



# Against Conferencing-as-usual in times of Genocide: Criminology, Complicity, and Sexual Violence in Palestine

molly rosabelle ackhurst<sup>1</sup> · Shalini Nair<sup>2</sup> · Tanya Serisier<sup>3</sup>

Received: 4 October 2025 / Accepted: 8 October 2025  
© The Author(s) 2025

**Keywords** Palestine · Sexual Violence · Settler Colonialism · Academia · Criminology · Conferencing

## Introduction

This reflection stems from a roundtable convened at the European Society of Criminology Conference (EUROCRIM) in September 2025. Originally proposed as a discussion on expertise and sexual violence research, the session was reconfigured in response to a call by the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) to boycott the conference. In place of the planned roundtable, we delivered a collective statement addressing sexual violence within the context of settler colonialism in Palestine, situating our interventions through reflections on our own positionalities and the broader complicities of Criminology as a discipline and the European Society of Criminology as a disciplinary body. The statement brings together individual reflections grounded in a shared commitment to feminist, anti-colonial, and abolitionist praxis.

As feminist scholars committed to anti-colonial and abolitionist praxis, we understand knowledge production cannot be separated from the material conditions and structures of violence in which it is embedded. This means considering sexual vio-

---

✉ molly rosabelle ackhurst  
[m.r.ackhurst@gre.ac.uk](mailto:m.r.ackhurst@gre.ac.uk)  
Shalini Nair  
[shalini.nair@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:shalini.nair@glasgow.ac.uk)  
Tanya Serisier  
[t.serisier@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:t.serisier@bbk.ac.uk)

<sup>1</sup> University of Greenwich, London, England

<sup>3</sup> University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, UK

<sup>2</sup> Birkbeck, University of London, London, England, U.K.

lence not only as an individual or interpersonal harm, but as a key form of violence within wider colonial, carceral and disciplinary structures, including academia (Jaleel 2021). It was from this position that we chose to not proceed with our scheduled roundtable on the ethics and politics of institutional knowledge production on sexual violence at the European Society of Criminology's (ESC) EUROCRIM 2025 conference in Athens. Instead, we read this statement on sexual violence in the context of Settler Colonialism in Palestine, our own positionality, and the complicities of both Criminology as a discipline and the ESC as a disciplinary body.

The decision was in response to a call for a boycott by the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI 2014), which forms part of the broader Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement – a grassroots, Palestinian-led coalition which has been formally active for two decades, and informally far longer. Where BDS (2024), which focuses broadly on “ending the complicity of complicity of states, corporations, and institutions in Israel’s ongoing, live-streamed genocide” (The Guardian 2024), PACBI attends to “culture washing” and the complicity of academic and cultural institutions in normalising Israeli occupation of Palestine and its apartheid system of governance. Some, including the executive of the ESC, accuse PACBI of opposing academic freedom. However, it is absurd to talk about academic freedom in relation to Palestine and Israel without considering ‘scholasticide’, the destruction of every university in Gaza and the killing of Palestinian scholars, as well as the well-documented ways in which Israeli universities are part of the ongoing denial of Palestinian freedom (Wind 2024).

PACBI’s call for a boycott of the 2025 ESC was due to its complicity in normalising the genocide in Palestine. The ESC executive board refused to exclude participants from illegal Israeli settlement-based Ariel University in the occupied West Bank, or to hold other Israeli universities accountable through land and complicity acknowledgements. It also refused to reconsider its relationship with the American College of Greece (ACG) – a private U.S. institution with strong ties to Israel. Moreover, the ESC board, which issued a strong statement in support of Ukraine (ESC 2022), declined to take a similar stand on Palestine, stating that they do not take “public positions on conflicts occurring outside of Europe” (ESC 2024). The ESC board also rejected a proposal from Criminologists for Palestine (2025), a collective of ESC members who oppose Israel’s genocide, to allow a democratic vote on a motion concerning collaborations with complicit Israeli academic institutions. The motion was discussed, but not voted on, at the conference, although the Board has committed to a subsequent electronic vote on the issues raised. Prior to the conference opening, Panteion University and the Athens municipality withdrew their support for the conference, citing the ESC’s legitimisation of Israeli war crimes. After local organisations also announced protests, the conference proceeded in a highly securitised fashion, heavily policed and with delegates required to show IDs to enter the venue and frequently required to show their conference pass (Criminologists for Palestine 2025).

Since then, on September 16, the UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory (2025) has held that Israel has committed genocide against Palestinians in the Gaza Strip. Its report noted that “sexual and gender-based violence has been widespread and systematic, perpetrated in different

forms since 7 October 2023”. It also states that acts of sexual violence “committed by force, threat of force or coercion, causing severe and extreme psychological harm to the victims” were not just meant to target individuals but were “part of a pattern of collective punishment to fracture, humiliate and subjugate the Palestinian population in its entirety”.

This statement represents our attempt to think through relations of complicity in times of genocide. In doing so we build off of feminism’s rich and vibrant legacy of challenging enclosures – whether of land, knowledge, or bodies. More specifically, we also build off attempts made within this very journal to intervene in harmful academic practices through critical dialogue as well as “wench tactics”, everyday resistance by scholars within hegemonic institutions (Fletcher et al. 2017).

## **Sexual Violence, Palestine, and the Broader Context of Settler Colonialism**

### **Tanya Serisier:**

Sexual violence has always been an intrinsic element of colonial and settler colonial violence, as well as racial systems of segregation and oppression such as apartheid (Abdulhadi 2019). This is seen in the widespread use of sexual violence against oppressed and colonised peoples but also in the use of ‘atrocities stories’ to justify that violence (Sharpe 1993). Casting colonised men as sexually rapacious is a key element in European racist logics and systems of oppression, resulting both in the colonial justifications of ‘white men are saving brown women from brown men’ and in the ‘myth of the black (and Arab and Indian) rapist’ as a justification for other forms of violence and oppression (Davis 2011; Spivak 2015). These logics have meant that in colonial societies and societies built on settler colonialism, sexual violence, and its purported regulation, is a key site where racial and gendered power and oppression meet.

It is for this reason that as critical scholars of sexual violence, we must avoid logics of ‘sex exceptionalism’, treating sexual violence not only as ‘uniquely’ bad but as divorced from other forms of structural violence and power (Gruber 2023). It is also why we must be critically attentive to structural harms generated in the name of responding to or avenging sexual violence. In other words, many of the things that governments and societies do ‘in the name of’ responding to sexual violence have other intentions and effects.

Since late 2023 a major element of my research has been studying the mobilisation of claims of sexual violence by Hamas and other Palestinians on October 7th in order to justify Israel’s genocidal military campaign (Matthews and Serisier 2024). This has included, among other things, attempts to conscript Western feminists, and their opposition to sexual violence, into support for Israel’s actions. As so often happens in colonial contexts, this has sat alongside the continued normalisation of sexual violence committed against Palestinians. This is a key example of the ways in which the production of knowledge and expertise around sexual violence is itself part of the wider structures that produce and enable that violence.

**molly ackhurst:**

It is also important for us to remember, and be very clear on, the ways in which sexual violence has been used against Palestinian people by the Israeli state, and also why.

Structural and systemic usages of sexual violence against Palestinians have been documented since the very outset of the Nakba. In the Safsaf massacre of October 1948, survivors and even Israeli military records attest to the rape of Palestinian women and girls (Falah 1996). In the years following 1967, under occupation, sexual violence has only been further embedded into carceral and security regimes. International organisations documented practices in Israeli prisons and detention centers against Palestinian men, women, and children. In 2025 numerous organisations including the UN and Amnesty (2025) reiterated that Israel has systematically used sexual, reproductive and other gender-based violence against Palestinians since October 2023 as part of ongoing genocidal acts.

These acts of sexual violence are part of the terror through which the Israeli state consolidated itself, and continues to maintain authority. Thinking with Patrick Wolfe's (2016) work on race and colonialism we can understand these acts of violence as central to the management of the colonial project of Israel, underpinning each of the four e's which make up what he calls a "logic of elimination" that continues to this day in Palestine. Notably, as Wolfe writes, this eliminationist logic is not simply about the removal of a population. Instead, it is made up of a mix of extraction, exploitation, expropriation and expulsion. In this way, it is essential to understand that at its core the Israeli state is an economic and expansionist project which cannot be separated from neo-colonial and imperial projects.

Feminist work has long shown that sexual violence is a tool of power and control (D.C. Rape Crisis Centre 1972; Kelly 1988; Bevacqua 2000), and the acts deployed and emboldened by the Israeli state are no different. We must thus acknowledge that when sexual violence is wielded against Palestinian people it is to humiliate, denigrate, and break their resistance so that Israel can continue to assert its violent dominance, and further its logic of elimination. In this way, sexual violence in the Palestinian context is not simply a series of isolated crimes, but a technology of colonial rule, and one that is central to the governance of occupied populations.

And yet as Tanya has touched on, many who have purported to know sexual violence to be rooted in power have turned away from this knowledge, allowing reports of sexual violence perpetrated by Palestinian people to further support for - and in turn invisibilise the structural violence of - Israel. Here again we see the cogs of the logic of elimination at work, as those with greater epistemic authority (the coloniser and those who embolden this project) are given voice, heard and believed in ways that the colonised are not. And it is because of this that zooming in and attending to epistemic systems and that which underpin them (such as notions of expertise) is so essential.

#### **Shalini Nair:**

Building on what Tanya and molly have noted so far, we, as researchers committed to dismantling these structural oppressions, wish to highlight the sustained lack of focus on colonialism and racialisation within the discourse of sexual violence. As a journalist and researcher on social inequality in India for nearly two decades,

now based in UK academia, this elision in knowledge-production within the colonial metropole seems particularly disturbing and deliberate.

Sexual violence, based on the racialised dehumanisation of much of the global South, has been intrinsic to European colonialism, settler colonialism, and the transatlantic slave trade. The motif of colonised lands as the female body, to be reined in by the masculine coloniser, recurs across artworks, cartography, and poems (Loomba 2005). This motif persists across periods, from the European conquests of the Renaissance to the heydays of British imperialism. It continues to be central to Western neo-imperialism, including its numerous proxy wars that persistently devastate the global South.

In a study that draws on the Public Committee Against Torture in Israel (PCATI) database for 2005–2012, Daniel Weishut (2015) documents the systematic use of sexual violence to torture Palestinian men and children into confessions in Israeli detention. This includes verbal abuse, forced nudity, rape and threats against female relatives. A quarter of the victims were under the age of twenty, a majority of whom were minors. This is in keeping with the practice *Nādirah Shalhūb-Kīfūrkiyān* (2019) terms ‘unchildling’ - the violent, racist, and sexist project of stripping Palestinian children of their childhood to serve the ends of settler colonialism.

Official acknowledgement of state-sanctioned sexual violence rarely exists; when it does, it is attributed to the deviant acts of a few bad apples within an otherwise efficient policing and military system. For instance, the gang rape and murder of a Bedouin girl by the Israeli army in 1949 came to light only in 2003, following a Haaretz article based on previously classified military documents, an incident hauntingly reconstructed in Palestinian writer Adania Shibli’s novel *Minor Detail* (Lavie and Goralı 2003; Shibli 2020). Most soldiers convicted in the case received light sentences, while there was no accountability sought from the settler colonial state itself. This is part of a broader pattern that continues to date, as is evident in the muted response to a 2024 video of a Palestinian prisoner raped by the guards at a detention facility in the Negev desert in southern Israel (Ali 2024).

Sexual violence is central to colonial and settler-colonial regimes and to maintaining control over dissident populations and dispossessing them. This violence is enacted differently on children, women, men, and queer communities, from the everyday sexual humiliation of Palestinians to the sexualised torture in Israeli prisons and detention centres. However, liberal feminist discourses often frame sexual violence in “conflict” as occurring only among non-Western populations, carried out by non-state actors, a framing that goes a long way in obscuring the sexual violence that is central to Zionist settler colonialism (Medien 2021). In fact, the very term “conflict” used in mainstream discourse on Israel-Palestine, including by the ESC, attributes equal responsibility to both sides without accounting for the underlying power inequalities of settler colonial oppression and anticolonial resistance. We must break from this epistemic whiteness, building our collective struggle against sexual violence on the foundation of anti-colonial feminist politics.

## **Positionality and the Complicities of Criminology as a Discipline**

**Tanya Serisier:**

The context in which this conference occurs, both broadly and specifically, highlights the importance of thinking about how we confer authority and expertise, and the role that authority and expertise around sexual violence play, both socially and politically. We've also seen the ways in which politicised forms of expertise are constructed in order to create specific and partial narratives around sexual violence, from Sheryl Sandberg, famous *Lean In* feminist, creating a documentary film (*Screams Before Silence Film* 2024) positioning herself as an expert on sexual violence, to the highly flawed reporting of the *New York Times* (Gettleman et al. 2023).

The “selective outrage” around sexual violence in this conflict once again asks us to follow Ahmed (2000) in querying what kinds of knowledge are produced in relation to sexual violence in colonial settings and to follow numerous critical feminist scholars who ask us to consider how speech and silence around rape co-exist and reproduce each other along axes of power.

Speaking as a white woman from a settler-colonial society, I have also felt compelled to consider the interpellation of white Western feminists as occupying privileged positions of knowing and condemning certain forms of sexual violence. When Netanyahu gave his speech on sexual violence on October 7 in English and directly asked western feminists ‘where the hell are you?’ this was a call to contribute to and participate in a colonial politics of knowledge production around sexual violence (Prime Minister’s Office 2023). It is this call that has grounded my own work alongside Palestinian, Israeli and other feminists to produce knowledge that avoids what Mhajne (2024) has described as the “paradox of weaponisation and denial” that is often presented as the only option in relation to sexual violence, particularly in situations of colonial violence and conflict.

What is clear, however, is that these are not equal spaces. Representatives of the ESC have spoken repeatedly about ‘free speech’ and ‘open, scholarly exchange’. But as is clear, here and elsewhere, open, scholarly exchange and academic freedom are aspirations, not business as usual, when we consider the knowledge and expertise economies of colonialism. As Said (1978) most famously but many other anti-colonial scholars have shown, economies of knowledge production are themselves colonial in colonial situations and institutions. Hence the calls to ‘decolonise’ academic spaces that have seen themselves as performing open, scholarly exchange for decades or even centuries.

#### **molly ackhurst:**

Reflecting critically on conference environments and academic practices more broadly also invites us to ask questions of the pulls of expertise and who the ‘figure of the expert is’ - and the particular the ways in which expertise around sexual violence becomes tethered to particular bodies, affects, and claims to authority. Or to put this differently, examining our continued conferencing in a time of genocide forces us to question why we as feminist sexual violence researchers may wish to embody the figure of the expert and also what the compromises being an ‘expert’ may try to demand of us (Naples 2003).

In thinking then about why feminists may wish to ‘become’ and embody the expert – and what’s required to do so my own journey into academia is of use. I came to this work from British frontline sexual violence support services, spaces largely dominated by white, middle-class women, much like the critical feminist academy I later

entered—particularly its branches focused on sexual violence. Looking back, I see how these experiences and my positionality shaped my investment in the figure of the feminist expert. Through this work I saw first-hand the awfulness of sexual violence day in and day out, which in turn left me deeply and affectively attached to solving the devastating impact of sexual violence for the survivors who I felt so deeply for (ackhurst 2024). For I believed that embodying the expert could be a means to that end. That belief was further underpinned by a sense that my authority was tied to a certain kind of feminist “led-by” politics of listening (ackhurst 2025; see also Serisier 2024). From recent interviews I’ve conducted with British feminist academics, I know this impulse is not mine alone. Many of us arrive at this work to fix, to speak with and for wounded survivors, and to transform harm. While incredibly mobilising, asking questions of these shared commitments and what they produce is also essential. For instance what does it mean that so many of us do this work due to a desire to solve the problem of sexual violence? And what does it mean that our authority is often tied to the voices of survivors and the ways we are able to “give them voice”, with their untainted, unquestioned, voices becoming raw material for our authority, especially when “listening” is imagined as a route toward academic or professional expertise?

In some instances, I would suggest that the pull of expertise may result in feminists who work around sexual violence seeing their project as more vital than others. This is perhaps because of longstanding feminist legacies that have positioned sexual violence as *the* central political concern – where standing with survivors and committing to ending such harm has been seen not just as one part of feminist work, but often *the* moral and political priority. Alongside this, due to feminist concerns over maintaining the transgressive nature of survivor discourse (Alcoff and Gray 1993), ‘correct’ representation of this speech is frequently understood as essential so as to maintain its inherently transgressive nature. Yet there are risks to this feminist politics. The most significant of these is that this politics and work may invisibilise feminist listening practices that are “led-by” those who are most able to embody the wounded survivor, whilst also failing to question the fact that asking critical questions of the demands of survivors – especially when their speech is (mis)used to embolden violent projects – may at times be essential. The outcomes of this type of politics have played out since October 7th, where Palestinian stories of sexual violence de-legitimised, for a manifold of reasons. However, we also saw this politics operate in a smaller scale at this ESC conference, where some feminists described their work as more important rather than relinquishing power and taking actions such as following the PACBI guidelines.

In this sense, the conference and academia is not and must never be seen of as a neutral space of scholarly exchange but a stage on which feminist researchers – including myself – navigate competing pulls: the desire to witness, the drive to advocate, but also the temptation to consolidate authority by listening and in turn speaking for some survivors all the while turning away from others. This is sharpened when the context is genocide, where the stakes of knowledge production are amplified, and where the moral urgency of testimony seems to invite, almost demand, expertise. If feminist listening is to be more than another form of appropriation, it is essential to resist the affective pull to embody the expert, and to step back from the moral comfort of ‘standing with survivors’ as a claim to authority.

**Shalini Nair:**

We wish to clarify that none of us are Palestinian scholars and therefore do not claim to be authoritative voices on Palestine. This statement is informed by our research, positionality, and solidarity. As a woman of colour from formerly colonised India, my journalism and academic research examine how British colonialism in the Indian subcontinent produced enduring forms of gendered violence. My work also looks at the impunity claimed by post-colonial India for enforced disappearances, sexual violence, and sexualised torture in Kashmir, revealed through the persistent efforts of Kashmiri activists and scholars (Nair 2022). As a researcher committed to reframing understandings of sexual oppression and resistance from the margins (Nair 2023), I aim to challenge such impunity wherever it persists, both inside and beyond academia.

Criminology as a discipline and the criminal justice system as a praxis have their origins in the need to legitimise the colonial state's enslavement and colonisation of peoples, expropriation of land, resources, and labour, and suppression of rebellions. Much of the work within this discipline remains focused on reforming the colonial, carceral state, rarely holding the imperial powers accountable for the genocide of Indigenous populations or ecocide on their lands. Given this history, criminology is implicated, and therefore organisations such as the ESC (2025) must do more than simply facilitate "scholarly exchanges." While the ESC has taken a strong stance and made commitments regarding Ukraine, it has refrained from a similar position on Palestine, claiming it does not address conflicts outside Europe (ESC 2022; 2024). The developed world of Europe is itself a product of colonialism, the violence inflicted beyond its borders and, the extraction of resources from 'outside of Europe.' The works of Palestinian scholars such as Rashid Khalidi, Edward Said, and Israeli historian Ilan Pappé have implicated Europe's role in the Zionist settler-colonial project in Palestine - from the dehumanising Orientalist discourses to active political and military support, and the criminalisation of any show of Palestinian solidarity (Said 2015; Pappé 2007; Khalidi 2020).

Likewise, much of the research on gendered violence within Criminology continues to seek solutions from, to use abolitionist Mariame Kaba's (2021) term, the criminal punishment system. This approach overlooks the criminal punishment system's long-standing colonial legacies that disproportionately impact racialised and marginalised populations across the globe. Such feminisms have frequently aligned with the white man's project of "saving brown women from brown men", coded specifically as Muslim in the post 9/11 world (Abu-Lughod 2002; Spivak 2015). It reflects a limited understanding of how colonialism and racial hierarchies underpin the current global order. We, therefore, commit to challenging imperial feminist and, as Puar (2013) terms it, homo-nationalist discourses that obscure Israel's gendered violence against Palestinians.

## A Call to Disrupt Conferencing in Times of Genocide

**Tanya Serisier:**

We have all grappled with questions of participation/attendance at this conference following the PACBI call to boycott, but also the parallel calls to attend and intervene

in the conference. The fact is that these questions are structural and require structural analysis and intervention, which was part of the collective impetus for this panel and its topic. We are aware of both the risks of ceding space completely so that the ‘views’ and perspective of the European society of criminology and, by extension of European criminologists are decided without the interventions of pro-Palestine and anti-colonial voices. We are also aware of participation being co-opted by the knowledge economy as usual of neoliberal academia, where it doesn’t matter what you say as long as you say it in the right institutional setting, and where the most radical content can also be subject to the same logics of production and institutional reputation-building. Indeed, the ESC committee and conference organisers have pointed to the existence of pro-Palestine talks and speakers on the programme as reason to continue to participate and have these discussions and debates ‘within’ the context of the conference as usual.

It is for these reasons that we need to question the dynamics and production of knowledge authority and expertise – the conditions that grant authority and legitimacy to speech and interventions. There are multiple ways of intervening and disrupting this knowledge-economy-as-usual, but there are also multiple institutional constraints that prohibit and prevent this disruption and this affects us all unequally – in relation to seniority, relative precarity or stability of employment, nationality and visa status, class, gender and race. What is clear, we suggest, is that the circumstances of this conference introduce these as matters of urgency and for urgent addressing. What does it mean for us to be here in an academic space like this in a time of genocide, rising authoritarianism and climate emergency? How do we inhabit and claim these spaces differently and pull them towards different ends? What options are available to us individually and collectively?

**molly ackhurst:**

All of us here have reckoned with the question of whether to attend this conference at all in light of the PACBI call for boycott. Yet boycott and disengagement also carry different stakes depending on positionality: for senior colleagues, with established reputations and institutional security, refusing a platform can be a deliberate and strategic form of intervention. One Tanya made effectively when she withdrew from the conference entirely one week prior to its commencement. For those of us – like Shalini and I – who are earlier on or in more precarious positions, with contracts that depend on visibility, output, or networks, the decision not to attend is different (Burton 2018). Not only that but it is also less likely to carry any political weight, thus contributing to a system where – as Vossen (2017) notes – academics both “publish AND perish”. In that sense, the ‘cost’ of boycott is distributed unequally across hierarchies of precarity, race, and geography.

That being said, boycott is not our only tool for resistance. If conferencing is business as usual for neoliberal academia, then the task for feminist anti-colonial researchers is to disrupt the very terms of business as usual — to create practices of listening, refusal, and interruption that do not simply reproduce the knowledge economy. Here I am thinking with Tanya’s (2024) work on political listening, and my own (ackhurst 2025) on the importance of shifting away from a ‘led by’ politics towards one that instead centres.

Part of this work also means acknowledging our own positionality. For instance, I myself am an ECR yes, but also one who is white and middle class with a permanent position. Being honest about the pressures I face is key, but so too is refusing to allow these to become an excuse for silence. In this vein a further part of this work means recognising that even the smallest acts of disruption — withholding expertise, unsettling authority, insisting on different listening practices — can matter, especially when coordinated collectively. Indeed, this is what formative work by the likes of Cooper (2014) on everyday utopias reminds us. That change can - and does - happen through spaces that work to create “the change they wish to encounter, building and forging new ways of experiencing social and political life” (Copper 2014: 2).

The question that remains however is how we carry these practices beyond this room, how we build solidarities that make it possible for all of us — regardless of career stage, employment status, or institutional location — to boycott, to disrupt, and to reclaim space without simply reproducing the inequalities we seek to undo. While no easy task - central to it is that we listen and respond differently as we move forward.

#### **Shalini Nair:**

This statement protests the ESC’s dismal position on the ongoing genocide in Palestine and its failure to situate it within the century-long Palestinian struggle for self-determination. It aims to make visible the discipline’s historical entanglements with the colonial and carceral project, which it continues to uphold, as is evident from the heavy presence of security forces at this very venue. More importantly, our statement and the visible symbols of Palestinian solidarity on our bodies are meant to signify that no conferencing-as-usual should take place amid a relentless, two-year-long genocide. This is our stand against the complicities and the strategic silences within the academia, the media and other normative spaces, and an effort to forge broader solidarities. As an immigrant from the global South on a visa and a non-permanent academic contract, I am cognisant of the potential risks, both within academia and beyond, in taking this stand. However, for those of us who understand the unequal colonial-neoliberal world order from the vantage of the margins, it would be unconscionable not to use every privilege and reclaim every space to speak out on Palestine.

## **Epilogue**

We wish to stress again that the above statement, and our decision to withdraw our original roundtable from the ESC’s conference is not an isolated gesture. It is instead part of a broader feminist commitment to transnational solidarity, and collective struggle against imperial and authoritarian state violence. Feminist work has long recognised that genocidal violence – whether in Palestine, Myanmar, Congo, or Sudan – is enabled and sustained by international systems of racial capitalism, militarism, and authoritarianism. As we have charted here, central to these systems, and in turn to sexual violence itself, are the processes and practices of knowledge production which academic boycott demands be interrupted.

As we seek to counter the ongoing impacts of settler colonialism, racial capitalism and other intersecting structural violences, boycotts are not, of course, a complete solution. They do, however, ask us to pose the question asked by the editors of *Feminist Legal Studies* in their discussion of “wench tactics”: “How does feminism enact openings and closings in conditions of violence?” (Fletcher et al. 2017) One answer to this question is to disrupt the logics of “academia as normal”, where scholasticide in Gaza is not a threat to academic freedom, but refusing to legitimate a university constructed illegally as part of a process of forced displacement and ethnic cleansing is. To “conference as usual” in these circumstances is to refuse to acknowledge the conditions of violence that sit at the heart of much academic practice. The ethics of boycott, in contrast, can and must be understood as part of the work of feminism, which asks not only that we withdraw, but also put in the sustained labour to create different forms of accountability and resistance. In this sense, engaging in BDS and following the PACBI guidelines are also intricately connected to efforts to challenge the structures that underpin the emergence of reactionary fascisms across contexts - from the carceral state and widespread anti-immigration mobilisations in the US and UK to anti-gender politics in Hungary and beyond. And now, more than ever, it is essential that we work to form a politics that rejects complicity and insists on collective liberation.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## References

- Abdulhadi, Rabab. 2019. Israeli settler colonialism in context: Celebrating (Palestinian) death and normalizing gender and sexual violence. *Feminist Studies* 45: 541–573.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2002. Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others. *American Anthropologist* 104: 783–790. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2002.104.3.783>.
- ackhurst, molly. 2024. Collaging carceral entrapments and reorienting to the imagination. *Feminist Review* 138: 84–98.
- ackhurst, molly. 2025. Listening, or Led-by? Belief, Innocence, and the risks of a Survivor-Led feminist politics. *Feminist Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14647001251380418>
- Ahmed, Sara. 2000. Who knows? Knowing strangers and strangeness. *Australian Feminist Studies* 15: 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713611918>.
- Alcoff, Linda, and Laura Gray. 1993. Survivor discourse: Transgression or recuperation? *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 18: 260–290.
- Ali, Faisal. 2024. Israeli Media Airs Footage Showing Alleged Sexual Abuse of Palestinian Detainee – Video. *The Guardian*, August 8. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2024/aug/08/israeli-media-alleged-sexual-abuse-palestinian-detainee-video>. Accessed 1 October 2025.

- Amnesty International. 2025. UN report on Israel's gender-based violence and genocidal acts against women's health facilities must spur action to protect Palestinians. Amnesty International, March 13. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2025/03/un-report-on-israels-gender-based-violence-and-genocidal-acts-against-womens-health-facilities-must-spur-action-to-protect-palestinians/>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Bevacqua, Maria. 2000. *Rape on the public agenda: Feminism and the politics of sexual assault*. Boston: Northeastern University.
- Burton, Sarah. 2018. Writing yourself in? The price of playing the (Feminist) game in the neoliberal university. In *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university*, ed. Kinneret Lahad, 115–136. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Cooper, Davina. 2014. *Everyday utopias: The conceptual life of promising spaces*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Criminologists for Palestine. 2025. Criminologists for Palestine. <https://criminologists4palestine.wordpress.com/>. Accessed 23 September 2025.
- Davis, Angela Y.. 2011. *Women, Race, and class*. London: Vintage.
- ESC. 2022. Declaration of the Executive Board of the European Society of Criminology concerning the war in Ukraine, 21 April 2022. April 21. <https://escnewsletter.org/archive/declaration-of-the-executive-board-of-the-esc-concerning-the-war-in-ukraine-21-april-2022>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- ESC. 2024. Statement of the Executive Board of the European Society of Criminology on International Conflicts Outside Europe. November 8. <https://esc-eurocrim.org/v2/news/>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- ESC. 2025. Statement of the Executive Board of the European Society of Criminology. August 31. <https://esc-eurocrim.org/v2/news/>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Falah, Ghazi. 1996. The 1948 Israeli-Palestinian war and its aftermath: The transformation and de-signification of Palestine's cultural landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86: 256–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1996.tb01753.x>.
- Fletcher, Ruth, Diamond Ashiagbor, Nicola Barker, et al. 2017. Wench tactics? Openings in conditions of closure. *Feminist Legal Studies* 25: 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10691-017-9355-y>.
- Gettleman, Jeffrey, Anat Schwartz, Adam Sella, and Avishag Shaar-Yashuv. 2023. Screams without words: How Hamas weaponized sexual violence on Oct. 7. The New York Times December 28. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/28/world/middleeast/oct-7-attacks-hamas-israel-sexual-violence.html>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Gruber, Aya. 2023. Sex exceptionalism in criminal law. *Stanford Law Review* 75:755–846.
- Jaleel, Rana. 2021. *The work of rape*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kaba, Mariame. 2021. *We do this 'Til we free us: Abolitionist organizing and transforming justice*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Kelly, Liz. 1988. *Surviving sexual violence*. Bristol: Polity.
- Khalidi, Rashid Ismail. 2020. *The hundred years' war on palestine: A history of settler colonialism and Resistance, 1917–2017*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Lavie, Aviv, and Moshe Goral. 2003. I saw fit to remove her from the world. Ha'aretz October 29. <https://www.haaretz.com/2003-10-29/ty-article/i-saw-fit-to-remove-her-from-the-world/0000017f-db62-d856-a37f-ffe2fa5b0000>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Loomba, A. 2005. *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Matthews, Heidi, and Tanya Serisier. 2024. 'Bombing Gaza Isn't Fighting Sexual Violence'. *Counterpunch*, January 16. <https://www.counterpunch.org/2024/01/16/bombing-gaza-isnt-fighting-sexual-violence/>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Medien, Kathryn. 2021. Israeli settler colonialism, humanitarian warfare, and sexual violence in Palestine. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 23: 698–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2021.1882323>.
- Mhajne, Anwar. 2024. Understanding Sexual Violence Debates Since 7 October: Weaponization and Denial. *Journal of Genocide Research*, May: 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2024.2359851>
- Nair, Shalini. 2022. 'Memory is the most important strategy in kashmir: Khurram Parvez, on Thirty-One years since Kunan poshpora'. *The Caravan: A Journal of Politics & Culture*, February 23. <https://caravanmagazine.in/gender/kashmir-khurram-parvez-kunan-poshpora-memory-thirty-one-years>
- Nair, Shalini. 2023. Speak-out movements from the margins: An intersectional and spatial analysis of sexual violence in India. *Journal of Gender Studies* 33 (1): 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2023.2216637>.

- Naples, Nancy A.. 2003. Deconstructing and locating survivor discourse: Dynamics of narrative, empowerment, and resistance for survivors of childhood sexual abuse. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28: 1151–1185.
- PACBI. 2014. PACBI Guidelines for the International Cultural Boycott of Israel | BDS Movement. July 15. <https://bdsmovement.net/pacbi/cultural-boycott-guidelines>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Pappé, Ilan. 2007. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. London: Oneworld Publications.
- Prime Minister's Office. 2023. Statement by PM Netanyahu. December 5. <https://www.gov.il/en/pages/ev-ent-press051223>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2013. Rethinking homonationalism. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 45: 336–339.
- Rape Crisis, D. C. 1972. Centre. How to Start a Rape Crisis Centre. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED108060>. Accessed 15 May 2024.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism: Western concepts of the orient*. New York: Pantheon.
- Said, Edward W.. 2015. *The question of Palestine*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Screams Before Silence Film*. 2024. Kastina Communications. <https://www.screamsbeforesilence.com/>
- Serisier, Tanya. 2024. A precondition for justice: Political Listening, feminism and sexual violence. *Social & Legal Studies* 0(0):1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09646639241278567>
- Shalhūb-Kīfūrkiyān, N.ādīrah. 2019. *Incarcerated childhood and the politics of unchilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharpe, Jenny. 1993. *Allegories of empire: The figure of woman in the colonial text*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shibli, Adania. 2020. Minor detail. Translated by E Jaquette. London: Fitzcarraldo Editions.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2015. Can the subaltern speak? In *Colonial discourse and Post-Colonial theory*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 66–111. London: Routledge.
- UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory. 2025. Legal analysis of the conduct of Israel in Gaza pursuant to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. September 16. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/sessions-regular/session60/advance-version/a-hrc-60-crp-3.pdf>. Accessed 1 October 2025.
- Vossen, Emma. 2017. Publish and perish: On publishing, precarity and poverty in academia. *Journal of Working-Class Studies* 2: 121–135.
- Weishut, Daniel, J. N. 2015. Sexual torture of Palestinian men by Israeli authorities. *Reproductive Health Matters* 23:71–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rhm.2015.11.019>
- Wind, Maya. 2024. *Towers of Ivory and steel: How Israeli universities deny Palestinian freedom*. London: Verso Books.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2016. *Traces of history: Elementary structures of race*. London: Verso Books.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.