GENDER IN IR: SOVEREIGNTY, SECURITY, AND MILITARISM

Lecturer: Paul Roe

Course Description
This course is concerned with gender ‘in’ International Relations. More specifically, it is concerned with how the sovereign state, the primary function of the sovereign state, security, and the most visible manifestation of state security, militarism, both construct and are sustained by specific masculinities and femininities, and how these particular gender constructions impact on the lives of particular groups of men and women.

Since the late 1980s, feminist critiques of so-called ‘Traditional’ International Relations (IR) have been some of the most sustained, accusing the discipline not only of having maintained an almost total gender blindness, but also of an active resistance on the part of many IR scholars to the import of feminist works. And nowhere has such resistance been stronger than in the field of Security, or more accurately, Strategic Studies. This course explores some of the main areas of contention. Its aim is not only to introduce the student to how the discipline has traditionally thought about war, peace, and security, but, more importantly, to evaluate the specific contribution that feminist critiques have made as part of the so-called ‘Critical Turn’ in IR.

Firstly, the general context of the debate is established, before, secondly, going on to look at how the discipline of IR has been constituted and sustained by a number of so-called ‘hegemonic’ masculinities. Although for some an initial focus on masculinity may well represent an unwanted move away from the feminist project, for others, because International Relations is constructed around men and masculinity, destabilising the subject of ‘man’ necessarily also destabilises the IR field in ways that the so-called ‘add women’ approach perhaps cannot. In the third section, though, the focus indeed shifts to how IR has excluded certain femininities. In particular, it looks at how women can be both the agents and the victims of militarisation and the practices of security, and also at possible resistances to such practices. Finally, the course addresses the question as to whether feminist concerns and gender scholarship can sit comfortably within the more critical body of IR works.

Teaching and Course Structure
For this course, there are no lectures. Instead, students will participate in seminars where they are expected to form their own opinions through ‘critical’ evaluation of the readings. At the postgraduate level, it is up to students to do most of the work. Seminar discussion will be structured around a short presentation of the topic, in which students will (briefly) summarise and then critique the readings. For each seminar, there will be one or two key texts (which are in the course reader). The purpose of the seminar is to ‘analyse’ and ‘evaluate’ ideas. Seminar discussion depends on serious preparation by students. It is therefore crucial that you do all of the reading required and come into the seminar fully prepared to actively take part in the discussion. For the topics discussed, there is not necessarily a right answer. What is important is to focus on the way that people think.
Method of Assessment
Each student will be assessed through a combination of seminar contribution, oral presentation, and written work. In terms of written work, one literature review and one term paper is required. The literature review should be 1,500-2,000 words long, and should be written on a topic different to both the student’s oral presentation(s) and term paper. The topic of the term paper, approximately 4,000 words in length, is of the students own choosing, although again it should be written on something different to the oral presentation and literature review. The number of oral presentations is dependent on the number of students taking the class, but is likely to be either one (relatively high number) or two (relatively low number).

For the final grade, should there be one oral presentation, then: 45% is given to the term paper, 25% to the literature review, 20% to the oral presentation, with the final 10% being allotted to seminar attendance and contribution. Should there be two oral presentations, then: 40% is given to the term paper, 20% to the literature review, 15% to each oral presentation (total 30%), and 10% to seminar attendance and contribution.

* Please Note: Any written work submitted after the agreed deadline without the prior consent of the professor will be subject to downgrading in accordance with departmental policy: one day late, one-third of a letter grade reduction; then every two further days late, one-third of a letter grade reduction.

Week 1/Seminar 1. Introduction
This first seminar will act as a brief introductory class where the nature of the course is discussed, together with the expectations of both the professor and students. Here, initial oral presentations will be assigned.

Week 1/Seminar 2. No Class

I. What’s at Stake? The Nature of the Debate

Week 2/Seminar 3. IR and Gender/Gender and IR (?)
Key Texts:

Week 2/Seminar 4. Gender and the ‘Traditionalists’: Sovereignty, Security, and Militarism
Key Text:

Further Reading:
Tickner, Gendering World Politics, Chapter 1: Troubled Encounters: Feminism Meets IR’.
Tickner, Gender in International Relations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992),
Chapter 2: ‘Man, the State, and War: Gendered Perspectives on National Security’.

II. Hegemonic Masculinities in International Relations
Week 3/Seminar 5. A Question of Men? Masculinities in IR
Key Texts:
Marysia Zalweski & Jane Papart (eds.), The “Man” Question in International Relations (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998), Chapter 3: Steve Smith, “Unacceptable Conclusions” and the “Man” Question: Masculinity, Gender, and International Relations’.

Further Reading:
Pettman, Worlding Women, Chapter 5: ‘Men, Masculinities and War’.
Zalewski & Papart (eds.), The “Man Question in International Relations, Chapter 2: Charlotte
Hooper, ‘Masculinist Practices and Gender Politics: The Operation of Multiple Masculinities in International Relations’; Chapter 5: Craig N. Murphy, ‘Six Masculine Roles in International Relations and their Interconnection: A Personal Investigation’.

Week 3/Seminar 6. Masculinity and the States’man’
Key Text:

Week 4/Seminar 7. Militarised Masculinity: The Politics of Soldiering
Key Text:

Week 4/Seminar 8. Militarised Masculinity(?): Men at War
Key Text:

Week 5/Seminar 9. Militarised Masculinity(?): Gays in the Military
Key Text:

Week 5/Seminar 10. Militarised Masculinity(?): The Politics of Peacekeeping
Key Text:

Week 6/Seminar 11. Masculinity and ‘Defence Intellectuals’
Key Text:

Week 6/Seminar 12. Gender and the Revolution in Military Affairs: Cyborg Soldiers
Key Text:

Further Reading:
Whitworth, Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2004), Chapter 4: ‘Canada: Peacekeeping Country Par Excellence?’; Chapter 5: ‘When the UN Responds: A Critique of Gender Mainstreaming’; Chapter 6: ‘Militarized Masculinities and Blue Berets’; Chapter 7: ‘Conclusion: Do Warriors Make the Best Peacekeepers?’.


Ducat, The Wimp Factor, Chapter 5: ‘Permutations of the Presidential Phallus: Representations of Bill Clinton, from Emasculated Househusband to Envied Stud Muffin’.


Enloe, The Morning After, Chapter 1: ‘Are UN Peacekeepers Real Men? And Other Cold-War Puzzles’.

Week 7/Seminar 13. No Class

III. Where are the Women?
Key Texts:
Grant & Newland (eds.), Gender and International Relations, Chapter 10: Fred Halliday, ‘Hidden from International Relations: Women and the International Arena’.

**Week 8/Seminar 15. Women in Peace Movements**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**
Cook & Woollacott (eds.), Gendering War Talk, Chapter 5, Sara Ruddick, Notes Towards a Feminist Peace Politics’.
Sylvester, Feminist International Relations, Chapter 10: ‘Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects’.

**Week 8/Seminar 16. Women in the Military**

**Key Texts:**

**Further Reading:**


**Week 9/Seminar 17. The Militarization of Women’s Lives: Mothers at War**

Key Text:


**Week 9/Seminar 18: The Militarization of Women’s Lives: Base Prostitutes**

Key Text:


Further Reading:


Enloe, The Morning After, Chapter 5: ‘It Takes More Than Two: The Prostitute, the Soldier, the State, and the Entrepreneur’.

Enloe, Maneuvers, Chapter 6: ‘Nursing the Military: The Imperfect Management of Respectability’.

Enloe, Bananas, Beaches, and Bases, Chapter 4: ‘Base Women’.


**Week 10/Seminar 19. Sexual Violence and the Politics of Security**

Key Text:

**Week 10/Seminar 20. Gender and Humanitarian Intervention**

Key Text:

**Week 11/Seminar 21. Sex-Trafficking and the Politics of Security**

Key Text:

Further Reading:
Enloe, Maneuvers, Chapter 4: ‘When Soldiers Rape’.

**IV. Gender and the ‘Critical Turn’: Where IR Does Understand?**

**Week 11/Seminar 22. Gender and Securitization**

Key Text:

**Week 12/Seminar 23. Gender and Human Security**

Key Text:

Further Reading:
Tickner, Gender in International Relations, Chapter 5: ‘Toward a Nongendered Perspective on Global Security’.

Week 12/Seminar 24. No Class