

## **Everyday invasions: *Fuckland*, geopolitics, and the (re)production of insecurity in the Falkland Islands**

Matthew C. Benwell and Alasdair Pinkerton

*Abstract:* Academic and popular debates examining the geopolitics of the Falklands Islands/Islas Malvinas have focused overwhelming attention on the 1982 war and its aftermath in ways that foreground (in)security in predominantly militaristic terms. This is perhaps unsurprising given the geopolitical significance of these events for the UK, Argentina, the Falkland Islands and the wider Southern Cone region. Notwithstanding these tendencies, this paper seeks to think through another example of ‘invasion’ of the Falkland Islands that has been important in provoking and sustaining insecurity among Islanders. The infamous film *Fuckland* (2000), directed by José Luis Marqués, was filmed covertly in the Falklands without the consent of Falkland Islanders who star in it. By examining the scales, sites, practices, and shifting temporalities of *Fuckland*, as well as the everyday insecurities it (re)produces, we show how the bodies, homes and community of Falkland Islanders have been territorialised in the Argentine geopolitical imagination, and therefore subject to modes of violence. *Fuckland* serves as a potent reminder of the vulnerability of the Islands and Islanders to violation from outside parties for (geo)political or other advantage. Such ‘violations’ of territorial sovereignty are of interest because they take us beyond limited militaristic framings of, and concerns with, (in)security, whilst unveiling the possibilities for a more intimate and embodied geopolitics that can better understand Islanders’ everyday and ongoing security concerns. Examining these kinds of events can be useful in understanding why the Falkland Islands Government (and the Islanders themselves) continue to be so cautious in their management of contemporary diplomatic relations with Argentina.

*Key words:* everyday geopolitics; invasion; (in)securities; Falkland Islands

## Introduction

In the last few years, domestic political affairs in Argentina and the United Kingdom have set the tone for an improvement in diplomatic relations between the two countries and raised hopes for renewed cooperation in the South Atlantic over the disputed Falklands Islands or *Islas Malvinas* (Dodds and Manóvil, 2001; FCO, 2016). The election of the pro-business candidate Mauricio Macri as President of Argentina in December 2015, as well as the fallout from the United Kingdom's vote to leave the European Union in June 2016, have created a particular set of (geo)political and economic conditions conducive to warming bilateral ties. Amidst this apparent *détente*, practical signs of cooperation in the South Atlantic region have been rather more limited. Proposed exchanges of fishery data between Argentine and Falkland Islands' authorities, and the introduction of additional flights between Latin America and the Falkland Islands have, so far, failed to materialise – although some progress has been made on the identification of the remains of Argentine soldiers buried at Darwin cemetery undertaken by the Red Cross (see Benwell, 2017a; *Mercopress*, 2017). Indeed, while the UK's Minister of State for Europe and the Americas, Alan Duncan, was hailing the potential investment opportunities for British business in Argentina, the response of the Falkland Islands Government (FIG) and Islanders to the incoming administration in Buenos Aires has been rather more circumspect (Governor's Office Stanley, 2017). The publication of an article discussing the pros and cons associated with the potential introduction of visas for Argentine visitors to the Falklands in *The Penguin News* (the newspaper of the Falklands), a measure reportedly supported by some Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) of the Falkland Islands, is a striking illustration of the insecurities invoked by the prospect of increasingly open relations with Argentina and the enhanced mobility of Argentine nationals to and from the Islands (Niebieskikwiat, 2017). Popular accounts in the Argentine and British press tend to explain these responses as somehow indicative of the parochialism characterising the Falklands community and/or evidence of the lingering scars of military invasion and the 1982 Falklands/Malvinas War. Whilst the events of 1982 (and their continued commemoration, see Benwell, 2016) are an inescapable backdrop to understanding the contemporary geopolitics of the South Atlantic, this paper contests such simplistic and pejorative constructions of the Falkland Islands and the security concerns of its citizens.

Instead, we consciously foreground a specific example of non-military 'invasion' of the Falkland Islands that invites a reconsideration of how (in)security might be conceptualised. This paper concentrates analysis on the notorious film *Fuckland* (2000) directed by the Argentine José Luis Márques. *Fuckland* was covertly filmed in the Falkland Islands in 1999 without the permission or knowledge of the FIG or the Islanders who unwittingly star in the film, and its production alone serves as a particularly unsettling example of unwelcome and unethical intrusion (see Pinkerton and Benwell, 2014 for discussion of another example of a popular geopolitical intrusion). The film's disturbing plotline pertaining to Argentine male fantasies of 'sexual invasion' and territorial conquest achieved through the bodies of islander women, provides an opportunity to interrogate gendered and intimate notions of threat, (in)security and invasion that have never before been examined in the context of the Falkland Islands. Insidious invasions such as those required for the making of *Fuckland* are often overshadowed by the focus on the Argentine military invasion that preceded the 1982 Falklands War. However, we argue that they are critical to understanding Falkland Islanders' ongoing and intimate experiences of (in)security and associated anxieties about increasing contact with Argentina. What makes these incursions especially troubling for Islanders is the fact that they have been instigated, and in this case filmed, by Argentine citizens, making them less 'spectacular' than the military invasion of 1982 but, at the same time, more difficult to detect and potentially highly intrusive. They act as potent reminders of the vulnerability of the islands to exploitation and/or violation from outside parties for (geo)political or other advantage and help explain the ostensible reticence of Islanders to engage with Argentina and its citizens.

By drawing on the work of feminist geopolitics and specific interventions on intimate (Cowen and Story, 2013; Pain and Staeheli, 2014; Pain, 2015) and embodied geopolitics (Mayer, 2004; Smith, 2009, 2012) we show how the (in)securities of Falklands Islanders can be framed in ways that go beyond the straightforward fear of state-sanctioned military invasion. We have previously bemoaned the limited nature of discussions about the security of the Falkland Islands, citing the fixation with 'hard' militaristic framings sourced, more often than not, from the perspectives of ex-military officers in the British Armed Forces (Benwell, 2017b; Benwell and Pinkerton, 2016). This paper shows how geopolitics and security of the South Atlantic can be theorised differently by thinking through the production of intimately lived (in)securities

*in* the Falklands. By examining the scales, sites, practices, and shifting temporalities of the film *Fuckland*, as well as the everyday insecurities it (re)produces (Philo, 2014), we show how the bodies and homes of Falkland Islanders have been territorialised in the Argentine geopolitical imagination, and therefore subject to modes of violence.

We proceed by, initially, situating this paper within literatures related to feminist perspectives on geopolitics, the body as 'territory', and security, before introducing *Fuckland*. We analyse the film through three interrelated 'vignettes' drawing on key scenes from the film, that enable critical geopolitical reflection on the film's production, representation of Islander women, as well as the ongoing consequences of such invasions for the everyday (in)securities of Falkland Islanders.

### **(In)securities, intimate geopolitics and the Falkland Islands**

Geopolitical scholarship on British Overseas Territories (OTs) like the Falkland Islands, Gibraltar and the Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus (see, for example, Dodds and Benwell, 2010; Dodds, 2012, 2013; Dodds *et al.* 2015; Gold, 2004, 2009) has been typically drawn to conventional notions of security, understood through diplomacy, defence, and the strategic importance of these territories to the UK in the context of various regional challenges. Our engagement with literature from feminist geopolitics, and more recent interventions on intimate geopolitics, invites a reconsideration of how geopolitics and the security of British OTs might be conceptualised in ways that unsettle (the predominant interest in) "'official" security agendas' (Philo, 2012: 1). This body of work attends 'to everyday, lived experiences of (in)security, drawing attention to the unexpected sites and subjects of securitisation' (Williams and Massaro, 2013: 752). It has brought geopolitical research increasingly into contact with everyday spaces of the home, school, street, internet and more, acknowledging a wider array of geopolitical actors in the process (see Benwell and Hopkins, 2016). As Koch (2011: 500) is at pains to point out, this does not mean that feminist geopolitics 'ignores the "macro-scale", but it rather insists on the co-constitution of scales', as well as, 'considering the central actors of geopolitics as not just states, but also people' (*ibid*: 512). Interventions investigating domestic geopolitics have been useful here for teasing out connections between violences experienced in the home *and* as a consequence of global events (e.g. Brickell, 2012,

2014; Pain, 2014). They have prompted a reconsideration of how and where geopolitical research interrogates war, conflict, (in)security and violence, as well as the relations that are framed as constituting geopolitics (Cowen and Story, 2013).

More recently, this work has turned to intimacy to show how, 'all forms of violent oppression work through intimate emotional and psychological registers as a means of exerting control' (Pain and Staeheli, 2014: 344). The recognition of 'the global and intimate as mutually constituted entities' opens up space for a fuller consideration of how (in)securities can be emotionally and psychologically experienced as a result of citizens' daily encounters (Brickell, 2014: 1259; Dowler, 2012). These insights are especially relevant for our examination of intrusion and (in)security in the Falklands, concepts that are almost exclusively discussed in relation to 1982 and post-war concerns with the military deterrent stationed in the Islands and its role in warding off future Argentine aggression (despite the intentions of the FIG to move beyond such limited understandings). And yet, the interventions of non-state actors in the intimate relations and spaces of Falkland Islanders, and their subsequent representation in diverse forms of popular culture, are an extreme source of insecurity, not least because of how difficult they can be to detect. Despite their seemingly trivial nature, these kinds of intrusions are extremely unsettling and can connect to/animate governmental debates concerning appropriate state security measures (as outlined in the introduction). They can also challenge conceptualisations of threat and (in)security in British OTs like the Falklands, by drawing attention to slower and less-spectacular forms of violence (see Marshall, 2014) that are enacted in, for instance, the making of a film like *Fuckland*. Such breaches, celebrated as creative takes on the sovereignty dispute by some in Argentina, have the potential to be disruptive and deeply offensive, undermining Islanders' sense of sovereignty and security. These kinds of episodes have, we argue, negatively influenced civilian-led attempts at rapprochement between citizens of the Falklands and Argentina in the intervening years after the war.

The interest in these marginalised sites, relations and subjects of geopolitics has been coupled with attention to the ways that (in)securities are variously experienced by people according to, for instance, gender, generation and ethnicity (see Benwell, 2017b; Botterill *et al.*, 2016; Fluri, 2009; Sjoberg, 2015 for some examples). For Sjoberg (2016), an emphasis on the experiential and felt nature of security can shed light on 'previously invisible actors in security,

previously invisible structures of security and/or insecurity, and previously invisible dynamics within those matrices' (Sjoberg, 2016: 52). Feminist scholars engaging with geopolitics and security studies have repeatedly demonstrated how experiences of security and insecurity are profoundly gendered (e.g. Enloe, 1993; Cockburn, 2004). Such gender analysis encourages scholars to question what security is for different people given that very often, 'both security and insecurity are understood as knowable when seen, and security as a qualifiable and quantifiable desired end' (Sjoberg, 2016: 55). The covert nature of the making of *Fuckland* with its derogatory and intimate sexualised representations of Islander women, as well as the conflation of women's bodies with the geopolitics of the territorial dispute make sensitivity to this gender-security nexus especially pertinent. The pioneering work of Enloe (1993) and Yuval-Davis (1997: 23) emphasises strategic concerns with women as reproducers of the nation, positioned as, 'symbolic border guards and as embodiments of the collectivity' (also see Cockburn, 2004). As part of nationalist and geopolitical projects, the control of 'girls and women becomes a man's way of protecting or reviving the nation' (Enloe, 1993: 239). Geopolitics is overtly patriarchal and embodied here given that, 'control of women's reproduction carries with it control of women's bodies and of women's behaviour, for women's bodies (along with territory) are where the nation constructs its identity' (Mayer, 2004: 156-7). The appropriation of women's bodies in reaffirming territorial claims, and its explicit representation in a film like *Fuckland*, results in acutely gendered experiences of (in)security that we explore below.

The work of Smith (2012: 1513) takes this notion of intimate and embodied geopolitics further in the context of India's contested Jammu and Kashmir State, exploring 'how reproductive bodies and potential babies are caught up in geopolitical projects, as entities that can not only be territory but can also make territory'. She underlines the mundane practices of territoriality that occur in everyday spaces of the region, acknowledging women's bodies as 'a critical site through which territorial sovereignty can be defended' (*ibid*: 1516). Of course, they can also be the subjects of territorial ambition and numerous studies have charted the disturbing use of rape as a weapon of war in the pursuance of geopolitical objectives (e.g. Diken and Laustsen, 2005; Enloe, 1993; Mayer, 2004; Smith, 2009). In line with feminist geopolitics, then, this body of work is critical of traditional 'studies of territoriality and of boundaries [that] have often centred on big issues of sovereignty and security in ways that

seem to make gender irrelevant to the concepts' (Wastl-Walter and Staeheli, 2004: 141). For Diken and Laustsen (2005: 126),

'Bodily margins cannot be understood in isolation from other margins. As land is penetrated by enemy troops, so is the body and vice versa: the concern for the unity and order of the body politic is mimetically reproduced in the preoccupations about the purity and impurity of the physical body.'

In the case of the Falkland Islands, the 'engineering [of] territory through bodies' (Smith, 2012: 1515) has been largely confined to (sexual) fantasies manifest in popular culture, as opposed to state-sponsored projects or violence examined in the examples cited here.

Despite this, we would like to argue that the representation and popular circulation of troubling sexualised narratives inherent to a film like *Fuckland* has important effects on the (in)securities and emotional geopolitics of Islanders (Pain, 2009). These are not innocent and parodic storylines, most especially for people living in a territory subject to considerable diplomatic pressure from a much larger neighbouring state. It is also worth noting here, the popular and academic interest in Argentina at the annual publication of census statistics for the Falkland Islands (*Mercopress*, 2016; *La Opinión*, 2017; Peretti and Varisco, 2016). Although the press commentaries are never formally connected to the geopolitics of the sovereignty dispute, contributors to the comments sections underneath such reports regularly make insinuating remarks that serve as reminders of the close scrutiny placed on the changing demographic profile of the Falklands. In so doing, Argentine newspapers and their online commentariat revel in some of the same challenges identified by Lord Shackleton in his 1976 report, chiefly the long-term demographic viability of the islands (Shackleton 1976, 13, 1) with such a low female population.

### **Producing and audiencing *Fuckland***

The director of *Fuckland* frames the film as a parodic take on the Argentine man abroad, seemingly oblivious to the violations and violence it enacts on women from the Falkland Islands most especially. The film is invasive on many different levels, and we expand on these in the sections below, but the logistics of its production and the incursions that were

necessary are astonishing and briefly outlined here. A crew of five Argentine men and two British women travelled to the Falklands to undertake the covert filming of *Fuckland*, shortly after post-war restrictions were lifted on Argentine citizens visiting the Islands in 1999. The crew included two actors, Fabián Stratas from Argentina and Camilla Heaney from the UK, with the latter casted to play the part of a Falkland Islander. The entire crew took exceptional measures to ensure they were not detected by Islanders and the authorities during their weeklong stay. This encompassed filming a pilot project in a similarly sized town in the province of Buenos Aires, where the crew simulated working incognito in a small community in which the presence of outsiders would be conspicuous. For the actual trip to the Falklands, each member of the crew had a carefully crafted double-identity that enabled them to clear customs and divert attention from their actual role (see Marqués, 2000). There were also strict rules of communication and behaviour that were adhered to by the crew throughout their stay as the director Marqués explained to the authors in an interview:

‘The most complicated thing of all was to establish an order of filming taking into account that we shouldn’t be seen together in front of the community. Normally a film crew, we all meet and we discuss things...there wasn’t any of this, it was simply done through notes where I wrote [for example], at six in the morning, camera number one will be here in this square, behind a tree...We put together a plan, a plan where let’s say a meeting happens between Camilla, Fabián, the ‘real’ people [Islanders], those that were there in that moment and the film crew that was hidden somehow’ (interview with José Luis Marqués, 23/03/14).

This starts to hint at the elaborate planning that went into the making of *Fuckland*, as well as the deception and violation of ethics involved in its manipulation of relations with civilians and authorities of the Falkland Islands. Even the title of the film is, in itself, symptomatic of this manipulation and worthy of some reflection. In one scene from the film, Camilla teaches Fabián how to pronounce Falklands with a local accent, and after successfully repeating it several times, he abruptly states, ‘Like fuck...Fucklands!’ Camilla responds, slightly taken aback, ‘Like what?’ before swiftly changing the direction of the conversation. This subtle corruption of Camilla’s words very suddenly reveals the darker intentions of Fabián and hints at the deception involved in this and other ‘innocent’ interactions with actual Islanders, reflected on in the vignettes below.

The problematic nature of the deceptions inherent to the production and representations in *Fuckland* make it necessary to reflect on the role of the audience, as well as our positionality as researchers who have chosen to watch, engage with and write about the film. We contend that *Fuckland* should not be understood simply as a passively-received geopolitical 'representation', but, instead, as an active geopolitical object/text that is being constantly re-produced (and its violence constantly re-enacted) through its consumption by audiences (the entire film can be streamed on *YouTube*, see Pickering, 2017). Through the act of viewing, audiences become complicit in Fabián's voyeurism, surveillance, stalking, and possible rape of Falkland Islands' women, and, in turn, complicit in the (re)production of invasion. Viewers of the film witnessing Fabián's unsolicited interactions with real Falkland Islanders are produced as an 'unethical audience'; enrolled as active geopolitical agents in the islands' reinvasion through the act of viewing. *Fuckland*, we argue, exists in a constant state of 'becoming', and the invasions that it both represents and enacts are re-produced through the film's consumption by audiences, with unsettling and ongoing consequences for Falklands-Argentine relations. As well as re-enacting and re-producing the violation associated with territorial and intimate invasions, these kinds of geopolitical artefacts erode confidence in the diplomatic and practical efforts to build trust and cooperative relations between the Falkland Islands and Argentina.

These concerns about the complicit audience required considerable ethical deliberation and ultimately shaped our approach to the analysis of the film. We needed to 'turn the lens' on our own scholarship and reflect on whether undertaking research on and giving exposure to *Fuckland* was indeed ethical (Pain, 2015: 72; Koopman, 2016). This could conceivably lead to more people viewing the film, reminding Islanders of the violations involved in the film's making nearly 20 years ago, and, more troublingly, contribute to individual or collective distress – albeit more indirectly than in other interview-based 'violence against women research'. Following Fontes (2004), we are conscious of the possibility of 'retraumatization' in VAW research, and we hope, here, to foreground the sensitivity with which we have treated the film in our research and writing of this paper. Our intrigue in the film emerged having conducted lengthy periods of research in Argentina and the Falkland Islands with different communities, exploring a range of topics related to the geopolitics of the sovereignty dispute (see Benwell, 2016, 2017a/b; Pinkerton, 2008). While the film was often referred to within

Argentina as a slightly odd yet amusing take on the Malvinas issue, within the Falkland Islands the film was never mentioned, despite the fact that we were both particularly interested in Islander-Argentine (civilian/everyday and political) relations. The silence surrounding the film was in contrast to the relative openness of most Islanders when they were asked questions about the 1982 Argentine military invasion. Given the gendered nature of sexualised violence inflicted on Islander women in the film, our identity as male researchers is, of course, important to consider. Although we can only speculate as to the effect this had on whether people broached *Fuckland* in our fieldwork encounters (it is worth noting that a female postgraduate researcher from the Falklands could not find anyone willing to talk about the film when she asked for volunteers), our identity as men in this case would have almost certainly compounded the reluctance and general levels of suspicion that are often directed towards (outsider) researchers undertaking work in the Falklands (see Benwell, 2014). The absence of references to the film in our interviews and discussions meant that we both refrained from directly asking questions about *Fuckland* while working in the Falklands. For this reason, the voices of Islanders and any sense of the film's reception in the Falklands are missing from this paper.

While a fuller understanding of *Fuckland's* reception within and beyond the Falklands might have been useful (although ethically challenging as we have suggested), we contend that the intrusive production of the film and its legacies for everyday (in)securities in a small island community like the Falklands remain of critical importance. An interview with the film's director in Buenos Aires helped to inform our understanding of the intricacies of the film's production and the crew's framing of their exchanges with the Falkland Islanders. These insights inform the vignettes presented below. Despite the difficulties of researching and writing about offensive civilian intrusions like *Fuckland*, then, these kinds of 'texts' and their (re)production are critical to explore in order to understand how they might have implications for practical geopolitical policy-making and everyday relations between citizens.

***Vignette 1: 'The only solution is to populate the islands with Argentines'***

'Precocious, precursor, pioneer. It'd take lots like me, in 20 years they're ours. If other patriots follow my example in a few years the islands will be full of Argentines. They

want to be English, let them be English but the next generation will be the one that decides and then I want to see you, think about it a little.’ (Extract from Fabián in *Fuckland*, 2000)

This verbal monologue features towards the end of *Fuckland* and is juxtaposed with the fairly innocuous scene of Fabián walking through the departure gate at Mount Pleasant Airport (MPA) in the Falklands (a restricted military area where filming is forbidden), on his way to boarding a return flight to Chile and then Argentina. Although less shocking than some of the graphic and offensive scenes that feature earlier in the film, the words recited here are reflective of the intimate, lingering and slower forms violence that can instil insecurity in a place like the Falklands. On the one hand, there is a striking sense of self-congratulating triumphalism on the back of Fabián’s short-lived seduction and sexual ‘conquest’ of Falkland Islander Camilla (discussed in more depth below). On the other hand, however, the quote emphasises the need to focus on the *longue durée* in Argentina’s efforts to claim territory in the South Atlantic. Fabián’s fantasies pertaining to the genetic alteration of the Falkland Islands’ population will supposedly bear fruit in 20 years, when the next generation of ‘hybrid’ Argentine-Falkland Islanders will decide to switch their geopolitical allegiances to Argentina.

Although wildly fanciful, the notion of temporality has been a consistent point of concern in relation to how Argentina has pursued its Malvinas claim. Assorted Argentine diplomats and commentators regularly call on Argentina to exercise diplomatic restraint in favour of a longer-term strategy, which occasionally lead to optimistic projections about the number of years it will take for the Malvinas to become Argentine (Alexander, 2014; Fernandez-Armesto, 2012). Of course, these calls are accompanied by frustration with the fact that Argentina has repeatedly shown anything but patience and restraint at key moments in the sovereignty dispute, most notably evidenced by the invasion of 1982 (preceded by several years of Anglo-Argentine sovereignty negotiations, see Dodds, 2002). The infamous ‘charm offensive’ instigated by Carlos Menem’s Foreign Minister Guido di Tella in the 1990s, initiated contact between citizens from Argentina and the Falkland Islands through phone calls and the sending of presents (including toys and Winnie the Pooh bears) and videos (Dodds and Manóvil, 2001: 785). This strategy, which was met with bemusement by Islanders and produced no tangible diplomatic advances, was nonetheless implemented to woo the (next generation of) Islanders and instil confidence in the Argentine government, in ways that might generate the conditions

for an eventual acceptance of Argentine sovereignty. Similarly, the so-called 'reconciliatory' visits of groups of Argentines to the Falklands have received a markedly frosty reception from Islanders in recent years. Arguably, the most sensitive of these was the visit of the organisation *Rugby Sin Fronteras* (Rugby Without Borders), which looked to organise a rugby match between citizens of Argentina and the Falkland Islands. Their intention to involve young people living in the islands by training on the fields adjacent to the secondary school and handing out t-shirts and other sporting paraphernalia, was interpreted as a sinister act of geopolitical interference designed to lure the next generation of Islanders towards Argentina (*Mercopress*, 2011). While the threat of an impromptu military invasion by Argentina may have subsided, the insecurities produced by these kinds of 'long game' initiatives are substantial. Despite the stated innocence of their intentions, these are read in the islands as insidious attempts to target future generations of Islanders for geopolitical ends, and serve as reminders of the enduring and diverse threats posed to their security.

Fabián's use of the term pioneer is also loaded on many different levels and can be linked to historical 'practice[s] of territoriality' and state creation in other peripheral parts of Argentina, including Patagonia (Smith, 2012: 1515). These frontier zones have been central to the Argentine geographical imagination, a nation defined through violent colonial expansion, and the subsequent establishment and consolidation of its borders (e.g. successive military campaigns in the 1870s known as The Conquest of the Desert, led to the annihilation of large numbers of indigenous people in Patagonia to facilitate the extension of Argentine authority over these austral territories. In Argentina the term *pionero* or pioneer has most often been associated with members of immigrant communities from England, Scotland and Wales who subsequently 'populated' territories in Patagonia, most notably the provinces of Santa Cruz and Chubut). Fabián imagines himself as the inheritor to these pioneering Argentine nation-builders, although his chosen frontier is a territory that has resisted Argentine territorial expansion and incorporation. The *Malvinas* and neighbouring territories in the South Atlantic and Antarctica are, in many respects, Argentina's 'phantom limbs' – the pieces of Argentina's tri-continental vision that remain beyond Argentine political jurisdiction, despite featuring on official maps produced by the state (Escudé, 1988). The closure of this last remaining frontier is portrayed as the responsibility of every 'good' Argentine patriot, as Fabián later states, 'One has to give the best they have'; in other words, one needs to do the best in the name of the

national cause, and in this case the 'recuperation' of the Malvinas. As we have made clear, such civilian-inspired intrusions in the name of the *patria* are the cause of notable insecurity in the Falkland Islands, partly because of their unpredictable and stealthy nature.

Fabián aims to 'reclaim' the Malvinas through the bodies of Islander women who are overtly territorialised in *Fuckland*, constructed as sites of geopolitics to be controlled, struggled over, penetrated and exploited by men (Rose, 1993; Smith 2012). As the director makes clear, Fabián wishes to, 'turn himself into the leader of the invasion after convincing his compatriots to follow in his mission... 'Make the homeland [*haga patria*], get a kelper pregnant'' [a term often used in Argentina and Latin America to refer to Islanders although rarely used in the Falklands themselves, see Niebieskikwiat, 2014] (Marqués, 2000: 12). While the Falklands are robustly defended by the British Armed Forces stationed at MPA, the only solution to the sovereignty dispute, according to Fabián, is to populate the islands with Argentines. The 'territory' of the islands, incorporating women's bodies as 'an extension of the landscape' (Mayer, 2004: 166), is made vulnerable to violation and penetration, in intimate ways that are beyond the scope of military defence. As Mayer (2004: 166) contends,

'the real boundary of the nation and its homeland is no longer a line drawn on a map or on the ground. Rather than being physically articulated, a national boundary can be imagined in men's minds or drawn within women's bodies'.

The biopolitical inferences are made clear through the securitisation of particular bodies and although they are the subject of fantasy in *Fuckland*, they map on to actual concerns in the Falklands related to the (un)sustainability and genetic composition of the islands' population. This came to the attention of policy-makers following the publication of Lord Shackleton's report in 1976, who identified a 'shortage' of women and a 'surplus' of men in the Falkland Islands, with all the attendant risks to the community's long-term viability (Shackleton, 1976). One solution to this skewed demographic composition was brought to wider public attention with the creation of a so called 'settler scheme' targeted at British women in 1981 (*Daily Express*, 1981).

## **Vignette 2: Surveillance, stalking and the geometries of sexual violation**

Throughout *Fuckland*, film footage gathered from Fabián's concealed video camera reveals his strange routinized surveillance of real Falkland Island women as he tours the everyday spaces of Falkland Islands life. In a supermarket he spots a young woman with a small child. The camera lingers on their bodies while they stand at the checkout waiting to pay for their groceries, and we are left in no doubt of Fabián's interest in the seemingly fertile, child-bearing body of the young mother. Unwittingly, the small child—who is, perhaps, only about 18 months old—becomes the vector for the prolonged examination of his own mother by Fabián. Fabián approaches the pair by greeting the boy with an apparently playful, cooing 'Hello'. During the awkward encounter that follows, the woman reluctantly reveals the boy's name—Jack—but is clearly weary of Fabián's somewhat overly-inquisitive presence and actively disengages from conversation. Fabián gives up and moves on, targeting next a female tour operator, originally from the Philippines. In the 'West Stores', Fabián strikes up a conversation with a young woman on the supermarket checkout by complimenting her nose piercing and engaging in some seemingly-gentle flirtation, before juxtaposing this conversation in the following scene with the cover image from Cate Haste's account of British sexual mores, *Rules of Desire* (1994, paperback edition), that he picks up in the supermarket's book section. While in normal circumstances, these encounters and conversations might be considered to be commonplace, innocent examples of daily human interaction, the audience is, of course, aware of Fabián's sinister intent as well as the potentially hazardous consequences of his febrile sexualised gaze. The profoundly discomforting experience of watching these events unfold is heightened by our knowledge as viewers of the covert nature of the filming and the denial of agency afforded to the women (and children) being surveilled, filmed and presented to us in the film without their own knowledge or permission. We, as the audience, are not only enrolled and made complicit within Fabián's search for an unwitting sexual 'conquest', but are, through our own voyeuristic gaze, unwitting participants in an ongoing cycle of bodily violence perpetrated against the film's sexualised subjects.

Fabián eventually focuses his pursuit on a young Falkland Islander, Camilla, who he befriends following a chance encounter in an internet café. Camilla takes Fabián around Stanley in her Land Rover, they smoke and talk together, and she is even willing to echo his chants of 'Malvinas Argentinas'. We witness Fabián and Camilla having dinner together and, eventually,

returning to his hotel room, where they have sex. Unbeknown to Camilla, however, Fabián has also toured Stanley in the pursuit of condoms, which, in a preceding scene, he is shown repeatedly piercing with a needle. The encounter, while consensual, is, in reality, a gross act of sexual deception. In the scenes that follow, we see images of Fabián taking a battlefield tour, juxtaposed between video of Camilla and Fabián happily enjoying a walk along the pristine beach at Gypsy Cove. As the tour guide's description of the fighting in 1982 becomes more vivid and animated, so the scene on the beach also turns more violent. A series of rapid cuts, an intensification in background music, and glimpses of landmine warning notices, culminates in snapshots of a violent sexual encounter that are strongly suggestive of Camilla's rape by Fabián.

Unlike other woman shown in *Fuckland*, Camilla is in reality a 'fictional' character played by an English actress – although this is not revealed to the audience until the closing credits of the film, and in no way diminishes the profoundly disturbing sexualised violence and perverse fantasies enacted upon her body by Fabián. There are parallels here between *Fuckland* and, for example, the 16-minute short film *No Lies* (1973) in which the director, Michael Block, manipulates his audience into becoming unwitting witnesses of, and participants in, what Sobchack (1977: 16) has described as, 'rape demonstrated' and 'rape experienced'. Sobchack, here, refers to the fictionalised account of film-maker, Alec, invasively filming a rape victim, Shelby, in her New York apartment:

'Alec stalks and corners Shelby physically and emotionally. We watch him violate her privacy, her trust, her defenses, her space. He relentlessly probes and insensitively attacks, hurting and humiliating the young woman who seems unaware, caught off-guard, consistently blind to Alec's betrayal of her to the camera and the audience'.

While Alec (unlike Fabián in *Fuckland*) is not looking to perpetrate an overt act of sexual violence, his exploitation of Shelby's confidence and trust, and his orchestration of her emotional breakdown for the benefit of his camera is tantamount to her re-traumatisation. By concealing the fictional nature of *No Lies* from its audience, Sobchack argues that 'the only real rape' has, in fact, been perpetrated upon 'us' – the humiliated, gullible, hubristic viewer. If we accept this argument, the geometries of violation in *Fuckland* are made even more complex by the blurring of fact and fiction, and the sinister and covert filming of real Falkland

Islanders, who are the real victims of, to use Shelby's turn of phrase, 'a friendly neighbourhood rapist' both *on* and *off* screen.

### ***Vignette 3: Exposing everyday (in)securities through the filming of *Fuckland****

The production of *Fuckland* resulted in violations of the FIG's authority as we have already made clear, but perhaps more troubling were the intimate intrusions into the everyday lives of unsuspecting islanders. The nefarious intentions of Fabián emerge early on in the film as he begins to scout potential 'breeding partners', entering into awkward conversations with different men and women around the islands. While many of these interactions appear to be fairly mundane (Fabián films himself talking to a man driving an airport taxi, a woman at his hotel, the hairdressers, the supermarket and so on), they are extremely uncomfortable given the viewer's awareness of the intentions of Fabián and the breach of trust involved in covertly filming. For instance, Fabián enters into small talk with a woman working in a store, eventually encouraging her to show off her belly button piercing to him. As he walks away, Fabián, in an overdubbed comment, speculates that she must be no more than 16 or 17 years of age, seemingly ruling her out of his hunt for an eligible Islander to impregnate. Many of these scenes filmed around Stanley are followed by seedy remarks where the women, subjected to the male gaze, are judged according to their attractiveness, availability and potential fertility. Dubbed over footage of Islanders dancing in one of Stanley's nightspots, Fabián remarks, 'How affectionate, the fatty! Let's see if *Greenpeace* accuse me of fucking sheep... what a piece of whale! Not even with a boat hook, I'd sooner give up.' These inordinately offensive comments reflect Fabián's thoughts about the appearance and perceived desirability of women from the Falklands (relative to the islands' sheep). Women's bodies are sites that have been directly implicated in territorial struggles (Rose, 1993) and represented as central to the biological and symbolic reproduction of the nation (Yuval-Davis, 1997). This has made them particularly vulnerable to appropriation and violence at the hands of men (Mayer, 2004) and, as Diken and Laustsen (2005: 118) point out, 'the abuse of the enemy's women is considered to be the ultimate humiliation'. Niebieskikwiat (2014) has previously identified the pejorative ways that Islanders have been constructed in Argentina, as provincial, inbred and lacking in cosmopolitanism (relative to citizens in urban parts of Argentina), and these verbal slurs directed at women are symptomatic of such attitudes.

The (un)ethical approach to the production of *Fuckland* is clearly extremely problematic, given the lack of consent for initial filming (inclusive of children), as well as for the use of footage in the film itself. The director seemed to overlook these ethical breaches, preferring to focus instead on what he considered to be the public appetite for such a film in Argentina, at the turn of the century (when only a handful of Argentines had visited the islands after 1982):

‘I was interested in getting cameras in and showing the people here in Argentina how the Islanders live, it was something very attractive about the film, beyond the history and the fact that it was done clandestinely’ (interview with José Luis Marqués, 23/03/14).

Rather than make a conventional documentary about the Falkland Islands, obtaining the permission of the relevant authorities and citizens involved, the director elected to go ‘undercover’ in order to represent the everyday lives of Islanders. As a result, Islanders were filmed, observed, ridiculed and denigrated without any respect for the most basic of ethical principles including informed consent.

Furthermore, the fact that this was not considered problematic is instructive and connects with how Argentina has managed diplomatic relations (or the lack thereof) with the Falkland Islands. Argentine politicians have consistently stated that the right to self-determination does not apply to the Falkland Islanders, on the basis that they are a population implanted by a colonial power (as opposed to being a community ‘native’ to the islands). More extreme statements and representations emanating from the Argentine government have even denied the Islanders’ existence altogether (McElroy, 2013). The foreign policies of the government, alongside the overriding conviction of most Argentines that the islands are an integral part of their national territory, inform the seemingly nonchalant attitude of the film crew to the multiple violations of the rights, sites and bodies of Islanders. The intrusive approach taken to ethics and the filming of intimate relations and spaces of Islanders is, therefore, ‘wrapped up in national, global and geopolitical processes and strategising, international events, policies and territorial claims’ (Pain and Staeheli, 2014: 345). Moreover, the perceived intransigence of the Falkland Islanders to open up to relations with Argentina is directly related to these kinds of intimate and everyday violations. Statements from Argentina’s government pertaining to the ‘peaceful’ pursuance of their Malvinas sovereignty

claim (in an effort to draw distinctions with the military invasion launched by the dictatorship), tend to fall on deaf ears in the Falklands when the intimate insecurities of Islanders are violated in such ways. We argue, therefore, for understandings of violence, violation, (in)security and invasion that take into account the intimate and embodied geopolitics of the sovereignty dispute. Shifting attention from the predominant focus on hard, militaristic and spectacular forms of violence to softer, slower and more insidious incursions can help to better inform what is understood as peaceful and/or threatening in the Falkland Islands and Argentina. Bringing in these geographies, actors and relations (between civilians and their bodies) to framings of (in)security offers the opportunity to better comprehend the psychological and emotional effects of everyday intrusions, moving debates beyond an exclusive fixation with the military-security nexus (Giles and Hyndman, 2004; Koch, 2011). They can, as Dowler *et al.* (2014: 349) contend, encourage interrogation of '(in)security in relation to the co-constitutive relationship between the embodied, intimate everyday, and national and global processes'.

Ironically, the insecurities generated by surveillance and spying were reflected back on to the film crew of *Fuckland* who were convinced the authorities were aware of their project:

'Well, let's see, from the first day I stepped on [the islands] until the day I left, I had a permanent paranoia attack...the embassy or the secret service of the UK only had to ask who's travelling to the islands this week on LAN Chile [the airline that flies to the Falklands from Punta Arenas, Chile]. Oh look, an actor, a film director, a sound engineer, it was so obvious...But anyway, this didn't happen. I spent the whole week with the sensation that we were being observed and that we'd get to the last day and they'd say give us all the cassettes' (interview with José Luis Marqués, 23/03/14).

The actors instrumental in undertaking these kinds of intrusions, then, are not immune to feeling insecure and paranoid as to whether they are, in fact, the subjects being placed under surveillance. Indeed, the director explained how, upon returning to Argentina, he ended up being rushed to intensive care with chest pains as a result of the stress he endured during the week of filming in the Falklands. The embodied insecurities were acutely felt by the crew of *Fuckland*, given their imagined notions of the Falklands as a highly securitised society where their presence would be easily detected by British military authorities. These ideas about militarisation correspond with how the Falkland Islands are framed by Argentina's

government who regularly accuse the UK of militarising the South Atlantic. Despite these preconceptions, the crew were far more likely to have been discovered by Islanders, given the level of contact and the filming that they conducted with them. The fact that they were not would have only compounded the sense of insecurity for the Falklands community, especially given the continued reproduction of these intimate security breaches in the film (a copy of the film was, rather brazenly, sent to a pub in the Falklands by the director). The consequences of this kind of cinematic intrusion, then, are far more long-lasting for Islanders and their legacies continue to generate distrust that is influential in shaping future geopolitical relations with Argentina.

## **Conclusion**

As Jennifer Hyndman (2004: 319) notes, in modern warfare, 'people's bodies, homes, communities, and livelihoods have become the battlefields of contemporary conflict'. Hyndman makes this observation in specific reference to the recognition in international humanitarian law of sexual violence and in particular rape as a strategic weapon of war—a judicial act that, according to Hyndman 'recasts' public and private space in militarised and violent conflict. Although sexual violence was not weaponised in the context of the Argentine invasion in 1982 (unlike in the Balkans conflict in the 1990s, for example), the violent sexual invasion intimated in *Fuckland* is suggestive of the lingering threat to the inviolability of the Falkland Islands as a 'lived' community and individual women's bodies. The bodies of Falkland Islands' women have long been the source of geopolitical concern – particularly regarding their quantity and fertility, and therefore their ability to sustain and reproduce the islands as 'lived' and 'populated' British territory. Through these concerns, the bodies of Falkland Islands women have, themselves, undergone a process of geopolitical territorialisation – whereby their bodies have become the terrain for policy interventions, as well as the projection of sexualised fantasies and violence. *Fuckland's* concluding scenes, which intersperse scenes of sexual violence, military battlefields and landmine warning notices, draw together military and sexual violence, and are suggestive of the lingering remnants of invasion. Landmines and Fabián's unborn child become the unknown, uncharted, sinister and threatening legacies of Argentine territorial and bodily invasions.

In so doing, *Fuckland* also draws our attention to the everyday, gendered and lived nature of insecurity in the South Atlantic where, despite much official attention and media discourse focusing on military notions of security, the community itself are faced with more insidious threats – including of sexualised notions of violence and ‘invasion’. Our analysis of *Fuckland* seeks to be productive in ‘extending analysis of the intimate relations of violence, that seem at once everywhere and absent in analyses of the political, and in connecting apparently separate, differently scaled and situated forms of violence and insecurity’ (Pain, 2015: 72). Following Pain (2015, 2015: 67), we have used language with distinctly military overtones (e.g. invasion, incursion and so on) to refer to everyday breaches of citizens’ security, ‘not to draw direct parallels but to illustrate continuities across violences in different arenas, and to point to their integrated whole’. It is equally important to note that in drawing out these continuities we do not wish to validate *Fuckland*’s desire to be seen as the spiritual successor (and ethical/moral equivalent) to Argentina’s military invasion in 1982. Thus the registers, temporalities, and scales of security discourse associated with the Falkland Islands might be usefully recast, allowing for the consideration of civilian *and* military dimensions; a recognition of slow acts of layered violence alongside sudden acts of military aggression; and the recasting of Cartesian and territorial visions of geopolitical ambition to account for the intimate, embodied and emotional. While we are not seeking to draw any direct lineage between *Fuckland* and specific policy responses per se, we nonetheless recognise the film’s capacity to provoke fear and inform governmental and societal responses to security and surveillance.

## **Bibliography**

- Alexander H (2014) Falkland Islands will be ours, says Argentina’s new minister. *The Telegraph*, 19 March 2014. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/southamerica/falklandislands/10706185/Falkland-Islands-will-be-ours-says-Argentinas-new-minister.html> (accessed 1 December 2017)
- Benwell MC (2014) Considering nationality and performativity: undertaking research across the geopolitical divide in the Falkland Islands and Argentina. *Area* 46: 163-169.

- Benwell MC (2016) Encountering geopolitical pasts in the present: young people's everyday engagements with memory in the Falkland Islands. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 41: 121-133.
- Benwell MC (2017a) Going underground: banal nationalism and subterranean elements in Argentina's Falklands/Malvinas claim. *Geopolitics* [ePub ahead of print].
- Benwell MC (2017b) Connecting ontological (in)securities and generation through the everyday and emotional geopolitics of Falkland Islanders. *Social & Cultural Geography* [ePub ahead of print].
- Benwell MC and Hopkins P (eds) (2016) *Children, Young People and Critical Geopolitics*. Abingdon: Ashgate.
- Benwell MC and Pinkerton A (2016) Brexit and the British Overseas Territories: changing perspectives on security. *RUSI Journal* 161: 8-14.
- Botterill K, Hopkins P, Sanghera G and Arshad R (2016) Securing disunion: young people's nationalism, identities and (in)securities in the campaign for an independent Scotland. *Political Geography* 55: 124-134.
- Brickell K (2012) Geopolitics of home. *Geography Compass* 6: 575–88.
- Brickell K (2014) 'The whole world is watching': intimate geopolitics of forced eviction and women's activism in Cambodia. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 104: 1256-1272.
- Cockburn C (2004) The continuum of violence: a gender perspective on war and peace. In: Giles W and Hyndman J (eds) *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 24-44.
- Cowen D and Story B (2013) Intimacy and the everyday. In: Dodds K, Kuus M and Sharp J (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 341-358.
- Daily Express* (1981) 27 January, cited in *Falkland Islands Times* (1981), February, 8.
- Diken B and Laustsen CB (2005) Becoming abject: rape as a weapon of war. *Body & Society* 11: 111-128.

- Dodds K (2002) *Pink Ice: Britain and the South Atlantic Empire*. London: I B Tauris.
- Dodds K (2012) The Falkland Islands as a 'strategic gateway': Britain and the South Atlantic Overseas Territories. *RUSI Journal* 157: 18-25.
- Dodds K (2013) Consolidate! Britain, the Falkland Islands and wider the South Atlantic/Antarctic. *Global Discourse: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Current Affairs and Applied Contemporary Thought* 3: 166-172.
- Dodds K and Benwell MC (2010) More unfinished business: the Falklands/Malvinas, maritime claims and the spectre of oil in the South Atlantic. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28: 571-580.
- Dodds K, Jensen RB and Constantinou CM (2015) Signposts: Cyprus, the UK and the future of the SBAs. *RUSI Journal* 160: 36-45.
- Dodds K and Manóvil L (2001) Back to the future? Implementing the Anglo-Argentine 14th July 1999 joint statement. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 33: 777-806.
- Dowler L (2012) Gender, militarization and sovereignty. *Geography Compass* 6/8: 490-499.
- Dowler L, Christian J and Ranjbar A (2014) A feminist visualisation of the intimate spaces of security. *Area* 46: 347-349.
- Enloe C (1993) *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. London: University of California Press.
- Escudé C (1988) Argentine territorial nationalism. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 20: 139-165.
- Giles W and Hyndman J (eds) (2004) *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Los Angeles: University of California Press
- FCO (2016) UK and Argentina agree joint statement on areas of mutual cooperation. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-and-argentina-agree-joint-statement-on-areas-of-mutual-cooperation> (accessed 28 November 2017).
- Fernandez-Armesto F (2012) Thirty years on, the British still can't admit the truth about the Falklands. *The Independent*, 30 March 2012. Available at:

<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/felipe-fernandez-armesto-thirty-years-on-the-british-still-cant-admit-the-truth-about-the-falklands-7604005.html> (accessed 1 December 2017).

Fluri JL (2009) Geopolitics of gender and violence 'from below'. *Political Geography* 28: 259-265.

Fontes LA (2004) Ethics in Violence Against Women Research: The Sensitive, the Dangerous, and the Overlooked, *Ethics & Behavior* 14: 141-174.

Gold P (2004) Sovereignty negotiations and Gibraltar's military facilities: how two 'red-line' issues became three. *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 15: 375-84.

Gold P (2009) Gibraltar at the United Nations: caught between a Treaty, the Charter and the 'Fundamentalism' of the Special Committee. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 20: 697-715.

Governor's Office Stanley (2017) Governor's address to the Falkland Islands Legislative Assembly. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/governors-address-to-the-falkland-islands-legislative-assembly> (accessed 28 November 2017).

Haste C (1994) *Rules Of Desire: Sex in Britain, World War I to the Present*. London: Pimlico

Hyndman J (2004) Mind the gap: bridging feminist and political geography through geopolitics. *Political Geography* 23: 307-322.

Koch N (2011) Security and gendered national identity in Uzbekistan. *Gender, Place & Culture* 18: 499-518.

Koopman S (2016) Beware: your research may be weaponized. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 106: 530-535.

*La Opinión* (2017) Censo en Malvinas, 5 March 2017. Available at: <http://diariolaopinion.com.ar/noticia/174617/censo-en-malvinas> (accessed 28 November 2017).

Marqués JL (2000) *Fuckland: Cine Ficción/Verdad*. Atomic Films: Buenos Aires.

Marshall DJ (2014) Love stories of the occupation: storytelling and the counter-geopolitics of intimacy. *Area* 46: 349-351.

- Mayer T (2004) Embodied nationalisms. In: Staeheli LA, Kofman E and Peake LJ (eds) *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 153-167.
- McElroy D (2013) 'No such thing as Falkland islanders', says Argentine foreign minister. *The Telegraph*, 6 February 2013. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/southamerica/falklandislands/9852717/No-such-thing-as-Falkland-islanders-says-Argentine-foreign-minister.html> (accessed 1 December 2017).
- Mercopress* (2011) Falklands' second visit for Argentina's 'Rugby without borders', 8 March 2011. Available at: <http://en.mercopress.com/2011/03/08/falklands-second-visit-for-argentina-s-rugby-without-borders> (accessed 8 December 2017).
- Mercopress* (2016) Falklands' population in 'constrictive' trend, says Argentine team on the field, 6 February 2016. Available at: <http://en.mercopress.com/2016/02/06/falklands-population-in-constrictive-trend-says-argentine-team-on-the-field> (accessed 28 November 2017).
- Mercopress* (2017) Falklands: next month Argentine families will know results of DNA tests at Darwin cemetery, 24 November 2017. Available at: <http://en.mercopress.com/2017/11/24/falklands-next-month-argentine-families-will-know-results-of-dna-tests-at-darwin-cemetery> (accessed 28 November 2017).
- Niebieskikwiat N (2014) *Kelpers: Ni Ingleses, Ni Argentinos*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.
- Niebieskikwiat N (2017) En las Malvinas quieren imponer visa de entrada para los argentinos. *Clarín*, 1 May 2017. Available at: [https://www.clarin.com/politica/malvinas-quieren-imponer-visa-entrada-argentinos\\_0\\_Hyd3WzB1-.html](https://www.clarin.com/politica/malvinas-quieren-imponer-visa-entrada-argentinos_0_Hyd3WzB1-.html) (accessed 28 November 2017).
- Pain R (2009) Globalized fear? Towards an emotional geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography* 33: 466–486.
- Pain R (2014) Everyday terrorism: connecting domestic violence and global terrorism. *Progress in Human Geography* 38: 531-50.
- Pain R (2015) Intimate war. *Political Geography* 44: 64-73.

- Pain R and Staeheli L (2014) Introduction: intimacy-geopolitics and violence. *Area* 46: 344-360.
- Peretti G and Varisco M (2016) Malvinas: cosmopolitismo, envejecimiento y estancamiento demográfico. In: Lan D (ed) *Geografías en diálogo*. Tandil: Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, pp. 65-72.
- Pinkerton A (2008) 'Strangers in the Night': The Falklands Conflict as a radio war. *Twentieth Century British History* 19: 344-375.
- Philo C (2012) Security of geography/geography of security. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37: 1-7.
- Philo C (2014) Insecure bodies/selves: introduction to theme section. *Social and Cultural Geography* 15: 284-290.
- Pickering S (2017) *Understanding Geography and War: Misperceptions, Foundations, and Prospects*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pinkerton A and Benwell MC (2014) Rethinking popular geopolitics in the Falklands/Malvinas sovereignty dispute: creative diplomacy and citizen statecraft. *Political Geography* 38: 12-22.
- Rose G (1993) *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shackleton Rt. Hon Lord (1976) *Economic Survey of the Falkland Islands* (Vols 1-2), Report. London: Economist Intelligence Unit.
- Sjoberg L (2015) Intimacy, warfare, and gender hierarchy. *Political Geography* 44: 74-76.
- Sjoberg L (2016) Centering Security Studies around felt, gendered insecurities. *Journal of Global Security Studies* 1: 51-63.
- Smith SH (2009) The domestication of geopolitics: Buddhist-Muslim conflict and the policing of marriage and the body in Ladakh, India. *Geopolitics* 14: 197-218.
- Smith S (2012) Intimate geopolitics: religion, marriage, and reproductive bodies in Leh, Ladakh. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102: 1511-1528.

Sobchack V (1977) No Lies: Direct Cinema as Rape. *Journal of the University Film Association* 29: 13-18.

Wastl-Walter D and Staeheli LA (2004) Territory, territoriality, and boundaries. In: Staeheli LA, Kofman E and Peake LJ (eds) *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 141-151.

Williams J and Massaro V (2013) Feminist geopolitics: unpacking (in)security, animating social change. *Geopolitics* 18: 751-758.

Yuval-Davis N (1997) *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage.