

War, Language and Gender, What New Can be Said? Framing the Issues¹

Anita Taylor & M.J. Hardman

"The dominant voice of militarized masculinity and decontextualized rationality speaks so loudly in our culture, it will remain difficult for any other voices to be heard until . . . that voice is delegitimated." - Carol Cohn ("Sex and Death" 717)

We take seriously Cohn's argument that the language of the ostensibly rational and objective world of national defense policy is a "gloss," and an "ideological curtain" masking important gender-related motives. We will argue here that the gloss of which she speaks is, in fact, a powerful cover story used to mask the role of violence (and war as its ultimate expression) in perpetuating a worldview. We pursue the objective Cohn articulated, to deconstruct the power of the "dominant voice of militarized masculinity" so that alternative views, alternative voices can be heard. We seek to expose what the cover story obscures.

Linking the Concepts of War, Language and Gender: Identifying the Cover Story

Frankly, given the huge amount of attention these issues have received, one could wonder what is left to say. We intend to refocus on some important work by those who preceded us in discussing the links among war, language and gender; and to add a new framework that may help bring the available information to wider attention. Our effort is needed because patterns of gender linked war and war language persist, even after literally thousands of pages of scholarship exposing the links between language and war and gender and violence. Too few people take such analyses seriously, in part because the matters explored run counter to the overall cultural narrative they intend to deconstruct. Thus, continuing the work of sorting out the links among war, language and gender, while no easy task, seems essential.

We know, and have known for many years, that war rhetoric relies on violent language². We know that violence links to gender³. Many examinations of the gendered language of violence of all kinds, including war, have been made⁴. Language has been shown as a window into culture and into the thought patterns of a culture⁵. It has been examined as a tool of rationalizing and justifying violence, including war, such as in the extended conversation about "just" wars⁶. Gender has been studied for its role in justifying violence, causing violence, and as it manifests violence⁷.

All these works provide remarkable insights. We know that violence is a many-headed hydra. Violence ranges from the massive annihilations of wars among nations to the similar and, perhaps, somewhat less severe damages of both physical and psychological dominations done by political structures, churches, and economic institutions. It includes individuals hurting other individuals, in all kinds of ways. So, too, is gender many faceted. The regular *Women and Language* reader well understands the arguments that gender must be seen as more than an individual's sex; it must be seen,

simultaneously, as: a characteristic of (some) languages; sets of expectations for individuals' behaviors, attitudes and feelings; sets of social structures created and recreated through human interactions; complex webs of relationships; ideology; interactive outcomes of perceptions and self-presentations⁸, thus always in progress and in relations. The scholarly and public intellectual worlds have not completed their work of understanding the complex and pervasive phenomena of gender. We know, however, that most people live their lives within the frames of some (several) conceptions of gender and Bem's work demonstrates that for many humans gender frames constitute the primary lens through which they see the world. Especially significant, a particular conception of gender is embedded in the foundations of the huge and powerful political structures of the modern United States and the associated global economic and political structures⁹. Thus, it is critical that we understand gender as these currently dominant cultures constitute it and are constituted, not because their view is more accurate, but because those cultures wield massive economic and political power, power that spreads their violence generating views of gender. U. S. cultural views contaminate (for good and ill) virtually every culture they touch.

Languages guide the construction (and reconstruction) of all these structures, ideologies, and interactions. Languages provide the core to build the frames of gender that "are" the worlds (the ideologies and institutions and rules for interactions) within which we live our lives and whereby those institutions constrain our lives. Hence, sorting out some of the gender links among war, language and gender, while no easy task, seems essential. That is what we set out to do with this special issue. We believe a feminist perspective can offer some alternative insights, if only by juxtaposing analyses and raising new questions from the contradictory conclusions.

We begin with a look back at Riane Eisler's important feminist analysis, one far too often dismissed. Eisler examined the development of western civilization and posited the claim that in pre-"historic" times our Neolithic forbears organized their cultures around veneration of a female life force, life-giving and nurturant, symbolized in her title by the chalice. These early cultures, she argued, were egalitarian and did not reflect hierarchical structures.¹⁰ She contrasted these early cultures, egalitarian and obviously peaceful, with the later replacements, which she believes, the Greeks and the Hebrews exemplify. These replacement cultures, organized around a primary male god, were both hierarchical and warlike. These cultures, she posits, needed war *because* they were hierarchical. Because the previous (and preferred) state of human beings was to live

in egalitarian relationships, people did not (do not) submit easily to being dominated; hence the elites of the hierarchies had to develop ideologies to justify the domination, which include the cover story we referred to above. They built structures to enact the ideologies and they needed violence, including wars, to enforce the structures. Simply put, dominator patterns create violence; humans do not docilely accept being dominated. As the ultimate exemplar of violence, wars inevitably result from dominator cultures.¹¹

Recent rediscoveries in Peru lend additional support to the thesis that violence is not essential to the construction of civilization¹². Caral, where archeological excavations continue, provides evidence that early, sophisticated cultures were not limited to the European locales Eisler described. Caral, a large and complex site, reveals an at least 4600 year old city, estimated to have had a population of many thousands. It thrived as a center of commerce and civilization for at least 700 years, perhaps several hundred years longer (Haas, Creamer and Ruiz), and its archeological site contains no evidence of fortifications, weapons or other signs of needed defense.

Such ancient records belie much of modern patriarchal myth. Clearly, human societies can be organized to live without war. We are persuaded that the key to rise of violence can be found in cultural changes from egalitarian patterns to dominator patterns. Analyses locate the causes of the change to dominator patterns variably: economic forces arising from agriculture, such as shortages of resources; acquisitiveness; the psycho-historical arguments of "human nature" as exemplified in the concept of rational "man"¹³. Whatever the many economic, socio-biological and psychological "causes" of the shift, important for our analysis is the web¹⁴: introduction of hierarchy into human relationships, including hierarchal gender relationships; the necessity for violence to enforce the hierarchy, thus tying gender to violence.

Scholarly searches for unraveling the various webs have focused in large part on the ideology and the social and institutional structures.¹⁵ From these analyses have come good understandings of patriarchies¹⁶. Mary Clark's article in this publication summarizes the relationships among patriarchy (by definition gendered) and war. To be specific to our current concerns, the existing "superpower" and its cohort global economic and political systems are patriarchal. That these systems are patriarchal clearly links war and gender in the current world; and the link will persist through time as long as the nation / organization "in power" has patriarchal form.

Finding the causes of hierarchy buried within ancient records must and will go on. But we cannot wait the final word on why patriarchy arose to continue the task of finding ways to destabilize it. What confronts us today is global dominance of patriarchies that rely on violent enforcement of their hierarchal patterns. As we considered how to frame papers in this issue, we have been haunted by a question posed to Riane Eisler at a presentation not long after the publication of *The Chalice*

and the Blade: As long as any dominator culture exists with virtually unrestricted access to resources, how can alternative, nondominator cultures resist? Recent world history seems to answer, they cannot. Resistance to powerful dominator cultures and states seems to require building similarly powerful dominator cultures for "self-protection." Clark's comparison in this issue of religious rhetoric of three leaders and our own list of similarities between George W. Bush & Osama Bin Laden (note 50) illustrate this well. Such need for resistance may explain, in part, the easy spread of western cultural influences even into cultures where people abhor many of its aspects. Patterns of gendered domination replicate easily; they export well. They seem to provide defense against unwelcome outside influences. They carry the powerful cover story that "you, too, can have the freedom to decide how you will live your life," with the "you" here seeming to refer to everyone, when only the ones on top in dominator relationships have much real freedom. This analysis convinces us that dominator cultures can only be changed, if they can be changed, from within.

The pattern, of course, is not without exceptions. Much resistance has and does exist; Western hegemony is not complete. Among the Jaqi cultures, for example, a non-gendered view of the sexes remains, in spite of the incursions to the contrary over 500 years¹⁷. Jaqi non-gendered culture is not, of course, undamaged; and current schooling practices are further eroding what has survived. On the other hand, both there and in other places throughout the world, people are attempting to maintain and/or recover what has been lost. Such examples can be found among First Nations, north and south¹⁸.

Recognizing that powerful patriarchies can only be changed from within is also not new. That is, in part, the entire basis of modern feminisms. Feminist scholars have worked to destabilize patriarchies by scholarship in economics¹⁹, politics²⁰, sociology²¹, philosophy²², linguistics²³, science²⁴, among other fields. These findings help expose how patriarchal cultures damage individuals, groups, and societies. The work of scholars represented by publishing in *Women and Language* has examined the role of language in perpetuating the webs of dominator relationships²⁵. We have focused on particular languages and language patterns; we have used a wider focus and examined discourse structures and rhetoric²⁶. We have added to understanding the links among domination, gender and violence by showing their intricate interconnections with language²⁷.

We want to add here a focus on the narrative and the discourse. Whatever might have caused the initial shift from egalitarian to dominator (hierarchal) patterns, most parties do not find the resulting relationships comfortable. Thus, to perpetuate those relationships, the language through which people see and structure their worlds, and the narratives that frame those views and values, must validate the system. Dominator structures must, in essence, cover up the unease, the damage, the disfunctionality of hierarchal relationships. Once we

recognize this 'cover story' for what it is; we can turn to un-covering what lies below.

Delinking the Concepts: Deconstructing the Cover Story

One thing is clear: Violence and masculinity must be disassociated. Since patriarchies rely on that link, breaking the connection is key. How can such delinking take place? It needs to be fundamental, as basic as the postulates that guide thinking. Powerful dominator cultures must be changed from within. That means we start with language, with how each of us, daily, talks, thinks, writes and interacts. Our everyday talk is how we begin to enact a different paradigm. Of course, larger scale political and social action are badly needed, but without changing the language, without changing how we think using the language and the stories we tell in its comfort, we make social action immeasurably more difficult.

W & L readers know that language changes all the time. Some changes occur without our realizing it, as for example metaphorical uses no longer recognized as metaphorical (e.g., "fighting" disease). Other changes result from overt political action. We've seen that happen in the U.S. in the last 30 years: introduction of Ms. into the language; dropping male so-called generics; making it socially inappropriate to use derogative terms to describe women, people of color, American Indians, gays and lesbians, etc. Here we suggest additional strategies of overt language change (and, therefore, the associated thinking) to begin to deconstruct the story of patriarchy and thus un-cover the damages from the hierarchies it requires. We need alternative narratives, new metaphors, and different discourse structures. And we need to "see" the connections among them all and between each and the cultural stories upholding patriarchal hierarchies.

Different narratives

The narratives of a culture that reflect and teach its world view cannot simply be discarded. Rather, we need to pull back the screen and reveal the cover stories for what they do. We need to illustrate the disconnect between what a story claims (e.g., "we are a peaceful people, driven to violence or war only when threatened") contrasted to facts of violence in the culture.

It won't be sufficient merely to de-stabilize the existing stories. We need to discover ways to let new narratives in without strengthening the old ones by threatening them. If a new story is just one more relatively isolated tale, it will be ignored. If it is a story sufficiently powerful to pose a threat, the force of existing structures will be mobilized to squelch it. The process of destroying challenges can, ironically, reinforce the dominant narrative. Thus, finding alternatives that actually expose the cover sufficiently to weaken it poses huge challenges.

One possibility: Turn to science fiction. Our colleagues in that genre have provided many ways to unleash the imagination. They have provided, for example, several alternative views of gender. "Serious" scholars need to pay more attention to these. Among these pieces are some that have shown us a dominator culture with a different link to gender, e.g., *Egalia's Daughters* and *Maerlande Chronicles* (Brantenberg and Vonarburg). *Egalia's* world is virtually a mirror of 1980s western culture except that it is matriarchal. *Maerlande Chronicles* constructs a future world after the patriarchy has ecologically destroyed the previously known world. Other writers show us worlds that have no gender or places where people are gendered differently, or they envision cultures with many and variable genders, and those with genders similar to those of modern western civilizations but no hierarchies²⁸. And, while it is not presented as science fiction, Elliot's article in this issue begins to introduce such an alternative vision as well.

Alternative visions serve well because they provide antidote to the persistent spectre of essentialism. In spite of much evidence showing that the relationships among biology and gender vary so much that nothing about the human body is fully determinative of gender relationships, the concept that biology is destiny retains its firm grip on both scholarly thought and the popular imagination.²⁹ Some sociobiologists still claim that evolution favored aggression in males, a needed link to make war³⁰. We cannot escape the suspicion that much of the motivation behind the current popular and scholarly drives to unearth genetic links to behavior resides in resistance to the vast changes in gender relationships that have occurred in the western world in the past twenty years. Whatever motivates it, a strong urge to turn correlations among sex and dispositions, biology and behavior into causations exists. Beliefs in causal links between biology and aggressive male behavior persist in the face of clear evidence that women can be violent; that women dominators engage in wars, offensive as well as defensive; and that dominated women "fight back" at their dominators just as do dominated men. Such beliefs ignore that men are not violent. As Henri Myrtinnen's paper in this issue shows, violent masculinity must be carefully taught. We do not find it fanciful to conclude that one major reason so many institutions (including media) of dominator cultures work so hard to ensure the violence / masculinity link is that the culture needs the violence to shore up the hierarchy. Since the human animal is not naturally violent, to make it so is indeed difficult acculturation.³¹

In addition to science fiction, we need new stories—or to unearth (dis-cover, to honor Daly's analysis) and reinvigorate some old ones. Because the dominant paradigm needs violence to sustain it, our modern western cultures have created and perpetuated narratives that glorify war, warriors, and the leaders who make war. Modern western culture narratives have submerged and subverted alternative stories. We need alternative narratives, such as those discussed by Kaplan and

Vickroy in this issue: stories that tell of the futility and horror rather than the heroism and glory of war. What if we thought of all wars as failures, failures of peacekeeping? What if leaders who could not maintain peace were seen as failures? What if male violence were shamed, instead of being glorified (e.g., football "heros") or excused as "boys will be boys"? What if we retold stories that showed violence as continuum, so that we saw harsh words to differ from violent sport or warfare as degrees of difference in a single variable? These would help destabilize narratives that categorize the most obviously violent persons as deviant and the extremely violent as deranged and ignore all the teaching that went into making them so. As it is now we develop narratives glorifying warlike quests, or actual wars, that establish "manhood." Suppose our stories glorified the person who refused to fight, not just the "manly" hero that "won" the war? Why not childbirth as heroic quest or worthy of ceremony?³² Or suppose we had rituals that emulated some American Indian rituals that required warriors returning from battles in which they had to kill another to undergo purification rites?³³

What if our hero narratives were about peacemakers? Suppose we *really* paid attention to the nonviolent values of Gandhi and Martin Luther King and even Jesus whose own reported language displayed both a pacifist and feminist sensibility in spite of what churches--mostly church fathers--have done with his words over the centuries. Oh, some say, we do honor those stories. To which we respond, which stories do we memorialize? Take as illustrative the "national mall" in Washington DC, a site recognized by most visitors as a symbolic center for the United States. The mall has memorials (big ones) to three wars; it has one plaque to honor Martin Luther King Jr., That two foot bronze square lies flat on the ground, nearly unmarked, hidden in a grove of trees far from where one might expect it. The black marble gash in the earth engraved with more than 58,000 names memorializing the war dead in Vietnam symbolically reflects how gradually nations can enter the deep abyss that war can become; it was hugely controversial. It did not "earn" full acceptance until a "heroic" statute of (male) soldiers was appended. Only much later, after much pressure, was a statute of female participation in the war added: a statute of nurses caring for a wounded soldier. The nurses' location, separated from the others, is hidden in tourist season by a thick curtain of leafy trees.

Two other mall monuments memorialize World War II and the Korean conflict. Where is the matching memorial to the peacemakers? Their narratives do not get retold in the same way as those of generals and presidents or prime ministers who send the generals to war. Sometimes they don't get retold at all. Washington DC is filled with statues of generals; where are the statues of peacemakers? A statute of Gandhi stands far from the mall, along Embassy Row, a place visited by few tourists to the city. Arguably, the Lincoln Memorial could be considered to honor a peacemaker, but Lincoln is primarily remembered for "winning" the U. S. Civil War,

a horrible and bloody conflict that saved a union. That war, noble as the cause of ending slavery may have been, was not about making peace; it was to preserve a nation. Most of his posterity do not know Lincoln as a peacemaker; he did not live to implement his ideas of making peace, ideas beautifully expressed in his second inaugural. To repeat: Where are the statues of peacemakers? How many peacemakers or war resisters can even the educated audience of this publication name?

Another perspective should be considered in *Women and Language*, a feminist publication. The U. S. national capitol is adorned with statutes of, literally, dozens of people, the vast majority of them men of war. We should ask the question, Where are the group statues? Clearly, statutes of individuals, warlike or not, replicate a hierarchical model that places one, the individual, a "winner" in an elevated state among the population. While it is accurate that the various war memorials mostly symbolize groups and group efforts, it also is worth noting that the groups are honored when they have died in violent confrontations. Thus, dying in battles warrants commemoration; groups seeking peace do not.

To turn from after the war memorializing to discussion of it in progress, consider the approach to the U. S. invasion of Iraq in 2003. How much on-going media and official attention did six million people in countries all across the world marching for peace in a coordinated fashion receive? Media in many countries covered these stories; U. S. media virtually ignored them. What a story that should have been! When have six (or more) million people ever come together for any positive purpose? In this case those outpourings of desire for peace crossed languages, cultures, nations. Yet in the U.S., the story barely registered in popular awareness, received minimal media coverage, and did not linger in collective memory³⁴. If we genuinely believed in peace, those narratives would have been celebrated as examples of the human spirit.

In telling different stories, we need to continue the work of showing how narratives contribute to building our gendered identities. Much has been done. More is needed. We must remain vigilant to how such analyses and narratives are marginalized and find better ways to achieve popular media exposure for them. We also need stories that show how we "other" those we battle against (see below).

Once again, sadly, these calls are not new. Elise Boulding (*Cultures*) and Helen Caldicott made such points, to name only two of many public spokespeople for foregrounding peace narratives. The problem is building a cultural resonance for such stories that compete with narratives of heroic wars and violent activities. Authors in this issue bring some of these narratives to our attention. Kimble's article is instructive as he shows the process in reverse. Where U. S. wartime narratives highlighted the cowardly (read surprise) attack on Pearl Harbor by the "Japs" and the cruelty of the "Krauts," postwar stories turned them back into human beings, "like" ourselves. We hope this *W & L* special issue might invite and inspire

readers from all nations and cultures to revive or contribute stories that honor peace and peacemakers. We need more such analyses and more attention to how narratives participate in creating a dehumanized other who can be bombed or beheaded without significant remorse. We need to resurrect narratives that show how ordinary people, human and warm-blooded as any of us, can through hopelessness and violent suppression lose human empathy, toward self and other. Such stories can show how acts of the powerful elicit violence by the powerless.

We need to insist that "history" include stories about ALL the players of the past. Until recently, women were not even part of western history unless they were queens or otherwise rich and powerful. We not only need monuments celebrating peaceful movements and people (King, Gandhi), we need recognition of women and feminine achievements. For example Jane Adams' creation of garbage collection dramatically improved urban life in America; where is the monument to that? It does not exist. Indeed, we barely recognize the daily heroism of the people who do such unpleasant and low ranked work (LeGuin, "Carrier Bag"). Clara Barton's work in the U. S. Civil War created the Red Cross, an institution that has brought relief to millions, world-wide for more than a century along with the counterpart it inspired, The Red Crescent. Where do we memorialize that work?

Mentioning these notable achievements in improving the material conditions of life for the weak and powerless raises important issues that need more examination. Even as such tales provide needed additions to our historical narratives, these cases exemplify the bandaid approach³⁵. They involve larger issues of gender as well as language. Seeing efforts to ameliorate the pain caused by oppressive structures as bandaids shows what happens when the cause of violence is not addressed. Many people do much good work helping to relieve the suffering of others. Paradoxically, doing such good works perpetuates the system itself. This highlights the power of hierarchical systems. Peacemakers in such systems fix, patch and repair, but never solve. Then when people see no solution, the cycle repeats, often worse with outcomes of more violence, more repression, more economic control, more suffering. As mentioned, the Red Cross / Red Crescent are examples; so is social work and much charitable activity. The metaphor spotlights the complexity of creating peaceful processes in hierarchical systems.

We must "uncover" (dis-cover) alternative narratives. Stories that don't support the dominator culture have been ignored. Thus, many years passed before research about the bonobos as among our primate ancestors to become known beyond a tiny circle of primatologists. Similarly, what mainstream historical narratives to this day include information about deliberate small pox introduction into remote Indian villages? Widely told narratives of aggression and battles ignore basic data showing that survival of humans as a species over millennia has depended upon cooperation (Clark, McElvaine). Our

human ancestors survived as groups not lone individuals; just as survival of the human embryo to grow into a fetus and eventually be birthed requires cooperation among a growing set of cells (Gonzalez-Crussi). Species survival depended on cooperative hunting, food finding and gathering. It required cooperation in building shelters against the climate and to protect from predators, mostly large carnivorous animals. Early humans over the millennia during which our large brains evolved did a lot more hiding from predators than engaging in "heroic defense" against them or "battling" other groups of humans. Later humans cooperated in agricultural production and infrastructure creation (roads, ports and ships on Minoa; irrigation canals pyramids, roads--the whole infrastructure of a very large city that was also clearly the crossroads for markets--at Caral and nearby cities)³⁶. The archeological records of these ancient sites show little evidence of violent behavior between humans (no such evidence at Caral). Narratives that illustrate the need for cooperation for humans to survive need to be revived and fostered. We need to resurface these stories (LeGuin "Carrier Bag"), to correct the widely believed "man the hunter," and "man the warrior" survival stories. We need narratives that bring the much, largely ignored 'factual' evidence of humans working together for survival into our cultural and political histories.

We also need narratives that recognize as complicit in violence those of us who only peripherally play roles in the narratives of violence. Beyond recognizing how many good people provide band aids to promote healing from the effects of dominance driven violence, we need narratives that show those of us who think of ourselves as peaceful and nonviolent how much we actually share responsibility for the violence of war (and other forms of violence as well). For example, wars cannot be conducted without support of the entire military industrial complex that Dwight Eisenhower (a military man) warned us against³⁷. Our narratives need to show how *all* participants in those industries play some part in the wars that result or the violence produced by weapons³⁸. All who drive cars when alternative means of transport are available, or who do not demand from their government that revenues make available alternative means help perpetuate the violence that results from petroleum ownership and extraction. All who proudly use diamonds to symbolize their love support the cartel that limits the supply to keep diamonds precious and thus play a part in the vicious diamond trade that slaughters children. We need narratives of how all profit from the violence of a few. We cannot continue to ignore the role of the world's demand for oil supporting the current violence in Iraq, Iran, places in Russia, Africa, South America and other places around the world. Narratives of complicity need to be told, re-vitalized, un-covered.

In this list of needed narratives we have named no unwritten or untold stories. The narratives to which we refer have all been written into (some) historical documents, poetry, movies. The task for the concerned academic is to honor those stories. We can be sure

students in our classes read them; student theatre groups perform them; community book groups read them. We especially need to be sure "history" courses include alternative texts. As scholars we need to discover more such stories, those buried in the "history" written from the perspective of the violent patriarchies. We cannot leave these narratives buried because "history is written by the winners."

New metaphors

A task related to developing new narratives is infusing our talk (and thought) with new metaphors. The first challenge will be to notice metaphors when used. Common metaphors that we mostly fail to notice as metaphor when using them fill our talk and writing. Often we do not even realize they are metaphorical. Oye-wumi pointed out such an example in discussing the influence of English thinking in understanding Yoruba language and culture: the English equation of seeing with knowing. To say I see, meaning I understand, would rarely be recognized as metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson point out that most people consider metaphors to be primarily matters of language, style issues that are peripheral to sense making and largely decorative. On the contrary, they argue, not only is metaphor "pervasive in everyday life, . . . [but that] Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical" (3). Many narratives we have discussed above rely heavily on metaphor, just as the English reliance on "seeing" as understanding is a fundamental thought pattern, not just a matter of language. And since metaphors frame thinking, they heavily influence how we perceive; they have far more influence than "mere" talk.

We focus in this paper on metaphors related to violence to expose the interrelation of sex and violence metaphors and to suggest alternatives. We cite examples from U. S. English and we invite scholars of other languages to offer comparative analyses. Such research is badly needed to support the delinking of violence, gender and language. In U. S. English, violence and dominance metaphors pervade the language, almost always with gendered implications, usually with gendered ranking as we discuss below. Because of patriarchal structures, violence and dominance are male identified even when women do the acts. Hierarchy is involved in talk of 'climbing the corporate ladder,' of working 'hard' to 'get ahead' in life. It's there when we seek to 'come out on top' to 'win a competition' for a job, to 'neutralize' a opponent's (read adversary's) position. A suitor even 'wins' the hand of a lover. Violence occurs repeatedly in our talk. We 'fight' cancer, 'battle' diseases, 'attack' problems. U. S. presidents declare "war" on poverty, drugs, terror, etc. Dwight Eisenhower, for example, declared in 1954 that adding the words, "under God," to the U. S. Pledge of Allegiance would "strengthen those spiritual weapons" needed by the country in its struggles with hostile outside forces, in this case, the USSR and Communism (qtd in Baer). Joanna Russ' titles her book

reflecting on a lifetime of feminist struggle, *What are We Fighting For?* Nicholson's collection of writings by 20th century U. S. feminists shows repeatedly how conceiving of the struggle for women's rights as a battle against a gendered hierarchy framed their thinking. Readers may check themselves on this one: Simply try to pass a single day without using a violent metaphor. That quickly illustrates how both ranking and violence pervade our language.

Cohn's path-making "Sex and Death" demonstrates well the gendered implications of our violence metaphors. She shows how the men engaged in the Manhattan Project conceived the urgency of their work as a race they had to win. We can easily understand that conception in terms of the actual war in which their sponsoring government was engaged. But Brian Easlea, has shown how the competition to win did not end with the war, and was often as much between teams as nations. Cohn goes on to show pervasive use of sexualized metaphors decades after the stunning 'success' of the Manhattan project, as her contemporaries in the 1980s engaged in a 'cold' war (a chilling double metaphor that became a name). Easlea's *Fathering the Unthinkable* now, sadly, out of print gives chilling examples of language infused with sexualized metaphors for atomic weapons, contrasted with the curiously desexualized (dehumanized, thoroughly othered) victims when such weapons actually kill people: Collateral damage describes noncombatant casualties; mutual assured destruction, reduced to MAD, refers to nuclear holocaust.

When we attend to our language patterns we quickly begin to 'see' the pervasive gendered violence. While at work on this chapter, we heard a news story about nations' various ways of involvement in the Iraq war, in which the reporter described Japan's "pacifist" Post WWII constitution, which does not allow troops to be in combat abroad as a "military castration, born of Japanese aggression of 30s & 40s . . ." (Gifford). Seemingly simple daily activities, especially in childhood, reflect the gendering of violence and dominance, beginning with the accusations of "girl" or "don't act like a girl" hurled at very young boys. The gendered verbal bullying extends into adult lives as football coaches and drill sergeants berate recruits as "ladies" or "old women." We need to "name" (see discussion below) the process of using the terms of 'sissy' and 'girly' to insult boys, a process we saw the California governor use in 2004, trying to intimidate legislators by calling them "girly men."

Again, a reader self-check might be instructive. Listen to your talk and those around you. Note how often in very short span of time you will hear, and say, fight, attack, destroy, target, aim, etc. When native speakers of U. S. English set out to eliminate violent metaphors from their talk the effort can at first be nearly paralyzing.

Once we see and hear the metaphors in our talk, we then can begin to change them. Mary Clark's article in this volume has good suggestions. Also useful are works of Elgin, and Lakoff & Johnson. We need to break the sex, war and sports trilogy that metaphorizes war as a

game and turns sport into war. We suggest referring to Hardman's report from a workshop that sought alternatives for metaphors of competition and violence ("Metaphorical Alternatives." The report includes dozens of examples. We need constant attention to (easy phrasing here would be 'we need to fight the impulse' to) talking in ways that avoid violent metaphors. We need to follow the model of bell hooks who never writes of the feminist "fight" for freedom from oppression; she always uses the verb/noun "struggle."³⁹ We need to learn, and make habitual, rejection of violent metaphors in our talk.

Alternative discourse structures

We approach here a huge task. In the space available we will do little more than present outlines of arguments and point readers toward resources that can provide more depth and insight. We look first at a pattern of gendered ranking, derived from some fundamental postulates on which English language and thought are based. Then we examine the impact of two valued thinking and associated language; the power of naming (labeling); and the necessity to keep the agent, the active element, in focus. Regarding each discourse structure, we note how each previously identified process links with ranking to create an other against which violence is justified. This section concludes with a call for action as we talk and teach for change.

Gendered hierarchy: The basic postulates of English. Here we call attention to foundational analysis found in M. J. Hardman's concept of derivational thinking.⁴⁰ Through derivational thinking English grammaticalizes ranking and genders it. Derivational thinking can be found in American English in almost every idea expressed and sentence spoken. It involves a gendered hierarchy principle reflected in what psychologists would call a cognitive schema. But by whatever name, we argue it influences how users construe the world to "be".⁴¹

Derivational thinking involves three interlocking postulates. Hardman identifies a postulate as a concept "manifested structurally across all the levels of a grammar within a culture" ("Levels" 42) that functions in ways that all native speakers reflect and use it even when they cannot state the rules that prescribe it. Hardman named three postulates in U. S. English. The involve number, ranking (the comparative / superlative), and sex-based gender. The first two, by themselves, do not appear to involve gender, but because the three mutually reinforce one another they both reflect and create gendered thinking. We summarize the three postulates with the following trilogy: Number is important; number one is most important; number one is masculine.

The first postulate, of number (number is important), reflects that, with few exceptions, English speakers must consider number whenever they talk. Number matters. To speak in English, one must make many decisions about number, not least being whether the subject of the sentence is singular or plural, which then determines how

one talks about that subject. Apparent exceptions to the postulate of number appear in unmodified imperatives (get out, be careful). But even in these cases, the speaker addresses a plural or singular addressee, and thinks accordingly.

Imperatives imply a clear sense of the second postulate, that one should almost always rank when comparing two or more items. When a speaker assumes the right to give another orders or instructions it implies rank, a situation not found in all languages. The ranking postulate reflects the speaker's pattern of comparing in a ranking manner. Native speakers of U. S. English understand (and repeatedly use) the postulate of ranking. They easily and often apply the comparative / superlative principle (you are wise; she is wiser; I am wisest). Other language scholars also now recognize comparison as a primary language category, for example, Vit Bubenik, who writes, "Noun (and adjective) would be defined as a primary grammatical category the domain of which includes sub-categories of *gender*, *number*, *case* (plus *comparison* with the adjective)" (70). [Emphasis in the original]

With the second postulate, reflected in a conclusion that number one is most important, the interlocking and negative effects of the gendered hierarchy appear. The ranking postulate has two premises: First, ranking is almost always appropriate; second, singular ranks highest. In absence of superior explanations favoring plural, singular is the default position.⁴² Absent this ranking postulate comparisons need not disparage or disempower. Conceivably, comparisons could be just that, noting similarities and differences among items (concepts, things, etc.). For something to be similar or different from something else might be interesting, and such comparisons would be ways to learn, ways we come to know the world. However, U. S. English turns comparing into ranking. Related items are rarely just compared.

The ranking postulate makes the concept of hierarchy part of the grammar. Ranking makes comparisons insidiously dangerous. Turn the process of comparing into ranking, and any items seen as related become not just different from, but more or less, better or worse, than each other. A rank COULD be merely a description of quantities. A biological hierarchy with which we are familiar, for example, ranks animal species according to complexity. So primates rank as more complex than protozoa (and many phyla in between). But the underlying pressure in U. S. English drives ranking toward a value comparison. The conclusion that more complex animals, with humans as the apex of course, are superior to the simple ones seems "natural." In spite of a practical or philosophical and intellectual understanding that organisms, simple and complex, intertwine in an ecology requiring both the single celled and the complex for survival, (the human could not survive without the bacterium, for example) humans and their primate cousins have highest value. Such a mental framework drives the conclusion that the most valuable "deserves" to rule, the

rest to serve. And, it suggests, only one can be most valuable.

The third postulate (number one is male) supplies the connection that genders the hierarchy principle. The postulate, that the singular is male, male-identified or masculine, results in preferring male over not-male. In the absence of known or assigned gender, male or male-identification will be assigned. Ranking object and subject within a sentence, and then assigning preferred gender to these grammatical slots, provides an example of derivational thinking that is also grammatical, involving the three postulates. Such assignment underlies our linking passivity and victimization (object status) to femininity and assigning agentiveness (subject status) to masculinity. Thus, if anything bad befalls one, it's the woman's fault; if anything good or worthwhile is done, men do it. Simply put, male is standard (an idea Bem described as androcentrism) and all else is deviant. Again, note that without the principle of hierarchy, to be different (i.e., not male) would not, in itself, be deficient. But with the principle of hierarchal thinking (ranking), different becomes deficient. Hence male and male-identified are preferred, no explanation required. For the sexes not to be ranked, for female-identified (or male-identified) to be simply 'different' requires major mental gymnastics. For female or female-identified to be just different not deviant or deficient calls for explanation. That western thinkers use the ranking postulate explains why so many critics of Eisler read her to claim that ancient matriarchies (hierarchies) existed, rather than what she actually argued: that pre-'historic' cultures were egalitarian. The ranking postulate also explains why in sport or other "games" contests declaring a single winner are preferred to several or many winners. The contest that doesn't end in declaring one of the contestants superior becomes suspicious or degraded.

Of course, recognizing male and masculine (male-identified) as preferred is not new in feminist scholarship⁴³. What's new in Hardman's formulation of the three postulates are the links and the focus on the interactive nature of the elements. Through talk the links are reinforced sentence by sentence, day by day. The postulates reinforce themselves through constant use. When we recognize the near inevitability of ranking any two items seen as related, because only one can be most valued; and that such ranking will be deemed almost always appropriate; and gender will be involved in the items so compared, we reveal the deeply anchored nature of valuing male or male-identified over female or female-identified speech and thought. The familiarity and constant iteration of these interactive elements make change difficult and show why the links between definitions of masculinity and violence are so pernicious.

Because of the central role of hierarchy in generating violence, we need to remain especially alert to it in our talk. We need to recognize how ranking is counterproductive and to remember how consistently it generates resistance among those not "at the top." Especially those of us who think in English must resist the

elevation of one. We must quit talking as if to be good means to be number one; and as if people who aren't number one, are "not good." We need to think 'different and equal / equal because we are different – not different but equal, which denies both sides & implies ranking. We need to work hard at eliminating all unnecessary ranking comparisons, especially those involving people, from our talk; and we need to guard carefully against turning difference into deficit. We need to heed the caution of the Kesh in LeGuin's *Always Coming Home*.

Like and different are quickening words,
Brooding and hatching.
Better and worse are eggsucking words,
They leave only the shell. (313)

Resist two-valued thinking (Isness). An especially pernicious pattern in language is the two-valued orientation, reflected in English in the verb, 'to be'. This verb typically takes the form 'is', 'are', 'was', 'were', and 'am'. The two-valued orientation of 'is' and its counterpart, 'is not', demonstrate categorical perspectives that become problematic when applied to a non categorical world. Such an application occurs when the typical English speaker thinks in opposites: hot and cold, weak and strong, war and peace. If in fact any of these abstractions could be concretized, the accurate categories would be hot and not hot, peaceful and not peaceful, etc. Two-valued orientation in Western thinking has deep roots with English not the only language where it's found. Aristotle and all his many disciples over the centuries exemplify it well. No exposition of it provides new insight to readers of *Women and Language*. Yet we live surrounded by cultures that consistently lead us to forget that in our perceiving and our thinking and our language we use a seemingly simple verb to impose two-valued categorical structures on the world.

The verb 'to be' is one of the unique features of Indo-European languages, and even within these languages, the functions vary. Many languages have nothing analogous, including the Jaki languages Hardman has written about. This verb carries with it features of eternal and absolute. Using this verb suggests a universalism we hesitate to challenge. If we do question the assumptions underlying any such sentence, we do so only with the verb itself-replying 'is not', and thus find ourselves within two-valued thinking. Thus, the sentence "to be violent is human nature" carries with it the implication of permanent, absolute, immutable characteristics. Responses suggested by isness carry with them, non-existence: 'violence is not human nature'. Such a construction loses the perception of human nature as a set of possibilities, in that we can find violence together with empathy, generosity, kindness, meanness--all appearing as possibilities of the human genome. Each possibility requires particular environments for expression that all of us participate in constructing. As we look at language, violence and gender, and the effects of the isness of English, we find that the two-valued construction tends to

obscure the possible human variability. For example, think of the cooperation it takes for traffic to function such that we can arrive at our destination, even as we metaphorize such cooperation as violence (e.g. 'fight traffic'). If we can stay away from the two-valued 'is/is not' thinking--a task the grammar of our language makes difficult--it opens wide possibilities for "human nature."

We need to remember that all knowledge comes from human beings, that whatever knowledge we have resides in a human brain or in some media recording thereof. All such knowledge, as we learn in science, remains partial and temporary. The sentence should say not "to be violent is / is not human nature," but rather, "violence, as a possibility of human nature, needs particular constructions for its expression. If we don't want violence, then we need to create ways to construct and express other facets of human nature."

In use of English, the 'to be' verb occurs many times more often than any other verb.⁴⁴ This seemingly innocent verb leads us much too often into not innocent patterns. We forget (or never "see") that we choose how to categorize our experiences. Since we acquired these categories (cognitive schemata) with which we think as we acquired our first language(s), they were part of how we learned to be human. We know, of course, that such language patterns enable thinking in communities and help individuals become members of humanity and the social group(s) with which they identify. We know as well that the patterns also constrain thinking and perceiving. So we must take care to not apply such patterns where they do not fit. In the case at hand, two-valued orientation, (isness) does not fit most of the phenomena with which we deal. It assuredly does not apply to good and bad, to powerful and weak, to war and peace, or to manly and not manly. Absence of war differs from the presence of peace, just as to be feminine does not mean one is nonviolent. These are matters of definition, of naming. We reinforce such categorical thinking in our daily talk, using structures we should work at resisting. On its face, this pattern should be among the easiest to resist with the habit of use easily broken. Unfortunately, most do not find it easy to change, especially in English, given that nearly 50% of our sentences contain some form of the "to be" verb. Moreover, the language and the thought pattern have become the language of science. Reducing our use of this pernicious verb to the absolute minimum will require considerable effort and time.

Recognize the existence of paradoxes. Another strategy for changing our discourse grows from the above, the necessity to recognize the reality of paradox. Following Western patterns of two-valued orientation, one believes that contradictory truths cannot exist. If two statements contradict each other, one of them must be false. And yet, as many authors in a special issue of *Women and Language* (Fall 2001) showed, paradoxes pervade our lives including their gendered aspects. Gender, both personal identity and social construction; "is" both real and ephemeral. Each of us "is" a biological

being with all that means for how we respond to the world; and each of us "is" created by the social interactions and structures through which we learned how to respond to the world. Each of us exhibit both female and male elements, both feminine and masculine ones. Each of us "is" both violent and not violent. Paradoxes of gender and violence exist. Until we have learned to be able to hold two apparently contradictory truths in our mind, and recognize in our language the links among violence and gender, we will not be able to transcend the violent world of the patriarchies, nor step outside the web of their needed wars.

Attend to naming and labeling. As the preceding discussion shows, we need to remain vigilant about naming and the labeling that often works through adjectives to affect names. Names have been important issues to feminists from early feminist movement. Lucy Stone, one of the first women in the United States to enter formal college study, saw the importance of naming. She wrote on the topic and did not take the name of her husband when they married (Gring-Pemble).. In some ways, Simone deBeauvoir's entire *The Second Sex* revolves around discussing names. Betty Friedan has been credited with igniting U. S. Second Wave Feminism with a book discussing, "the problem that had no name" (11-27). As noted earlier, much feminist scholarship has been devoted to issues of naming.⁴⁵ So here we do not need to develop the importance of naming and labeling, only to note how it is used to teach violent masculinity to boys and enforce it in men. We call for attention to naming in ways that resist the dominators' use of it as a tool. We need to "name" the process of using the terms of 'sissy' and 'girly' to insult boys and men. Such labeling needs to be identified for what it reflects about a privileged definition of masculine gendering.

The 2004 California governor example, and many others that could be cited from the U. S. election campaigns of 2004, show how current this problem remains in spite of years of feminist research and activism. They show the power of dominator structures and the tenacity with which those privileged by them hold on to power. Naming and labeling remain as important to feminist movement as ever. Even now defenders of patriarchy demean attention to names as "mere" political correctness, while others respond to name change efforts by claiming such matters are trivial. These are, readers of this publication know, efforts to preserve language privilege. The very existence of efforts to demean language change activism demonstrates the significance of our efforts at change. If language really were trivial, "mere" political incorrectness, reflecting existing biases would not be defended so staunchly. As we know, names matter; they do more than refer. They create frames, evoke emotions, associate concepts. They justify violence, as when Saddam Hussein was labeled Hitlerian to make war upon his country acceptable. Names cause violence, as demonstrated every time an adolescent boy gets into a fight when called a sissy by his peers. Names also reflect violence as shown in the shameful U.S.

history of whites labeling blacks as nigger in the U. S., using the label to stand for a range of physical violence that would be done should the name itself not be sufficient enforcement. We know that to name is to control. The ubiquity of violent terms in our language reflects its widespread use for that purpose. We must expand our efforts to speak out and resist such language.

We need to point out the gain from labeling what others do as terrorism while we support "freedom fighters" and ourselves engage in "just war." Whose is a war for liberation and whose is a guerilla war or an insurgency? How actually different is it that one "intended" to cause diseases or death to "noncombatants" as one engages in war or settlement from using "innocent" civilian casualties as weapons?⁴⁶ How much of a noncombatant is one who continues supporting a government that refuses to deal with its opponents except to target them for death? We must name the complicit, even if the category includes ourselves. We cannot let it pass when "peace-loving" leaders talk about "clean" and dirty bombs or "justice, freedom and jihad" without explicit and careful definitions.

Identify the agent. One way to hold leaders responsible is to keep people in agent roles. Talk and writing need to identify the actors in sentences. That requires consistent identification of agents. Patkin in this issue shows the process of turning women who engage in suicide bombings into objects. Even as they engage in an extreme form of message sending, we do not hear their voices; we assume they are manipulated pawns. Dominant group spokespeople talk for the women, often in spite of utter ignorance about them. The dominators' voices absorb their own. That shows, of course, why the patterns persist: They help preserve existing power structures.

Feminist analyses have shown a number of tactics for doing so. Joanna Russ' *How to Suppress Women's Writing* describes well a number of tactics used to hide the active agent or, if the agent is female to pollute her agency. Russ concentrates on how these practices silence women, but the process occurs whenever a speaker intends to hide or mask the agent.⁴⁷ Agents act; they accomplish whatever is being talked about. In this context seeing that 'whatever' is something of value, however trivial otherwise. Thus, the categories Russ describes (syntactic discourse patterns) function to reinforce patriarchal dominator structures. They shunt the accomplishments of women over to men's credit, denying her (and thus all her sex) the agency, the credit, for work done. When the 'whatever' is something abhorrent, then discourse patterns make them appear to be merely occurrences without villains producing them. Or the villains become deviants, separated and not representative.

In the language of (western, male-identified) science (as in "it was found that . . ."), sentences often intend to hide the perceiving agent. Cohn describes in detail the process in the defense intellectual community, as have many others ("Sex and Death"). The process of hiding the acting agent may intensify when discussing war and

violence because of how abhorrent is the action described. Taylor and Hardman have discussed the role of passive verbs in disguising the absence of objectivity in science and its methods because the language hides the role of the scientist in posing questions, framing research, choosing measurement tools, etc. ("Gender-based"). Many feminist critics of science have exposed the hidden masculine biases in science and science writing; too few have focused on the role of language in facilitating the submersion of such bias.⁴⁸

Similar and widely cited constructions occur in discussion of 'domestic' violence, a term that carefully hides the practice of wife, child, husband or partner battering. From the same field comes the egregious example of "the woman was beaten" rather than "the man beat his wife." Feminists analysts of such violence have often described how language hides the actions of the perpetrator. We hear more about the woman beaten, or the abused victim, than about the abuser who is usually, though not always, male. Though less common today, when attention first focused on violence in relationships, even professionals asked more questions about "why the battered woman stays," than about "why the man batters."

This process of hiding agency stems directly from reliance on isness previously discussed. And, as noted above, the very pervasiveness of that language pattern contributes to its impact. We need to pay constant attention to sentence construction with a specific goal of identifying agency, which avoiding isness helps us do.⁴⁹

When we actually discuss violence and war (in contrast to metaphorical uses of the terms), we need to use language in ways that make clear all the agents who act as killers, including those whose complicity makes it possible for others to kill. Even heroic soldiers defending their homeland do so by killing other people, who are often seen by THEIR supporters as heroic as well. Our language can keep foregrounded the agent role of even some "victims." People provoked by oppressive structures may believe it acceptable, even moral, to kill, other human beings. Thus they 'are' both victims of the structure and killers (agents) when they act. We need to avoid letting language constructions hide either role. To hear all voices we must perceive the human beings on all 'sides' of the conflict. Three thousand dead in New York and 3000 dead in Afghanistan and 30,000 plus dead in Iraq need to be perceived as several great tragedies, or related parts of one. The grief of Palestinian families and that of Israeli families must both be perceived as human grief.

Resist making perceived opponents / enemies into the "Other". Our examples show how both labeling and hiding agency help make humans with whom we differ into some "other," as less than fully human, almost objects. Such othering makes people into lesser beings, more akin to animals, as which they are often labeled (an insult to most animals, which rarely kill except for food or self-defense). When we permit such dehumanizing, we make it easier to bomb, kill, go to war with them. Violently "taking out" someone who is well "othered" can

become its own justification for war and many related forms of violent. That was goal and result of equating Saddam Hussein with Hitler in 1991, the Taliban with uncivilized tyrants after 2001 when these same mujahadeen had been freedom fighters. Whenever one's opponents are turned into barbarians, radical othering has taken place. In earlier years othering was at work to make the "primitive" Africans and indigenous peoples of the Americas into "savages" that justified conquering and destroying them or their cultures. When language is used to magnify an "other's" bad characteristics into the whole of who and what they are it moralizes immoral behavior against that other. We think, "after all, they aren't really human, so they don't deserve to live or be treated nonviolently."⁵⁰

Wars require demonization of others, ways to dehumanize their agency. This creates circumstances in which these othered humans "deserve" to be killed. (Tickner). Such linguistic violence is prerequisite for the type of violence we are at the date of publication seeing in Iraq, Sudan, Guantanamo and dozens of other places in the world. Both U. S. mainstream media and internet screeds originating many places for several years now have made Arabs (and Muslims) into "others," not part of the "civilized" human family, but part of inherently violent, even primitive, non-democratic "tribes." Similarly, those who see the U.S. as the embodiment of evil have thoroughly otherized a whole people. War makes this necessary, because humans do not regularly, normally, or easily kill each other. Such language motivates soldiers into killing people they basically have no quarrel with. And it also affects those not directly doing the killing. A survey examining Americans' terrorism fears by the Survey Research Institute at Cornell University that was reported in December 2004 found 44 per cent of respondents believe "the U.S. government should--in some way--curtail civil liberties for Muslim Americans" ("Fear Factor"). Clearly, much work remains to reduce othering of those who differ from us.

Scholarship for change: Reveal language effects. One task that remains for feminist language scholars: to explore is how widely these patterns of English occur in other languages. Scholars have examined some clearly gendered languages; more need to look at the basic, underlying rules of grammar to establish the extent to which the patterns of gendered ranking pervade western thinking. We need research also into the ways in which the patterns are exported, together with ways to step aside from perpetuating the patterns. Such examination is among the critical next steps for those of us interested in the interactions among language, gender and violence. Without that understanding we may find it impossible to assess the impact of the past and rapidly expanding hegemony of English and other western perspectives.

How important, and difficult, such analyses will be can be seen in the embedding of these fundamental postulates and two-valued orientation in the foundation of easily exported worldviews. Note the wide spread of the pattern that first alerted Hardman to the English

postulates, a conception that the world divides "naturally" into two (and only two) gender categories⁵¹. Although scholarship has yet to establish exactly how widespread, we know it is sufficiently broad we now find it difficult to "see" alternative landscapes. Many years after her original research had to pass before Hardman's description of the Jaji languages was accepted as anything except flawed scholarship. The perception of a universal (two-valued) gender divide has made cultural encounters with those not reflecting such a perspective nearly impossible for westerners to understand⁵². Good illustrations of the difficulties can be found in recent studies attempting to disentangle western conceptions of pre-colonial cultures from what may have actually existed, notably Oye-wumi's analysis of English and the impact of colonial contact on the languages and cultures of the Yoruba ("Invention"). Oye-wumi shows the invasive reach of English influence. We need much similar work to see what we might learn from a close examination of European contact and colonialism in other locales. Without recognition of many of these patterns, western thinkers usually perceive nonwestern cultures totally unaware that we impose a "viewing" lens on what we think we are seeing. We may never recognize the cover story we impose on a culture that may previously had quite different structures from what we think was there. And, as Oye-wumi points out, it doesn't take long for such impositions of English patterns to nearly obliterate what was formerly there. We need much more feminist scholarship to work at disentangling indigenous stories and patterns from the colonial language influences. Delinking language, violence and gender requires understanding the deep and complex connections between language and thinking patterns that help guide perceptions. Such scholarship has begun, but it remains far from reaching its destination.

Talk and teach for change. Even while at work on needed scholarship, we need to begin to change our talk; and we need to teach differently. Insuring that our students recognize the patterns of language is an essential first step. They (and we) can learn to notice how language provides the path for thinking. Otherwise, it will be difficult to recognize when to get off previously created trails. That's what language patterns do for us; they provide paths and make it hard to see what's off the trail. Language makes some forms of thought easy; we need to resist those easy routes. Although difficult, it is possible to say anything in any language, if we have the patience and the will. We can choose to use the familiar structures, or we can choose to do otherwise. We need to carefully attend to integration of these new language insights into our teaching. Languages do change. We can go off the path; we can explore new paths; we can create new ones. Language structure, strong as it is at keeping us in preexisting patterns, is nevertheless always flexible. That is true of *all* language, which means that what we urge is possible. We need first to pay attention to the task to start the process of change.

Conclusion

Each of these suggestions, individually, seems small, unable to dent the violence that pervades thinking in so many cultures, and especially in the currently dominant western worldview. Yet, as Elgin argues persuasively, very rarely does violent behavior, individually or by nations, occur when it is not preceded by violent language.⁵³ Hence, we can benefit greatly from conscious attention to building new narratives, using alternative metaphors, and adopting the discourse strategies suggested. We all need to change our own gendered verbal patterns that link to dominance and thus to war. We need to name what our leaders do when they engage in rhetorical strategies to justify or popularize war preparation and implementation. Talk DOES matter; words can hurt. Language, as Cohn showed persuasively 20 years ago, masks violence, diverts attention, makes ignoring its consequences easier. In so doing, language, carelessly used, provides the forms that make it (and its user) part of the violence.

We hope this special *W&L* publication promotes a continued conversation. Clearly the issues will not go away. We hope we have made available narratives that can be heard and material that can help us help each other create and discover, from all nations and cultures, additional narratives that create the conditions for peace.

Endnotes

- 1 We thank readers of earlier drafts of this paper for their insightful suggestions. The argument was much improved by comments from Debra Bergoffen, Mary E. Clark, and Cheris Kramarae.
- 2 Many excellent pieces of scholarship could be referenced here. Among them are Cohn, "Sex and Death"; Cohn, "Wars"; Collins, "Terrorism"; Gioseffi; Russell *Exposing*. We have not here, nor in the many notes to come, cited all possible sources—and we make no claim that these are the "best" that can be offered, for reasons that the essay itself shortly makes clear. What we do try to do in each case is offer some representative examples that support the claims made and to which readers may refer for more insights and references.
- 3 The scholarship available on the violence/gender link is vast; exploring it can be overwhelming. Representative examples include Bowker; Brownmiller; Callahan; Cohn "Missions"; Cohn & Enloe; Connell; Kaufman; St. George; Zillman.
- 4 e.g., Cohn, "Clean Bombs"; Cohn, "Response"; Easlea; Keller; *Secrets*; Tickner.
- 5 e.g., Bing; Cameron; Daly *Gyn/Ecology*; Hardman "Andean"; Holborow; G. Lakoff; R. Lakoff, *Language*; Lee, "Conception," "Symbols" and *Freedom*; Spender; Stanback.
- 6 See Cohn, "Response" and the extensive list of references cited there. Online: <http://www.barnard.edu/bcrw/respondingtoviolence/cohn.htm>. Accessed August 9, 2004.
- 7 e.g., Bowker; Connell; Glover; Johnson, *Gender*; Johnson, *Privilege*; R. Lakoff, *Talking*; Russell & van de Van.
- 8 e.g., Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing*, and *Myths*; Kessler and McKenna; Lorber; Oweyumi, "De-Confounding"; Taylor and Beinstein Miller, "Gender"; West and Zimmerman.
- 9 e.g., Chesler, *Women*; Chesler, *Patriarchy*; Enloe; Millet; Russell.
- 10 Eisler is often misread to have argued that early cultures were matriarchies. She did not. To be matri-focal is not to be matriarchal; only if one sees through a lens that inevitably sees ranking in differences would one confuse the two.

- 11 Clearly, we are not discussing a simple matter. Sometimes violence, even warfare, might seem required for self-defense. But self-defense and modern warfare are virtually unrelated. They may come to relate via events as violence escalates, but the motives for violence are *constructed*. For example, killing may be a matter of self defense for soldiers in combat—but what are they doing there in the first place? Initially, they were not personally threatened. Sometimes people say to pacifists, what would you do if someone attacked your child? Well, clearly, one would defend their child. That differs from warfare where most often rhetoric creates the hostilities, as the articles in this issue indicate. The 'sometimes violence is necessary' assertion too often serves as rhetorical justification for warfare. Modern war rhetoric uses national self-defense as justification, but defending oneself from, say a grizzly in the forest or a hate criminal, differs from setting out to kill people one never met. Similarly, the self-defense martial arts that use an attacker's own force as defense differ from missile guiding bombs to a screen-image target. Much too often war is rationalized by claims of self-defense, when ideology plays a primary role in generating the violence.
- 12 Sources on Caral and related sites include Ross; Shady Solis, Hass and Creamer; & Hass, Creamer and Ruiz..
- 13 See Clark, Tickner. The Hobbesian claim, developed by Adam Smith, results in the perception of 'society' as formed by grown men. It's too absurd for contemplation & yet it is absolute economics canon! McElvaine introduces a novel variation in arguing first that patriarchy was developed from males' search for usefulness following the loss of their important hunting contributions due to development of agriculture. He ties what he believes is the biological predisposition for bonding in small groups and aggression or hostility toward out-groups to the human need for survival of the small group. Kimbrell develops the thesis that modern male violence is tied to loss of male roles following industrialization, a conclusion we find inadequate because it ignores centuries of gendered male violence in some cultures preceding the industrial revolution.
- 14 We owe the metaphor to Daly, from *Gyn/Ecology*, and the added analysis in *Beyond*.
- 15 Zillman explores sexuality and aggression links but his analysis, while recognizing social and cultural influences, primarily focuses on individual psychologies. Broader views are illustrated by Boulding, *Building*; Estrich; Gearhart; Robinson; and Tickner.
- 16 e.g., de Beauvoir; Chesler, *Patriarchy*; Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*; Gunew.
- 17 e.g., Hardman, "Andean", "The Aymara," "Jaquaru," "The Imperial," "Data." For more information about Hardman's work, go to <http://grove.ufl.edu/~hardman/>
- 18 In addition to previously cited work by Hardman, note Alderete; Oye'wumi; Norberg-Hodge; Wagner.
- 19 Hartsock; Hartman.
- 20 e.g., Ferguson, A.; Ferguson, K; Jagger; Klein; MacKinnon.
- 21 e.g., Butler, Lorber, Faludi, *Backlash*
- 22 e.g., de Beauvoir; Daly, *Beyond*; Garry and Pearsall; Grosz *Space*; Keller, *Reflections*; and Rosak.
- 23 e.g., Hardman, "Gender," and "Sexist Circuits"; Hill; Junker; McConnell-Ginet; Oye'wumi, *Invention*; Taylor and Hardman, "Gender-based."
- 24 Bleier, *Feminist*; Haraway; Harding, *Feminism & Methodology*, and *Whose*; Harding and O'Barr; Keller *Reflections* and *Secrets*.
- 25 e.g., Ardener *Perceiving*, Ardener, *Defining*; Blair, Brown and Baxter; Bleier; R. Lakoff, *Talking*, and *Father*; Ng and Bradac; Schulz.
- 26 e.g., Hardman, "Derivational"; Grosz, *Jacque Lacan*; Hendricks and Oliver; Ramazanoglu; Russ. Roy's collection of women's writing on war provides vivid insights by bringing together a vast amount of women's writing over two-plus millennia.
- 27 e.g., Butler; Schulz; Ting-Toomey; Uchida.
- 28 e.g., Elgin *Native Tongue*, *The Ozark Trilogy*; LeGuin, *Always*. Gilman wrote what was described as an utopian novel, that, while not strictly science fiction, does revision gender. Gearhart's *Wanderground* is also described as utopian. For others with comment, see the annotated references below.
- 29 Bem, *Lenses*, shows this well; as does Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing*. Bleier and Kray both give examples of how biology itself is

- gendered in its construction as does Lippa in his summary of the psychological studies suggesting biological causes for gender.
- 30 Wilson is one of the classic writers regarding sociobiology; his latest and most refined presentation of its principles is in *Consilience*. *Sociobiology* represents his earliest work. Bleier's critique in *Science* is relevant here, as is the first section of Haraway's book and Kray.
- 31 See Clark *In Search*; McElvaine and the references cited by Myrtinnen.
- 32 See Deakins, Sterk for birthing as heroic quest, Brantenberg for an example of birthing ceremony.
- 33 Holmes, *Strong Hearts*. For a good historical fiction narrative on the issue of ceremony for post-war post-traumatic stress, see *Ceremony* by Silko.
- 34 *The Washington Post* reported on March 13, 2003 that "between 6 million and 12 million protesters rallied in about 75 countries Feb. 15 against war." The article is linked on the website of the Global Policy Forum (<http://www.globalpolicy.org/ngos/role/iraq.htm>) that includes many articles from newspapers and other sources about these world wide protests. Accessed December 15, 2004.
- 35 We are indebted to Mary E. Clark for the metaphor and raising the issue to our attention.
- 36 Eisler's analysis includes many resources relevant to Minoa; Ross; Shady Solis, Haas and Creamer write about Caral; Haas, Creamer and Ruiz discuss sites near Caral.
- 37 In his farewell address nationally broadcast January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower, a decorated general credited with leading allied forces in the successful liberation of Europe, warned about two dangers the country needed to remain alert to. The first he named was the pervasive power and potential influence of the combination of a large peacetime military required by the global communist threat and the existence of an equally large arms industry. This speech, which has become known as the "military industrial complex" speech, is among the Eisenhower presidential papers and is easily found through his presidential library: <http://www.eisenhower.utexas.edu/farewell.htm>. November 18, 2004.
- 38 Here is one possible alteration in a widely re-told narrative in the U.S. Defenders of the easy access individuals have to weapons in this country often say, "Guns don't kill, people do." Clearly this provides an example of a cover story. Of course, mostly, we do think of the person who murders as responsible for a disapproved act. And of course, the gun does not discharge itself. However, those of us who live within and behave in ways to perpetuate the system that makes those guns easily accessible for both planned and unplanned killings also helped make it possible for that gun to be discharged and to kill. Certainly this story of "guns not killing" tries to cover up the shared responsibility; but the cover does not destroy the facts beneath it.
- 39 hooks also never writes about "the" feminist movement, either; she drops the 'the'. By deleting the definite pronoun, she avoids making a singular from something clearly quite plural, and she changes static noun words into more active ones, feminist movement. Many useful analyses of metaphor have been made. For readers who want to further pursue the subject, Sapir and Crocker, Pepper, and Ortony are good places to begin. Gring-Pemble has recently written insightfully about rhetorical uses of metaphor.
- 40 The easiest way to access some of Hardman's work is her web page, <http://grove.ufl.edu/~hardman/>. Published pieces supporting the alternate world-view as demonstrated in Jaqi languages are Hardman, "Andean," "Aymara," "Imperial," "Data-source." Also of interest regarding the Jaqi is "Was Jaqi-Frauen uns voraushaben: Gleichheit in grammatischer und konversationeller Struktur" *Frauengespräche: Sprache der Verständigung*, ed. Senta Trömel-Plötz. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuck Verlag, 1996. 304-323.
- 41 We began developing the argument presented in "Gender-based" (Taylor and Hardman) in a paper in 2000. It remains in process. That paper includes many references useful to develop the argument of how the 'to be' verb impacts / reflects thought, among them Bourland, "Semantics"; Hayakawa; Johnston; and Korzybski.
- 42 The strong preference for one *may* be the place where dominant contemporary U. S. users of English differ most dramatically from other English speakers. More research among the variety of English speaking cultures is needed to test the hypothesis.
- 43 See, for example, Cameron; Kramer; Kramarae; R. Lakoff *Talking Power*; Miller and Swift; Penelope; Spender.
- 44 For readers who want to move beyond Korzybski's dense writings on this subject, we can offer our own unpublished work, and refer them to David Bourland, whose writings provide a location to examine the variety of issues relating to the 'to be' verb. His published materials are not widely distributed in libraries, but one of his basic pieces could be accessed via <http://www.generalsemantics.org/library/61-4-bourland.pdf> as of December 12, 2004.
- 45 In addition to many of the previously cited sources, we refer readers to R. Lakoff, *Language*.
- 46 On this point see especially the essays in Collins & Glover.
- 47 As a case in point, Beach's commentary demonstrates how. In describing when writers might choose the passive voice, he says "passives are often used when tact, diplomacy and objectivity are necessary," and he follows with the "appropriate use" of a passive as "When the writer wants to be tactful or evasive by not mentioning the agent. . . . [or] When the writer wants to make a statement sound more objective without revealing the source of information."
- 48 Keller's *Reflections* and *Secrets* are good on the language masks, as are the essays in Harding and O'Barr, and Walby.
- 49 In addition to Russ' *How to Suppress*, a good discussion of hiding agency is in Lafrance and Hahn; and Hardman's "How to" includes suggestions for ways to work toward focus on agency through class assignments.
- 50 To illustrate how easily people can be constructed as "other," note the following comparisons of George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden
- Both are deeply religious considered zealots by many.
Both claim to be acting on the word of their respective gods.
Each has put a bounty on the head of the other.
Both send young people to do the killing and dying.
Neither does any killing themselves.
Both express admiration for the killing and dying done on their "side."
Both manipulate mass media.
Both believe themselves to be acting in accordance with their view of good and the other to be the absolute embodiment of evil.
Both are found arrogant by those who oppose them.
Neither expresses doubt.
Both come from privilege and wealth.
Both had fathers who provided support for them.
- 51 Kessler and McKenna present an incisive analysis of this "incorrigible proposition."
- 52 We have already referred to two good examples of this process in citing the work of Hardman and Oweyume. But the process has been discussed many times in re-examinations of 19th & early 20th century anthropologists. Both Gimbutas & Eisler discussed the point with reference to excavations in "pre-historic" Europe. Misunderstandings of Whorf's work, dismissal of Parker's spring from the same perceptual framing. Many indigenous voices are also being heard, see for example, Jaimes; Schoepfle, et. al; and Hardman "Feminism."
- 53 Elgin developed the relationships between talk, violent talk and how talk precedes violence in several publications. See, for example, *How to Turn the Other Cheek and You Can't Say That to Me*.

References

- Alderete, Wara. "The Empowerment of Indian Women" *Peace & Freedom* Jan/Feb 1992, 8
- Ardener, Shirley. (ed.). *Defining Females: The Nature of Women in Society*. NY: Wiley, 1978.
- . (ed.). *Perceiving Women*. London: Malaby Press, 1975.
- Baer, John. *The Pledge of Allegiance: A Centennial History*. Annapolis, MD: Free State Press, 1992.

- Beach, David. "Grammar Corner. Passive v. Active: The Jury Is In." *Writing @ Center*. George Mason University Writing Center. 8.1 (Fall 2004): 4.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Trans. H. M. Parshley. Vintage Books, 1989, 1974 (Alfred A. Knopf, 1953).
- Bem, Sandra Lipsitz. *The Lenses of Gender*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Bing, J. "Penguins Can't Fly and Women Don't Count" *Women and Language* 15.2 (1992) 11-14.
- Blair, Carole, Julie R. Brown, & Leslie A. Baxter. Disciplining the feminine. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80 (1994): 383-409.
- Bleier, Ruth. *Feminist Approaches to Science*. NY: Pergamon Press, 1988.
- . *Science and gender: A Critique of Biology and its Theories on Women*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1984.
- Boulding, Elise. *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2000.
- . *The Underside of History*. Rev. ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1992.
- Bourland, D. David J. "The E-Prime Imperative." *E-Prime III: A Third Anthology*. Ed. Bourland, D. David Jr. and Paul Dennithorn Johnston. Concord, CA: International Society for General Semantics, 1997. 1-16.
- Bowker, Lee H. (ed). *Masculinities and Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.
- Brantenberg, Gerd. *Egalia's Daughters: A Satire of the Sexes*. Seattle: Seal Press, 1985 (trans from original, 1977).
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. NY: Fawcett Columbine, 1975.
- Bubenik, Vit. *An Introduction to the Study of Morphology*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa, 1999.
- Butler, Judith L. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. NY: Routledge, 1990.
- Callahan, Mathew. *Sex, Death, & the Angry Young Man*. Ojai, CA: Times Change Press, 1991.
- Caldicott, Helen. *Saving the Planet: National Radio Broadcast, Portland, Oregon, November 12, 1989*. Westfield, NJ: Open Media, 1991.
- Cameron, Deborah, ed. *The Feminist Critique of Language*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge, 1998 1990.
- Chesler, Phyllis. *Patriarchy: Notes of an Expert Witness*. Monore, ME: Common Courage Press, 1994.
- . *Women and Madness*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972; NY: Four Walls Eight Windows. 1989.
- Clark, Mary. *In Search of Human Nature*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Cohn, Carol. "'Clean Bombs' and Clean Language." Eds. Jean Bethke Elstain and Sheila Tobias. *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory*. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1990 33-55.
- . "Missions, Men and Masculinities: Carol Cohn Discusses 'Saving Private Ryan' with Cynthia Weber." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1.3 (1999): 460-75.
- . Response to Questions for Barnard Symposium on Violence. Undated. <http://www.barnard.edu/bcrw/respondingtoviolence/cohn.htm> Accessed August 9, 2004. Online posting excerpted from Ruddick and Cohn.
- . "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 (1987): 687-718.
- . "Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War." In *Gendering War Talk*, edited by Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott, 227-46. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Cohn, Carol, and Cynthia Enloe. "A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminist Look at Masculinity and the Men Who Wage War." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (2003): 1187-1209.
- Collins, John and Ross Glover, eds. *Collateral Language: A User's Guide to America's New War*. New York University Press, 2002.
- Collins, John. "Terrorism," in John Collins and Ross Glover, eds. *Collateral Language*, New York: New York University Press, 2002. 155-174.
- Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1995
- Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.
- . *Gyn/ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978.
- Deakins, Alice. "Birthing as Heroic Adventure." Paper at Annual Conference of the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language and Gender, October 1990. October 1990.
- Easley, Brian. *Fathering the Unthinkable: Masculinity, Scientists and the Nuclear Arms Race*. London: Pluto Press, 1983.
- Eisler, Riane. *The Chalice & the Blade*. New York: Harper, 1987.
- Elgin, Suzette Haden. *How the Turn the Other Cheek and Still Survive in Today's World*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publisher, 1997.
- . *The Language Imperative*. Cambridge MA: Perseus Publishing, 1999.
- . *Native Tongue*, reissued by NY: Feminist Press, 2000.
- . *The Judas Rose* reissued by NY: Feminist Press, 2002.
- . *Earthsong (Native Tongue III)* NY: Feminist Press, 2002.
- . *You Can't Say That to Me*. Wiley, 1995
- Enloe, Cynthia. "Wielding Masculinity inside Abu Ghraib: Making Feminist Sense of an American Military Scandal." *Asian Journal of Women's Studies* 10.3 (2004): 89-102.
- Estrich, Susan. *Real Rape*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987.
- Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. NY: Crown Publishers, 1991.
- . *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man*. NY: Perennial, 2000.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Women and Men*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
- . *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- "Fear Factor." Cornell News. December 17, 2004. <http://www.news.cornell.edu/releases/Dec04/Muslim.Poll.bpf.html> Accessed December 24, 2004.
- Ferguson, Ann. *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance*. London: Pandora, 1989.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. NY: Dell Publishing, 1963.
- Garry, Ann and Marilyn Pearsall, eds. *Women, Knowledge and Reality: Explorations in Feminist Philosophy*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Gearhart, Sally Miller. *Wanderground: Stories of the Hill Women*. 1979. Republished 2002 by Spinsters Ink Books, Denver, CO.
- Gearhart, Sally. Why reproduce in captivity? Women's history month presentation, California State University San Bernardino. April, 1988.
- Gifford, Rob. *Morning Edition*. National Public Radio. April 12, 2004.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. *Herland*. NY: Pantheon Books, 1979. First published as serial in *The Forerunner*, 1915.
- Gimbutas, Marija. *The Language of the Goddess: Unearthing the Hidden Symbols of Western Civilization*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.
- Gioseffi, Daniela, ed. *Women on War: An International Anthology of Women's Writings From Antiquity to the Present*. The Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2003.
- Glover, Ross. "The War on ____." *Collateral Language*. Ed. John Collins and Ross Glover. New York University Press, 2002. 207-222.
- Gonzalez-Crussi, F. *On Being Born*. NY: the Overlook Press, 2004.
- Gring-Pemble, Lisa. *Grim Fairy Tales: The Rhetorical Construction of American Welfare Policy*. Westport, CN: Praeger, 2003.
- . "Writing Themselves into Consciousness: Creating a Rhetorical Bridge Between the Public and Private Spheres." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 41-62.
- Grosz, Elizabeth A. *Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*. / NY: Routledge, 1990
- . *Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. NY: Routledge, 1995.
- Gunew, Sneja, ed. *Feminist Knowledge: Critique and Construct*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. NY: Routledge, 1991.
- Harding, Sandra, ed. *Feminism & Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1987.
- . *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1991.

- Hardin, Sandra, and Jean F. O'Barr. *Sex and Scientific Inquiry*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Hardman, M. J. "Andean Ethnography: The Role of Language Structure in Observer Bias." *Semiotica*, 71.3/4 (1978): 339-372.
- , ed. *The Aymara Language in its Social and Cultural Context*. University of Florida Social Sciences Monograph No. 67. Gainesville: U. Presses of Florida, 1981.
- . "Data Source Marking in the Jaqi Languages." *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Ed. W. Chafe & J. Nichols. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1986. 113-136.
- . "Derivational Thinking, or, Why is Equality So Difficult?" *Seeking Understanding of Communication, Language and Gender*. Ed. Carol Ann Valentine. CyberSpace Publishing Corporation. 1993. 250-263.
- . "Feminism as an Imperialist Construct." *Women and Language* 27.1 (Spring 2004): 79-83.
- . "Gender Through the Levels." *Women and Language* 16.2 (1993): 42-49.
- . "The Imperial Languages of the Andes." *Language of Inequality*. Ed. N. Wolfson and J. Manes. University Park: University of Pennsylvania, 1985. 183-193.
- . "Jaquaru Color Terms." *International Journal of Anthropological Linguistics*. 47 (1981) 1
- . "Joanna Russ' How to Suppress Women's Writing as Student Observation Guide." *Women and Language* 17.2 (Fall 1994) 18-20.
- . "Metaphorical Alternatives to Violence: Report from a Workshop." *Women and Language* 21.2 (1998): 43-47.
- . "The Sexist Circuits of English." *The Humanist* (March/April 1996): 25-32
- Hartman, Heidi. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism." Ed. *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. Linda Nicholson, NY: Routledge, 1997. 97-122.
- Hartsock, Nancy. *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward A Feminist Historical Materialism*. NY: Longman, 1983.
- Haas, Jonathan, Winifred Creamer and Alvaro Ruiz. "Dating the late Archaic Occupation of the Norte Chico region in Peru." *Nature* 432, (December 23, 2004): 1020-1023.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. "Confounding Gender," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 22 (1997): 649-686.
- Hayakawa, S. I. "What is Meant by Aristotelian Structure of Language?" *Language Meaning and Maturity Selections from ETC.: A Review of General Semantics*. Ed. S. I. Hayakawa, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954. 217-224.
- Hendricks, Christina and Kelly Oliver, eds. *Language and Liberation: Feminism, Philosophy and Language*. Albany: State University of New York, 1999.
- Hill, Alette. O. *Mother Tongue, Father Time: A decade of linguistic revolt*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press, 1986.
- Holborow, Marnie. *The Politics of English*. London: Sage, 1999.
- Holm, Tom "Patriots and Pawn: State Use of American Indians in the Military & the Process of Nativization in the US." *The State of Native America Genocide, Colonization & Resistance*, Ed. M. Annette Jaimes, Boston: South End Press, 1992. 345-370.
- . *Strong Hearts Wounded Souls: Native American Veterans of the Vietnam War*. Austin: U. of Texas Press, 1996.
- hooks, bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press, 1984
- . *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Boston, South end Press, 1992.
- Jagger, Alison M. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. London: Rowman and Allanheld, 1983.
- Jaimes, M. Annette, ed.. *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization and Resistance*. Boston: South End Press, 1992.
- Johnson, Allan G. *The Gender Knot: Unraveling our Patriarchal Legacy*. Phila: Temple University Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Alan G. *Privilege, Power and Difference*. NY: McGraw Hill, 2001.
- Johnston, Paul Dennithorn. "Escape from a Frozen Universe" *To Be or Not: An E-Prime Anthology*. Ed. Bourland, D. David Jr. and Paul Dennithorn Johnston. San Francisco: International Society of General Semantics, 1991. 15-20.
- Junker, Marie-Odile. "Metaphors We Live By: The Terminology of Linguistic Theory." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 10 (1991): 141-145.
- Kaufman, Michael, Ed. *Beyond patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- . *Secrets of Life Secrets of Death: Essays on language, Gender and Science*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Kessler, Suzanne J, and Wendy McKenna. *Gender An Ethnomethodological Approach*. U. of Chicago Press, 1978, 1985.
- Klein, Ethel. *Gender Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Korzybski, Alfred. *Science and Sanity An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*. Lakeville, CT: The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, 1933.
- Kramer, Cherris. Women's Speech: Separate but Unequal? *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60 (1974): 14-24.
- Kramarae, Cherris. *Women and Men Speaking*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1981.
- Kray, Susan. "Never Cry Bull Moose: Of Mooses and Men: The Case of the Scheming Gene." *Women and Language* 13.1 (1990): 31-37.
- LaFrance, Marianne and Eugene Hahn. "The Disappearing Agent: Gender Stereotypes, Interpersonal Verbs, and Implicit Causality." *The Women & Language Debate: A Sourcebook*. Eds. Camille Roman, Suzanne Juhasz, and Christanne Miller. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1994.
- Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. U. of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980, 2003.
- Lakoff, Robin. *The Language War* Berkeley: U. of California Press, 2000.
- . *Talking Power*. New York: Basic Books, 1990.
- Lakoff, Robin. T., and Coyne, J. C. *Father Knows Best*. NY: Teachers College Press, 1993.
- Lee, Dorothy. "The Conception of the Self Among the Wintu Indians." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 45:3 (1950): 131-140.
- . *Freedom and Culture*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall 1959, reissued 1987 by Waveland Press.
- . "Symbols and Values, An Initial Study," in *Freedom and Culture Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1987*.
- LeGuin, Ursula, K. *Always Coming Home*. Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1999.
- . "the Carrier Bag Theory of Fiction." Ed. Denise DuPont *Women of Vision*. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1988. 1-9.
- Lorber, Judith. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- McConnell-Ginet, Sally. "Our Father Tongue: Essays in Linguistic Politics." *Diacritics* 5(1975): 44-50.
- McElvaine, Robert, *Eve's Seed*. New York: McGraw Hill, 2001.
- Miller, Casey and Kate Swift. *Words and Women*. NY: Anchor Books, 1977.
- Millett, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. NY: Doubleday.
- Ng, Sik. H. and James Bradac. (1993). *Power in Language: Verbal Communication and social Influence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nicholson, Linda, ed. *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. NY: Routledge, 1997.
- Norberg-Hodge, Helena. *Ancient Futures: Learning from Ladakh*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1991.
- Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Oye'wumi, Oyeronke. "De-confounding Gender: Feminist Theorizing and Western Culture, a Comment on Hawkesworth's "Confounding Gender" *Signs* 23 (1998): 1049-1062.
- . *The Invention of Woman: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Parry-Giles, Shawn. J. and Trevor Parry-Giles. (1996). "Gendered Politics and Presidential image construction: A Reassessment of

- the 'Feminine Style.'" *Communication Monographs* 63 (1996): 337-353.
- Pepper, Stephen Coburn, *World Hypotheses, A Study in Evidence*. Berkeley: U. of California press, 1942.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline, ed. *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Robinson, Victor, "Denial and Patriarchy: The Relationship Between Patriarchy and Abuse of Women." Eds. Anita Taylor and Judith Beinstein Miller. *Conflict and Gender*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1994.
- Ross, John F. "First City in the New World?" *Smithsonian Magazine*, August 2002, pp. 57-64.
- Roy, Arundhati. In Gioseffi, Daniela. *Women on War: an International Anthology of Women's Writings from Antiquity to the Present*. New York: The Feminist Press, 2003. p. xvii.
- Roszak, Theodore. *The Gendered Atom: Reflections on the Sexual Psychology of Science*. Berkeley, CA.: Conari Press, 1999.
- Ruddick, Sara and Carol Cohn. "A Feminist Ethical Perspective on Weapons of Mass Destruction." Eds. Steven Lee and Sohail Hashmi. *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Russ, Joanna. *How to Suppress Women's Writing*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983.
- . *What are We Fighting For? Sex, Race, Class and the Future of Feminism*. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Russell, Diana E. H., and Nicole Van de Ven. Eds. *Crimes against women :Proceedings of the International Tribunal*. Millbrae, CA : Les Femmes Pub., 1976
- Russell, Diana E. H. Ed. *Exposing Nuclear Phallacies*. NY: Pergamon Press, 1989.
- Sapir, J. David and J. Christopher Crocker, eds. *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*. Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- St. George, Donna. "Pregnancy and Homicide. *The Washington Post*, December 19-21, 2005, A1+.
- Schoepfle, G. Mark, Kenneth Nabahe, Angela Johnson, and Lucie Upshaw . "The Effects of the Great Stock Reduction on the Navajos." *Diné Be'iiina' - A Journal of Navajo Life*. 1.2 (Winter 1988): 58-60.
- Schulz, M. R. "The Semantic Derogation of Woman." Ed. Deborah Cameron. *he Feminist Critique of Language*. London: Routledge, 1990. 134-137.
- Shady Solis, R., Jonathan Hass and Winifred Creamer. "RESEARCH - REPORTS - Dating Caral, a Preceramic Site in the Supe Valley on the Central Coast of Peru." *Science*. 292.5517 (2001): 723-727.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Ceremony*. NY: Viking Press, 1977. Reissued by Penguin Books, 1986.
- Slonczewski, Joan. *A Door into Ocean*. Avon 1986. Reissued by Orb books, 2000.
- Spender, D. *Man Made Language*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1985.
- Stanback, M. H. "Language and Black Woman's Place: Evidence from the Black Middle Class." Eds. Paula A. Treichler, Cheris Kramarae & Beth. Stafford, *For Alma Mater: Theory and Practice in Feminist Scholarship*. Urbana, IL: U. of Illinois Press. 177-193.
- Sterk, Helen, with Alice Deakins, Deborah Ballard-Reisch and Karen Sterk. "Heroic Birthing" Unpublished manuscript, Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College.
- . *Who's Having this Baby? Perspectives on Birthing*. East Lansing : Michigan State University Press, 2002.
- Taylor, Anita and Judith Beinstein Miller. Gender diversity: Conceptions of femininity and masculinity. Paper presented at the Berkeley Women and Language Conference, Berkeley, California. (1994, April).
- Taylor, Anita and Judith Beinstein Miller. "Introduction: The Necessity of Seeing Gender in Conflict." Eds. Taylor, Anita & Judith Beinstein Miller (eds.), *Conflict and Gender*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1994. 1-23.
- Taylor, Anita and M. J. Hardman. "The Gender-based Hierarchy in U. S. English Compounded by the Tyranny of Is'." ICA convention, Seoul Korea, July 15, 2002.
- Taylor, Anita and M. J. Hardman. "Tyranny of Is." OSLCG convention, San Diego, October 14, 2001.
- Thomson, Amy. *The Color of Distance*. Ace, 1999.
- Tickner, J. Ann. *Gender in International Relations; Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. NY: Univ. of Colombia Press, 1992
- Ting-Toomey, S. "Introduction: The pragmatics of gender-related communication." Eds. Lea. P. Stewart and Stella Ting-Toomey. *Communication, Gender and Sex Roles in Diverse Interaction Contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1987. 1-6.
- Uchida, A. "When 'Difference' is 'Dominance': A Critique of the 'Anti-power-based' Cultural Approach to Sex Differences. *Language in Society* 21 (1992): 547-568.
- Vonarbug, Elisabeth. Trans. Jane Brierley. *The Maerlande Chronicles*. Victoria, B.C.: Beach Holme, 1992.
- Wagner, Sally Roesch.. *Sisters in Spirit: Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Influence on Early American Feminists*. Summertown, TN: Native Voices, 2001
- Wilson, Edward O. *Consilience The Unity of Knowledge*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.
- Wilson, Edward O. *Sociobiology The New Synthesis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- West, Candace and D. H. Zimmerman. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1 (1987): 25-151
- Wood, Julia T. *Who Cares? Women, Care & Culture*. Carbondale, IL: Southern University Press, 1994.
- Zillman, Dolf. *Connections Between Sexuality and Aggression*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Additional Resources Worth Consulting

Tools for envisioning alternative narratives, metaphors and discourse structures. We offer here a brief annotated bibliography, compiled by M. J. Hardman, that concentrates on science fiction, although we highlight one important essay by Ursula K. Le Guin. The chosen items point to writing that brings together matters of gender and of language, along with some suggestions for classroom use. Many other items could be included; we include these as ones found useful.

Le Guin, Ursula K. "The Carrier-Bag Theory of Fiction" in *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places*. NY: Perennial Press, 1989. 165-170. First published in Ed. Denise Du Pont. *Women of Vision*. NY: St. Martin's Press 1988.

In this piece Le Guin directly discusses the issue of who gets to tell what story and why. The essay dramatically demonstrates that different narratives of human 'his' story could have been preserved. If used in class and time permits, Le Guin's entire book should be assigned because the many essays included, some of which have become well known and are often quoted, show her thinking as she examined many of the issues discussed in this issue (and many others) of *W & L*.

The science fiction pieces:

Le Guin, Ursula K. *Always Coming Home*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985. with composer, Todd Barton ; artist, Margaret Chodos-Irvine; maps drawn by the author. Reissued Berkeley: U. of CA Press 2000

Le Guin purports to translate, with music included, from the original Kesh, text discovered in a future archaeological dig. The Kesh did not do hierarchy or sexism and the grammar of Kesh did not support derivational thinking. Le Guin translates well, giving an

example of using English without ranking or sexism. This is also a non-linear novel. I recommend students read the Stone Telling sections first & then read it through or in a different order if preferred. I have found that rereading in different orders shifts the vision provided by the novel. This is one of the very few books I have ever found that quite repays rereading. It shows that what we wish to do is possible. For excerpts, go to <http://www.ursulakleguin.com/ach/>

Le Guin, Ursula K. *The Birthday of the World & Other Stories*. NY: HarperCollins, 2002. Several stories in the collection are relevant:

"The Matter of Seggri" — A thought experiment about the imbalance of the sexes, now possible. Presents a world with one man to 16 women, the men spoiled and limited. Women run everything. An interesting look at stereotyping, limiting by category, men not being taken seriously intellectually, having no place to go, inequality in love relationships—in many ways mirroring (i.e., showing in reverse) current patterns.

"Unchosen Love" and "Mountain Ways" — From Planet of O, with four people in a marriage where one may have sex with two partners but with one prohibited. A complex social structure without hierarchy.

"Solitude" — How one's culture makes one's soul. An interesting definition of magic that fits with the notion that language has actual physical results and that one must not violate another's autonomy with magic (language). Again, an absence of hierarchy among adults.

"Old Music and the Slave Women" — A Hainish story. A local story of the horrors of war and how war dehumanizes both sides. Shows how a revolution may "eat its own" and how violence begets violence. Also shows love and affection even in such an environment, with some retained compassion.

Other recommendations appear in alphabetical order by author.

Elgin, Suzette Haden. *Native Tongue* (original 1984). NY: Feminist Press Reprint edition 2000.

Elgin invented Láadan, a constructed language by and for women, and a world with aliens where linguists are essential. A story of development of language and of its results on thinking and behavior. This is the first book of a trilogy; Feminist Press has recently also reissued *Judas Rose Earthsong*.

Moon, Elizabeth. *Remnant Population*. Baen 1996.

An old woman decides not to leave home when the powers that be order her to. She is a colonist on a planet believed to have no sentient species. Her own growth is a marvel to read, and her interaction with the inhabitants in a first-contact situation delightful. Relevant here is what

is important to the inhabitants and how it clashes with the colonialist military hierarchy.

Slonczewski, Joan *A Door into Ocean* Avon 1986

Imagine a language where we all share whatever we do. We share talking, or loving, or hitting. A fascinating creation of culture without hierarchy, with complexity, water based, in which empathy is a linguistic postulate in the language.

Thomson, Amy. *The Color of Distance*. Ace 1999.

The author invents a language based on color and lets us watch a biologist learn the language after she is shipwrecked on the planet. Death, for the fully adult, is optional, but new adults are made, by hormonal linking, only upon the death of an elder. Thomson also creates conflict resolution such that war is not an option. There is a sequel, *Through Alien Eyes*.

Tiptree Jr, James. "The Women Men Don't See" (1973) reprinted in *Star Songs of an Old Primate; Ten Thousand Light Years from Home; Warm Worlds & Otherwise; More Women of Wonder; Future Earths*; and "Houston, Houston Do You Read?" (1976) reprinted in TOR double (with *Chaos* Joanna Russ) (& in collections)

These two stories are classics. The first is about an airplane crash in Mayan territory and a decision that two women make. The story is in the quiet details of perception and counteracting behavior between the male narrator and the protagonist woman. The second story is of a future earth without men (thanks to virus/genemeddling laboratories) where three anachronisms arrive from a NASA accident. We see those we live with through the eyes of women who have never known male aggression except in history books.

Vonarburg, Elisabeth. *Chroniques de Pays de Mères* Québec/Amérique 1992 -- giving us in English: *In the Mother's Land*. Translated by Jane Brierley, 1992 Spectra/Bantam. *Maerlande Chronicles*. Translated by Jane Brierley. 1992 Tesseract (Beach Holme). On the Tiptree 1992 short list.

This is the first role reversal fiction I found believable. Men destroyed the world with their play with armaments, so the survivors in this post-holocaust novel develop other social structures to make sure they never do it again, while coping with the genetic effects of pollution both for people and for the earth. War is not an option.

Zettel, Sarah. *Playing God*. Aspect / Warner 1998.

This good read deals with the absurdities of violence and war. A biotechnologist/anthropologist is hired to clean a biological weapon out of the ecosystem of the creators of said weapon. An excellent story of a peacemaker.

Copyright of Women & Language is the property of George Mason University Communication Dept and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.