Course Description and Aims
This course is concerned with gender ‘in’ International Relations. More specifically, it is concerned with how the primary function of the sovereign state, security, and the most visible manifestations of state security, war and 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 strongest than in the field of Security, or more accurately, Strategic Studies.

Set against this, the aim of the course is mainly threefold: firstly, to (re)introduce how the discipline has traditionally thought about war and peace; secondly, to reveal the gender constructions, biases, and inequalities that mark the traditional scholarship; and thirdly, to evaluate the specific contribution that feminist critiques have made as part of the so-called ‘Critical Turn’ in IR.

Course Structure
The first part looks at how 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 second part, however, the focus then shifts more to how ‘malestream’ IR has excluded certain femininities (if not women); in particular, it looks at how women can be both the agents and the victims of militarisation and the practices of security.
Learning Outcomes
The course is designed to produce the following main learning outcomes:
The ability to identify IR’s traditional assumptions informing thinking about war and peace;
The ability to comprehend the gendered nature of what makes war and thinking about war possible;
The ability to recognise in what way feminist-informed critiques of IR both constitute and contribute to debates as part of so-called Critical Security Studies;
The ability to both recognise and formulate questions that contribute to such existing debates.

Teaching Method
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. 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 ‘evaluate’ assumptions and arguments. 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 short term paper is required. 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). The topic of the term paper, approximately 2,500 words in length, is of the students own choosing, although it should be written on something different to the oral presentation(s).

For the final grade, should there be one oral presentation, then: 65% is given to the term paper, 25% 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, 25% to each oral presentation (total 50%), and 10% to seminar attendance and contribution.

Week 1/Seminar 1. Introduction
The 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.
Although there is no oral presentation for this first seminar, the following texts will help students to familiarise themselves with the general nature of the debate.

**Further Reading:**


**Hegemonic) Masculinities in International Relations**

**Week 1/Seminar 2. A Question of Men?**

**Key Text:**


**Further Reading:**

Marysia Zalewski & 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’; Chapter 5: Murphy, ‘Six Masculine Roles in International Relations and their Interconnection: A Personal Investigation’.


**Week 2/Seminar 3. Militarised Masculinity: The Politics of Soldiering**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**


**Week 2/Seminar 4. Militarised Masculinity: The Politics of Peacekeeping**

**Key Text:**
Sandra Whitworth, *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2004), Chapter 4: ‘Canada: Peacekeeping Country Par Excellence?’

**Further Reading:**

Whitworth, *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping*, Chapter 6: ‘Militarized Masculinity and Blue Berets’; Chapter 7: ‘Conclusion: Do Warriors Make the Best Peacekeepers?’


**Week 3/Seminar 5. Militarised Masculinity (?): Gays in the Military**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**


Zalewski & Papart (eds.), *The “Man” Question in International Relations*, Chapter 7: Carol Cohn, ‘Gays in the Military: Texts and Subtexts’.


**Key Text:**
Carol Cohn, ‘Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defence Intellectuals’, *Signs*, vol.12, no.4, 1987.

**Further Reading:**
Cooke & Woollacott (eds.) *Gendering War Talk*, Chapter 10; Cohn, ‘Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War’.


**Week 4/Seminar 7. Militarised Masculinity: The Revolution in Military Affairs**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading**
Where are the Women?

Week 4/Seminar 8. Film: Fahrenheit 9/11

For this seminar, there will be a screening of Michael Moore’s 2004 film Fahrenheit 9/11. The purpose is to provoke discussion (for week 5/Seminar 9 below) as to how, and with what implications, such a powerful critique of the Bush administration and the US-led war in Iraq nonetheless perpetuates certain hegemonic masculinities and, in doing so, largely marginalizes women’s voices.

Week 5/Seminar 9: Fahrenheit 9/11 continued: Where are the Women?

Key Texts:

Further Reading:

Week 5/Seminar 10. Femininities: The ‘Feminisation’ of the Military (?)

Key Texts:

Further Reading:
Joshua Goldstein, War and Gender (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), Chapter 2: ‘Women Warriors: The Historical Record of Female Combatants’.


**Week 6/Seminar 11. Femininities: Militarized Femininity**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**

**Week 6/Seminar 12. Where are We Now? Feminist IR in the Age of the War on Terror**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**