Fighting for Agency
Deconstructing Women's Violence in the Israeli Defense Forces and Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam

Heather Doi

International Relations (IR) scholarship is notorious for overlooking how women's participation, inclusion and exclusion unfold in the political realm; and yet, mainstream IR literature abounds with gendered boundaries and stereotypes.[1] Not until the early 1990s did feminist IR scholars seek to deconstruct the "oppositional logic that mystifies categories like woman/man, domestic/international and peace/war."[2] These dualisms are central to IR theory and practice, visible in the annals of political theory. Firstly, the ancient Greeks defined public life by the "politics, war and diplomacy" only a privileged few could practice. In Machiavelli's canonical text, *The Prince,* politics is a militarized game wherein only a masculinised virtu can hope to tame contingencies, represented by the female goddess Fortuna.[3] Ann Tickner notes that today, Machiavelli's Fortuna, or woman, is the problem of anarchy in realist international relations.[4] These select examples show how gender divisions and roles live on in theory, but it seems less probably that they persist in today's intertwining mix of global political actors.

More than ever, women are visible in male-dominated institutions and areas of scholarship such as national defence, peace and conflict studies, and military organizations.[5] As women's salience in global politics increases, we notice more often that they also commit acts of proscribed and sanctioned violence. Women's violence penetrates the deepest corners of IR theory and practice defying the entrenched links between men, masculinity and militarism; women still face assumptions about femininity, appropriate female behaviour and hostility when they are defied.[6] Women's violence is thus viewed not as a human capability, but a

transgression of their femininity and the gender roles laid out for them. This still occurs, twenty years after feminist IR research revealed gender subordination and divisions in the key areas of global politics. Feminist IR must now go beyond "seeing" violent women, to acknowledging women's agency through violence, in spite of existing stereotypes.

I will use a feminist IR perspective to compare the extent to which women's sanctioned violence in the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) and proscribed violence in the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), allow for women's agency. I define women's agency through violence as the ability to cogently choose, in relation to institutional influences, to act in pursuit of a goal. Other actors must first recognize this reality before women's violence can be viewed as an act of political agency. I argue that although both of these organizations welcome women into their ranks, gender role stereotypes embedded in national narratives overwhelm the possibility of the idea of women's violence as a means of satisfying a political goal. Furthermore, we must not assume that the immediate experience of violence is indicative of true agency. Subsequent implications of women's violence and their effects on surrounding, individuals, groups and institutions, are often a more accurate barometer of lasting gender stereotype deconstruction. Firstly, I outline how feminist IR that applies gender as a dynamic analytic category can deconstruct the idealized gender identities and roles regulating women's political experiences. Secondly, I examine the conditional agency of women in the IDF who are conscripted to military service, but kept out of most combat roles by gendered traditions and national narratives. Lastly, I look at the female fighters in the LTTE who are caught in the debate over whether violence is emancipatory, or a coercive tool that removes agency. In this paper I hope to capture the problematic realities of a political environment that often supports female agency, but only insofar as gender stereotypes are left intact.

Methods

Feminist IR: Illuminating Questions

The boundaries set by idealized gender roles and identities reinforce the limits of acceptable gendered behaviours. These constraints on women's agency require a feminist IR outlook to question existing gendered theories and practices where they have not been questioned before. Using an "explicitly feminist" approach, Laura Sjoberg and Caron E. Gentry identify three prominent narratives commonly used to help us come to terms with women's violence.[7] The mother, monster and whore explanations suggest that a woman's violence reflects her "womanhood," not her capacity for independent, and potentially politically motivated, thought.[8] These narratives respectively characterize a woman's violent actions as a reaction to her role as wife or mother, as a pathological flaw that destroys her femininity, or as "inspired by sexual dependence and depravity".[9] They reduce the multi-faceted explanations for women's violence to gender stereotypes, and simultaneously deny the possibility of women's agency through violence. Similarly, when women in the IDF and LTTE engage in combat or suicide bombing, they transgress existing national narratives that perpetuate the link between men and militarism. In these military organizations, men are agents – they choose their actions – and women are stripped of this capacity to choose.[10] At the same time, it is too simplistic to assert that all women, or humans for that matter, commit violence unaffected by institutions and the global political context.[11]

A feminist approach is necessary to uncover the gender roles and stereotypes dictating how violent women are perceived; they question the core understandings of global political theory and practice to eliminate women's subordination. As Tickner points out, feminist approaches to International Relations emerged as a challenge to the discipline's dominant social scientific methodologies. [12] They surfaced alongside the "postpositivst"

debate comprising critical theory, postmodernism and historical sociology among others. [13] Most feminist empirical IR research has rejected the "social scientific path," the process of forming and testing hypotheses, choosing instead to rely on "postpositivist methodological framework." [14] As a result, feminist IR poses questions and illuminates puzzles that are distinct from social scientific findings. For example, Tickner notes that social scientific approaches, informed by a western scientific worldview, measure progress based on how questions are answered. [15] A social scientific approach to women's sanctioned and proscribed violence might evaluate participation by quantifying their numbers. However, presence is not necessarily indicative of women's agency, nor does it explain why women's violence is often attributed to womanly dysfunctionalities. In contrast, feminists assert that *"the questions that are asked – or more importantly, those that are not asked"* are just as important, if not more so. [16] Queries that begin with gender subordination and lead to investigations into women's portrayal in the media, the stereotypes surrounding gender identity, and the possibility that violent women are political actors are a sampling of what feminist methodologies seek to uncover. It is clear that the difference between social scientific and feminist methodologies is not just that one sees gender while the other does not; rather, their directions of inquiry are shaped by the different ways in which each formulates and values knowledge.

Gender Illuminated

Gender is perhaps the most important tool for feminist inquiry. My discussion of global political violence, women, and agency applies gender as a dynamically conceived analytic category used to uncover gender stereotypes and roles. But what does this mean in practice? Gender is widely applied in feminist research, and debates abound over whether or not it is conducive to fluid and inclusive political analysis; however, Mary Hawkesworth notes that the analytic category itself and its influence in shaping

the scope of feminist inquiry are less frequently investigated.[17] As a tool for feminist methodologies, gender has developed and transformed over time. One possible conception and application of gender is as a "research guide or 'heuristic' that illuminates new questions for feminist inquiry."[18] As a positive heuristic, gender is broadly conceived. It frames "puzzles or problems in need of exploration or clarification," and investigates them through a "trial-and-error" approach.[19] Used in this way, gender highlights the intertwining "symbol systems, normative precepts, social structures, and subjective identities subsumed under gender's rubric."[20] In my discussion, gender highlights power relations between the state and individual, man and woman, and nationalist narratives within military organizations and society at large. In doing so, it acts as a positive heuristic.

Alternatively, gender as an analytic category can also perform a negative function, tightly bound up with central feminist assumptions. Since feminist discourse originally set out to repudiate biological determinism, gender as a negative heuristic is focused on challenging the natural attitude.[21] The natural attitude posits among other things, that individuals are either masculine or feminine, with any divergence from these distinct categories regarded as "either a joke or a pathology."[22] In my examination of women's violence, gender as a negative heuristic explains the separate understandings of gender role and gender role identity. This means that violent women can have a strong sense of themselves as women without subscribing to the hegemonic notion of what constitutes femininity.[23] The different applications of gender as an analytic category clarify that gender is not a simplistic variable, nor can it be homogenously applied. When narratives, power relations and stereotypes overlap, gender is applied as a fluid analytic category, used to deconstruct the convoluted context in which women's global political violence occurs.

Feminists have traditionally used gender to challenge gender essentialisms; however, the resulting plethora of definitions

and uses has raised doubts over gender's effectiveness as an analytic category.[24] Susan Bordo identifies a "gender skepticism" arising firstly from the preeminence gender has enjoyed in feminist analysis, and secondly from assumptions about gender as a cultural construction.[25] Lesbian and non-white feminists often argue that gender is an "isolate[d] model" excluding race, class, ethnicity, nationality, age and sexuality.[26] Privileging gender as an analytic category caters to "white, middle-class feminists who have the luxury of experiencing only one mode of oppression."[27] When used as a generalized category, gender might only succeed in truncating the deep-rooted cause of an issue, identifying it as an effect of "gender" while ignoring the intertwining issues mentioned above. Furthermore, a gender specific analysis risks overlooking those women whose oppressive experiences are not restricted to gender oppression. Secondly, gender analysis that understands masculinity and femininity as social constructions, while assuming the sexed body is biologically determined, is challenged by feminist postmodernist understandings of the body, sex, and sexuality as socially constructed.[28] Although the analytic category sets out an explorative framework for gender analysis, these skepticisms reveal that there is much at stake over the gender definition itself. It is clear that although gender has established itself as a fundamental tool for feminist analysis, it must first be interrogated and aired of its assumptions if it is to act as an illuminating analytical force.

Just as women's presence in politics does not denote agency, acknowledging gender as an analytic category does not guarantee emancipatory insight into the gender-biased political sphere. Gender must be conceived and used critically lest it become as permanent and divisive as the natural attitude. One keystone understanding of gender, advanced by second wave feminists and discussed by Newman and White, distinguishes "between the biological aspects of being female or male and the cultural expectations of femininity or masculinity."[29] During this time, gender grew to encompass a "range of variation in cultural

constructions of femininity and masculinity," turning it from a punitive, prescriptive category, into an analytical tool capable of separating gender identity from gender roles.[30] With the assumption that sex and gender were separate in gender based analysis, feminist scholars increasingly contradicted the natural attitude and argued for a persistence of gender identity. This attitude prevailed even when individuals were "thoroughly disaffected from and refusing participation in prevailing conceptions of femininity."[31] This analysis of gender meanings and the analytic category is central to a critical assessment of the stereotypes afflicting women's participation in violent conflict. It provides a foundation for refuting gender stereotypes that categorize women as inherently passive: women who commit violence transgress gender roles, but they are still women. However, this textbook definition does not address the implications of these transgressions. As a result, feminists disagree over whether to recognize women's violence, as an act of political agency.

In *Mothers, Monsters, Whores* Sjoberg and Gentry put forth a more sophisticated conception of gender as an analytic tool, discussing its implications for women's political participation. They interpret gender as "an intersubjective social construction that constantly evolves with changing societal perceptions and intentional manipulation."[32] Because gender adapts alongside societal norms, feminist politics become more than just an issue of "self, psyche and sexuality."[33] Gendered analysis must necessarily tie the individual to interactions with greater social norms and structures. When gender comprises both individual decision and structural influence, it establishes the conditions for the possibility of human agency. This definition also emphasizes gender fluidity across cultural lines, and variability through time. Although Sjoberg and Gentry do account for differences in the way men and women "live gender," they gloss over race, class, ethnicity and nationality as primary gender mediators.[34] For women in the IDF and LTTE, gender subordination is as much a product of

militaristic nationalism, as it is a product of idealized gender stereotypes. Nationalist narratives structure the discussions over women's roles within the larger organization, and the significance of their individual actions. Ultimately, the factors affecting agency are more diverse than a simple dichotomy between men and women, masculinity and femininity. To foster a sophisticated understanding of gender that will enhance feminist objectives, gendered analysis must draw on other sources of oppression such as nationalism, ethnicity, class, race and age.

Women in the IDF: Harmless Soldiers

The "varied and complex" gender dynamics of militarism comprise a multitude of these factors affecting women's political agency.[35] In the Israeli Defense Force women are conscripted as soldiers alongside men. Conscription appears to do away with gendered boundaries that secure militarization as a male domain; however, women's political agency is restricted by deep-seated gender roles within the military, and by the constant struggle to uphold an unchanging national identity. Because the IDF is a highly organized, hierarchical organization, military forces have the power not just to interpret women's actions as inconsequential, but to stymie their attempts to move into combat roles, leadership positions, or to express themselves as individual actors in defiance of the male-centred, nationalist narrative. The IDF's reluctance to allow full female agency is indicative of the gendered divisions of power within the military, as well as within civil society.

On February 3, 1948, the IDF conscripted women between the ages of nineteen and twenty five to military service without children between the ages of eighteen and twenty-eight, to military service.[36] Initially, conscripts served in the Women's Corps as nurses, cooks, drivers, and clerks; they looked after the needs of women soldiers in the IDF; and taught children in Israel's immigrant neighbourhoods.[37] Although conscripted women overwhelmingly performed stereotypically peaceful or nurturing

duties, their inclusion in the armed forces meant women also contributed to the symbolic and literal building of the nation. Sjoberg and Gentry describe a similar situation with Palestinian women's enlistment in resistance organizations. Although Palestinian women delivered seemingly feminized tasks such as teaching literacy skills, giving health education, working in nurseries and kindergartens, "these services integrated women into the organizations and normalized their appearance as the public face of the Resistance."[38] Similarly, the IDF is not just a military that mobilizes for war and then disbands: it is an omnipresent force whose primary goal is to uphold a national identity. Women's incorporation into this pervasive organization dedicated to upholding the Jewish community at once fixes women soldiers in gendered roles, while also granting them political agency through the larger militarized structure.

Conscription brings women into the IDF; however, their capacity for individual agency is overpowered by a nationalist narrative that determines the nature and extent of their participation. Ben-Amos (2003) argues that since the 1948 War of Independence, Israel's national identity has been concentrated in the image of a dead, Israeli soldier.[39] The national identity is a mythical force purportedly "meant to reach back into an immemorial past, and move into an indefinite future, transcending the finitude of each individual."[40] In glorifying the homogenous, collective unit, this narrative quietly excludes those who do not fit into the imagined story, including Arabs, "oriental Jews" and women.[41] Although women are not traditionally included within the militarized, masculinised national identity, they are prescribed another role in upholding the nation. While men act as warriors for the homeland, women are traditionally framed as the "caring housewife, antithetical to the military role."[42] In 1949, Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, David Ben Gurion gave weight to this argument when he upheld the decision to ban conscription for women with children, describing motherhood as a "sublime and sacred thing."[43] Although Ben Gurion found it unproblematic to

have young men serve in the army, he described "taking an eighteen year-old newly wed away from her husband's embrace as little short of a crime."[44] These historical examples show that the national narrative is upheld by gender stereotypes valuing women as caretakers or reproductive forces. When conscription increases women's salience in non-violent roles, they are allowed to be political actors and soldiers. When women seek participation in combat, they transgress stereotypes underlying the national narrative, and are challenged by gendered divisions of power.

Gender stereotypes play out in the IDF's resistance to women in military combat. Exclusion from combat roles is significant, not because women's violence ensures their position as political actors, but because it uncovers engrained gender essentialisms prevalent in military organizations. These are the underlying beliefs that allow for female conscripts and recruits, all the while denying them equal participation rights. Women's roles in the IDF have expanded since 1948, and yet they are still excluded from "combat positions in the field divisions, including armor, infantry, artillery, and combat engineering."[45] This gendered division of military duties is not exclusive to the IDF, and lingers within the United States military as well. Holly Yeager writes that although American women are allowed to serve in ninety percent of military occupations, "they are still barred from jobs or units whose main mission is direct ground combat."[46] Women in the military walk a fine line between what their gender makes available to them, and what it holds just out of their reach. Sjoberg and Gentry capture the paradox surrounding women in the military: They "are soldiers, but not combat soldiers; they have weapons, but are generally not expected to use them."[47] These restrictions exist despite a marked increase in numbers of women in the U.S. military since Vietnam, and our "general acceptance of women on the battlefield."[48] Feminist scholarship must deconstruct these stereotypes so that women can exercise agency while transgressing the idealized boundaries of femininity.

The hypocrisy of accepting women into the military, while simultaneously imposing gendered restrictions upon arrival, is characteristic of women's military participation. In "Redefining the Warrior Mentality," author and retired Lieutenant General, Claudia J. Kennedy, expresses a similar sentiment drawn from her personal experience in the U.S. army. Kennedy notes that women entering the military are framed on one side by a debate over gender roles, and by the historically entrenched conception of militarized masculinity on the other.[49] This creates a "climate in which the armed services have welcomed women with one hand and pushed them away with the other."[50] Women have been integral to the IDF's success since its formal establishment. Their various contributions to the state military, both combative and non-combative, have helped shape Israel's political history. In this way, women exercise agency as members of the Israeli military. However, when women engage in combat they betray the masculine, military imagery invoked by the national narrative; opportunities for equality or agency are subsumed by the more important goal of upholding a cohesive military and protecting the Jewish community. Insofar as women fulfill their reproductive duties to the nation they are allowed to participate in this narrative, but claims to equality through military participation are muted by an overbearing nationalism.

The LTTE Debate

Like women in the IDF, Tamil women of Sri Lanka are also caught at the centre of a debate over nationalism and gender roles. In the 1990s, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) succeeded as the leading militant Tamil group[51], marking the beginning of two decades of conflict between the LTTE and government of Sri Lanka (GOSL). In 2002 an unstable ceasefire was reached, but "it was a "no-war/no-peace situation" in which fighting had largely stopped, but peace was yet to be secured.[52] After two decades of fighting, Sri Lanka had become a "landscape of war," upon which 70,000 people had died, and another 1.6

million Tamils had been displaced.[53] Amidst the suffering, thousands of Tamil women joined the LTTE's women's wing, Birds of Freedom, engaging in combative and non-combative operations to aid in the self-governance fight against the GOSL.[54] Through conflict, women militarily defended their "collective cultural identity," confounding stereotypes of the male aggressor and female pacifist.[55] However, a reluctance to give up on these ingrained stereotypes has stirred debate over the possibility of agency for women within a terrorist organization.

The LTTE maintains that through participation in liberation movements its women are emancipated from oppressive social structures.[56] The opposing position, often backed by Western sources, asserts that these women are manipulated and used as "men's pawns in a patriarchal society."[57] These arguments, both for and against women's agency through proscribed violence, contrast the discussions about women in the IDF. Because Israeli soldiers participate in state sanctioned violence, women's equal access to combat is a step towards gender equality and the abolishment of militarized gender stereotypes. In contrast, Tamil women committing proscribed violence are more likely to be judged as subordinated, or victimized by the male-dominated terrorist organization. In both of these situations, agency is not just determined over gendered criteria, but is also subject to the power of state politics. In the following paragraphs I will engage with both of these arguments, emphasizing that women are complex actors whose decisions are informed, as are men's, by a mixture of individual conviction, cultural restrictions and institutional norms. We cannot understand why women perpetrate proscribed violence if we compartmentalize motivation solely with the actor, or solely blame her actions on the surrounding hierarchy, ideologies, and social norms within which she acts.

An estimated 8,000 to 10,000 armed combatants make up the LTTE,[58] and approximately 35% of these are Tamil women.[59] The high percentage of Tamil women in combat contrasts severely

with the gendered breakdown of IDF combat forces, which showed that in 2000, combat forces comprised only five percent women.[60] In fact, the LTTE's conscious efforts to include women in its political and military initiatives are "unique among Tamil and many other guerrilla, terrorist and criminal group."[61] The move also represents a transgression of the restricted roles that traditional Tamil society and culture allocates for women in the public sphere. Adele Balasingham, wife of the LTTE's chief political advisor, describes female militarism as a natural extension of Tamil nationalism, and a means of reaching women's equality. Balasingham states that by participating in the liberation struggle, "[y]oung women broke the shackles of social constraint, they ripped open the straight jacket of conservative images of women."[62] In this depiction, traditional virtues are replaced with courage, and a newfound "thirst for liberation."[63] Unlike female conscription to the IDF, which occurs in spite of persistent gender role stereotypes, the Tamil struggle claims to deconstruct stereotypes that objectify women and their sexuality. Female agency is rooted in the violent overhaul and reconstruction of the cultural norms regulating women's place in society.

While the LTTE claims its female cadres have unwavering confidence in their missions, Western scholarly analysis often implicates terrorist organizations of coercing women into committing suicide terrorism, or engaging in combat.[64] Stack-O'Connor argues that the LTTE is unconcerned with women's liberation from social oppression, and is only borrowing strands of Leftist ideology and feminist theories to achieve its real objective: the independent Tamil state.[65] Stack O'Connor is not alone in her suggestion that women's interests are secondary to the Tamil national struggle. Cathrine Brun suggests that the name, Birds of Freedom, is meant to suggest that women can achieve freedom, but only through the "nationalism of a Tamil homeland."[66] These arguments correctly identify the Tamil's quest for self-determination as the framework within which LTTE members are expected to act. Insofar as women act as self-sacrificing,

courageous defenders of the Tamil nation, they can claim freedom through violence. Women are urged to shirk the diminutive expectations of traditional Tamil culture in favour of militant behaviours that serve the Tamil nation. However, it must be noted that while both women and men are undoubtedly influenced by this nationalist narrative, they have experienced extensive "economic, social and political marginalization" in post-colonial times.[67] These other forms of oppression should be equally explored as factors inciting women to engage in political violence. Furthermore, while the highly militarized, nationalist setting influences women's decision to commit proscribed violence; it does not eliminate their own reasoning and motivation for joining the LTTE as female fighters.

The debate over Tamil women's agency within the LTTE has been summarized in two arguments. Firstly, the LTTE claims that its women are overthrowing oppressive structures and seeking liberation through violent conflict. In juxtaposition, scholars such as Stack-O'Connor[68] and Brun (2008) regard women's involvement in the LTTE as a strategy initiated by the LTTE to support its only real goal: Tamil self-determination. These positions provide valuable insight into the coexisting narratives of collective and individual freedom, but frame the question of agency too narrowly. Richter-Montpetit argues that although scholars frequently investigate "for whom gender inequality is deconstructed," analysis must be pushed further to uncover "at whose cost that deconstruction is achieved."[69] So, although the LTTE has reconfigured female sexuality and aimed to alleviate gender subordination, new roles glorifying male masculinity are enforced in their place. Gender subordination has not necessarily disappeared, but changed shape. For example, while LTTE women are glorified as liberated souls, "normal women" are now seen as inferior to Tamil women.[70] Tamil women who choose to strengthen their collective identity through the LTTE are recognized as political actors, albeit within a restrictive nationalist

framework, while others are subject both to political and gender subordination.

Conclusion

In this paper I demonstrate that although women's salience in sanctioned and proscribed violence is increasing, idealized gender role stereotypes characterize the national struggles within which these women act. To this end I established the importance of deconstructing gender stereotypes in feminist inquiry, examining agency attributed to women in the IDF, and to female combatants in the LTTE. In the IDF, women soldiers are expected to embrace the contradictions of militarized femininity, providing a military presence without impinging on the role of the male war hero. Female fighters in the LTTE are integrated into all aspects of violent conflict, validating their womanhood insofar as they prove themselves able to act like men. Even when women's access to violence increases, national narratives create a rigid guideline for participation that includes those who fit within characterizations, or subscribe to the dominant institution's ideologies. For those who don't fit within the framework, full agency is still denied. In both the IDF and LTTE, women are simultaneously ascribed and denied political agency and gender equality. However, despite these conflicting messages women are remaking gender boundaries, participating in violent conflict as soldiers, combatants, relief workers and suicide bombers. In spite of institutional, cultural and political barriers to women's participation in violence, women are active agents in times of conflict.

Notes

[1] Annica Kronsell, "Methods for Studying Silences: Gender Analysis in Institutions of Hegemonic Masculinity," in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* ed. Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 110.
[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., 237.

[4] J. Ann Ticker, *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2001), 34.

[5] Laura Sjoberg and Caron E. Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics* (London, New York: Zed Books, 2007), 3.

[6] Ibid., 13.

[7] Ibid., 11.

[8] Ibid., 29-30.

[9] Ibid., 12.

[10] Ibid., 17.

[11] Ibid.

[12] J. Ann Tickner, "Feminism meets International Relations: Some Methodological Issues," in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* ed. Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 19.

[13] Qtd. In Tickner, "Feminism meets International Relations," 19.

[14] Tickner, "Feminism meets International Relations," 19.

[15] Ibid., 23.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Mary Hawkesworth, "Gender as an Analytic Category," in *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006), 147.

[18] Ibid., 145.

[19] Ibid., 149-50.

[20] Ibid., 150-51.

[21] Ibid., 151.

[22] Ibid., 146.

[23] Ibid., 152.

[24] Ibid., 147.

[25] Qtd. in Hawkesworth, "Gender as an Analytic Category," 147.

[26] Hawkesworth, "Gender as an Analytic Category," 147.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Jacquetta Newman and Linda A. White, *Women, Politics, and Public Policy: The Political struggles of Canadian Women* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11.

[30] Hawkesworth, "Gender as an Analytic Category," 147.

[31] Ibid., 152.

[32] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 5.

[33] Hawkesworth, "Gender as an Analytic Category," 174.

[34] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 6.

[35] Lynne Segal, "Gender, War and Militarism: Making and Questioning the Links," *Feminist Review* 26 (2008): 28.

[36] Israel Defense Forces, *Conscription to Women's Corps,* http://dover.idf.il/IDF/English/about/History/40s/1948 1808.htm

[37] Ibid.

[38] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 116.

[39] Aver Ben-Amos, "War Commemoration and the Formation of Israeli National Identity," *Journal of Political & Military Sociology* 31, no. 21 (2003): 173.

[40] Ibid., 171.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Yechezkel Dar and Shaul Kimhi, "Youth in the Military: Gendered Experiences in the Conscript Service in the Israeli Army," *Armed Forces & Society* 30, no. 3 (2004): 435.

[43] Qtd. In Martin van Creveld, "Armed but not dangerous: Women in the Israeli Military," *War in History* 7, no. 1 (2000): 87.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Dar and Kimhi, "Youth in the Military," 434.

[46] Holly Yeager, "Soldiering Ahead," *Wilson Quarterly,* Summer 2007 (2007): 54.

[47] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 59.

[48] Yeager, "Soldiering Ahead," 57.

[49] Claudia J. Kennedy, "Redefining the Warrior Mentality: Women in the Military," in *Sisterhood is Forever: The Women's Anthology for a New Millennium,* ed. Robin Morgan (Washington Square Press, 2003), 409.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Sunila Abeysekera, "Gendering Transitional Justice: Experiences of Women in Sri Lanka and Timor Leste in Seeking Affirmation and Rights," in *Engendering Human Security: Feminist Perspectives,* ed. Thanh-Dam Truong, Saskia Wieringa, Amrita Chhachhi (London:Zed Books, 2006), 6.

[52] Cathrine Brun, "Birds of Freedom: Young People, the LTTE, and Representations of Gender, Nationalism, and Governance in Northern Sri Lanka," *Critical Asian Studies* 40, no. 3 (2008): 401.

[53] Patricia Lawrence, "The Watch of Tamil Women: Women's Acts in a Transitional Warscape," in *Women and the Contested State: Religion, Violence, and Agency in South and Southeast Asia,* ed. Monique Skidmore and Patricia Lawrence (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 92.

[54] Alisa Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers and Freedom Birds: How and Why the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam Employs Women," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 19, (2007): *45.*

[55] Lawrence, "The Watch of Tamil Women," 12.

[56] Tamilnation, "Women and the Struggle for Tamil Eelam," *Voices of the Tiger Bulletin, February 1990,*
http://tamilnation.org/women/90womenguerillas.htm
[57] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 139.
[58] Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers and Freedom Birds," 45.
[59] Lawrence, "The Watch of Tamil Women," 99.
[60] Dar and Kimhi, "Youth in the Military," 34.
[61] Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers, and Freedom Birds," 44.
[62] Ibid., 46.
[63] Lawrence, "The Watch of Tamil Women," 99.
[64] Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores," 134.*
[65] Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers, and Freedom Birds," 47.
[66] Brun, "Birds of Freedom," 400.
[67] Ibid., 401.
[68] Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers, and Freedom Birds," 46-49.
[69] Cited in Sjoberg and Gentry, *Mothers, Monsters, Whores,* 3.
[70] Stack-O'Connor, "Lions, Tigers, and Freedom Birds," 47.