Gender and Security:

How do we bring conflicting knowledge about “gender,” its structural, practical and discursive (raced, abled, sexed, classed, religious etc.,) manifestations in daily life, to bear on the quest to prevent or resolve conflict and build sustainable peace and security? What does identifying the articulation of sex and sex differences during conflict tell us about possible routes to its resolution?

How can tracing alterations in the multiple activities of men and women—as combatants, civilians, war makers, peace-builders, labourers, citizens, and caretakers—inform our programs for security? How does tracing alterations in the multiple activities of men and women during and after conflict alter our understandings of gender, sex, and sex difference? How can the resolution of conflict and the building of sustainable peace and security transform our understandings of gender and sex?

Consider the efforts of the United Nations to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate former combatants post-conflict (the formal program is referred to as DDR) with the goal of building a sustainable peace. These endeavours are crucial to the resolution of the conflict and the restoration of the social and political economies. Yet, DDR programs consistently overlook women and girl combatants. As a result, women and girls are denied the economic benefits; educational opportunities, psychological support, and social recognition offered to men and to boys post-conflict and are left to negotiate for themselves in an often-hostile environment. The strain on individual women and girls, as well as the difficulties posed by their unacknowledged existence, directly affects the restoration of family ties and the reconstruction of social relations.

Answering the question posed by Cynthia Enloe (1990) so many years ago—“where are the women?”—could prompt recognition of the participation of women and girls as combatants and initiate more appropriate and adequate responses. Relatedly, the argument that weapons left in homes create a greater danger of violence in the family, known as the “safety-argument”, is rarely directed towards men in the context of DDR. The assumption seems to be that this is a “feminized/effeminate” argument, and would not be one that appealed to or could convince men. However, such a presumption—based as it is on particular conceptions of masculinity and femininity and the associated roles of men and women during and after conflict—has been proven false. When a NATO disarmament mission in Macedonia used public service announcements focusing on women and home safety it discovered that, contrary to expectations, the argument resonated very powerfully with men.

Thus, we have four tasks this semester: 1) to keep open to debate and question the concepts of ‘gender’ and ‘sex’ to which we refer, while also keeping open to debate and question the concepts of ‘security,’ ‘peace’ and ‘conflict’ and; 2) to identify how the relationships among these concepts are institutionalized and operationalized by non-governmental organizations (such as Human Rights Watch), multilateral institutions (such as the United Nations), states (such as the United States) and individuals (such as combatants or peace-keepers); 3) to imagine how reconstructing those relationships might lead to different outcomes and; 4) to identify how the costs and benefits of such re-imaginings/reconstruction of these relationships might be specifically affected by post 9/11 global politics.
To best facilitate our exploration and discussion, I expect that all of us attend class having read the material closely and prepared to participate fully. I also expect that we shall each take responsibility for following daily news with an eye to new information and developments pertinent to our discussion (e.g., the role of Afghan women in the peace negotiations). And, most importantly, I expect that our class discussions will be engaged, lively, and consistently respectful of differences in opinion, attentive to differences of interpretation, and responsive to differences in experience. For bear in mind, at stake are not solely matters of interpretation but also matters of life.

Formal Requirements

1) One class presentation: 15% (in pairs)

The presentation should be for the same class as you are writing one of your 3-5 page analytic discussion papers. However, the presentation should not be a public reading of your discussion paper. Rather, while you need to present the same three analytical points as in your paper (descriptive, critical, synthetic), your primary responsibility is to teach/involve the class in the readings. This can be a difficult task, so you and your partner should brainstorm ways to generate excitement and interest—from role-playing, to jeopardy style games, to theater . . . the choice is yours. Importantly, each presentation should conclude with 4 questions to pose to the class to lead both general/small group discussions—so think creatively about what you would like us to debate, learn, and conclude from the readings.

2) Four 5-page analytic discussion papers. 40%

These discussion papers serve as the basis for the presentations, and also as independent records of your thinking. They should display the following: 1) understanding descriptively the three major points made in each reading, that is make sure to identify and state the principle theses; 2) critically engaging these three major points—e.g., does the author present a convincing argument regarding these points, how so, why or why not, what counts as evidence, in what theories or traditions are these arguments situated, is there an obvious or not so obvious blind spot in the author’s reasoning and so forth, and; 3) relating the argument of one reading to at least 2 of the other readings—e.g., showing how one argument is disproved or improved if another argument is accounted for, showing how one each argument responds to or builds upon another. Crucially, both your presentation and your analytic discussion papers should conclude by raising 3 effective questions for class discussion and debate. These 3 questions can be specific clarification questions—e.g. how do we define sex and does it differ from gender—or substantive questions—e.g. can the United Nations afford a more complicated understanding of gender—but cannot be only one type. An effective question is one that helps us comprehend new ideas, construct an improved argument, generate debate, orient or introduce a unique approach.

Because these papers are essentially the preparation for our class discussion and debate, it is a requirement that the papers be handed in sequentially at the end of the class—i.e., only one paper
per class in class—and in class. Only in extra-ordinary circumstances will I accept a paper outside of class attendance.

3) Class participation: 35%
Attendance is %10

In our reading and discussion, we will be relying closely on the written text to substantiate our positions and to document our reasoning. Consequently, I expect that the readings for class will be brought to each class for easy reference. I am utterly sympathetic to occasional statements such as—“I think she said something about sovereignty and war in the middle, near where the stuff about rape comes in, but it could have been last week’s reading, does anyone know what I mean?” —but, they should occur only once or twice over the course of the semester because they are just frustrating to everyone. . . .including the speaker!

If bringing the readings to class poses a hardship, please let me know as soon as possible. The readings are on reserve at College Library.
Finally, I reserve the right to change the readings with two weeks notice. I will not increase the number of readings, but I may subtract or shift readings.

Anybody who wishes to discuss specific academic/learning concerns or requirements that could affect participation in this course please let me know immediately. Otherwise, I will assume that all are aware of and responsive to the academic standards, e.g. regarding plagiarism, set forth by the University of Wisconsin, and all violations of those standards will be handled accordingly. Incompletes will only given in case of extreme emergency and demonstrable hardship.

REQUIRED
Octavia E. Butler: Parable of the Sower
Dagmar Herzog: Brutality and Desire: War and Sexuality
Kathleen Kuehnast etc. al: Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21
Anonymous: A Woman in Berlin: Eight Weeks in the Conquered City: A Diary
Kelly Oliver: Women as Weapons of War
Christina Rathbone: A World Apart: Women, Prison, and Life Behind Bars
Leila Ahmed: A Quiet Revolution: The Veil's Resurgence
Anne E. Brodsky: With all Our Strength

RECOMMENDED:
Yasmina Khadra: The Swallows of Kabul
Margot Badran: Feminism in Islam: Secular and Religious Convergences

Film Series:
http://www.pbs.org/wnet/women-war-and-peace/
WEEK ONE: 1/23
Introductions: TWO PAPERS ARE DUE BEFORE SPRING BREAK

WEEK TWO: 1/30
Octavia Butler: Parable of the Sower.
Questions to consider: How does Butler consider security in a post-apocalyptic Los Angeles? How does race figure into considerations of gender and of security? What does it mean to conceive of a wall as a form of security? “Crazy to live without a wall to protect you.” (pg.9) How is ‘sanity’ a form of security? Is this still a future we understand? What do we gain from a ‘fictitious’ approach to gender or security? Is it useful or just ‘fantasy’? What are the basic needs/goods identified for security? How does Butler draw on a history we might recognize (‘we shall not be moved” pg. 121) of the civil rights, 19th century civil war emancipation to denote the despair of her imagined future? What does that tell us?

WEEK THREE: 2/6
Kelly Oliver: Women as Weapons of War

WEEK FOUR: 2/13
Dagmar Herzog: Brutality and Desire: War and Sexuality- Chps, 5 ,6 ,7 & 8

WEEK FIVE: 2/20
Anonymous: A Woman in Berlin: Eight Weeks in the Conquered City: A Diary

WEEK SIX: 2/27:
Kathleen Kuehnast et. al, Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21

Introduction - Helga Hernes, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, and Kathleen Kuehnast
UNSR 1325: Translating Global Agreement into National and Local Commitments - Sanam Anderlini
Appendices--Resolutions 1325, 1889, 1820, 1888

WEEK SEVEN: 3/5
Kathleen Kuehnast et. al, Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21

Rape Is Not Inevitable during War - Elisabeth Jean Wood
Perpetrators of Sexual Violence in the Post-Yugoslav Wars - Inger Skjelsbaek
&
Dagmar Herzog: Brutality and Desire: War and Sexuality, Chp. 10
WEEK EIGHT 3/12
SIGNS: Journal of Women and Culture in Society: Vol. 32, No. 3 Spring 2007
Women in Refugee Camps: pgs. 575-620


WEEK NINE: 3/19
International Peacekeeping, Vol 17. No2. 2010
Selections to be decided in class.

WEEK TEN: 3/26
SIGNS: Journal of Women and Culture in Society Vol 36. No. 1 Autumn 2010
“Feminists Theorize International Political Economy” Shirin M. Rai and Kate Bedford, pp. 1-18


“Militarized Humanitarianism Meets Carceral Feminism: The Politics of Sex, Rights, and Freedom in Contemporary Antitrafficking Campaigns” Elizabeth Bernstein, pp. 45-71

WEEK ELEVEN: SPRING BREAK (TWO PAPERS ARE DUE BEFORE THIS DATE!)

WEEK TWELVE: 4/9
Christina Rathbone: A World Apart: Women, Prison, and Life Behind Bars

WEEK THIRTEEN: 4/16
Theoretical Criminology August 2000 4:

&
“Confining Femininity: A History of Gender, Power and Imprisonment,” Mary Bosworth pp. 265-284

WEEK FOURTEEN: 4/23
SIGNS: Journal of Women and Culture in Society Vol. 36, No. 3 Spring 2011
“The Big Words and Our Work: Peace, Women, and the Everyday”
Tani Barlow, pp. 588-601,

&
“We want empowerment for our women” Transnational Feminism, Neoliberal Citizenship, and the Gendering of Women’s Political Subjectivity in Postconflict South Sudan” Jennifer Erickson and Caroline Faria, pp. 627-652

WEEK FIFTEEN: 4/30
Leila Ahmed: A Quiet Revolution: The Veil’s Resurgence

WEEK SIXTEEN: 5/7
Anne Brodsky: With all our Strength