

## **Conflict (Resolution) in the Global South**

**By Bernedette Muthien  
Director, Engender (NGO)**

### **CONTACT DETAILS:**

Tel & Fax: +27-21-448 2112

Mobile: +27-83-345 0552

Email: [bmuthien@icon.co.za](mailto:bmuthien@icon.co.za) / [info@engender.org.za](mailto:info@engender.org.za)

Website: [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za)

PO Box 12992, Mowbray, 7705, Cape Town, South Africa

## **Kissing all Cheeks: Unpacking Conflict (Resolution) in the Global South**

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

This chapter is written by a South African woman of colour. The discussions are focused on South Africa, and is intended to extend to other countries in the global South.

There can be no peace or democracy without human rights and justice. Hence the notion of *positive peace*, rather than the more traditional view of negative peace (absence of war or 'formal' or violent conflict/s). At present there exists no positive peace, or human security, anywhere in the world. For example, in developed countries many people are unemployed, with millions in the USA living well below poverty levels.

Nonviolent conflict, by its very nature, is creative, allows for fluidity and transformation, and thus is a positive concept.

Conflict occurs when people disagree on ideas, values and [or] goals. All conflict is not necessarily bad. If handled well, conflict can help and challenge people to find creative ways to resolve a problem. Conflict "gives a creative opportunity for development and change" [Burnley: 1988: 55]. Conflict does not have to lead to violence. Michael Banks describes conflict as "a catalyst for social processes": conflict provides "stimulus, challenge, change and progress" [Banks, 1987: 260]. [Muthien, 1998: 6].

Hence post-conflict environments especially afford unique creative spaces for transformation and insertion of historically marginalised agendas, as well as fertile grounds for reconciliation.

In this chapter I discuss human rights and justice with respect to South Africa.

Historically marginalised sectors in South Africa, like women and LGBTQI or queer<sup>2</sup> people, bolstered by local activisms and international allies, were able to insert their own agendas into our Constitution and other key legislative and policy measures that guaranteed widespread social equity and freedom from violence, on paper at least.

In line with this, and led by the African National Congress (ANC) during the negotiations in the early 1990s, South Africa began a process of ensuring women's political and wider participation with one of the world's highest representivities in especially government. Local government has not yet effected similar equitable gender ratios, showing the challenges of putting policy into practice and local resistance to macro change.

Similarly, various legislative and policy measures pertaining to gender and gender violence have been instituted since 1994. In particular South Africa's Domestic Violence Act (DVA) of 1999, and Sexual Offences Act (under parliamentary review since at least 2004), both of which define gender-based violence (GBV) very broadly and inclusively, irrespective of gender and other statuses.

It was precisely the work of activists, engaged with and by the new democratic government, largely composed of former activists, who advocated for, and drafted these

---

<sup>1</sup> With immense appreciation to Silke Roth, Heinrich Boell Stiftung (especially Gitti Hentschel and Beate Adolf), Auswärtige Amt (especially Otto Lampe and Thomas Fitschen), the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), and all the other individuals and institutions who supported the production of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> LGBTQI is lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/ed, queer and intersex/ed, at present the most inclusive way to describe non-heteronormative people. The use of the far simpler term 'queer' is part of a radical global movement's aim to reclaim previously pejorative terms.

seminal pieces of legislation. The problem of implementation, which requires further funds and intersectoral collaborations, remains, especially on the part of the police and judicial system.

In every possible field of legislation in South Africa, activists have left their mark. Our progressive environmental laws reflect our green movement. Labour legislation reflects a balance between the demands of capital, and the needs of workers, as well as the country's imperatives for macroeconomic stability, growth and poverty reduction. Indigenous people (the Khoisan or Bushman are the first nations people of Southern Africa) have been active in shaping their place in the new democracy. Children's rights and legislation have been shaped by rights NGOs like Molo Songolo and RAPCAN, and health, especially the HIV/AIDS challenge, has been radically challenged and transformed by e.g. the Treatment Action Campaign, while housing is kept on track through the activism of e.g. the radical Landless People's Movement. Sometimes civil society, in the form of organised NGOs, employ litigation to hold the state accountable to its seminal Constitution, most often successfully, yet sometimes compromising in acknowledgement of the "progressive realisation of rights", i.e. that the state can only fulfil its constitutional obligations to provide for the people when it has the necessary resources to do so (this especially in relation to housing and health). It does seem as if the civil movements that operated, and were mostly repressed, under apartheid are thriving in the more open democracy of the present. During August 2005 a stalwart of the domestic anti-apartheid movement, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) launched the new UDF (United Democratic Front, the largest domestic anti-apartheid coalition during the 1980s), as a new mass movement to combat poverty, without support from the ruling ANC. With all its contradictions and challenges, the new South Africa does seem as if it is living its ideals of democracy, more than a decade after our first general election.

### Security policy in South Africa

Security policy in the democratic South Africa was birthed during the lengthy multi-party negotiations process of CODESA<sup>3</sup> (1990-1994), with activists and academics actively involved in the process. These negotiations led to the Defence Review, a broad network of government (especially the military), civil society (including the Coalition for Defence Alternatives) and academics, and the redefinition of South African security away from the traditional notion of national security, to one of human security, with a policy acknowledgement that the greatest threat to South African security will not be from a neighbouring country, but in reality is poverty. This was during the relatively exciting late 1990s, when the country was pregnant with the possibilities of transformation and justice.

This fairly progressive, if not outright radical, domestic definition of security, still begs the question of who defines security, and on whose behalf, as well as whose interests are served by the definition? More people were killed in any number of conflicts in the world, especially Africa (e.g. Darfur, Sudan) than during 9/11 or the London transport bombings.

So whose security, security for whom? An extensive report released during 2005 by the University of the Witwatersrand's Institute for Socio-Economic Research (WISER) suggests that security, and private security in particular, is in the eyes of the beholder. Rich white people, and the tiny 1% black elite, who speak of their lack of domestic security, and spend millions annually on private security companies, largely and ironically

---

<sup>3</sup> Congress for a Democratic South Africa.

staffed by former apartheid security personnel, can be contrasted with poor black people in townships that police and ambulance services will not even enter, who merely ask for jobs and food. According to the WISER report, it is the rich (99% white) that feel most insecure, and spend most on private security, while it is the poor (99% black) that are, in fact, the least secure and subject to daily violences<sup>4</sup>.

## Gender differences in violence

Women are particularly affected by daily violence, which fundamentally infringes on their lived security<sup>5</sup>. As Lisa Vetten puts it:

...it can be extrapolated that the 52 733 rapes reported by the SAPS [South African Police Services] in their 2003/04 released data is more accurately calculated as falling somewhere between the region of 104 000 and 470 000 actual rapes having taken place. [2005: 2]

Vetten's relatively *conservative* extrapolation for that year suggests that between 285 and almost 1,300 women were raped a day, i.e. one rape occurred every minute. This national emergency is compounded by access to other common aspects of security, such as police services and justice, as Vetten attests:

The legacy of apartheid legislation such as the Group Areas Act, as well as the under-resourcing of rural areas shifts costs on to women which obstruct their access to justice. In 1994 for instance, 74% of the country's police stations were located in white suburbs or business districts (Department of Safety and Security, 1998). [2005: 4-5]

In a landmark 2005 case, South Africa's Constitutional Court ruled in favour of a plaintiff, who sued the Minister of Safety and Security, because three police officers, in uniform and on duty, gang raped her. Lynette Denny<sup>6</sup> asserts that:

the incidence of rape specifically, rather than other forms of gender-based violence, is equivalent to that of tuberculosis in the country, "approximately 300 in every 100,000" and hence "rape is our number one public health problem" and should be considered a "national emergency". [Muthien, 2003: 13].

In 1999 South Africa gained yet another moment of fame, with its entry into the *Guinness Book of Records* for the country's high rape statistics. The Medical Research Council's extensive report on intimate homicide or femicide, the murder of women by their male partners, was released early in 2005: a woman is murdered by her male partner *every six hours*.

Predictably, violence against women is not unique in South Africa. Spain's efforts since 2004 to combat their own epidemic of femicide caused a media frenzy. During 2005 the World Health Organisation (WHO) completed an extensive international survey<sup>7</sup> of GBV, which affirms Amnesty International's 2005 report<sup>8</sup> on GBV, and the work of researchers

---

<sup>4</sup> The use of the plural "violences" is intended to emphasise the complexity and diversity of violence, e.g. in Johan Galtung's [1996] 'triangle' of violence, from direct/personal to structural/institutional to cultural/ideological.

<sup>5</sup> For further explication cf Muthien 2003, 2004a, 2004b. And [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za).

<sup>6</sup> Personal interview, March 2002. Prof Lynette Denny, head of the University of Cape Town's Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, several years ago founded a simple cervical screening project in Khayelitsha, a local township, to combat easily preventable cervical cancer, by providing free pap smears to indigent women. Interview part of extensive research project, reported in Muthien 2003.

<sup>7</sup> WHO's "World Report On Violence And Health", written by Henriette Jansen, includes two rates for intimate partner violence: "In 48 population-based surveys from around the world, 10-69% of women reported being physically assaulted by an intimate male partner at some point in their lives. In large national studies, the range is between 10-34%.... Physical violence in intimate relationships is often accompanied by psychological abuse, and in a third to over a half of cases by sexual violence.

<sup>8</sup> "Making Violence Against Women".

across the world, especially in developed countries like Germany, of a minimum of 30% domestic violence, i.e. at least one in three women are battered by their male partners across the world. The WHO states that this rate is up to 69% in some countries. Even Oprah Winfrey regularly covers the issues of GBV and femicide on her talk show, accompanied by well-researched articles in O magazine.

The *WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women* (initiated 1997, published 2002) asserts:

Violence against women (VAW) is one of the major public health and human rights problems in the world today. It is a universal phenomenon, which cuts across boundaries of culture or class and which affects millions of women worldwide. Its serious consequences on the health and well being of women and their children compel us to act towards its immediate prevention and elimination. Violence against women is both sustained by and in turn helps to sustain women's unequal status in society. [2002: 3]

Data from a wide range of countries suggest that partner violence accounts for a significant number of deaths by murder among women. Studies from Australia, Canada, Israel, South Africa and the United States of America show that *40–70% of female murder victims were killed by their husbands or boyfriends*, frequently in the context of an ongoing abusive relationship. This contrasts starkly with the situation of male murder victims. In the United States, for example, only 4% of men murdered between 1976 and 1996 were killed by their wives, ex-wives or girlfriends. [2002: 114, 118, emphasis added]

In South Africa and elsewhere it is largely *women* (and children) who are raped and killed *by men*. This is an undeniable fact, and hence brings home the gendered differences in violence. More women are killed in the world every day, during conflicts and in times of peace, than male combatants and non-combatants combined. These women die from easily preventable conditions during pregnancy and childbirth, by virtue of their physiology and socio-economic status from AIDS and other illnesses, by virtue of their gender from sex selection before or during birth (infanticide/femicide), due to their gender from violence and murder at the hands of men whom they often know and love (domestic violence and rape). Even the institution of marriage challenges the notion of security for women, as the WHO multi-country report shows that husbands routinely rape their wives:

sexual assault by an intimate partner is neither rare nor unique to any particular region of the world. For instance, 23% of women in North London, England, reported having been the victim of either an attempted or completed rape by a partner in their lifetime... The prevalence of women sexually assaulted by an intimate partner in their lifetime (including attempted assaults) has also been estimated in a few national surveys (for example, Canada 8.0%, England, Wales and Scotland (combined) 14.2%, Finland 5.9%, Switzerland 11.6% and the United States 7.7%). [2002: 151-152].

Hence South Africa and Spain are not exceptions, but mere expressions of the same global theme of generic societal violence, and violence against women specifically.

## Engendering Security

Why are there such high levels of endemic violence against women by men in societies supposedly at peace (not at war with other countries)? Phrased differently, why is there such silence about a global war being fought against 50% of the world's population, against specifically women's bodies and souls? And if women are by far the majority of survivors of gender based violence, why are women in particular so silent about it? Especially since the majority of women give birth to and raise the boys and men that perpetrate such violences against women and children. Every rapist, every batterer, was birthed by a woman.

For decades archeologists<sup>9</sup>, anthropologists and other social scientists have shown that for approximately 5,000 years we have been living under a system of rule that is based on domination and oppression, competition and violence, insecurity and fear<sup>10</sup>. This dominator system functions by creating differences where there are none, such as between black and white, between women and men, between heterosexuals and homosexuals. Identities are formed by Othering, where I can only be black because I am not white, a woman because I am not a man, heterosexual because I am not homosexual, where one binary opposition rules over and oppresses the Other. It does not tolerate anything in between these artificially exaggerated polar opposites. Most contemporary religions, including Judaism, Christianity and Islam, and their respective wars of conquest fought in the names of their respective gods - Jews against Pagans, Christian 'Holy Crusades', Islamic *jihads* - are part of this dominator system, the rule by (some) men over Others, especially women. The use of violence as a method of control is a critical expression of this dominator system, which is also called patriarchy.

A very simple expression of patriarchal violence is the war being waged between two kinds of fundamentalisms, both originally and ironically born in the Middle East - Islam and Christianity – through international terrorist networks<sup>11</sup>, pitted against the military might of the USA<sup>12</sup>, which is fundamentally supported by conservative Christians. European debates on allowing Muslim women and girls to wear headscarves can be juxtaposed with the societal prevalence of crucifixes and other symbols of Christianity. It can also be evinced by the entire foundation of the European Union on Christianity, and repeated rejection of Turkey's application to join the EU, especially ironic given the significant influence of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, visible through architecture and the very origins of modern science<sup>13</sup> and philosophy (which predates and informed the Greeks). Ironically, the post-Newton empiricism that modern science is built on was derived from the work of Alhazen<sup>14</sup> during the 10<sup>th</sup> century, and centuries later by the Italian, Galileo Galilee (1564-1642), an inductive science that is different to the classic Greek methods of deduction and assumption.

## Men, masculinity and violence

While women and children are by far the majority of survivors of violence, men are also profoundly affected by violence. The WHO multi-country study shows the extent of men as survivors of rape by other men:

Studies conducted mostly in developed countries indicate that 5-10% of men report a history of childhood sexual abuse... Most experts believe that official statistics vastly under-represent the number of male rape victims. The evidence available suggests that males may be even less likely than female victims to report an assault to the authorities. There are a variety of reasons why male rape is underreported, including shame, guilt and fear of not being believed or of being denounced for what has occurred. Myths and strong prejudices surrounding male sexuality also prevent men from coming forward. [2002: 154]

---

<sup>9</sup> E.g. the work of the late Marija Gimbutas, and more accessible Riane Eisler. Also the Center for Partnership Studies URL: [www.partnershipway.org](http://www.partnershipway.org) . Also Heide Göttner-Abendroth, URL: [www.hagia.de](http://www.hagia.de) .

<sup>10</sup> Cf Muthien, 2004. "Engendering Security". URL [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za)

<sup>11</sup> with cells present even in South Africa

<sup>12</sup> Supported by its allies, Spain and the UK in particular, specifically targeted for bombings by terrorists.

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Teresi, 2003.

<sup>14</sup> Born in Persia during 965, his non-Western name is Abu Ali al-Hasan ibn al-Haytham.

Perpetrators of violence, of all genders, are themselves brutalised by the violence they perpetrate, and it is a well-known fact that the majority of child abusers are themselves survivors of child abuse. New soldiers in militaries around the world are routinely brutalised during their training to instil aggression and encourage them to kill their 'enemies'. The construction of masculinities is itself premised on violence, from a denial of emotion and sensitivity (e.g. "boys don't cry"), to inculcating aggression and excessively competitive behaviour. The European football competition evinces this win-lose system of and for men starkly, with losing team members crying in the midst of jubilant victors, while many of us join in this win-lose competitive frenzy without thinking of alternative, collaborative ways to excel, non-competitive sport to get our citizens fit and healthy.

Even witnesses of violence are brutalised by vicarious trauma. So no single member of our global society is immune from this violence. All *Al Qaeda* has done through its so-called terrorism is to bring the violence of the global system back home to the global North, to form a complete circle of violence, to have the snake's head bite its own tail.

Female heads of government and other institutions of social control, billions of Euros to combat gender violence, legislation and policy *has not* and *will not* fundamentally alter this dominator system. The only way society will be transformed to equity, justice and nonviolence will be through fundamental shifts in consciousness, undoing the violences of over 5,000 years, of combining modern technology with the ancient pre-patriarchal systems of partnership<sup>15</sup> and cooperation, fluidity and tolerance.

## The Legacy of Colonialism

It took centuries of brutal oppression, and often violent opposition, for European countries to relinquish control over their colonial territories. And over fifty years of legal apartheid for white supremacists to relinquish control of Namibia and South Africa. Like the apartheid rulers, those in power will not relinquish their power unless they believe they have no choice. In this same way men, who by the nature of their constructed identities, benefit structurally from the dominator system, will not relinquish power without significant struggle. Unless it is repeatedly shown how this same system of domination brutalises men individually and collectively, as masculinities studies shows. And the costs of maintaining the violences of patriarchy is clearly shown to outweigh its benefits. For the past forty years feminist economists have shown the deleterious economic effects of GBV on the world. Even sexual harassment in the workplace has the victim/survivor lose valuable productivity time<sup>16</sup> in the midst of the trauma, while the perpetrator loses productivity through not focusing on his work, and often repeats the harassing behaviour wherever he is employed. The WHO's 2004 report, *The Economic Dimensions of Interpersonal Violence*, attests:

Interpersonal violence is expensive. For instance, estimates of the cost of violence in the United States of America reach 3.3% of the gross domestic product. In England and Wales, the total costs from violence – including homicide, wounding and sexual assault - amount to an estimated \$40.2 billion annually... Evidence abounds that the public sector - and thus society in general – bears much of the economic burden of interpersonal violence...

Workplace violence in Australia resulted in costs to employers of \$5 582 per victim and \$837 million annually in damage to the Australian economy... Internationally, a report commissioned by the ILO on the costs of violence and stress in work environments estimated that losses from stress and violence at work represented from 1.0% to 3.5% of

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf Graham Kemp and Douglas Fry's edited volume, *Keeping the Peace* [2004], for examples of ancient and modern societies that routinely employ nonviolent conflict resolution to 'keep the peace'.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. WHO's *The Economic Dimensions of Interpersonal Violence*, 2004.

the gross domestic product over a range of countries. [2004: xvii, xviii, 79 or pages 11,12, 36 of downloaded pdf]

In similar ways that apartheid brutalised *all* South Africans, irrespective of skin colour, so too the unequal global economic system brutalises the global South. The new South African government felt compelled to implement structural adjustment programmes that saw its poorest people suffer more economically than under apartheid. With so-called “stable macroeconomic fundamentals”, and a mandate for the ruling African National Congress from more than two thirds of the population in the 2004 elections, the South African government now promises aggressive development beyond its black economic empowerment programme that enriches only a small black elite that ten years after liberation owns a mere 1% of the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. Whites, who structurally benefited under apartheid, still control 99% of the wealth in South Africa, eleven years later.

A fitting example of white elite resistance to sharing wealth more equitably, let alone legally, is the diamond company, De Beers, who before the first ever general election in South Africa in April 1994, and with the approval of the apartheid-era South African Diamond Board, shipped tonnes of unpolished diamonds out of the country, thus avoiding payment of 15% export duty to the new democratic government<sup>17</sup>. Thus both the government, and the country’s citizens, were robbed of billions of euros that could be spent on development and combating poverty.

The gender ratio of wealth ownership, and resistance to transformation, should be equally obvious. Naledi Pandor, South Africa’s Minister of Education, quantifies gender inequality in the country:

Of the 364 listed companies and state-owned enterprises in South Africa, only seven have women CEOs, and three out of every five have men-only boards. Although women account for 41% of South Africa’s workforce, only 15% of executive managers and just 7% of all directors are women... We have... only one woman vice-chancellor [head] in our 22 universities. [*Mail & Guardian*, September 2 to 8, 2005, page 20, edited version of address at the “Women Creating Wealth Conference”, on 11 August]

These are real constraints that face new democracies of the global South, like Brazil and South Africa, fairly equally. How to remain part of structurally unequal economic global relations, as a matter of survival, a system that requires significant cutbacks in social spending, while simultaneously caring for its citizens. Only the global North can significantly alter the violences that structural economic programmes wreak on real people, only developed countries can fundamentally alter unequal trade through e.g. the WTO. To name but one example, even if all of Africa unites, and a pan-African government takes control of all indigenous natural resources, like diamonds, it still needs a market to sell the diamonds to, to turn raw materials into commodities. Diamonds without markets are worthless rocks in a capitalist consumer society. Diamonds without value and desire is precisely why De Beers has had a stranglehold on marketing diamonds, more latterly to mainland China, and also controlling the value of diamonds by releasing limited quantities onto world markets. Networks and collaborative programmes of developing countries, such as the African Union and NEPAD, will take a very long time to become globally effective, and to fundamentally shift unequal global power relations.

The world’s hero, Nelson Mandela, shared a Nobel Peace Prize with FW de Klerk, who is directly and personally responsible for several recorded instances of genocide in South

---

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Nic Dawes, 2005.



Africa. Democracy in South Africa required both an oppressive government, and a broad liberation movement, *simultaneously* willing to negotiate sharing power. Without the active cooperation of each party to end centuries of brutal oppression and genocide, our relatively peaceful transition would never have been possible.

### Overcoming hatred and violence

Hatred and revenge, fear and insecurity, will only benefit 1% of the world's population who own the world's wealth. Peace, growth and development all require trust and forgiveness, of self and others, even in the absence of perpetrator/s and/or full disclosure of atrocities.

Structural violence mirrors personal or direct violence, so that rape survivors cannot reclaim their lives without forgiving perpetrators they may never encounter again, perpetrators who have long forgotten the individuals they so routinely brutalised in seemingly endless spirals of violence. So too blaming the South African government for our people's poverty will not achieve as much as actively and constructively engaging with government to transform our society. Even the corporate sector, through investment in development, are contributing to transformation, with Vodacom, a leading mobile phone network, supporting the establishment of holistic rape care centres throughout the country, and its competitor, MTN, contributing significantly to our government's 16 Days Campaign to End Violence Against Women and Children. The same principles apply to global relations, and transforming global relations, for the benefit of all the world's people.

The South African state cannot govern without taking into account the welfare of its people. So too the global North cannot survive while the majority of the world's populations live in abject poverty. The sellers *and* buyers of armaments, supported by their respective governments, should take equal responsibility for funds that should more productively be spent on development and genuine human security, especially during transition from active conflicts.

Governments, like South Africa, who borrow from the World Bank and buy Presidential jets and billions of Euros of armaments from European companies that bribe Deputy Presidents, are as accountable as the G8. People who wake every day and go to work and pay their bills are as accountable, through their silences, as those who physically perpetrate violence. We are all, each, responsible for our world, for development, justice and peace. And as the majority of South Africans, of all skin colours, under apartheid, who *chose* to not join the liberation movement, now benefit from our new democracy, so too all the world's population benefits from peace and justice. In our modern world ignorance and innocence have become obsolete words.

### Acknowledging Diversity

Throughout interviews in a recent anthology, Audre Lorde speaks of the need for recognition of diversities, while forging a united front against oppressions:

we cannot separate the struggles for liberation because it is, eventually, all human liberation. And until we come into that concept, until we broaden our viewpoints so that liberation doesn't remain the private province of any one particular group, until we do that, we're going to be working against each other, and working against ourselves. [Kaminsky, 2004: 4-5]

Bernice Johnson Reagon affirms the strategic, even if most challenging, need for unity:

At a certain stage nationalism [more homogenous groups] is crucial to a people if you are going to ever impact as a group in your own interest. Nationalism at another point becomes reactionary because it is totally inadequate for surviving in the world with many peoples... You don't do no coalition building in a womb... as Che Guevara said shortly before he died, the great revolutions are those revolutions guided by the basic principles of love. [2000: 345, 355].

North-South cooperation requires a new consciousness, a new honesty, that has us first scrutinise ourselves, our own governments, and our own trading and other practices.

Peggy Antrobus speaks of a counter-cultural approach which would validate alternative sources of power, and of her notion of "personal transformation", rooted in agency:

The kind of personal change that I envisage is one that would challenge leadership to recognize shortcomings and contradictions within oneself, to be consistent, ethical and honest about one's own limitations while experiencing one's own inner power. Above all, this kind of personal transformation would prevent us from thinking ourselves superior to others and trying to control or dominate others, but would rather help us to take responsibility for ourselves and our actions. [2004: 132, 172-175].

Conclusions: Eradicating poverty, building peace

As South Africa can never be secure until poverty is redressed, so too 9/11, the Barcelona train massacre, the London transport bombings, and other terrorist attacks show that the global North will never be secure until developing regions have secure, equitable democracies. Desmond Tutu asserts that for him, the African principle of *ubuntu*

speaks of the very essence of being human ... you are generous, you are hospitable, you are friendly and caring and compassionate. You share what you have. It is to say 'My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours.' We belong in a bundle of life. We say: 'A person is a person through other persons'. It is not 'I think therefore I am'. It says rather: 'I am human because I belong. I participate. I share.' [1999:31]

Every development Euro in Africa is an investment in the security of Europe. The Cold War-era investments in despots should be replaced with combating poverty, disease, and violence, especially against women and children. Our freedoms, our democracies, our security, are all inextricably linked. So-called terrorism shows our mutual human vulnerabilities, beyond our suits and other ethnic accoutrement, evinces our interdependence. And begs us to work together as equal partners, north-south, men-women, for the freedom and security of our entire planet and all its diverse inhabitants.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amnesty International. 2005. "Making Violence Against Women". URL: [www.amnesty.org](http://www.amnesty.org) .  
Amnesty International. 2004. *Making Violence Against Women Count*.

Antrobus, Peggy. 2004. *The Global Women's Movement: Origins, Issues and Strategies*. Dhaka: University Press, Bangkok: White Lotus, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, Bangalore: Books for Change, Kuala Lumpur: SIRD, Cape Town: David Philip, London and New York: Zed Books.

Dawes, Nic. 2005. "De Beers's tax bill is forever". In *Mail & Guardian*. September 9 to 15, page 5.

Eisler, Riane & David Loye. 1990. *The Partnership Way: New Tools for Living and Learning, Healing our Families, Our Communities and Our World*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Eisler, Riane. 1987. *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Banks, Michael. 1987. "Four Conceptions of Peace". In *Conflict Management and Problem Solving: Interpersonal to International Applications*. Dennis JD Sandole and Ingrid Sandole-Staroste Eds. New York: New York University Press.

Burnley, Jen. 1988. "Conflict". In *Education for Peace: Issues, Principles, and Practice in the Classroom*. David Hicks Ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Galtung, Johan. 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Sage.

Gimbutas, Marija. 1999. *The Living Goddesses*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Göttner-Abendroth, Heide. 2004. "Matriarchal Society: Definition and Theory". In *The Gift, A Feminist Analysis*. Rome: Athanor.

Hall, Joan Wylie. 2004. Editor. *Conversations with Audre Lorde*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Kaminsky, Margaret. 2004 (1975). "Interview with Audre Lorde". In Hall.

Kemp, Graham, and Douglas P Fry. 2004. *Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Societies Around the World*. New York & London: Routledge.

Medical Research Council. 2004. "Every 6 Hours a Woman is Killed by her Intimate Partner: A National Study of Female Homicide in South Africa". MRC Policy Brief. No 5, June 2004. Authors Shanaaz Matthews, Naeemah Abrahams, Lorna Martin, Lisa Vetten, Lize van der Merwe and Rachel Jewkes.

Muthien, Bernedette. 2004a. "Engendering Security". In *Human Security = Women's Security*. Conference proceedings of October 2003 (English and *Deutsche*). Berlin:

Feminist Institute of the Heinrich Boell Stiftung. URL: [www.boell.de](http://www.boell.de) . Also URL [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za) .

Muthien, Bernedette. 2004b. "Strategic Interventions: Gender-based violence & HIV/AIDS". In *Agenda*. (abbreviated report). URL: [www.agenda.org.za](http://www.agenda.org.za) .

Muthien, Bernedette. 2003. "Strategic Interventions: Gender-based violence & HIV/AIDS". Cape Town: Community Law Centre, University of the Western Cape. URL: [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za) .

Muthien, Bernedette. 1998. *Introduction to Peace Studies*. Cape Town: Quaker Peace Centre.

Reagon, Bernice Johnson. 2000. "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century". In Smith.

Smith, Barbara. 2000. Ed. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Teresi, Dick. 2003. *Lost Discoveries: The Ancient Roots of Modern Science – from the Babylonians to the Maya*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Tutu, Desmond Mpilo. 1999. *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York, London: Image

Vetten, Lisa. 2005. "Violence against women: Good practices in combating and eliminating violence against women". Report for the UN Division for the Advancement of Women, Expert Group Meeting, 17-20 May, Vienna.

World Health Organisation. 2005. "World Report on Violence and Health". Written by Henrietta Jansen. URL: [www.who.org](http://www.who.org) .

World Health Organisation. 2004. *The Economic Dimensions of Interpersonal Violence*.

World Health Organization. 2002. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: WHO.