

Canadian  
Forces  
College

Collège  
des  
Forces  
Canadiennes



## A TYPICAL SOLDIER: MILITARIZED MASCULINITY'S EFFECT ON GENDER INTEGRATION IN THE FORCES

Maj A.V. Pleasance

**JCSP 42**

### ***Exercise Solo Flight***

#### **Disclaimer**

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2016.

**PCEMI 42**

### ***Exercice Solo Flight***

#### **Avertissement**

Les opinions exprimées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

© Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2016.

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

**A TYPICAL SOLDIER: MILITARIZED MASCULINITY'S EFFECT ON  
GENDER INTEGRATION IN THE FORCES**

Maj A.V. Pleasance

*“This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions, which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied, except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.”*

Word Count: 4799

*“La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.”*

Compte de mots: 4799

**A TYPICAL SOLDIER:  
MILITARIZED MASCULINITY'S EFFECT  
ON GENDER INTEGRATION IN THE FORCES**

*There is a time in a boy's life when the sweetness is pounded out of him; and tenderness, and the ability to show what he feels, is gone.*

- Norah Vincent

## **Introduction**

The meaning of what it is to be a soldier in today's world is evolving as more and more women begin to make the decision to enter into military service. But this evolution of meaning inevitably must lead to discussions about identities and gender. What does it mean to be masculine and conversely, what are the traits associated with femininity? Interestingly enough, the answers to these questions, while changing to a small degree over time, remain largely unaltered. To be feminine means "having qualities or an appearance traditionally associated with women, especially delicacy and prettiness"<sup>1</sup>, whereas, synonyms for masculinity include "virility, manliness, maleness, vigour, strength, muscularity, ruggedness, toughness, robustness."<sup>2</sup> Gender, as a social construct, relies on these ideas of masculinity and femininity to frame expected behaviours. The fact that these expected behaviours are not innate and not linked to a person's biological sex is important when examining what happens when a traditionally male dominated culture such as the military becomes integrated. How does the process of masculinization take place after integration and does a militarized masculinity continue to manifest itself or does it cease? And further, does it even matter to what extent militarized masculinities play a role in how one understands what it is to be a "soldier"?

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/feminine>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/masculinity>

These questions all play a part in the exploration of a militarized masculinity and its impact on the successful gender integration into the militaries of many advanced and democratic societies. Gender integration has become an important measure of equality and representation, with discrimination based on gender being illegal in many countries including Canada, the US and in member countries of the European Union (EU). The fact that a country has committed to gender integration in its military does not necessarily mean that the initiative has been a success. To the contrary, in many cases there is significant evidence that the “add women and stir” method has done very little to change negative attitudes or behaviours. Karen Davis and Brian McKee assert that “the real hurdle for women participating in the military today has little to do with their physical and mental abilities but rather revolves around social and cultural issues characterizing a ‘warrior’ framework”.<sup>3</sup> One explanation points to militarized masculinities which “refers to the assertion that traits stereotypically associated with masculinity can be acquired and proven through military service or action, and combat in particular.”<sup>4</sup> Also, “[g]ender integration policies of the military tend to privilege the male soldier while reinforcing the dominant masculine identity of the institution. This may be done at the expense of the female soldier as well as impact unit cohesion and effectiveness.”<sup>5</sup> When states perpetuate the belief that masculinity can be best realized through combat and warfighting and at the same time aim for successful gender integration within their armed forces, inconsistencies arise. The relatively recent “External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces” or the “Deschamps Report” as it has quickly become known, is a document that

---

<sup>3</sup> Karen D. Davis and Brian McKee, “Women in the military: facing the warrior framework”, in *Challenge and change in the military: Gender and diversity issues*, edited by Franklin C. Pinch, Allister T. MacIntyre, Phyllis Browne and Alan C. Okros, (Winnipeg: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, 2004), 52.

<sup>4</sup> Maya Eichler, "Militarized Masculinities in International Relations," *Militarized Masculinities in International Relations*, (The Brown Journal of World Affairs, Fall 2014). 81

<sup>5</sup> Tiffany Bohm, "A Phenomenological Analysis of Gender Integration Policies in the U.S. Military, 1980 to 2013," (Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 2015). Abstract.

illustrates these very inconsistencies. Canada is not alone in dealing with the dichotomy between gender integration and a masculinized workplace. The US continues to struggle with complete gender integration as do a number of other western democracies. By presenting an analysis of three militaries that have, to varying degrees, supported female enrollment this paper will demonstrate that despite an apparent focus on equality and gender integration the construction of, and reliance by these institutions on, militarized masculinities and hyper masculinity specifically, continue to prevent real integration and equality.

The first section will focus on Canada's pursuit of gender inclusion and the challenges it has and continues to face through a review of the Somalia affair and more recently, on the Deschamps Report. The second section will examine Israel's history of gender inclusion with a focus on the all-female Nachshol Reconnaissance Company and a consideration of whether the use of militarized masculinities has impacted the successful integration of its military. And finally, the third section will examine the US' recent decision to allow females in to all combat roles and the deviating support surrounding that decision.

## **Canada**

Despite substantial gains in the areas of gender discrimination and equal rights, the military is still such a highly masculinized culture that society actually looks to supposed military traits as examples of masculinity. This circular understanding of masculinity is reinforced in popular culture where movies like Rambo support the idea of the warrior as hero. Additionally, this militarized masculinity is used as a way of motivating and inspiring military members and promoting team cohesion. Historically, when full time soldiering was an occupation reserved only for men, this method was arguably acceptable in that male and female

roles coincided with generally accepted perceptions of gender and masculinity and femininity. In the last 30 years, as many states have undertaken efforts to include females in their military forces, not just in support roles but in the traditionally male dominated combat trades, the method of reinforcing militarized masculinities is no longer as straightforward.

Canada has a long history of female participation in the military but it wasn't until 1989, 7 years after the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was signed, that women were permitted in the combat arms. Before that time, women had been restricted to non-combat roles, including trades such as logistics, nursing and administration. In 2014 females comprised approximately 15% of the military. The air force and navy had the most with slightly more than 18% and in the army women made up 12.5%.<sup>6</sup> These numbers appear low, and definitely not in line with the employment target of 25% set out by the federal government<sup>7</sup>. However, gender integration in Canada hasn't been as easy as simply opening the door to women. One of the main obstacles to fully integrating women into the armed forces is the reliance on militarized masculinities to achieve military aims.

For years Canada was strongly committed to peacekeeping and in the 1990s consistently contributed more troops to UN missions than any other country.<sup>8</sup> And while it might be understandable to assume that peacekeeping operations would require a force to be less violent, less focussed on a warrior mentality, and militarized masculinities remain a part of the military even when the missions are focused on assistance more than warfighting. This was evidenced during one of the darkest moments in Canadian military history, the Somalia Affair. In 1993,

---

<sup>6</sup> Government of Canada, "Women in the Canadian Armed Forces", last modified 6 March 2014, <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=women-in-the-canadian-armed-forces/hie8w7rm>

<sup>7</sup> Bruce Campion-Smith, "Looking for a few good women — Canada's military goes on a hiring spree", *Thestar.com*, 14 March 2016.

<sup>8</sup> United Nations Peacekeeping, "Troop and police contributors archive (1990 - 2014)", date accessed 29 April 2016, [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors\\_archive.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml)

members of the Airborne Regiment from CFB Petawawa deployed on a UN mission to Somalia and tortured and murdered a young Somali man. Two soldiers were charged and in the subsequent trial and inquiry disturbing information was revealed that indicated such a systemic problem within the unit that the Airborne Regiment was ultimately disbanded. Sandra Whitworth makes the connection between the behaviour of those soldiers and the presence of militarized masculinities in the forces. She says, “[t]he events in Somalia revealed...the pervasiveness, and effects of, militarized masculinity within issues of Canadian foreign policy.”<sup>9</sup> The fact that these men had been recruited, trained and exposed to a culture that reinforced the idea that the use of violence, misogyny and racism equated to being a soldier serves to underline the effects of militarized masculinities on an organisation’s people. In *Theater of War- Combat, the Military and Masculinities*, David Morgan writes that “[t]he stance, the facial expressions, and the weapons clearly connote aggression, courage, a capacity for violence, and, sometimes, a willingness for sacrifice. The uniform absorbs individualities into a generalized and timeless masculinity...”<sup>10</sup> At the time of the Somalia incident, women had only been allowed to serve in the combat arms for a few years and the Airborne Regiment had no female soldiers in its ranks. Until the murder of Shidane Arone, there had been no thought given to the fact that the culture of the unit was out of control. The issue of gender integration in that particular context was moot. However, as time has passed and more and more women have made the decision to join the military the requirement to consider issues and the integration challenges that have arisen has become even more important.

---

<sup>9</sup> Sandra Whitworth, “Militarized Masculinities and the Politics of Peacekeeping: The Canadian Case,” in *Feminist Perspectives on Canadian Foreign Policy*, edited by Claire Turenne Sjolander, Heather A. Smith and Deborah Stienstra, (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2003), 77.

<sup>10</sup> David Morgan, “Theater of War- Combat, the Military and Masculinities”, in *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1994),

When the law was passed in 1989 giving women the right to serve in all roles in the Canadian Forces, militarised masculinity was still the norm. In the years following the decision many women reported being sexually assaulted, raped, victims of harassment and intimidation. In a Maclean's article from May 1998, Dawn Thomson recalls what she saw on her first posting to CFB Esquimalt. "She saw a wall of men's faces—then came the hollering and the catcalls, a cacophony of sexual innuendo and gutter talk. 'We were referred to as fresh meat more than once,' she noted in her diary." This objectification and demonstration of hyper masculinity is a way of bonding and achieving cohesion while at the same time "othering" those who belong to groups who do not conform. Women are one of those groups. Deborah Harrison and Lucie Laliberté write about violence against women, specifically in reference to military communities. They say that "[e]xcluding and denigrating women are important aspects of combat unit bonding".<sup>11</sup> Based on the contents of the Deschamps report issued last year, their conclusion remains relevant.

In May 2014, Maclean's, the same magazine that published Dawn Thomson's story 16 years earlier published another article about sexual assault in the Canadian Forces. The article detailed numerous cases where women had been sexually assaulted and faced harassment and career implications after having reported the attacks. Based on Maclean's exposé, the Chief of Defence Staff (CDS) ordered an "External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces", headed by Madame Deschamps as the External Review Authority (ERA). What the ERA found was "that there is an underlying sexualized culture in the CAF that is hostile to women and LGTBQ members, and conducive to more

---

<sup>11</sup> Deborah Harrison and Lucie Laliberté, *The First Casualty: Violence against Women in Canadian Military Communities*, (Toronto: Lorimer, 2002), 24.



serious incidents of sexual harassment and assault.”<sup>12</sup> This sexualized culture can best be attributed to the militarized masculinity that makes up so much of the military culture. “Military training inculcates ‘exaggerated ideals of manhood’ that often rely on the devaluation of gendered others as well as those othered by race or sexuality.”<sup>13</sup> The devaluation of females through sexual assault is a startling result of an institution’s condonation and approval of hyper masculinity. Unfortunately, despite the fact that women have long been a part of Canada’s Armed Forces, are permitted into every trade and officer occupation and now make up 15% of the military population the continued use of hyper masculinity as a way of ensuring cohesion has prevented the full integration of women into the forces. This seems at odds with the official position of the government and military leaders who have publicly indicated the importance of gender equality and integration however, official positions and practice are often not synchronised. Because a hyper masculine culture has historically been the norm in the military it is unreasonable to believe that simply ordering people to stop behaving in ways which result from that philosophy is enough. What this means is that the culture needs to be reformed but until there is a real threat to the institution there is unlikely to be any impetus to change. According to institutional theory, while implementing legislation and issuing policies and directives are important steps they are not sufficient to ensure change unless the institution’s legitimacy is threatened. Pierre Pahlavi observes “institutional theory poses that any substantive organizational change in a given institutional milieu only occurs when pressures from either the external or internal environment are strong enough to seriously endanger the social legitimacy of the institution.”<sup>14</sup> Until Maclean’s published the story in 2014 and despite some media attention

---

<sup>12</sup> Marie Deschamps, “External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces,” accessed on April 25 2016, i.

<sup>13</sup> Maya Eichler, “Militarized Masculinities...”, 83.

previously, sexual misconduct was being dealt with at a much lower, and less publicized, level. Now, two years and one external review later there is a focus on addressing the symptoms of this hyper masculine environment. However, unless the reliance on hyper masculinity to achieve military goals is lessened it is unlikely that the sexualized culture will be diminished. Ordering people to end behaviours simply does not address why the behaviour exists in the first place and proactive measures must be taken at the institutional level to address this.

## **Israel**

At first glance, the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) appears to be well on its way to achieving full gender integration. In fact, Israel uses conscription as a way of ensuring sufficient manning of its armed forces and therefore it does not exclude women from the conscription process. Instead, males and females are both required to complete compulsory service in the IDF once they reach the age of 18 unless excused for various religious and other reasons; males for a period of 3 years and females for 2 years. And while women have long been a part of the IDF, the road to integration has not been easy. There are indications that despite a reputation for an advanced and integrated military, Israel's approach is actually not as progressive as one might believe.

Notwithstanding the fact that women have been conscripted into the IDF since it was formed in 1948, the jobs that were open to women at that time were mainly administrative and professional duties.<sup>15</sup> Since then, a substantial amount of progress has been made regarding the employment possibilities for women in the IDF. Females are now integrated into more than 90%

---

<sup>14</sup> Pierre C. Pahlavi and Eric Ouellet, "Institutional analysis and irregular warfare: Israel Defense Forces during the 33-Day War of 2006", *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Vol 23, Iss 1, 2012, 33.

<sup>15</sup> Dana Levin, "You're Always First a Girl; Emerging Adult Women, Gender and Sexuality in the Israeli Army", *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Vol 26(1), (Sage Publishing), 5.

of military occupations including combat roles. In 2000 the Security Service Law was amended to read “Every woman of military age has the same right as a man of military age to serve in every position in military service”,<sup>16</sup> but in May of 2015 the IDF made the decision not to allow women in tanks. This decision was made “partially because of some of the physically demanding tasks and partially out of concern for the lack of privacy.”<sup>17</sup> While this decision itself is indicative of the overall perception of women in the forces as needing special treatment and being unable to cope with situations in which men find themselves, Orna Sasson-Levy, a respected and published sociologist at Bar-Ilan University says “...it is not so important whether they serve in combat or non-combat units. What is bad is gender segregation. Most women serve in... mostly female roles...at the top of the hierarchy are combat soldiers...we need to see more men as clerks and teachers, and more women as combatants.”<sup>18</sup> An example of what Sasson-Levy is referring to is the fact that not only more women than men continue to serve in administrative and logistical functions but that when women are assigned to combat roles they are often segregated and do so in units composed solely of women. An example of this type of segregated unit is the all-female Nachshol Reconnaissance Company. A field intelligence unit, its “mission is to patrol and gather field intelligence”<sup>19</sup> along the Israeli border. The women who belong to the unit are proud of their role and feel not only equal but superior to the men who serve in other combat units. Captain Dana Ben-Ezra, the Company Commander of the unit in 2013 said “We are the only unit in the world made up entirely of female combat soldiers,” and “My girls often carry out tasks more difficult than those of male combat soldiers.” It is apparent

---

<sup>16</sup> Judah Ari Gross, “New combat positions for women in the IDF, same old obstacles,” *The Times of Israel*, 13 March 2016. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/new-combat-positions-for-women-in-the-idf-same-old-obstacles/>

<sup>17</sup> Judith Suvilovsky, “Despite some progress, most combat roles are closed to women in the IDF”, *Jerusalem Post*, 13 August 2015. <http://www.jpost.com/Not-Just-News/Despite-some-progress-most-combat-roles-are-closed-to-women-in-the-IDF-412063>

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Yair Barzilai, “Leading the way in gender equality”, *Israel Defense Forces*, 27 January 2013. <http://www.idf.il/1283-18166-en/Dover.aspx>

that the officer speaks with pride of the fact that her company is made up of all females and she goes on to discuss the fact that “the IDF would not have established the Nachshol Company had there not been a need for it”.<sup>20</sup> The question of the requirement for a gender segregated unit in the IDF is an interesting one.

The fact that an entire field unit would be established and manned solely by women is a clear indication that gender integration in the IDF has a long way to go, but why? The reason for this slow move towards successful gender integration rests on the fact that the institution is still closely tied to an ideology of militarized masculinity. In Israel, boys grow up knowing that they will be required to serve in the military and their ideas of what that means are shaped from a young age. In this country, arguably more than in the US or in Canada, masculinity is militarized to an extreme level. Uta Klein speaks about a “siege mentality” which has increased cohesion among the Jewish collective but in turn has contributed to a “military mind” which “constructs different identities for women and men: men are the warriors, fighters and protectors and women are the emotional supporters of the fighters, the worried and the protected.”<sup>21</sup> Klein argues that “the armed forces maintain a centrality in Israeli society that...structures gendered social practices in daily life”.<sup>22</sup> Thus, men learn what it is to be masculine day to day from observing military interactions around them. When these young men join the military they look to their service as a rite of passage, “it is related to and spoken of in fatalistic, quasi-religious terms, as an inevitable, inescapable, pseudo-biological phase of male maturation.”<sup>23</sup> This desire for men to

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Uta Klein, “Our Best Boys: The Gendered Nature of Civil-Military Relations in Israel”, *Men and Masculinities*, Vol 2 No 1, July 1999, 48.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>23</sup> Rela Mazali, “Soldiers born: Military service as initiation rite in Israel”, *Unpublished lecture*, quoted in Uta Klein, “Our Best Boys: The Gendered Nature of Civil-Military Relations in Israel”, *Men and Masculinities*, Vol 2 No 1, July 1999, 53.

be warriors, fighters and protectors does not translate easily into a military where gender integration and gender equality are the ideals.

Understanding the fact that Israeli men are raised with very specific ideas of how to “do” gender it is not surprising then to see that Israeli women are also raised with presumptions of gender as they grow up. One could argue that a lack of successful gender integration could be attributed to the fact that women who join the IDF contribute to the segregation of genders in the military by embracing feminine extremes instead of attempting to integrate and make the environment a more gender neutral space. These ideas of gender that women internalize as they grow up in Israeli society and learn how to best operate in the military often revolve around ideas about being “the emotional supporters of the fighters”. Research conducted and presented by Dana Levin in the *Journal of Adolescent Research* indicated that many young women who had served in the IDF felt special when they were chosen to be the “platoon secretary”, “someone who mostly takes care of the soldiers, to talk to them, to listen to them” and that “with the Chief of Staff...women who don’t look good don’t get there.”<sup>24</sup> Many women enjoyed the attention given to them in these roles and some even went so far as to indicate that they enjoyed being one of only a few women “because it meant that the male soldiers would vie for the attention of the female soldiers.”<sup>25</sup> But rather than incriminating the women as contributors of the segregation, these examples and the insinuation that women need to be found attractive and of comfort to the men with whom they work, speaks to the gendered hierarchies which are established within the military. These hierarchies prevent effective integration and “through an elaborate system of gender divisions and distinctions, the military intensifies the salience of gender and constructs

---

<sup>24</sup> Dana Levin, “You’re Always First a Girl; Emerging Adult Women, Gender and Sexuality in the Israeli Army”, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Vol 26(1), (Sage Publishing), 14.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

and reinforces gender differences, which in turn legitimate gender inequalities.”<sup>26</sup> The women are simply reacting in normal ways in an environment which has already created the hierarchies to which they belong.

## **United States**

Where Canada and Israel have a reputation of having integrated women into the military for a longer period of time, the US has a reputation for taking a much more extended and protracted approach to integration. In reality, the timeline detailing female participation in the US military is very similar to that of the two countries discussed above. In the 1970’s military academies opened their doors to women and in that same decade women were allowed to become pilots.<sup>27</sup> What is different is that while women were allowed in combat roles in 1989 in Canada and in 2000 in Israel, in the case of the US the law still restricted women from being employed in all combat roles until December 2015, more than a quarter century later than their northern neighbour. For more than 40 years the arguments surrounding this last bastion of integration have been passionate and despite the recent decision to permit women into all roles, there remain many individuals of all ranks who believe that the decision is wrong. These individuals include the likes of General Joseph E. Dunford. A former commandant of the Marine Corps, Dunford is currently the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Marines had asked for exceptions to the inclusion of women into the “ranks of infantry, machine-gunners and fire-support reconnaissance units,”<sup>28</sup> essentially those roles that would provide the greatest risk

---

<sup>26</sup> Dafna N. Izraeli, “Gendering Military Service in the Israel Defense Forces”, in *A Soldier and A Woman*, edited by Gerard J. DeGroot and Corinna Peniston-Bird, (Toronto: Pearson Education Ltd, 2000), 260.

<sup>27</sup> Women in Military Service For America Memorial Foundation, Inc., “Highlights in the History of Military Women,” Last accessed 28 April 2016. <http://www.womensmemorial.org/Education/timeline.html>

for women to engage directly with the enemy in combat. The Secretary of Defense, Ash Carter refused to grant any exceptions and as such, every job in the US military is now open to women who qualify. While a crucial step has been taken towards complete integration of women into the American armed forces, another very real challenge to integration remains, that of the prevailing attitudes and militarized masculinity that continue to pervade the American consciousness concerning military service.

Hyper masculinity and militarized masculinity are not just a military phenomenon. The perception that in order to be a “real man” one must display a level of masculinity that prevents anyone from doubting the verity of such a claim is splashed everywhere in the current media saturated environment. Advertisements for pickup trucks, condoms and luxury cars all have depicted men as danger loving and sexually cavalier. In the 1980s Donald Mosher and Mark Sirkin described three components of hyper masculinity, those being callous sexual attitudes, violence as manly and danger as exciting.<sup>29</sup> The media draws on this sense of hyper masculinity and in so doing shapes perceptions of manliness. But, there is also no doubt that the military as an organization plays on these ideas of exaggerated masculinity as well, reinforcing and emphasizing them as effective ways to build cohesive teams of men who will be willing to commit violent acts for the sake of the state.

An example of this masculine culture perpetuated by the military as an institution is presented by the fact that even though women have been members of the Marine Corps since 1918<sup>30</sup> basic recruit training for that service continues to be segregated by gender. Female

---

<sup>28</sup> Mark Thompson, “Women in Combat: Why the Pentagon Chief Overruled the Marines”, *Time*, 3 December 2015. <http://time.com/4135583/women-combat-marines-ash-carter/>

<sup>29</sup> Donald L. Mosher and Silvan S. Tomkins, “Scripting the Macho Man: Hypermasculine Socialization and Enculturation,” *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol 25, No 1, February 1988, 60.

recruits are instructed by an all-female staff with evaluation standards that differ from those of their male counterparts. According to Lt. Col. Kate Germano who commanded the all-female 4th Recruit Training Battalion,

Segregation imprints the thought within male recruits that females are “the other” and perpetuates the false notion that they are less mentally and physically competent. Furthermore, segregation also leads male drill instructors and recruits to believe that females enjoy an easier boot camp experience and undermines the accomplishments of both the female recruits and their training staff. This is a dangerous practice that has damaged group cohesion and fostered demeaning stereotypes for female Marines.<sup>31</sup>

The reasons for segregated training speak to a highly patriarchal culture. “Most notably, gender-segregated recruit training was deemed critical to protecting female recruits from ridicule and criticism, scorn from male counterparts when perceived as underperforming, and resentment when outperforming male recruits.”<sup>32</sup> Essentially, it doesn’t matter whether the women underperform or outperform, they will be met with negative responses. The institutional policies, designed to separate and “protect” female recruits and which result in “othering” of female Marines and reinforcement of demeaning stereotypes, contradict the institution’s policies of gender integration.

The arguments against full inclusion of women into all roles do not end with Marines or even males in general. In fact, many women also believe that this decision will have a negative impact on force effectiveness. Margaret Wentz, a writer for the *Globe and Mail* thinks, that

---

<sup>30</sup> Women Marines Association, “History of the Women Marines,” date accessed 29 April 2016. [https://www.womenmarines.org/wm\\_history.aspx](https://www.womenmarines.org/wm_history.aspx)

<sup>31</sup> Kate Germano, “Integration of Marine Corps recruit training: One shot to get it right,” *Military Times*, 20 January 2016. <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/opinion/2016/01/20/gender-integration-marine-recruit-training-commentary/79054826/>

<sup>32</sup> Anne Chapman, “Mixed Gender Basic Training: the United States Army Experience 1973–2004”, quoted by Kevin Collins in “The Gender- Integrated Marine Corps Shaping success in policy implementation”, *Marine Corps Gazette*, Vol 98, Iss 12, December 2014. <https://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/2014/12/gender-integrated-marine-corps>



women on the front lines are a liability but not only because of their physical differences. “The full integration of women in combat roles has been portrayed as a breakthrough equivalent to the integration of black soldiers and gays. But when it comes to fighting, gender differences matter much more than race or sexual orientation.”<sup>33</sup> Wentze is not the only woman who argues against inclusion and thereby full integration of women into the forces. A female Marine Officer, Captain Lauren Serrano, elaborates on the theme presented by Wentze, that women and men are just too different to be able to do the same jobs in the same unit. Serrano dismisses the argument that just because a woman is physically capable of performing a job she should be permitted to do so. She argues that “Female Marines who want to stir the pot by joining the infantry ranks are more interested in their careers than the needs of the Corps—they are selfish...” and “The time, energy, and conflict associated with setting women up for success in infantry billets will not make the Marine Corps more combat effective.”<sup>34</sup> Her opinions are presented in such a way as to delegitimize the importance of the subject of integration and focus the blame on women for being too demanding and not sufficiently dedicated to the military. She speaks directly to the issue of militarized masculinity when she says “The implied task is to create an infantry community of warriors” and in her opinion, women are simply not warriors. The fact that someone such as Serrano, having undergone the training and been inculcated concerning the ideals and values of this military organization believes that women don’t belong, says more about the deep seated institutional beliefs and prioritization of masculinity than the recent policies of gender integration. Until the underlying dogma changes, the task of changing the attitudes of service members in opposition to gender integration will be an uphill battle.

---

<sup>33</sup> Margaret Wentze, “Women in combat: Let’s get real”, *The Globe and Mail*, 27 January 2013. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/women-in-combat-lets-get-real/article7879189/>

<sup>34</sup> Lauren F. Serrano, “Why Women Do Not Belong in the U.S. Infantry Marine infantry isn’t broken, it doesn’t need to be ‘fixed’”, *Marine Corps Gazette*, Vol 98, Iss 9, September 2014. <https://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/2014/09/why-women-do-not-belong-us-infantry>

While much of this section has focused on the Marines resistance to the recent decision announced by Secretary Carter, it is not because they are the only service who openly supports a hyper masculine culture. Some examples include the Navy Seals and the Army's Delta Force. These organizations, while not as openly opposed to the changes still rely on militarized masculinity in order to achieve their aims. The result then would naturally be that women in those units are no more successfully integrated than the women in the Marine Corps. The fact that they are included does not mean that they have been successfully integrated.

## **Conclusion**

As has been examined, the idea that gender is a socially constructed phenomenon which serves to reinforce stereotypes and provides ways of being for entire portions of a population is one which influences greatly the ways in which organizations and institutions structure themselves and provide information to their members. In the case of the military, an institution focused on aggression and violence, incorporating militarized masculinity and using it to provide male members with identities has, for many years, allowed military members to exaggerate their warrior like qualities and exude "manliness". The issue that has arisen in the last 40 years or so is that, as women have begun redefining their femininity, there has been a requirement for the institutions and organizations to which they belong to also redefine gender. Unfortunately, as presented in this paper, neither Canada, Israel nor the US have adequately changed how masculinity is presented in order to ensure that integration of members of the other 50% of the population into the military has been adequately successful. Canada, despite being a country which mandated the entry of women into all combat roles in 1989 and into submarines in 2000 continues to accept and reinforce in its military negative behaviours and attitudes; attitudes which contribute to a "sexualized culture... manifested through the pervasive use of language

that is demeaning to women, sexual jokes and innuendos, and low-level harassment... rooted in cultural norms that permit a degree of discriminatory and harassing conduct within the organization.”<sup>35</sup> This comment, made by the ERA in the Deschamps report, shocked a significant number of military members, both male and female. Many individuals saw it as an attack on an honourable and principled profession. It was difficult for many to accept that the philosophy to which they prescribed could be so shameful.

However, an examination of all of these examples of how militarized masculinity prevents successful integration does not mean that no progress is being made. In fact, in late 2015 the Canadian Chief of Defence Staff announced plans to follow in the path of Sweden and Norway and begin using advisors to provide advice during planning and operations that would take into account considerations of gender. Additionally, although much of this paper has focused on the US Marines resistance to gender integration, it must be acknowledged that the US military forces have improved upon their inclusion policies dramatically within the last decade. The repealing of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” law in 2011 and this most recent announcement to allow women to serve in all combat roles are important first steps in being able to provide an equal and integrated military culture. What will make these changes even more significant and improve the likelihood of success will be when the institutions and their leaders understand the significance of how they use gender to shape the ethos and not expect the men and women in uniform to be able to separate their actions from their masculinized culture .

---

<sup>35</sup> Marie Deschamps, “External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces,” accessed on April 25 2016, i.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barzilai, Yair. "Leading the way in gender equality." *Israel Defense Forces*. 27 January 2013. <http://www.idf.il/1283-18166-en/Dover.aspx>
- Belkin, Aaron. *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Facade of American Empire, 1898-2001*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012. Date accessed, 14 April 2016. <http://aaronbelkin.org/pdfs/Bring%20Me%20Men%20-%201st%20chpt.pdf>
- Bohm, Tiffany. "A Phenomenological Analysis of Gender Integration Policies in the U.S. Military, 1980 to 2013." Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 2015.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. "Militarism and War." *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. Ed. Laura J. Shepherd. New York: Routledge, 2010. 105-115.
- Collins, Kevin. "The Gender- Integrated Marine Corps: Shaping success in policy implementation." *Marine Corps Gazette*. Vol 98, Iss 12. December 2014. <https://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/2014/12/gender-integrated-marine-corps>
- Davis, Karen D., and Brian McKee. "Women in the Military: Facing the Warrior Framework." *Challenge and Change in the Military: Gender and Diversity Issues*. Ed. Franklin C. Pinch, Allister T. MacIntyre, Phyllis Browne, and Alan C. Okros. Winnipeg: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, Canadian Defence Academy, 2004. 52-75.
- Deschamps, Marie. "External Review into Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces." Date accessed, 25 April 2016. <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/caf-community-support-services/external-review-sexual-mh-2015/summary.page>.
- Detraz, Nicole. *International Security and Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2012.
- Eichler, Maya. "Militarized Masculinities in International Relations." *Militarized Masculinities in International Relations*. The Brown Journal of World Affairs, Fall 2014. Date accessed, 14 April 2016. <https://www.brown.edu/initiatives/journal-world-affairs/index.php?q=211-fall%E2%80%93winter-2014%2Fmilitarized-masculinities-international-relations>
- Germano, Kate. "Integration of Marine Corps recruit training: One shot to get it right." *Military Times*. 20 January 2016. <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/opinion/2016/01/20/gender-integration-marine-recruit-training-commentary/79054826/>
- Government of Canada. "Women in the Canadian Armed Forces". Last modified 6 March 2014. <http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=women-in-the-canadian-armed-forces/hie8w7rm>

Gross, Judah Ari. "New combat positions for women in the IDF, same old obstacles." *The Times of Israel*. Last modified 13 March 2016. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/new-combat-positions-for-women-in-the-idf-same-old-obstacles/>

Harrison, Deborah, and Lucie Laliberté. *The First Casualty: Violence against Women in Canadian Military Communities*. Toronto: Lorimer, 2002.

Izraeli, Dafna N. "Gendering Military Service in the Israel Defense Forces." in *A Soldier and A Woman*, edited by Gerard J. DeGroot and Corinna Peniston-Bird. Toronto: Pearson Education Ltd, 2000.

Kennedy, Caroline. "Gender and Security." *Contemporary Security Studies*. Ed. Alan Collins. Third ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 117-30.

Klein, Uta. "Our Best Boys: The Gendered Nature of Civil-Military Relations in Israel." *Men and Masculinities*. Vol 2 No 1. July 1999. 47-65.

Knight, Charles. "Sexuality, cohesion, masculinity and combat motivation: Designing personnel policy to sustain capability". *Australian Army Journal*. Vol. 10, No. 3, 2013. 58-78.

Levin, Dana. "You're Always First a Girl; Emerging Adult Women, Gender and Sexuality in the Israeli Army." *Journal of Adolescent Research*. Vol 26(1). Sage Publishing.

Masters, Cristina. "Cyborg Soldiers and Militarised Masculinities." *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. Ed. Laura J. Shepherd. New York: Routledge, 2010. 176-86.

Morgan, David H.J. "Theater of War: Combat, the Military and Masculinities." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

Mosher, Donald L. and Silvan S. Tomkins. "Scripting the Macho Man: Hypermasculine Socialization and Enculturation." *The Journal of Sex Research*. Vol 25, No 1, February 1988. 60.

Obradovic, Lana. "Being All She Can Be: Gender Integration in NATO Military Forces". *SSRN Electronic Journal SSRN Journal* (n.d.): Date accessed, 14 April 2016.

Pahlavi, Pierre C. and Eric Ouellet. "Institutional analysis and irregular warfare: Israel Defense Forces during the 33-Day War of 2006." *Small Wars and Insurgencies*. Vol 23, Iss 1, 2012. 32-55.

Serrano, Lauren F. "Why Women Do Not Belong in the U.S. Infantry: Marine infantry isn't broken, it doesn't need to be 'fixed'." *Marine Corps Gazette*. Vol 98, Iss 9. September 2014. <https://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/2014/09/why-women-do-not-belong-us-infantry>

Sjoberg, Laura, ed. *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Sutton, Barbara, Sandra Morgen, and Julie Novkov, eds. *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarization*. London: Rutgers UP, 2008

Suvilovsky, Judith. "Despite some progress, most combat roles are closed to women in the IDF." *Jerusalem Post*. 13 August 2015. <http://www.jpost.com/Not-Just-News/Despite-some-progress-most-combat-roles-are-closed-to-women-in-the-IDF-412063>

Thompson, Mark. "Women in Combat: Why the Pentagon Chief Overruled the Marines." *Time*. 3 December 2015. <http://time.com/4135583/women-combat-marines-ash-carter/>

United Nations Peacekeeping. "Troop and police contributors archive (1990 - 2014)". Date accessed 29 April 2016.

[http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors\\_archive.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml)

Wente, Margaret. "Women in Combat: Let's Get Real". *The Globe and Mail*. Toronto, 26 Jan 2016.

Whitworth, Sandra. "Militarized Masculinities and the Politics of Peacekeeping: The Canadian Case" in *Feminist Perspectives on Canadian Foreign Policy*. Edited by Claire Turenne Sjolander, Heather A. Smith and Deborah Stienstra. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2003. 76-89.

Women in Military Service for America Memorial Foundation, Inc. "Highlights in the History of Military Women." Date accessed 28 April 2016.

<http://www.womensmemorial.org/Education/timeline.html>

Women Marines Association. "History of the Women Marines." Last accessed 29 April 2016.

[https://www.womenmarines.org/wm\\_history.aspx](https://www.womenmarines.org/wm_history.aspx)

Zalewski, Marysia. "Feminist International Relations: Making Sense..." *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. Ed. Laura J. Shepherd. New York: Routledge, 2010. 28-43.