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In Battering States: The Politics of Domestic Violence in Israel, anthropologist Madelaine Adelman utilizes an impressive array of ethnographic methods to examine how statecraft shapes domestic violence. Her thoughtful project is interdisciplinary in nature and analyzes when and how intimate partner violence intersects with cultural politics of the state. Her focus centers on Israel, where a number of distinctive factors make this a particularly compelling site for the type of study in which she engages: the existence of a “contentious multinational and multiethnic population,” “competing and overlapping sets of religious civil family law” (p. 2), pervasive state securitism and political violence, and widening economic disparity. As Adelman argues, while this exact combination of processes is unique to Israel, its component parts are not atypical of states with diverse populations in an era of globalization.

The book begins with a description of Adelman’s project and a discussion of how her work is situated in the existing domestic violence literature. Adelman rejects the use of an individual perspective on domestic violence in favor of a macrolevel analysis. Thus, instead of focusing on individual characteristics to explain domestic violence or individual interventions to address it, she conceptualizes domestic violence as a process that cannot be separated from the material and ideological conditions that enable its existence; she terms this the “politics of domestic violence.”

Adelman uses a constructionist lens to describe how domestic violence came to be understood as a social problem. She discusses the ways in which the state has, for the most part, taken seriously framings by advocates and claims makers of violence against women as a serious social problem, reflected by efforts such as the development of organizations and shelters to support victims of domestic violence, a move toward legislative and policy changes, and an increase in annual arrest rates.

A strength of Adelman’s project is her analysis of the intersection of domestic violence with Israel’s personal status law, also known as family law. Adelman argues that this system, which is primarily offered as the solution to domestic violence in Israel, is often “difficult and dangerous” for battered women. Under Israel’s personal status law system, some laws are universally applied to all citizens while other laws only pertain to members of specific religious communities. This system determines who is able to marry whom and also how marriages can be terminated. A major issue with this system, as Adelman points out, is that both civil and religious courts manage personal status law. While couples that wish to begin or end a marriage are required to utilize the religious court that is affiliated with their particular religious
identity (either Jewish, Muslim, Druze, or Christian), boundaries between the courts are not rigid. Civil family courts frequently draw on interpretations of community members’ religious law in making decisions pertaining to marriage and divorce.

Religious courts exclusively handle marriage and divorce, yet the legal matters associated with divorce may be handled either through religious or family court. Adelman argues that, while there are some differences among the various religious courts in terms of divorce laws, the judges of all religious courts typically uphold both an ideology of gender complementarity (the functionalist view idea that men and women complement each other to create a complete system) and a focus on marital reconciliation. Adelman provides detailed examples of how belonging to a particular national or religious community presents legal opportunities and barriers to battered women seeking divorce. She demonstrates how the pluralistic personal status law system in many ways increases battered women’s vulnerabilities while simultaneously providing abusive men with legal means to control women’s lives.

Adelman’s work also provides an interesting analysis of the ways in which the dominance of political and national violence shapes how domestic violence is both understood and addressed in a security state such as Israel. Not surprisingly, because statecraft influenced by securitism ensures that the state’s primary focus will be on preventing and addressing political violence, Adelman maintains that domestic violence becomes viewed as less of an important national issue in a state like Israel.

Finally, Adelman’s macrolevel focus allows for her unique exploration of what she deems “a political economy of domestic violence” (p. 161). Instead of a primary focus on individual-level solutions to domestic violence, such as the importance of women’s economic independence or a need for women to leave their abusive relationships, Adelman refreshingly turns her analysis to the ways in which state policies produce the “nonrandom distribution of poverty and domestic violence” in the first place (p. 161). She examines the relationship between economics and domestic violence, focusing specifically on issues such as Israel’s economic priorities that structure domestic violence, neoliberal social welfare policy reforms, global labor flows leading to larger populations of vulnerable immigrant women, and financial conflicts surrounding national security and social justice.

Adelman’s impressive project is one of the first long-term ethnographic analyses of domestic violence produced inside or outside the United States. Her data comprise interview-generated narratives with both front-line workers and battered women from various religious backgrounds, participant observation, and a diverse array of cultural texts (including official policies and regulations, legislative debates, court rulings, state and international reports, and press releases, posters, pamphlets, stickers, and signs). The result is an original, thorough, and multilayered analysis that provides an important contribution to a wide variety of literatures.

This study also demonstrates the ways in which aspects of identity (religion, ethnicity, and nationality) shape women’s experiences with domestic
violence and the varied ways that the state may (or may) not intervene. While throughout the book Adelman provides examples of women’s agency and individual attempts to resist the violence they experience both at the hands of family and state, I did find myself wishing that Adelman included more of the interviewee’s own words and experiences to enrich her analysis. But this is a minor quibble given the enormous overall contribution of this book.
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The use of women’s rights to justify colonial and imperial intervention in nonwestern societies has been a longstanding concern and much theorized feature of postcolonial studies of gender and colonialism. Indeed, no discussion of the gendered and racialized colonial relationship is complete without reference to its oft-cited encapsulation by postcolonial critic Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in the trope: “White men are saving brown women from brown men (“Can the Subaltern Speak?” in Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader [Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994], pp. 90–105). In the aftermath of the post 9/11 Afghan War and ongoing U.S. involvement in the Middle East, postcolonial feminist critiques have directed attention also toward western and nonwestern feminist movements that uphold political, cultural, and militaristic projects in the name of saving “other” women from their societies and cultures. Sara Farris’s In the Name of Women’s Rights: The Rise of Femonationalism builds on this scholarship to examine the entanglement of feminism in right-wing nationalist politics in Europe from 2000 to 2013. Farris introduces the construct “femonationalism” short for “feminist and femocratic nationalism” (pp. 3–4) to question why ideologically divergent groups have coalesced in the cultural vilification and exclusion of Muslim men, indeed all nonwestern men, from European society while espousing the emancipation of Muslim and nonwestern migrant women and their integration into Europe.

The book comprises five chapters. Chapter 1 describes the ways in which the Partij voor Vrijheid (PVV or Party for Freedom) in the Netherlands, the Front National (FN National Front) in France, and the Lega Norda (LN Northern League) in Italy have increasingly mobilized the notion of gender equality to advance their anti-immigrant and xenophobic agendas. Farris also demonstrates the significant participation of feminist intellectuals and politicians including some women of Muslim descent in these campaigns. Chapter 2 underlines the usefulness of postcolonial and critical race theories of gender and nationalism to theorize gendered inconsistencies that are ob-