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War, then, is a tremendously diverse enterprise, operating in many contexts with many purposes, rules, and meanings. Gender norms outside war show similar diversity. The puzzle, which this chapter fleshes out and the remaining chapters try to answer, is why this diversity disappears when it comes to the *connection* of war with gender. This connection is more stable, across cultures and through time, than are either gender roles outside of war or the forms and frequency of war itself.

The answer in a nutshell is that killing in war does not come naturally for either gender, yet the potential for war has been universal in human societies. To help overcome soldiers’ reluctance to fight, cultures develop gender roles that equate “manhood” with toughness under fire. Across cultures and through time, the selection of men as potential combatants (and of women for feminine war support roles) has helped shape the war system. In turn, the pervasiveness of war in history has influenced gender profoundly – especially gender norms in child-rearing. P. 9

The evidence – from large-scale organized female participation through various types of gender integration through the participation of individual women – supports Hypthesis 2. When women have found their way into combat, they have generally performed about as well as most men have. Women in combat support roles, furthermore, have had little trouble fitting into military organizations, and have held their own when circumstances occasionally placed them in combat (especially in guerrilla wars). They can fight; they can kill. … Women physical strength, while less than men’s on average, has been adequate to many combat situations – from piloting to sniping to firing machine-guns. One recurring argument of those opposed to women in combat – that the women would be unable to drag wounded comrades from the battlefield under fire – is refuted by the record of women nurses’ doing so. Women’s supposedly lower levels of aggressiveness, and their nurturing nature, have been, historically, no obstacle to many women’s participation in combat. Furthermore, contrary to the idea that women are too soft-hearted to kill, not only did Soviet snipers coolly shoot down dozens o German soldiers, but in various cases women took the lead in cruelty and torture, especially of prisoners. P. 127

The gender integration of groups (men and women) does not apparently disrupt small-group bounding. In sum, then, male bonding provides a poor explanation of gendered war roles. P. 203

Gender as an absolute division in war is not explained by the biology of either individuals or groups. P. 250

War as a cause of gender:

The persistent strength of “reverse causality” from war to gender pervades this study. The war system influences the socialization of children into *all* their gender roles. War’s influence shadows all of our lives. .. Gender serves as a medium or vector, as it were, for war’s presence in our most intimate social settings. P. 410

In raising boys into men, we can ask ourselves … whether we are producing warriors, and if so at what cost to the boy. We may be surprised to see how high the cost is, even if the boy never goes on to fight a war. P. 411