IR406 Gender Justice and War

Introduction

‘Gender’ does not mean ‘women’, it refers to the ways in which human beings are classified as either male or female (even though this is not always biologically straightforward) and the association of these categories with particular subjective identities as well as social norms and expectations of masculinity and femininity. Gender can be explained or understood in a variety of ways, for example in ways which rely on biological, psycho-analytical, psychological, social or linguistic accounts of what it means to be gendered as a human being. But however it is defined and explained, gender has always been relevant to understanding and judging war. Over the past twenty years there have been a variety of developments in the theory and practice of war and peace which have brought the issue of gender centre stage. These range from the increasing involvement of women in the military, to the growth of feminist peace movements, to the so-called ‘feminisation’ of modern warfare, to the explicit inclusion of rape in the category of crimes against humanity. This is therefore a particularly interesting time to explore explanatory and normative questions about the mutual interrelation of gender and war.

Aims

A large literature has accumulated around the topics of gender and international relations and, in particular, of gender, war and peace since the 1980s. This course is designed to introduce students to some of the key themes in this literature. We will be exploring the following explanatory and normative questions: to what extent do gendered relations of power contribute to sustaining and reproducing war as a political, social and economic phenomenon? In what sense does gender figure in the causes and consequences of war? What are the implications of a gender perspective for normative judgements about war and peace? The key aim of the course is to enable students to understand and assess different answers to these questions, and to formulate and be able to defend their own responses.

Objectives

By the end of the course, students should:

1. Be able to understand and assess different theories of gender and the relations and distinctions between sex and gender, masculinity and femininity.
2. Be able to understand and assess the contributions of feminist theorists to the explanatory and normative judgment of international relations, war and peace.
3. Possess knowledge of substantive empirical material relating to a variety of topics: eg., women and homosexuals in the military; the role of sexual violence in war; gender and national identity; gender and transitional justice; gender and international law; gender, peace-keeping and peace-making; and women’s peace movements.
4. Be able to apply theoretical understanding to the judgment of empirical cases.

Teaching Methods

This course is taught in a 2 hour seminar format. Seminars begin in Week 1, Michaelmas Term and are held weekly throughout Michaelmas Term, Lent Term and in the first week of Summer Term. Seminars are intended as a forum for students to discuss specific questions in relation to specific readings. At the end of each seminar, students will be given a set of notes providing an overview and guidance on reading and questions for the following week’s topic. Students are expected to prepare
thoroughly for seminars by reading at least three of the key readings and thinking about the questions beforehand. For each seminar after the second meeting, one student will be nominated to introduce the discussion in the following week. The purpose of the introduction will be to frame the class debate by identifying key questions/problems of interest in the literature for general discussion. All students will be expected to contribute to discussion in any given week. In addition, four seminars (Weeks 1-4, Lent Term) have been allocated for formal presentations (in pairs or groups) on one of the four topics identified below:

1. Gender roles in war post 1989: case study
2. Gender and National Identity
3. Political Violence and Sexual Violence
4. Gender and Transitional Justice

Guidance on the format for group presentations is given below.

Course Information

This course outline in addition to seminar notes will also be available electronically through the IR406 public folder.

Course Requirements

Students intending to take formal assessment in this course must also write three essays during the course of the year (maximum length 2,500 words).

Deadline Essay 1: 30th November
Deadline Essay 2: 29th February
Deadline Essay 3: 2nd May

Producing these essays is vital preparation for the end of year examination. Titles for essays can be taken from the seminar questions, from the sample examination papers (below) or negotiated with the tutor.

Course Assessment

One unseen 3 hour examination in the summer term, requiring 3 questions to be answered, at least one from each of the two sections (see sample papers below)

Guidelines on Presentations Weeks 1-4 Lent Term

1. Gender roles in wars post 1989: case study
2. Gender and National Identity
3. Political Violence and Sexual Violence
4. Gender and Transitional Justice

The purpose of these presentations is to give students the opportunity to work with each other to research a particular theme or set of questions in detail. Students can come to their own decisions on what they would like to concentrate on within the specified theme. The aim should be to construct a presentation of not more than 45 minutes, allowing the rest of the seminar for questions, discussion and
debate. These seminars will be entirely organised by the students in question, including managing the discussion period. Here are some points to bear in mind:

1. What is a presentation for?

Presentations are intended to facilitate and frame discussion of a topic. They are designed to deepen understanding of topics mapped out in hand-outs. They are not supposed to be repetitions of hand-out material or the equivalent of an essay read out loud. Presentations may take the form of an argument for a particular point of view or a more even handed overview of certain debates.

2. What makes a good presentation?

A good presentation is well researched, clearly structured and engages the attention of its audience. It raises questions, does not simply repeat hand-out material and is not so detailed that the audience are unable to follow. A good presentation leads to a lively discussion. However, presentations also depend for their success on the audience. If non-presenting members of the class have not done any preparation it is difficult for discussion to be stimulated, even if the presentation is a good one.

3. Resources

If you want photocopies for the presentation, you must get the material to Kim two days in advance. If you want OHP transparencies/ pens, or any other facilities then let Kim know in advance.

4. Tips

Don't try to do too much in a presentation. It is often more effective to look at one case study in detail than to try to cover everything relevant to a particular topic. Try and isolate the particular questions and empirical material you are interested in and then focus on that. Students giving presentations should work from notes (don't just read out a text) and address the group as a whole, not just the tutor. Use OHPs, hand-outs or power-point to remind you and your audience of the overall structure of your discussion. In the case of pair or group presentations, division of labour, co-ordination and rehearsal are key. A presentation will not work if each participant has produced an independent speech, participants need to decide on the structure of the presentation as a whole and then decide who does what. Aim for 45 minutes max. and end your presentation with further questions/topics for discussion.

Assessment

The presentations are not formally assessed, but each pair/group will be provided with feedback which will comment on and allocate a grade to:
Content
Structure
Presentation skills
Effectiveness in stimulating discussion
Seminar Programme and Essay Deadlines

**Michaelmas Term**

1. Introduction to the Course (12/10/07)
2. Key Terms and concepts: gender and war (19/10/07)
3. Feminism, Gender and IR (26/10/07)
4. Waltz and Elshtain – a critical comparison (2/11/07)
5. War and Masculinity (9/11/07)
6. Gendered Language, Myths and Symbols in the Legitimation of War (16/11/07)
7. Women and Gays in the Military (23/11/07)
8. Gender and New Wars: sanctions; genocide and humanitarian intervention (30/11/07 - essay deadline)
9. Gender, ‘civilians’, ‘combatants’ and humanitarian rescue/ relief (7/12/07)
10. Gender, Terrorism and the War on Terror (14/12/07)

**Lent Term**

11. Gender roles in war post-1989: case study (11/1/08)
12. Gender and national identity (18/1/08)
13. Political Violence and Sexual Violence (25/1/08)
14. Gender and Transitional Justice (1/2/08)
15. Gender, Peace-Making and Peace-keeping 1: Overview (8/2/08)
16. Gender, Peace-Making and Peace-keeping 2: UN Resolution 1325. (15/2/08)
17. Women’s and Feminist Peace Movements (22/2/08)
18. Feminist Ethics and the Critique of Just War Theory (29/2/08 – essay deadline)
20. Feminism and Pacifism (14/3/07)

**Summer Term**

21. Gender, Justice and War: Review and Revision (2/5/08 – essay deadline)
Seminar Programme and Key Readings

Michaelmas Term

Week 2: Key Concepts: Gender and War

Questions: Why is ‘gender’ not a synonym for women? What is ‘war’? How is ‘war’ changing? Why might gender be relevant to the understanding and judgment of war?

Key Readings

Gender: what differences can you see between Goldstein’s and Carver’s notions of ‘gender’?

Carver, T. ‘Feminist Theories of Politics and Postmodern Theories of Gender’, Chapter 1 in Gender is not a Synonym for Women*
Goldstein, J. S. ‘A puzzle: the cross-cultural consistency of gender roles in war’, Ch. 1, War and Gender*

War: is war becoming post-modern or pre-modern? Read a chapter from at least one of the following:


Week 3: Feminism, Gender and IR

Questions: What contribution has feminist scholarship made to the study of IR in the fields of a) empirical research; b) theory? What are the key features of feminist critiques of ‘mainstream’ IR? What is your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of feminist approaches?

Key Readings

Enloe, C. ‘Gender Makes the World Go Round’, Chapter 1, Bananas, Beaches and Bases, * see also Ch. 8

1 * = source is available as an offprint. Full references for all of the key readings are in the General Reading List below. Please note also that many of the journal articles mentioned in key readings are available electronically.
Survey articles – read one of

Critiques of feminist work in IR
Jarvis, D. S. L. ‘Feminist Revisions of International Relations’, Ch 6 in International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism.

Week 4: Waltz and Elshtain: a Critical Comparison

Kenneth Waltz’s book Man, the State and War (1958) is a classic in international relations theory and his idea of the ‘3rd level’ of analysis, or structural realism, continues to influence much mainstream work in international relations. Jean Bethke Elshtain’s book (1987) Women and War is a classic in feminist work on international relations. The purpose of this session is to deepen understanding of feminist engagements with mainstream IR by looking closely at these two texts and their strengths and weaknesses. See also chapters on Waltz and Elshtain in I. Neumann & O. Waever (eds) The Future of International Relations: masters in the making?, London, Routledge, 1996. JX1391 F99

Week 5: War and Masculinity

Questions: What does it mean to claim that war is inherently masculine? Is it true that war, or political violence in general, is inherently masculine? What is the distinction between militarized masculinity and masculinity in general?

Key Readings

Enloe, C. ‘Beyond Steve Canyon and Rambo: Histories of Militarized Masculinity’, Chapter 3 of The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the end of the Cold War
Elshtain, J. B. Women and War, Chapter 6
Goldstein, J. S. Gender and War, Chapter 5
Hartsock, H. C. M. ‘Masculinity, Heroism and the Making of War’ in Harris & King (eds) Rocking the Ship of State*
Hooper, C. ‘Masculinities and Masculinism’, Ch. 2, Manly States: masculinities, international relations and gender politics*
Moon, S. ‘Gender, Militarization and Universal Male Conscription in South Korea’ in Lorentzen & Turpin (eds) *The Women and War Reader*

**Week 6: Gendered language, myths and symbols in the legitimation of war**

Question: What part does gendered language, myth and symbolism play in the ideology of war?

**Key Readings**

Cohn, C. ‘Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals’, *Signs*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1987*
Cohn, C. ‘Emasculating America’s Linguistic Deterrent’ in Harris & King (eds) *Rocking the Ship of State*
Cooke, M. ‘Subverting the Gender and Military Paradigms’ in Stiehm, J. Hicks (ed) *It’s Our Military Too! Women and the US Military*
Elshtain, J. B. *Women and War*, Chapter 2
Jeffords, S. ‘Telling the War Story’ in Stiehm, J. Hicks (ed) *It’s Our Military Too! Women and the US Military*
Kesić, O. ‘Women and Gender Imagery in Bosnia: amazons, sluts, victims, witches’ in Ramet (ed) *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans*
Leeuw, M. de ‘A gentlemen’s agreement: Srebrenica in the context of Dutch war history’ in Cockburn & Zarkov (eds) *The Postwar Moment: militaries, masculinities and international peacekeeping*

**Week 7: Women and Gays in the Military**

Questions: Are the equal opportunities arguments the same for the military as for other areas of employment? How do we explain the traditional exclusion of women and gays from combat roles? How does the gender politics of militaries compare to the politics of race or sexuality?

**Key Readings**

Kummel, G. ‘When Boy Meets Girl: The ‘feminization’ of the military’, *Current Sociology*, Vol. 50, No. 5, 2002 (see also the rest of this special issue on ‘Gender and the Military’)*
Miller, L. L. ‘Feminism and the Exclusion of Army Women from Combat’ in Simon (ed) *Women in the Military*.

**Week 8: Gender and New Wars: sanctions; genocide; humanitarian intervention**

Questions: What are the key gender issues in so-called ‘new wars’?

**Key Readings**

Cockburn, C. ‘The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence’ in Moser & Clark (eds) *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors*
Sjoberg, L. *Gender, Justice and the Wars in Iraq: a feminist reformulation of just war theory*, pp 147-163

**Week 9: Gender, ‘Civilians’, ‘Combatants’ and humanitarian rescue/ relief**

Questions: In what ways are the concepts of ‘civilian’ and ‘combatant’ gendered and what are the implications of this gendering? What are the gender politics of humanitarian rescue?


Week 10: Gender, Terrorism and the War on Terror

Questions: What is the relationship between the gendered politics of war and the gendered politics of terrorism? How have feminist scholars responded to 9/11 and the ‘War on Terror’? What is the gender politics of the ‘war on terror’?


Bouatta, C. ‘Feminine Militancy: Moudjahidates during and after the Algerian War’ in V. Moghadam (ed) Gender and National Identity: women and politics in Muslim societies.


Griset, P. & Mahan, S. Terrorism in Perspective, Section 5, ‘Women as Terrorists’


Lent Term

Week 1: Pair/ Group Presentation on Gender Roles in Wars post-1989 (case study).
Key Readings: See lists for MT Weeks 8-10 above. The presenting group should select one particular conflict as the focus of their analysis.

Week 2: Pair/ Group Presentation on Gender and National Identity

Key Readings


Cockburn, C. ‘Women and Nationalism’, Chapter 1 in *The Space Between Us: negotiating gender and national identities in conflict*.


Sunindyo, S. ‘When the Earth is Female and the Nation is Mother: Gender, Armed Conflict and Nationalism in Indonesia’, *Feminist Review*, Issue 58, Spring 1998


Week 3: Pair/ Group Presentation on Political Violence and Sexual Violence

Key Readings


Enloe, C. ‘The Prostitute, the Colonel, and the Nationalist’, Chapter 3 of *Maneuvers*


Thomas, D. Q. & Ralph, R. E. ‘Rape in War: The Case of Bosnia’ in Ramet (ed) *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans*

Turshen, M. ‘The Political Economy of Rape: an Analysis of Systematic Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women During Armed Conflict in Africa’ in Moser & Clark (eds) *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors*

Zarkov, D. ‘The Body of the Other Man: Sexual Violence and the Construction of Masculinity, Sexuality and Ethnicity in the Croatian Media’ in Moser & Clark (eds) *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors*

**Week 4: Pair/Group Presentation on Gender and Transitional Justice**

**Key Readings**

Askin, K. D. *War Crimes Against Women: prosecution in international war crimes tribunals*, Chapters 2-5 & 7-8


Charlesworth, H. & Chinkin, C. ‘Redrawing the boundaries of international law’, Ch. 10 in *The Boundaries of International Law: a feminist analysis*.


Krog, A. ‘Locked into Loss and Silence: Testimonies of Gender and Violence in the South Africa Truth Commission’ in Moser & Clark (eds) *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors*


**Week 5: Gender, peace-making and peace keeping 1: overview of issues**

Question: Does a gender analysis contribute anything to the theory and practice of conflict resolution and peaceful regime change?

**Week 6: Gender, peace-making and peace keeping 2: UN Resolution 1325**
Question: Assess the rationale for, and impact of, UN Resolution 1325

**Key Readings**


Cordero, I. C. ‘Social Organizations: from victims to actors in peace-building’, in Moser & Clark (eds) *Victims, Actors or Perpetrators*

Enloe, C. ‘Are UN Peacekeepers Real Men? And other Post-Cold War Puzzles’ in *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the end of the cold war*

Helms, E. ‘Women as Agents of Ethnic Reconciliation? Women NGOs and International Intervention in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina’, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, vol. 26, No. 1, 2003*


**Week 7: Gender and Peace Movements**

Questions: How would you assess the work of feminist anti-nuclear campaigners in the 1980s or ‘The Women in Black”? Is there an argument for women-only or women-led peace movements? How successful have these movements been over time?

**Key Readings**


Kirk, G. ‘Our Greenham Common: Feminism and Nonviolence’ in Harris & King (eds) *Rocking the Ship of State*

Lentin, R. ‘Israeli and Palestinian Women Working for Peace’ in Lorentzen & Turpin (eds) *The Women and War Reader*

Roseneil, S. ‘The External Mode of Action’, Ch 6* Disarming Patriarchy: feminism and political action at Greenham*, see also Ch 5.

Week 8: Feminist Ethics and the Critique of Just War Theory

Question: What are the central themes of the feminist critique of ‘mainstream’ ethics? In what sense, if any, is just war theory masculinist?

Key Readings

Browning-Cole, E. & Coultrap McQuin, S. ‘Toward a Feminist conception of a Moral Life’ in Browning-Cole & Coultrap-McQuin (eds) Explorations in Feminist Ethics

Elshtain, J. B. Women and War, Chapter 4


Peach, L. ‘An Alternative to Pacifism? Feminism and Just War Theory’, Hypatia, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1994*

Robinson, F. ‘Traditions of International ethics: a critical reappraisal’, Ch. 4, Globalizing Care*

Ruddick, S. Maternal Thinking, Chapter 6


Week 9: Motherhood, War and the Idea of Maternal Thinking

Question: What has motherhood to do with war? Assess Ruddick’s argument for a feminist, non-violent ethics based on the notion of ‘maternal thinking’.

Key Readings


Elshtain, J. B. Women and War, Chapter 5


Nicolić-Ristanović, V. ‘War, Nationalism, and Mothers in the Former Yugoslavia’ in Lorentzen & Turpin (eds) The Women and War Reader

Ruddick, S. ‘Maternal Thinking’, Ch 1, Maternal Thinking*, see also Chs. 2 & 7

Schepers-Hughes, N. ‘Maternal Thinking and the Politics of War’ in Lorentzen & Turpin (eds) The Women and War Reader

Week 10: Feminism, Pacifism and Non-Violence
Question: What is the relationship between feminism and pacifism as political ideologies? Is there a necessary link between feminism and non-violence? Can non-violent action change the world?

**Key Readings**

Carroll, B. A. ‘Feminism and Pacifism: Historical and Theoretical Connections’, Chapter 1 in Pierson (ed) *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives*


Carter, A. ‘Should Women be Soldiers or Pacifists?’ in Lorentzen & Turpin (eds) *The Women and War Reader*

Harris, A. ‘Bringing Artemis to Life: a plea for militance and aggression in feminist peace politics’ in Harris & King (eds) *Rocking the Ship of State*


Ruddick, S. *Maternal Thinking*, Chapter 9


Reading Suggestions for Beginners

This course engages with massive literatures from a range of disciplines and fields, the following are suggestions to get people started who have no background in one or other of the three key literatures from which the course draws: international relations; gender studies and feminist scholarship.

If you have no background in IR, I suggest you read one of the following textbooks for an overview of the field:
Chris Brown with Kirsten Ainley *Understanding International Relations* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 3rd edition 2005) JZ1305 B87 (more sophisticated)
S. Burchill et al *Theories of International Relations* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 3rd edition 2005) JX1391 (also more sophisticated and focused solely on theoretical paradigms)

If you have no background in gender theory, I suggest you read the following introduction, Connell, R. W. *Gender*, Cambridge, Polity, 2002 CC HQ1075 C75

If you have no background in feminist theory, I suggest you read at least one of:

In addition, the key readings specified for seminars in Weeks 2, 3 and 4 should help to build up a suitable background to tackle the rest of the course.

General Reading List

**Sex, Gender and Feminism**

Carver, T. *Gender is not a Synonym for Women*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 1996, CC HQ1190 C33.

---

2 ** = Temporarily restricted loan.
Trip, A. (ed) Gender, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2000 MC HQ1075 G33.**

Gender, Feminism and International Relations


Murphy, C., 'Seeing Women, Recognising Gender, Recasting International Relations', *International Organization* OFF/P.4410.


**Gender and War: Legitimation, Reproduction, Effects**


Carpenter, R. Charli Innocent Women and Children: gender, norms and the protection of civilians, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006. KZ6515 C29


Hunt, K. and Rygiel, K. (En)Gendering the War on Terror: war stories and camouflaged politics, Aldershot, Ashgate: 2006. HV6432 E51


Mertus, J. War’s Offensive on Women: the humanitarian challenge in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan (with a case study on Afghanistan by J. A. Benjamin), West Hartford, Conn., Kumarian Press, 2000 CC HV369 M57.


Ramet, S. P. (ed) Gender Politics in the Western Balkans: women and society in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States, University Park, Pa, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999 MC HQ1715.5 G32.**


Gender and the Military


Current Sociology: Special Issue on Gender and the Military, Vol. 50, No. 5, 2002 HM1.


Goldman, N. L. (ed) Female soldiers – combatants or noncombatants?: historical and contemporary perspectives (see in particular arguments pro and contra by Segal and Tutin in final section), Westport, Conn, Greenwood Press, 1982 MCRT UB416 F32.

Hall, E. *We can’t even march straight: homosexuality in the British armed forces* (personal account, argument for ban to be lifted), London, vintage, 1995 MC UB419.G72.G38.


**Gender and Nationality**


Hageman, K. ‘Female Patriots: women, war and the nation in the period of the Prussian-German Anti-Napoleonic wars’, Gender and History, 16. 2. 2004: 397-424.
Sunindyo, S. ‘When the Earth is Female and the Nation is Mother: Gender, Armed Conflict and Nationalism in Indonesia’, Feminist Review, Issue 58, Spring 1998: pp 1-21 HQ1101.
Sexual Violence and War

Boling, D. *Mass Rape, Enforced Prostitution and the Japanese Imperial Army*, Baltimore, University of Maryland School of Law, 1995 MC JX5418 B68.


Thomas, D. Q. & Ralph, R. E. ‘Rape in War: The Case of Bosnia’ in Ramet (ed) *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans* HQ1715.5 G32.


### Gender, Feminism, Peacekeeping and Peace

**A Stone in the Water: Report of Roundtables with Afghan-Canadian Women on the Question of the Application UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in Afghanistan.**

(www.humansecuritybulletin.info/archive/en_v1i4/inthenews_5.htm)


*Gender and History*, Special Issue on Feminisms and Internationalism, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1998 *HQ1101*.


---
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Olsson, L. Gendering UN Peacekeeping: mainstreaming a gender perspective in multidimensional peacekeeping operations, Upsalsa, Department of Peace and conflict Research, Uppsala University, Report 53, 1999 COLL.P 10478 [SPEC].


Roseneil, S. Disarming Patriarchy: feminism and political action at Greenham, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1995 MCRT JX1965 R81.**

Sharoni, S. Gender and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: the politics of women’s resistance, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1995 CCHQ1278.5.Z8 W87.


Snyder, A. Setting the Agenda for Global Peace: conflict and consensus building, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2003. MC JZ5578 S67


MCRT U162.6 O91.


**Feminist Ethics**


**Useful Journals**

*Feminist Review* HQ1101

*Feminist Studies* HQ1101
Journal of Peace Research JX1903
Womens Studies International Forum HQ1101
Hypatia HQ1101
Signs HQ1101
Journal of Women’s History HQ1101
Gender and History HQ1101
International Affairs JX1
Ethics and International Affairs JX1255.E73
Review of International Studies JX1
International Studies Quarterly JX1
International Journal of Feminist Politics HQ1236
Journal of Refugee Studies HV640
Men and Masculinities HQ1088

Useful Websites
www.humansecuritybulletin.info/
www.peacewomen.org/
www.gendercide.org/
Sample Examination Paper

IR406: Gender, Justice and War

Answer THREE of the following questions, at least ONE from Section A and ONE from Section B

Section A

1. Is war inherently masculinist?

2. Assess the claim that war is becoming ‘feminised’?

3. Critically assess Ruddick’s ethic of maternal thinking.

4. Assess the argument that feminist critiques of war fail to grasp the full explanatory relevance of the ‘gender variable’.

5. Should feminists be pacifists?

6. Can nationalists be feminists?

Section B

7. Critically assess the impact of the ICTY on the rights of women in war.

8. Analyse and assess the legitimacy and effectiveness of any one example of a women’s peace movement.

9. ‘The army should be an equal opportunities employer like any other’. Discuss.

10. Do women and men get sexually assaulted in war for the same reasons?

11. Does a gender analysis contribute anything to the theory and practice of peace-keeping?

12. Can a gender perspective be helpful in explaining and judging the ‘war on terror’?
IR406 Examination Paper, June 2004

3 hours

Answer three questions, at least one from Section A and one from Section B.

Section A

1. What theories of gender are most useful in explaining the predominant sexual division of labour in war?

2. Critically examine the interrelation between war and hegemonic masculinity in the post-cold war period.

3. Does successful peace-keeping require a feminisation of military culture?

4. Is there a contradiction between feminism and nationalism as political projects?

5. Assess feminist critiques of classical just war theory.

6. Assess the claim that the theory and practice of peace are gendered.

Section B

7. Analyse and assess the use of the notion of ‘combat-effectiveness’ in contemporary policies concerning women and gays in the military.

8. How might the idea of a women only peace movement be justified?

9. What kinds of difference would the implementation of UNSCR 1325 make to peace-making or peace building processes?

10. “The witnesses almost universally experience the trials as dehumanising and re-traumatizing experiences.” (Mertus) Critically examine alternatives to ICTs as ways of delivering justice to the victims of sexual violence in war.

11. How is sexual violence against men in situations of violent conflict to be explained?

12. Critically examine the symbolic role of women in representations of the current war on terror.
IR406 Examination Paper, June 2005

3 hours

Answer three questions, at least one from Section A and one from Section B.

Section A

1. Compare and contrast Waltz and Elshtain on the question of how war in the international system is to be explained and understood.

2. EITHER a) Is ‘maternal thinking’ an adequate ethical response to the practice of war? OR b) Is it possible to articulate a feminist theory of just war?

3. Are ‘subordinate nationalisms’ compatible with feminist ideology?

4. Examine the role of gendered images and symbols in the legitimation of war.

5. Should the massacre at Srebrenica be classified as ‘gendercide’?

6. Does the concept of hegemonic masculinity aid our understanding of war in the post Cold War era?

Section B

7. Assess the arguments of Kinsella and Carpenter that the concept of the ‘civilian’ in humanitarian law is gendered.

8. Outline and assess the problems facing the implementation of UN Resolution 1325 over the next decade.

9. Are the policies of Western militaries towards the inclusion of women and gays based on the same logic of militarized masculinity?

10. EITHER a) Do women have a distinctive contribution to make to peace making? OR b) What, if any, is the link between feminism and pacifism as political ideologies?

11. How is the systematic use of sexual violence in war to be explained?

12. Do international criminal tribunals represent a masculinist response to delivering justice post bellum?