

The vulnerability of the penis:

Clark, Janine

DOI:

[10.1177/1097184X17724487](https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17724487)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Clark, J 2017, 'The vulnerability of the penis: sexual violence against men in conflict and security frames', *Men and Masculinities*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17724487>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Published as: Clark, Janine Natalya. "The Vulnerability of the Penis: Sexual Violence against Men in Conflict and Security Frames." *Men and Masculinities* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17724487>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Men and Masculinities

The Vulnerability of the Penis: Sexual Violence against Men in Conflict and Security Frames

Journal:	<i>Men and Masculinities</i>
Manuscript ID	JMMX-16-0028.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Bodies, Conflict, Hegemonic Masculinity, Performativity, Violence, War
Abstract:	<p>Sexual violence remains a persistent scourge of war. The use of sexual violence against men in armed conflict, however, remains under-researched and is often sidelined. As an explanation, this inter-disciplinary article situates the issue of sexual violence against men within a new analytical framework. It does so through a focus on the core subtext which this violence reveals – the vulnerability of the penis. Highlighting critical disconnects between what the penis is and what it is constructed as being, it argues that the vulnerable penis is deeply destabilizing to the edifice of phallogentric masculinity, and hence it has wider security implications. Conflict-related sexual violence has increasingly been securitized within the framework of human security. The concept of human security, however, is deeply gendered and often excludes male victims of sexual violence. This gendering, in turn, reflects a broader gendered relationship between sexual violence and security. Sexual violence against women manifests and reaffirms their long-recognized vulnerability in war. Sexual violence against men, in contrast, exposes the vulnerability of the penis and thus represents a deeper security threat. Fundamentally, preserving the integrity and power of the phallus is critical to the security and integrity of phallogentric masculinity, and thus to maintaining a systemic stability that is crucial in situations of war and armed conflict.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The Vulnerability of the Penis: Sexual Violence against Men in Conflict and Security Frames

Introduction

'One of the interrogators was keen on beating my testicles time and again, as a result of which I fainted more than eight times' – words of a Palestinian ex political prisoner (cited in Punamaki 1988: 88).

'They started torturing me here [gesturing toward his genitalia]. They were also beating me and there was a guard behind me turning the electricity on. I passed out. They were beating me and shocking me. The interrogator was beating me with a cable over my whole body. I still didn't have any clothes on ... they asked me every thirty minutes if I would confess' – words of a Syrian soldier (cited in Human Rights Watch 2012).

'During the first interrogation, the official in military fatigues forced me to undress. He tried to have oral sex with me. He forced himself on me and raped me. During questioning, the officials would squeeze my penis. They would force me to masturbate them. One of them masturbated me. I was severely tortured when I resisted' – words of a Tamil man in Sri Lanka (cited in Human Rights Watch 2013).

Within academia and policy discourse, men who suffer conflict-related sexual violence (including rape) are often sidelined and marginalized. Their stories and trauma remain secondary to the central thematic of male perpetrators and female victims. Numerous factors sustain this gendering of sexual violence. The coding categories used in some jurisdictions, for example, deny the very existence of male rape. The Sudanese Criminal Code is a case in point (Ferrales et al. 2016: 571). Men may also struggle to see themselves as victims and to thus acknowledge what has happened to them (Levine 2006: 128). Quintessentially, the notion of victimhood sits uncomfortably with 'social expectations of what it is to be a man in our society – as strong, tough, self-sufficient, and impenetrable...' (Weiss 2008: 277). The operationalization of these social expectations, in turn, contributes to the critical under-reporting of sexual violence against men (Dolan 2014a: 81). Men may feel ashamed of coming forward (Oosterhoff 2004: 70); they may fear other people's reactions (Javaid 2016:

1
2
3 287); they may worry that their stories will not be believed (Capers 2011: 1274). In
4 jurisdictions where homosexuality is illegal, moreover, a man who reports rape might expose
5 himself to considerable risk (Vojdik 2014: 932),¹ the ‘taint’ of homosexuality transforming
6 his victimhood into a guilty and culpable act (Sivakumaran 2005).
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 In a recent report on conflict-related sexual violence against men, Kapur and Muddell (2016:
15 26) argue that ‘Greater consciousness about the existence of male victims of sexual violence
16 and their likely vulnerabilities is essential to enhancing their access and participation in
17 processes aimed at achieving acknowledgement, accountability, and reform’. A key aim of
18 this inter-disciplinary article is to contribute to building this ‘greater consciousness’, by
19 positioning sexual violence against men within a new analytical framework. Specifically, this
20 research focuses on the critical subtext which these crimes expose, namely the vulnerability
21 of the penis. This ‘side’ of the penis is rarely seen. Within contemporary discourse on sexual
22 violence (see, for example House of Lords Select Committee on Sexual Violence in Conflict
23 2017: 22), the penis is typically framed as a weapon. It is a hard, aggressive object that
24 penetrates and tears, causing pain and suffering. In an international climate of ‘no impunity’
25 and increased attention to the use of sexual violence in conflict, this war functionality of the
26 penis necessarily takes centre stage. Yet there is also a more fundamental reason why the
27 organ’s vulnerability remains frequently hidden; the exposure of this vulnerability challenges
28 phallogocentric masculinity by stripping the phallus of its power and strength – and hence
29 dominance. As Thompson and Holt point out (2004: 316), ‘As a biological marker of
30 maleness, the penis serves as a metonym for patriarchal privilege’. Yet the ‘signifying
31 phallus’ (Lipset 2011: 28) is more than this. It also represents stability and order, the
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 ¹ According to Dolan (2014b), ‘When a “real man” is defined as strong and in control and invulnerable, it is
57 easy to assume that if he was engaged in a same-sex act, then surely “*he must have wanted it*”’.

1
2
3 maintenance of something solid. Quintessentially, norms about what it means to be a ‘real’
4 man ‘serve to reproduce a particular political system in which the categories of “men” and
5 “women” are stable and unproblematic’ (Ostberg 2010: 47). The reality of sexual violence
6 against men, thus, is deeply destabilizing, particularly in situations of war and armed conflict.
7 These crimes weaken the ‘fortress’ of phallicism (Elise 2001: 499); and if men’s bodies are
8 penetrable and vulnerable, so too is the fortress itself. The vulnerable penis, in short, is an
9 abject that ‘disrupts identity, system, order’ (Kristeva 1982: 4), and hence it is also a wider
10 security ‘signifier’.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 The issue of conflict-related sexual violence has been securitized through the recognition that
24 these crimes have implications for international security. This securitization, however, is
25 heavily gendered. According to Waever (2011: 472), ‘Securitization ultimately means a
26 particular way of handling a particular issue, processing a threat through the security format.
27 Thus, the security quality does not belong to the threat but to its management’. This research
28 argues that far less attention has been given to managing the security threat posed by conflict-
29 related sexual violence against men because it presents a more elemental threat. In the field of
30 computer science, preserving the integrity of the operating system kernel ‘is critical to the
31 security and integrity of a computer system’ (Baliga, Kamat and Ifode 2007: 246).
32 Preserving the integrity and power of the phallus, similarly, is critical to the security and
33 integrity of phallic masculinity, and thus to maintaining a systemic stability that is
34 crucial in situations of war and armed conflict. It is important, however, not to essentialize
35 the penis as a vulnerable organ and to acknowledge the social contextual fluidity of
36 vulnerability (Delor and Hubert 2000: 1564). This article accordingly examines both the
37 ‘everyday penis’ and the ‘war penis’.

The Quotidian Vulnerability of the Penis

Vulnerability, according to Levine (2004: 398), is an ‘extraordinarily elastic concept, capable of being stretched to cover almost any person, group, or situation, and then of being snapped back to describe a narrow range of characteristics like age or incarceration’. Illustrative of this ‘stretching’, the concept is widely discussed in multiple and diverse contexts, from disasters (Bankoff 2001; Wisner et al. 2004), mental health (Raphael, Stevens and Pedersen 2006; Haddadi and Besharat 2010) and research ethics (Levine et al. 2004; Lange, Rogers and Dodds 2013). When the notion of vulnerability is invoked in relation to sexual violence, it is typically ‘snapped back’ to describe the particular gendered vulnerability of women (Humphrey and White 2000; Dartnall and Jewkes 2013).² Their bodies and genitalia are penetrable and vulnerable. This narrow gendering of vulnerability, however, neglects the reality of the penis’ own vulnerability.

In everyday life, the penis is vulnerable both socially and biologically. Socially, ‘No other human organ receives as much verbal attention as the penis’ (Francken et al. 2002: 426). Phallogentric conceptions of masculinity and the importance that is attached to penis size³ mean that there are huge pressures on the penis to satisfy and ‘perform’. Sexual performance, in turn, is intrinsically linked to the performativity of hegemonic masculinity – and thus to the social construction of masculine hierarchies. In effect, ‘One’s place in the peer hierarchy is heavily determined by success at sexual conquests, by sexual adroitness, and by leadership in sexual encounters’ (Hyde et al. 2009: 248). Unrealistic expectations of the penis, however –

² Morash et al.’s (2012) study of men’s vulnerability to sexual assault in prison is one of the notable exceptions.

³ It is important to emphasize, however, that the notion of ‘big is better’ has not been historically fixed. For the ancient Greeks, for example, ‘...the large or priapic penis symbolized a sexual excessiveness and licentiousness dangerous to their self-perception as rational and self-controlled’ (Stephens 2007: 88).

1
2
3 which pornography⁴ and the media have significantly fuelled – make the organ vulnerable to
4
5 failure; and this vulnerability, by extension, renders the owner of the penis potentially
6
7 vulnerable to low self-esteem and negative body image. To cite Veale et al. (2014: 90), ‘...if
8
9 a man believes that he is abnormal in his penis size then he is likely also to believe that others
10
11 will evaluate him negatively and may reject or humiliate him’.

12
13
14
15
16 It seems that elevated expectations of the penis, moreover, remain intact even when the organ
17
18 is ‘unwell’. According to a study by Bullen et al., for example, a major concern among men
19
20 with penile cancer was that they would no longer be able to sexually satisfy their wives or
21
22 future girlfriends (2010: 936-937). Ultimately, the study participants’ fears and insecurities
23
24 surrounding performativity exposed how ‘men’s sense of masculinity and of self can be
25
26 deeply undermined by the experience of the disease’ (Bullen et al. 2010: 939). The ‘ageing’
27
28 penis similarly faces strong pressures to perform, satisfy and ‘stay hard’. It is no longer
29
30 permitted to quietly grow old or even to take semi-retirement. The message that is continually
31
32 relayed – in the media and by manufacturers of products such as Viagra – is that ‘To the
33
34 extent that men can demonstrate their virility, they can still be men and stave off old age and
35
36 the loss of status that accrues to that label’ (Calasanti and King 2005: 16).

37
38
39 In addition to its social vulnerability, the penis is also biologically – and hence inherently –
40
41 vulnerable. The first reason is due to its external position (Diamond 2015: 66). As one
42
43 illustration, the anthropologist Helliwell spent 20 months working with the Gerai community
44
45 in Indonesian Borneo. She recounts how, on one occasion, a local woman chased an intruder
46
47 from her house during the night. When Helliwell expressed her concerns that the intruder
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 ⁴ Segal (1998: 50), for example, underscores that the ‘hominoid penis is anything but permanently erect,
57
58 anything but endlessly ready for unencumbered sex, anything but triggered by the nearest passing [person]’.

1
2
3 might have tried to rape the woman, the latter asked with surprise: ‘How can a penis hurt
4 anyone?’ (Helliwell 2000: 790). Among the Gerai, the penis and male genitalia, far from
5 being seen as threatening and potentially harmful to women, are viewed instead as vulnerable
6 – and more vulnerable than women’s genitalia – because they are outside the body.
7 According to Helliwell (2000: 808-809), ‘This reflects Gerai understandings of “inside” as
8 representing safety and belonging, while “outside” is a place of strangers and danger, and it is
9 linked to the notion of men as braver than women’. The externality of the penis, moreover,
10 means that in some cultures, it is viewed as vulnerable to ‘theft’. During a Koro⁵ epidemic in
11 southern China in the 1980s, for example, Mattelaer and Jilek (2007: 1511) – a urologist and
12 clinical psychiatrist respectively – were told that ‘genital-robbing female fox spirits had been
13 seen roaming the area’. This information sowed widespread fear among local people, causing
14 the epidemic to ‘spread’ from village to village (Mattelaer and Jilek (2007: 1511).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 A second biological reason for the penis’ vulnerability is its internal structure. An erect penis
33 can become fractured during sexual intercourse, which can subsequently lead to infection,
34 urethrocutaneous fistula and sexual dysfunction (Chung, Szeto and Lai 2006: 199; Lehmler
35 2014: 67).⁶ Paradoxically, therefore, the penis is most at risk when it is ‘performing’.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Erection enables the execution of masculinity, yet also ‘converts the safe, flaccid penis into a
vulnerable organ’ (Godec, Reiser and Logush 1988: 124). Conditions such as erectile
dysfunction further expose the penis as vulnerable. If it cannot stay ‘hard’, it becomes

⁵ Koro refers to a condition of intense anxiety about the penis – and specifically to fears that the penis is shrinking, detracting or even disappearing. According to Srivastava and Pandit (2013: 37), ‘The term koro is thought to derive from the Malay word kura which means “tortoise”, with symbolic meaning that the penile retraction is compared with the retraction of the head of the tortoise into its shell’. Several countries, including India, Thailand and Nigeria, have experienced ‘koro epidemics’ (see, for example, Choudury 1998).

⁶ Historically, moreover, ejaculation was viewed as dangerous to men. According to Stephens (2007: 95), ‘...as medical treatises such as Tissot’s *Onanism* warned, men who relinquished themselves to “excessive” ejaculation would wind up at least emasculated, more probably insane, and possibly dead’.

1
2
3 ineffective and inadequate, unable to do its job. To cite Potts (2000: 87), 'It denotes the
4
5 deficiency of a man – his failure robustly to represent the phallus'.
6
7

8
9
10 In an everyday context, thus, the primary performative role of the penis is a sexual one. In
11
12 situations of war and armed conflict, however, the notion of performativity assumes a higher
13
14 level, meta importance. War is the ultimate expression of phallogentric masculinity, and the
15
16 penis is required to perform in a way that upholds and defends the phallogentric – and
17
18 heteronormative⁷ – status quo. This, in turn, protects and defends those who are 'vulnerable',
19
20 namely women and children. What is seldom acknowledged, unsurprisingly, is the organ's
21
22 own vulnerability.
23
24

25 26 27 **The Vulnerability of the Penis in War and Armed Conflict** 28

29
30
31 Rape is frequently described as a 'weapon of war' (Card 1996; Diken and Laustsen 2005;
32
33 Bergoffen 2009). By extension, thus, the penis itself is typically conceptualized and framed
34
35 as a weapon (Mullins 2009; Wachala 2012). This image of the combative, aggressive penis is
36
37 synonymous with power and might. In the words of Brownmiller (1975: 49), rape 'is the
38
39 quintessential act by which a male demonstrates to a female that she is conquered –
40
41 vanquished – by his superior strength and power'. Such one-dimensional portrayals of the
42
43 penis, however, are problematic and perpetuate a gender-specific victimology that prioritizes
44
45 and elevates female victims of sexual violence in conflict. In its safety recommendations for
46
47 researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies, for example, the
48
49 World Health Organization focuses exclusively on female victims. Sexual violence, it notes,
50
51 can include 'violent acts against the sexual integrity of women, including female genital
52
53
54

55
56
57 ⁷ Jones (2006: 451) defines heteronormativity as 'culturally hegemonic heterosexuality'.
58

1
2
3 mutilation and obligatory inspections for virginity' (World Health Organization 2007: 5).
4
5 Specific forms of sexual violence against men, including blunt trauma to the male genitals
6
7 (Carlson 2006) and castration, are not mentioned. When sexual violence against men in
8
9 armed conflict is acknowledged, it is often done so in a cursory way⁸ and frequently 'limited
10
11 to an observation that the numbers are unclear and male victims are underreported' (Refugee
12
13 Law Project 2013: 12).
14
15

16
17
18 Some feminist scholars have also played a part in downplaying the use of sexual violence
19
20 against men. If, as Halley (2008: 114) argues, rape has become a 'discourse of equivalents',
21
22 inevitably it is always compared to something else. Crimes committed against men thus
23
24 recede into the background, particularly when conflicts are themselves portrayed as 'wars
25
26 against women'. Giving the example of the Soviet army's campaign of destruction during
27
28 World War II, Halley (2008: 114) maintains that 'To frame this campaign as a "war against
29
30 women" – no matter how many rapes it included, and there were hundreds of thousands of
31
32 them – would be a historical travesty...'. The discourse of equivalents, thus, is a distinctly
33
34 gendered discourse that contributes to explaining differential levels of seriousness attached to
35
36 sexual violence, depending on whether the victims are male or female. Some feminist
37
38 scholars have also promoted the idea that rape specifically targets women's reproductive
39
40 capacities (see, for example, MacKinnon 1994; Allen 1996). The resultant notion of
41
42 genocidal rape further reinforces the 'discourse of equivalents' and its inherent comparative
43
44 logic. Discussing feminist scholarship on the use of rape in the former Yugoslavia during the
45
46 1990s, for example, Jaleel (2013: 126) notes that 'The emphasis on both female reproduction
47
48
49
50

51
52 ⁸ The International Protocol on the Documentation and Investigation of Sexual Violence in Conflict states, for
53
54 example, that 'It is important to recognise that women, men, girls and boys can all be victims of sexual violence.
55
56 Nevertheless, the historical and structural inequalities that exist between men and women, and the different
57
58 forms of gender-based discrimination that women are subjected to all over the world, contribute to women and
59
60 girls being disproportionately affected by sexual violence in conflict settings' (Foreign and Commonwealth
Office 2014: 15).

1
2
3 and forced pregnancy as a war crime, a crime against humanity and a genocidal strategy,
4
5 helps explain why the sexual abuse of men during the conflict barely rates a mention'.
6
7

8
9
10 The truth is that sexual violence against men in conflict is an uncomfortable reality that
11
12 fundamentally goes 'against the grain' by challenging dominant gendered scripts of who does
13
14 what to whom in war (Baaz and Stern 2013: 36; Vojdik 2014: 940). According to Lacan
15
16 (1995: 285), 'the phallus is a signifier, a signifier whose function, in the intrasubjective
17
18 economy of the analysis, lifts the veil perhaps from the function it performed in the
19
20 mysteries'. The phallus is a particular signifier in situations of war, the ultimate environment
21
22 in which 'uber-masculinity' and virility are demanded (Goldstein 2001). Sexual violence
23
24 against men necessarily problematizes and undermines these demands, by 'lifting the veil' on
25
26 the penis' vulnerability in war.
27
28

29
30
31
32 *The suffering penis*
33
34

35
36 The recurrent use of sexual violence in war has inevitably given rise to a wealth of different
37
38 causal theories (see, for example, Browmiller 1975; Thornhill and Palmer 2000; Turshen
39
40 2000; Leatherman 2011; Skjelsbaek 2012). More recently, there has been a shift in focus as
41
42 some scholars have sought to explain critical *variations* in the use of conflict-related sexual
43
44 violence (see, in particular, Wood 2006, 2009; Butler, Gluch and Mitchell 2007; Cohen and
45
46 Nordås 2015). Although as yet these efforts have not extended specifically to explaining
47
48 variations in sexual violence against men, Wood's work nevertheless is particularly relevant in
49
50 this regard. According to her, two key variables critically determine whether or not an armed
51
52 group engages in sexual violence; namely, the decisions taken by the group's leaders and
53
54 their enforceability, and the combatants' own norms regarding the use of violence against
55
56 their enforceability, and the combatants' own norms regarding the use of violence against
57
58

1
2
3 civilians (Wood 2009: 136). These two variables highlight the fact that sexual violence can
4 be used strategically (top-down dynamic) or more opportunistically (bottom-up dynamic).
5
6
7 The following examples, drawn from a variety of different conflicts, indicate that the
8 deployment of rape and sexual violence against men often serves a strategic purpose.
9
10

11
12
13
14 After Algeria achieved independence from French colonial rule in 1962, Algerian nationalists
15 from the *Front de Libération Nationale* (FLN) – which was established in 1954 – sought
16 revenge against pro-French Algerians known as *harkis*. The latter were viewed as dangerous
17 traitors who needed to be punished for their disloyalty to the Algerian cause. The FLN’s
18 violence against the *harkis* included acts of castration (Evans 2017: 90). The motive,
19 however, was not solely punitive. It was also about diluting the security threat that the *harkis*
20 posed to the newly independent Algerian state. To cite Evans (2017: 101), ‘This was violence
21 which aimed at personal humiliation through bodily mutilation, in particular sexual
22 humiliation through emasculation of men ...’. Although the emasculation of the *harkis* was
23 primarily a symbolic way of addressing the ongoing danger that they were seen to represent,
24 it was linked to a clear strategic rationale. The pursuit of state security thus created extreme
25 insecurity for the *harkis*, whose ‘treachery’ rendered the male organ deeply vulnerable.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 This vulnerability leitmotif was similarly in evidence during the nine-month Liberation War
44 in Bangladesh in 1971. The Pakistani army performed body checks on Bengali men to
45 ascertain whether they were Muslims, and it did so specifically by requiring them to expose
46 their penises. As the anthropologist Mookherjee (2012: 1588) notes, ‘If anyone was found to
47 be non-circumcised, they were deemed to be Hindus and would be killed’.⁹ In this example,
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 ⁹ It is estimated that 20,000 women and girls were raped during the Bangladesh Liberation War (Jahan 2009:
57 303). Yet, as Mookherjee (2012: 1580) points out, ‘The constant evocation of the rape of women during the
58 Bangladesh war stands in contrast to the silence relating to male rapes and violation during the war’.

1
2
3 therefore, it was the non-circumcised penis that was especially vulnerable. The absence or
4
5 presence of a foreskin could make the critical difference between life and death in the
6
7 particular nationalist context of the war. It is noteworthy that the relationship between
8
9 nationalism and gender is frequently conceptualized as aggravating female vulnerability (see,
10
11 for example, Snyder et al. 2006: 188). The rape of enemy women becomes a concomitant and
12
13 extended 'symbolic rape of the body of that [enemy] community' (Seifert 1996: 39). The
14
15 example of Bangladesh, however, illuminates an important dynamic between nationalism and
16
17 sexual violence against men. In this case, the contours of the male body and of the nation
18
19 intertwined. The penis became a corporeal delineator of the 'in-group' and 'out-group', and
20
21 thus a core marker of an individual's identity and loyalties. This nationalist context both
22
23 rendered the circumcised penis critically vulnerable and heightened the utility of sexual
24
25 violence in conflict. To cite Alison (2007: 81), 'The ethnonational element means that
26
27 symbolically the victim's national identity is also feminised and humiliated'.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 If a Bengali man's penis *provided* important information about him, in Sri Lanka, during the
35
36 25-year civil war between government armed forces and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil
37
38 Eelam (LTTE), sexual violence against men was used as a way of *extracting* vital
39
40 information from them. According to Human Rights Watch (2013),
41
42
43
44

45 Rape appears to have been a key element of broader torture and ill-treatment of
46
47 suspected LTTE members and others believed linked to the LTTE. This torture was
48
49 intended to obtain confessions – whether accurate or false – of involvement in LTTE
50
51 activities, obtain information on others including spouses and relatives, and, it appears,
52
53 to instill terror in individuals and the broader Tamil population.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The LTTE were a formidable military opponent,¹⁰ and part of the government's multi-
4 pronged approach to crushing the insurgency movement was to build intelligence against it.
5
6 Sexual violence against Tamil men (and women) – including forcible masturbation, genital
7 beatings and oral/anal rape – thereby became a weapon of war that facilitated the
8 government's intelligence-gathering efforts. Even after the LTTE's defeat in 2009,
9 government forces continued to use sexual violence against Tamils in order 'to obtain
10 information about any remnants of the LTTE since then [the end of the conflict], whether in
11 Sri Lanka or abroad' (Human Rights Watch 2013).¹¹ During the protracted war in Sri Lanka,
12 therefore, it was the instrumental utility of the penis (and more precisely the Tamil penis) that
13 made it vulnerable.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 While the use of sexual violence against *harki* men in Algeria, Bengali men in Bangladesh
28 and Tamil men in Sri Lanka served a clear strategic purpose, it is difficult to discern any such
29 purpose in the sexual violence inflicted on men in the Omarska camp in Bosnia-Herzegovina
30 (BiH) in 1992. Located in the north-west of BiH, in the municipality of Prijedor, the Omarska
31 camp operated from May until August 1992 and held up to 3,000 prisoners (Bosnian Muslims
32 and Bosnian Croats) at one time. The prisoners were overwhelmingly male but included at
33 least 36 women (Prosecutor v. Tadić 1997: §155). These women were repeatedly subjected to
34 sexual violence (Cigelj 2006). One of the most shocking incidents of sexual violence
35 committed in the camp, however, involved the sexual mutilation of a male prisoner. In the
36 first case at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) to deal
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ¹⁰ Beehner (2010: 3) notes that 'Unlike most violent non-state actors, the LTTE fielded an army of 20,000 well-
52 trained conscripts, a full-flung navy, and even an air force. The Tigers purchased GPS systems to accurately
53 target its missile projectiles well before the Sri Lankan military did. They were adept at both guerilla and
54 conventional types of warfare'.

55
56 ¹¹ In contrast to government forces, the LTTE themselves did not use sexual violence during the conflict. Wood
57 (2009: 143) seeks to explicate this 'puzzling absence of sexual violence in the LTTE's repertoire of violence'.
58
59
60

1
2
3 with sexual violence against men, the Trial Chamber described how G and Witness H were
4
5 ordered to jump into an inspection pit. Another prisoner, Fikret Harambašić, who was naked
6
7 and bloodied from various beatings, was made to join them. According to the judgement,
8
9

10
11
12 ...Witness H was ordered to lick his [Harambašić's] naked bottom and G to suck his
13 penis and then to bite his testicles. Meanwhile a group of men in uniform stood around
14 the inspection pit watching and shouting to bite harder. All three were then made to get
15 out of the pit onto the hangar floor and Witness H was threatened with a knife that both
16 his eyes would be cut out if he did not hold Fikret Harambašić's mouth closed to
17 prevent him from screaming; G was then made to lie between the naked Fikret
18 Harambašić's legs and, while the latter struggled, hit and bite his genitals. G then bit off
19 one of Fikret Harambašić's testicles and spat it out and was told he was free to leave
20 (Prosecutor v. Tadić 1997: §206).¹²
21
22
23

24
25 The sexual mutilation of Harambašić was gratuitous rather than strategic. It served to
26
27 humiliate a group of men who were already suffering¹³ and to reinforce their utter
28
29 powerlessness (Prosecutor v. Tadić 1997: §232). In this case, therefore, the vulnerability of
30
31 the penis and genitalia existed within a broader context of prisoner vulnerability. Living and
32
33 sanitary conditions in the camp were appalling, and acts of brutality and violence were an
34
35 everyday occurrence; '...detainees were beaten constantly by the guards, at the slightest
36
37 perceived provocation, and some were beaten to death' (Prosecutor v. Karadžić 2016: §1760).
38
39
40
41
42

43 Men are not only sexually tortured, abused and mutilated in war. They are also raped
44
45 (Sivakumaran 2007, 2010; Storr 2011; Natabaalo 2013; Refugee Law Project 2013).
46
47

48
49 ¹² Duško Tadić was the president of the local board of the Serbian Democratic Party in Kozarac, a village in
50 Prijedor municipality. In 1997, he was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for crimes against humanity and
51 violations of the laws or customs of war (on appeal in 1999, he was further convicted of graves breaches of the
52 Geneva Conventions) committed in Omarska. He was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment and was granted
53 early release in July 2008.

54
55 ¹³ The *Guardian* journalist Ed Vulliamy (1992) visited the camp in August 1992 and described how 'The
56 internees are horribly thin, raw-boned; some are almost cadaverous, with skin like parchment folded around
57 their arms; their faces are lantern-jawed, and their eyes are haunted by the empty stare of the prisoner who does
58 not know what will happen to him next'.
59
60

1
2
3 Although male rape targets the anus, it further exposes the vulnerability of the penis. A penis,
4
5 as Edley and Wetherell (1995: 9) underscore, ‘means masculinity or manhood’. In war,
6
7 therefore, the ultimate way in which to overpower enemy men is to target their masculinity –
8
9 and hence their sexual organs. Fundamentally, the penis must be subjugated and feminized,
10
11 and this is one of the functions of male rape (Refugee Law Project 2013: 13). **The penis is**
12
13 **ordinarily required to be active and to penetrate. As Jackson (2006: 113) argues, ‘...the**
14
15 **heteronormative assumption that women and men are “made for each other” is sustained**
16
17 **through the common-sense definition of vaginal penetration by the penis as “the sex act”.**
18
19 **Male rape denies the penis this penetrative role¹⁴ and pacifies it,** reducing it from a phallus to
20
21 a piece of flesh. It thus disables the “legitimate” deployment’ of the penis (Goug and
22
23 Edwards 1998: 417), which in turn has wider implications.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **The Destabilizing Vulnerable Penis and Its Security Implications**

31
32
33
34 As a construct, masculinity takes diverse forms.¹⁵ However, scholars have frequently
35
36 identified a hegemonic masculinity, ‘in relation to which images of femininity and other
37
38 masculinities are marginalized and subordinated’ (Barrett 2001: 79). This hegemonic
39
40 masculinity can be more specifically defined as phallogentric masculinity (Stephens 2007:
41
42 85), which, because of its association with dominance, elevates an image of the penis that is
43
44 deeply at odds with the organ’s vulnerability. To cite Potts (2000: 88), ‘Masculine sexuality
45
46
47

48 ¹⁴ It is important to note, however, that there is some recognition within international criminal law that a male
49
50 victim may be forced to penetrate the rapist with his own penis. According to the International Criminal Court’s
51
52 Elements of Crimes, for example, which define rape as both a crime against humanity and a war crime, rape
53
54 occurs, *inter alia*, when ‘The perpetrator invaded the body of a person by conduct resulting in penetration,
55
56 however slight, of any part of the body of the victim *or of the perpetrator* with a sexual organ, or of the anal or
57
58 genital opening of the victim with any object or any other part of the body’ (International Criminal Court
59
60 2002/2010: article 7 (1) (g)-1(1), article 8 (2) (b) (xxii)-1(1)). Emphasis added.

¹⁵ Connell and Messerschmidt (2005: 852) underline that ‘Masculinities are configurations of practice that are constructed, unfold, and change through time’.

1
2
3 is valorized for being hard and fast; it strives to achieve the powerful proportions and
4
5 positions of the phallus'. The juxtaposition of the phallus with vulnerability thus appears
6
7 oxymoronic, the result of an erroneous slippage. More elementally, because it exposes the
8
9 concomitant 'vulnerability of masculinity and manhood' (Scarce 1997: 9), it is deeply
10
11 destabilizing. Fundamentally, the reality of the organ's own vulnerability is discordant with
12
13 its required meta functionality in maintaining the edifice of phallogentric masculinity and
14
15 heteronormativity. Through the reconfiguration of the male body as the 'penetrated' rather
16
17 than 'penetrator', the boundary between interiority and exteriority becomes blurred and thus
18
19 unstable. As Guss (2010: 135) argues, 'The image of the closed anus, repelling invasion,
20
21 protecting the interior, and resisting territorialization, is based in a sense of the self that is
22
23 discrete and boundaried; violation of this fictive self-containment is threatening because it
24
25 endangers a particular type of masculinity'. The implications of this endangerment, in turn,
26
27 are especially acute in situations of war and armed conflict.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 War is an 'invitation to manliness' (Mosse 1985: 34) and the ultimate arena for the
35
36 manifestation and expression of hegemonic masculinity. It is where men are expected 'to
37
38 represent the virility, strength and power of the family and the community' (Sivakumaran
39
40 2007: 268), and to protect both themselves and others. The use of sexual violence against
41
42 men not only disrupts and disturbs traditional war dynamics, but also reveals the ease with
43
44 which the penis can be disempowered – and its owner 'de-masculinized'. This reality sharply
45
46 conflicts with the masculine ideals associated with warfare; the frequent gendering of the
47
48 nation as female cements the heroic role of men as combatants who fight to defend and
49
50 protect 'her' (Mookherjee 2008: 41).¹⁶ Within this framework, there is little scope for an
51
52
53
54

55
56 ¹⁶ This gendering of the nation as female, however, is not a constant. Hagemann (1997: 206), for example, notes
57
58 that 'In monarchical Prussia, as earlier in revolutionary America and France, the modern nation was...conceived
59
60 of from the beginning as a male-dominated space shaped by military values'.

1
2
3 acknowledgement of masculine vulnerability, and hence this vulnerability is sidelined. It is
4
5 women's bodies that are visible in warfare – and women's bodies that ultimately matter
6
7 (Grey and Shepherd 2013: 122). **The gendered securitization of conflict-related sexual**
8
9 **violence has further reinforced this.**
10

11
12
13
14 Sexual violence is increasingly recognized as constituting a security threat. The United States
15
16 National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, for example, underlines that 'Sexual
17
18 violence in conflict is a security issue that must receive the same level of attention as other
19
20 threats to individuals in conflict situations' (White House 2014: 7). In the United Kingdom,
21
22 similarly, a recent report by the House of Lords Select Committee on Sexual Violence in
23
24 Conflict (2016: 29) emphasizes that 'Sexual violence in conflict is a human rights violation
25
26 and is contrary to international law. It jeopardises international peace and security,
27
28 accentuates gender discrimination and prevents postconflict societies achieving sustainable
29
30 peace'.
31
32

33
34
35
36 There has also been a series of United Nations (UN) Security Council Resolutions addressing
37
38 women, peace and security. The first to explicitly frame sexual violence in war as a security
39
40 issue was Resolution 1820.¹⁷ According to this, sexual violence is a dimension of broader
41
42 gender discrimination and violence against women that erodes their 'capacity and legitimacy
43
44 to participate in post-conflict public life', thereby negatively impacting on 'durable peace,
45
46 security and reconciliation' (UN Security Council 2008). UN Security Council Resolution
47
48 1889 similarly recognizes that 'the marginalization of women can delay or undermine the
49
50 achievement of durable peace, security and reconciliation' (UN Security Council 2009); and
51
52
53

54
55
56 ¹⁷ Anderson (2010: 246) maintains that the significance of Resolution 1820 'lies in the simple fact that to
57
58 include an issue on the security agenda is to accord it priority'.
59
60

1
2
3 Resolution 2106 'affirms' that the political, social and economic empowerment of women is
4 a crucial part of 'long-term efforts to prevent sexual violence in armed conflict and post-
5 conflict situations' (UN Security Council 2013). The recognition of conflict-related sexual
6 violence as a security issue, in other words, is situated within a broader agenda linking
7 security with women's inclusion/exclusion. This, by extension, is connected to the anti-
8 impunity project in international criminal law. If the inclusion of women is a necessary part
9 of this project, so too is the prosecution of sexual violence in conflict, which quintessentially
10 translates as prosecution – and 'exclusion' – of the 'aggressive penis threatening the
11 vulnerable vagina' (Guss 2010: 125).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The securitization of sexual violence has primarily occurred within a human security
26 framework. The concept of human security was first introduced in 1994 in the Human
27 Development Report, which emphasized the changing nature of security threats in the post-
28 Cold War world and the quotidian security concerns that many people face in their lives.
29 According to the report,
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life
39 than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Job security, income security, health
40 security, environmental security, security from crime – these are the emerging concerns
41 of human security all over the world (UN Development Programme 1994: 3).
42
43
44
45

46 The UN General Assembly (2012: §3) subsequently outlined a comprehensive definition of
47 human security as 'an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing
48 widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their
49 people'. According to this definition, human security encompasses, inter alia, 'people-
50 centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen
51 the protection and empowerment of all people and all communities' (UN General Assembly
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2012: §3(b)). Although the concept of human security has its critics (see, for example, Paris
4
5 2001; Buzan 2004), there are good reasons for positioning conflict-related sexual violence
6
7 within a human security framework. The emphasis on human insecurities, for example, draws
8
9 attention to the wider contextual matrix of instability, displacement and war strategy in which
10
11 sexual violence occurs; and, by extension, the focus on ‘cross-cutting threats’ is an inherently
12
13 intersectional approach cognizant of the ‘multiple inequalities’ that facilitate gender-based
14
15 violence (Strid, Walby and Armstrong 2013: 558). Furthermore, the ‘people-centredness’ that
16
17 ostensibly defines human security is a predominantly bottom-up approach that, potentially,
18
19 can provide valuable insights into the diverse and complex needs to which sexual violence in
20
21 conflict gives rise (Denov 2006: 332).
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Human security, however, has become a gendered concept centred on the security of women.**

28
29 As Hoogensen and Stuvøy (2006: 216) submit, ‘...an apparently objectively defined concept
30
31 is used to identify insecurities experienced by women, and that appears to suffice’. This
32
33 ‘feminization’ is particularly evident in the fact that conflict-related sexual violence against
34
35 men is seldom explicitly discussed within a human security framework. The marginalization
36
37 of men’s security needs, in turn, contributes to the marginalization of male victims.
38
39

40
41 **Emphasizing this point, Carpenter (2006: 86) insists that ‘...much of the “human security”**
42
43 **discourse in international institutions is based upon a highly gendered understanding of who**
44
45 **is to be secured, characterized by the exclusion of civilian males as subjects of “protection”**
46
47 **or as victims of “gender-based violence”’.**
48
49

50
51
52 **While some scholars have thus called for a broader and more gender inclusive approach to**
53
54 **human security (see, for example, Romaniuk and Wasylciw 2010: 36), this article argues that**
55
56 **the gendering of human security reflects a broader gendered relationship between sexual**
57
58

1
2
3 violence and security. Fundamentally, sexual violence in conflict raises different issues
4
5 depending on whether it is committed against women or men. Sexual violence against women
6
7 manifests and reaffirms their long-recognized vulnerability in war, which feminists situate
8
9 within a wider context of vulnerability created by structural violence and gender inequalities
10
11 (see, for example, Brownmiller 1975; MacKinnon 1994; Card 1996; Nordstrom 1996;
12
13 Pankhurst 2003). Sexual violence against men, in contrast, exposes the vulnerability of the
14
15 penis and, hence, the vulnerability of hegemonic masculinity. It thus represents a more
16
17 systemic security threat.
18
19

20
21
22
23 A medical analogy is useful for illustrating the point. Cancer cells are prone to nuclear
24
25 envelope instability and they can ultimately suffer nuclear envelope rupture. Such a rupturing
26
27 severely disrupts the cells' architecture and induces genome instability. According to Lim,
28
29 Quinton and Ganem (2016: 3212), '...nuclear envelope rupture is permanent, leaving the
30
31 chromosomal contents therein completely exposed to the surrounding environment...'. The
32
33 use of sexual violence against men, it is argued, can be likened to a form of nuclear envelope
34
35 rupture. The cellular architecture of the phallus, and phallogentric masculinity, is thereby
36
37 damaged and destabilized, leaving it weak and exposed. This, moreover, critically alters the
38
39 meta 'security constellation' (Buzan and Waever 2009). If '...deep understandings of
40
41 processes of securitisation demand a concept for the larger social formation' (Buzan and
42
43 Waever 2009: 257), phallogentric masculinity provides such a concept. Yet, when the phallus
44
45 is decoupled from masculinity, insecurity replaces security. The vulnerable penis, in short,
46
47 puts both men and women at risk of violence, and thus symbolizes a common condition of
48
49 'shared helplessness' (Segal 2008: 33). If this supports the need for a more gender neutral
50
51 approach to human security, it also underlines that an expanded approach to human security
52
53 could create new insecurities by drawing attention to the vulnerability of the penis. In a world
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of growing security threats, including from global terrorism and religious fundamentalism,
4
5 the 'veiling' of this vulnerability is therefore essential for preserving the power of the penis
6
7 and all that it represents. In the words of Žarkov (2001: 78), 'Because the phallic power of
8
9 the penis defines the virility of the nation, there can be no just retribution for its loss'.
10

11
12
13
14 One approach to this problematic vulnerability would be to reverse 'the centrality of the
15
16 penis' (Stephens 2007: 85). Aside from the practical issue of how to bring about this reversal,
17
18 however, the de-centring of the penis and its de-coupling from masculinity would be doubly
19
20 destabilizing, both 'emasculating' the concept of phallogentric masculinity and creating a
21
22 new and anchorless liminal masculinity linked to performativity. Masculinity has to be
23
24 performed (Butler 1988: 527); but what would this performance look like without the penis?
25
26 If 'masculinities and femininities are things that people 'do'' (Amalia Sa'ar & Taghreed
27
28 Yahia-Younis 2008: 307), what can men do with a penis that is vulnerable and bears a closer
29
30 resemblance to feminine sexuality (Potts 2000: 97)? This is not to suggest that a vulnerable
31
32 penis can never 'perform' masculinity. The point, rather, is that within the meta framework of
33
34 hegemonic masculinity, the penis performs a preordained role. To quote from Butler (1988:
35
36 526), 'Just as a script may be enacted in various ways, and just as the play requires both text
37
38 and interpretation, so the gendered body acts its part in a culturally restricted corporeal space
39
40 and enacts interpretations within the confines of already existing directives'. The vulnerable
41
42 penis necessarily challenges these boundaries.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Conclusion**

50
51
52
53
54 The dominance of the phallus can be challenged in many different contexts. Erotic dancers,
55
56 for example, 'tease' it and utilize it in their own performances, simultaneously arousing and
57
58

1
2
3 controlling/resisting it. This strategy enables dancers to ‘perform their position as both virgin
4 and whore, to use this position as a site of resistance instead of acquiescing to phallic
5 exchange and phallogentric fantasy’ (Egan 2003:113). In rural Zimbabwe, wives can
6 purchase ‘husband-taming’ herbs designed to control their spouses’ behaviour – and in
7 particular infidelity (Goebel 2002: 463). If these herbs are misused, they can effectively
8 emasculate a man. According to one healer, ‘...the penis will disappear with all the testicles.
9 Everything will go inside, no penis plain, and the husband will become very fat that same
10 day’ (cited in Goebel 2002: 481).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 This article has primarily focused on the penis in the context of war and armed conflict. War
23 is a dual arena that both demands the expression of phallogentric masculinity yet also
24 challenges it. Critically, the use of sexual violence against men in conflict exposes the
25 vulnerability of the penis which, by extension, reveals deeper vulnerabilities in the edifice of
26 phallogentric masculinity and heteronormativity. This adds a new security dimension. While
27 the use of sexual violence against women in conflict is increasingly framed as a human
28 security issue, the use of sexual violence against men raises more systemic security issues
29 that contribute to causally explaining the marginalization of the organ’s vulnerability. If, as
30 Lehman (1998: 124) argues, ‘the penis is and will remain centered until such time as we turn
31 the critical spotlight on it’, the issue of its vulnerability is precisely a critical spotlight.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 This vulnerability, however, should be acknowledged and addressed as part of the process of
48 post-war reconstruction and peace-building. According to Brickell (2005: 40),
49
50
51

52
53
54 Meaningful subversion of dominant forms of masculinity will remain difficult...
55 However, fissures within hegemonic patterns do permit acts and cultural forms that
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 leave the way open for a reconfiguring of selves and their contexts, initially at the
4 microlevel of society.
5
6

7
8 These fissures are most likely to emerge when societies are in transition and recovering from
9 armed conflict. When men return to civilian life and the demands of militarized masculinity
10 decline, this is the time for societies to engage in debates on what it means to be a 'real' man
11 and to develop new understandings of masculinity. In 2007, for example, CARE International
12 created the 'Young Men Initiative' in the Western Balkans;¹⁸ in 2011, the Ministry of
13 Women's Affairs in Cambodia launched the 'Good Men' campaign;¹⁹ and in 2006, a group of
14 men in Rwanda founded the Rwanda Men's Resource Centre.²⁰ By challenging gender norms
15 and seeking to promote more positive forms of masculinity that are decoupled from violence,
16 physical strength and virility, innovative projects such as these have the potential to raise
17 greater awareness of sexual violence against men in conflict. What this article has ultimately
18 sought to emphasize, through its thematic focus on vulnerability, is the disconnect that exists
19 between what the penis *is* and what it is *constructed* as being; and addressing this disjuncture
20 is an important part of the global fight against sexual violence conflict. Quintessentially,
21 sexual violence is, in part, an expression of men's attempts to live up to the myth of the
22 'potent phallus' (Schneider, Cockcroft and Hook 2008: 140).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ¹⁸ See http://www.care.org/sites/default/files/documents/YE-2012-Balkans_Young_Mens_Initiative.pdf

54 ¹⁹ See [http://countryoffice.unfpa.org/cambodia/drive/GMC-cover\(Oct2015-approvedversion\).pdf](http://countryoffice.unfpa.org/cambodia/drive/GMC-cover(Oct2015-approvedversion).pdf)

55
56 ²⁰ See <http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2013/11/in-rwanda-men-work-to-change-attitudes-and-confront-violence>
57
58

References

- Alison, M. 2007. 'Wartime Sexual Violence: Women's Human Rights and Questions of Masculinity', *Review of International Studies*, 33(1): 75-90.
- Allen, B. 1996. *Rape Warfare: Hidden Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Anderson, L. 2010. 'Politics by Other Means: When does Sexual Violence Threaten International Peace and Security?' *International Peacekeeping*, 17(2): 244-260.
- Baaz, M.E. and M. Stern. 2013. *Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War? Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.
- Baliga, A., P. Kamat and L. Iftode. 2007. 'Lurking in the Shadows: Identifying Systemic Threats to Kernel Data (Short Paper)', Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Symposium. Accessed April 2 2017. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Liviu_Iftode/publication/4251809_Lurking_in_the_Shadows_Identifying_Systemic_Threats_to_Kernel_Data/links/0912f510057b8ab1c000000.pdf
- Bankoff, G. 2001. 'Rendering the World Unsafe: "Vulnerability" as Western Discourse', *Disasters*, 25(1): 19-35.
- Barrett, F.J. 2001. 'The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy. In *The Masculinities Reader*, edited by S.M. Whitehead and F.J. Barrett, 77-99. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beehner, L. 2010. 'What Sri Lanka can Teach us about COIN', *Small Wars Journal*, 1-8. Accessed January 28, 2016. <http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/513-Beehner.pdf>
- Bergoffen, D. 2009. 'Exploiting the Dignity of the Vulnerable Body: Rape as a Weapon of War', *Philosophical Papers*, 38(3): 307-325.
- Brickell, C. 2005. 'Masculinities, Performativity and Subversion: A Sociological Reappraisal', *Men and Masculinities*, 8(1): 24-43.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Bullen, K., S. Edwards, V. Marke and S. Matthews. 2010. 'Looking Past the Obvious: Experiences of Altered Masculinity in Penile Cancer', *Psycho-Oncology*, 19(9): 933-940.
- Butler, J. 1988. 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory', *Theatre Journal*, 40(4): 519-531.
- Butler, C.K., T. Gluch and N.J. Mitchell. 2007. 'Security Forces and Sexual Violence: A Cross-National Analysis of a Principal-Agent Argument', *Journal of Peace Research*, 44(6): 669-687.
- Buzan, B. 2004. 'A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value', *Security Dialogue*, 35(3): 369-370.
- Buzan, B., and O. Waever. 2009. 'Macrosecuritisation and Security Constellations: Reconsidering Scale in Securitisation Theory', *Review of International Studies*, 35(2): 253-276.
- Calasanti, T., and N. King. 2005. 'Firming the Floppy Penis: Age, Class and Gender Relations in the Lives of Old Men', *Men and Masculinities*, 8(1): 3-23.
- Capers, B. 2011. 'Real Rape Too', *California Law Review*, 99(5): 1259-1307.
- Card, C. 1996. 'Rape as a Weapon of War', *Hypatia*, 11(4): 5-18.

- 1
2
3 Carlson, E.S. 2006. 'The Hidden Prevalence of Male Sexual Assault during War:
4 Observations on Blunt Trauma to the Male Genitals', *British Journal of Criminology*,
5 46(1): 16-25.
- 6 Carpenter, R.C. 2006. 'Recognizing Gender-Based Violence against Civilian Men and Boys
7 in Conflict Situations', *Security Dialogue*, 37(1): 83-103.
- 8 Choudhury, A.N. 1998. 'Hundred Years of Koro: The History of a Culture-Bound
9 Syndrome', *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 44(3): 181-188.
- 10 Chung, C.H., Y.K. Szeto and K.K. Lai. 2006. "'Fracture" of the Penis: A Case Series', *Hong
11 Kong Medical Journal*, 12: 197-200.
- 12 Cigelj, J. 2006. *Apartman 102*. Banja Luka, BiH: Humanitarna kulturna udruga Kraljica
13 Katarina.
- 14 Cohen, D.K., and R. Nordås. 2015. 'Do States Delegate Shameful Violence to Militias?
15 Patterns of Sexual Violence in Recent Armed Conflicts', *Journal of Conflict
16 Resolution*, 59(5): 877-898.
- 17 Connell, R.W. and J.W. Messerschmidt. 2005. 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the
18 Concept', *Gender and Society*, 19(6): 829-859.
- 19 Dartnall, E., and R. Jewkes. 2013. 'Sexual Violence against Women: The Scope of the
20 Problem', *Best Practice and Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 27(1): 3-
21 13.
- 22 Delor, F. and M. Hubert. 2000. 'Revisiting the Concept of "Vulnerability"', *Social Science
23 and Medicine*, 50(11): 1557-1570.
- 24 Denov, M.S. 2006. 'Wartime Sexual Violence: Assessing a Human Security Response to
25 War-Affected Girls in Sierra Leone', *Security Dialogue*, 37(3): 319-342.
- 26 Diamond, M.J. 2015. 'The Elusiveness of Masculinity: Primordial Vulnerability, Lack and
27 the Challenges of Male Development', *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 84(1): 47-102.
- 28 Diken, B. and C.B. Laustsen. 2005. 'Becoming Subject: Rape as a Weapon of War', *Body and
29 Society*, 11(1): 111-128.
- 30 Dolan, C. 2014a. 'Has Patriarchy been Stealing the Feminists' Clothes? Conflict-Related
31 Sexual Violence and UN Security Council Resolutions', *IDS Bulletin*, 45(1): 80-84.
- 32 Dolan, C. 2014b. 'Into the Mainstream: Addressing Sexual Violence against Men and Boys
33 in Conflict'. Accessed January 12, 2016.
34 <https://www.warchild.org.uk/sites/default/files/Into-the-Mainstream.pdf>
- 35 Edley, N. and M. Wetherell. 1995. *Men in Perspective: Practice, Power and Identity*. Hemel
36 Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- 37 Egan, R.D. 2003. 'I'll be Your Fantasy Girl If You'll be my Money Man: Mapping Desire,
38 Fantasy and Power in Two Exotic Dance Clubs', *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of
39 Culture and Society*, 8(1): 109-120.
- 40 Elise, D. 2001. 'Unlawful Entry: Male Fears of Psychic Penetration', *Psychoanalytic
41 Dialogues*, 11(4): 499-531.
- 42 Evans, Martin. 2017. 'Reprisal Violence and the *Harkis* in French Algeria, 1962',
43 *International History Review*, 39 (1): 89-106.
- 44 Ferrales, G., H.N. Brehm and S. Mcelrath. 2016. 'Gender-Based Violence against Men and
45 Boys in Darfur: The Gender-Genocide Nexus', *Gender and Society*, 30(4): 565-589.
- 46 Francken, A.B., H.B.M. van de Wiel, M.F. van Driel, W.C.M. Weijmar Schultz. 2002. 'What
47 Importance do Women Attach to the Size of the Penis?' *European Urology*, 42: 426-
48 431.
- 49 Godec, C.J., R. Reiser and A.Z. Logush. 1988. 'The Erect Penis – Injury Prone Organ',
50 *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection and Critical Care*, 28(1): 124-126.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Goebel, A. 2002. "Men these Days: They are a Problem": Husband-Taming Herbs and
4 Gender Wars in Rural Zimbabwe', *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 36(3): 460-
5 489.
- 6 Goldstein, J.S. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*.
7 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 8 Grey, R. and L.J. Shepherd. 2013. "Stop Rape Now?" Masculinity, Responsibility and
9 Conflict-Related Sexual Violence', *Men and Masculinities*, 16(1): 115-135.
- 10 Guss, J.R. 2010. 'The Danger of Desire: Anal Sex and the Homo Masculine Subject', *Studies*
11 *in Gender and Security*, 11(3): 124-140.
- 12 Haddadi, P., and M.A. Besharat. 2010. 'Resilience, Vulnerability and Mental Health',
13 *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5: 639-642.
- 14 Hagemann, K. 1997. 'Of "Manly Valor" and "German Honor": Nation, War, and Masculinity
15 in the Age of the Prussian Uprising against Napoleon', *Central European History*
16 30(2): 187-220.
- 17 Halley, J. 2008. 'Rape in Berlin: Reconsidering the Criminalisation of Rape in the
18 International Law of Armed Conflict', *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, 9(1):
19 78-124.
- 20 Helliwell, C. 2000. "It's Only a Penis": Rape, Feminism and Difference', *Signs*, 25(3): 789-
21 816.
- 22 Hoogensen, G. and K. Stuvøy. 2006. 'Gender, Resistance and Human Security', *Security*
23 *Dialogue*, 37(2): 207-228.
- 24 House of Lords Select Committee on Sexual Violence in Conflict. 2016. *Sexual Violence in*
25 *Conflict: A War Crime*. April 2016. Accessed May 9, 2016.
26 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201516/ldselect/ldsdcv/123/123.pdf>
- 27 Human Rights Watch. 2012. *Syria: Sexual Assault in Detention*. Accessed February 2, 2016.
28 <https://www.hrw.org/news/2012/06/15/syria-sexual-assault-detention>
- 29 Human Rights Watch. 2013. "We Will Teach you a Lesson": *Sexual Violence against Tamils*
30 *by Sri Lankan Security Forces*. Accessed January 28 2016.
31 <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/02/26/we-will-teach-you-lesson/sexual-violence-against-tamils-sri-lankan-security-forces>
- 32 Humphrey, J.A. and J.W. White. 2000. 'Women's Vulnerability to Sexual Assault from
33 Adolescence to Young Adulthood', *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27(6): 419-424.
- 34 Hyde, A., J. Drennan, E. Howlett and D. Brady. 2008. 'Young Men's Vulnerability in
35 Constituting Hegemonic Masculinity in Sexual Relations', *Men's Health*, 3(3): 238-
36 251.
- 37 Foreign and Commonwealth Office. 2014. International Protocol on the Documentation and
38 Investigation of Sexual Violence in Conflict: Basic Standards of Best Practice on the
39 Documentation of Sexual Violence as a Crime under International Law. Accessed
40 August 14, 2016. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/53f2fed34.html>
- 41 International Criminal Court. 2002/2010. *Elements of Crimes*. Accessed 7 March 2017.
42 <https://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonlyres/336923D8-A6AD-40EC-AD7B-45BF9DE73D56/0/ElementsOfCrimesEng.pdf>
- 43 Jackson, S. 2006. 'Interchanges: Gender, Sexuality and Heterosexuality: The Complexity
44 (and Limits) of Heteronormativity', *Feminist Theory*, 7(1): 105-121.
- 45 Jahan, R. 2009. 'Genocide in Bangladesh'. In *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and*
46 *Eyewitness Accounts*, edited by S. Totten and W.S. Parsons, 297-321. New York:
47 Routledge.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Jaleel, R. 2003. 'Weapons of Sex, Weapons of War: Feminisms, Ethnic Conflict and the Rise of Rape and Sexual Violence in Public International Law during the 1990s', *Cultural Studies*, 27(1): 115-135.
- Javaid, A. 2016. 'Feminism, Masculinity and Male Rape: Bringing Male Rape "Out of the Closet"', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 25(3): 283-293.
- Jones, A. 2006. 'Straight as a Rule: Heteronormativity, Gendercide and the Noncombatant Male', *Men and Masculinities*, 8(4): 451-469.
- Kapur, A; and K. Muddell. 2016. *When No One Calls It Rape: Addressing Sexual Violence against Men and Boys in Transitional Contexts*, International Centre for Transitional Justice. December 2016. Accessed January 8, 2017. https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ_Report_SexualViolenceMen_2016.pdf
- Kristeva, J. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lacan, J. 1995. *Écrits: A Selection*. Transl. A. Sheridan. London: Routledge.
- Lange, MM., W. Rogers and S. Dodds. 2013. 'Vulnerability in Research Ethics: A Way Forward', *Bioethics*, 27(6): 333-340.
- Leatherman, J.L. 2011. *Sexual Violence and Armed Conflict*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lehman, P. 1998. 'In an Imperfect World, Men with Small Penises are Unforgiven: The Representation of the Penis/Phallus in American Films of the 1990s', *Men and Masculinities* 1(2): 123-137.
- Lehmiller, J.J. 2014. *The Psychology of Human Sexuality*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Levine, C., R. Faden, C. Grady, C., D. Hammerschmidt, L. Eckenwiler and J. Sugarman. 2004. 'The Limitations of "Vulnerability" as a Protection for Human Research Participants', *American Journal of Bioethics*, 4(3): 44-49.
- Levine, K.L. 2006. 'No Penis, No Problem', *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 33(2): 100-147.
- Lim, S., R.J. Quinton and N.J. Ganem. 2016. 'Nuclear Envelope Rupture Drives Genome Instability in Cancer', *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 27(21): 3210-3213.
- Lipset, D. 'The Tides: Masculinity and Climate Change in Coastal Papua New Guinea', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 17(1): 20-43.
- MacKinnon, C. 1994. 'War, Genocide and Women's Human Rights', *Harvard Women's Law Journal*, 17: 5-16.
- Mattelaer, J.J., and W. Jilek. 2007. 'Sexual Medicine History: Koro – The Psychological Disappearance of the Penis', *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 4(5): 1509-1515.
- Mookherjee, N. 2008. 'Gendered Embodiments: Mapping the Body-Politic of the Raped Woman and the Nation in Bangladesh', *Feminist Review* 88: 36-53.
- Mookherjee, N. 2012. 'The Absent Piece of Skin: Gendered, Racialized and Territorial Inscriptions of Sexual Violence during the Bangladesh War', *Modern Asian Studies*, 46(6): 1572-1601.
- Morash, M., S. Jeong, M.N. Bohmert and D.R. Bush. 2012. 'Men's Vulnerability to Prisoner-on-Prisoner Sexual Violence', *The Prison Journal*, 92(2): 290-311.
- Mosse, G. 1985. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mullins, C.W. 2009. "'We are Going to Rape You and Taste Tutsi Women": Rape during the 1994 Rwandan Genocide', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(6): 719-735.
- Natabaalo, G. 2013. 'Male Rape Survivors Fight Stigma in Uganda'. Accessed February 9, 2016. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/04/2013411111517944475.html>

- 1
2
3 Nordstrom, C. 1996. 'Rape: Politics and Theory in War and Peace', *Australian Feminist*
4 *Studies*, 11(23): 147-162.
- 5 Oosterhoff, P., P. Zwanikken and E. Ketting. 2004. 'Sexual Torture of Men in Croatia and
6 Other Conflict Settings: An Open Secret', *Reproductive Health Matters*, 12(23): 68-
7 77.
- 8
9 **Ostberg, J. 2010. 'Thou Shalt Sport a Banana in Thy Pocket: Gendered Body Size Ideals in**
10 **Advertising and Popular Culture', *Marketing Theory* 10(1): 45-73.**
- 11 Pankhurst, D. 2003. 'The "Sex War" and Other Wars: Towards a Feminist Approach to
12 Peacebuilding', *Development and Practice*, 13(2-3): 154-177.
- 13 Paris, R. 2001. 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, 26(2):
14 87-102.
- 15
16 Potts, A. 2000. "'The Essence of the Hard On": Hegemonic Masculinity and the Cultural
17 Construction of "Erectile Dysfunction"', *Men and Masculinities*, 3(1): 85-103.
- 18 Prosecutor v. Karadžić. 2016. Case No. IT-95-5/18-T. ICTY Trial Chamber Judgement.
19 Accessed April 28, 2016.
20 http://www.icty.org/x/cases/karadzic/tjug/en/160324_judgement.pdf
- 21
22 Prosecutor v. Tadić. 1997. Case No. IT-94-1-T. ICTY Trial Chamber Opinion and
23 Judgement. Accessed January 7, 2016. [http://www.icty.org/x/cases/tadic/tjug/en/tad-
25 tsj70507JT2-e.pdf](http://www.icty.org/x/cases/tadic/tjug/en/tad-
24 tsj70507JT2-e.pdf)
- 26 Punamaki, R.L. 1988. 'Experiences of Torture, Means of Coping and Levels of Symptoms
27 among Palestinian Political Prisoners', *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 17(4): 81-96.
- 28 Raphael, B., G. Stevens and K. Pedersen. 2006. 'Vulnerability and Mental Health',
29 *Vulnerability and Youth Studies*, 1(2): 127-138.
- 30 Refugee Law Project. 2013. *Promoting Accountability for Conflict-Related Sexual Violence*
31 *against Men: A Comparative Legal Analysis of International and Domestic Laws*
32 *Relating to IDP and Refugee Men in Uganda*. Accessed February 1, 2016.
33 http://www.refugeelawproject.org/files/working_papers/RLP.WP24.pdf
- 34
35 **Romaniuk, S.N., and J.K. Wasylciw. 2010. "'Gender" Includes Men Too! Recognizing**
36 **Masculinity in Security Studies and International Relations', *Perspectives*, 18(1): 23-**
37 **39.**
- 38
39 Sa'ar, A. and Yahia-Younis, T. 2008. 'Masculinity in Crisis: The Case of Palestinians in
40 Israel', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 35(3): 305-323.
- 41 Scarce, M. 1997. *Male on Male Rape: The Hidden Toll of Stigma and Shame*. Cambridge,
42 MA: Perseus Publishing.
- 43 Schneider, V., K. Cockcroft and D. Hook. 2005. 'The Fallible Penis: A Discourse Analysis of
44 Male Sexuality in a South African Men's Interest Magazine', *South African Journal*
45 *of Psychology*, 38(1): 136-151.
- 46 Segal, L. 1998. 'Only the Literal: The Contradictions of Anti-Pornography Feminism',
47 *Sexualities*, 1(1), 43-62.
- 48 Seifert, R. 1996. 'The Second Front: The Logic of Sexual Violence in Wars', *Women's*
49 *Studies International Forum*, 19(1-2): 35-43.
- 50 Sivakumaran, S. 2005. 'Male/Male Rape and the "Taint" of Homosexuality', *Human Rights*
51 *Quarterly*, 27(4): 1274-1306.
- 52 Sivakumaran, S. 2007. 'Sexual Violence against Men in Armed Conflict', *European Journal*
53 *of International Law*, 18(2): 253-276.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sivakumaran, S. 2010. 'Lost in Translation: UN Responses to Sexual Violence against Men
4 and Boys in Situations of Armed Conflict', *International Review of the Red Cross*,
5 92(877): 259-277.
- 6 Skjelsbaek, I. 2012. *The Political Psychology of War Rape: Studies from Bosnia and*
7 *Herzegovina*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 8 Snyder, C.S., W.J. Gabbard, J.D. May and N. Zulčić. 2006. 'On the Battlefield of Women's
9 Bodies: Mass Rape in Bosnia-Herzegovina', *Affilia*, 21(2):184-195.
- 10 Srivastava, M. and B. Pandit. 2013. 'Koro: A Case Report and Review', *International*
11 *Journal of Physiology*, 1(1): 37-40.
- 12 Stephens, E. 2007. 'The Spectacularized Penis: Contemporary Representations of the Phallic
13 Male Body', *Men and Masculinities*, 10(1): 85-98.
- 14 Storr, W. 2011. 'The Rape of Men: The Darkest Secret of War'. Accessed December 21,
15 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2011/jul/17/the-rape-of-men>
- 16 Thompson, C.J. and D.B. Holt. 2004. 'How do Men Grab the Phallus? Gender Tourism in
17 Everyday Consumption', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 4(3): 313-338.
- 18 Thornhill, R., and C. Palmer. 2000. *A Natural History of Rape*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 19 Turshen, M. 2000. 'The Political Economy of Violence against Women during Armed
20 Conflict in Uganda', *Social Research*, 67(3): 803-824.
- 21 UN Development Programme. 1994. *Human Security Report 1994*. Accessed March 3, 2016.
22 http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf
- 23 UN General Assembly. 2012. 'Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: 66/290.
24 Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit
25 Outcome'. Accessed July 19, 2016.
26 [http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/hsu%20docu](http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/hsu%20documents/GA%20Resolutions.pdf)
27 [ments/GA%20Resolutions.pdf](http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/hsu%20documents/GA%20Resolutions.pdf)
- 28 UN Security Council. 2008. Resolution 820. Accessed January 28, 2016.
29 [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1820\(2008\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1820(2008))
- 30 UN Security Council. 2009. Resolution 889. Accessed January 28, 2016.
31 [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1889\(2009\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1889(2009))
- 32 UN Security Council. 2013. Resolution 2106. Accessed January 28, 2016.
33 [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2106\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2106(2013))
- 34 Veale, D., E. Eshkevari, J. Read, S. Miles, A. Troglia, R. Phillips, L.M.C. Echeverria, C.
35 Fiorito, K. Wylie and G. Muir. 2014. 'Beliefs about Penis Size: Validation of a Scale
36 for Men Ashamed about their Penis Size', *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 11(1): 84-92.
- 37 Vojdik, V.K. 2014. 'Sexual Violence against Men and Women in War: A Masculinities
38 Approach', *Nevada Law Journal*, 14(3): 923-952.
- 39 Vulliamy, E. 1992. 'Shame of Camp Omarska'. Accessed February 11, 2016.
40 <http://www.theguardian.com/itn/article/0,,191240,00.html>
- 41 Wachala, K. 2012. 'The Tools to Combat the War on Women's Bodies: Rape and Sexual
42 Violence against Women in Armed Conflict', *International Journal of Human Rights*,
43 16(3): 533-553.
- 44 Walby, S., J. Armstrong and S. Strid. 2012. 'Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social
45 Theory', *Sociology*, 46(2): 224-240.
- 46 Weiss, K.G. 2008. 'Male Sexual Victimization: Examining Men's Experiences of Rape and
47 Sexual Assault', *Men and Masculinities*, 12(3): 275-298.
- 48 White House. 2011. *United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security*.
49 Accessed August 15, 2016.
50 <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/National%20Action%20Pla>
51 [n%20on%20Women%2C%20Peace%2C%20and%20Security.pdf](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/National%20Action%20Plan%20on%20Women%2C%20Peace%2C%20and%20Security.pdf)

- 1
2
3 Wisner, B., P. Blaikie, T. Cannon and I. David. 2004. *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's*
4 *Vulnerability and Disasters*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
5 Wood, E.J. 2006. 'Variation in Sexual Violence during War', *Politics and Society*, 34(3):
6 307-341.
7 Wood, E.J. 2009. 'Armed Groups and Sexual Violence: When is Wartime Rape Rare?'
8 *Politics and Society*, 37(1): 131-161.
9
10 World Health Organization. 2007. *WHO Ethical and Safety Recommendations for*
11 *Researching, Documenting and Monitoring Sexual Violence in Emergencies*.
12 Accessed December 16, 2015.
13 http://www.who.int/gender/documents/OMS_Ethics&Safety10Aug07.pdf
14 Žarkov, D. 2001. 'The Body of the Other Man: Sexual Violence and the Construction of
15 Masculinity, Sexuality and Ethnicity in Croatian Media'. In *Victims, Perpetrators or*
16 *Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*, edited by C.O N. Moser and
17 F.C. Clark, 69-82. London: Zed Books.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60