

Rethinking Masculinity and Practices of Violence in Conflict Settings

Article (Accepted Version)

Kirby, Paul and Henry, Marsha (2012) Rethinking Masculinity and Practices of Violence in Conflict Settings. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 14 (4). pp. 445-449. ISSN 1461-6742

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/40796/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Rethinking Masculinity and Practices of Violence in Conflict Settings

Accepted for publication in the
International Feminist Journal of Politics, Vol. 14, No. 4 (2012)

Reviewed Pre-Publication Copy

Paul Kirby
Department of International Relations
University of Sussex
Falmer
Brighton
BN1 9SJ
p.c.kirby@sussex.ac.uk

Marsha Henry
Gender Institute
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London
WC2A 2AE
m.g.henry@lse.ac.uk

September 2012

Why rethink masculinity and conflict? After all, the connection of men and masculinities to organised (and seemingly unorganised) violence has been subject to considerable academic scrutiny over the last decades, not least as part of the feminist critique of disciplinary International Relations (IR) (Zalewski and Parpart 1998; Parpart and Zalewski 2008; Enloe 2000; Hooper 2001; Hansen 2001). It is now increasingly common for texts to both note the unequal character of gendered violence (it is predominantly men who do the killing and the maiming) *and* to stress the contingent and sometimes paradoxical status of this situation (women kill and maim too, and the content of 'man' and 'woman' varies significantly over time, space and context). Elite institutions still prove stubbornly resistant to teaching gender, feminism and sexuality within 'the international', despite introductory texts which increasingly offer such insights to the curious student (Foster, Kerr, Hopkins, Byrne and Åhäll 2012; Shepherd 2009). Certainly, feminist and gender scholars write often of multiplicity in masculinities, of constructions of gendered agency, and of representations of violence as themselves constitutive of gender (Coleman and Bassi 2011; Gentry 2012; Åhäll 2012; Shepherd 2006). The analysis of gender within global politics has also moved beyond the level of the state and war to interrogate the full spectrum of social life, from popular culture to political economy.

Some are more sceptical of this situation, warning that the actions and power of *men* themselves are obscured in the consensus that there are many *masculinities* (McCarry 2007). At the same time as they direct attention to the material practices of men (and not just abstracted constructions of 'masculinity') such criticisms also tend to gloss over rich and situated examples of critical theorising on precisely those themes (see, for example, Hearn 2004). A different brand of critic has suggested that feminism may be incapable of properly analysing the variety of gendered experiences in conflict (Jones 1996). But here too, a comprehensive history of the field instead reveals many close and nuanced considerations of men and women at war (Eriksson Baaz and Stern 2009; Belkin 2012; Carver, Cochran and Squires 1998; Hooper 2001; Hutchings 2008b; MacKenzie 2009).

Nevertheless, ambiguities do persist in the way feminist and gender scholars describe and account for masculinity (Clatterbaugh 1998; Hutchings 2008a). Against this background, a number of problems come into sharper focus. First, how are masculinities and violences connected in *specific locations* of power? Second, how do these connections play out *internationally*, in the interactions between political communities, however understood? Third, just how related are gendered identities to *fighting, killing and dying* in conflict settings? And fourth, how do the complexities of violence situated in this way reflect back onto *theorising* about gendered hierarchy and difference?

Some of these questions are more familiar than others, but the collection of articles presented in this special issue of *International Feminist Journal of Politics* substantially addresses all of them. In the first place, demonstrating a significant empirical commitment, each contribution also includes careful theoretical reflection on both gender and conflict. They are united too by a keen awareness of the intersectionality of gender with other social fields, and by attention to the resulting layers of performance and identity. This comes out particularly strongly where differential international and inter-communal placements of race, ethnicity and nation come into play: for Paul Higate in the contrast between consensual bonding amongst 'Western' security professionals and the more coercive interactions between them and racialised colleagues; for Ruth Streicher in the perhaps surprising valorisation of Thai soldiers (and their 'civilised' uniforms) in the eyes of Malay-Muslim girls and women; for Megan MacKenzie and Marianne Bevan in the idea of

cautious and restrained New Zealand police culture against a more aggressive Timor Lestese variant; and for Maria O'Reilly in the projection of a paternalistic 'liberal' identity onto the task of state-building amongst Balkan men posed as devalued and divergent.

A second crucial thread uniting the papers concerns the relation of masculinity to violence. Here the *rethinking* is even clearer, disentangling military masculinities from *war as such*.ⁱ Most prominently, Luisa Maria Dietrich challenges the connection between masculinity and violence by showing how involvement in guerrilla organisations *undid* pre-existing identities, enabling female fighters to gain the status of heroic combatants and leaders usually reserved for men, and re-valuing activities and emotions commonly designated as 'feminine' (cooking, tenderness, mourning) such that male guerrillas embraced them and reflected on them fondly. Tellingly, it was in the period *after* war when gender norms retreated to older patterns. Putatively 'non-gender' factors, such as political vision and class dynamics, are shown to have a major impact on ideas of appropriate gender identity, just as the conditions particular to private military contracting contribute to the status of *fratriarchy* as a dynamic within Higate's account of hazing.ⁱⁱ Across the cases examined, then, masculinities *do* intersect with violence, but in sometimes surprising ways. For example, masculinity and conflict may be connected as much by the *restraint* of violence as by its promotion. Consider Streicher's Thai soldiers, rendered attractive as symbols of cleanliness, civilisation and modernity; or MacKenzie and Bevan's New Zealand police officers, emphasising their training and experience as pacifying aggression; or O'Reilly's reading of Paddy Ashdown as protective father, using his implied strength to settle otherwise warring children.

Finally, the close reading provided by each article reveals a series of disjunctures, slippages and paradoxes in the performance of masculinity. Attempts to articulate a particular form of masculinity fail, remain partial or appear as always in process, part of more-or-less conscious projects of national identity-making (Streicher), of undoing and reforming a particular notion of sovereignty (O'Reilly), of narrating the mission of international 'assistance' (MacKenzie and Bevan), of privatising force in the service of imperial and hegemonic power (Higate) and of revolutionary transformations of social class (Dietrich). So we are reminded again that masculinity (indeed, all gender) is always incomplete, but in a constant dialectic – shifting in different fields, and established temporarily and evasively.

And yet this collection of papers also gestures towards some continuing problems in the analysis of masculinities and violence. The process of 'rethinking' always leaves one open to the charge of having forgotten some old lessons. In particular, the analysis of a series of phenomena *adjacent* to violence (the party as a male-bonding session, the association of the uniform with state identity, the conditions of guerrilla life, training for peace-time policing or the written reflections of a High Representative) may lead us to neglect the role of masculine violence itself. The field of war envelops much beyond combat, and to speak of a 'conflict setting' is to speak of much more than fighting, killing and dying, which take up a relatively small part of it. And yet it is these activities that are transformative, and it is in relation to them that other martial practices are aligned. They are complex forms of social organisation, but it is the *violence* which they organise. This need not imply any functionalist support, as if uniforms *only* exist so that there can be armies, but it does suggest a need to remain attentive to what it is that *violence itself* accomplishes in gender orders. We do not, then, propose that masculinity and violence have been successfully rethought wholesale, but the exceptional contributions to this issue do expose, interrogate and assess gender and violence as interwoven processes in motion.

References

- Åhäll, L. 2012. 'Motherhood, Myth and Gendered Agency in Political Violence', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14 (1): 103-20.
- Barkawi, T. and Brighton, S. 2011. 'Powers of War: Fighting, Knowledge, and Critique', *International Political Sociology* 5 (2): 126-43.
- Belkin, A. 2012. *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898-2001*. London: Hurst.
- Carver, T., Cochran, M. and Squires, J. 1998. 'Gendering Jones: Feminisms, IR, Masculinities', *Review of International Studies* 24 (2): 283-97.
- Clatterbaugh, K. 1998. 'What is Problematic About Masculinities?', *Men and Masculinities* 1 (1): 24-45.
- Coleman, L. M. and Bassi, S. A. 2011. 'Deconstructing Militant Manhood', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13 (2): 204-24.
- Enloe, C. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Eriksson Baaz, M. and Stern, M. 2009. 'Why Do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC)', *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (2): 495-518.
- Foster, E., Kerr, P., Hopkins, A., Byrne, C. and Åhäll, L. 2012. 'The Personal Is Not Political: At Least in the UK's Top Politics and IR Departments', *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, DOI:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2011.00500.
- Gentry, C. E. 2012. 'Thinking About Women, Violence and Agency', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14 (1): 79-82.
- Hansen, L. 2001. 'Gender, Nation, Rape: Bosnia and the Construction of Security', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3 (1): 55-75.
- Hearn, J. 2004. 'From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men', *Feminist Theory* 5 (1): 49-72.
- Hooper, C. 2001. *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hutchings, K. 2008a. 'Cognitive Shortcuts: Masculinity Discourses in Theories of Contemporary International Relations', in Parpart, J. L. and Zalewski, M. (eds) *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations*, pp. 23-46. London: Zed Books.
- Hutchings, K. 2008b. 'Making Sense of Masculinity and War', *Men and Masculinities* 10 (4): 389-404.
- Jones, A. 1996. 'Does "Gender" Make the World Go Round?: Feminist Critiques of International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 22 (4): 405-29.
- MacKenzie, M. 2009. 'Securitization and Desecuritization: Female Soldiers in the Reconstruction of Women in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone', *Security Studies* 18 (2): 241-61.

- McCarry, M. 2007. 'Masculinity Studies and Male Violence: Critique of Collusion?', *Women's Studies International Forum* 30 (5): 404-15.
- Parpart, J. L. and Zalewski, M. (eds). 2008. *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations*. London: Zed Books.
- Shepherd, L. J. 2006. 'Veiled References: Constructions of Gender in the Bush Administration Discourse on the Attacks on Afghanistan Post-9/11', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8 (1): 19-41.
- Shepherd, L. J. (ed.). 2009. *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Zalewski, M. and Parpart, J. L. (eds). 1998. *The 'Man' Question in International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

-
- i The extent to which any account of war focuses on the actual practices of fighting and killing is itself subject to some debate. See Barkawi and Brighton (2011).
- ii Indeed, Higate's article is also notable for setting out and extending the much-neglected notion of patriarchy as a form of masculine power and sociality.