Introduction

Rethinking Civil–Military Connections
From Relations to Entanglements

Birgitte Refslund Sørensen and Eyal Ben-Ari

The global security landscape has changed dramatically over the past few decades, altering how military forces are recruited, trained, and deployed globally. As a result, interfaces between armed forces and civilians have been shaped in numerous new ways. Just think of the "wars against terrorism" waged by coalition forces typically headed by a few large military powers but engaging other nations with no, or limited, recent war experience. Think of the increasing deployment of military personnel and technologies to provide "homeland security," and the growing use of troops for "military operations other than war" (MOOTW), including tasks such as border control and provision of security at major public events, as well aiding in humanitarian crises after devastating disasters. Think of the crisis simulations, operational exercises, and live demonstrations of military capacity that take place in public spaces with civilians as audience. Think also of the trend away from large conscripted armies toward smaller voluntary forces, and the concurrent growth of public relations departments within the armed forces (Ben-Ari this volume). Think of the global recirculation and use of militarized human capital, security equipment, and expertise (Grassianni this volume), or of the more subtle presence of "things military" in the commercialized products of the entertainment, technology, and fashion industries or indeed in the landscape. And think of the large number of civilians employed at army bases or who assist veterans, soldiers, and families in need, not to mention military reserves who continuously traverse civilian–military boundaries. Indeed, circumstances under which relations between civilians and militaries are established are many and diverse.

In this volume, we argue that a plethora of critical civil–military encounters demand anthropological attention and necessitate reconceptualizing the field of civil–military relations, which continues to be firmly anchored in the classical debates within political sociology and political science. The basic dilemma that underlies theorizing within these disciplines has centered on the military's potential threat of using the organized means of violence at its disposal to take over political, social, and economic institutions. Hence, previous theorizing has primarily focused on issues concerning appropriate and effective control mechanisms ensuring that military force is used in the interest of society and not against it. This perspective, however, pays little heed to how ordinary civilians encounter and experience military institutions during their everyday lives, nor how civilian life influences the military. We find this line of inquiry critical because it can illuminate how military and civilian domains are tied together, constituting complex entanglements destabilizing the classic civil–military binary and manifesting themselves in unexpected ways. Accordingly, our volume explores the particular perspectives that ethnography and anthropology can contribute to documentations and conceptualizations of, and critical debates about, current civil–military relations. Anthropology is methodologically well suited to capture ongoing transformations and manifestations of civil–military relations from unique empirical positions that go beyond and add to the restricted, nationally framed institutional gaze. Moreover, anthropology can develop innovative theoretical vocabularies enhancing our understanding of the reach and depth of these entanglements.

In what follows, we briefly position the anthropological study of civil–military relations in its wider scholarly background and elaborate on our analytical framework. First, we outline the field's formative sociological legacy and then proceed to discuss some anthropological research trajectories that have clear relevance for the study of civil–military relations but which have only partly or indirectly been conceptualized in those terms. The body of sociological and anthropological literature discussed here is not exhaustive but suggestive of how the scholarly field of civil–military relations has developed. We end by charting out an agenda for an anthropology of contemporary civil–military entanglements building on the limitations and gaps that the ethnographic cases make visible in the existing literature.

The Sociological Legacy

Generally speaking, scholarly studies of the relations between the armed forces and societies are characterized by a broad development that has

taken place in political sociology and political science (Lomsky-Feder and Ben-Ari 2000). This movement should be pictured as a number of successive, and cumulative, intellectual waves—each wave characterized by a central theoretical model. All however, proceed from the realization that the central core—the starting point for any analysis—is that the uniqueness of the military (along with the police) lies in the organization of legitimate (if at times contested) state violence (Boene 1990).

The examination of military and society relations in the post–World War II era was launched by scholars focusing on the military as a social institution and on its leadership as a professional and social elite. The emphasis here was on the links between military and civilian sectors of society within a structural-functionalist perspective (Burk 1998; Huntington 1957; Janowitz 1971, 1976; Moskos 1976). These kinds of studies tended to focus on the institutional level, and their *problematique* revolved around the capacity of political systems to balance democratic arrangements with security considerations, the prominence of military elites in decision-making, and allocation of resources to military efforts. The dominant conceptualization within this approach was on how permeable the boundaries were between the civilian and military sectors and the mutual influence of the more extreme orientations of both spheres (Luckham 1971). Because the overwhelming stress within this approach was on institutions and on elites, little was said (or asked) about war as an "autonomous" phenomenon, as an occurrence with a distinctive set of implications for society.

The second wave of research thus investigated the ways in which societies and nations are "made" through preparation for, mobilization toward, and the perpetration of wars. Based in critical sociology, this perspective included "sociological" *and* "cultural" versions. In the more "sociological" vein, war was examined as part of the social order, and especially as an integral part of state institutions as they impact wider society. This was evinced in what may be called the "State, Society, and War" approach: for example, modern war was examined as a primary means by which the state establishes its power within society by mobilizing resources for external conflicts. The most compelling dimension of these studies has been to show how war (or its possibility) works toward centralizing the state and contributes to the institutionalization of the means of violence in a given society (Giddens 1985; Mann 1988; Tilly 1995). Accordingly, while the earlier school focused on the relations between the armed forces and society, this approach concentrated on how war is part of ongoing relations between state and civil society. Such diverging analytical foci were predicated on very different assumptions (Lomsky-Feder and Ben-Ari 2000). First, while the initial (functional-institutional) approach was developed in the heyday of America's success in World War II and was es-

sentially celebratory, the latter (conflict-statist) approach was formulated in the context of the Cold War and the debacle of Vietnam, and was highly critical. Second, the distinct frameworks called attention to different issues: the first to institutional linkages (the structure of a regime) and the second to focal points of power and dissension (in and around the structures of the state). Third, while one asked about the mechanisms by which democracies continued to function in face of the importance of the military, the other asked about how armed struggles figured in the manner by which democratic states were enhanced by certain kinds of militarism.

Studies belonging to the "cultural" approach are allied with the critical sociologists but uncover the manner by which militarism is constructed. This scholarship is concerned neither with the direct study of the military nor with the state, but with patterns of cultural construction since it examines the cultural means by which war is sacralized and constructed in collective memories. Within the social sciences, this broad wave includes such works as those carried out by Kertzer (1988) and Da Matta (1984) on political and military rituals, or by Mosse (1990) on military cemeteries.

The next wave of studies took up many of the macro-level insights of the previous approaches to explore how social construction of the military and war affects individuals' life-worlds. Since the mid-1980s, scholarly investigations began to ask questions about military experiences—in a sense foreshadowing many of the concerns that anthropologists have taken up. For example, the studies in the collection by Segal and Sinaiko (1986) demonstrated the importance of a "bottom-up" approach to analyzing (American) military life and the utility of studying hitherto little explored areas such as socialization into the military, the criteria by which soldiers appraise their own service, or the creation within the armed forces of certain folk images and stereotypes. Other works (Eisenhart 1975; Shatan 1977) suggested the profitability of analyzing military training in symbolic or ritualistic terms. Similarly, Edna Lomsky-Feder (1998) examined how war and military service figure in the personal narratives of Israeli men. In theoretical terms, these studies linked constructions, structures, power, and resources related to the armed forces and war to individual military and civilian experiences.

The Anthropological Entry

With rare exceptions, anthropologists have usually ceded the study of civil–military relations to sociologists and political scientists, perhaps as a consequence of the discipline's historical focus on "exotic others" and "society" rather than the state. Moreover, the proclivity of ethnographers to

study the underdog and the marginal has left the study of elites and mainstream (including the military) a relatively understudied subject (Gusterson 1993: 60). Finally, most American anthropologists have viewed the U.S. military in terms of the Vietnam debacle and, since 9/11, through the lens of the occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan. Consequently, the armed forces have often been regarded as somehow morally tainted and therefore not "worthy" of anthropological research, and anthropologists in any way linked to the military have been seen as in some way "polluted" (Ben-Ari 2011; Rubinstein 2012). Indeed, Greenhouse's (1989: 49) suggestions seem to still hold: that because of the common premise pervading our discipline that war is pathological, and because of a professional value orientation that opposes armed aggression, key cultural questions about conflict and the armed forces have been obscured.

While one would expect the armed forces to be a critical site if one wants to understand the contemporary social and cultural significance of armed conflicts (Ben-Ari 2004, 2008), there are relatively few ethnographic studies of the role of armed forces in violent conflicts. As Krohn-Hansen (1994: 367) emphasized, anthropological studies tend to focus on the victim's perspective, often ignoring the perpetrators or the relations between the parties to violence. While it is important to document and consider how wars and armed conflicts impact the everyday lives of ordinary people, the analysis of victims' tribulations does not necessarily tell us much about how relationships between civilians and the armed forces develop and are experienced. In response to this gap, some anthropologists have directed their attention toward perpetrators of violence. However, most of these studies have concerned the emergence and actions of nonstate actors such as vigilante groups, rebels, and guerrilla fighters (Grätz 2007; Hoffman 2011; Nordstrom 1997; Thiranagama 2014; Vigh 2006), positioned on the margins of society and whose use of violence is not legitimized by, but may in fact be directed at, the state. Moreover, many studies in this tradition do not aim to understand relations between perpetrators and victims, but to explore the structural and cultural factors that have pushed or pulled particular groups toward a violent life trajectory.

Military forces, however, have not been entirely absent in anthropological research. A few early contributions included studies of the militaries of authoritarian regimes or majority world countries, but it was only with the critical end of the Cold War that a distinct anthropology of the military began to emerge (McFate 2005). The end of the Cold War resulted in major transformations having dramatic impact on the armed forces. Bickford's (2011) study of how unification of Germany undermined the lives and identities of former East German officers is one example. The initial euphoria following the fall of the Berlin Wall disappeared with the advent

of a new kind of abhorrent war, variously termed "asymmetrical wars," "hybrid wars," "postmodern wars," or simply the "new wars" (Hoffman 2007; Kaldor 1999; Münkler 2005), with a heavy involvement of nonstate actors mobilized around "identity politics" and deliberately targeting civilians. While the Global South experienced the lion's share of these wars, they also manifested themselves at the doorstep of Europe and tore the Balkans apart (Cushman 2004; Halpern and Kideckel 2000; Schaüble 2014).

A decade later, the events of 9/11 resulted in a new generation of asymmetrical wars, as armed forces from the United States, the United Kingdom, and other industrial democracies coalesced in "the global war on terror," "peace-building," "counterinsurgencies," or, more benignly, "humanitarian wars" (Masco 2014; Frederic, Rubinstein, and Zoli this volume). Suddenly, it seemed violence that had previously been mostly limited to "out there" came "home," and the areas traditionally studied by anthropologists became connected to the anthropologists' own home countries in new and forceful ways. Civilian urban spaces transformed into "battlespaces" with citizen surveillance (Graham 2009), and troops returning from tours to the more remote zones of prolonged wars also brought war back home. This escalation of transnational military operations reinforced the scholarly interest in the military that had emerged with the end of the Cold War, and a more critical military anthropology was added to the ethnographic descriptions of militaries.

Issues that interested anthropologists from the outset were the armed forces' internal organization or cultural patterns, and how civilians were transformed into soldiers—issues that continue to generate insightful research as armies transform themselves in response to new political conditions and security challenges (Ben-Ari 1998b; Danielsen 2015; Frederic this volume; Hawkins 2001; Holmes-Eber 2014; Kirke 2000; Nørgaard 2004; Simons 1997, 1999; Sion 2004; Winslow 1997). One also finds a growing body of literature on the gendered nature of militaries (Aciksoz 2012; Altinay 2004; Bickford 2003; Duncanson 2013; Enloe 2000; Haaland 2008; Higate 2003; Kilshaw 2009; Kronsell and Svedberg 2012; McSorley 2013; Stachowitsch 2013; Sylvester 2014; Whitworth 2004; Woodward and Jenkings 2013). Another focus area, producing rich ethnographic studies, is military communities around army bases in the United States (Frese 2008; Hawkins 2001; Lutz 2001; MacLeish 2013) and around the world where anti-base movements caught anthropological attention (Altinay and Homes 2009; Fitz-Henry 2011; Inoue 2007; Lutz 2009; McCaffrey 2002; Schober 2016; Vine and Jeffrey 2009). The global military connection was also the core of Gill's (2004) study of the training of other countries' troops in American military schools, and of anthropological studies of the transformation of national armies in former colonies (Agyekum 2016).

The deployment of armed troops from several nations with United Nations or NATO mandates resulted in a series of studies of peacekeepers (Frederic this volume), but also, and very importantly, a revival of studies of war veterans (Gustavsen and Haaland this volume), in vogue in the wake of the two world wars. While earlier studies were the territory of historians occupied with how nations reconciled themselves with the ramifications of "trench warfare" (Mosse 1990; Winter 1995), today studies focus almost exclusively on veterans' experiences of combat-related injuries and suffering. As noted by Hautzinger and Scandlyn (2014), PTSD (Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder), TBI (Traumatic Brain Injury), and depression have been identified as the "signature injuries" of post-9/11 wars, and medical anthropologists are making valuable contributions to this field, challenging psychiatric approaches by emphasizing the social dimensions of these disorders (Finley 2011; Kilshaw 2007, 2009; Messinger 2013; Moss and Prince 2014; Tomforde this volume). While contemporary wars demand fewer casualties, insurgents' frequent use of IED's (Improvised Explosive Devices) repatriate many veterans in need of complicated surgeries and amputation. The body, which anthropological studies of soldiering have demonstrated to be key to the development of the masculine warrior, now threatens to become the source of processes of emasculation (Wool 2012, 2015; MacLeish 2012; Messinger 2009; Wool and Messinger 2012). Other studies have investigated the ties linking armed forces to their societies: Altinay (2004) on the influence of the Turkish armed forces in the country's education system, and Ben-Ari and Frühstück (2003) and Sørensen and Pedersen (2012) on how civilians are exposed to the military as audiences at public events demonstrating military capacities or in ceremonial celebrations of the warrior hero. Each new war requires legitimization, and veterans returning from combat yearn for appropriate social recognition of their efforts, as Gustavsen and Haaland (this volume) show. The cultural understandings and social positioning of veterans, however, are contestable and changeable, and some anthropological works address the dynamic social construction of public images of "the veteran" (Aciksoz 2012; Gustavsen 2016; Sørensen 2015 and forthcoming; Truusa and Kasearu this volume). Moreover, "things military" not only appear in the public sphere, but enter our everyday lives in numerous and subtle ways (Enloe 2000; Lutz 2001, 2002). Building on Der Derian's (2001) work, Gonzalez (2010) shows how the U.S. military markets itself through movies, toys, etc. and infiltrates American families, while Tomforde (this volume) explores how contemporary artists portray the experience of German troops abroad. Sørensen (2015) demonstrates how the Danish military regulates ties between deployed troops and their families. Truusa and Kasearu (this volume) in a like manner underscore

how service in the military by Estonian husbands is a central theme in the narratives of their wives.

Military anthropology may still be in its infancy, but it is vibrant and has already demonstrated its relevance to understanding one of the key factors that shape today's world. The authors of the chapters appearing in this volume concur that the military and civil–military relations deserve a central place in contemporary anthropological research, both in terms of ethnographic exploration and conceptual elucidation. In the following section, we trace out our argument for an anthropology of civil–military entanglements as one way to build on existing achievements and what we consider remaining gaps and shortages.

Civil–Military Entanglements

A few key propositions inform the way we rethink civil–military relations from an anthropological perspective in the current global security landscape. Each addresses what we consider two limitations of the sociological legacy: its exclusive focus on Western nation-states and its rather uncritical adoption of the "civil–military" institutional dichotomy. Anthropological writings on processes of economic and cultural globalization have provided us with an alternative source of inspiration, which we find pertinent to the study of contemporary wars and security landscapes. Anthropologists' efforts to capture the complex and dynamic flows and linkages associated with globalization have given rise to a rich and creative analytical vocabulary, including concepts such as "assemblage" (Ong and Collier 2004; Marcus and Saka 2006), "scapes" (Appadurai 1996), "friction" (Tsing 2005), and "entanglement" (Thomas 1991; Hodder 2012). Despite differences in focus and emphasis, scholars are in broad agreement that globalization is marked by contingency, and is inherently open-ended and partly unpredictable, which calls for analytical attention to the specific and local. Hodder (2012: 88), who himself employs the notion of "entanglement," emphasizes that this goes beyond networks simply connecting separate entities, and implies dialectic relationships between productive and enabling "dependence" and constraining and limiting "dependency." Moreover, he contends, entanglements potentially destabilize and reconfigure the constituent parts: "It is not that there are no such divisions, but that the distinctions are effects or outcomes" (Hodder 2012: 91).

We can better understand the nature and dynamics of contemporary civil–military connections, if our attention to entanglements translates into two distinct, but interrelated analytical moves: first, we need to incorporate the views and experiences of nations or groupings with differ-

ent war trajectories and world order positions, but without losing sight of how these are embedded in wider transnational or global settings; second, we contend that the macro-sociological civil–military dichotomy is one social, cultural *construct* that tends to reduce related phenomena to a simple either/or classification within which one entity or process is "civilian" or "military." Instead of this dichotomous view we suggest directing our analyses toward its disaggregated constitutive elements; the actors, sites, discourses, technologies, objects, etc. that are mobilized and reconfigured in innovative ways and make up particular, sometimes unexpected manifestations of civil–military relations.

Political scientists and sociologists are not alone in focusing their thinking about militaries and their surrounding societies on Western nations. In fact, anthropologists studying the military have mostly focused on the United States, and their works have inadvertently come to constitute the analytical and moral template for exploring civil–military encounters and relations elsewhere, shaping thematic and theoretical orientations and influencing what is considered appropriate or legitimate anthropological lines of inquiry. It is thus largely due to the preoccupation of American colleagues that the military, its army bases, and its communities have emerged as a recognized ethnographic field within anthropology, and inspired anthropologists from elsewhere to scrutinize the role of the military in their own societies. American military anthropology, however, has not only been a source of inspiration, but also a constraining factor or at times even a moral gatekeeper when its heavy preoccupation (sometimes obsession) with the way our discipline has been "subtly moulded by the priorities of national security state and the exigencies of other people's wars" has been projected onto the global community of anthropologists by default (Gusterson 2007: 156; see also Price 2008, 2011a, 2011b: Wax 2003).

But not all anthropologists—and especially those outside the classic and new hegemonic powers—have served such a role, and not all anthropologists are marked by the same kind of disciplinary guilt trip about anthropology's role in colonialism (Ben-Ari 1998a, 2011) and consequently about its role in "serving" the armed forces. By stating this, we do not imply forsaking our discipline's critical potential, but rather insist on anthropology's trademark as a globally and holistically oriented discipline, which calls for an examination of civil–military entanglements from the vantage point of countries with a different "war trajectory and culture" than that of the United States. Lutz (2002) makes a similar point, but whereas she is primarily interested in how different national histories are tied to legitimization and glorification of military action, we propose a broader, more open-ended and comparative exploration of how particular

civil–military connections are shaped, negotiated, and entangled in social life in different places. This volume aims to make a modest contribution to a more diversified exploration of contemporary civil–military relations from the vantage points of such cases as Israel or the United States, societies fundamentally ordered in and around armed conflict and internal security concerns, and Japan, Germany, Norway, and Denmark, countries that, each in their way, have long avoided military deployment, but are currently slowly adapting to the new global security landscape and its political agendas, and renegotiating the purpose and mandate of their respective armed forces.

A central concern of American military anthropologists has been with processes of militarization, which entails a complex process where institutions of civilian society are configured in preparation for and conduct of war and violence. Militarization, Lutz argues, "is simultaneously a discursive process involving a shift in societal beliefs and values in ways necessary to legitimate the use of force, the organization of large standing armies and their leaders, and the higher taxes or tribute used to pay for them" (Lutz 2002: 723). Importantly, the mobilization of civilian institutions for war is intimately linked to the creation of hierarchies of race, class, gender, and sexuality, and leaves noticeable as well as more subtle traces in public space and popular culture, as several of the chapters in this volume explicate. For anthropologists, it is in the very everydayness, the taken-for-granted nature, of militarization that makes it such a dominant force since it entails unquestioned ways of organizing societies, groups, and individuals. The countries included in this volume have all embarked on processes involving militarization, but despite remarkable similarities regarding how militarization operates and manifests itself, there are also significant differences, which are rooted in the countries' unique war histories and memories, patterns of social organization and cultural values.

Militarization is never a straightforward process, as Frederic (this volume) shows, since it may be replaced by processes of demilitarization. However, in this respect anthropologists are uniquely situated to study how the armed forces bargain with various civilian entities. At the heart of such bargaining lies the armed forces' autonomy to manage and practice violence, but it extends into negotiations about the entitlements, status, social welfare, and recognition that members of the armed forces should enjoy, as well as struggles over competing discourses and cultural imageries of military, nation, and society, and of veterans, soldiers, and civilians. Uesugi's contribution (this volume) underscores this by showing how Ghurkas who have served in the country's armed forces for generations struggle for inclusion in the citizenship regime of the United Kingdom. In turn, the social position of civilians and soldiers is often intimately linked

to the ways in which the military's potential for lethal violence is represented and legitimized or rejected in the cultural imagery. Ben-Ari's contribution (this volume), for instance, charts out the ways in which popular culture is used to soften the images of Japan's Self-Defense Forces and gradually habituate diverse publics to their presence in society and their actions (see also Frühstück 2007). Another example is the perception of recent activist position taken by Denmark in embarking on foreign deployments as a revival of its long-suppressed national identity as a warrior nation (see also Sørensen and Pedersen 2012; Sørensen and Linnet nd.).

The military's potential for violence runs as a thread through much scholarly writing, including anthropology, and with recent developments in the global security landscape there is good reason not to dismiss this focus. However, war and violence do not always take center stage in civil–military relations. Agyekum (2016) provocatively suggests the existence of "positive militarization" when the armed forces utilize their unique resources and competences to support society in times of distress, distributing and coordinating emergency relief without the use of force. Whether the military's role in such "operations other than war" is best perceived as an example of increasing "securitization" of nonmilitary areas (Bajc 2007; Fosher 2008; Tierney and Bevc 2007), or is indeed "civilizing" (or better "civilianizing") the military to consider the use of violence a last resort, as Agyekum suggests, can only be properly answered empirically. In any case, it is important to consider how militaries' benign activities are tied to their potential for violence in their bargaining of relations to civilian populations, whether at home or at sites of operation.

We argue for the inclusion of more "national voices" in exploring present-day civil–military relations and remain critical of the nation-state as a natural analytical framework. That said, it is important to recognize that national militaries are globally entangled. Nordstrom (1997, 2004) forcefully argued that the concept of "local wars" is largely a fiction since they are anything but local, but instead imbricated with much larger systems. Lutz in her work with Nonini (1999) and the essays by Tanaka and Frederic (this volume) demonstrate how transnational economic and political processes have transformed people's livelihood and increased levels of conflict, violence, and warfare. The global entanglement of national armed forces is, for instance, reflected in joint policy making and cooperation through supranational institutions, deployment of multinational coalition forces, exchange of security information, joint training and exercises, and military equipment and expertise purchases, as well as in collaborative efforts to develop postdeployment responses to war veterans' needs and mutual inspiration regarding public display of military powers or public commemoration of fallen soldiers.

Our second proposition concerns the conventional "civil–military" dichotomy itself, inherited from theories in political science and military sociology, which demarcates "military" and "society" as two bounded and opposed entities (Lutz 2001). We contend that it is analytically useful to disaggregate the dichotomy, by which we mean delineating how "civil" and "military" relations occur and are negotiated at multiple levels (macro, meso, micro), involve various actors (ministries, governments, interest organizations, individual soldiers/families, celebrities, media, cultural institutions, the public), and take place in a plethora of domains/sites (parliaments, streets, homes, museums, the internet, or garrisons). Our disaggregation is linked to our understanding of what could possibly be the core issues of the study of civil–military relations. For example, the ties between the military and local governments and communities, economic corporations and subcontractors, the media and lobbies, or humanitarian and human rights movements do not seem to involve only problems of civilian control, the central concern of many writings on civil–military relations. Rather, each kind of link is marked by its own "logic of action" and its unique practices and meanings.

This point is crucial, for it emphasizes anthropology's promise to capture ethnographically the multiple ways in which "things military" (institutions, people, values, symbols, objects, etc.) are entangled with "things civilian" (people, social life, or popular culture). In this sense, anthropology seeks not only to address the classic issues of how societies affect the military, but to explicitly go beyond a focus on states and militaries, beyond law and politics. This point implies directing our analytical gaze toward the mundane, the ordinary, parts of lives and experiences (in homes, museums, schools, companies, associations, etc.) in which the armed forces and various civilian entities negotiate, cooperate, and sometimes conflict.

Seen this way, moreover, we can appreciate how a look beyond formal institutional arrangements and institutional forms reveals that civil–military entanglements are fluid, blurry, contestable, and always negotiable. As Woodward (2004) shows, the very landscape of a territory is something that is constantly created, changing and evolving in interaction with military and security considerations. And as Gustavsen and Haaland (this volume) argue, Norway's historical trajectory reveals how civil–military entanglements may expand and diminish but also become more and less transparent. Tomforde (this volume) shows how different historical periods are marked by diverse entanglements between the military and artistic worlds. In a complementary manner Rubinstein and Zoli (this volume) demonstrate both the tensions between and the blurring of the roles of the military and police via veterans' critiques of militarized policing.

One promising contribution of anthropology to civil–military thinking lies in its ability to trace out the ripples and reverberations of entanglements to areas not usually associated with such ties, but which are significant for how war, violence, and the military shape contemporary societies. The essay by Sørensen and Heiselberg examines the effects deployments abroad of Danish soldiers have on family dynamics and domestic family life, demonstrating the intricate links between global processes and the most intimate kinds of interpersonal ties (see also Heiselberg forthcoming; Sørensen 2013). Moreover, in its attention to everyday situations where soldiers occupy social roles as partners, fathers, and human beings, this study challenges the elusiveness of civil–military relations and undermines the dichotomy between clearly demarcated institutions characterized by more or less permeable boundaries, and points out how such distinctions are always situational and depend on context. Tanaka's study (this volume) shows how such global-intimate ties can be expressed at an even deeper level: he shows how the very bodies and bodily sensations of Okinawan civilians are shaped by the mundane practices of fighter jets taking off and landing at American Air Force bases near their homes. A further move away from the institutional conceptualization of the civil–military complex is exemplified by the studies of Grassiani and Pedersen (this volume), as they demonstrate how notions of "civilian" and "military" assume particular but shifting moral values in relation to wider security and war agendas, and how their attachment to objects, people, and situations becomes one way of creating moral hierarchies. In Grassiani's study, the Israeli security industry's labeling of security solutions marketed to Kenya as "combat proven" is one way to discursively declare their reliability and create obscure entanglements between Palestinian zones and Kenyan citizens. Although such representations are obviously related to how the "reputational content" of the military and of military personnel are promoted or besmirched, their import seems to go beyond the situational. People use talk about "things military" as a medium for discussing or evoking images of themselves and of the societies they live in. Pedersen's study traces how Danish civilians' moral confutation of killing and the armed forces' commitment to casualty aversion interfere with the soldiers' processes of military becoming.

Our approach to "civil–military entanglements" accentuates the methodological questions that have always accompanied anthropology's engagement with war, violence, and the military. These have included reflections on the risks, dangers, and implications of conducting fieldwork under fire (Nordstrom and Robben 1999); cautionary remarks that scholars could be seduced by high ranking informants in the military (Robben 1995); arguments regarding the inevitable political position of any

researcher (Frederic 2016; Castro 206; Rubinstein 1998; Weber 2016); and, not least, ethical considerations regarding anthropologists' embeddedness within military institutions and units (Gusterson 2003, 2007; Gonzalez 2004a, 2004b; Kelly and Jauregui 2010; Lucas 2009; McFate and Lawrence 2015). Gazit's interrogations (this volume) take us a step away from discussions about fieldwork during times of war and armed violence to questions about fieldwork under conditions of (constant) war preparations and what at present seems to be an ever deeper and subtler penetration of "things military" into ordinary lives. It is also in this light that the collection edited by Rubinstein, Fosher, and Fujimura (2012; also Rubinstein and Zoli this volume) should be seen: as showing the variety of issues and engagements between anthropologists with the military and other parts of the national security state. The most important message from their collection is that we must be wary of homogenizing the experiences of anthropologists studying civil–military engagements. To this we would add that we should also be constantly alert and imaginative in searching out possible empirical manifestations of civil–military entanglements.

The Structure of This Volume

As the chapters of this volume reveal, "things military" and "things civilian" meet and get interpreted, negotiated, and entangled at many levels and in many of social contexts. While we acknowledge that civil–military relations are always framed by the particular security and political environments of nation-states, and that it is important to heed how nation-states differently positioned in the global security landscape produce civil–military relations, this volume is not primarily intended to provide an overview of national instantiations. Instead, in order to accentuate the salient point that in our contemporary world, "things civilian" and "things military" do not (only) constitute a macro-level binary, but are indeed intertwined at all levels and take on many disguises, the chapters are organized to provide examples from different domains. The first section illustrates how civil–military relations are embedded in everyday lives and intimate relations. The next group of chapters concern public social space, where civilians experience the military as consumers of some sort. Section three is closer to the original aim of civil–military studies, as it directs its focus at how "civilian" and "military" are inscribed in the contract between state and citizens. The next section takes us to the global and international domain. Finally, we recap and integrate the essays in an editorial epilogue.

Birgitte Refslund Sørensen is associate professor at the Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen. With her background in conflict studies and political anthropology, Sørensen has been both practitioner and researcher on issues of postconflict reconstruction for the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development and the Danish Refugee Council. She has also been a consultant on veterans' affairs in Denmark. Her latest publications include "Veterans' Homecomings" in *Current Anthropology*; "Public Commemorations of Danish Soldiers" in *Critical Military Studies*, and "Postconflict Reconstruction" in Palgrave MacMillan's interdisciplinary handbooks series on gender.

Eyal Ben-Ari is director of the Center for Society, Security and Peace at Kinneret College on the Sea of Galilee. He has carried out research in Israel, Japan, Singapore, and Hong Kong. His main areas of research are the sociology of the armed forces, early childhood education, and popular culture in Asia. Among his recent books are (with Zev Lehrer, Uzi Ben-Shalom, and Ariel Vainer) *Rethinking the Sociology of Warfare: A Sociological View of the Al-Aqsa Intifada* (2010), (with Nissim Otmazgin) *The State and Popular Culture in East Asia* (2012), (with Jessica Glicken Turnley and Kobi Michael) *Special Operations Forces in the 21st Century: Perspectives from the Social Sciences* (2017), and *Japanese Encounters: The Structure and Dynamics of Cultural Frames* (2018).

References

Aciksoz, Salih Can. 2012. "Sacrificial Limbs of Sovereignty: Disabled Veterans, Masculinity, and Nationalist Politics in Turkey." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26 (1): 4–25.

Agyekum, Humphrey Asamoah. 2016. "From Buga-Buga Soldiers to Officers and Gentlemen. How Notions of Professionalism and Civility Transformed the Ghana Armed Forces." Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen.

Altinay, Ayse Gul. 2004. *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender and Education in Turkey*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Altinay, Ayse Gul, and Amy Holmes. 2009. "Opposition to U.S. Military Presence in Turkey in the Context of the Iraq War." In Catherine Lutz (ed.), *The Bases of Empire*, 270–98. New York: Pluto Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bajc, Vida. 2007. "Introduction: Debating Surveillance in the Age of Security." *American Behavioral Scientist* 50 (12): 1567–91.

Ben-Ari, Eyal. 1998a. "Colonialism, Anthropology and the Politics of Professionalization: An Argumentative Afterword." In Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu (eds.), *An-*

thropology and Colonialism, 384–411. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press and London: Curzon Press.

———. 1998b. *Mastering Soldiers: Conflict, Emotions and the Enemy in an Israeli Military Unit*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

———. 2004. "Review Article: The Military and Militarization in the United States." *American Ethnologist* 31 (3): 340–48.

———. 2008. "Review Article: War, the Military and Militarization around the Globe." *Social Anthropology* 16 (1): 90–9.

———. 2011. "Anthropological Research and State Violence: Some Observations of an Israeli Anthropologist." In Laura A. McNamara and Robert A. Rubinstein (eds.), *Dangerous Liaisons: Anthropologists and the National Security State*, 167–84. Santa Fe: School of Advanced Research Press.

Ben-Ari, Eyal, and Efrat El-Ron. 2002. "Blue Helmets and White Armor: Multi-Nationalism and Multi-Culturalism among U.N. Peacekeeping Forces." *City and Soc*iety 13 (2): 271–302.

Ben-Ari, Eyal, and Sabine Fruhstuck. 2003. "The Celebration of Violence: A Live-Fire Demonstration Carried Out by Japan's Contemporary Military." *American Ethnologist* 30 (4): 539–55.

Bickford, Andrew. 2003. "The Militarization of Masculinity in the Former German Democratic Republic." In Paul R. Higate (ed.), *Military Masculinities*, 157–73. Westport: Praeger.

———. 2011. *Fallen Elites: The Military Other in Post-Unification Germany*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Boene, Bernard. 1990. "How Unique Should the Military Be? A Review of Representative Literature and Outline of Synthetic Formulation." *European Journal of Sociology* 31 (1): 3–59.

Burk, James. 1998. "The Logic of Crisis and Civil Military Relations Theory: A Comment on Desch, Feaver and Dauber." *Armed Forces and Society* 24 (3): 455–62.

Castro, Celso. 2016. "Interviewing the Brazilian Military: Reflections on a Research Experience." In Helena Carreiras, Celso Castro, and Sabina Frederic (eds.), *Researching the Military*, 87–93. London: Routledge.

Cushman, Thomas. 2004. "Anthropology and Genocide in the Balkans: An Analysis of Conceptual Practices of Power." *Anthropological Theory* 4 (1): 5–28.

Da Matta, R. 1984. "Carnival in Multiple Planes." In J. J. MacAloon (ed.), *Rite, Drama, Festival, Spectacle*, 208–40. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

Danielsen, Tone. 2015. "Making Warriors in the Global Era: An Anthropological Study of Institutional Apprenticeship; Selection, Training, Education and Everyday Life in the Norwegian Naval Special Operations Commando." Doctoral diss., Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo.

Der Derian, James. 2001. *The Virtuous War: Mapping the Military-Industrial-Media-Entertainment Network*. London: Routledge.

Duncanson, Claire. 2013. *Forces for Good? Military Masculinities and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan and Iraq*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eisenhart, Wayne. 1975. "You Can't Hack It Little Girl: A Discussion of the Covert Psychological Agenda of Modern Combat Training." *Journal of Social Issue*s 31 (4): 13–23.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Finley, Erin. 2011. *Fields of Combat: Understanding PTSD among Veterans of Irac and Afghanistan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fitz-Henry, Erin E. 2011. "Distant Allies, Proximate Enemies: Rethinking the Scales of the Antibase Movement in Ecuador." *American Ethnologist* 38 (2): 323–37.

Frederic, Sabina. 2016. "An Ethnographic Research in the Military Field: Rethinking Academic Autonomy in the Study of the Exodus of Junior Military Personnel in Argentina."

In Helena Carreiras, Celso Castro, and Sabina Frederic (eds.), *Researching the Military*, 119–30. London: Routledge.

Frese, Pamela. 2008. "Guardians of the Golden Age: Custodians of Military Culture and the Fortified 'Home' in Time and Space." *Home Cultures* 5 (1): 11–26.

Frühstück, Sabine. 2007. *Uneasy Warriors: Gender, Memory and Popular Culture in the Japanese Army*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1985. *The Nation-State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gill, Lesley 1997 "Creating Citizens, Making Man: The Military and Masculinity in Bolivia." *Cultural Anthropology* 12 (4): 527–50.

———. 2004. *The School of the Americas: Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gonzalez, Roberto J. 2004a. "Anthropologists in the Public Sphere: Speaking Out on War, Peace, and American Power." In Roberto J. Gonzalez (ed.), *Anthropologists in the Public Sphere*, 1–20. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 2004b. "Epilogue. Unconventional Anthropology: Challenging the Myths of Continuous War." In Roberto J. Gonzalez (ed.), *Anthropologists in the Public Sphere*, 257–72. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Gonzalez, Roberto (ed.). 2010. *Culture: Essays on the Warfare State*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Graham, Stephen. 2009. "Cities as Battlespace: The New Military Urbanism." *City* 13 (4): 384–402.

Grassiani, Erella. 2013. *Soldiering under Occupation: Processes of Numbing among Israeli Soldiers in the Al-Aqsa Intifada*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Grätz, Tilo. 2007. "Vigilante Groups and the State in West Africa." In Keebet Von Benda-Beckman and Fernanda Pirie (eds.), *Order and Disorder*, 207–33. Oxford: Berghahn.

Greenhouse, Carol J. 1989. "Fighting for Peace." In Mary Lecron Foster and Robert A. Rubinstein (eds.), *Peace and War*, 49–60. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Gustavsen, Elin. 2016. "The Construction of Meaning among Norweigan Afghanistan Veterans." *International Sociology* 31 (1): 21–36.

Gusterson, Hugh. 1993. "Exploding Anthropology's Canon in the World of the Bomb: Ethnographic Writing on Militarism." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22 (1): 59–79.

———. 2003. "Anthropology and the Military: 1968, 2003 and Beyond?" *Anthropology Today* 19 (3): 25–26.

———. 2007. "Anthropology and Militarism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36: 155–75.

Haaland, Torunn Laugen. 2008. "Invisible Women and Friendly War-Fighters: Perceptions of Gender and Masculinities in the Norwegian Armed Forces." *Norma* 2: 167–81

Halpern, Joel M., and David A. Kideckel. 2000. *Neighbors at War: Anthropological Perspectives on Yugoslav Ethnicity, Culture*, and History. Philadephia: Pennsylvania University Press.

Hautzinger, Sarah, and Jean Scandlyn. 2014. *Beyond Post-Traumatic Stress*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Hawkins, John P. 2001. *Army of Hope, Army of Alienation*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Heiselberg, Maj Hedegaard. Forthcoming. "Families at War in Time and Space." *Critical Military Studies*, Special Issue, coedited with Mads Daugbjerg.

Higate, Paul R. 2003. *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*. London: Praeger.

Hodder, Ian. 2012. *Entangled*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hoffman, Danny. 2011. *The War Machines*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hoffman, F. 2007. *Conflict in the 21st Century*. Arlington: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.

Holmes-Eber, Paula. 2014. *Culture in Conflict: Irregular Warfare, Culture Policy, and the Marine Corps*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1957: *The Soldier and the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Inoue, Masamichi. 2007. *Okinawa and the U.S. Military*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Janowitz, Morris. 1971. *The Professional Soldier*. New York: Free Press.

———. 1976. "Military Institutions and Citizenship in Western Societies." *Armed Forces and Society* 2 (2): 185–203.

Kaldor, Mary. 1999. *New and Old Wars*. Cambridge: Polity.

Kelly, John D., and Beatrice Jauregui (eds.). 2010. *Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Kertzer, D. I. 1988. *Ritual, Politics and Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kilshaw, Susie. 2007. "Toxic Emissions: The Role of Semen in Gulf War Syndrome Illness Narratives." *Anthropology and Medicine* 14 (3): 251–58.

———. 2009. *Impotent Warriors*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Kirke, Charles. 2000. *Red Coat, Green Machine: Continuity and Change in the British Army 1700– 2000*. London: Continuum.

Krohn-Hansen, Christian. 1994. "The Anthropology of Violent Interaction." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 50: 367–81.

Kronsell, Annica, and Erika Svedberg. 2012. *Making Gender, Making War*. New York: Routledge.

Lomsky-Feder, Edna. 1998. *As If There Was No War: The Perception of War in the Life Stories of Israeli Men* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Magnes.

Lomsky-Feder, Edna, and Eyal Ben-Ari. 2000. *Military and Militarism in Israeli Society*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lucas, George R., Jr. 2009. *Anthropologists in Arms*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Luckham, Robin A. 1971. "A Comparative Typology of Civil–Military Relations." *Government and Opposition* 6 (1): 5–35.

Lutz, Catherine 2001. *Homefront: The Military City and the American Twentieth Century*. Boston: Beacon Press.

———. 2002. "Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis." *American Anthropologist* 104 (3): 723–35.

——— (ed.). 2009. *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts*. New York: Pluto Press.

Lutz, Catherine, and Donald Nonini. 1999. "The Economies of Violence and the Violence of Economies." In Henrietta Moore (ed.), *Anthropological Theory Today*, 73–113. London: Polity Press.

MacLeish, Kenneth T. 2012. Armor and Anesthesia: Exposure, Feeling, and the Soldier's Body. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26 (1): 49–68.

MacLeish, Kenneth T. 2013. *Making War at Fort Hood*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maguire, Mark, Catarina Frois, and Nils Zurawski. 2014. *The Anthropology of Security*. London: Pluto Press.

Mann, Michael. 1988. *States, War and Capitalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Marcus, George, and Erkan Saka. 2006. "Assemblage." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2–3): 101–9.

Masco, Joseph. 2014. *The Theater of Operations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

McCaffrey, Katherine T. 2002. *Military Power and Popular Protest*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

McFate, Montgomery. 2005. "Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of Their Curious Relationship." *Military Review* 85 (2): 24–38.

McFate, Montgomery, and Janice H. Laurence (eds.). 2015. *Social Science Goes to War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McSorley, Kevin (ed.). 2013. *War and the Body*. London: Routledge.

Messinger, Seth. 2009. "Incorporating the Prosthetic: Traumatic Limb-Loss, Rehabilitation and Reconfigured Military Bodies." *Disability and Rehabilitation* 31 (25): 2130–34.

———. 2013. "Vigilance and Attention among U.S. Service Members and Veterans after Combat." *Anthropology of Consciousness* 24 (2): 191–7.

Moskos, Charles C. 1976. "The Military." In Alex Inkeles, James Coleman, and Neil Smelser (eds.), *Annual Review of Sociology* 2: 25–77. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Mosse, George L. 1990. *Fallen Soldiers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mosse, Pamela, and Michael J. Prince. 2014. *Weary Warriors*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Münkler, Herfried. 2005. *The New Wars*. Cambridge: Polity.

Nordstrom, Carolyn. 1997. *A Different Kind of War Story*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 2004. *Shadows of War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nordstrom, Carolyn, and Antonius C. G. M. Robben (eds.). 1996. *Fieldwork under Fire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nørgaard, Katrine. 2004. "The Technology of Trust: The Military Ethos and the Will to Culture" (Danish). Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen.

Ong, Aihwa, and Stephen J. Collier. 2004. *Global Assemblages*. London: Blackwell.

Price, David. 2002. "Lessons from the Second World War Anthropology: Peripheral, Persuasive and Ignored Contributions." *Anthropology Today* 18 (3): 14–20.

———. 2008. *Anthropological Intelligence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2011a. Counterinsurgency, Vietnam, Thailand and the Political Use of Militarized Anthropology. In Laura McNamara and Robert Rubenstein (eds.), *Dangerous Liaisons: Anthropologists and the National Security State*, 51–76. Santa Fe: SAR Press.

———. 2011b. *Weaponizing Anthropology*. Petrolia, CA: AK Press.

Robben, Antonius. 1995. "The Politics of Truth and Emotion among Victims and Perpetrators of Violence." In Carolyn Nordstrom and Antonius C. G. M. Robben (eds.), *Fieldwork under Fire*, 81–103. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rubinstein, Robert A. 1998. "Methodological Challenges in the Ethnographic Study of Multilateral Peacekeeping." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 21 (1): 138–49.

———. 2003. "Peacekeepers and Politics: Experience and Political Representation among U.S. Military Officers." In Pamela R. Frese and Margaret C. Harrell (eds.), *Anthropology and the United States Military*, 15–28. New York: Palgrave.

———. 2012. "Master Narratives, Retrospective Attribution, and Ritual Pollution in Anthropology's Engagements with the Military." In Robert A. Rubinstein, Kerry Fosher, and Clementine Fujimura (eds.), *Practicing Military Anthropology*, 199–33. Sterling VA: Kumarian Press.

Rubinstein, Robert A., Kerry Fosher, and Clementine Fujimura (eds.). 2012. *Practicing Military Anthropology*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.

Schober, Elisabeth. 2016. *Base Encounters: The U.S. Armed Forces in South Korea*. London: Pluto Press.

Schäuble, Michala. 2014. *Narrating Victimhood*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Segal, David R., and H. Wallace Sinaiko (eds.). 1986. *Life in the Rank and File*. Washington, DC: Brassey's.

Shatan, Chaim F. 1977. "Bogus Manhood, Bogus Honor: Surrender and Transfiguration in the United States Marine Corps." *Psychoanalytic Review* 64 (4): 585–610.

Simons, Anna. 1997. *The Company They Keep: Life Inside the U.S. Army Special Forces*. New York: Free Press.

———. 1999. "War: Back to the Future." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28: 73–108.

Sion, Liora. 2004. *Dutch Peacekeepers: Between Soldiering and Policing*. Doctoral thesis, Free University of Amsterdam.

Stachowitsch, Saskia. 2013. "Professional Soldier, Weak Victim, Patriotic Heroine: Gender Ideologies in Debates on Women's Military Integration in the U.S." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 15 (2): 157–76.

Sylvester, Christine. 2014. "Bodies of War." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16 (1): 1–5

Sørensen, Birgitte Refslund. 2013. "Soldaterfamilier: sociale fordringer og forandringer" [Soldierfamilies: social demands and changes]. In Hanne Mogensen and Karen Fog Ol-

wig (eds.), *Familie og slægtskab – antropologisker perspektiver* [Family and kin – anthropological perspectives], 97–114. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

———. 2015. "Veterans' Homecomings: Secrecy and Post-deployment Social Becoming." *Current Anthropology*, Supplement, 56 (12).

———. Forthcoming. "Public Commemorations of Danish Soldiers: Monuments, Memorials and Tombstones." *Critical Military Studies*, Special Issue, coedited with Mads Daugbjerg.

Sørensen, Birgitte Refslund, and Jeppe Trolle Linnet. Nd. *Courage and Coziness: Soldiers Made in Denmark*. PDF available at Academia.edu.

Sørensen, Birgitte Refslund, and Thomas Randrop Pedersen. 2012. "Homecoming Parades: A Ceremonial Celebration of the Warrior and the Warrior Nation" (Original in Danish: "*Hjemkomstparader: ceremoniel fejring af krigeren og den krigsførende nation*"). *Slagmark. Tidsskrift for idehistorie* 63: 31–48.

Thiranagama, Sharika. 2014. "Making Tigers from Tamils: Sri Lankan Tamils and Long Distance Nationalism in Toronto, Canada." *American Anthropologist* 116 (2): 265–78.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1991. *Entangled Objects*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tierney, Kathleen, and C. A. Bevc. 2007. "Disaster as War: Militarism and the Social Construction of Disaster in New Orleans." In David Brunsma, David Overfelt, and J. Steven Picou (eds.), *The Sociology of Katrina*, 37–54. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tilly, Charles. 1995. "States and Nationalism in Europe 1492–1992." In John L. Comaroff and Paul Stern (eds.), *Perspectives on Nationalism and War*, 187–204. Luxembourg: Gordon and Breach.

Tomforde, Maren. 2009. "'My Pink Uniform Shows I Am One of Them': Socio-Cultural Dimensions of German Peacekeeping Missions," in Gerhard Kümmel, Guiseppe Caforio, and Christopher Dandeker (eds.), *Armed Forces, Soldiers and Civil–Military Relations*, 37–57. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

———. 2010. "Introduction: The Distinctive Role of Culture in Peacekeeping." *International Peacekeeping* 17 (4): 450–6.

Tsing, Anna. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connections*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vigh, Henrik. 2006. *Navigating Terrains of War: Youth and Soldiering in Guinea-Bissau*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Vine, David, and Laura Jeffrey. 2009. "'Give Us Back Diego Garcia': Unity and Division among Activists in the Indian Ocean." In Catherine Lutz (ed.), *The Bases of Empire*, 181–217. New York: Pluto Press.

Wax, Murray L. 2003. "Wartime Dilemmas of an Ethical Anthropology." *Anthropology Today* 19 (3): 23–24.

Weber, Claude. 2016. "Immersion Experience within Military Organizations." In Helena Carreiras, Celso Castro, and Sabina Frederic (eds.), *Researching the Military*, 131–40. London: Routledge.

Whitworth, Sandra. 2004. *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Winslow, Donna. 1997. *The Canadian Airborne Regiment in Somalia: A Socio-Cultural Inquiry*. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing.

Winter, Jay. 1995. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, Rachel. 2004. *Military Landscapes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Woodward, Rachel, and K. Neil Jenkings. 2013. "Soldiers' Bodies and the Contemporary British Military Memoir." In Kevin McSorley (ed.), *War and the Body*. London: Routledge.

Wool, Zoë. 2012. "On Movement: The Matter of US Soldiers' Being after Combat." *Ethnos* 78 (3): 1–31.

———. 2015. *After War: The Weight of Life at Walter Reed*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wool, Zoë, and Seth D. Messinger. 2012. "Labors of Love: The Transformation of Care in the Non-Medical Attendant Program at Walter Reed Army Medical Center." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 26 (1): 26–48.