

“‘Women of Peace’ We Are Not”: Feminist Militants in the West German *Autonomen* and the Women’s Movement

Patricia Melzer

ABSTRACT

In the 1980s, the Left scene of the *Autonomen* was highly visible in West Germany, in particular because of their militancy that was a central part of their activism. Meanwhile, the autonomous women’s movement had forged relationships to the peace movement and overall denounced political violence and militancy. This article examines the politics of *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, a small group of militant feminists in Hamburg whose activism connected the politics of the *Autonomen* to those of the autonomous women’s movement. Feminist militants are rarely discussed in scholarship on German political movements—I argue that they in fact constituted an important entity in West German political activism.

In 1982, a small, independent feminist press in Munich, Frauenbuchverlag, published a collection of essays by a variety of women activists. The compilation, according to the two editors, was conceptualized as a presentation of diverse feminist voices on a controversial topic: war and violence. Driven by the conviction of a “connection between emancipation and antimilitarism” insisted on by many women active in the peace movement, the editors envisioned the book not only as a way to present feminist voices, but also as a means of stimulating debate within women’s political groups and the peace movement at large.¹ The essays in the book *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still: Streitschriften aus der Frauenbewegung* edited by Ruth Esther Geiger and Anna Johannesson range from positions clearly rejecting (political) violence as masculine defined, to insisting that a focus on disarmament in the women’s peace movement draws attention away from the daily war against women, to advocating non-violent politics as explicitly feminist. The “Streitschriften” character of the book—its emphasis on debate—manifests primarily through the few contributions that question

the impulse to separate women's/feminist politics from the revolutionary Left's use of violence. The contribution by a group of radical women from Hamburg, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* (Women Against Imperialist War), however, is the most provocative: it consists of only a two-page statement by the activists explaining why their *actual* text is missing. The authors pulled it from the volume in response to the editors' concern that the essay—that calls for armed struggle and advocates for politics of the terrorist group Red Army Faction (RAF)—would give the press legal trouble.² The brief statement adamantly opposes the idea that feminist politics are necessarily nonviolent; on the contrary, they insist on the need to “fight and destroy the causes of war.”³ Militancy, it appears, was part of feminist discourse in the 1980s and demands a reevaluation of what is understood to constitute feminist activism.

The omitted paper was later circulated in radical Left and feminist activist circles. Among other things, it conceptualizes the violence of groups like the RAF as an important feminist political tool. The RAF's strategic violence is viewed as more effective in countering patriarchal violence than nonviolent strategies; the targeting of state and imperialism are seen as necessary steps towards women's liberation: “The politics of the RAF were/are important to us exactly for this reason: because they do not avoid reality, imperialist power structures, the alienation; they do not lie about this reality with compromises and by adapting to the system, but instead take seriously, and radically fight for, the goal and the possibility of liberation from imperialism, i.e., our liberation as humans.”⁴ The authors of the controversial text, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, were a women's group that initially formed in Hamburg in the wake of the militant protests during the swearing in of Bundeswehr soldiers in Bremen on May 6, 1980. They sought to generate debates with other feminist activists about effective forms of political resistance. The women met regularly in the women-only bar on Stresemannstraße in Hamburg, a part of the left-alternative neighborhood Schanzenviertel to discuss and plan actions. These included: calls to protests, position papers and declarations, and actions of solidarity with political prisoners, in particular the RAF.⁵ Marxist and anti-imperialist, the group clearly took a pro-RAF position, thereby supporting what they saw as the international armed struggle against imperialism carried out by underground guerilla groups.⁶ Eventually, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* would consist of groups active in cities such as Düsseldorf, Frankfurt am Main, and Hamburg.⁷ Their publications are examples of early formations of feminist voices within the *Autonomen* movement that advocated for feminist militancy in revolutionary contexts.⁸ As a small but vocal group, these women were a part of a number of militant women who raised issues of sexism within Left politics at the same time as they challenged the women's movement on some of its concepts of gender and violence. Their position papers and discussion papers serve as an example for the debates that were taking place in the early 1980s, debates that preceded the heyday of an *autonomen* feminist activism lasting until the second

half of the 1980s. A textual analysis of compilation of their flyers, theses papers, and articles that circulated between June 1980 and February 1982, gives us some insight into the political rationale of the early *autonomen* women's groups.

The *Autonomen* movement (which mainly formed after 1977) is largely understood by mainstream culture to be a militant political formation known for dramatic street battles with the police and for squatting actions in the 1980s. Feminist groups such as *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, connected militant Left politics with the larger women's movement. Generally, these activists are discussed separately from what usually is described as "the women's movement." Women who view violence as a legitimate means of resistance are invisible in the debate on women's social movements—it appears that their violence disqualifies them as feminist activists. Because of this preconceived notion of what constitutes feminist politics, the link between the autonomous women's movement and *Autonomen* that is created by feminist militants remains largely invisible in the literature on both feminism and radical Left politics in Germany.⁹ These *autonome* women—independent but loosely connected groups of women whose militant politics were grounded in a radical denunciation of patriarchal power—challenged (hetero)sexism within the *Autonomen*, and linked anti-imperialist analyses with feminist politics, while rejecting mainstream feminist politics of nonviolence. Their position as a link between the radical Left and the women's movement is unique and is emphasized in the women's political writings. The impact of these feminist militants can be traced far into the 1990s postunification landscape of street politics and, despite being largely ignored by scholars of German social movements, they constitute an important element in the history of German radical Left politics as well as for a historiography of feminist activism.

Since the late 1990s, several publications by *autonome* activists as well as scholars have presented a more comprehensive picture of the politics and worldview of the groups often reduced to being the *schwarzer Block* (the black block) who argue their politics "with rocks in their hands."¹⁰ These sources form the background to my analysis of movement publications by *autonome* women, in which militancy takes a central position and that convey insights into feminist goals and methods of *autonome* women. These insights demand a reevaluation of the definition of "feminist activism" that many women in the autonomous women's movement in the 1980s declared as primarily nonviolent—a definition that remains basically unquestioned in the literature.¹¹

The best-known feminist group who used political violence was the *Rote Zora*. In the literature, the *Rote Zora* usually is presented as an anomaly that does not represent legitimate feminist goals.¹² The writings by *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* question the assumed isolation of feminist militants like the *Rote Zora* from "the" feminist movement in Germany.¹³ Their writings are only one example of the many heterogeneous feminist expressions within *autonomen* movement publications,

however, as Almut Gross points out, “specific content, political attitudes and opinions, ways to organize and to act can be seen as characteristic of women’ politics.”¹⁴ The texts by *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* make visible the discourse of controversial positions of feminist militants and particularly speak to the role that political violence plays in feminist militancy. Understanding the relationship of the autonomous women’s movement and the *Autonomen*, as it was mediated and lived by a small group of feminist activists, is central when looking at feminist militancy. More specifically, the goals of feminist militants were formulated in conversation with, and in contrast to, those of the women’s peace movement and the larger autonomous women’s movement, creating a diverse and complex discourse on feminist political strategies and worldviews.

A note on terminology: this essay discusses three different feminist political formations. “*Autonome* women’s groups,” “*autonome* women,” and “women in the *Autonomen* movement” denote women who from within the *Autonomen* scene denounced sexism and organized politically. These activists were in close relationship with the *autonome Frauenbewegung* (autonomous women’s movement), a relationship that often was defined by attempts to separate from / draw boundaries between each other. The autonomous women’s movement emerged in the early 1970s from the left spectrum of the New Social Movements and developed politics of autonomy (from both the state and the Left). Finally, the *Frauenfriedensbewegung* (women’s peace movement) describes the activism by women who understood pacifism to be the basis for resistance to militarism and the arms race. References to *autonome* women, whose feminist militancy is the focus here, are thus distinct from the autonomous women’s movement and the women’s peace movement. Nevertheless, there existed many overlaps in the political work of these women, in particular between *autonome* women and the autonomous women’s movement, and many militant women viewed themselves *as part* of the autonomous women’s movement.

***Autonome* Women and Feminist Militancy**

The political “home base” of most feminist militants in the 1980s was the scene of the *Autonomen*. The beginnings of the *Autonomen* can be traced back to the early 1970s, to the antiauthoritarian wing of the student movement (“Spontis”). After the escalation of violence during the German Autumn in 1977, which ended in the suicide of three RAF members in prison and the murder of Hanns Martin Schleyer by the RAF, the radical Left distanced themselves from the politics of the RAF. During the Tu-nix congress in Berlin in 1978, autonomous groups formed that continued to reject any type of collaboration with the state. While they did not agree with the anti-imperialist, Marxist leanings of the RAF and their prioritizing of guerilla violence as only effective political resistance, the *Autonomen* declared militancy in form of direct and concrete confrontational tactics in dealings with state power, such as the

police, as a part of their political identity.¹⁵ Militancy should express rage and frustration of the individual activist at the power of the capitalist and inhuman system as much as it should be effective in hindering the execution of state power.¹⁶ The “anti-authoritarian subjectivism” of the *Autonomen* includes a notion of militancy that not only consists of violence against concrete objects, but that “additionally signifies a refusal to be co-opted or to let one’s decisions and behavior be dictated by the laws and norms of the dominant society.”¹⁷ In 1980, several protests and other actions solidified the growing presence of militant *autonome* groups in various regions. Events like the *Rekrutenvereidigung* (swearing-in of recruits of the Bundeswehr) on May 6 in Bremen that resulted in heavy street fighting between protesters and police, the constructions of the *Hüttendorf* (onsite dwellings) in Gorleben (a projected long term nuclear waste storage facility), and the escalation of confrontations between squatters and police in Berlin later that year marked the beginning of a decade of visible, radical autonomous politics.¹⁸ Membership in the *Autonomen* movement always has been characterized by a certain lifestyle and by an informal political activism including squatting, urban living, and antiestablishment aesthetics.¹⁹ Keywords that speak to aspects of each *autonome* group include: self-determination and the personal as political, action before theory, independence, and a number of “anti” positions, such as anti-imperialism and antifascism, and, of course, militancy, i.e., the often spontaneous use of (street) violence against property and the police. *Autonome* groups emerged in connection with a countercultural social milieu, so called *Stadtteil* (neighborhood) politics, that provided an infrastructure of bars, infoshops, squatter houses, neighborhood initiatives, etc. that helped create a counterpublic sphere. Peace politics (NATO’s double-track decision, Cold War nuclear armament), house squatting (gentrification), nuclear power plants, and the expansion of the Frankfurt am Main airport with the Startbahn West served as focus points for the *Autonomen* in the 1980s and into the 1990s.

The heyday of the *Autonomen* clearly were the 1980s, with the themes of the movement finding their climax—and decline—during this decade. Particularly in the second half of the 1980s, women within *Autonomen* circles challenged sexism within their political communities and demanded a feminist critique of the state more generally. The feminist intervention by *autonome* women into militant discourses about oppression and their politicizing of sexism and patriarchy in the 1980s also challenged some political principles of the autonomous women’s movement and its definition of feminist activism. Those debates established militancy as part of feminist politics—a merging of violence and feminist politics that finds early representation in the group that formed *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*.

These substreams within the feminist community are rarely examined in historical scholarship and in the movement’s publications: the literature of the *Neue Frauenbewegung* (second-wave women’s movement) omits them entirely,²⁰ and in publications

about and by *Autonomen*, they often present a political element about which male authors helplessly lack words,²¹ or that is merely discussed as a general “thematizing of gender relations” within the movement.²² Here women-driven efforts to generate an internal movement debate about (hetero)sexism and to integrate resistance to patriarchal power structures at large into *autonomen* political actions are lost in the historiography. Yet these women constitute an important *Schaltstelle* (coordinating point) between the autonomous women’s movement and radical Left groups that demands a critical engagement with the notion of feminist resistance as primarily nonviolent. Above all, these women challenge a preconceived notion of femininity that circulated in large parts of the women’s movement (in particular within the women’s peace movement) and that underlies the understanding of feminist resistance as nonviolent, which has important implications for feminist theories on violence.

Autonome women groups are separately located from what generally is referred to as the autonomous women’s movement. While the autonomous women’s movement rejected the idea that a male-dominated system could provide liberation to women and instead focused on creating a female counterculture, viewed patriarchy as the primary system of oppression, and initially refused to work with the state, it did begin to rely on state funds to realize feminist projects (domestic violence shelters, etc.) in the mid- to late 1970s.²³ The reliance on public funds places autonomous women’s projects into the dilemma of receiving state subsidies while wanting to retain autonomy.²⁴ In contrast, the women’s groups that formed within the militant sectors of the Left adhered to the politics of the broader *Autonomen* movement and categorically rejected any cooperation with the state or any vision of women’s liberation within the existing system. The *Autonomen* formed the political backdrop for these feminist groups; however, the feminist political themes and content, which *autonome* women carried into the discourse of the militant Left, were based on those of the autonomous women’s movement—differences between the two feminist camps manifested in particular in theoretical approaches and in forms of political resistance. The term *autonome* women signals a political attitude that—despite the overlaps—was distinct from both those of the autonomous women’s movement and those of the *Autonomen* and that formed (according to my argument) an important link between the two political identities.²⁵

The overarching goal of women in the *Autonomen* movement was “women’s liberation”; beyond that, their political themes and tactics were closely connected to, and developed from, the general themes of the militant Left.²⁶ Many women were active in the autonomous women’s movement and brought their experiences with resistance against sexism with them into the *Autonomen* movement. The move to form separate, women’s-only groups (e.g., women’s houses in the squats) was driven partially by sexist politics by the men in the movement and partially by an extended analysis of imperialism (and what was understood to be its economic engine, capitalism) to include

patriarchal power structures. So while *autonome* women's groups participated in the political actions of the larger *Autonomen* movement and laid claim to these politics as potentially feminist (e.g., the women's block was a set institution in the lineup of militant protests), they also politicized sexism and sexual violence within their own movement, such as in the campaign against rapists among the *Autonomen* that was launched after women had been raped in *autonomen* circles.²⁷

Militant women's groups formed throughout the 1980s and 90s; however, in the literature there appears to be some agreement that it was from 1986–1989 that their impact on Left and feminist politics was the greatest.²⁸ During this time, important consolidation efforts and new formations took place, and collective actions were planned and executed. After the mid-1980s, the group Rote Zora (that split from the Revolutionäre Zellen in 1984) made feminist militancy visible in the *autonome* movement. Their attacks in 1987 against Adler-Textilien in Haibach for their exploitation of South Korean female workers met with broad approval by women in the radical scene.²⁹ Feminist themes of concern included gene and reproductive technology, immigrant and refugee women, internationalist politics (Kurdistan), Fantifa (the feminist or women's contingent of the Antifa), the overall oppression of women—ideologically and materially—including sexism and sexual violence (debate on rapes in the *autonomen* scene), and campaigns of solidarity with political prisoners.³⁰ The feminist publications *anagan* (1984–1986, Berlin) and *AMAZORA* (1990–1997, Berlin), discussed feminist opinions and actions in the environment of the political scene.³¹

During the 1990s some of the momentum left the feminist spectrum of the *Autonomen*, with many activists retreating into the private sphere—there seemed to be more common interest with the autonomous women's movement than with *autonomen* men.³² At the end of the 1990s, the gender debate flared up once more; since the mid-1990s, the movement—similar to the autonomous women's movement—has not been successful in productively meeting the criticisms of racism and paternalism voiced by activists of color.

Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg clearly saw themselves as a link between the *Autonomen* and the autonomous women's movement. In their call for a meeting of political women in September 1980 in Hamburg, the authors understand themselves to be part of a development of the larger women's movement: "We are women from across the FRG who together are fighting against imperialist and patriarchal domination, and who are in the process of developing through shared lives and struggles resistance with other women, a resistance though which we develop a revolutionary perspective."³³ They combine a militant critique of state, industry, and military treaties with a feminist basic attitude; they advocate for the militant strategies and tactics of the *Autonomen* to achieve feminist goals, and formulate these goals firmly in an anti-imperialist framework.

The documents at hand were flyers or pamphlets combined into a booklet (Brochüre) with the title: “Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg: Flugblätter, Thesenpapiere, Artikel vom Juni 1980 bis jetzt.” In 1982, they were sold for DM 4, in women’s and Left bookstores.³⁴ The brochure includes calls for events of political discussion, women’s meetings and peace conferences, theses about the women’s movement and their role in the peace movement, discussions about anti-imperialist politics and about feminism, flyers about hunger strikes by RAF and Irish prisoners, as well as an article about armed struggle and the importance of an anti-imperialist analysis for feminist politics. Overall the calls issued are directed at the autonomous women’s movement and at times at the women’s peace movement, less at *autonome* men. In their writings, the women clearly situate themselves as part of a feminist debate. The goal seems to be to create a feminist critique of relations of power enhanced by an anti-imperialist analysis, and the integration of militant tactics into feminist activism more broadly.³⁵

Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg: Political Violence as Feminist Resistance

With their critique of nonviolent resistance as ineffective, Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg address both the women’s movement and the peace movement, reflecting a larger debate that was taking place in feminist activist circles. Feminist militants engaged with other women activists in several ways: for one, they believed that patriarchy/imperialism/militarism are interdependent systems of oppression (referring to what we today call “intersectionality” or “assemblages”).³⁶ Accordingly, the concepts of a “primary” versus “secondary” contradiction produced by a class society (the interpretation of the Marxist Left) cannot simply be replaced by an undifferentiated critique of patriarchy. A new feminist politics, as Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg argue instead, will combine “our fight against male power and male domination” with “our fight against state and imperialism, which profit the most from existing structures between guys and women.”³⁷ Feminist militants thus challenged those parts within the autonomous women’s movement that defined feminist resistance within a theory of separatism. Instead of relying on a conceptual distancing from systems of oppression, feminist militants believed that these assemblages of power could only be resisted by meeting their violent manifestations with counterviolence.

Another point of discussion was *autonomen* women’s rejection of nonviolence and cooperation with the state as feminist strategies that many in the autonomous women’s movement supported. This was rooted in a notion of femininity claimed by *autonome* women that they conceptualized in opposition to traditional gender roles. The autonomous women’s movement and, in particular, the women’s peace movement at this point in time (early 1980s) laid claim to a notion of femininity that was primarily marked by nonviolence and that rejected militant feminist resistance. The redefinition of this femininity by *autonome* women was shaped by their militant opposition to the state. They viewed the critique of the state that was initially defining

for the early autonomous women's movement as increasingly watered down in the context of state-funded feminist projects and/or as replaceable with a feminized pacifism within the peace movement. *Autonome* women rejected a growing identification with values traditionally associated with women and femininity, as well as the tendency to transfer political empowerment into a female-defined individual spirituality and into "safe spaces" that at times were financially carried by the state. In contrast to this, *autonome* women insisted on militancy as a necessary feminist strategy in order to resist the cooptation of feminist projects by the state and to effectively confront an overall sexism that they viewed as being sanctioned by society. So they understood violence to be a political means that does not conflict with femininity and directly challenged the women's peace movement in its pacifism by claiming that patriarchal wars and militarisms can only be resisted successfully with violence. These contentious points of discussion are reflected in the writings of *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, who questioned and challenged certain basic assumptions of the autonomous women's movement and the women's peace movement.³⁸

In their introductory statement, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* observe a split in the autonomous women's movement, "the result of a narrow-minded and false concept of women's liberation that has weakened us."³⁹ The militant women saw this split as dividing those feminists who ignored the class system and economic exploitation in their fight against patriarchy, and those who returned to the broader Left movement, giving up on separate feminist politics. *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* viewed themselves as outside of this division. Instead of viewing patriarchy and imperialism in terms of "principal and secondary contradiction," *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* recognize the interdependence of both systems of oppression and the necessity of organizing accordingly. Feminist-lived autonomy and self-determination—keywords of both the women's movement and the radical Left—should thereby not be defined as demarcation (against men), but actively through the content and goal of women's struggle against both male domination and imperialism: "Because imperialism today determines the entire 24-hour day, labor as well as reproduction, the relations between men and women today are caused by their function within imperialism and can only be really cracked in the struggle against it."⁴⁰

Thereby, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* create a link between their own exploitation (and privilege) and those of women in the "Third World." They insist on having to fight patriarchy *as* imperialism/capitalism in a global economy:

What counts now: to understand that our struggle against patriarchal, sexist structures here, against the insane alienation of women can only be carried out as a struggle against the internationally organized, imperialist domination of capital and international division of labor that condemns women worldwide to ensure the reproduction of this system though their unpaid labor.⁴¹

Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg understood themselves to be a connection between autonomous women's movement and *Autonomen*. The question that Sibylle Plogstedt asked in the feminist journal *Courage* in 1981—namely, if violence had arrived in the women's movement—was implicitly answered with a “yes” when Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg located their political identity within the women's movements as well as in the *Autonomen* movement: “We, Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, are both part of the women's movement, and part of the [radical Left].”⁴² Thus one can find in their writings a call both to the autonomous women's movement and the peace movement to “overcome old demarcations/separations among us” in order to resist together / resist militantly.⁴³ As within the *Autonomen*, the militancy underlying the politics of Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg is understood as a political expression of determination that is lacking within other movements and their nonviolent tactics. The protests in Bremen in May had radicalized the authors: “The rocks and mollies (molotov cocktails) that went flying were important because they expressed a new quality of resistance: those who throw rocks do not negotiate anymore with the rulers, have no expectations, determine the confrontation, do not seek integration.”⁴⁴ The result, according to the authors, is effective resistance that, in contrast to nonviolent protest, cannot be integrated into the oppressive system of the state and is thus criminalized.⁴⁵

In general, the language of Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg is infused with metaphors and references to war. Such is the case in the position paper “Wie sind wir zu anti-imperialistischen Inhalten gekommen?” that mirrors the militancy of the *Autonomen* and the armed groups of the 1970s.⁴⁶ In it, the militant women use terminology such as “enemy,” “revolution” versus “Left occupational therapy,” “attack” on “central positions,” and “struggle/fight.” This use of language clearly establishes resistance against state and system within a framework of war. In all the texts authored by the group, the West German state is—particularly in its role as NATO ally—depicted as imperialist warmonger who “ideologically prepares for war” by pushing the militarization of German society (swearing in of Bundeswehr recruits, initiatives to employ women in the Bundeswehr, etc.).⁴⁷ Attempts by the state to repress militant resistance against its politics equals a declaration of war that needs to be responded to accordingly: “Everybody who resists feels this ‘small war’ all around them, is aware that the state has declared war on them. For us it is important that we do not shy away from this declaration of war, but that we accept it—furiously, aggressively and seriously.”⁴⁸

However, Frauen gegen imperialistische Krieg do not only understand violence by women against the state to be based in the political logic of the *Autonomen* and anti-imperialists, but instead view it in the context of feminist efforts of autonomy that were in danger of becoming compromised by the system: “If we women want to act autonomously we need to be radical with ourselves. We have nothing, no history, no

tradition, that we can refer to because we live in a male-dominated society.”⁴⁹ They view their call for militancy as an outgrowth from their work within the autonomous women’s movement—their identity as feminists precedes their identity as *Autonome*—yet they disapprove of the exclusive focus on women-specific projects as misguided: “Our desire was to develop a new political offensive out of the women’s movement (from which most of us have come). . . . We knew that our position did not foreground the conquering of safe spaces, that we did not want to establish calm refuges within this system because that does not attack the state and male domination, does not abolish them but instead simply sidesteps them.”⁵⁰

Based on their own experiences in the women’s movement, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* therefore claimed that a consistent feminist critique of the state was missing in the women’s movement agenda. While the autonomous women’s movement originally had formulated a clear critique of the state, the attention on feminist projects resulted in a political attitude that viewed autonomy as basis for political work, but did not focus on direct opposition to the state. Aside from their analysis that connects imperialist with patriarchal domination, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* divert from the women’s movement through their militant opposition to the state. While parts of the autonomous women’s movement retreated into separate cultural spaces and understood themselves as independent of the state (even though many later relied on state funds for their projects), *autonome* women denounced the state as a major vehicle of women’s oppression and declared it their enemy that must be combated, not simply avoided. Their militancy—violence against property, physical resistance to the state’s monopoly of violence (street fights with the police, housing battles in the squats [*Häuserkampf*], etc.)—therefore grows from the conviction that (feminist) liberation is only possible through the abolition of the state.

In contrast, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* claim that the women’s movement has become “deradicalized”: its emphasis on “Freiräume schaffen”—i.e., creating safe (separate) cultural and social spaces for women—and its collaboration with governmental agencies, according to the group, has betrayed the original struggle for autonomy from personal domination by men, from commercialized manipulation through capitalism, and from institutionalized patriarchal power through the state. “Large parts of the women’s movements have bought into the illusion—and they share this illusion with the entire rest of the alternative movement—that they can change social power relations without having to fight state and capital.”⁵¹ Activism and projects of the women’s movement have become nothing but “easily controllable unpaid social work” that absorbs women into the system without them actually changing it.⁵² Liberation, so they argue, is not possible in cooperation with the state, only against it, and in the *Autonomen* context, the state is not an abstract entity, but always haunted by the specter of fascism that dominates the political imagination of the Antifa: “If we do not want to remain powerless, our goal must be to break with the

system, that is the only way we can prevent the pigs from succeeding again, as under fascism, to integrate so many women, to clutter them with ideologies of motherhood and thereby prepare the ground for wars.”⁵³ Collaboration with the state, per *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, in fact not only deradicalizes but also invites co-optation of feminist politics into the repressive system.

Simultaneously, they continue to argue, the political and cultural separatism of some radical feminists builds on a limited notion of women’s liberation that makes the privileges of Western women invisible—privileges gained from within a context of international labor relations. The focus on the domestic “daily war” waged against German women ignores the liberation of women from militaristic wars within the international context, a topic that the militant Left, as well as the peace movement, was concerned with.⁵⁴

That we within the women’s movement have a certain leeway, receive financial support, still find jobs and thus can free ourselves from the labor of reproduction more so than women in the Third World is derived for the most part from a wealth based on the exploitation of the Third World. When we lose sight of this correlation, we not only reproduce a piece of these imperialist oppressive structures, instead of fighting them especially here in the metropolitan urban areas, but we also do not arrive at a true notion of women’s oppression.⁵⁵

Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg’s criticism of those parts of the autonomous women’s movement that rejected political violence and that advocated politics of separatism logically resulted in them denouncing the goals and political tactics of the women’s peace movement, as well as the peace movement at large.⁵⁶ They rejected the concept of peace the movement organized around and that was limited to the demand of nuclear weapon-free zones. They also resisted the notion of femininity that many women (and men) in the peace movement relied on and that presumed women to possess a natural or socialized peacefulness.⁵⁷ According to this conviction, militarism and politics are manmade and must be stopped by a women-led counter-politics of peace. In their texts, *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* clearly speak out against this basic assumption:

that we are sick of being reduced to these women’s “natural qualities,” that is, to impart peacefulness, the eternal mothers and social workers that make peace between irreconcilable contrasts; that we are no “peace women” because we cannot see peace occurring here or anywhere else on this world and because we cannot conjure up peace, but instead can only combat and destroy the causes of war.⁵⁸

Instead of voicing fear and despair in face of the armed race between the two super powers—as Danish women did in 1980 in their Women for Peace movement, which

was expanded to include a feminist statement against male militarism that same year by the Berliner Frauengruppe in their call to action entitled *Anstiftung für Frieden—Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* instead asked the peace movement to reorient their activism. This reorientation did not intend to ground the necessity of a peace movement for German women, but rather aimed at the worldwide liberation of women—thus lent the peace movement an anti-imperialist framework. Pacifism, argued the militant women, is a luxury many women cannot afford and thus should not be celebrated as a specifically feminist and/or feminine/female quality. Additionally, pacifism allows activists to appeal to the state without making it accountable for its exploitations and thus also allows them to avoid questioning their own privilege.

We, that is the peace movement and the anti-imperialist Left, the women's movement, we can learn from the liberationist movements in our fight against our shared opponent that one can defeat one's enemy when one has dropped all illusions about him (the enemy), when one attacks him materially . . . our sisters within the liberationist movements are role models to us because they have conquered the ability to attack imperialism and defeat it. They do not want to achieve "safe spaces" like parts of the women's movement in the metropolitan areas, but freedom through their liberation struggle.⁵⁹

Not only did the peace movement propagate a gendered ideology, charges the group, they also operated under a certain assumption of "peace"—such as peace in Europe and the end of the arms race—that lacks an anti-imperialist focus in ignoring the global dimension of the rearmament policy. Relying on nonviolence as the only form of political agitation leads to powerless resistance aimed at nothing but "maintaining 'peace' here, i.e., the status quo," and does not address the actual imperialist wars and oppression that other people are experiencing.⁶⁰ The concentration on a nuclear-free West Germany (expanded to include Europe) ignores this reality. The demand to make the FRG a rearmament-free zone thus is limited, the efforts for peace shallow. Instead of challenging imperialism's global destruction and the role of the FRG and NATO in this process, the peace movement selfishly only regards its own needs for security. The result is a peace politics that settles for "pacified" territories within a violent system that simultaneously wages war outside its national boundaries: "And we are not interested in staying out of it as much as possible, maybe even with the hope that we will not be bombed in the process, but our goal is the smashing of NATO, the liberation from imperialism, for us and for all peoples of the world."⁶¹

The movement's negotiations with the state around their own security concerning nonviolent protests led to a deradicalization—the state was allowed to "integrate" the movement into its own intentions: "This is the what the rulers count on, and as long as the peace movement defines its struggle exclusively through the fear of a war in the metropolitan areas and not through the need for liberation of people here and in

the Third World, it risks buying into this calculation.”⁶² The militant women claim it is fear that defines the nonviolence of the peace protests, and that feeds the peaceful image of femininity within the women’s movement, while “women’s groups holding on to this fear, are petrified within their misery and declare that a (political) strategy.”⁶³ *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* conclude that a missing anti-imperialist reference masks the absence of local war as peace: “the peace movement becomes pacified with the offer of a nuclear-free zone, that is, with the promise that war will not take place here.”⁶⁴ Instead of demanding peace, one must meet imperialist wars with war—internal state militarism provokes militant resistance: “we think it is pointless . . . to try to stop imperialism’s war machine with peaceful protests and actions of refusal/disobedience . . . we say: war to the imperialist war and thereby envision not only a third world war . . . but also a toppling of a system that already today is waging open and hidden wars against people who resist its domination.”⁶⁵ Any other goal, furthered by peace politics that propagates a pacifism controllable by the state, is not justifiable.

Conclusion: Feminist Militancy as Feminist Politics

Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg tied their feminist politics to the campaigns of the *Autonomen* as well as to those of the peace movement. They were tapping into a general atmosphere of political departure that was spreading among the *Autonomen* in 1980 and that would last until the late 1980s: “During the last year, resistance here in the FRG, the militant battles by the squatters, the countless protests and actions of the peace movement, the anti-Haig protest in Berlin, the determined resistance of opponents of the NATO Startbahn West, has shown the rulers that the time is past when they could follow through with their projects without interruption.”⁶⁶ The writings of these feminist militants paint a picture in which women in the *autonome* movement inhabit an important place within the political landscape of the Left in West Germany: they forged theoretical and political connections (often through discussions and differences) between a militant Left scene focused on an anti-imperialist activism in opposition to the state, and a feminist movement that was struggling to define its relationship to the state as well as to other social movements (such as the peace movement): “We have felt during the last year (1980) that to want revolution is more than just a phrase, more than just an analysis of imperialism, but that to want revolution is above all: to want to change oneself and others, to want to break with structures and roles that are imposed on women in particular. That is: to realize, that personal and political liberation only happen together, are dependent on each other.”⁶⁷ The controversial question of what role violence plays for the women’s movement is solved by *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* by declaring militant resistance to be an important part of their feminist identity:

Women's liberation means that we fight for self-determination, for subjectivity, that we turn around the experiences we have made as women on the bottom, to be defined through weakness, to become alienated from ourselves: to transform those into collective strength, by standing up against domination, against institutions and institutionalization, against oppression, against chauvinism, to become a counterforce that is able to abolish the imperialist domination and power.⁶⁸

The violent acts of the RAF and other armed groups are not understood as glorification of male violence, but rather—in their uncompromising rejection of the system and their aim to destroy it—as an inspiration for the group *as feminists* (not “instead” but “because of”), that declares political violence to mean gender liberation. *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* aimed at developing a new offensive of feminist politics that rejected ideologies of the peaceful feminine, and aligned itself instead with a militant anti-imperialist activism.

However, feminist militancy is not historicized as part of feminist politics. Instead, the arguments made by activists such as *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg*, are dismissed as “not actually feminist” and as shaped by the masculinized politics of the Left that are merely using feminist rhetoric to legitimize their actions. Sibylle Plogstedt's “Ist die Gewalt in der Frauenbewegung angekommen?,” in which the author criticizes political violence as antifeminist,⁶⁹ is evaluated by feminist and political historians such as Ilse Lenz as “authentic and understandable,” while women in armed groups are charged with having merely appropriated “feminist metaphors” which they then “integrated into the ideology of armed struggle.”⁷⁰ “These strategies,” Lenz claims, “however, were clearly criticized by *all factions* of the women's movement.”⁷¹ This generalization—and simplification—of the diverse autonomous women's movement is countered by the fact that feminists within the movement debated questions of political violence in sophisticated and complicated ways.⁷² Diverse feminist positions are mirrored in the book *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still*, whose editors had invited *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* to contribute—the editors clearly understood these militant women to be a part of a complicated feminist political landscape that connected feminist activism with a broader radical Left scene.

Regarding *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* specifically, it remains to be researched how this “connecting function” of feminist militants was concretely reflected within political circles of the Left. In any case, the discussions by *Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg* convey how the autonomous women's movement in Germany created an—albeit controversial—feminist militancy that should be a part of the historiography of German protest movements.

Notes

1. Ruth Esther Geiger and Anna Johannesson, eds., *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still: Streitschriften von Frauen zu Krieg und Gewalt* (Munich: Frauenbuchverlag, 1982), 8. All translations of German texts cited in the article are mine.
2. Instituted in 1976, paragraph 129 of the (West) German criminal code prohibits, among other things, the “advertising for and support of” a terrorist organization.
3. “Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg,” in Geiger and Johannesson, *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still*, 177.
4. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, “Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg,” 1982, 9/39, BRD05.150, Frauenbewegung 80er Jahre (FB 80er), Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen, Rote Flora, Hamburg, Germany.
5. Many in the *Autonomen* movement rejected the RAF’s form of political violence. The *Autonomen*’s own “street militancy” did not believe in underground, armed struggle. The *Autonomen* rejected the anti-imperialist framework of the RAF, as well as their identity as avant-garde. Supporters of the RAF among the *Autonomen* often were referred to as “anti-imps.” The political differences between “anti-imps” and other *Autonomen* solidified in the mid-1980s and made shared organizing difficult (see Sebastian Haunss, “Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie—Linksradikalismus seit der Studentenbewegung” in *Die Sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945*, eds. Roland Roth and Dieter Rucht [Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008], 457–458). *Autonome* also criticized the guerilla militancy of the Revolutionäre Zellen/Rote Zora, even though members of those groups did not live underground. The Revolutionäre Zellen/Rote Zora, however, were able to maintain close ties to the Left, in particular through their “new interpretation of the theory of classic anti-imperialism that was reliant on the politics of the Soviet Union” (Haunss, “Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie,” 458). This new interpretation resonated more with the antiracist anti-imperialism among the *Autonomen*. Accordingly, there was broader support for the Revolutionäre Zellen/Rote Zora, since they understood themselves to be part of the radical Left scene and were less hierarchically organized. In contrast, the RAF increasingly lost political support (see Schultze and Gross, *Die Autonomen*, 84–88; Haunss, “Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie,” 457). However, the prisoner rights movement (Knastbewegung) was politically important to the *Autonomen* and they expressed solidarity with RAF prisoners through hunger strike actions and publications, the dissemination of letters by political prisoners about their conditions of detention, and through protests, etc.
6. The German *Bundesverfassungsschutz* (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution) categorized Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg as part of “close RAF circles in Hamburg,” and as “the legal branch of the RAF” and surveilled them accordingly (Wortprotokoll des Leiters des Landesamtes für Verfassungsschutz Christian Lochte vor dem PUA Hafenstr., Mai 1988, 3, 8, <http://www.nadir.org/nadir/archiv/Haeuserkampf/Hafenstrasse/88/LochtePUA>). Also see J. Smith and André Moncourt, *The Red Army Faction, A Documentary History*, vol. 2, *Dancing with Imperialism* (Oakland: PM, 2013), 189.
7. See Smith and Moncourt, *The Red Army Faction*, 170–171.
8. The pro-RAF position of Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg was not representative of all *autonomen* women. As Smith and Moncourt note, the “distinction, between anti-imps and *Autonomen*, was further complicated by the militant women’s movement, sections of which remained hostile to the RAF, while others were finding inspiration in its struggle” (*The Red Army Faction*, 168). However, Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg’s opposition to strategies of nonviolence advocated by the autonomous women’s movement and the peace movement corresponded with the overall militant attitude of other *autonomen* women. Other feminists, including lesbians, also identified as anti-imperialist groups among the *Autonomen*. For example, the anonymous, lesbian authors of the book-length feminist militant publication *Frauen die kämpfen, sind Frauen die leben* (which includes reprints of some of the writing by Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg) write in their introduction: “As part of our dignity and lesbian identity, we

- understand ourselves within the context of the struggles of women and lesbians that consistently flare up throughout patriarchy's existence. But we also see ourselves in the context of all women and men who fight against global domination and oppression—for self-determination—against imperialism" (*Frauen die kämpfen, sind Frauen die leben: Ansätze zum revolutionären Frauen- und Lesbenkampf gegen Imperialismus und Patriarchat* [Zürich: Selbstverlag, 1988], 5). For the authors, guerilla struggle constituted an important part of their lesbian identity in their fight against oppression, including heterosexism.
9. Katharina Karcher names three reasons for the silence by feminist scholarship on feminist militancy: lack of knowledge about the groups; a sense that the militancy of a minority is irrelevant for the larger women's movement; ideological differences that view violence as irreconcilable with feminist politics ("How [not] to 'Hollaback': towards a transnational debate on the 'Red Zora' and militant tactics in the feminist struggle against gender-based violence," *Feminist Media Studies* [2015]: 72, doi:10.1080/14680777.2015.1093099).
 10. Thomas Schultze und Almut Gross, *Die Autonomen: Ursprünge, Entwicklung und Profil der Bewegung* (Hamburg: Konkret, 1997), 8. See also Geronimo, *Feuer und Flamme: Zur Geschichte und Gegenwart der Autonomen* (Amsterdam: Edition ID, 1990), 11–72; A.G. Grauwacke, *Autonome in Bewegung: Aus den ersten 23 Jahren* (Berlin: Association A, 2004); Haunss, "Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie," 447–473; George Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life* (Oakland, CA: AK, 2006).
 11. I draw on archival material collected at the Hamburger Institute for Social Research and the community archives of the Rote Flora in Hamburg and the Papiertiger in Berlin in the mid-2000s.
 12. See, for example, Ilse Lenz, ed., *Die Neue Frauenbewegung in Deutschland: Abschied vom kleinen Unterschied*, (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009), for a dismissal of the Red Zora as a feminist-identified political group. Vojin Sasa Vukadinovi evaluates the feminist militancy of the Rote Zora as "nonanalytical politics of attack" and as "hostile to any theory," that, he argues, sets them apart from the feminism of their time ("Spätreflex. Eine Fallstudie zu den Revolutionären Zellen, der Roten Zora und zur verlängerten Feminismus-Obsession Bundesdeutscher Terrorismusfahnder," in *Der Linksterrorismus der 1970er-Jahre und die Ordnung der Geschlechter*, ed. Irene Bandhauer-Schöffmann and Dirk van Laak [Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2013], 148, 149).
 13. In order to differentiate between activists' relationship to revolutionary politics on the one hand, and feminist politics on the other, Katharina Karcher in "Sisters in Arms? Female Participation in Leftist Political Violence in the Federal Republic of Germany since 1970" (PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2013), offers three categories of political identity within militant activist circles: (*female*) *militant* signifies a primary identity as revolutionary; *feminist militant* indicates a feminist identity and a recognition of the need to include a feminist agenda within a broader revolutionary context; *militant feminist* is a political identity that is based in a radical feminism (241–243). While the differentiation between feminist militant and militant feminist might be useful analytically, it is not practical in its application, since demarcations between political identities and agendas are more blurry than these categories allow for.
 14. Almut Gross, "Autonome Frauen und FrauenLesben," in *Die Autonomen*, Thomas Schultze und Almut Gross (Hamburg: Konkret Verlag, 1997), 172.
 15. For a historical account of the origins of the *Autonomen* and the role the 1968 movement had as their predecessor, see Katsiaficas, *The Subversion of Politics*; Geronimo, *Feuer und Flamme*, 11–72; Schultze and Gross, *Die Autonomen*, 20–30 and 40–54. In his account of the development of radical Left politics after 1968, Haunss differentiates between anti-imperialist groups ("K-Gruppen") of the 1970s and the *Autonomen* of the 1980s (Haunss, "Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie").
 16. See Schultze and Gross, *Die Autonomen*, 60–61.
 17. Darcy K. Leach, "An Elusive 'We': Antidogmatism, Democratic Practice, and the Contradictory Identity of the German Autonomen," *American Behavioral Scientist* 52 (2009): 1050.

18. See "Introduction" in Hanno Balz and Jan-Henrik Friedrichs, eds., *"All we ever wanted . . .": Eine Kulturgeschichte europäischer Protestbewegungen der 1980er Jahre* (Berlin: Karl Dietz, 2012), 13–36.
19. Their specific aesthetics, shared music culture, and a distinct way of urban living have some people define the *Autonome* as much as a subculture as a political community (Jan Schwarzeimer, *Die Autonomen zwischen Subkultur und sozialer Bewegung* [n.p.: Books on Demand GmbH, 2001]).
20. Edith Hoshino Altbach, "The New German Women's Movement," *Signs* 9 (1984): 454–469; Myra Marx Ferree, *Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012); Ute Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte: Zwischen bürgerlicher Verbesserung und neuer Weiblichkeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996); Frigga Haug, "The Women's Movement in Germany," *New Left Review* I/155 (1986): 50–74; Kristina Schulz, *Der Lange Atem der Provokation: Die Frauenbewegung in der Bundesrepublik und in Frankreich, 1968–1976* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus), 2002.
21. Such is the case in Geronimo's *Feuer und Flamme* (156–157) where the author discusses a feminist critique of the *Autonomen* but is unable to think through its political implications, and in the case of the writing collective (Grauwacke, *Autonome in Bewegung*, 168).
22. Haunss, "Anti-imperialismus und Autonomie," 461.
23. For a brief overview of the German autonomous women's movement, see Ute Gerhard, "Frauenbewegung," in Roth and Rucht, *Die Sozialen Bewegungen*, 188–217; on the importance of the autonomous women's movement's discussions of violence, see Patricia Melzer, *Death in the Shape of a Young Girl: Women's Political Violence in the Red Army Faction* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 56–72.
24. Gross, "Autonome Frauen," 174. See Gerhard, "Frauenbewegung," for a discussion of the debate on "autonomy and money," i.e., acceptance of state funds for feminist projects while maintaining control (209).
25. In this context, the German term "autonome FrauenLesben" (literally: "autonomous Women-Lesbians") is often used to increase visibility of lesbians in the women's movement. It is similar to the English "womyn" that indicates both women and lesbians (see Gross, "Autonome Frauen," 175–176). While the term was/is used to advocate an inclusion of homosexual (now: queer) sexualities within the women's movement, it also has been problematized as further categorizing and appropriating lesbian subjectivity.
26. "Women's liberation" from patriarchal hierarchical conditions was understood to be possible only through revolutionary changes of existing social structures (patriarchy, capitalism, imperialism). Depending on the makeup of the *autonome* women's groups, revolution was envisioned to take place with or without men. Beyond this rather vague shared goal, visions of how feminist-revolutionary change would manifest remain unclear (Gross, "Autonome Frauen," 182–183).
27. For a discussion of feminist actions in the *Autonomen* scene see Gross, "Autonome Frauen," 176–183; also Grauwacke, *Autonome in Bewegung*, 167–184.
28. See Gross, "Autonome Frauen," 177.
29. For a discussion of the Rote Zora's militancy and their impact on the *Autonome* scene, see Karcher, *Sisters in Arms?*
30. Antifa is short for Antifaschistische Aktion, a nationwide network of antifascist groups associated with the *Autonomen* movement. Antifa networks began forming in the 1980s and in particular in the 1990s in response to growing violence against people of color in Germany after unification. Its name is derived from the Antifaschistische Aktion founded in 1923 that initially organized communist activists and later included all socialist and Left groups fighting National Socialism (see Grauwacke, *Autonome in Bewegung*, 291–312).
31. The feminist publication *anagan* distanced itself from the autonomous women's movement, locating its political alliances instead in the radical Left scene; in the first edition, the authors dissociate from the autonomous women's movement: "a new women's newspaper! by women from

- the 'scene'! by women who want nothing anymore to do with the women's movement or never have" ("Von *Courage* bis *Amazora*—20 Jahre Frauen/Lesbenzeitungen," in *20 Jahre radikal: Geschichte und Perspektiven autonomer Medien* [Hamburg: Libertäre Assoziation, 1996], 205).
32. See Gerhard, "Frauenbewegung."
 33. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg den Palästen," 1980, 1/4, FB 80er.
 34. All quotes by Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg are taken from texts in this collection of pamphlets and flyers. It is archived in the autonomous cultural center Rote Flora: BRD05.150, Frauenbewegung 80er Jahre (FB 80er), Archiv der Sozialen Bewegungen, Rote Flora, Hamburg, Germany. The text consists of altogether 44 pages.
 35. This essay offers a close reading of Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg's position on political violence as they debated it within the boundaries of their writings. Unfortunately it would exceed the limits of this paper to do a comprehensive analysis of the political environment beyond the group's immediate milieu, the *Autonomen*.
 36. The latter of which, as Jasbir Puar states, conceptualize race, sexuality and gender "as concatenations, unstable assemblages of revolving and devolving energies, rather than intersectional coordinates" (Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* [Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007], 195).
 37. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 9/39, FB 80er.
 38. The position of this militant group were irreconcilable with those of the established women's movement to such a degree that Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg did not perceive of them as a potential audience. I concentrate here on the points of contestation of the group with the autonomous women's movement and the women's peace movement, both of which understood themselves to be oppositional to the existing system.
 39. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Thesen zur Frauenbewegung," 1980, 3/8, FB 80er.
 40. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Wie sind wir zu anti-imperialistischen Inhalten gekommen?" 1980, 10/1, FB 80er.
 41. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Thesen zur Frauenbewegung," 1980, 3/8, FB 80er.
 42. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 1/31, FB 80er. This political position as connecting element between women's movement and *Autonomen* is again addressed in the statement by the group that was printed in place of their rejected essay in Geiger and Johannesson's *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still*. In the booklet the statement precedes the essay; the two pieces were circulated together: "that we understand ourselves as part of the anti-imperialist and the women's movement" ("Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 1/29, FB 80er). Ilse Lenz does not examine the question of violence as feminist but instead dismisses it as a "trivialization of violence," and as a "discursive appropriation and expropriation of feminist ideas" in the context of terrorism (Lenz, *Die Neue Frauenbewegung*, 268, 269)—according to her writing, militant women cannot be an authentic part of the women's movement. Considering that feminist discussions in the 1970s and 1980s were in fact much more complex than that (see Melzer, *Death in the Shape of a Young Girl*, 56–72, 109–151), Lenz's excluding conclusion is symptomatic for the simplification of controversial positions between feminist groups that is too often found in historiography of the women's movement.
 43. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Friedensbewegung und Anti-imperialistische Bewegung," 1982, 1/42, FB 80er. In accord with many activists on the left, Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg used primarily lower case in their writing. This rejection of spelling conventions was a transgression against bourgeois norms and carried political meaning.
 44. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 10/40, FB 80er.
 45. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Friedensbewegung und Anti-imperialistische Bewegung," 1982, 1/42, FB 80er.
 46. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Wie sind wir zu anti-imperialistischen Inhalten gekommen?" 1980, 10/1, FB 80er.

47. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Frauen gegen Imperialismus und Patriarchat," 1980, 3/16, FB 80er).
48. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 7/37, FB 80er.
49. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Wie sind wir zu anti-imperialistischen Inhalten gekommen?" 1980, 2/11, FB 80er.
50. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 9/39, FB 80er.
51. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Thesen zur Frauenbewegung," 1980, 1/6, FB 80er.
52. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Thesen zur Frauenbewegung," 1980, 2/7, FB 80er.
53. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Frauen gegen Imperialismus und Patriarchat Zerschlagen den Herrschaftsapparat," 1981, 3/16, FB 80er).
54. Anna Dorothea Brockmann, "Frauen gegen Krieg, Frauen für den Frieden—gegen welchen Krieg, für welchen Frieden eigentlich?" in Geiger and Johannesson, *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still*, 110.
55. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Thesen zur Frauenbewegung," 1980, 4/9, FB 80er.
56. Karola Maltry, *Die neue Frauenfriedensbewegung. Entstehung, Entwicklung, Bedeutung* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1993).
57. See Belinda Davis, "'Women's Strength Against Their Crazy Male Power': Gendered Language in the West German Peace Movement of the 1980s," in *Frieden—Gewalt—Geschlecht: Friedens und Konfliktforschung als Geschlechterforschung*, eds. Jennifer Davy, Karen Hagemann, and Ute Kätzel (Essen: Klartext, 2005), 244–265.
58. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," "an die gleichgeschalteten," 1982, 3/29, FB 80er.
59. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 8–9, 38–39, FB 80er.
60. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Friedensbewegung und Anti-imperialistische Bewegung," 1982, 1/42, FB 80er.
61. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 8/38, FB 80er.
62. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Friedensbewegung und Anti-imperialistische Bewegung," 1982, 3/44, FB 80er.
63. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Wie sind wir zu anti-imperialistischen Inhalten gekommen?," 1980, 1–2/11–12, FB 80er.
64. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Friedensbewegung und Anti-imperialistische Bewegung," 1982, 2/43, FB 80er.
65. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Stellungnahme zu Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 3/29, FB 80er.
66. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 11/41, FB 80er.
67. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 11/41, FB 80er.
68. Frauen gegen imperialistischen Krieg, "Krieg dem imperialistischen Krieg," 1982, 11/41, FB 80er.
69. Sybille Plogstedt, "Ist die Gewalt in der Frauenbewegung angekommen?" *Courage* 6:9 (1981): 30–35. This piece was reprinted in Geiger and Johannesson, *Nicht Friedlich und Nicht Still*, 80–95.
70. Lenz, *Die Neue Frauenbewegung*, 269, 273.
71. Lenz, *Die Neue Frauenbewegung*, 269; emphasis added.
72. See Karcher, *Sisters in Arms?*; Melzer, *Death in the Shape of a Young Girl*, chs. 1, 3.