



CRESC Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 113

Thin Ice: postcoloniality and sexuality in the politics of citizenship and military service

Vron Ware

CRESC, Open University

July 2012

For further information:

Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC)
Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University,
Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK
Tel: +44 (0)1908 654458 Fax: +44 (0)1908 654488

Email: cresc@manchester.ac.uk *or* cresc@open.ac.uk

Web: www.cresc.ac.uk



Thin Ice: postcoloniality and sexuality in the politics of citizenship and military service

Vron Ware

Vron Ware is a Research Fellow based at the Centre for Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC), and the Centre for Citizenship, Identities and Governance (CCIG) at the Open University. Author of *Beyond the Pale* (1992), *Out of Whiteness* (2002) and *Who Cares about Britishness?* (2007), her study of Commonwealth soldiers in the contemporary British Army (*Military Migrants: Fighting for YOUR country*) is published by Palgrave (2012).

Email: Vron.Ware@open.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper was written for a collection entitled *Gender, Globalization and Violence: postcolonial conflict zones* edited by Sandra Ponzanesi, Department of Media and Culture Studies/Graduate Gender Programme, Utrecht University, the Netherlands, due 2013. The book will focus on the gendering of violence in specific historical and geopolitical contexts, aiming to establish a link between war and conflict with gender, race and sexuality, together with other axes of differentiation.

The research and thinking for 'Thin Ice' relates to a study of Commonwealth soldiers which was carried out with the support of CRESC Theme 2, Reframing the Nation. The project continues under the heading 'The Militarisation of Everyday life'.

Thin Ice: postcoloniality and sexuality in the politics of citizenship and military service

Paying close attention to the figure of the soldier as a particular kind of worker-citizen can offer an effective means of exposing the hidden material and financial resources that are required to commit a country to war and keep it there. It can also provide a focus for tracking the ideological energy involved in securing public acquiescence and marginalising opposition as a form of disloyalty to the national state. In democratic societies, military culture is regarded as distinct from civilian culture for the simple reason that the armed services exist to deal with the control and use of physical force. The ethos of the British Army, for example, states that ‘Soldiers have the responsibility and legal right to use lethal force, and may be required to lay down their own lives and risk those of their comrades.’ This places the serviceman or woman in a very different position as an employee of the state, arguably making him or her into an exceptional form of public servant, licensed and trained to kill as part of their profession. It is in times of war, when deaths and injuries of soldiers are inevitable, that the profile of armed service work as a form of citizenship that deserves particular rewards comes into view. This point is articulated by the question: do soldiers deserve privileges and exemptions on the basis of their readiness to sacrifice their lives for the nation?

A number of factors are changing the roles that modern soldiers are required to perform: human rights discourse with its emphasis on individual and group rights, risk analysis, privatisation of legalised violence, technological developments and the profound impact of neo-liberalism on the global economy of war. National military institutions now operate alongside and in conjunction with a vast array of civilian NGOs as well as privatised security forces providing remunerative employment to a martial workforce which includes thousands of ex-soldiers from different countries. Examining the construct of the soldier-citizen in different national contexts offers a means to track the changing dimensions of contemporary warfare, particularly when scrutinised through a range of different analytical frames. Asking how, where and why the relationship between soldiers and citizens delineates the boundaries of our political communities suggests important lines of investigation in the search for more effective resistance to war, militarisation and social injustice.

These are questions that resonate powerfully in discussions about the role of armed services in all multicultural and postcolonial societies. They raise issues which, in the UK at least, have far-reaching implications for ordinary citizens who have little or no knowledge of how military organisations work, and they have acquired a new urgency during the decade since 2001, a period in which war has become entrenched in the political life of many NATO countries. One consequence of this process in the UK is that the figure of the soldier has been transformed. Military culture is now ubiquitous throughout the media, constantly visible in news, military bulletins, films, bookshops, documentaries, digital games, forums, art and photography.

Although there has been a proliferation of valuable work on war, security and military intervention since 2001, most of the publications about soldiers themselves have taken the form of memoirs, autobiographies, novels or reportage by embedded journalists. In academic terms, studying the organizational culture of armed forces tends to be the preserve of military social scientists more likely to be grounded in psychology, political science and International Relations than sociology or gender and postcolonial studies.¹ There are, of course, exceptions, but the specialization of defence and security studies militates against a broader engagement with the inter-relationship between civil and military spheres, whether on a national basis or in a comparative context. For example, Anthony King has provided a sociological account of military transformation within Europe’s armed forces as a result of wars in Iraq and

Afghanistan, but this has focused on the ‘operational’ and ‘tactical’ levels rather than management issues within the army or the relationship between armies and the societies from which they draw their ‘manpower’.²

The recent emergence of feminist security studies is an important development, creating a critical space where women’s rights and the politics of gender equality are studied in the context of global governance structures and institutions. Since the issue of women’s rights has been made integral to militarized reconstruction projects as well as becoming a pretext for war itself, a gender-based critique of security discourse in areas of ‘peacekeeping’ and humanitarian intervention is an especially urgent matter. There are two possible problems with this analytical approach, however. First, the development of any specialist field risks accepting the very terms it was originally supposed to disaggregate, becoming embroiled in internal dialogue rather than engagement with a non-academic or non-professional audience. Secondly, a feminist focus on women’s bodies and female agency does not automatically benefit from or concur with an intersectional analysis of ethnicity, sexuality and gender.³ The combination of these problems means that the scrutiny of military institutions remains concealed from wider public view and opportunities to analyse the consequences of war on domestic fronts are likely to be missed.

Tarak Barkawi makes a similar point about this disciplinary lacunae in the introduction to his book *Globalization and War*: ‘Specialists in war and the military pay insufficient attention to society, politics and culture, while sociologists, cultural theorists and to a lesser degree political scientists are not sufficiently attentive to the importance of war to their subject matters. ...war and society stand in a dynamic interrelationship with each other.’⁴ Tracing these faultlines that run between war and society, or, in the context of this essay, between civil and military, can offer insights into the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion at home as well as revealing fundamental issues about a nation’s standing in the world.

The concept of militarisation is central to this project since it opens up this ‘interrelationship’ to those who are neither specialists nor insiders. Cynthia Enloe, whose work has instructed a generation of feminists on how to think critically about military institutions, has defined it as follows:

Militarization is a step-by-step process by which a person or thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas. The more militarization transforms an individual or society, the more that individual or society comes to imagine military needs and militaristic presumptions to be not only valuable but also normal.⁵

Her work has entailed a long-running engagement with processes of militarisation in different national and regional locations, exemplifying from a feminist standpoint what this labour actually entails. Charting the spread of militarisation demands an attention to cultural as well as institutional, ideological and economic transformations, she argues, which means that it requires a host of skills: ‘the ability to read budgets and to interpret bureaucratic euphemisms, of course, but also the ability to understand the dynamics of memory, marriage, hero worship, cinematic imagery and the economies of commercialised sex.’

The complex array of cultural, institutional, ideological and economic transformations that have thrust the armed forces into the public eye in the UK are without doubt covered by the umbrella of militarisation as defined by Enloe. It is worth pointing out that the list of skills required to monitor the processes by which the armed forces are reconnected with civilian life now includes the targeted use of social media as propaganda. With the help of multiple Facebook and Twitter accounts, the Ministry of Defence has been able to access a new dimension of reporting from the war zone, providing a running commentary on successful military operations as well as drawing attention to positive encounters with Afghan civilians

through details of reconstruction projects and human interest stories.⁶ The portrayal of the armed forces as modern, professional, humanitarian and, above all, representative of British society, underlines the importance of recruitment policy as a key element in the inter-relationship between civil and military, society and war.

From a US perspective, Krebs argues that an analysis of military institutions offers particular insights because they act as a hinge that mediates between domestic and international politics.⁷ In an exploration of how that hinge operates as a mechanism of inclusion and exclusion, he asserts that military recruitment policies are instrumental in shaping the politics of citizenship, the definition of the political community, and thus the boundaries of nationality.

Militaries are undeniably social as well as functional institutions, shaped by but also shaping social structures and values. Debates over who serves continue to arouse passion in part because the military's manpower policies are widely viewed as having important implications for citizenship and national identity—arguably a polity's most central questions.⁸

For those researching the politics of citizenship, belonging and national identity, paying attention to an army's employment policies and strategies when the country is at war becomes an important way of investigating the limits of the nation – both an idea and in policy terms as well. I have explored this political sphere in another context, examining the knot of racism, national identity, citizenship and military service that lies at its core.⁹ In the context of this collection my aim is to connect the postcolonial implications of employing migrants and ethnic minorities as soldiers with a gender-based perspective on gender and sexuality in military work. These two analytical projects have their own trajectories but they also overlap - or intersect – in fundamentally important ways.

The alignment between a nation's armed forces and the civil society they are supposed to defend (and represent) is an important feature of democratic societies, and therefore the issue of cultural diversity, which includes ethnicity, sexuality and gender, provides a crucial index of the health (or otherwise) of that inter-relationship. A national armed force that is inclusive conveys fundamental ideas about the terms of citizenship offered by the nation as a political body, while also adding legitimacy to the military as a democratic and progressive institution. Writing about 'the comforting myths' engrained in the popular folklore of American nationalism, Carl Boggs writes:

Nothing is more sacred...than the belief that the United States is a unique and enlightened democracy – for many the greatest system of governance ever known to mortal beings. Where there is democracy, of course, freedom, human rights, justice and equality must surely be close behind.¹⁰

An integrated military can also be a powerful weapon in the global sphere too, serving a strategic purpose in the war to shape perceptions of NATO as a force for good. During the first days of the No Fly Zone (NFZ) imposed on Libya, the first female British Typhoon pilot was deployed in a small contingent of Royal Air Force (RAF) jets. Described as 'the flame-haired "top gun"' in one newspaper, the pilot's gender was used as an occasion to note that there are no bars to women becoming pilots in the RAF.¹¹ Meanwhile, during the same month, the military media operation in Afghanistan posted an item about the 'heroine of Helmand', a 20-year-old member of the Royal Military Police, who had 'made history' by arresting 17 members of the Taliban in 'a single DAY'.¹² The following week, however, both these stories were eclipsed by news from the US media machine boasting that an all-female crew, The Strike Eagles of 'Dudette 07', had 'made history' by carrying out an air mission on the border with Pakistan. It turned out that 'Dudette 07' was set up to mark Women's History Month, and to celebrate the cause of equality in the military.¹³

The UK's position as a leading member of the NATO-led ISAF counter-insurgency in Afghanistan means that it offers a prime case study for analysing the role that its military institutions play at home. Within the past decade the British armed forces have been transformed by the application of modern European employment law as well as techniques derived from Human Resource Management (HRM) emanating from the US. The year 1998 proved to be a significant turning point in this process, beginning with the decision to recruit new soldiers from Commonwealth countries which simultaneously addressed a chronic labour shortage *and* new legal obligations to diversify its workforce.¹⁴ A few weeks after this change was announced, the army widened access to female recruits from 47 to 70 per cent to include all jobs with the exception of infantry and special forces, and introduced a new 'gender free' selection test.¹⁵ The following year, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) declared that the ban on homosexuals serving in the armed forces was illegal, and in 2000 the UK government announced that the armed forces would henceforth recognize sexuality as a private matter.¹⁶ Defence statistics for 2010 show that the army has had a year on year increase in non-UK citizens, rising from 6.6% in 2007 up to 7.9% in 2010.¹⁷ The total figure for ethnic minorities in the army was 2.8% for officers and 10.4% for other ranks, and the corresponding figure for women was also 7.9% in total, with 11.3% officers and 7.3% other ranks.¹⁸

Marching orders

On the same day that UN Resolution 1973 sanctioned the No Fly Zone in Libya, almost eight years after the invasion of Iraq, the UK's most important war hero faced the prospect of public humiliation at home. Dressed in shiny satin clothes and clasping his scantily clad female partner round the waist, Lance Corporal Johnson Beharry, VC, was given his 'marching orders' after reaching the semi-finals of the TV competition, *Dancing on Ice*.¹⁹ His final assignment, a solo performance choreographed to Bobby McFerrin's 'Don't worry, be happy,' was the culmination of months of training, beginning with his first tentative steps on the ice and continuing through the weekly ordeals of condescending judges combined with a brutal system of public voting to eliminate contestants. The degree of sympathy that he received, indicated by his Twitter account, the tabloid press and the reaction in the rink itself, was the least surprising aspect of this entertainment. For anyone paying attention to the process of militarisation in UK society, this spectacle of a young and damaged war hero appearing as a celebrity on prime time TV was further proof of the significant shift in social and cultural attitudes towards soldiers during the past decade.

Beharry has been an important figure in the politics of military service in the UK, not least because of his record in service. He was the first living soldier since 1965 to be awarded the Victoria Cross. While on deployment in Al-Amarah, Iraq, in 2004 he distinguished himself by driving members of his unit to safety on two occasions when they came under heavy fire. After he recovered sufficiently from the serious head injury he received, he was given the award the following year, at the age of 24, and the citation commended him 'For his repeated extreme gallantry and unquestioned valour, despite intense direct attacks, personal injury and damage to his vehicle in the face of relentless enemy action.' Although he has remained in the army, he is not eligible for deployment in Afghanistan as a result of his injuries but he continues to play an important role inside the institution. Buildings are named in his honour and he is frequently cited as a role model, for example, and the status of his award also entitles him to represent the British Army at state events, particularly those that commemorate the war dead. One such occasion was Armistice Day in 2009 when Beharry handed a wreath to the Queen to place on the Tomb of the Unknown British Warrior in Westminster Abbey at a special service to mark the passing of the last soldier actively engaged in the 1914-18 war.

Throughout the series, the endless jokes and puns referring to his military background ensured that the link between masculinity, discipline and heroism remained intact. As his partner and

coach said lovingly on camera, he taught me to be ‘the best of the best’, echoing the famous slogan of British Army’s special forces. At the same time, the synchronized dance routines and costumes offset the normative heterosexuality associated with military culture, a fact which Beharry himself acknowledged when he begged not to be dressed in pink. The exercise was also remarkable, however, in that it forced the soldier to reveal his vulnerability by ‘unlearning’ the stilted body movements associated with the parade ground. Since his rehabilitation Beharry has talked openly about the way that his memory, co-ordination and balance had been affected by his injuries, using his experience to raise funds for charities set up to rehabilitate wounded soldiers. His ability to enthrall an enormous TV audience was partly explained by his struggle to overcome with his own mental impairment through dedication and determination to succeed. This was possibly another reason why he, his trainers and even the judges constantly referred to his progress as ‘a journey’.

Together with his noticeable Caribbean accent, this reminder of how far he had come added a critical element to the increasing visibility of military figures in mainstream public culture. Beharry was not only the sole black competitor taking part in a majority white sport, but he was a minority within the army too. In 2001 he joined as a citizen of Grenada, becoming one of 116 Commonwealth soldiers who joined the 1st Battalion The Princess of Wales’s Royal Regiment that year.²⁰

The symbolic importance of Beharry’s minority status was immeasurable. It transmitted a signal that the armed forces are comfortably multicultural, having successfully overcome their previous reputation for endemic racism and bullying. When he first stepped on to the ice on the opening night of the show, as if on cue, a female voice from the crowd interrupted the brief interval before the music began: ‘You’re a hero!’ she cried. For those who had read Beharry’s autobiography *Barefoot Soldier* this was undeniably an electric moment in this military migrant’s own passage from an impoverished childhood in Grenada to an icon of militaristic national identity in Britain.²¹ For many others it merely underlined the rationale of including a soldier as a celebrity – despite the fact that the real time twitter feed indicated that he was unknown in the world of show business. However, it would be misguided to dismiss the term ‘hero’ as merely a patriotic response to Britain’s wars. Today the term needs to be analysed in the context of a much more complex and politically ambiguous critique of the conditions under which soldiers are expected to serve.

Soldier-citizens

As soon as Blair’s invasion of Iraq began in 2003, documented conflicts between defence chiefs and treasury revealed deep rifts over the funding and suitability of new equipment in Iraq, confirming public perceptions of the lack of protection given to troops on the ground. The steady fatality rate in Iraq and Afghanistan brought the issue of death in service to public attention, a process initiated largely by anti-war activists, including military families of the deceased.²² Throughout these and other developments, a discourse emerged that cast a sympathetic view of the soldier as both a hero, ready to risk life and limb on behalf of fellow citizens, but also a victim of inept and ill-thought out foreign policy. One focus for this disjunction was the Military Covenant campaign, launched in 2007 from the offices of the army’s HR department and supported by the *Independent* newspaper.²³ The Covenant stated the basic agreement that: ‘Soldiers are bound by service. The nature of service is inherently unequal: soldiers may have to give more than they receive. Ultimately, they may be called upon to make personal sacrifices - including death - in the service of the nation.’

In return, it continued, soldiers, who are required to ‘forgo some of the rights enjoyed by civilians’, should ‘always expect the Nation and their commanders to treat them fairly, to value and respect them as individuals, and to sustain and reward them and their families.’

The campaign to press the government to honour the Covenant was backed by a host of organisations and powerful individuals, including senior military figures and politicians from all parties. Its positive effects in drawing attention to the privations suffered by an overstretched and under-resourced military and reminding the nation of the debt of honour it owed to the soldiers who fought on its behalf, produced even more negative attitudes towards the wars being fought on two fronts. As Ingham and Dandeker argued, the concept ‘paradoxically broke the link in the public mind between the army and the unpopular intervention in Iraq: it separated the men from the mission, thereby letting loose large-scale but hitherto fairly latent support for “our boys”.’²⁴

Meanwhile in response to public unease, an inquiry launched by the government to investigate the status of the armed forces acknowledged that the military had become ‘increasingly separated from civilian life and consciousness’.²⁵ The inquiry culminated in the inauguration, in 2009, of an annual Armed Forces Day which was presented as an opportunity for the nation to say ‘thank you’. Two years later, one of David Cameron’s first actions as PM after the election in 2010 was to visit troops in Helmand Province. Barely a month later, on the eve of Armed Forces Day, he declared that the military should play a huge role in the national consciousness, just as it did during the Second World War. ‘I believe as a country at war we should show the same appreciation,’ he said, ‘with the military front and centre of our national life once again.’²⁶ He was not just referring to important state events or the pieties associated with remembrance. Permitting a serving soldier to take weeks out of his day job to participate in a celebrity ice-skating contest was one outcome of this policy shift. Since 2007 the growing acceptance of military uniforms in public space has been illustrated by the visibility of servicemen and women at major cultural, fundraising and sporting events, culminating in the extraordinary role of soldiers as security staff and seat fillers at the London Olympics. The image of the institution as progressive and reflective of the citizenry as a whole is therefore crucial in building a national consensus about social cohesion and the terms of inclusion as well as Britain’s role as a ‘great’ military power.

The business case

There are many aspects of ‘diversity management’ that are illuminated by cross-national, comparative perspectives. Joseph Soeters and Jan van der Meulen outline six broad reasons why the topic has become important within different national military settings.²⁷ These range from the need to increase recruitment to establish legitimacy among the civilian population to the recognition of new skills and strategies to deal with intercultural issues among civilian populations where armies are deployed. While they offer a useful framework for combining ethnicity, gender and sexuality in one analytical perspective, they emphasise that the term ‘cultural diversity’ does not mean that all minorities can be treated as the same. The ‘history of women in the military is quite different from that of ethnic minority soldiers and their past,’ they note.²⁸ Expressed in the simplest terms, where ethnicity has historically provided a rationale for enlisting (and promoting) certain groups on the basis of their suitability for warfare, gender has invariably been the basis for keeping women out. Behind this sweeping generalisation there are many important qualifications and historical variations but in the context of the argument I am making here, the inclusion of ethnic (and in the case of the UK, national) minorities *and* women on *equal terms* within the same military workforce has been a feature of the late twentieth century. This phenomenon has not received the attention it deserves, partly because of the disciplinary divides noted earlier and partly because of the difficulty in accessing defence institutions to carry out research.

Although Soeters and Meulen’s collection was primarily addressed to a specialist, military studies audience, their introductory essay illustrates why the topic is so important to an analysis of the interconnections between military institutions and civil society from a civilian perspective. The six reasons for examining the project of ‘diversifying the uniform’ fall into

two broad categories: the articulation between civil and military in domestic terms and the conduct of war itself.²⁹ To begin with, the issue of cultural diversity in the armed forces acknowledges the question of identity and the rights of citizenship and belonging that have been asserted in the course of social movements of 20th century. As a result of these struggles, women and minorities have succeeded in widening access to almost all areas of employment, including education, business and politics. 'In sum,' they write, 'empowered by identity politics, these groups are demanding basic civil rights, demands that the military cannot afford to resist.'³⁰

Following on from this, the issue of cultural diversity illuminates the symbolic relationship between the armed forces and the nation it is charged to defend. In the UK, for example, in recognition of the fact that the armed forces 'are no longer immune to the wider changes that have taken place in society,'³¹ the British Army faced a statutory obligation not only to 'eliminate unlawful racial discrimination' but also 'to *promote* equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups.' (my emphasis)³² With many national armed forces, particularly those that are based on conscription, it is thought that they have a nation-building role by bringing different sections of the population together at formative period of their lives. 'Since minority groups in society at large are often relatively deprived in terms of education and job opportunities, the armed forces can help by positioning themselves as a vehicle for social mobility.' By doing so, it is argued, they strengthen their own legitimacy.

Thirdly, the pressure to acknowledge cultural diversity enables the army to live up to, or aspire to, the ideal of being an Equal Opportunity employer which in turn improves its image and aids recruitment. Dandeker, who has written extensively about the policy shifts behind the recruitment of minority ethnic personnel in the UK armed forces, has called this the 'business case'.³³ By increasing its intake of ethnic minorities as it competes for new employees, the armed forces engage with a wider recruitment pool. The same is also true of women. By employing a more diverse cross section of personnel they are likely to benefit from a broader range of skills and experience.

So far one could argue that these issues are remarkably similar to those faced by any public institution with a mandate to represent the community it is supposed to serve. In the case of the UK, the mechanisms to address racism inside military institutions were directly linked to the pattern of reform imposed on the police force. The Macpherson Report, the result of an inquiry into institutional racism in the Metropolitan Police in 1998, led to a new law which extended the definition of 'public authorities' encoded in previous race equality legislation to cover the police, the prison service and also, for the first time, the armed forces.³⁴ Rather than focusing on the institutional politics of diversity, however, we now turn to the more public platform of the employment tribunal. It is here that conventional ideas about soldiers as particular kinds of workers and citizens are likely to be challenged, and where the legal protection of individual rights might be seen to conflict with the conditions of military service.

Media scrutiny of cases involving women and minorities provide an important method of bringing military matters to the attention of civilian audiences, although this is a complex issue that goes far beyond the role of various forms of media as a source of information, seeing these discursive spaces as part of the social process in which ideas are negated, produced and absorbed. As Winter and Woodward suggest in their discussion of the role of the media in relation to a study of women in the contemporary British Army, media scrutiny is also constitutive, 'in that it shapes the terms through which information is made meaningful'.³⁵ New sources of media such as online blogs, forums and commentaries have greatly facilitated the public airing of once-private observations of serving soldiers, overlapping with more traditional forms of information such as newspapers, radio and TV.

Yet in the absence of this type of public airing, however sensationalist and reactionary, there is little analysis within feminist and postcolonial studies of the wider implications of thinking about soldiers as individuals within a rights-based environment, in the UK at least. The following examples of instances where minority soldiers file grievances on grounds of discrimination or harassment offer a chance to review how and why attention to the politics of cultural diversity in the armed forces is intrinsic to a feminist and postcolonial critique of militarisation.

Mother-migrant-soldier

In April 2010, Tilern Debique, a former British soldier, successfully sued the UK Ministry of Defence for discrimination on grounds of race and sex. She had joined the British Army in 2002 and served in the Royal Signals, rising to the rank of corporal before leaving in 2008. In the meantime she had given birth to a daughter and her grievance was based partly on her employer's attitude towards her status as a single parent. As a result of reporting late for training and then a month later missing a parade on account of childcare issues, she had been told by her commanding officer that she was expected to be available for duty at all times and that the army was 'unsuitable for a single mother who couldn't sort out her childcare arrangements'. At the hearing Debique, who represented herself, said that the reaction of her superiors had left her feeling discriminated against and 'on a path to dismissal'.³⁶

The details of the case were hard to discern, such was the torrent of venom that greeted the news of the employment tribunal considering her grievance. Under the front page headline, 'Mother of all defeats!' the conservative tabloid newspaper, the *Daily Mail*, announced that the army faced a £100,000 payout if it was found that Debique had suffered loss of earnings, injury to feelings and aggravated damages.³⁷ Hundreds of words were devoted to ridiculing and undermining her predicament. The *Mail* editorial commented that she had effectively betrayed the many brave female soldiers who, serving in Afghanistan and elsewhere, have fought for the right to be treated as equals by the Army.³⁸ When the tribunal ruled in her favour, the paper compared her likely settlement with the compensation received by a male paratrooper who was severely disabled having lost both legs as a result of injuries sustained in Afghanistan. During the week of the hearing continued to run articles about the subversion of British society by 'pseudo-courts' representing human rights culture which had created a 'sanctum for political correctness'.

What made this case historic was that it took account of the individual's immigration status as a citizen of St Vincent, a Commonwealth country, awarding her damages for racial discrimination. Debique, who represented herself, had claimed that she had planned to bring her sister from St Vincent to care for her daughter but immigration law prevented relatives from staying for more than six months. This meant that she was in a different position from UK personnel who would be able to call on family support with childcare. The tribunal panel chairman suggested that the UK Border Agency (UKBA) should make an exception for serving soldiers and commented: "We found that such an exception would have put ... Commonwealth soldiers, and particularly the complainant, on a level playing field with soldiers with families who have the right of abode in the UK."³⁹ The ruling in Debique's favour confirmed that her nationality was not perceived as a contentious factor affecting her ability to work as a British soldier. It was her status as a migrant that presented a problem, not to the armed forces as her employer but in the civil area of immigration law.

Debique's ethnicity, however, presented an opportunity outside the confines of the tribunal to articulate anti-immigration sentiments as a way of undermining the legitimacy of her grievance. For one thing, it enabled her claim for compensation to be denounced as a ploy to 'return home to her poverty-stricken Caribbean village as a rich woman.'⁴⁰ The size of the settlement demanded by Debique was regarded as proof of her lack of commitment to her job

as a soldier, reflecting that as a migrant, her motives had been pecuniary and self-interested all along. Another report in the *Mail* wrote that: 'The youngest of eight children - six girls and two boys - born to Tilman Jordan and Alina DeBique, Tilern spent her first ten years in a tiny wooden two-room shack, sharing one bedroom. Cooking was outdoors, while a standpipe provided water.'⁴¹

Debique's Caribbean origins also provided grounds for condemning her child-raising practices as well. The same report told how she had left her baby, apparently conceived under 'mysterious' circumstances, with relatives in St Vincent for the first two years of its life. Instead of interpreting her childcare arrangements as the result of a supportive transnational family struggling to cope in the face of restrictive UK immigration law, this was used as another stick to beat her in public as a fraudulent mother, a charge which only compounded her crimes as a hopelessly unsuitable soldier.

Romping in the hay

Debique's grievance can be usefully compared to another landmark claim made two years earlier when an employment tribunal considered a case of sexual discrimination, as well as discrimination on the grounds of sexual preference. In this example, Kerry Fletcher, who joined in 1996, becoming the first woman to ride with the King's Troop, was awarded £187,000 in compensation after the tribunal accepted her evidence of sexual harassment by a male sergeant. Fletcher, who was a UK citizen and open about being lesbian, was forced to leave the army before her twelve year contract was finished after being bullied by the sergeant who threatened to 'convert' her. The tribunal commented: 'This is as severe a case of victimisation following an allegation of sexual harassment as one could see in an employment tribunal.'⁴²

Analysis of unsympathetic media publicity is useful because it reveals the depth of feeling provoked by the idea of human rights law, which is invariably seen as an imposition by the EU, being used to undermine national values and customs. The lifting of the ban on homosexuals in 2000, combined with the widening of posts available to women, had inevitably provoked huge storms about the insidious effects of political correctness enforced by those with no experience and knowledge of military culture. Thatcherite defence pundit Gerald Frost referred to the destructive consequences of applying civil law in the military sphere as 'cultural subversion.'⁴³

The structure of outrage was strikingly similar in the reporting of the tribunals hearing the two women's grievances. The lurid media representation illustrated a range of 'common sense' opinions about females in the armed forces, suggesting that for each example of inappropriate behaviour there was a model of the deserving and compliant. The image of the intrepid, flexible woman soldier, exemplified by the 'heroine of Helmand', continues to be a valuable tool for the Ministry of Defence both in terms of recruitment and in military operations as well.⁴⁴ Being a mother of young children need not be an obstacle, and in fact it can indicate her added readiness to serve the nation as long as she has the equivalent of a 'wife' to provide the unconditional care demanded of army spouses.⁴⁵ However, there is a widespread view, both within the army and among the wider public, that the army is not a place for single parents, particularly if they are women and particularly if they ask for support. A quick glance at Army Rumour Service (ARRSE) which aims to provide 'a useful(ish), informative and amusing site for people with an interest in the British Army' aired this perspective in no uncertain terms, with comments on Debique's case such as:

As evidently she can't do her duty , parades , work etc she should simply be discharged as a waste of space.

Just shows how stupid the law is under New Labour that a cunt like this can get compensation (sic).⁴⁶

Other comments blamed 'the law' for allowing cases like this to be taken seriously, using the example of DeBique's successful hearing to condemn the whole notion of equality and diversity.

When stuff like this is allowed to happen, we might as well disband the MOD and call it a day. We've had some excellent recruits from Commonwealth countries, but why did we need to go hunting them in the first place? It's a slippery slope to long hair, trade unions and no war after 1700 hours every Friday.⁴⁷

It is significant that in each case, the amount claimed and then paid out to the two women was compared to compensation awarded to those injured in the line of duty. As we noted earlier, DeBique's claim for financial compensation on grounds of loss of earnings, injury to feelings and aggravated damages was portrayed as a form of betrayal since it far exceeded the actual payment awarded to a physically wounded male war-hero. The comparison underlined the level of sacrifice that the nation demanded of its *real* soldiers, most of whom are male.⁴⁸ However, in one paper Kerry Fletcher's case was compared to Captain Philp, 30, the first woman to lose a limb in service, who was recovering from having her left leg amputated below the knee as a result of injuries she sustained in Afghanistan.⁴⁹ Her claim was also contrasted with the compensation received by Ben McBean, a black Marine, hailed "the real hero" by Prince Harry after losing an arm and a leg in Afghanistan'.⁵⁰

Viewed alongside other grievances of bullying, racial or sexual discrimination or harassment, the success of each claimant in court effectively challenged dominant notions of soldiering as a form of labour circumscribed by gender roles and sexuality. Media commentators referred to the women's clothes, partners, and other aspects of their private lives to suggest inappropriate sexual behaviour that undermined their claim. The *Mail*, for example, revealed that DeBique called herself Sexy T on her MySpace page, and showed a photograph of her wearing a see-through shirt to cast aspersions on her mothering skills. Fletcher's openly lesbian identity positively invited an expose of salacious reportage, building on evidence given in the tribunal about previous sexual misdemeanors allegedly committed by her in the past.

Given the importance of normative heterosexuality in military culture it was hardly a surprise that the tabloid print media went to town on the topic of a promiscuous lesbian soldier demanding compensation for 'hurt feelings'. Columnist Richard Littlejohn, also writing in the *Mail*, described how she was caught 'romping in the hay' with 'a blonde female corporal in the stables at a base in Yorkshire - the catalyst for her obscene pay-out this week'.⁵¹ During the tribunal hearing, he wrote, 'we learned that she had sent topless photos of herself to male colleagues, which in other circumstances could be considered sexual harassment on her part.'

Rather than dwell on the sexual politics of soldiering, however, I want to suggest here that particular cases of harassment inside the army, such as Kerry Fletcher's, can serve an important purpose within domestic, civilian debates. Littlejohn, who has made a career out of controversial racist and sexist commentary, continued, 'Nevertheless, in the Looking Glass world of our industrial tribunal system, the default position in sex and race cases is that the complainant is always an innocent victim and the accused guilty as charged.' By holding the details of one lesbian soldier's sex life up to ridicule, he was able to prove how misguided the law was in general. In this next quote he demonstrated the folly of paying out large sums of money to individuals who should never have been allowed to join the army in the first place:

If she can't cope with barrackroom banter and has a fit of the vapours when a sergeant jokingly offers to 'convert' her to straight sex, how would she react if some

mad mullah threatened to saw off her head with a scimitar unless she converted to Islam?

Contrary to the picture Littlejohn painted of a self-serving individual out to rinse her employer for as much as she could get, the Fletcher case drew attention to the corrosive effects of victimization in a military environment. Details revealed once again that the hierarchical chain of command structure served to protect those in authority while intimidating juniors from making complaints. But although the Ministry of Defence was obliged to issue an apology to Fletcher, the hostility expressed by some sections of the media reflected a view inside the institution that the concept of individual rights enshrined in European equality legislation was at odds with a military culture that required its workers to 'forgo some of the rights enjoyed by civilians'. In other words, the recognition of diversity and cultural pluralism as uniformly positive assets was not always compatible with the emphasis on teamwork, discipline and selfless commitment enshrined in the army's corporate values and standards.⁵²

Racists on the frontline

In a discussion of the relevance of cultural diversity in the evolving nature of warfare, Soeters and van der Meulen shift the focus from domestic politics to debates about the effectiveness of military units, 'especially when they are engaged in operations other than war.'⁵³ In the context of humanitarian relief missions and civil-military co-operation, they write, intercultural awareness and likewise communication skills are usually more important than competency as warriors.⁵⁴ The extent to which the ethnicity and gender of military personnel become instrumental in war varies from one country to another. The use of female soldiers in peace-keeping and humanitarian operations has been noted before,⁵⁵ and the deployment of particular ethnic groups on the basis of their cultural affinities also has many precedents. One example might be the British Army's use of Gurkha soldiers in Afghanistan where the Nepalese are valued not just for their fighting skills but also for their familiarity with central Asian culture.⁵⁶ A news item published by the MoD in August 2011, for example, asserted that 'the affinity between the two cultures, based on similar lifestyles and the ability to converse in Urdu, allow close relationships to be formed between that Afghans and Gurkhas'.⁵⁷

In the last section of this essay I want to emphasise the urgency of paying close attention to the interface between army and society both at home *and* in the context of war. Firstly, in many armed forces currently taking part in the NATO-led ISAF operation the institutional procedures intended to promote equality and diversity for individual soldiers have become intertwined with the military criminal justice system designed to prevent atrocities on the battle field. Although it has been proved time and time again that no amount of 'diversity management' or 'equal opportunities' prevents soldiers from committing atrocities, as the activities of the 'kill team' demonstrated in the case of the US Army, the absence of effective mechanisms to control racist and sexist violence within any national armed forces will automatically lead to war crimes of this sort.⁵⁸ In her comment on the photographs of dead civilians taken by the US soldiers who murdered them, Malalai Joya wrote that Afghans believed that the brutal actions of these 'kill teams' revealed the aggression and racism which is part and parcel of the entire military occupation.⁵⁹ The equality and diversity laws that protect soldiers' individual rights must therefore be studied in relation to the enforcement of military regulations governing the treatment of civilians and detainees by occupying armies. In the British Army, for instance, the overlap between these two policy areas has resulted in a renewed commitment to inculcate 'the military ethos' through teaching a set of core values, one of which is 'respect for others'.⁶⁰

The issue of diversity reinforces the centrality of culture in the ‘war on terror’ as well as the importance of propaganda, providing a link between the management of information about the aims and objectives of the global counter-insurgency and the negotiation of multiculturalism and gender equality within civil society. Once again, an employment tribunal provided the occasion to glimpse these highly contentious issues when, in 2009, a British Muslim soldier claimed he was racially abused and physically attacked by a sergeant.⁶¹ The incident was potentially damaging not just because it involved a senior NCO but also because the individual’s ethnicity – he was a UK citizen born to parents of Pakistani origin - was directly connected to his work for the special forces in Afghanistan. His family alleged that he had been made ill by the racist attacks.⁶² However, this hearing differed from the two discussed earlier in that it was held in private and the judgement was still pending two years later. The media was permitted to report the basic details of the young man’s charge but there was no discussion of his ethno-religious identity as a factor either in his ability to be a soldier or his suitability for a role in the special forces.

Nevertheless this case is useful, despite the lack of details, because it is a reminder that the negative publicity surrounding one Muslim soldier’s treatment threatens to damage the carefully constructed narrative of the valuable work performed by other British soldiers who are also Muslims. Racist treatment of Muslims inside the army would, for many observers, simply confirm the fact that the occupation of Afghanistan is part of a global war against Muslims in general, a war that includes the repression and demonisation of Muslims at home. Conversely, a positive representation of Muslim soldiers in the British armed services reinforce Muslims’ claim to belong within UK civil society as well as highlighting the military project of fighting extremists in a country that happens to be Islamic.

These themes resonate in parallel debates across Europe where the figure of the migrant has been stigmatised as an emblem of fear and resentment, and refugees and asylum seekers are seen as scroungers who drain public resources without giving anything in return. Since 2001, Muslims have been viewed with increasing hostility as the ‘enemy within’, a message highlighted when the activities of a tiny minority of Islamist anti-war protestors receive disproportionate publicity as evidence both of their treachery and of ‘the weakening of our collective identity’.⁶³

‘Europe needs to wake up to what is happening in our own countries,’ announced UK Prime Minister Cameron in a speech on the threat of terrorism delivered in Munich in February 2011. ‘Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We’ve failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We’ve even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values.’⁶⁴

Cameron’s use of the pronoun ‘we’ allowed him to deliver a speech directly to UK audiences as well as to strengthen the link in Europe between the failures of multiculturalism and the growth of terrorism at the hands of Islamist extremists. It was no coincidence that his intervention began with a claim that the UK had the fourth largest military defence budget in the world and that his government was committed to reinforcing Britain’s ‘actual military capability’ in the face of cuts to public spending. In this essay I have used the example of the UK to argue that paying close attention to the composition of a country’s armed forces offers a means to track the changing dimensions of national citizenship and the terms of inclusion and exclusion, however ambiguous or contradictory. There, as Mason and Dandeker have pointed out, the national citizenship project is still in a process of flux, or as they put it, in need of ‘rethinking’, and one in which the direction of foreign policy and the composition of the armed forces are integral.

How does Britain come to terms with its post-imperial status while maintaining a commitment to an international diplomatic and expeditionary military role? How can

its hitherto strongly ethnicist conception of nationality be reconciled with a world in which large scale migration and settlement is both a fact of life and the sine qua non of economic success? And how can existing citizenship rules, framed largely in terms of an earlier debate about immigration and a primordialist view of nationality, be accommodated to what looks increasingly like an emerging contractual, civic conception of citizenship – if one that is yet to be fully and clearly articulated?⁶⁵

The differing histories of military service within different national contexts need to be understood as long-running, contested *and* contestable pacts between citizens and rulers in order to grasp the volatility of these questions today. Compulsory military service was abolished in Germany and Sweden in 2010, for example, a measure which is likely to have profound consequences both for citizenship and for the composition of their respective militaries.⁶⁶ This is not a specialist field of study confined to experts in military and security matters. An analytical perspective sensitive to gender and postcoloniality is absolutely necessary in order to chart the correspondences between what happens in the armed forces and what happens in society. It is essential if we are to challenge the process of militarisation that proceeds in all countries involved in the NATO-led ISAF occupation of Afghanistan and other multi-national adventures. Bearing in mind the massive proliferation of private contractors and civilian development agencies taking place under the aegis of military intervention, this inquiry offers a valuable opportunity for transnational collaboration in the search for more effective solidarities under conditions of permanent war.

¹ Paul Higate and Ailsa Cameron, 'Reflexivity and Researching the Military,' *Armed Forces & Society*, 2006. 32: 219.

² Anthony King, *The Transformation of Europe's Armed Forces: from the Rhine to Afghanistan*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 6.

³ See, for example, the call for papers for the annual conference on Feminist Security Studies, ISA, in 2011. Themes include: 'Mainstreaming gender in peace and security sectors: What works, what doesn't, and where do we go from here?' and 'Feminist perspectives on the military: Women soldiers'. http://www.peacewomen.org/news_article.php?id=50&type=event (accessed 29.3.2011)

⁴ Tarak Barkawi, *Globalization and War*. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006. 28-9.

⁵ Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The international politics of militarizing women's lives*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000, p. 3.

⁶ One Twitter account was first called Helmand Blog, and subsequently renamed the UKForcesAfghanistan. Also on Twitter, DefenceHQ is the 'official corporate news channel of the UK Ministry of Defence.'

⁷ Ron Krebs, 'A School for the Nation? How Military Service Does Not Build Nations, and How it Might'. *International Security*, Vol 28, No. 4 (Spring 2004).

123.

⁸ Krebs, 2004, 89.

⁹ Vron Ware, 'Whiteness in the Glare of War: soldiers, migrants and citizenship,' *Ethnicities*, 10(3) 313–330, 2010.

¹⁰ Carl Boggs, *Empire versus Democracy: the triumph of corporate and military power*, New York: Routledge, 2011, 1.

¹¹ Rosa Silverman, 'Female pilot in action over Libya,' *The Independent*, Wednesday, 23 March 2011. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/female-pilot-in-action-over-libya-2250933.html> (accessed 28.3.2011) See also Nick Hopkins, 'Woman pilot in Libya combat mission' *Guardian*, Wednesday, 23 March 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/mar/23/woman-pilot-libya-combat-mission> (accessed 28.3.2011)

¹² Ian Drury, 'The heroine of Helmand: Young military police officer makes a record 17 Taliban arrests in single DAY,' *Daily Mail*, 3 April 2011.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1373027/The-heroine-Helmand-Young-military-police-officer-makes-record-17-Taliban-arrests-single-DAY.html#ixzz1IjW8o6SR> (accessed 6.4.2011)

¹³ Daily Mail reporter, 'The Strike Eagles of "Dudette 07": All-female crew in historic mission over Afghanistan,' *Daily Mail*, 4 April 2011.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1373179/All-female-U-S-flight-squadron-make-history-launching-air-mission-Afghanistan.html#ixzz1Ijax0qvx> (accessed 6.4.2011)

¹⁴ The drive was so immediately successful that in 2005 a report in *The Times* claimed (erroneously as it turned out) that 'The Army has stopped actively recruiting Commonwealth and foreign soldiers because the numbers joining up have risen by nearly 3,000 per cent in seven years.' (Evans, 2005) Figures published in 2008 show that by then there were 7,240 officers and soldiers from Commonwealth countries, trained and untrained. Of these, 2205 were Fijian, 690 Ghanaian and 630 Jamaican, while South Africans and Zimbabweans combined totalled 1365.¹⁴ (Taylor, 2009)

¹⁵ MoD, *Women in the Armed Forces: A Report by the Employment of Women in the Armed Forces Steering Group*, (London, Ministry of Defence, 2002), p. 6.

¹⁶ Victoria Basham 'Effecting Discrimination: Operational Effectiveness and Harassment in the British Armed Forces' *Armed Forces & Society* 2009; 35; 728

¹⁷ □ UK Defence Statistics 2010, Chapter 2, Table 2.14. Strength of the Trained UK Regular forces by Service and Nationality <http://www.dasa.mod.uk>

¹⁸ UK Defence Statistics 2010, Chapter 2, Table 2.7 Strength of UK Regular Forces by Service and sex, at 1 April each year. <http://www.dasa.mod.uk>

This figure is higher when all three services are taken into account. Between 1997 and 2010 the percentage of females in the UK Regular Forces increased from 7.0% to 9.6%. At 1 April 2010 females accounted for 12.2% of Officers and 9.0% of Other Ranks.

¹⁹ <http://dancingonice.itv.com/2011/WatchVideo/johnsons-marching-orders-1792> (accessed 20.3.2011)

²⁰ David Mason and Christopher Dandeker, 'Evolving UK Policy on Diversity in the Armed Services: Multiculturalism and its Discontents,' *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, Vol. 47, No. 4, 393 – 410, November 2009, p. 399.

²¹ Johnson Beharry & Nick Cook, *Barefoot Soldier* (London: Little, Brown Book Group, 2006).

²² This history is more thoroughly documented in Vron Ware, 'Lives on the Line', *Soundings*, September 2010. <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2010-09-28-ware-en.html> (accessed 29.3.2011)

²³ Although it sounds like a formal constitutional document, the Covenant is a more of a conceptual agreement between the nation and its armed forces, one that is sporadically re-invented by the forces of history and politics. The pact was formally codified as a 'covenant' in 2000 in an army doctrine publication and employed as a campaigning tool to improve the conditions of service life.

²⁴ Sarah Ingham and Christopher Dandeker, 'The covenant we must protect from the lawyers,' *Parliamentary Brief Online*, 24 June 2010. <http://www.parliamentarybrief.com/2010/06/the-covenant-we-must-protect-from-the-lawyers> (accessed 23.3.2011)

²⁵ Report to the Prime Minister by: Quentin Davies MP, Bill Clark OBE Ministry of Defence & Air Commodore Martin Sharp OBE MA RAF, *Report of Inquiry into National Recognition of our Armed Forces*. May 2008, p. 3.

²⁶ BBC News, 'Cameron wants nation to appreciate armed forces'

20 June 10 04:57. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/10359155> (accessed 22.3.2011)

²⁷ Joseph Soeters & Jan van der Meulen, *Cultural Diversity in the Armed Forces: An international comparison*, Abingdon: Routledge Military Studies, 2007.

²⁸ Soeters and van der Meulen, 2007, 3.

- ²⁹ Christopher Dandeker and David Mason, 'Diversifying the Uniform? The Participation of Minority Ethnic Personnel in the British Armed Services,' *Armed Forces & Society*, 2003; 29; 481.
- ³⁰ Soeters & van der Meulen, p. 5
- ³¹ The Armed Forces Bill. Bill 4 of 2000-2001. Research Paper 01/03. 8 January 2001. House of Commons Library. P. 23.
- ³² <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/34/section/2> (20.10.10)
- ³³ David Mason and Christopher Dandeker, 'Evolving UK Policy on Diversity in the Armed Services: Multiculturalism and its Discontents,' *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* Vol. 47, No. 4, 393 – 410, November 2009.
- ³⁴ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/34/crossheading/further-extension-of-1976-act-to-police-and-other-public-authorities> (20.10.10)
- ³⁵ Patricia Winter and Rachel Woodward, *Sexing the Soldier: the politics of gender and the contemporary British Army*, London: Routledge, 2007.
- ³⁶ Adam Gabbatt, 'MoD faces payout after female soldier wins discrimination case', *Guardian*, Wednesday, 14 April 2010. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/apr/14/tilern-debique-soldier-army-discrimination> (accessed 14.3.2011)
- ³⁷ Vanessa Allen, 'Mother of all defeats!', *Daily Mail*, Tuesday, April 13, 2010. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1265446/Single-mother-soldier-wins-discrimination-case-Army-failed-provide-adequate-childcare.html> (accessed 14.3.2011)
- ³⁸ Comment, 'Act of Betrayal', *Daily Mail*, 14 April, 2010, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1265841/DAILY-MAIL-COMMENT-Act-betrayal.html#ixzz1GaPP9SfC> (accessed 14.3.2011)
- ³⁹ Female soldier awarded £17,000 by employment tribunal', *Guardian*, Friday, 16 April 2010, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/apr/16/tilern-debique-mod-employment-tribunal?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487> (accessed 14.3.2011)
- ⁴⁰ Dan Newling and Katherine Knight, 'Single mother soldier who claimed £1.1million over childcare left her baby after two years' *Daily Mail*, 16 April 2010. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1266647/Single-mother-soldier-claimed-1-1m-childcare-left-baby-years.html#ixzz1I5V9j2YF> (accessed 30.3.2011)
- ⁴¹ Dan Newling and Katherine Knight, *ibid.*
- ⁴² 'Lesbian soldier Kerry Fletcher wins £187,000 harassment payout,' *The Times*, November 27, 2008, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article5240881.ece> (accessed 18.3.2011)
- ⁴³ Gerald Frost 'How to destroy an army: the cultural subversion of Britain's armed forces' in Alexandrou, Bartle and Holmes, *New People Strategies for the British Armed Forces*, London: Frank Cass, 2002. 37.
- ⁴⁴ Richard Norton-Taylor, 'Women still banned from combat roles after Ministry of Defence review,' *Guardian*, Monday 29 November 2010. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/nov/29/women-combat-ban-remains> (accessed 28.3.2011)
- ⁴⁵ Jenny Stocks, 'Men wear their war wounds with pride, it's different for us women', *Daily Mail*, 6 January, 2011. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-1344482/The-awesome-courage-mother-lose-limb-serving-Iraq.html#ixzz1HtoN2E00> (accessed 28.3.2011)
- ⁴⁶ Army Rumour Service (ARRSE) Thread: 'Now she wants Â£500,000.....Sexy T' 14.4.2010. <http://www.arrse.co.uk/naafi-bar/132721-now-she-wants-£500-000-sexy-t.html> (accessed 28.3.2011)
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*
- ⁴⁸ Vanessa Allen, 'Mother of all defeats! Huge blow to Army as it faces £100,000 payout after tribunal backs single mother who went AWOL over childcare', *Daily Mail*, 14th April 2010.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1265446/Single-mother-soldier-wins-discrimination-case-Army-failed-provide-adequate-childcare.html#ixzz1HbS7xuMa> (accessed 25.3.2011)

⁴⁹ Richard LittleJohn, 'When "hurt feelings" cost more than an arm and a leg,' *Daily Mail*, 27 November, 2008. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1090050/RICHARD-LITTLEJOHN-When-hurt-feelings-cost-arm-leg.html#ixzz1GynnzKbL> (accessed 28.3.2011)

⁵⁰ Alistair Taylor, 'Bullied lesbian wants £400k Army compo', *The Sun*, 23 September, 2008. http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/campaigns/our_boys/article1721433.ece (accessed 29.3.2011)

⁵¹ LittleJohn, op cit.

⁵² Mason and Dandeker, ibid, 2009.

⁵³ Soeters & van der Meulen, 6.

⁵⁴ See, for example, the discussion of female military personnel in the Swedish military and their value in performing humanitarian functions: Annica Kronsell, 'The Swedish Military Manpower Policies and their gender implications' in Pertti Joenniemi, Ed., *The Changing Face of European Conscription*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

⁵⁵ Donna Bridges and Debbie Horsfall, 'Increasing Operational Effectiveness in UN Peacekeeping : Toward a Gender-Balanced Force' *Armed Forces & Society* 2009, 36:1.120.

⁵⁶ Cynthia Enloe has comprehensively analysed the value of ethnicity as a factor in using military institutions to deal with domestic conflict, in her book *Ethnic Soldiers: state security in divided societies*, published in 1980.

⁵⁷ 'Gurkhas forge relationships in Afghanistan', MoD, Military Operations news, 1 August 2011. <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/DefenceNews/MilitaryOperations/GurkhasForgeRelationshipsInAfghanistan.htm> (accessed 30 April 2012)

⁵⁸ Jon Boone, 'US Army 'kill team' in Afghanistan posed for photos of murdered civilians', *Guardian*, Monday 21 March 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/mar/21/us-army-kill-team-afghanistan-posed-pictures-murdered-civilians>

⁵⁹ Malalai Joya, 'Kill teams in Afghanistan: the truth' *Guardian*, Wednesday 30 March, 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/mar/30/kill-team-photos-afghanistan-us> (accessed 30.3.2011)

⁶⁰ The Aitken Report, An Investigation into Cases of Deliberate Abuse

and Unlawful Killing in Iraq in 2003 and 2004, Ministry of Defence, 25 January 2008. http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7AC894D3-1430-4AD1-911F-8210C3342CC5/0/aitken_rep.pdf (accessed 1.4.2011) See also 'Values and Standards of the British Army', 2008. AC 64813. http://www.army.mod.uk/documents/general/v_s_of_the_british_army.pdf (accessed 10.2.2011)

⁶¹ 'Fresh race row for MoD as British Muslim soldier claims he was branded a "Paki" and was throttled by sergeant', *Daily Mail*, 16 February, 2009.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1146304/Fresh-race-row-MoD-British-Muslim-soldier-claims-branded-Paki-throttled-sergeant.html#ixzz1Fu0NmU7Z> (7.3.2011)

⁶² Lucy Cockroft, 'Muslim SAS soldier sues MoD for racial discrimination,' *Telegraph*, 6 September 2009, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/6146837/Muslim-SAS-soldier-sues-MoD-for-racial-discrimination.html> (accessed 10.3.2011)

⁶³ David Cameron, PM's speech at Munich Security Conference, Saturday 5 February 2011. <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/speeches-and-transcripts/2011/02/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference-60293> (accessed 22.3.2011)

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Mason and Dandeker, 2009, op cit, p. 407.

⁶⁶ Helen Pidd, 'Marching orders for conscription in Germany, but what will take its place?' *Guardian*, Wednesday, 16 March 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/mar/16/conscription-germany-army>. (accessed 3.5.2011)

Politics, 'Recruitment woes plague Swedish military' *The Local: Sweden's news in English*, 17 January 2011. <http://www.thelocal.se/31474/20110117/> (accessed 3.5.2011)