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Preface
A pilgrim’s progress

*Gender Inclusive* includes much of my writing over the past two decades on the theme of gender and violence, particularly mass violence and genocide. All these materials are previously published, but disparately, and it seems worthwhile to bring them together between a single set of covers. In doing so, and revisiting my output on this subject since the beginning of the 1990s, I am struck by the consistency of tone and method throughout the selections. Most of my basic preoccupations and strategies are evident in the earliest piece presented here, and the one that first attracted some wider attention in a North American context. “The Globe and males” (1990) was fueled, above all, by an ethical and activist conviction that certain workings of the gender variable in society were being systematically excluded from mainstream discourse on the subject, resulting in the profound distortion of some core social phenomena, notably violent victimization. To demonstrate this, I carried out a content analysis of four months of *Globe and Mail* editions. I contrasted the underrepresentation and exclusion of men in mass-cultural narratives of victimization with males’ statistical overrepresentation in numerous victim categories. Among other things, I encouraged readers to imagine female victims in the place of male ones, to appreciate how many stereotypes and morally dubious assumptions ran rampant in the discourse. One such thought experiment concerned a massacre of young civilian men by the Peruvian army. How, I asked, would the tenor of the coverage differ if all the victims were female? In its earliest and most tentative form, one glimpses here the project that would sprout a decade later as “Gendercide and genocide” (2000) (Chapter 11), and a much broader inquiry into gender-selective mass killing.

“The Globe and males” was the product of a lengthy correspondence, for me a formative one, with Professor Ferrel Christensen of the University of Alberta, to whom this book is dedicated. A deeply liberal man, Ferrel spent the 1980s growing increasingly disturbed by the vituperative and demonizing character of much commentary about men at the time (and since) – notably in the realms of sexuality, sexual violence, and domestic abuse. Among his writings during this period was a monograph, *Pornography: The Other Side*, which first circulated in mimeo form, and was discovered on a
back shelf of the University of British Columbia bookstore by an undergradu-
ate student just beginning to articulate his own critique, and anxiously seek-
ing buttresses for it. Ferrel provided that initial foundation, and he has never
failed to come through for me since – including, via the Gender Issues
Education Foundation (GIEF), with occasional but significant financial infu-
sions to assist with projects like *Men of the Global South: A Reader* (2006;
see Chapter 9). My research on gender and politics would have taken a
quite different turn without him, or in any case taken far longer to find its
feet. In that sense, Ferrel’s intellectually questing approach – and I hope also
something of his personal decency and humanity – is a prominent feature of
these pages.

Another figure who deserves mention alongside Ferrel is the scholar and
activist Noam Chomsky, whose work I first stumbled across in the mid-
1980s, and whom I have been privileged to know personally and correspond
with for many years. (I should stress that I have not shared my gender
writings with him, and have no idea what he would make of them.) Under-
pinning Chomsky’s deeply humanist orientation, I discovered, was an
empiricist-derived methodology as simple and elegant as it was potent and
subversive. It runs something like this: (1) Clear your mind of preconcep-
tions (2) Examine the data honestly (3) Assume that analytical and ethical
consistency is desirable (4) Examine mainstream discourse, and substitute
the variables (5) Draw honest and morally viable conclusions. Most readers
will be familiar with how this operates in Chomsky’s writings on global
politics. The basic assumption of a moral and benevolent US foreign policy
is first ruthlessly deconstructed. Readers are then invited to consider main-
stream media framings, and to imagine designated enemies (e.g., the Soviet
Union in its day) being granted the same dispensation of presumed benevo-
lence, and the same obfuscations of mass atrocity when they or their allies
commit them. How readily would we (that is, “Westerners”) recognize such a
framing as propagandistic, self-serving, and ethically indefensible? I adopt a
similar methodology throughout this book. Chomsky is also a consummate
public intellectual. In my more marginal way, I too have sought to cultivate
“ideal readers” who are interested and intelligent, but by no means necessarily
(or primarily) academic specialists.

I moved from the study of “The Globe and males” to the global study of
males; but I kept an eye throughout the 1990s on the “home front,” and this
led early in the new century to a second searching exploration of North
American institutions and their little-recognized gendering. Titled “Of
rights and men” (Chapter 2), the essay focused this time on the United
States. Of course, artificial distinctions between the national and inter-
national spheres should be destabilized. The commonalities and crossovers –
as well as stark contrasts – between the arenas are things that the radical
tradition, exemplified by Chomsky and others, has long emphasized. For the
radical gendering of that analysis, we must credit successive waves of feminist
theorists, beginning perhaps with Olympia de Gouges during the French
Revolution, and continuing through the present generation of engaged theorists of International Relations (IR) — or rather engaged, since the great majority were and are female, and primarily concerned with female oppression and victimization.

Lest there be any doubt, let me say it loud: I’m feminist and proud. My politics from early childhood have focused on the plight and needs of the underdog. Any comfortable notion I might have derived from the wider society that women were somehow inferior to men was rapidly quashed by encounters with female students, who always seemed to occupy eight of the ten places above me on the honor roll. Fairly early on, I developed a vague sense that around me and in the outside world, capable female minds and complex female spirits were being constrained by discrimination and abuse. At the same time — I am talking about the mid-1970s — dramatic and positive transformations were evident in the status and opportunities of North American women and girls. I hung out mostly with girls in that period — never got on quite as well with the boys. That trend carried over to my early working life, as a temporary secretary and data-entry operator in Canada, the UK, and Australia. Often, I was the first male in this role that my co-workers had seen, and as “one of the girls” in the white-collar trenches, I gained some keen insights into gendered assumptions and stereotypes. This empathy with females was generally, and crucially, reciprocated. For what it’s worth, at every stage of the intellectual and activist endeavor traced in this book, most of those who have offered encouragement, useful information, and personal validation have been women.

**Gendering international relations**

The article excerpted as Chapter 4, “Does ‘gender’ make the world go Round?” (1996), is still probably the best-known piece I have published on gender and international politics. The article won the prize of the British International Studies Association for the best article in *Review of International Studies* that year, and I believe it played a role, however slight, in shifting the terms of debate within the emerging field of feminist IR. Much of the article consisted of a survey and review of the feminist IR literature through to the early 1990s. This is now outdated, and to reproduce those passages here would not only be redundant but would do a certain injustice to the more nuanced and inclusive feminist analyses which have built upon these prece- dents. I have, nonetheless, left intact a number of the criticisms I raised in “Does ‘gender’ . . .,” particularly with regard to the postmodern strand typified (for my purposes) by Christine Sylvester’s book, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (1994). What struck me then as flippant and crass analyses unfortunately remain prominent — and are now even of wider concern, since they have migrated from feminist IR scholarship to the sphere of gendered policymaking and its real-world consequences. These are themes that I would explore systematically in later works like “Effacing the
male” (2001, see Chapter 5) and “Genocide and humanitarian intervention: incorporating the gender variable” (2002, Chapter 15).

The criticisms I raised in 1996 are also of some historical interest. They help to explain the rather tortuous path of “Does ‘gender’ . . .” to final publication in Review of International Studies. Written in 1993 as a graduate paper for a UBC seminar course instructed by the leading IR scholar Kal Holsti, it was submitted, with Holsti’s generous encouragement, to the Review. There, it was roundly assailed by the – presumably feminist – IR specialists who were predictably asked to conduct the peer review. Dispirited, I was prepared to abandon the submission; but a Review editor encouraged me to proceed with a revise-and-resubmit. I did so. Again the reviews were withering, and unanimous in their rejection. Most revelatory to me were the following comments from one anonymous reviewer:

The thing which I find the most perplexing about this paper, and the most frustrating, is that it is suggested throughout that this is a critique which is sympathetic to feminist contributions in IR and yet it is difficult to find anything particularly sympathetic here. Its central argument, in fact, is that feminism is suspect precisely because of its normative commitment to women and improving women’s equality [!]. I do not object to the paper on the grounds that it is unsympathetic to feminism, but rather on the grounds that it does not acknowledge this. This is a critique of feminist IR from what I would describe as a traditional, indeed extremely conservative (some would say anti-feminist) perspective, which sees attention to women detracting from the often more important concerns facing men. It is an argument which follows in form the more general backlash against feminism, affirmative action, anti-racist scholarship, human rights for gays and lesbians, etc., etc. If these assumptions were acknowledged in the paper, then it could be judged on those grounds – and as a conservative critique of feminism, it is more sophisticated than many which have come before it . . . I think that these arguments, and the interpretations of feminist IR found here[,] should certainly not go unchallenged and deserve to be vigorously debated with. But I also think that this debate can take place only when the author deals more openly with the political assumptions which inform the paper than is the case in the version we have here.

More intriguing than the description of this longtime leftist activist as “traditionally, indeed extremely conservative” was the implicit message: just acknowledge you’re a reactionary, and we can let you into the arena as a useful whipping-boy. Conform to our with-us-or-against-us framework, or prepare for the gatekeepers to reject and anathematize you.

The second round of reviews reached me during fieldwork in Johannesburg, South Africa, for my doctoral thesis, The Press in Transition."
Guided more by a desire to vent than by any sense that the verdict could be overturned, I submitted a long typewritten response to the Review editors. To my shock, I returned to Canada a couple of months later to discover a letter declaring that the peer reviews had been overruled, and the article would appear. It went on, as I say (and hell, why not say it again), to receive the award for Review article of the year.

The aftermath is also of some interest, because it attests to the transformations that have occurred in the field of gender and IR since I first sought to contribute to it. The Review later published a lengthy riposte to my article, titled “Gendering Jones” and written by a trio of scholars from the University of Bristol (Terrell Carver, Molly Cochran, and Judith Squires). This was pretty rough handling – not far different from the tone and import of the peer review just cited. I responded in kind, in an essay that needs no republishing here. How, then, was I able a few years later to mingle with these same folks as an invited speaker at a gender-and-IR conference at Bristol, and to invite Terrell Carver, in turn, to speak at the Mexico City research institute where I was then working, and contribute a chapter on men and masculinities to my Gendercide and Genocide volume (2004)? Three factors were in play. In the first place, Terrell and I actually met, hit it off, and decided that collaboration held greater appeal for both of us than sniping from our respective turrets of the ivory tower. As well, the evolution of gender and IR since I published “Does ’gender’...” had led to groundbreaking and subversive work, including that of R. Charli Carpenter and (to a lesser but still impressive extent) the entries in Zed Books’ “Gender and Conflict” series, that made me feel less of a black sheep in the field. I hope, though, that I shall always retain something of an inky tint.

Lastly, my own work moved rapidly from a mere critique of existing perspectives and a sketchy framing of an alternative method to systematic exploration of the research agenda that I outlined in the final section of my Review article. As this work has progressed – and the remainder of the book encapsulates that progression – I have sought to shed any defensiveness or undue reticence in my earlier writings. I have also been stimulated and guided, as from the outset, by scholars and students of feminist IR. It was my good luck to stumble into the field at the very point that its literature was growing substantially richer, more diverse, and more questioning. I have not made my peace, by any means, with all of the core underpinnings of feminist critiques; and as noted, with the penetration of the most simplistic forms of those critiques into the policy sphere, the conundrum is in many ways more problematic. A great many males continue to suffer and die, unrecognized and unprotested by international organizations, as a result of precisely the blinkered mindsets that I have criticized from the outset. There are a few indications that policies may be changing, as with the shift in development NGOs away from an exclusive focus on women (or “womenandchildren”) to a slightly more inclusive gender-and-development (GAD) framing (see Chapter 9). But sustained activist effort will be necessary, I believe, to correct
the tunnel vision and superficial ideological framings that persist in GAD and the international humanitarian sphere.

**Gendering genocide**

My interest in the gendering of mass violence in war and genocide, which surfaces briefly in the earliest selection here, moved to the forefront of my research in 1993. Professor Diane Mauzy encouraged me to pursue a point I had raised in discussions in her graduate seminar on ethnic conflict: the clear gender-selectivity of the atrocities then being inflicted in the bloodiest phase of the Bosnian war, and the disproportionate victimization of males. She also granted me access to her extensive file of press clippings. The result, “Gender and Ethnic Conflict in Ex-Yugoslavia,” published with commendable dispatch by *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (1994), was my first work to explore gendered vulnerabilities in conflict situations systematically and inclusively: addressing the experiences of females and males alike, while asserting that Bosnian men’s predicament merited at least as much concern, from an analytical and humanitarian perspective, as the abuses inflicted upon Bosnian women. Buried in the text was a protest and a Cassandra-like warning about the UN’s abandoning of Bosnian “battle-age” males to their fate in a “safe area” created in 1993 in a town few people had heard of – Srebrenica. This, I suggested, had left Bosnia’s most vulnerable demographic group exposed to the vengeful wrath of the Serbs.

A year or so later there occurred the Srebrenica massacre (July 9–13, 1995), the worst mass killing in Europe since the immediate aftermath of the Second World War. Srebrenica recurs as a touchstone in many of these writings. This is not because the death toll was especially large: gender-selective slaughters at Nanjing in 1937, in Bangladesh in 1971, and during Saddam Hussein’s “Anfal” campaign of 1988, to cite just a few, were inflicted on a much larger scale. Srebrenica’s special resonance in international relations and public debate derived from the location of the killing zone in “civilized” Europe. It also reflected the blatantly systematic aspect of the gender separation, though only the fact that this was partially captured on video distinguished Srebrenica from many similar massacres. Srebrenica was central to subsequent international-legal prosecutions, notably the Yugoslav tribunal’s conviction of Radislav Krstic, the Bosnian Serb General who presided over much of the killing. Finally, Srebrenica stands as perhaps the only gender-selective mass killing of civilian males to be recognized as such in mainstream discourse. That is to say, the standard strategies of displacement and effacement of male victims are rarely resorted to; instead, Srebrenica is acknowledged as a massacre of Bosnian Muslim men and boys. As such, it has remained central to my pedagogy and activism around these issues – though much less significant to my scholarly research, since it has been so widely analyzed and discussed by others.

The Srebrenica massacre, followed by the Croatian invasion of the Serb-dominated Krajina region later in the summer of 1995, marked the climax of
Figure 1 A coffin holding the exhumed remains of a victim of the 1995 Srebrenica massacre is transported for reburial in the annual ceremony commemorating the massacre, in the village of Potocari, Bosnia and Herzegovina. (Photo by Adam Jones, July 2007.)
the Bosnian war. But the peace accord reached at Dayton in November left unresolved the status of the territory destined to explode next: Kosovo. When the Serbs launched their genocidal campaign in April 1999, all the time-honored gender-selective strategies were evident, notably the rape of Kosovar women and the mass expulsions of every ethnic Albanian demographic save one: Kosovar men of “battle age,” who again were marked for persecution, detention, and extermination. As the OSCE report, “Kosovo/Kosova: As Seen, As Told,” would later emphasize (almost uniquely in the history of human rights reporting): “Young men were the group that was by far the most targeted in the conflict in Kosovo . . . Every young Kosovo Albanian man was suspected of being a terrorist . . . Many were executed on the spot, on occasion after horrendous torture . . . Many young men ‘disappeared’ following abduction.”

I spent much of the war on “vacation” in Barcelona, feverishly writing emails, bulletin-board posts, and press releases to try to draw greater attention to the gendered atrocities unfolding. Rather early in the process, I found my mind mulling a word that was new to me: gendercide. Surely the play on words encapsulated the “genocidal cull” (in journalist Ian Traynor’s chilling phrase) of ethnic Albanian males. A check with one of the early Internet search engines established that the term had already been coined, and the concept already explored: by Mary Anne Warren, in her 1985 book, Gendercide: The Implications of Sex Selection. Warren’s term, and my own expansion and inclusive handling of it, formed the heart of “Gendercide and genocide,” today my best-known essay. Like “Effacing the male” (Chapter 5), “Gendercide and genocide” was written (as the framing introductory chapter) for a planned book, Gendercide in Kosovo. I decided, in the end, that the materials worked better as free-standing essays, and that is how they first appeared, mostly in rather obscure publications.

My work on gendercide – which includes a substantial female-centered component, especially with regard to “Gendercidal institutions against women and girls” (Chapter 16) – places the phenomenon in global-historical context, explores its dynamics as they unfold in genocidal and proto-genocidal campaigns, and unpacks its significance for strategies of genocide prevention and humanitarian intervention. The inquiry has drawn me into an academic field – comparative genocide studies – with which I had not the slightest familiarity before 1999, but which has now become my home (though I keep a couple of pieds-à-terre on the side). This field offered little in the way of gendered inquiry when I arrived in 2000; even today, only a few volumes can really be considered part of a “gender and genocide” literature. Accordingly, my 2008 essay on that subject (Chapter 10) – the most recent selection here, written for Dan Stone’s edited volume The Historiography of Genocide – returns in many respects to the feminist IR literature. At the same time, I seem to be gaining a new presence in that literature via another circuitous route – namely, through citations of my work in comparative genocide studies! There is an appealing symmetry to this, and it
bolsters my conviction that the time is opportune to publish this omnibus collection.

Notes


2 See Olympe de Gouges, “Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen” (1791) – less well known than Mary Wollstonecraft’s Vindication of the Rights of Woman from the following year, but much more radical and no-nonsense in its approach. Available online at http://www.library.csi.cuny.edu/dept/americanstudies/lavender/decwom2.html.

3 This is a schematic description; many of the institutional manifestations of blinkered thinking in the policy sphere were more influenced by grassroots activism and NGO lobbying than by academic specialists and their intellectual output.


9 See also the essay “Gendercide in Kosovo,” not included in this volume, which focuses on the dynamics of the Serb campaign of mass killing and atrocity; available at http://adamjones.freeservers.com/gendercide_in_kosovo.htm.
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