the International Executive Committee and the Israel section, Ballantyne and Frank's visit to Israel widened the split between them. Meetings with Israeli members impressed upon Ballantyne and Frank just how far the section had strayed from the League ideology of internationalism and goal of world peace. Following the mission, Ballantyne and Frank further alerted the Committee of the Israel section's intransigent nationalism and "refusal to look at the situation with open eyes."⁹²

Despite such disappointments, the mission did yield two positive developments: Ballantyne and Frank's visit to Lebanon solidified the ties of common purpose existing between the International Executive Committee and the Lebanon section, and the mission report prompted the League to pass its most substantial resolution on the Middle East. Talks with Lebanese members demonstrated to Ballantyne and Frank the section's strong dedication to League ideology and goals. As Frank described in her mission report, "The Section is aided by good organizational methods and by a strong commitment to the aims and objectives of the League."⁹³ Ballantyne and Frank also developed personal bonds with Lebanese members. In an emotionally-charged recollection of her second visit to Lebanon as part of a 1978 WILPF mission, Frank described her eagerness to visit again Lebanese members after the intervening years of separation:

I was so excited because I had been in Lebanon three years previously. In the meantime Israel had come up and invaded and taken over this other part of Lebanon and I really wanted to see these people...They took such good care of me the previous time I had been there, Edith and me. The fact that I was Jewish and that I was concerned about them, it was—I mean, if you want to talk about sisters, it was there.⁹⁴

Ballantyne and Frank's meetings with Syrian and Lebanese women and opportunity to witness first-hand the conditions in South Lebanon profoundly affected not only these two women personally but also the League's Middle East policy.⁹⁵ Prior to visiting South Lebanon, Frank had been aware of the region's problems. Actually seeing the Israeli planes flying overhead and visiting the refugee camps really impressed upon her the tragedy of the region. As she explained:

Members of the section in Lebanon had close family members killed. We visited Anissa Najjar, head of the Lebanese section, and she took us to a children's school she had started. We learned later that the school was bombed and destroyed. These kind of things, seeing it and having been there, had a tremendous effect. So I understood much more what they were undergoing, how they were having to live.⁹⁶

Discussions with Syrian and Lebanese women led Ballantyne and Frank to conclude that no resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict was possible without an Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and the establishment of a Palestinian homeland.⁹⁷

As a result of such experiences and discussions, Ballantyne and Frank left the Middle East asserting that it was "time for the WILPF to take a political stand."⁹⁸ In their mission report, Ballantyne and Frank proposed that the League support an overall settlement which recognized Israel's right to exist within its pre-1967 borders and the Palestinians' national rights. They recommended that the negotiations directed at such a settlement should take place "under the joint aegis of the Soviet Union and the United States, or the United Nations" and should include representatives from Israel, the Arab states contiguous to Israel, and the Palestinians.⁹⁹ Ballantyne and Frank suggested that the League show its solidarity with both Middle East sections by providing medical assistance to clinics in the Lebanese and Israeli towns of Nabatiya and Kiryat Shmona. They also urged the League to arrange meetings between Palestinian and Israeli women; to organize visits between special interest groups from outside the Middle East (such as educators, scientists, and artists) and their Middle East colleagues; to examine the treatment of Arabs and Israelis in children's textbooks and the mass media; and to form a Middle East Committee at International Executive Committee Meetings responsible for carrying out the meetings' proposals.¹⁰⁰

At the 1975 Middle East seminar in Hamburg, the League translated Ballantyne and Frank's proposals into its most substantial resolution on the region. The resolution called for Israel's withdrawal to its pre-1967 borders; a two-state solution; the cessation of arms sales to the Middle East; the use of U.N. agencies alone to channel aid to the region; and the initiation of negotiations under the joint aegis of the U.S. and the Soviet Union, which would include representatives from Israel, the Arab states contiguous to Israel, and the Palestinians, including the PLO.¹⁰¹ The most significant aspects of this resolution were the League's demand for Israeli withdrawal, support of a two-state solution, and recognition of the PLO as a necessary participant in any negotiations. These positions were antithetical to Israeli policy; and thus in 1975, the League took its strongest stand against the Israeli government.

The League's development of specific positions on such controversial aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict caused ruptures in the WILPF community. Several Jewish members of the U.S. section disagreed with the League's emerging Middle East policy and resigned from the WILPF in protest.¹⁰² Many Jewish U.S. section members, however, such as Frank and Naomi Marcus, not only

remained active but also were at the forefront of creating this new policy.

The Israel section also strongly objected to the 1975 resolution. Israeli members interpreted the movement's opposition to their government's policies as reflecting an anti-Israel and even anti-Semitic bias in the League.¹⁰³ In response, the Israel section became even more defensive of its government. Using the WILPF name, the section increased its distribution of nationalist propaganda to League members and organizations not affiliated with the WILPF outside the Middle East. Contradicting the League's official stand on the region, such propaganda presented arguments supporting Israel's protracted occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and opposing the creation of a Palestinian state and the participation of the PLO in negotiations.¹⁰⁴

During the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, the Israel section increasingly abandoned its commitments to achieving world peace and to the ideology of internationalism in favor of an aggressive nationalism. The International Executive Committee unsuccessfully attempted to temper the Israel section's nationalism and reestablish the group's ties to the movement by employing those factors that were fundamental to the League's sense of community. Although Israeli members continued to function as a national section until 1978, they did so only in name. By the mid-1970s, the bonds of common goals and ideology that Israeli members had once shared with both the Lebanon section and the International Executive Committee had dissipated.

The Reconstitution of the Community

The International Executive Committee became alarmed by Israeli members' use of the WILPF name to spread nationalist propaganda and demanded that they stop this action. In an August 1977 letter to Shulewitz, International President Kay Camp explained, "Please know that we strongly support the right of citizens to speak out whatever their views, but when they speak in the name of WILPF, their views must not conflict with WILPF's own positions. I am sure you understand how this must be so."¹⁰⁵ The section defied such requests and continued to distribute propaganda under the WILPF name.

In 1978, Frank returned to the Middle East as part of a WILPF-sponsored mission. Meetings with the Israel section only reconfirmed the hard-line views of its members. As in her 1975 report, Frank notified the International Executive Committee of the section's uncompromising support of its government's militarism in her 1978 mission report.¹⁰⁶ Based upon Frank's findings and the Israel section's defiant spread of highly nationalist propaganda, the International Executive Committee moved to disband the group.

In a July 1978 correspondence, Camp informed Shulewitz that the Israel

section's status was being placed on the agenda of the International Executive Committee Meeting scheduled to take place in August. In explaining the Committee's decision, Camp relied on the constitution. Camp maintained that national sections should not use the WILPF name to promote ideals antithetical to League ideology and objectives. Reminding Shulewitz of the content of WILPF ideology and goals, Camp quoted points two, three, and four of the "Aims and Principles." She then quoted section 4, point 3 of the constitution, outlining the conditions under which the International Executive Committee can move to expel a national section:

A national section shall be dissolved by the Executive Committee if it has fewer than ten-members, has violated this constitution or acts in a manner prejudicial to the realization of the objectives of the League. The decision to dissolve a national section may be appealed to the Congress by the section concerned.¹⁰⁷

Camp concluded by describing to Shulewitz her sadness over having to write such a letter: "I regret having to write these words Malka in view of my personal feelings for our Israeli section and you, as well as WILPF's lengthy and intense involvement with and aspirations for all the people of the Middle East."¹⁰⁸ Meeting in Geneva one month later, International Executive Committee members voted in favor of disbanding the Israel section.

Conclusion

In 1983, the League admitted a new Israel section.¹⁰⁹ During her 1978 visit to Israel, Libby Frank met two peace activists, Maya Zahavi and Zamira, from the *Gesher LeShalom* [Bridge to Peace] movement. Zahavi was a Jew from Tel Aviv and Zamira was a Palestinian from Nazareth.¹¹⁰ Composed of both Jewish and Palestinian women, *Gesher LeShalom's* ideology was similar to that of the WILPF: the movement was committed to overcoming the nationalism and misunderstanding which perpetuated the Arab-Israeli conflict by establishing constructive dialogue between Palestinians and Jews. Frank recalls her immediate sense of connection with Zahavi, "Maya and I fell in love with each other within five minutes."¹¹¹ Frank and sister International Executive Committee members maintained contact with *Gesher LeShalom* in the following years, and in 1983 the Committee admitted the organization as the WILPF's new Israel section. Soon after, the Committee also accepted a Palestinian national section from the West Bank and Gaza. The new Israeli members' commitment to League goals and ideology led to their swift integration into the WILPF community and to their initiation of positive, though sometimes difficult, dialogue with Lebanese members.¹¹²

Historians have analyzed the role of gender, race, class, and ethnicity in the formation of bonds between women. Such analyses examine women's communities within distinct cultures or national borders. Even Hewitt's call for a global analysis of sisterhood proceeds by a comparative method and overlooks the possibility of trans-national and cross-cultural ties among women. A study of the WILPF, however, shows that a global analysis of sisterhood can proceed by a non-comparative method and that a shared sense of identity could be forged between women of different nationalities and cultures.

The crisis precipitated by the Israel section's nationalism during the 1960s and 1970s demonstrates that the WILPF community's ties were based not on national, cultural, racial, gender, economic, or religious factors, but instead on common ideology and goals. As immigrants from Europe and North America, Israeli members held a cultural affinity with the majority of League members. Furthermore, the Israel section shared a religious tradition with the movement's large Jewish membership, including a significant number of Jewish members in the International Executive Committee. However, the bonds of ideology proved stronger than those of culture or religion. When Israeli members rejected the League's ideology of internationalism and goal of world peace by supporting their government's militarism, the ties that once bound the group to the WILPF community dissipated and the International Executive Committee expelled the section. Ironically, by disbanding the Israel section, the WILPF community reaffirmed its bonds of common goals and ideology.

In contrast, Lebanese members did not share a cultural affinity with the majority of League members. Yet, the Lebanon section's strong commitment to League ideology and goals not only influenced the movement's approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict, but also ensured the group's integration into and continued participation in the WILPF community.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. I wish to thank Professor Ellen DuBois and my fellow students in Professor DuBois' seminar on international women's history for their valuable comments and suggestions while I was preparing this article. I am especially indebted to Allison Sneider and Kira Hilden-Minton for helping me to conceptualize this essay through numerous drafts and to WILPF members Libby Frank, Kay Camp and Naomi Marcus for their willingness to share their knowledge and experiences with me.

APPENDIX

The "Aims and Principles" Section of the WILPF Constitution:

1. The League aims at bringing together women of different political and philosophical tendencies united in their determination to study, make known, and help abolish the political, social,

economic, and psychological causes of war, and to work for a constructive peace.

2. The primary objectives of the League are the achievement of total and universal disarmament, the abolition of violence and other means of coercion for the settlement of all conflicts, the substitution in every case of some form of peaceful settlement, and the strengthening of the United Nations and its family of Specialized Agencies, for the prevention of war, a sustainable environment, the institution of international law, and for the political, social, and economic cooperation of all peoples.
3. Conscious that under systems of exploitation and oppression these aims cannot be attained and that a real and lasting peace and true freedom cannot exist, the League's duty is to facilitate by nonviolent means the social transformation which would permit the inauguration of systems under which would be realized social, economic, and political equality for all without discrimination on grounds of sex, race, religion, or on any other grounds.
4. The League sees as its ultimate goal the establishment of an international economic order founded on meeting the needs of all people and not on profit and privilege.
5. The work of all the national sections of the League is based on these aims and principles and on the statements and resolutions adopted by the International Congress and the International Executive Committee.

SOURCE: Catherine Foster, *Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), ix.

NOTES

1. During the 1960s and 1970s, scholars of American women's history asserted that bonds have developed between women based on their common experiences as a gender. For example, in her study of white, middle- to upper-class women in New England between 1780 and 1835, historian Nancy Cott contended that the shared experience of subordination in a patriarchal society "bound women together even as it bound them down" and created a distinctive women's culture. Although Cott focused on one sector of the female population, she maintained that the "concept of 'womanhood' rooted in the experience of Yankee middle-class mothers...applied to the female sex as a whole" and created ties among women that united them in spite of class and regional divisions. Similarly, Caroll Smith-Rosenberg argued that the rigid gender-role differentiation prevalent in American society between the 1760s and 1880s engendered a unique sense of community among women characterized by bonds of love and intimacy. In the 1980s and 1990s, opposing analyses of sisterhood appeared refuting claims of an inherent bond among all women based on their common experiences as a gender. Historians such as Nancy Hewitt and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese argued that a universal community of women and definition of womanhood does not in fact exist and has not existed historically. Such historians, however, did not deny the formation of sisterhoods. Instead, they asserted that, as with men, economic and social factors have created conflict between women and have served to separate American women and create distinct sisterhoods among them along the lines of race, class, and ethnicity. For example, examining slave women in the nineteenth century and housewives, female industrial workers, and privileged women in the early- and mid-twentieth century, Hewitt demonstrated that the development of a sense of community among each of these same-class groups of women necessarily excluded women from other classes. For a discussion of the disparate identities among slaveholding and slave women in the antebellum South, see also Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988). Nancy F. Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1977), 1, 17, 123; Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth-Century America," *Signs: Journal of*

- Women in Culture and Society* 1 (1975): 3, 9, 24; Nancy Hewitt, "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s," in *Unequal Sisters: A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History*, ed. Ellen Carol DuBois and Vicki L. Ruiz (New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, 1990), 1, 3, 5, 11.
2. Nancy Hewitt, "Sisterhood in International Perspective: Thoughts on Teaching Comparative Women's History," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 1 & 2 (1988): 23.
 3. See Carol Cini's article in this collection.
 4. Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Pioneers for Peace: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1965* (1965; reprint, Oxford: Alden Press, 1980), 18.
 5. Catherine Foster, *Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 11.
 6. Bussey and Tims, 18.
 7. *Ibid.*, 19.
 8. *Ibid.*, 32. International Congresses convened at inconsistent intervals until 1934 and then triennially.
 9. See Appendix for a full text of the constitution's "Aims and Principles" section.
 10. Foster, ix.
 11. *Ibid.* These two points are from the constitution as it existed in 1989. The language is almost identical to the early constitution. The essential difference is the change in wording in point two from the "League of Nations" to the "United Nations" to reflect the post-World War II scene.
 12. *Ibid.*, 16-17.
 13. This is consonant with Cott's view that women's common experiences of oppression in patriarchal societies are unifying forces.
 14. Foster, 16.
 15. Bussey and Tims, 56, 105, 108.
 16. Foster, 29. The League attempted to establish contacts with women outside Europe and North America. These contacts in turn often led to the formation of national sections. For example, in 1969 International Executive Committee member Kay Camp and two other WILPF members traveled to South America. The contacts initiated with Chilean women during this visit resulted in the admission of a Chile section. The League's conscious effort to diversify its composition was further reflected in International Chairman Elise Boulding's opening speech at the 1970 International Congress in India. This was the first International Congress to be held in a developing nation. Boulding asserted: "Being here is an affirmation that we mean to be a truly international organization in fact, not only in intention...Our efforts in WILPF should be directed, as I believe they were in its earliest days, toward identifying the skills and strengths of women in all sectors of society, in countries at all levels of development, to work for the twin goals of peace and development. It is my conviction that we cannot even adequately define peace or development unless we work in partnership with women from non-elite sectors of society." Foster, 70; Elise Boulding, Opening Address at the Eighteenth International Congress of the WILPF, 30 December 1970, reel 24, *The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Papers, 1915-1978*, ed. Ducey Mitchell (Sanford, N.C.: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1983) (hereafter cited as *WILPF Papers*).
 17. Although Israel and Lebanon were admitted as national sections in 1953 and 1962 respectively, the WILPF actually initiated its involvement with Jewish and Arab women in the Middle East earlier. During the 1920s, several small groups of Jewish women affiliated with the WILPF operated in Palestine. The League sent missions to the Middle East in 1931 and 1947. During her 1931 mission to Palestine, Elisabeth Waern-Bugge, a Sweden section member, was unable to organize a mixed group of Jewish and Palestinian women but did successfully found a short-lived group affiliated with the WILPF of Christian Palestinian women in Ramallah. A national section also briefly existed in Egypt prior to World War II. Subsequent to the admis-

sion of the Israel section but prior to that of the Lebanon section, Madeline Bouchereau of Haiti conducted the third official mission to the region in 1958, traveling to Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, and Israel. Foster, 28; Bussey and Tims, 108, 220-21.

18. In addition to Israel and Lebanon, the League's national sections outside Europe and North America included those in Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ghana, India, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Mauritius, Nigeria, and Sri Lanka. The League also maintained contact with independent members in Cyprus, Ethiopia, Gambia, Haiti, Kuwait, the Philippines, and Singapore. Foster, 29, 53, 70, 90-91, 111; Bussey and Tims, 245.
19. The Lebanon section records distinguish members as either Lebanese or Palestinian, without reference to religious affiliation. The section most likely comprised women of a variety of religions. For example, Anissa Najjar, Lebanon section Chairman during the 1970s, was Druze. Additionally, in 1975, the section opened branches among the mostly Muslim Palestinian refugees of South Lebanon. Palestinian members from South Lebanon, therefore, most likely were Muslim. While I believe that Christian women also participated in the Lebanon section, further research is required to determine their number, as well as the exact religious composition of the section.
Not only did the section most likely include non-Muslims, but also several Lebanese members probably were educated in European-style institutions and were familiar with European culture. The French mandate period (1914 to 1941) had initiated a continuing European presence and influence on Lebanese society. Despite European influences, I would still argue that Lebanon's Muslim and Arab ties had created a culture distinct from that of Europe and North America and that even non-Muslim Lebanese members of the WILPF were informed by this Muslim and Arab heritage. Future research might entail determining how Lebanese members perceived themselves culturally. Foster, 146; Libby Frank, "WILPF Middle East Mission Report," [1975], reel 103, *WILPF Papers*; Siba Farhoum to Edith Ballantyne, [1975], reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
20. Hannah Bernheim-Rosenzweig, International Education Committee Circular, 6 December 1961, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
21. In international correspondence and at meetings, WILPF members communicated primarily in English.
22. Mineke Bosch and Annemarie Kloosterman, eds., *Politics and Friendship: Letters from the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, 1902-1942*, trans. Nicky Williams and Mineke Bosch (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990), 15.
23. For example, following a disappointment at the IWSA Congress in 1911, Carrie Chapman Catt comforted Rosika Schwimmer by explaining, "We shall bind your wounds and give you soothing drinks and send you back recovered and ready for some other battle." Bosch and Kloosterman explain that IWSA members often referred to the alliance as a "distinct and separate empire of women, with Catt as the uncrowned queen surrounded by ladies-in-waiting, ambassadors, and subjects." *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Elizabeth Tapper, 1 November 1963, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
26. Anna Rantanen to Anissa Najjar, April 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
27. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 6, 197. Anderson points to the emergence of history as a discipline in Europe by the second quarter of the nineteenth century as contributing to the idea that nations are distinct communities. Anderson contends that the writing of histories within the context of national borders influenced citizens' "imagined" impression of belonging to the "community" of a nation. The development of such national histories informed citizens' perception of sharing a common historical bond not only with other citizens living within the nation's borders, but also with people who lived within those boundaries before the borders were even established. Although it may seem odd to use a study of nationalism to examine an organization committed to overcoming

- nationalism, Anderson's analysis is helpful in differentiating those factors which create a sense of community, whether or not national borders surround the community. *Ibid.*, 194-95, 197-98.
28. Bussey and Tims, 235-36.
 29. Bosch and Kloosterman, 16; Bosch and Kloosterman's study of the IWSA helped in the formation of this part of the analysis.
 30. Kay Camp, interview with author, Philadelphia, Pa., 17 May 1993.
 31. Libby Frank, interview with author, Philadelphia, Pa., 16 May 1993.
 32. Naomi Marcus, interview with author, Philadelphia, Pa., 17 May 1993.
 33. Foster, 29.
 34. Frank interview.
 35. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, May 1962, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 36. *Ibid.*, April 1964.
 37. Bussey and Tims, 221-22.
 38. Until 1974, members could join the League as either national section members or independent international members. Thus, although no Lebanon section existed in 1961, Wadia Khartabil was able to join the League as an international member. At the 1974 International Congress, the League eliminated this two-category membership; and from this time forward, all members joined as international members. "WILPF Membership and Pax et Libertas Bulletin," *Pax et Libertas*, 1974, reel 112, *WILPF Papers*.
 39. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, December 1961, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 40. *Ibid.*
 41. *Ibid.*
 42. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, May 1962, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*. As no official diplomatic ties existed between Israel and Lebanon, Israeli and Lebanese members corresponded by first sending communications to the Geneva headquarters. Headquarters would then forward any correspondence to the respective section. Bernheim-Rosenzweig helped to initiate this system in 1963. She was committed, at first, to the idea that the two sections have a means of directly addressing one another. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Tapper, 9 May 1963, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 43. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, May 1962, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 44. Susanne Saliternik and Hava Leshem, Israel Section Circular, September 1962, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 45. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, December 1961, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*; *Ibid.*, May 1962.
 46. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Tapper, 9 May 1963, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 47. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, January 1964, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 48. *Ibid.*
 49. Najjar to Ballantyne, [1973], reel 5, *WILPF Papers*; Lebanon Section Report on the Middle East, [1973], reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
 50. Ballantyne to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, 22 May 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*. In her correspondence to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Ballantyne quotes from Najjar's letter.
 51. Johanne Reutz-Gjermoe, "WILPF Mission to the Middle East," *Pax et Libertas* 32 (1967), reel 112, *WILPF Papers*. During the war, Israel occupied Jordan's West Bank, Syria's Golan Heights, and Egypt's Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula, bringing a population of more than one million Arabs under Israeli rule. Amos Elon, *The Israelis: Founders and Sons* (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 29.
 52. Bernheim-Rosenzweig, Israel Section Circular, December 1967, reel 78, *WILPF Papers*.
 53. *Ibid.*
 54. Foster, 65.

55. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Phoebe Cusden, 6 May 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
56. Boulding to the Officers and Members of the Lebanese and Israeli Sections of the WILPF, 21 January 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
57. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Boulding, 28 January 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
58. Enclosure 1 to Israel Section Circular, May 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*; Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 30 March 1971, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*; Bernheim-Rosenzweig, "The Story of Old-New Israel," [1975], *WILPF Papers*; Ibid., "Some Impediments to Peace in the Middle East"; Ibid., "Some Little Known Facts about the Middle East."
59. Eleanore Romberg to the Prime Minister of the Arab Republic of Syria, 2 November 1973, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
60. Najjar to Madame International President, December 1973, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
61. Malka Shulewitz to the *Pax et Libertas* Editor, 13 May 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
62. Ibid.
63. Resolutions Proposed by the Lebanon Section to the Eighteenth International Congress of the WILPF, November 1970, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
64. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to the WILPF International Executive Committee, 12 December 1970, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
65. Resolution Proposed by the U.S. Section to the Eighteenth International Congress of the WILPF, October 1970, reel 24, *WILPF Papers*.
66. Nelly Lehman, Report on the Eighteenth International Congress of the WILPF, [1971], reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
67. Ibid.
68. Naomi Marcus to Ballantyne, 31 July 1970, reel 24, *WILPF Papers*.
69. Ballantyne to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, 9 November 1972, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
70. Foster, 42.
71. Reutz-Gjermoe, Middle East Mission Report to the Eighteenth International Congress of the WILPF, December 1970, reel 24, *WILPF Papers*.
72. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 3 June 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
73. Lebanon Section Statement to National Sections and Members of the International Executive Committee, 6 June 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
74. Bernheim-Rosenzweig and Chava Manor to Boulding, 2 January 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*; Lebanon Section to the International Chairman, January 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
75. Boulding to the Officers and Members of the Lebanese and Israeli Sections of the WILPF, 21 January 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
76. Ibid.
77. Bosch and Kloosterman, 23-26. Bosch and Kloosterman's study helped in the formation of this section of the analysis.
78. Foster, 155.
79. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 6 August 1969, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
80. Ballantyne to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, 9 May 1970, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
81. Bosch and Kloosterman, 23. In their analysis of the IWSA, Bosch and Kloosterman argue that "the discourse of sisterhood allowed women to play with concepts of love and friendship in order to carry out a certain policy or to cover up less attractive dealings." Ibid., 28.
82. Ballantyne to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, 22 May 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
83. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 3 July 1973, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
84. Ballantyne to Bernheim-Rosenzweig, 22 May 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
85. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 9 June 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*.
86. Ibid.
87. Frank to Brenda Bailey, 15 October 1974, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
88. Ibid., 1 September 1974.

89. Frank to Shulewitz, 11 February 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
90. Frank to Najjar, 12 March 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
91. Kay Camp to Najjar and Shulewitz, 10 February 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*; Frank, "Report on WILPF Middle East Mission, 1975," 21 August 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
92. Ballantyne to Michael and Sabra Price, 15 May 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
93. Frank, "Report on WILPF Middle East Mission, 1975," 21 August 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
94. Frank interview.
95. As no WILPF section existed in Syria, Ballantyne and Frank met with members of the Federation of Syrian Women.
96. Frank interview.
97. Frank, "Report on WILPF Middle East Mission, 1975," 21 August 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
98. Frank to Najjar, 16 May 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
99. Frank, "Report on WILPF Middle East Mission, 1975," 21 August 1975, reel 103, *WILPF Papers*.
100. Ibid.
101. Foster, 80. What is often referred to as a "two-state solution" is the call for the creation of a Palestinian state next to Israel in either the West Bank or Gaza. The League's support for the inclusion of the PLO in any negotiations confronted the Israeli government's refusal to recognize the PLO. The government identified the PLO as a terrorist organization and prohibited Israeli citizens from meeting with members of terrorist groups. While the Israeli government was willing to meet with Palestinian representatives from the West Bank and Gaza, the majority of West Bank and Gaza citizens either were members of the PLO or supported the organization as their legitimate representative in any negotiations.
102. Frank interview.
103. Bernheim-Rosenzweig to Ballantyne, 9 June 1974, reel 5, *WILPF Papers*; Hazel Dobrin to Ballantyne, 13 May 1975, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*; Jenny Breuer to WILPF Headquarters, 14 April 1975, reel 79, *WILPF Papers*.
104. Ballantyne to Camp and Frank, 12 July 1978, Personal files of Libby Frank, Philadelphia, Pa.; Frank to Ruth Osborn, 13 May 1978, Personal files of Libby Frank.
105. Kay Camp, telephone interview with author, 3 June 1993. Camp read the letter over the telephone.
106. Frank interview.
107. Camp telephone interview.
108. Ibid.
109. Foster, 81.
110. Frank cannot recall Zamira's last name.
111. Frank interview.
112. Ibid.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

- Camp, Kay. Interview with author. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 17 May 1993.
 ——— Telephone interview with author, 3 June 1993.
- Frank, Libby. Interview with author. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 16 May 1993.
 ——— Personal files, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Marcus, Naomi. Interview with author. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 17 May 1993.
- Mitchell, Ducey, ed. *The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Papers, 1915-1978*. Sanford, NC: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1983. Microfilm.

Secondary sources

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Bosch, Mineke, and Annemarie Kloosterman, eds. *Politics and Friendship: Letters from the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, 1902-1942*. translated by Nicky Williams and Mineke Bosch. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990. Originally published as *Lieve Dr. Jacobs: Brieven uit de Wereldbond voor Vrouwenkiesrecht, 1902-1942* (1985).
- Bussey, Gertrude, and Margaret Tims. *Pioneers for Peace: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1915-1965*. 1965. Reprint. Oxford: Alden Press, 1980.
- Cott, Nancy F. *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835*. New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Elon, Amos. *The Israelis: Founders and Sons*. New York: Penguin Books, 1983.
- Foster, Catherine. *Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Hewitt, Nancy. "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s." In *Unequal Sisters: A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History*, edited by Ellen Carol DuBois and Vicki L. Ruiz. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, 1990.
- . "Sisterhood in International Perspective: Thoughts on Teaching Comparative Women's History." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 1 & 2 (1988): 22-32.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth-Century America." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1 (1975): 1-29.