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**Introduction and Overview**

*Sex and Death in Global Politics* is a module about gender and violence, and the many different areas of the social world where they meet. War and other forms of collective violence seem to be everywhere in world affairs, but it has often been commented that the many manifestations of gender may be less visible to us. At times aspects of gender violence (such as war rape) seem to enter into the realm of academic International Relations, whilst some questions (such as the inclusion of homosexuals in the military) have relevance for public policy and national culture. But many other issues (such as media representations of gender violence, the continuum between 'peace' and 'war' violence, or the connection between armies and prostitution, and so on) are more commonly discussed within sociology, political theory and history.

So although this module is formally part of a course on International Relations, it also takes in perspectives and arguments from history, sociology, political philosophy, anthropology, media studies and (predictably enough) feminist, gender and queer studies. As well as being 'multi-disciplinary', the module is also intended to be both theoretical and empirical. Given the subject matter, it is also inevitably political and normative, and we will investigate not only concepts and data, but also arguments about how gendered relations ought to be. At some points this will mean thinking about particular government policies, whilst at others we will need to take a broader view.

Further information on the module as a whole can be found below (on the classroom contract, presentations, assessment, and general study materials). There is also a glossary on Study Direct covering terms that are rather specific to gender and feminist theory, and which you may not be familiar with at the beginning of the module. Each week has a dedicated section featuring questions for class discussions, essential readings, further readings other materials that you will need to draw on when writing your assessed essays.

We meet on **Mondays** in **Arts C233** from **1-4pm**, as follows:

- **Thinking About Gender, Violence and War** (20 January)
- **Gender in War, Society and Culture** (27 January)
- **Imperial Gender** (3 February)
- **Militaries and Masculinities** (10 February)
- **Women at War** (17 February)
- **Queer Wars** (24 February)
- **Wartime Sexual Violence** (3 March)
- **Gendercide and Femicide** (10 March)
- **Preparing for the Assessed Essay** (17 March)
- **No Class: Essay Planning** (24 March)
- **Sex Industries at War and Peace** (31 March)
- **Sex and Death in Popular Culture** (7 April)
Module Aims and Structure

By the end of the course, students should have a strong grasp of the many issues covered in the course and be able to:

- identify and summarise the core academic debates about gender and violence in global politics;
- compare and contrast historical and conceptual material on a broad range of questions;
- critically interpret recent empirical and theoretical controversies related to global patterns of gender and violence;
- appraise the connection and disconnection between issues of gender violence and other aspects of international relations; and
- develop your own analysis of a selected issue related to the module.

The Classroom Contract

We have the advantage of three hours together each week, which will allow us both to attend to the complexities of texts, and to situate them more broadly within our topic. Although there are a lot of people on the module, our progress will nevertheless be more-or-less proportional to the energies devoted. These pages are our structure. Put otherwise:

The “syllabus,” in [one] sense, represents the letter of the contract. A good syllabus isn’t just a reading list, it’s a plan of action: “Here’s what we’re going to be doing. Are you in?” A good syllabus lists both my commitment to you as your teacher (This is what I will be teaching you) and your commitment to me as a student (This is what you will need to do in order to learn). The commitment, as I understand it, is mutual.

The classroom is a space of work, but also one of discovery. Our subject matter is inevitably political, and may therefore elicit strong positions. This is not to be feared, but the classroom is also intended as a safe space. If you find some of what we discuss triggering, there are ways for us to support each other in working with those issues (I will cover this in more detail in our first session).

My role is to situate our topics, to facilitate discussion, and to provoke thought. There are no points for agreeing with me, and I will not always offer thoughts that reflect my own position. As Max Weber put it almost a hundred years ago:

The primary task of a useful teacher is to teach his students to recognise 'inconvenient' facts - I mean facts that are inconvenient for their party opinions. And for every party opinion there are facts that are extremely inconvenient, for my own opinion no less than for others. I believe the teacher accomplishes more than a mere intellectual task if he compels his audience to accustom itself to the existence of such facts. I would be so immodest as even to apply the expression 'moral achievement,' though perhaps this may sound too grandiose for something that should go without saying.
This idea of the teacher is an attractive one, if not uncontested. But since you are also advanced students, I will seek to unify our study not just through some common thematics, but also by outlining a number of claims of my own about violence and gender.

**Readings and Class Discussion**

Each week, there are a number (usually 3-4) core readings. Everyone attending class should have read all of these articles or chapters, and should come prepared to discuss them. You may find it helpful to make some brief summary notes of the texts as you work through them, and then to sketch out brief answers to the discussion questions before class. This is preferable to simply trying to remember the salient points after the fact.

It is true that some of the readings are quite long, and that others are quite involved. Do not let this put you off. Our task, after all, is *in-depth analysis*. In some cases, there will be arguments made (say about gender as a construction) that are familiar to you. Try to identify the most important sections of a piece, and direct your attentions predominantly to those. I will situate the readings the class before, which should help. Occasionally, it will be appropriate for you to choose between two essential readings in a set, rather than completing them all, and I will let you know when this is the case. Above all, remember that it is always better to read something, however partially, than nothing at all.

Readings are arranged broadly in the order that you should approach them each week. The readings have been chosen either because they offer different perspectives on the same issue, or because they deal with different sub-themes of some larger issue. In other words, it is *worth the effort to engage with them all*. Where a reading is a chapter from a longer book by the same author, you should assume that the whole book will be of value for the purposes of essays or more sustained analysis.

**Discussions, “Presentations” and Controversies**

Presentations are a useful way for students to engage in more depth with a topic, and to develop a conversation in class. However, they can also tend towards the descriptive and end up following a predictable PowerPoint format. Far from adding dynamism to the classroom, they can instead discourage reading and bore their audience.

Instead of presentations by one or two students, this module features a number of *controversies*, or discussion topics. These are more focused sub-themes within a week, sometimes building on an essential reading or prominent event. Seven weeks on this module (weeks 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12) include such controversies.

Four or five students will commit to working on a week’s controversy, and to beginning a discussion of these points each week. For each controversy, there are a number of additional readings provided that you can draw on, although students may also wish to engage with less academic material in developing their discussion. There is no need to prepare text-heavy PowerPoint slides, although groups may wish to display some images or provide hand-outs for the class.
**What A Discussion Controversy Is:**

- An opportunity to explore one aspect of a topic in more depth
- A short collaborative project that you actively engage in *with other students*
- An intervention into an existing debate, which may mean that different students take on different sides of the controversy
- A classroom conversation that you will begin and lead
- An argument that you will take a (perhaps tentative) position on, and be prepared to defend to others
- A preamble to a set of questions for class consideration, which you should include

**What A Discussion Controversy Isn't:**

- A summary of further readings
- A mere description of the literature ("author A says; author B says")
- Your view on the essential readings (which everyone will have done anyway)

**Assessment**

*Sex and Death in Global Politics* is assessed by a 7,000 word essay, due on **Monday 12 May 2014**. Unlike on other modules that you may have taken, there are not set questions to answer. Instead, students come up with their own questions, which **have to be agreed with the convener** (me) by Week 12. Questions must be on a topic covered in this module.

**Consultation Hours**

I am available to discuss these and any other issues relating to the course during my term-time consultation hours, which are on **Mondays from 11.30-12.30** and on **Tuesdays from 12.00-13.00** in C374 (which is on the same corridor as the other IR Faculty offices and accessible through the Global Studies Building, Arts B). I may also be able to meet students outside of these hours by appointment, although this will depend on other commitments. I can also be reached by email at p.c.kirby@sussex.ac.uk.

**General Study Materials**

Reading lists are by necessity partial, not only because they select from a wide range of existing literature, but also because they tend to neglect non-academic sources of argument. In many cases, academic debates are themselves in motion, and relevant contributions may well emerge during the course of the module. The below resources cover *general texts* (which may be useful in explaining basic concepts), *academic journals* (which you can browse through for contemporary material) and *web resources* (which often engage with and draw on arguments that we will look at, but also present ideas in a rather different way to academic texts).
**General Texts**


**Academic Journals**

The following journals are good places to look for discussions of gender and violence, either because they are devoted entirely to gender issues or because they are receptive to critical discussions of security and global politics which incorporate feminist and gender perspectives:

*Alternatives: Local, Global Political Feminist Review*  
*Feminist Theory*  
*Gender and Society*  
*Hypatia: Journal of Feminist Philosophy*  
*International Feminist Journal of Politics*  
*Men and Masculinities*  
*Millennium: Journal of International Studies*  
*Politics and Gender*  
*Sexualities*  
*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*  
*Women’s Studies International Forum*

These more general IR journals are also worth looking at for contemporary discussions of collective violence (with or without an explicit gender perspective):

*Armed Forces and Society*  
*Civil Wars*  
*Conflict, Security and Development*
Web Resources

The following collection of sites largely focus on gender, but some deal only with war and violence:

International Organisations, Research Groups and Think Tanks

The Boston Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights
The Institute for Inclusive Security
Institute for War and Peace Reporting
International Crisis Group
PeaceWomen
The Refugee Law Project
UN Women (UNIFEM)
UN Women Watch
UN Women, War and Peace
United States Institute of Peace

Data Resources

Human Rights Watch
UN Women and Gender Data
The WomanStats Project
Women Under Siege Sexual Violence Cases
World Bank Gender Data

Blogs

Danger Room (Wired's security blog)
The Disorder Of Things
Feministe
Kings of War
openSecurity
Sociological Images
1. THINKING ABOUT SEX AND DEATH

Summary

In this first week we will take a general view of the connections between gender and violence. More specifically, we are interested to understand what a gender perspective does to our understanding of violence in its different forms, from 'domestic violence' to 'post-conflict' spaces to 'national security'. This means looking beyond war alone, but also beginning to consider some of the complexities of gender, particularly as it relates to different identities (or the intersection of identities). As well as looking at varieties of gender violence, we also begin in this week to think about different conceptual approaches to our topic. International Relations, like other academic disciplines, has over the last decades been strongly criticised for its lack of attention to gender. Since this criticism has most often come from feminist scholars, this has also led to a series of debates around the content and value of feminist analysis, as compared to traditional non-feminist inquiry, to a purportedly less-politicised 'gender studies' or to approaches which combine gender analysis with a perspective on race, class or other relevant categories. The question for us will be how to relate all of this to the global politics of violence.

Discussion Questions

1. What does feminism have to do with security studies, and vice-versa?
2. What acts should be included on a continuum of gendered violence? What are the merits and risks in using the idea of a 'continuum' in this way?
3. Is there a special method for studying gender and violence? If so, what does it look like?
4. Are there distinctly 'feminist' and 'gender' approaches to world politics? How do they differ?
5. What is 'intersectionality' and why does it matter?
6. What are the limits to 'gender' as a term of analysis?
7. Is the study of sex and death political? How?

**Essential Readings**


*Also read at least some of these very short contributions:*


**Recommended Debate: Feminism, Gender and International Relations**


Further Readings


Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 17, No. 3 (1988); Vol. 27, No. 4 (1998); and Vol. 37, No. 1 (2008) [two special issues and a forum on gender at ten year intervals in one of the first journals to feature discussions of feminism and global politics]


Non-Feminist Readings on War and Security (you may find these useful as contrasting approaches, but you can also draw on readings from other conflict and security modules)


2. Gender in War, Culture and Society

Summary

In this second week we turn to theoretical and historical questions about the relationship between gender in peace and in war. It is commonly claimed that the 'domestic' character of states (their political systems, economic models and territorial history) influence and even determine how and when they fight with other states (for example, in the idea that democracies do not go to war with each other). Gender and feminist analyses extend this view to historical relationships between men and women, and so try to understand how different internal gender arrangements might affect external politics. But peacetime society and culture does not only shape war-making; it is also shaped in turn by war. This is most famously the case in relation to changing patterns of labour during the World Wars. We will examine two texts on those changes (Milkman and Higonnet and Higonett), before turning to a more contemporary analysis of militarism, gender and society (Enloc) and a broad account of the transformation of voting rights in the 20th century (Towns). This will leave us with a better sense of how war has been historically linked to gender labour, equality and rights. And in a still wider sense, these are questions that open up the relationship of women and men to nationalism, the state and the conditions for peace.

Discussion Questions

1. In what ways did World War II transform the role of women? What were the limits of these changes?
2. Does the idea of a 'double helix' help us make sense of the history of gender and war?
3. What does soup have to do with war?
4. How and why did women's suffrage spread in the 20th century?

5. Considering these four readings together, what do we learn about, and what problems arise in the study of, war, militarism, gender and society?

**Essential Readings**

Ruth Milkman, 'Redefining "Women's Work": War Mobilisation and the Sexual Division of Labour', in *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1987)


**Further Resources**

The History Channel on American women in World War II:
http://www.history.com/topics/american-women-in-world-war-ii/interactives/inside-wwii-interactive

A graphically-dated but excellent Library of Congree video on Rosie the Riveter:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=04VNBM1PqR8

A 1940s Signal Corps information video on women in the military:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=enYgk47gQi8

**Further Readings**


Hagemann, Karen, Gisela Mettele and Jane Rendall (eds.), *Gender, War and Politics: Transatlantic Perspectives, 1775-1830* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).


3. **Imperial Gender**

![Image of children in a bathtub, one with light skin and another with dark skin, with text around them suggesting the use of soap.](image)

**Summary**

Last week focused on how gender politics within states are affected by war, and how war and conflict may effect them in turn. Following on from Ann Towns' account of global hierarchies, we now turn to one historical co-implication of gender and violence: that of empire and imperialism. We are interested not only in the imperial past, but also on its legacy and transformation in the present. Anne McClintock's rich analysis of imperial gender, and its relationship to other aspects of the social world, such as the family and the rise of commodities, provides the background for that discussion. Heather Streets' account of 'martial races' in the British Empire adds another concrete example of empire's effects. Patricia Owens offers an updated account of the links between knowledge of the Oriental other and violence via a reading the Abu Ghraib torture scandal. Finally, Chandra Mohanty's criticism of feminism in terms of its relationship to coloniality connects substantive accounts of imperial gender with the more general questions of intersectionality which we began to think about in the first week.

**Discussion Questions**

1. How is gender related to colonialism and its legacies?
2. Consider McClintock's claims about the connection of commodities, empire and gender and Streets' view of the connection between military strategy, race and gender. How convincing do you find their arguments?
3. Are contemporary examples of gendered violence imperial? If so, how?
4. Can we talk of 'orientalism' or 'colonial discourse' in our thinking about gender? What are the implications of such a critique?
5. Is (some) feminism and gender rights activism a kind of colonial discourse? How?

**Essential Readings**


**Controversy: Orientalism, Colonialism and Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code**

A Summary of the Supreme Court Verdict, 11 December 2013 (full verdict)

Siddharth Narrain, *We Dissent*, *Kafila*, 12 December 2013


**Further Readings**


4. MILITARIES AND MASCULINITIES

Summary

This week we turn to the first in a series of contemporary sites where gender meets violence. We start with the place of men in militaries, or, more specifically, the idea of military masculinity - which means taking in more than just biological 'men'. The central contention of this literature is that there is a specific social construction (or a series of linked social constructions) which governs appropriate behaviours in certain settings, and which is assigned the name of 'masculinity'. Sandra Whitworth provides a clear introduction to many of these ideas in her analysis of men in UN peacekeeping. But this idea has also been refined and challenged in a number of ways, whether in terms of how masculinities are constructed (Belkin) or of how they function in different military settings (Higate). We will also look at an analysis of how masculinity and heteronormativity may be bad for men (Jones) and debate whether, and how, men benefit systematically from militaries, male identity and violence.

Discussion Questions

1. What is military masculinity? How is it different from other forms of masculinity?
2. What is the relationship between 'military masculinity' and 'men'? Try and think of some examples?
3. Is it more useful to think of masculinity in terms of hierarchies or brotherhoods?
4. How are homosexuality and heterosexuality related to military culture?
5. Is military masculinity bad for men? According to what measures?
**Essential Readings**


**Controversy: Is Violence Good for Men?**


**Further Readings**


Summary

It is often assumed that war-making is not only inherently masculine, but also restricted to men. However, this close association has come under repeated challenge, and in this week we turn to the relationship of women to war, and to the contrasting politics of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as shifting constructions for understanding violence. On the one hand, this requires an analysis of the role that women have historically played in violence (Goldstein and Alison). But it will also lead us to look at where women have adopted what are usually thought of as 'masculine' roles, and where men have in turn become 'feminised' (Ortega). We will ask how representative such examples are, how they matter, and what relation they might have to policy debates about women and war, for example in the exclusion of women from combat roles in many Western armies, particularly those of the United States of America (MacKenzie). Instead of a controversy discussion, the last part of the class will be given over to a presentation by Dr Synne Lastaad Dyvik on Female Engagement Teams, followed by a Q&A (so you may wish to read up on these all-female units before the class).

Discussion Questions

1. What is 'the historical record' of female combatants? What can we conclude from it? And are there any limits to what lessons we can learn?
2. Considering also last week's discussion of masculinity, what does it mean to 'gender security'?
3. How close is the associated relationship between 'women' and 'femininity' in times of war?
4. Should women be excluded from combat roles in today's armies?
5. Can violence be good for women?

**Essential Readings**


**Further Resources**

Major Sergeant Julia L. Watson, 'Female Engagement Teams: The Case for More Female Civil Affairs Marines', *Marine Corps Gazette* [note images and references at foot of article]


Laura Sjoberg, 'What's Wrong with FETs?: Thoughts from Gendering Global Conflict', *The Duck Of Minerva*, 16 October 2013

Discussion regarding the female combat ban on Melissa Harris-Perry's show with members of Service Women's Action Network (SWAN).

Lawsuit brought by a number of female marines and SWAN against Leon Panetta (http://servicewomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/HegarvPanettacomplaint.pdf) on the grounds that the female combat ban was unconstitutional, November 2012

Coverage of the lawsuit in *Time* and the *Los Angeles Times*.


White House promotional video on Female Engagement Teams: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0kLp9RkGF8
Further Readings:


6. **Queer Wars**

Summary

'Queer' has many meanings, and in this week we will investigate several of them. Although associated in everyday speech with an insult directed towards (suspected) homosexuals, in academia and activism it has over the last decades come to mean not only attention to the lives and experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans* (LGBT) people, but also to an entire way of looking at the world. As struggles for gay rights have progressed, criticisms have also emerged of how that discourse has become assimilated into more traditional notions of state power and global hierarchy.

These complexities demand a somewhat lengthier collection of essential readings than might be the case in other weeks. Thus we move through an account of a conscious attempt to queer the nation and subvert 1990s homophobia (Berlant and Freeman) to the much more recent idea of homonationalism (Puar and Rai), the relationship between ideas of gay rights and Orientalist politics (Massad), the idea of a queer approach to contemporary issues of sexuality and violence (Rao), and finally to the thus-far unexamined role of trans* questions in security studies (Shepherd and Sjoberg). We will have grounds to revisit some of our discussion of imperialism and homosexuality from Week 3 in light of some of these arguments. Reflecting last week's discussion of female soldiering today, our controversy is homosexuality in the US military, both before and after the repeal of the policy of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'.
Discussion Questions

1. What does it mean to have a 'queer' approach to war and politics?
2. What do we learn from the transition from Queer Nation (as analysed by Berlant and Freeman) to Homonationalism (as diagnosed by Puar and Rai)?
3. Have gay rights today become complicit in homonationalism and/or orientalism? If so, how?
4. How does a trans* perspective change our understanding of security? What might it add to existing ideas of gender and sexual equality?
5. Why have militaries been so reluctant to allow gay men to serve openly?

Essential Readings


Controversy: Homosexuality in the US Military


Aaron Belkin et al. One Year Out: An Assessment of DADT Repeal's Impact on Military Readiness (Palm Center, September 2012)

Further Resources

Aaron Belkin discusses the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell on DemocracyNow!:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W0tNyYGuuUL

Lieutenant Dan Choi, 'Made To Be Broken': https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iBpweLRwrjc

A DemocracyNow! Debate on militarism and Don't Ask, Don't Tell: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Op0V5Juh1c (Part One)
Further Readings


Summary

Of all aspects of gendered violence, war rape has perhaps received the most attention. This has particularly been so in recent years, with the idea of rape as a weapon of war being adopted on a wide scale. In this week, we will focus on and unpack this idea in several stages. First, we will look at a classic statement of why we should think of rape as a 'cultural' act, as a deliberate tactic and as importantly linked to war as a political act (Seifert). This will be followed by a close analysis of how combatants and perpetrators themselves represent wartime sexual violence in one contemporary conflict (Ériksson Baaz and Stern). The final two readings will then further complicate some common claims about rape in war, either by challenging the idea of it as directly instrumental (Buss) or by arguing for an analysis of variation in rape in different contexts (Wood). Our controversy focuses on the politics of measuring and representing rape, and on one recent bold claim about the historical pattern of war rape.

Discussion Questions

1. What possible explanations are there for the occurrence of sexual violence in war and conflict settings?
2. Is rape a weapon of war? If so, how?
3. Can we draw any firm conclusions about global patterns of wartime sexual violence?
4. Are there political or analytical problems with recent attention to wartime sexual violence?
5. How is war rape connected to other forms of gender violence?
6. What should we do about wartime sexual violence?
Essential Readings


Controversy: The Politics of Representing War Rape


Responses to the Human Security Report
(the below and others are collected at the HSR2012 Tumblr):

Lauren Wolfe, 'Rape in War: Are We Getting It Wrong?', Women Under Siege, 10 October 2012


Megan MacKenzie, 'War Rape is Not Declining', The Duck Of Minerva, 17 October 2012

Andrew Mack, 'A Rejoinder to Megan MacKenzie', The Duck Of Minerva, 19 October 2012


Amelia Hoover Green, Dara Kay Cohen and Elisabeth Jean Wood, 'What's Wrongs with the Human Security Report and the "Global Decline Claim"?', The Duck Of Minerva, 1 November 2012

Andrew Mack, 'Global Trends in Conflict-Related Sexual Violence: A Response to Green, Cohen, and Wood', The Duck Of Minerva, 14 November 2012
Further Resources

Stop Rape Now: a website and campaign by the UN against sexual violence in conflict

Some recent documentaries about wartime sexual violence (some available online):

Another War (2010): a film by the Norwegian Refugee Council about rape in Liberia.


The Invisible War (2012): a documentary about rape within the US military.

Gender Against Men (2009): a documentary from the Refugee Law Project in Uganda

Further Readings


Turshen, Meredith, 'The Political Economy of Rape: An Analysis of Systematic Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women During Armed Conflict in Africa', in Caroline O. N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark (eds) *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors?: Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence* (London: Zed Books, 2001), pp. 55-88


Summary

Having examined the complexities of wartime sexual violence, we turn to other, more diffuse forms of gendered killing. These exist not just in situations of war and social conflict, but also situations of nominal peace, indeed of political stability and economic prosperity. Whilst we have examined many forms of gendered violence already, the acts analysed in this week share the special characteristic of being aimed at the elimination of persons on the basis of their gender, either because they are perceived as combatants by virtue of their gender identity alone (Carpenter), because the society they live in does not value the gender they possess at birth (Sen and Hudson), because they are victimised in a particular socio-economic situation as adults (Rodriguez) or because they are victims of attacks apparently based on the special status they are expected to hold within families and communities (Abu-Lughod).

Discussion Questions

1. What are the forms taken by sex-selective killing? How are they similar, and how different?
2. Does the mass killing of men in the Balkans change how we think about gendered harms in war? How, and with what consequences?
3. Why does femicide persist?
4. Is gendercide and femicide the problem of particular cultures or societies? Which
ones?
5. Is femicide in Mexico linked to neoliberalism?
6. What are the limits to the idea of femicide in the case of Ciudad Juárez?
7. How robust is the idea of 'honour crime'? Should such acts be considered on the same spectrum as femicide and gendercide?

**Essential Readings**


**Controversy: Femicide and Neoliberalism in Ciudad Juárez**

'The Exchange: Charles Bowden on Juárez, "Murder City"', *The New Yorker*, 24 May 2010
The Vice Guide to the Female Journalists of Juarez, July 2012

**Further Resources**

Holly Watt, Claire Newell and Zahra Khimji, 'Abortion Investigation: Available on Demand - An abortion if it's a boy you wanted', *The Telegraph*, 23 February 2012
'Sex-Selective Abortion "Widely Practiced" by UK Ethnic Groups', *Huffington Post*, 15 January 2014
Rahil Gupta, 'On sex-selective abortion, we must not make a fetish of choice', *The Guardian*,
Frances Ryan, 'Campaigns against sex-selective abortion are misogyny disguised as feminism', *The New Statesman*, 16 January 2014

**Further Readings**


Jones, Adam (ed.), *Gendercide and Genocide* (Vanderbilt University Press, 2004). [*this collects together papers previously published as articles, many of which are also listed individually here*]


Staudt, Kathleen A., Violence and Activism at the Border: Gender, Fear, and Everyday Life in Ciudad Juárez (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2008).


9. Preparing for the Assessed Essay

This module is assessed by a 7,000 word assessed essay on questions created by students, but agreed with the convener (me) by Week 12. Questions must be on a topic covered in this module.

In this session, we will begin work on these essays. In preparation, think about the topics we have covered so far, and have a look at the topics still to come. Think about which topic you are most interested in, and which specific issue or sub-theme within that topic you would like to write about. If there is more than one topic that interests you, prepare a short list.

Before the seminar, sketch out some ideas and notes for each of the topics that you are interested in. If you can, draft a few questions that might serve as the basis for the essay. Begin to think about what literatures need to be included in the answer to the question. What material is perhaps related but not absolutely necessary to an answer to this question?

During the session, we will explore issues around choosing a topic and structuring an answer, and on managing your work load. There will be an opportunity to discuss specific essay ideas, so do come prepared. This week and next will both also serve as an opportunity to catch up on reading.

Essays should use Chicago (footnote), Harvard or American Sociological Association (both in-text) referencing system. The important thing is for the referencing to be consistent.

10. No Class: Essay Work

In this week, we will not meet for a class. Instead, this is an opportunity to conduct further research for your assessed essay and to develop a detailed essay plan. Extended office hours will be available in the final weeks for discussion of the plans and advice before the submission of the assessment in May.
Summary

This week deals with a number of related, but not synonymous, issues: prostitution, sex trafficking and human trafficking. In turn, each of these areas is subject to considerable dispute, right down to conflicts over terminology itself ('sex work', 'slavery', 'trafficking', and so on). Each is also ambiguously related to exploitation and organised violence: for example, military prostitution clearly intersects with the hierarchies of armed force, but it is not necessarily the direct result of violence, and may even be less related to violence that are more apparently 'peacetime' examples of migration or sex work. Such debates also take place against the background of controversies in philosophy and political theory: for example, is there something specially wrong about treating human bodies as commodities.

Discussion Questions

1. Is prostitution a special kind of harm?
2. In what ways is sex work militarised?
3. Is Weitzer right about sex-trafficking campaigns? How can better understand the realities of exploitation, migration, trafficking and labour?
4. What do we learn from the example of male sex work in San Francisco?
5. How should ethical conclusions about prostitution and trafficking influence how we study them?
Essential Readings


Controversy: Global Governance and Sex Trafficking


BBC World Trafficking Debate, January 2011 (watch all five parts)

See also examples of official documents on the sex trade and human trafficking from national and international bodies, for example the UK Home Office's First Annual Report of the Inter-Departmental Ministerial Group on Human Trafficking (October 2012)

Further Resources

Trafficking: New Slave Trade or Moral Panic?, a 2010 London debate on trafficking and feminism: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H44IyOJgLnU

Stacely Dooley Investigates: Sex Trafficking in Cambodia, BBC3: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NJzI1_jX5RI

Further Readings


Bernstein, Elizabeth, Temporarily Yours: Intimacy, Authenticity and the Commerce of Sex (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007).


Doezema, Jo, 'Ouch! Western Feminists' 'Wounded Attachment' to the 'Third World Prostitute', Feminist Review, No. 67 (2001), pp. 16-38.


Summary

In the final week we turn to popular culture, and to debates around the role of representations of gendered violence therein. We all consume culture, usually on a daily basis, and debates rage about the meaning and effect of plots, characters and tropes found in film, literature and art. We will begin with two sustained analyses of how men and women are represented in popular culture, first in relation to masculinity and the Vietnam War (Jeffords), and then in terms of the role of women and the feminine in horror (Creed). We then evaluate two classic statements on one distinct form of media - pornography (Dworkin and Segal). Both claim a feminist perspective, but share little else, at least on the surface. In addition, we will make time to discuss representations of gender in contemporary film and television, most likely in terms of the film *Zero Dark Thirty* (2012).

Discussion Questions

1. How are masculinity and femininity often represented in popular culture?
2. Think about some different representations of masculinity and femininity in popular culture. How diverse are they? What unites them, if anything?
3. Can we reliably speak of the effects of representations of gendered violence on violence behaviour itself?
4. Should we follow the approach of Andrea Dworkin or Lynne Segal when it comes to pornography?
5. Should we regulate popular representations of gendered violence?
Essential Readings


Controversy: Analysing Gender Media

In your group, choose a film (or documentary, or TV show, or other cultural product) that seems to you to reveal important issues about gender and violence. Prepare an analysis of the work to present in front of the class.

You may wish to choose from one of the following films: Full Metal Jacket; Lust, Caution; Django Unchained; In The Land of Blood and Honey; or Before Night Falls.

Further Resources


Mark Kermode's review/rant of Sex and the City 2: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uHeQeHstrsc

Further Readings


