76 | preface

Feminist Review continues to welcome guest editors to present special issues. In this issue, we are delighted to have one of our Corresponding Editors, Belgrade-based Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović draw together articles and a Dialogue section from Central and Eastern Europe. Contributions are united by a focus on what the dramatic social and economic transitions of recent years have meant for women, and in particular, how such macro-processes as transition from communism to neoliberal market economies affect women's lives at the micro-level.

Feminist Review is committed to providing space to hear the views and concerns of women speaking from different geo-political locations, to ensure that the journal continues to reflect the agendas of women beyond its largely London-based Editorial Collective. This issue provides a glimpse of the current agendas for feminism of women writing from post-communist countries, and it affords an insight into different degrees of resistance to, and awareness of feminism and the differing self-consciousness about calling oneself a feminist these can engender. The up-to-date empirical accounts testify to women's ambivalence about Westernization. They show, for instance, the limits of Western style legal rhetoric given 'traditionally' gendered cultural understandings; and yet the current erosion of reproductive rights previously granted by the largely gender-blind socialist regimes. They document how women often bare the brunt of harsh economic conditions and the violence that escalates in the wake of men's increased unemployment and, for countries of the former Yugoslavia, brutalization by war.

Vesna Nikolić-Ristanović is a Serbian woman working for post-war reconciliation among those living in Serbia. She recruited contributors through networks of feminists, lawyers and criminologists. As ever, translation raises complex issues: is some nuance of the literal translation important or is the more commonly used term appropriate? For example, the article from Poland discusses the complexity and near impossibility of ungendering some masculine job titles, but the point is hard to convey where the English translations manage to eschew gendered presumptions. We are grateful to the translators and to the reviewers, variously located, and we hope the translations do justice to the intended meanings. We also hope that the issues raised by the challenge of translation provoke deeper insights into differently situated feminisms in/and the experience of political transition.

Pam Alldred

doi:10.1057/palgrave.fr.9400152