

## LSE Research Online

### **Marsha Henry**

Why critical military studies needs to smash imperial white supremacist capitalist heteropatriarchy: a rejoinder

# Article (Accepted version) (Refereed)

### **Original citation:**

Henry, Marsha (2018) Why critical military studies needs to smash imperial white supremacist capitalist heteropatriarchy: a rejoinder. Critical Military Studies. pp. 1-4. ISSN 2333-7486 DOI: 10.1080/23337486.2018.1429049

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

This version available at: <a href="http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/90469/">http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/90469/</a> Available in LSE Research Online: October 2018

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (http://eprints.lse.ac.uk) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Why Critical Military Studies Needs to Smash White Supremacist Capitalist Heteropatriarchy: A Rejoinder

Marsha G Henry
Department of Gender Studies, LSE

In my article 'Problematizing military masculinity, intersectionality and male vulnerability in feminist critical military studies' (2017), I outline some of the innovations in previous research on military masculinity, its plural and more broad formation as militarised masculinities; and some of the new, yet limited, directions of research which pays attention to gender in studies of militarised individuals and communities. In particular, I draw on the work of Crenshaw (1989, 1991), one of the founding Black feminist scholars amongst others, of concept of intersectionality, in order to share my increasing anxiety with what I argued is a process of depoliticisation in Critical Military Studies (CMS). However, to call this depoliticisation is itself problematic. What I should have argued is that this is rather a repoliticisation and reinforcement of racial, gender and class hierarchies both inside and outside of formal militaries and within and across a range of academic disciplines. This is evident in the superficial engagement with intersectionality by some military masculinity scholars or the use of intersectionality in what Carbado (2013) calls 'colour-blind' ways which 'cover over' privilege through the co-optation of a radical and emancipatory body of theories for examining 'multiple differences' and which I discuss in more detail (Henry 2017). Scholars who use intersectionality as a framework for challenging interlocking oppressions and those primarily interested in the interface or the mutually constituting nature of masculinities and militarisation, may be engaged in different epistemic and political projects. Yet, it is surprising that the feminist inspiration introduced by Enloe in the concept of military masculinity (1983), seems to have waned in regard to paying attention to constructions of femininity; femininities and patriarchy (Enloe 2017). There is a scholarship which pays attention to women in the military, military femininities and female military masculinities (i.e. Sasson-Levy 2015; Tasker 2002), but this work remains marginal within the subfield of militarised masculinities. Has the potential for critical perspectives within CMS been extinguished by a focus on military masculinity without feminism? Without intersectional feminism? While the subfield of militarised masculinities has been innovative in taking gender seriously in the context of male-dominated institutions, I ask, where are studies of military masculinity that focus on the persistence of patriarchy (Enloe 2017) and militarised femininities as a subject in their own right?

While work on Israeli military identities raises a number of questions about intersectionality's limits, it is evident that the burden of analysing gender (and its intersection with other axes of difference) remains with feminist critical military scholars. This burden has already been complicated by including categories such as sexuality, femininity, and whiteness (Hartal & Sasson-Levy 2017; Lomsky-Federer & Sasson-Levy 2015, 2017; Sasson-Levy 2013). However, I argue that militarised masculinities cannot afford to

<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> An interesting example is an article by Coston and Kimmel (2012) which challenges monolithic understandings of privilege, but pays little attention to the racialised foundations upon which intersectionality was developed.

neglect feminist theories and concepts and must engage in the project of smashing what bell hooks refers to as white supremacist capitalist heteropatriarchy (hooks 2009). This means that military/militarised masculinities could return to the critical and radical basis of intersectionality, the lived experiences of those communities referred to by such concepts, or the normative project for which intersectionality is the daily bread: black feminism (i.e. Combahee River Collective 1977; Lorde 1984; hooks 1984; Collins 1986). While my article was cynical about the growing epistemic commodification of intersectionality more generally, I am hopeful for new scholarship in the subfield. Recent studies of militarised masculinities demonstrate hope for a radical transformation of the existing gendered, classed and racial global order by politicising which and when differences matter; why inequalities persist; and where military men and women are not equally posititioned or privileged. Some examples of this work include Richter-Monpetit 2016; Barkawi 2017; Burnett and Milani 2017; Ingelaere and Wilén 2017; Chisholm 2017; Partis-Jennings 2017; Zalewski 2017; and Myrttinen (forthcoming) 2018. This work is situated within new epistemic assemblages which challenge the gendered, racial and/or neoliberal systems of oppression by both paying homage to the work of critical, radical and political scholarship on heterosexism, colonialism and capitalism (Ahmed 2015), or by simply taking up the task of smashing. There is no better moment for CMS scholars to do the same.

#### **Bibliography**

- Ahmed, Sara. 2013. "Making Feminist Points." feministkilljoys. Accessed June 13, 2015.
  - https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/ (last accessed 30 November 2017)
- Barkawi, T. (2017). Soldiers of Empire. Cambridge University Press.
- Burnett, S., & Milani, T. M. (2017). Fatal Masculinities: A Queer Look at Green Violence. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *16*(3), 548-575.
- Chisholm, A. (2017). Clients, contractors, and the everyday masculinities in global private security. *Critical Military Studies*, 3(2), 120-141.
- Collective, CR (1977). 'A Black Feminist Statement' (pp. 210-18).
- Coston, B. M., & Kimmel, M. (2012). Seeing privilege where it isn't: Marginalized masculinities and the intersectionality of privilege. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 97-111.
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social problems*, 33(6), s14-s32
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. U. Chi. *Legal F.*, 139.
- Enloe, C. H. (1983). Does khaki become you?: the militarisation of

- women's lives. South End Press.
- Enloe, C. (2015). The recruiter and the sceptic: A critical feminist approach to military studies. *Critical Military Studies*, 1(1), 3-10.
- Enloe, C. (2017). *The big push: Exposing and challenging the persistence of patriarchy.* Univ of California Press.
- Hartal, G., & Sasson-Levy, O. (2017). ReReading Homonationalism: An Israeli Spatial Perspective. *Journal of homosexuality*, 1-24.
- Henry, M. (2017). Problematizing military masculinity, intersectionality and male vulnerability in feminist critical military studies. *Critical Military Studies*, 3(2), 182-199.
- hooks, b. 2009. *Belonging: A Culture of Place*. New York: Routledge. hooks, b. (1984). *From margin to center*. Boston, MA: South End.
- Ingelaere, B., & Wilén, N. (2017). The civilised Self and the barbaric Other: ex-rebels making sense of sexual violence in the DR Congo. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 35(2), 221-239.
- Lomsky-Feder, E., & Sasson-Levy, O. (2017). Women Soldiers and Citizenship in Israel: Gendered Encounters with the State.

  Routledge.
- Lomsky-Feder, E., & Sasson-Levy, O. (2015). Serving the army as secretaries: intersectionality, multi-level contract and subjective experience of citizenship. *The British journal of sociology*, 66(1), 173-192.
- Lorde, A. (1984). Sister outsider. Freedom.
- Myrttinen, H. (2018). Men, Masculinities and Genocide. In *A Gendered Lens for Genocide Prevention* (pp. 27-47). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Partis-Jennings, H. (2017). Military masculinity and the act of killing in Hamlet and Afghanistan. *Men and Masculinities*, 1097184X17718585.
- Richter-Montpetit, M. (2016). Militarized masculinities, women torturers, and the limits of gender analysis at Abu Ghraib. Researching war: Feminist methods, ethics and politics.
- Sasson-Levy, O. (2013). A different kind of whiteness: Marking and unmarking of social boundaries in the construction of hegemonic ethnicity. In *Sociological Forum*, March Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 27-50.
- Tasker, Y. (2002). Soldiers' Stories: Women and Military Masculinities in Courage Under Fire. *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 19(3), 209-222.
- Zalewski, M. (2017). What's the problem with the concept of military masculinities?. *Critical Military Studies*, *3*(2), 200-205.