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How does male and female difference shape gender relations and gender identities for men and women personnel?

What we are interested in is not an evaluation of these initiatives *per se* in terms of the advancement of women’s participation in the Army, but rather an understanding of how ideas about gender and difference are constructed and reproduced at a policy level.p.39

Policy, by which we mean institutional frameworks for doing things, may seem initially an offbeat topic for scrutiny using the methods of discourse analysis. Policies set out what is to be done to address an issue. But policies are more than that. In order to address an issue, policies have to be based on an understanding of that issue, and most usually policies that “do things” are devised because there are recognized problems or difficulties around the issue in question. Policies then frame issues around identifiable problems, and by so doing they construct issues as problems. A fist step in this type of policy analysis, then, is to be alert to the ways in which a problem is constructed, how an issue is made into a problem. A second step is to see what the policy actually does; what changes does a specific policy or group of policies aim to achieve? A third step reviews the wider implications of strategies for change; what assumptions about the world and the way it works frame the mechanisms for implementation? P. 41 (= DOGMES Pères)

It is instructive, writing eight years after the expansion of posts, to look at statistical data for women’s participation in the arms or services that became open to them in 1998. In 1999, 3.8 per cent of the Royal Artillery (330 personnel) were women. In 2006, this figure was 4.8 percent (380 women), a decline from a peak of 5.7 per cent (500 women) in 2000. … p. 43

Although the Army might advertise itself as an equal opportunities employer, under section 85(4) of the 1995 Sex Discrimination Act, amended by the 2006 Equality Act, British Armed Forces are exempt in respect of “an act done for the purpose of ensuring the combat effectiveness of naval, military and air forces of the Crown”. And although in practice women are often drawn into direct combat roles, official policy is that direct combat units are male only. Combat posts are defined as those where personnel are required to close with and kill the enemy using direct fire weapons. The exclusion of women from combat positions is an area of ongoing policy debate. … it was not until May 2002 that the report on *The Employment of Women in the Armed Forces* was published. The report concluded that women would not be permitted to join direct combat units, because of the risks this participation was seen to pose to operational effectiveness. Operational effectiveness could potentially be undermined because the presence of women could have negative impact on unit cohesion. P. 53

Furthermore, despite male and female differences in levels of aggression, some women would be able to summon the required levels of controlled aggression seen as necessary for direct combat engagements. Rather, the issue was presented as revolving around unit or group cohesion. Ultimately, the decision was presented as resting on the deployment of a precautionary principle: … “We have no way of knowing whether mixed gender teams can develop the bounds of unconditional trust, loyalty and mutual support that must be strong enough to survive the test of close combat. Nor can we tell what will be the impact on the other members of a team I f a member of the opposite sex is killed or maimed. Moreover, there is no way of testing to find out, since no conceivable trial could simulate the full effects of close combat.” (p. 54) == MoD, *The Wider Employment of Women in Ground Combat*, internal MoD briefing document (MoD = Ministry of Defence; England).

A hostile work environment has been associated with lower combat readiness and high levels of sexual harassment correlate with low levels of preparedness for operational missions. Studies conducted for the US Department of Defense by the RAND Corporation, a research institute not known for its radical political views, concluded that gender differences did not erode cohesion (SEE A FEW LINES BELOW); cohesion was high when people believed that commanders emphasized unity and the importance of the roles of all members in achieving mission success. Man and women can work together effectively in military units, the report argued, if women fee that they will be treated equally and if men perceive that women do not receive special treatment. Leadership is a key issue, rather than difference. The importance of leadership in the establishment of equitable (and thus militarily efficient) regimes of military organization is emphasized as a defining factor by the MoD in its current actions against sexual harassment p.55
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L. Rosen and L. Martin, “Sexual harassment, cohesion and combat readiness in US Army support units”, *Armed Forces & Society* 24, 1997 221-224

The 1997 RAND study is cited in A.N. Wojach, “Women can be integrated into ground combat units”, in HJ. Haley (ed), *Women in the military*, San Diego, CA: Greenhaven, 2002, p. 27-38

“Group bonding”, referred to as “esprit de corps”, is of prime importance to the identity of the British soldier, and “teamwork” is one of the features most often mentioned in the job descriptions on the Army recruitment website. P. 67

There is a carnivalesque quality of these stories of “letting go”, in their celebration of the unregulated body (the body that “wibbles and wobbles” even if it doesn’t fall down), and in the featuring of bodily excess and of “low” bodily features like excrement and arseholes: what Bakhtin calls “the material lower bodily stratum”. These bodies of “letting go” are the antithesis of the tough, disciplined and controlled military body. Theorists of carnival have pointed its fundamental ambivalence: although it celebrates the breakdown or inversion of social control (in this case, military discipline), it can also be seen as ultimately reinforcing that control by providing a “safety valve” that is contained and limited. Although “letting go” in this way is the antithesis of military discipline, the celebration of the ability to do one’s job the next day also works to reinforce that disciplinary system. It shows that, despite “Letting go” in the evening, discipline and proper military masculine behaviour can be restored when necessary. Such episodes of “letting go” might then be seen as a temporary escape from but also an integral part of the formal practices that produce military masculinities and disciplined military bodies. Although they offer a respite from, or temporary resistance to, the disciplines and bodily regulation of army life, they are still utterly concerned with the production of masculinities, however. Practices of “letting go “ might be seen as reinforcing essentialised notions of masculinity as wild and uncontrolled that underpin the disciplined, controlled military body/subject. This is Hockey’s argument, that “blowouts” celebrate the idea that hard drinking “is what “real men” *naturally* do. P. 71

See also website or the Inter Company Pace Sticking Competition, May 2006.

In this analysis of the “gender strategies” of US women naval officers entering the masculine workplace of the US Navy, Barrett identifies three discursive strategies adopted by the women. The first is a masculinising strategy, where women comply with masculine norms and adopt masculine discourse and practices. This adoption masculine practices extends to the body … (Note : se dissocier de cette comparaison aux homes; analyzer la femme telle qu’elle est) p. 74

The advertisement mobilises a key argument in the debate about women and soldiering: the argument that « feminine qualities » of empathy or negotiation, for example, can enhance the work of the soldier, and that the idea of what a soldier is and does needs to be expanded, particularly in the « peace-keeping » roles that came to the fore in the post-Cold War period. The women soldier here becomes the face of the British Army as “peace-keepers” p. 88

There is .. a need for social (as well as political and military) engagement with the military covenant that exists between soldier and society, and the need for the exchange of ideas between the two that consolidates that link, As a society, we expect our armed forces to undertake specific tasks and perform specific roles It is remarkable how little we know about these people, given what we ask them to do. P. 105