Introduction

THE DAWNING OF A KINDER, GENTLER US MILITARY

> America is never wholly herself unless she is engaged in high moral principle. We as a people have such a purpose today. It is to make kinder the face of the nation and gentler the face of the world.
>
> President George H. W. Bush, 1989 inaugural speech

In contrast to the later aggressively hawkish rhetoric of post-9/11 politics, George H. W. Bush's inaugural vision of a kinder, gentler global governance seems quaint by comparison. Yet he would go on to launch the Gulf War, a decision that would directly and indirectly create the geopolitical conditions that gave rise to the interminable war on terror. This apparent mismatch is, in fact, emblematic of American politics. The national identity of the United States, defined by the ideals of freedom, liberty, and safety, have in fact *always* been constituted through violence, from its settler colonial origins onward.[1] And so, addressing the nation, the elder Bush announced the invasion of Iraq by framing it as an act of liberation. "Even as planes of the multinational forces attack Iraq," Bush said solemnly, "I prefer to think of peace, not war."[2] He lamented the inevitable casualties to come but pledged that "out of the horror of combat will come the recognition that no nation can stand against a world united"—a world with the United States at the helm. Thirty years later, that unrealized promise of world peace remains the carrot that justifies the stick of continued occupation in the Middle East.

What's more, the folding in of gay rights, women's rights, and trans rights to that national brand over recent decades has further legitimated

war and militarism, now dressed up as mechanisms of gender and sexual equality. It is in this context that the US military has made extraordinary strides toward gender- and sexuality-inclusive personnel policies. With the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT), the end of the combat exclusion rule for women, and the removal of medical regulations against transgender service, the military is now a kinder, gentler place for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people (LGBTs) and cisgender straight women—at least on paper. Still, these changes are not exactly the feminist and LGBT rights victories they purport to be. Just as Bush Sr. waged war in the name of world peace, the incorporation of LGBTs and cis straight women has served as an alibi for US globalism, shoring up US empire while shortchanging those it purports to protect.[3]

This accomplishment was aided and abetted by what I call the *homonormative bargain* of the gay rights movement, the purchase of inclusion (for some) at the expense of the antiwar, antiracist, and gender-expansive politics of gay liberation. Social movement tactics of visibility, normalcy, and assimilation in the late twentieth century made inclusion possible, but only through complicity with the racist, misogynist, and imperialist agenda of the US settler state. As I will demonstrate, even those who directly benefit from this attenuated inclusion are, in fact, harmed by the deal.

Curious about the reception of this policy sea change, I began interviewing Army ROTC cadets in 2015. I was eager to hear the perspectives of this cohort of future officers, the first to experience officer training under the new policy regime, to live, work, train, and serve where policy meets practice. One of my earliest interviews was with Cara, a cadet in her last year of ROTC training. A 22-year-old white cisgender straight woman, Cara was enthusiastic about the repeal of DADT. To her mind, the move better aligned the military with her generation's more live-and-let-live attitude about sexuality; in a few years, she predicted, DADT would be so thoroughly anachronistic that she and her fellow officers would barely remember it. Cara told me that in her ROTC program, "I haven't really met anyone who's been actively against any gay people or anything like that. . . . [Acceptance] is such a norm now, almost, at least in my experience." Still, she hedged, "I'm sure it would be, maybe, a little bit different in some of these more masculine type branches, such as infantry and armor, where it's all males." After a beat, she reversed course, recalling a story

from her boyfriend, an Army infantry officer: "One of [his] classmates came out and said he was gay. It was kind of like, 'Okay.'" As she spoke, she shrugged her shoulders and held out her hands in a gesture that communicated indifference. She went on, "He did say there were some people who made comments, but that everyone else in their class [told those people], 'That's not okay.'" And so, Cara concluded, "I just really think our generation going into it is going to continue to shift that norm. It's going to be just like, accepted and like it always was there, you know?"

Given her welcoming attitude toward the DADT repeal, I expected Cara would be equally sanguine about the gender integration of combat. Yet on that topic, Cara's tone became cautious:

> I think it's very complicated. . . . My biggest concern with allowing it . . . is I think there is a huge discrepancy between physical strength, male and female, and I just don't think you can—we already do adjust standards for things like the PT [physical training] test and that sort of stuff, but if you're going to ask them to be in those roles, I think they have to rise up to the same standards as males and they need to be treated 100 percent the same. I do think *some* females can do it. But I think it's a very, very small percentage.

This tonal shift had me scratching my head. How could the same cadet regard the integration of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people (LGBs) as a much-needed corrective to old-fashioned attitudes, yet also maintain that the segregation of women from combat was a necessary evil? Similar gender-essentialist rationales also tempered Cara's enthusiasm for the third major policy change, transgender inclusion throughout the military:

> I understand [trans exclusion] from a military perspective with how many things you have to be male or female, especially with the physical stuff and the PT test. I don't know what the correct term is to use, but if you're saying you're female but you're actually male [*sic*], that could give you an extremely unfair advantage, just because your body is naturally built so much differently and you are naturally stronger than females. Something like that, I could understand why that would be an issue. So many things are male or female. You have to be one or the other.

It seemed that to Cara, the incorporation of sexual difference was only a problem to the extent that old guard military personnel held onto

outdated homophobic beliefs. By contrast, the incorporation of gender difference was a dangerous proposition. The bodies of cisgender women are inadequate for combat missions, and the bodies of trans people, trans women in particular, introduce too much "unfair advantage" and logistical difficulty. If cisgender women were not enough and transgender women were too much, sexuality integration was the only policy shift that Cara found "just right."

Intrigued, I nonetheless regarded this dissonance as an idiosyncrasy in the moment. Surely other interviewees would be more consistent: pro- or anti-inclusion. Yet as interviewing went on, this splitting cropped up again and again. Cadets were simultaneously supportive of the DADT repeal and wary about (or even outright hostile toward) transgender inclusion and women in combat roles.[4] I wondered why, if sexuality integration was a "nonevent," as most of my interviewees claimed, respondents so often viewed increased gender integration as such a monumental—and perilous—disruption to the institution. After all, women had served informally and meritoriously on the front lines for decades, despite the formal ban on their participation.[5] And why would cadets who saw themselves as LGBT allies consider transgender service a bad idea?

Shortly thereafter, I expanded my inquiry to include military servicemembers and veterans.[6] Maybe this contradiction in the gender and sexuality beliefs of cadets could be chalked up to their relative inexperience with the institution itself. It could be the case that servicemembers and vets would be more skeptical about the DADT repeal or less concerned about the end of combat exclusion and trans regulations. Real-world military experience might bring their attitudes about gender versus sexuality integration into alignment. As I continued interviewing, though, the discordant pattern persisted, even intensified.

These mismatched attitudes toward gender, sexuality, and inclusion, I argue, are more than institutionally specific quirks; they illustrate a broader divergence in how we understand gender and sexuality in the twenty-first century. In short, the United States is in the midst of a historic uncoupling of gender and sexuality ideologies. To be sure, the history and structure of the military mattered for the ways research participants narrated exclusion and inclusion; in particular, the institution's aggressively heteromasculinist history and culture distinguish it from other

contemporary organizational contexts in certain respects. However, as I show, the ideological uncoupling I found among respondents is also a consequence of the homonormative turn in gay rights organizing, the effects of which are felt well beyond the military. Decades of social movement strategy focused on dispelling myths of gender nonnormativity and minimizing the distance between hetero- and homosexualities has made LGB integration more palatable throughout society and its institutions.

Desexualization and the containment of the "effeminacy effect" that shaped the reimagining of homosexuality have made room for (some) expressions of LGB identity within the military's culture of hypermasculinity and within US society more generally.[7] The homonormative bargain carved out loopholes through which normatively gendered LGBs could slip. But it sidestepped the larger ideological forces of misogyny, transphobia, and femmephobia—the systematic devaluation of femininity—leaving them undisturbed. By choosing assimilation as its primary strategy for securing rights, the gay rights movement abandoned the gender deconstructionist tactics of its predecessor, gay liberation. On the one hand, this strategy tempered the harmful gender stereotyping of LGBs, gay and bisexual men in particular. On the other, it allowed biologically essentialist explanations of embodied gender difference—and gender deviance—to survive the mainstreaming of gay rights. This is why the end of the "gay ban" can be applauded by the same people who express significant anxiety about open trans service and women in combat.

Today, some gay and bisexual men can be repatriated by military service, while gender-nonconforming queers, cis women, and trans people remain gender outlaws by virtue of their "deficient" embodiment for military service. Further, this bargain remains a handshake deal; even the widespread support for open LGB service is highly conditional, revocable upon violation of the terms and conditions of homonormativity. Sexual harassment, jokes and teasing, and gender policing serve as mechanisms of what I call *queer social control* that enforce gender and sexual normativity for those who dare stray from it. Despite the promise of inclusivity, in practice, the military has made room only for a "few good gays," to the exclusion of all others.

Women's military service is largely understood through the frame I call *patriotic paternalism*: women are inherently in need of the protection of

the patriot, symbolically figured as white, cisgender, heterosexual, male, and American. Patriotic paternalism legitimates the war on terror by claiming it is about "saving" women in the Middle East from the imagined brutality of Middle Eastern men while simultaneously positioning American women as in need of protection from the overestimation of their abilities that puts them in peril on the front lines.[8] The paternal patriot, an agent of what gender and sexuality studies scholar Inderpal Grewal calls the "security state," must now juggle the dual security threats of terrorism and women's integration.[9] A countervailing narrative, a subsect of liberal feminist discourse Grewal calls "security feminism," frames women's combat participation as a matter of empowerment but is dismissed by most cadets, servicemembers, and veterans, who see it as political correctness run amok, a progressive lie that erases the "truth" of sex difference and puts women (and by extension, the nation) in harm's way.

Finally, transgender service presents a unique conundrum. The military is an institution organized by birth-assigned sex segregation in facilities, physical fitness standards, uniforms, and so much else. The military personnel I interviewed tied themselves in knots as they talked through the transformation of the military's gendered organization into what I call a *transgendering organization*, engaged in the institutional work of actively incorporating transness into its foundational logics.[10] Open trans service was administratively unimaginable to many: *What criteria should be used to classify trans servicemembers as male or female? How are cis people disadvantaged or harmed by these classificatory accommodations? Will this unravel sex segregation entirely, leading the military into ungendered chaos?* Trans women's inclusion, in particular, incited gendered anxieties about cis women's safety, demonstrating the social power of transmisogyny, the simultaneous disadvantaging of trans women by virtue of their transness and their womanhood. Between open LGB service and gender integration, there is a liminal space to which trans people have been relegated, excluded by the frames of homonormativity, patriarchal paternalism, and feminist empowerment that define and delimit institutional belonging.

But is belonging even a goal worth pursuing? Incorporation into an apparatus of empire is a far cry from the aims of gay liberationists who held and fought for radically deconstructionist sexuality and gender politics.

Militarism and war were anathema to their organizing priorities and strategies. By analyzing inclusion's history and reception, I critically examine it as a social movement aspiration, ultimately arguing that its steep price is exacted through the continued abjection of queered Others both at home and abroad. The homonormative bargain squandered a great deal of liberatory potential. How did we get from there to here? And where do we go next?

SEX, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY IN THE HETEROSEXUAL MATRIX

In the Global North, gender and sexuality were socially and scientifically linked through the late nineteenth-century "invention" of the homosexual and heterosexual. In fact, sexologists and psychoanalysts first conceived of same-sex attraction not as a matter of sexual difference, as we might today, but rather as a symptom of gender inversion. Early medical models of homosexual behavior attributed homosexuality to gender confusion, thus tying together gender and sexual transgression through the figure of the "gender invert."[11]

Historian Margot Canaday has shown how the establishment of the US bureaucratic state relied heavily on the regulation of queerness (both gender inversion and sexual perversion).[12] State legitimacy was fostered through what Canaday calls the bureaucratization of homosexuality: the making, unmaking, and remaking of the gender/sexual deviant through legal and administrative mechanisms. Within the military, the evolving science of sexology shaped the management of potential threats to its authority. Medical screening practices in the early twentieth century scrutinized the bodies and minds of new recruits for evidence of gendered deviance that might contaminate and imperil the burgeoning dominance of the US military on the global stage. As homosexuality supplanted the concept of gender inversion, the military's surveilling gaze moved from its enactment of medical and psychological tests of gender abnormality to sodomy investigations and later to the prohibition of LGB identity as we now know it.

The homosexual and the transsexual, two newly distinct subjects, emerged from the transition away from the notion of gender inversion.

Homosexuality was no longer the by-product of gender confusion, but rather a sexual desire, quasi-autonomous from gender nonconformity, which was reconfigured and remedicalized as the medical/psychological "condition" of transsexuality.[13] Crucially, the knot between gender and sexuality was not entirely undone by this process, but positioned as a correlative rather than causal relationship. The coercive arrangement of bodies and desires into a coherent and naturalized sex/gender/sexuality system—what Judith Butler terms "the heterosexual matrix"—stabilized the shift away from the gender invert by providing two novel and well-defined replacement categories.[14] Within the heterosexual matrix, individuals are assigned a sex at birth, socialized into a corresponding gender identity, and expected to align their sexual desires by gender and into fixed and binary categories. The discursive power of the heterosexual matrix stabilized any potential uncertainty produced in the shift from the gender invert to the homosexual and transsexual.

By the late twentieth century, the destigmatization of LGBT subjectivities began to unsettle the matrix; the tie between gender transgression and homosexuality was loosened by increased visibility and acceptance. In fact, LGB people were proving to be just as capable of gender conformity as straight people. At the same time, increased transgender visibility introduced questions about the presumed naturalness of sexed bodies and their corresponding gender identities. This is a significant threat to the matrix; if the belief that assigned sex is immaterial to gender becomes too widely adopted, the entire system could be called into question. Sociologists Laurel Westbrook and Kristen Schilt deem the resulting hand-wringing a "gender panic," in which the dominant gender discourse "reacts to a challenge to the gender binary by frantically asserting its naturalness."[15] Gender panic has motivated, among other things, the recent rash of anti-trans legislative efforts adjudicating trans people's access to bathrooms, locker rooms, schools, and sports. Put differently, as the tie between gender and sexual identity undermined the heterosexual matrix and gender panic set in, the tie between sex and gender was reasserted as a counterbalancing and stabilizing force.

This heterosexual matrix is not only about gender and sex, but also race. It is embedded within and racialized through the history and legacy of European and US empire.[16] Colonization and enslavement were

legitimated by dehumanization, which in turn relied on the "discovery" of sexed, gendered, and sexual deviance in its targets.[17] Practices of scientific racism identified the supposed inherent gender and sexual perversity of non-white people, thereby establishing their subhumanity in social, legal, and medical definitions that justified their subjugation. Through this process, indigenous people experiencing colonization and enslavement were defined by their embodiment rather than their enlightenment, the assumed purview of whiteness, and these taxonomic distinctions proved durable. Today, they underpin the continued preoccupation with the bodies and physicality of people of color. Consider the aforementioned war on terror, which racialized and targeted people from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) en masse (while downplaying terrorist acts perpetrated by white actors in the United States and abroad).[18] This process has produced significant reinvigoration of colonial-Orientalist tropes of savagery, deceit, and embodied gender and sexual deviance.[19] It is crucial, then, that we bear in mind that revisions to the heterosexual matrix can benefit some Western LGBs while reinforcing the disciplinary power of that matrix elsewhere. Race, sex, and gender difference are evoked to define MENA people as always already terrorists, if not in action, in inherent constitution.[20]

To return to the subject of gender panic, Schilt and Westbrook find that sex-segregated institutions are especially likely sites for it. In the military, where facilities, uniforms, fitness standards, and specialization are strictly divided by sex, increased inclusivity calls into question these well-established classification systems, thereby evoking gender panic. When this happens, the process of determining sex/gender and revising related sorting practices is likely to default to biological or medical-based rationales rather than identity-based ones. This naturalization work tightens the normative connection between sex and gender that was loosened by transgender visibility. Because the connection between gender and sexual identity has been relaxed by contrast, I argue that gender panic and its effects are heightened in battles over women in combat and open trans service compared to open LGB service. As this book shows, biologized explanations of the psychological and physical unfitness of both groups pervade the narratives of combat desegregation and trans inclusion in a way that they do not in those of LGB integration.

FROM LIBERATION TO RIGHTS

Open LGBT service policies were made possible (and desirable) by the social movement shift from gay liberation to gay rights. Paradoxical though it may seem on its face, I argue that gay rights discourse tacitly cosigns transphobia, femmephobia, and even homophobia, insofar as it positions indistinguishability from norms of straightness and cisness as the end goal. As I will show, the compromise made by homonormative politics—the homonormative bargain—limits how much open service can bring about cultural change sufficient to disrupt patterns of bias in the military and elsewhere. This bargain also excised the more radical antiracist politics of the gay liberation movement that paved the way. Homonormativity has retroactively erased many of the threads gay liberationists identified as crucial sites of intervention: poverty, white supremacy, imperialism, misogyny, and transphobia. It has rewritten events like the Stonewall riots as single-issue responses to sexual oppression, rather than as an intersectional critique of and challenge to police repression and state violence across marginalized identities.[21]

In reality, gay liberation activists, especially gender nonconforming activists of color, were active in multiple projects of antiracist and antiimperial resistance in the United States. Moreover, their contributions firmly planted gay liberation's fundamental tenets in a transgender epistemology: resistance to the disciplining power of gender, in addition to race and class, was understood as indivisible from resisting heterosexual hegemony. But this coalitional model did not survive the forces of social movement burnout, intergroup conflict, and Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO) disinformation tactics, all successful in breaking solidarities between the gay liberation, Black liberation, Third World liberation, and feminist movements.[22] Over the 1970s and 1980s, the movement shifted toward the less aggressive tactical repertoires of persuasion and bargaining.[23] The goal of dismantling the institutions that gay liberation saw as oppressive was replaced with persuasive arguments and strategic bargaining to achieve inclusion within them. Liberation for all was supplanted by incremental gay rights advances for some.

As a package of collective benefits, a rights strategy pursues legal and cultural recognition and equal treatment. Access to rights was built on the

ethos of homonormativity, a politic emphasizing sameness over difference, respectability over revolution.[24] Where gay liberation once resisted the state's encroachment on the sexual lives of queer and trans people, homonormativity seeks incorporation into the core institutions of liberal democracies. To garner attention and legitimacy in the highly competitive social problems marketplace, gay rights used sexual (and later gender) *identity* as the basis for its claims making. Adopting a quasi-ethnic conceptualization of sexual and gender identity made "LGBT" a legible legal category, thereby creating a pathway to seek remedy for discrimination and harm.[25]

This new tactical repertoire left aside the celebration of gender transgression in an effort to establish homosexual belonging within historically heterosexual institutions. Resistance to gender nonconformity, especially effeminacy, became a hallmark of the homonormative turn. Sociologist Peter Hennen defines effeminacy as "a historically varying concept deployed primarily as a means of stabilizing a given society's concept of masculinity and controlling the conduct of its men, based upon a repudiation of the feminine."[26] To pull homosexuality out of that state of repudiation, gay rights discourse severed the connection between effeminacy and homosexuality, moving gay and bisexual men to the other side of the masculine/feminine divide. Homosexuality, once conceptualized primarily as a manifestation of gender deviance, was politically transformed into a normalized and de-somatized identity.[27]

As I argue, this strategy was exceedingly successful in securing rights for some. Yet many queer and trans people are subjected to surveillance and sanction for gender transgression precisely *because* the gay rights movement so effectively excised them from the figure of the good LGBT citizen. The ways current, future, and former servicemembers narrate the DADT repeal compared to open trans service and gender desegregation of combat is the direct consequence of the homonormative bargain. Feminist scholar Deniz Kandiyoti coined the term "patriarchal bargain" to describe the strategies women use to succeed under the sexist and misogynist conditions of patriarchy; similarly, the homonormative bargain was struck to access success under the conditions of heterosexism.[28] As in any bargain, its gains have come with significant concessions: the homonormative bargain upholds and even exacerbates race, class, and gender inequality in the pursuit of sexual equality.

GENDERED MILITARISM AND THE SECURITY STATE

Militarism, the glorification of the military and militaristic modes of governance, is a deeply gendered ideological system. Political scientist Cynthia Enloe has argued that colonization and war are technologies of masculine dominance that feminize its subjects, thereby inscribing the gender binary and gender inequality onto geopolitical dynamics (that then trickle down to shape social practices like the gendered division of household labor).[29] The land we now call the United States was conquered and masculinized in such a manner, first through settler colonialism and later by maneuvers positioning it as a punishing and paternal force on the global stage. In the process, US militarism was gendered as masculine and racialized as white.

When social upheaval threatens to unseat that racialized masculine status, war reasserts and remasculinizes the national brand. Enloe uses the example of the Vietnam War (1954–75), a pivotal event for the development of gay liberation, as one such remasculinizing effort. The contemporary war on terror serves a similar purpose. The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 threatened to feminize the United States, whose defenses were so publicly "penetrated." By appointing itself to sovereign dominion over terror, the United States moved to recoup its gendered reputation, as even a cursory glance at 9/11 rhetoric and imagery amply demonstrates.[30] And unlike a specific nation like Vietnam, terror is a moving target. As a result, the pursuit of terror has authorized the United States to exercise incursion at will across the Middle East (and to surveil and indefinitely detain anyone in the name of homeland security).

In this endless war, the brown terrorist is positioned as the feminized, queered foil to the white American patriot.[31] Jasbir Puar and Amit Rai articulate this psychoanalytic formulation in which the gender invert is revived as the "monster-terrorist-fag."[32] The white gay American patriot is no longer monstrous, redoubling the threat of the brown Middle Eastern terrorist. The dual process of quarantining the racialized and sexualized Other (said monster-terrorist-fag) and selectively incorporating the acceptably raced, gendered, and sexualized homopatriot is the ground upon which open service made its home.[33] This dialectic is central to the production of what Puar calls homonationalism: the suturing together of

homonormativity and nationalist zeal that queers the monster-terrorist-fag and *un*queers the homopatriot.[34]

The US military expressly inculcates martial masculinity, a variant within the gender system that sociologist Raewyn Connell calls "hegemonic masculinity": the "configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy."[35] Masculinity, per Connell, is fundamentally relational, established through the subjugation of women, femininities, subordinated gay masculinities, and marginalized non-white masculinities. Martial masculinity, specifically, valorizes the warrior, historically imagined as the stoic and lethal white, heterosexual, cisgender patriot. And it is a relational accomplishment, made possible through the formal and informal exclusion of cis straight women and LGBTs. As cis, (ostensibly) straight women were incorporated into the military over the twentieth century, the combat exclusion rule ensured the preservation of the most sacred stage on which martial masculinity was performed: the front lines. DADT and its predecessors also provided a mechanism to silence any LGBT servicemembers who managed to make their way in. Simultaneously, the cultural deployment of misogyny, homophobia, and transphobia reasserted martial masculinity through, among other things, venerated fraternal traditions that assuage gender panic by maintaining the symbolic exile of all things feminine. As documented by folklorist Carol Burke and others, these traditions include a plethora of sexually objectifying and sexually violent traditions (chants, ceremonies, hazing rituals) that use gendered and sexual humiliation as a bonding mechanism.[36]

Increasingly, however, these politics and practices are out of step with the US military's image as the great liberator, protecting the world from the illiberal brutality of Islamic extremism. Appeals to tolerance have been used as a political tool to justify that project. Political theorist Wendy Brown calls tolerance a "tactical political response" that legitimizes liberal universalism and thereby military intervention on its behalf.[37] Gender and sexual intolerance within the US military are a contradiction to this mission, thus motivating a rebranding project that includes the end of DADT, combat exclusion, and medical disqualifications of transgender servicemembers. For Brown, the frame of tolerance always implies a power relation between the tolerant and the tolerated. Thus the "pinkwashing" of the

military through the incorporation of cis straight women and LGBTs technically fulfills a promise of tolerance while requiring the tolerated to twist and bend to fit the conditions of that tolerance.[38] This "tolerance trap," in the words of sociologist Suzanna Walters, forecloses possibilities for more radical social transformation.[39] In the case of the military, tolerance enables both inclusion and abjection simultaneously. As I will show, members of the military engage in a process of queer social control to contain the newly tolerated and the threat they represent to martial masculinity.

In the foundational essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?," postcolonial theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak identified "white men saving brown women from brown men" as an authorizing logic that legitimated British colonial rule.[40] Today, the same rationale continues to obscure the era of US empire by hiding it "behind the veil of women's victimization."[41] Much of Western feminist discourse has done the same, only in this case, with white women intervening "on behalf of" their "Third World sisters" in an act of presumed universal womanhood.[42] The war on terror has given rise to a novel configuration of this saviorhood and "securitization," or the discourses shoring up the intrusion of security and surveillance apparatuses into all domains of social life. Inderpal Grewal calls this "security feminism."[43] It relies on the global sisterhood frame to justify interventionist policy and positions domestic national security as a feminist issue. The goal of "women's empowerment" is enacted through the active embrace of securitization. Feminist pacifism and resistance to militarism are obscured by security feminism as it is used to counter assumptions about women's physical or psychological unfitness for military service. To the extent that security feminism challenges patriotic paternalism, it is by "leaning in" to patriotism. This feminist variant, then, is not unlike homonationalist LGBT politics, yet it is less powerful as a rationale for inclusion because the LGB patriot has already doubled down on rejection of femininity and women by extension.

Gender and sexuality studies scholar Toby Beauchamp has documented how securitization also informs contemporary transgender politics. Beauchamp argues that in the security state, "surveillance is a central practice through which the category of transgender is produced, regulated, and contested."[44] Some trans subjects (white, gender conforming, productive citizens) are made legible and legitimate through surveillance; others are

rendered security threats by their nonconformity. For example, when the Department of Homeland Security stoked fears of "male bombers [who] dress as females" to support the passage of the Real ID Act in 2005, trans advocacy organizations objected: not to the transmisogynist fearmongering, but to how the act would impede the freedom and privacy of the "good" trans citizen.[45] They called for increased access to gender marker changes so that trans US citizens might travel freely under the heightened scrutiny, a move that contributes to the emerging politics of transnormativity, which circumscribe transness to the surveilling gaze of medical and legal authority.[46] This does what legal scholar Dean Spade calls "administrative violence," distributing safety, freedom of movement, and gender legitimacy only to those who can and will submit to the surveilling gaze of the state.[47] In the military, administrative violence is done by the medico-legal gatekeepers charged with sorting trans servicemembers into the institution's binary sex segregation systems. Regardless of their ability to abide by the new sex classification regulations, trans women are also seen by cisgender servicemembers as invaders and gender pretenders who pose harm to cisgender women. Women are thereby divided from each other through this trans/cis binary and prevented from working together to challenge their mutual marginalization.

STUDYING THE US MILITARY

How do you study a problem like the military? With millions of members dispersed across a vast array of occupational specializations and geographic locations, there is no singular workplace experience or culture to investigate. Rather, the military is an assemblage, inclusive of "varying degrees of fragmentation, incoherence, ambiguity, and other disjointed elements and seemingly incompatible cultural tools."[48] Given this challenge and the relative dearth of research documenting the cultural impact of gender and sexuality policy change within this broad institution, I opted for breadth over depth in my data-gathering approach, spending five years conducting interviews with cadets, servicemembers, and veterans across an array of the military's occupational locations. Because policy becomes legitimized (or delegitimized) through institutional actors, interviews that