The Body of International Relations

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Lauren Beth Wilcox

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Raymond Duvall, Adviser

November, 2011

Table of Contents

--The body implies mortality, vulnerability, agency: the skin and the flesh expose us to the gaze of others but also to touch and to violence (Judith Butler, *Precarious Life,* pg. 26).

Chapter 1: *Bodies, Subjectivity and Violence*

International politics has been characterized in recent years by a proliferation of modes of violence that use, target, and construct bodies in complex ways. Virtually invulnerable pilots and drones operated from thousands of miles away drop precision-guided bombs intended to destroy buildings or individual people, often causing the 'accidental' slaughter of dozens of others at a time. Suicide bombers seek certain death by turning their bodies into weapons that seem to attack at random. Images of tortured bodies from Guantánamo Bay and Abu Ghraib provoke shock and outrage, and prisoners on hunger-strikes to protest their treatment are force-fed. In each of these instances, the body becomes the focal point central to practices of security and international relations— the body brought into excruciating pain, the body as weapon, or the body as that which is *not* to be targeted and hence is hit only accidentally or collaterally. Such bodily focus is quite distinct from prevailing international security practices and the disciplinary ways of knowing those practices in IR. Convention has it that states or groups make war and, in doing so, kill and injure people that other states are charged with protecting. The strategic deployment of force in the language of rational control and risk management that dominates security studies presents a disembodied view of subjects as reasoning actors. However, as objects of security studies, the people that are protected from violence or are killed are understood as *only* bodies: they are ahistorical, biopolitical aggregations whose

individual members breathe, suffer and die. In both cases, the politics and sociality of bodies are erased.

One of the deep ironies of security studies is that while war is actually inflicted on bodies, bodily violence and vulnerability, as the flip side of security, are largely ignored. By contrast, feminist theory is at its most powerful when it denaturalizes accounts of individual subjectivity so as to analyze the relations of force, violence, and language that compose our profoundly unnatural bodies. Security Studies lacks the reflexivity necessary to see its contribution to the very context it seeks to domesticate. Security Studies has largely ignored work in feminist theory that opens up the forces that have come to compose and constitute the body: by and large, security studies has an unarticulated, yet implicit, conception of bodies as individual organisms whose protection from damage constitutes the provision of security. In IR, human bodies are implicitly theorized as organisms that are exogenously determined—they are relevant to politics only as they live or die. Such bodies are inert objects: they exist to be manipulated, possess no agency and are only driven by the motivations of agents. Attentive to the relations provoked by both discourse and political forces, feminist theory redirects attention to how both compose and produce bodies on terms often alien and unstable. Contemporary feminist theorizing about embodiment provides a provocative challenge to the stability and viability of several key concepts in IR such as sovereignty, security, violence, and vulnerability. In this project, I draw on recent work in feminist theory that offers a challenge to the deliberate maintenance and policing of boundaries and delineation of human bodies from the broader political context.

Challenging this theorization of bodies as natural organisms is a key step in not only exposing how bodies have been implicitly theorized in IR, but in developing a reading of IR that is attentive to the ways in which bodies are both produced and productive. In conceptualizing the subject of IR as essentially disembodied, IR theory impoverishes itself. An explicit focus on bodies is important for two broad reasons. First, we can understand much more about violence in International Relations if we expand our conception of embodiment beyond a picture of bodies as inert, biological entities solely driven by the minds of agents. Theorizing the constitution and agency of bodies can reveal consequences of political violence that have not previously been recognized. Second, there are normative and political implications of the body both in terms of IR theory and the world of international politics. Explicitly theorizing the body in IR in relation to the subject and violence opens up space for thinking about politics and resistance in ways that are overlooked. By theorizing bodies, we can see bodies as sites of politics, not only as organisms that suffer from violence.

In a broad sense, the subfield of security studies has defined its topic of study as "the study of the threat, use, and control of military force" (Walt 1991, 212), with emphasis on the causes of war and the conditions for peace. Despite the traditional focus on military force, security studies has by and large ignored the bodies that are the intended or inevitable targets of the use of such force. One classic work in the field, Schelling's *Arms and Influence* (1966) specifically addresses coercion as the threat to cause pain and to hurt human bodies in order to manipulate a certain outcome. Few works are so explicit—that force involves the threat or use of military power to hurt and kill

3

human bodies is usually implicit in security studies. Furthermore, when the violence to human bodies is made explicit, such as in Schelling, such bodies are implicitly theorized precisely as organisms that can be hurt or killed. Contributing to the neglect of theorizing bodies has been the emphasis placed on *national* security. National security has long been the center of analysis in security studies, but in recent decades, the field has broadened to consider the referent object of security to be the individual as "people represent, in one sense, the irreducible basic unit to which the concept of security can be applied" (Buzan 1991, 18). The concept of 'human security' posits the question of violence against human bodies as a central issue in security studies, yet this theorization accepts the individual as an exogenous unit of analysis. The relationship between bodies, subjects and violence still remains undertheorized.

Furthermore, in the issue areas in which one might expect IR and security studies more specifically to address the question of bodies as central to theories of violence, the IR literature has not done so. The three forms of contemporary political violence that I address in depth in this work—torture/force-feeding, suicide bombing, and precision warfare—all engage the human body in a fundamental ways that that are ignored or obscured by the literature. The IR literature has asked, for example, whether suicide bombing can be considered a rational practice and what strategic functions it serves (Pape 2005; Gambetta 2005; Crenshaw 2007), as well as asking what meanings this practice has for its practitioners and the audience for this type of violence (Hafez 2006; Roberts 2007; Dingley and Mollica, 2007; Fierke 2009). Theorizing the body allows us to ask questions that have not, and cannot, be asked given prevailing implicit conceptions of the body in

4

IR. The literature hasn't asked what effects this practice might have that are not reducible to the motivations of individual actors; that is, what does the use of the body in this particular way entails politically that is absent in other forms of political violence. Understanding the political dynamics of the construction and deconstruction of the body can help us to understand why suicide bombing is a particularly feared yet captivating form of violence.

A focus on the bodies of prisoners at Guantánamo Bay reveals the workings of power in ways that have been overlooked by IR scholars seeking to theorizing torture and the war on terror. The IR literature asks why states torture and how state identity and international laws and norms serve to constrain states in this regard (Blakely 2007; Foot 2006; McKeown 2009). Ethical perspectives in IR have also discussed when, if ever, torture may be permissible (Shue 1978; Bellamy 2006). Torture is generally regarded as impermissible, as a remnant of a pre-modern past, as behavior 'civilized' states do not engage in. Seeing this kind of violent intervention on the body as something to be avoided misses how violence is often *productive*. We miss, for example, how torture and pain do not only harm the body, but produce particular subjects that can be tortured. While torture and the force-feeding of hunger strikers is argued to be an unwarranted bodily intrusion by opponents and a necessary, life-saving procedure as well as an important tactic in the war on terror by proponents, these positions both miss how this practice constitutes the bodies of the hunger-strikers as dependents and makes such techniques more acceptable to concerned audiences.

By assuming bodies are individuated biological entities, IR theory has been unable to conceptualize bodies as constituted in relation to one another. This relational constitution of bodies is a condition of possibility for the violence of precision warfare. On the topic of precision bombing, traditional strategic studies debates have centered on whether or not the use of precision guided munitions substantially adds to the coercive effects of air power, and whether the reliance on such weapons is in the short- and long-term interests of the US (Pape 1996; Press 2001). The causes and conditions that engender the targeting of civilians in bombing campaigns is still a matter of great debate in IR although the liberal humanitarian wars in the post-Cold War era as well as the War on Terror have focused on the use of precision bombing (Downes 2009; Milliken and Sylvan 1996; Thomas 2001). When bodies are explicitly mentioned in the literature on precision warfare, it is usually to describe this form of warfare as 'disembodied' in which the purveyors of violence operate at a great distance from the targets and the victims and targets are unseen and remain abstractions. Such distance between bomber and target, they claim, makes it psychologically easier to use lethal force and transforms civilian deaths from war crimes to 'accidents.' However, the contemporary technologies of precision warfare enable pilots and the operators of UAVs (unmanned aerial vehicles or drones) to see their targets quite clearly. Scholars have probed how the choice to develop and use precision air strikes and drones affects how bodies as potential targets are viewed, but less well understood is how precision warfare constitutes a political adaptation of bodies themselves, of the pilots and drone operators as well as those of the targets and those at risk from aerial warfare. By theorizing the subjects of precision

warfare as relationally constituted, we can understand how certain bodies can be produced as 'killable' as well as how this form of warfare comes to be perceived as legitimate.

Besides opening up interpretive space in IR, there are important normative implications for explicitly theorizing the body in International Relations. One of my aims in this project is to help create space for new kinds of theorizing in IR by denaturalizing the body. By casting the body as a material, 'brute' fact that can largely be ignored, we limit our understanding of the political possibilities for different kinds of bodily politics. Placing bodies as central to theorizing in IR allows us to think the processes of IR differently than are otherwise possible. In particular, we can theorize the body as such as an effect of practices of IR, rather than take the body for granted as an apolitical object. For example, as I discuss in chapter four, the body of the 'Israeli Jew' is constituted, in part, by practices of recovery organizations in the wake of suicide bombings. Understanding bodies as not just something that is acted upon in instances of violence, but as something that is constituted in and through international relations, can open up the body as a space for engaging in politics.

The normative aspects of this project are also informed by feminist theory: feminists have been at the forefront at theorizing the politics of embodiment in order to challenge the legitimization of women's subordination through social and scientific discourses that contend female physiology is the source of women's inferior social, economic, and political status. Through their analysis of the concepts of gender and sexuality, feminists challenged the too-easy equation of subjectivity with physical

embodiment. Feminists have interrogated issues of embodiment as political in order to expose how conceptions of the seemingly natural body normalize certain forms of political oppression and exclusion for those whose bodies are considered non-standard, deviant, or 'other', including women, queer people, transgender and transsexual people, racial and ethnic minorities and people with disabilities. Denaturalizing the body and theorizing its political constitution is thus a crucial component of a project to undermine various forms of marginalization and subordination in International Relations. Much as 'opening the black box of the state' allowed IR theorists to critically examine a much broader range of actors, issues and practices relevant to IR, opening up the body to political analysis allows us to critically interrogate the body as something with a history whose story is continually being written. While feminist scholars have played a leading role in theorizing embodiment, feminist scholars in IR have yet to fully explore the implications of the political constitution of the body and the body as a kind of political agent.

II. Feminists Theorize the Body in IR

Feminists working in International Relations have critiqued the subject of international relations as a specifically masculine subject marked by autonomy and rationality, a disembodied subject (Peterson 1992, 7; Tickner 2001, 52; Hooper 2001, 43-44). Feminists in IR have contributed to theorizing bodies in IR in a number of important ways, but their contributions have been limited in their reproduction of IR's tendency to

8

assume an apolitical body—a body that only breathes, suffers, and dies—through their theorization of gender. In this section, I describe how one influential work of feminist IR theorizes bodies and how this theorization is limited before I summarize my own method for theorizing bodies in the next section.

One of the most important feminist contributions in theorizing the body is work that highlights the ways in which strategic thought in International Relations ignores and in fact, necessarily obscures the gruesome realities of war and its impact on the human body. Beyond bemoaning the existence of euphemisms such as 'daisy cutters' and 'acceptable losses,' some feminists have shown how certain abstract calculations about war are made possible by the erasure of human bodily suffering. Feminists have tried to correct theories of violence and war that work to obscure the reality of bodily violence while focusing on political, strategic, and tactical maneuverings. Such theories have been criticized by feminists for their abstraction which allows theorists to distance themselves from the horrors of war. Carol Cohn, in her landmark essay, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," (1987) insists that this neglect of bodily harm is not an oversight, but rather is a precondition for the existence of the theory and the strategic apparatus underpinning it. The language of the nuclear defense specialists in her participant-observation not only euphemized the violent potential of nuclear weapons in terms of 'collateral damage,' 'clean bombs,' and assorted acronyms, but served to limit what could be thought and said. In the discourse of nuclear strategists, human suffering and death was invisible, rather, the survival of the weapons themselves was the focus. Cohn's work is an example of feminist theorizing about violence: violence in its bodily,

all-too-real manifestation cannot be seen in certain types of theorizing about international war and security. Not only is bodily violence invisible, but it is necessarily invisible if such theorizing is to proceed.

Cohn does more than expose the erasure of injured and destroyed bodies in discourses of nuclear strategy. Her work is a powerful explanation of how such bodies come to be erased in the practices of nuclear strategy, and how this erasure makes it possible for the field of nuclear strategy to function as it does. However, it is not enough to show the reality of bodies as injured or dead in order to fully appreciate how international security practices constitute the bodies that are acted upon, as well as how, in turn, bodies are productive of security practices. While such projects attempt to 'humanize' war (to varying degrees of success), the 'human' that they show is an injured body, a corpse, a body defined by its relationship to physiological harm or death. This kind of attempt to re-value bodies in opposition to strategic thought does not fundamentally challenge the reduction of the human to biological being, and thus erases the sociality of the body as it lives or dies. The representation of the injured or killed body is not enough for us to incorporate such persons as fully human in our ethical awareness; the representation of bodies fails to fully 'capture' the human subject, as such bodies are not necessarily viewed as anything other than bodies (see Butler 2004, 142-147). We need a fuller account of human bodies in their sociality and materiality to begin to account for bodies in their complex relationship to violence.

Feminist work in International Relations, and in Security Studies more specifically, has broadened and deepened since the late 1980s. In her influential

introduction to *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, V. Spike Peterson, insists that feminist scholarship "takes seriously the following two insights: first, that gender is socially constructed, producing subjective identities though which we see and know the world; and second, that the world is pervasively shaped by gendered meanings," (1992, 9). Gender is also theorized by IR feminists as relational (there is no masculinity without femininity), and as historically variable rather than fixed. "Gender" is considered to signify an aspect of human subjectivity, but it is also a discourse that determines meanings and values. Gender not only perpetuates the subordination of women but acts as a signifier of power such that values ascribed to masculinity are attributed to dominant groups, while values ascribed to femininity are ascribed to subordinate groups (See also Tickner 2001, 15; Locher and Prügl, 2001; Sjoberg 2006, 34). Feminists and gender theorists have exposed the operation of gender in assigning different roles to men and women in political conflict and international affairs more broadly (Enloe 1989, 1993; Moon, 1997; Moser & Clark, 2001; Carpenter 2003, 2006; Bloom, 2005), why wartime rape occurs and how it functions politically (Card 1996; Skjelsbæk 2001; Enloe 2001; Zarkov 2007), as well as how violent behavior of men and women is interpreted differently (Sjoberg and Gentry 2007; Oliver 2008).

Analyzing the power of gender discourses to shape international politics and differentially affect the lives of men and women is a crucial aspect in explaining the dynamics of international relations, but the theorization of gender in these strains of feminist theorizing leaves the constitution of the body outside the realm of politics. 'Gender' is viewed as a cultural narrative or ideology that is layered on the pre-existing

11

body of 'sex'. As such, much IR feminist scholarship is complicit with culture/nature dualism in that it reproduces the distinction between social practices of meaning-making and the body as a stable platform and blank slate outside of politics awaiting inscription by social forces. Pointing out the denial of bodies underlying strategic thought adds bodies back into International Relations, but the body that is denied is a material, flesh and blood, body that can only be killed or left to live. The body of 'gender' similarly remains conceptualized in dualistic terms as the opposite of culture and politics. Feminist theory has struggled with the conceptualization of bodies in terms that can help us to overcome these limitations. I describe feminist contributions to theorizing bodies that have not been well explored by feminists working in IR in the next section.

III. Rethinking Violence, Subjectivity and Bodies

While feminist and other critical IR scholars have decried the 'disembodiment' of theorizing about international security and have sought to center the broken, bleeding and starving body produced by political violence in our political imaginaries, such efforts at pointing out the cruelty of the violent practices of war do not necessarily change the underlying conceptualization of the body as an object of manipulation. It is here that feminist theory is most incisive, for feminists have struggled with the problems of how to theorize embodiment as a necessary but not exclusive aspect of subjectivity in their own terms, terms which can help us to 'think the body' in IR in such a way as to provide new purchase on central concepts such as power, security, vulnerability and violence. For

example, violence can be re-thought as something that is productive and not only destructive; vulnerability is not just a condition to be overcome but a constitutive feature of the embodied subject. This project is also significant in that it extends and adapts feminist theorizing about embodiment, and in particular the work of Judith Butler, to the realm of international political violence. The implication of feminist theory's emphasis on the co-constitution of bodies and political structures is to give IR a new starting point, as theorists can no longer begin with political communities populated by actors whose bodies are undifferentiated and can be transcended.

I turn to feminist insights in thinking about bodies not only to talk about how gender discourses produce particular bodies, but how bodies are performatively produced more generally. The concept of performativity is central to how I theorize the relationship between bodies, subjects and violence. By "performative," I mean, "that aspect of discourse that has the capacity to produce what it names" (Butler 1994, 33). Discourses can be termed performative because they do not provide a neutral reflection of an underlying reality, but rather create that very reality instead. To say that bodies are performative is to be concerned with the production of material realities, and thus, in feminist theory, to challenge the assumption that the sex of bodies as a material fact lies outside the realm of politics. Feminist thought teaches us that the body cannot be taken for granted as stable or pre-political. The apparent materiality of the body is due to "*a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*" (Butler, 1993, 9). In other words, materiality has a history and a politics. The 'biological body,' stripped of its political history, is itself

13

founded on a set of violent exclusions. The erasure of this process of materialization that makes it seem as if intelligible bodies are natural phenomena constitutes another moment of violence. Butler writes, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeals over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being" (1990, 33). The illusion of naturalness of our bodies is an effect, not of a single foundational moment, but of an iterated, citational process.

These violent exclusions that not only form the body that appears to be material and complete—a 'body that matters'—but also obscure this very process are what Butler refers to as normative violence that forms the subject specifically as an embodied subject. The subject is an inherently embodied subject—it is not exogenous, but rather is produced through compliance with various bodily norms. Butler's concept of normative violence names a form of violence that pre-exists the subject, as bodily norms produce certain bodies that fall outside of the norm. "Normative schemes of intelligibility establish what will and will not be human, what will be a livable life, what will be a grievable death" (Butler 2004, 146). In the subject's process of becoming, it must attempt to delineate its body from others, and create clear boundaries between the self's inside and outside. To do this, it expels the abject or "constitutive outside" that nonetheless shows up to haunt the self, as this founding repudiation is still included *by* its exclusion. The subject is not reducible to the body, nor it the body reducible to the subject. Neither the body nor the subject are ever complete; they are vulnerable to each

other and to others in ways that cannot be fully escaped and that are often violent relations.

Butler's concept of normative violence—the violence that comes from norms that determine whose bodies are the 'right' bodies—is important here, as bodies that fail to materialize properly are subject to some of the forms of violence that security studies is concerned with, albeit theorized in a different way. Torture can be seen not as a matter of strategic calculation but as an attempt to maximize bodily pain on one who is always already 'unreal' as an embodied subject. In establishing which lives will be livable, normative violence acts as a precursor to the violence we are more familiar with, making certain lives, certain bodies subject to violence that is not considered a wounding or a violation. Violence as we usually think of it—the violence that injures and kills pre-existing bodies—is also performative in producing certain embodied subjects, as violence is also a practice that constitutes certain embodied subjects. For example, as I argue in chapter 3, the force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners produces these prisoners as 'dependent' subjects by a citational reference to the practice of force-feeding unconscious and mentally unstable patients.

My claim about bodies is somewhat broader than Butler's. Butler is mainly concerned with the regulatory effects of gender, where as I am concerned with the constitution of bodies as political subjects more generally. Gender is an important productive discourse, but it is not the only one. Bodies are produced by a variety of practices, including political violence, but are also produced by discourses of race, religion, sexuality and civilization that, most importantly for the argument I advance in

this project, constitute the bodies of certain subjects as tortureable or killable, lives that must be protected or lives that are expendable.

My broad point in this dissertation is that scholars of security studies need to rethink bodies in multiple ways. Bodies are not natural objects that are only acted upon, but are inherently instable. They are produced in multiple ways through practices of international security, which are also productive of certain subjects and political possibilities. Warfare and political violence function to both make, and remake, bodies, not only in the sense of harming and killing them, but in making them into knowable types. Because suicide bombing, for example, obliterates the boundaries of the individual body and the boundaries between bodies—and thereby destabilizing the political continuity of the state—it expresses the political work that is necessary to make bodies appear as whole and complete and unquestionably belonging (or not) to a political community, work that is attempted in the recovery and burial effects following bombing. Torture, as I argue, expresses the instability of the role of prisoners relative to American identity in the US' war on terror, as the prisoners are made into 'enemy combatants' through their torture, and 'dependents' through their force-feeding. In the practice of precision warfare, violence expresses the instability of bodies by its ability to transform certain bodies into virtually invulnerable 'cyborgs,' while simultaneously making other bodies 'killable' as accidental collateral damage or as marked for death. These practices of warfare express the instability of bodies by making and remaking the terms on which these bodies are constituted in their respective political communities.

I use Judith Butler's work on various aspects of embodiment as an important grounding for re-thinking bodies in IR while acknowledging that her approach is not without several limitations. My argument of the expressivity of violence differs from Butler's in that her account of gender performativity describes a relationship between the structure of gender and an individual's performance of his or her assigned role in that structure. Individuals can undermine the power of the gender norm through parody (Butler 1990, 142-145). In discussing warfare and political violence, there is not necessarily a structure like that of gender and heteronormativity that regulates the behavior of individuals; rather, the political interactions that produce bodies and subjects take place in different power dynamics, including dynamics between two or more individuals, between individuals and the state or groups of individuals drawing on larger dynamics of gender, race and nation. In other words, the power to produce bodies as political subjects is more diffuse.

Butler's model of gender performativity also does not go far enough to account for the ways in which bodies matter; that is, it theorizes bodies, in effect, as only blank forms to be molded by discourse. In recent decades, feminists have articulated a vision of embodiment in which bodies have a form of agency; bodies can be productive, as well as produced. The materiality of bodies is not only an effect of political practices, but such practices are formed in relation to bodies as well. The 'culture' of discourse and politics and the 'materiality' of the body are intimately entangled in a chiasmic relationship. I argue that a dynamic model of embodiment is needed in order to theorize the body in International Relations: bodies must be understood as both material *and* cultural, both

produced by practices of International Relations *and* productive themselves.[1] Bodies are thus not fixed entities, but are always unstable and in the process of becoming. They are ontologically precarious; existing only in virtue of certain material/political conditions that allow them to be intelligible to others. Chapter two delves into the problem of theorizing bodies from a feminist perspective that takes into account the complexities of lived bodies in order to provide a framework for theorizing practices of international security.

I argue that understanding bodies as both produced by, and productive of, international relations is crucial to understanding aspects of political violence that go untheorized when we assume a natural, pre-given body. This theorization is also necessary to understand some of the seemingly paradoxical dynamics of pressing issues in theorizing violence in international security practices. Chapters three through five each critique the prevailing theorization of bodies in IR through an analysis of specific modes of contemporary political violence. Chapter three critiques the assumption of the body as only an object of manipulation and not an kind of agent in its own right, allowing us to theorize the dynamics of torture, hunger-striking and force-feeding of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay in a way that allows us to see the productive effects of violence and the agency of bodies. Torture in this case cannot be explained solely as an act meant to establish the presence of the sovereign state, given that is it denied, done in secret, and

---

[1] By 'practices,' I mean something akin to the Foucaultian definition of discourse. I use the term 'practice' to indicate the iterated nature of such actions. The term 'practice' also does not distinguish between language or linguistic acts, such as speeches or media representations, and 'physical' actions like torture or bombings. While the term 'discourse' in the poststructural framework challenges the distinction between the material and ideational (Hansen 2006, 21-23, Schatzki 2001), it is often misinterpreted as referring only to verbal or visual representations.

purposefully deployed so as not to leave visible marks on the body. The limits of torture, precluding the death of inmates and their force-feeding, suggest that torture in this context operates under a logic that prisoners can be harmed, but whose lives must also be forcibly sustained by the state.

In the fourth chapter, I show the limitations of the ways in which IR has thought about bodies by theorizing suicide bombing as an embodied practice. The IR literature on suicide bombing, like the literature on torture, focuses mainly on the issue of whether or not this mode of violence can be considered strategically rational and what cultural, religious, and/or nationalist meanings this practice may have in particular contexts. The action of the bodies themselves in the practice of suicide bombing opens up a field of inquiry into the nature of bodies, state, and borders that are not reducible to the self-understandings of actors. The literature on this issue has been so caught up with questions of the motivations of the bomber that it hasn't probed the implications of suicide bombing as an embodied practice caught up in contemporary discourses of life and security. That is, what political work does the body do as it is destroyed in order to transform into a weapon to kill others? Likewise, what are the political effects of efforts at recovering and reconstructing the bodies of bomber and victims?

Theorizing the body also leads us to a deeper understanding of the moral and political dynamics of precision warfare, including the use of drones and targeted killings. In contemporary warfare, the relationship between bombers and bombed is much more than strategic and adversarial; it is a deeply asymmetrical form of violence in which the bombers are virtually risk-free. Scholars and critics of precision warfare have argued that

the distance between the bomber and victim is a crucial condition of possibility for this type of violence, psychologically and politically (Grossman 1995, 97-113; Gregory 2004, 197-217). This type of warfare once involved targeting coordinates or grids in which individual people could not be seen. However, in today's precision warfare, the bombers and drone pilots can often see the targets of their missiles quite clearly. We must therefore search beyond the issue of sight and distance for the roots of this mode of violence, for mere visual representation of bodies is not sufficient to make killing in this way psychologically and politically untenable. In this chapter, chapter five, I investigate the co-arising formation of the bodies of bombers and the bodies of those targeted for assassination, as well as the bodies of bystanders, to ask about the conditions of possibility for this kind of violence.

These three chapters are linked by a demonstration that bodies are not natural, but instead are produced in various incarnations by practices of security. Violence is not only something that is done to an already established body. Rather, various forms of violence are part and parcel of the production of the various bodies that are subjected to violence. These chapters demonstrate the inadequacies of the ways in which bodies have been conceptualized in security studies, whether security is understood in terms of the protection of discrete, separate human beings or the guarding of aggregations of bodies in populations. These three chapters, each in their own right, demonstrate the disaggregation of bodies and subjects and reveal the body of security as a profoundly *unnatural* body produced through practices of security. I argue that bodies are neither stable in

themselves nor in relations to other bodies, but rather are produced through their relations to other bodies.

In order to establish why such theorization is important yet missing in IR, this chapter provides a reading of how the subject of IR has been theorized in relation to bodies. I argue that throughout IR theory there is reliance upon a concept that is implicitly a natural body constituted by biology, relevant only as it lives or dies. I argue that contemporary security practices are constituted in not only in reference to sovereign power, as most IR theory assumes, but biopower as well, in which bodies in the aggregate are not only objects of protection, but objects of active intervention. I next discuss work that feminists have done to critique not only how bodies are ignored in IR theory, but the implicit theorization of bodies in IR as autonomous, biological entities. In this, I set the stage for a productive critique of feminist theories of embodiment in the following chapter, leading to a methodology for thinking about the problem of embodiment in IR theory. I seek to recapture a sense of the vulnerability that is always present in theories of power and violence, not only in the sense of bodily vulnerability to violence and death, but also in terms of the political forces that constitute bodies as we know them.

IV. Subjects of International Relations

International Relations tells two broad stories about violence, rooted in traditions of political theory. In both of these stories, the human body is a natural organism whose

21

integrity is to be protected from violence as the pre-requisite for politics. The first is a realist story, in which violence is first of all about self-preservation. The second story is the liberal tradition, in which violence is a violation of the law. In both the realist and liberal traditions, the focus is on sovereign power: the power to kill or to let live, in which the body is a biological organism to be protected against death and deprivation. By contrast, in biopolitical practices of security, the body is produced as an object of knowledge in order to promote the life of the population as subject. By understanding contemporary security practices as constituted in relation to biopower as well as the more familiar terms of sovereign power, I call attention to the ways in which the naturalness of bodies and the conditions of life cannot be taken for granted.

Hobbesian Bodies

In realism, violence is natural and inevitable, and violence also marks the boundary between nature and human communities. Violence is sometimes necessary to maintain the political community from external and internal threats. Realism draws a sharp distinction between domestic and international politics, and maintains that states must be able to use or threaten violence in order to maintain the state's status and survival in the world. The iconic figure in the realist tradition is Hobbes, who is read as telling a relatively simple story of the establishment of the political community that excludes violence from the domestic realm. Realist theories of IR extend Hobbes's state of nature from individual "natural men" to relations between states. Violence in the form of interstate war is sometimes necessary because states provide protection for citizens not only from other states, but from anarchy and civil war from threatening individual's lives

in the absence of state authority. The objects that are to be defended by the state are, first and foremost, the living, breathing, bodies of humans as organisms. Sovereign power, in the artificial man of the Leviathan, is constituted precisely to protect the "natural man." (Hobbes 1996[1651], 9). It is their safety and bodily integrity that is to be protected. In order to foster life, to prevent the life that is "nasty, brutish and short," the state must be convened. In this logic, the survival of the state's citizens is dependent upon the survival of the state itself. As Dan Deudney insists, "Security from political violence is the *first freedom*, the minimum vital task of all primary political associations, and achieving security requires restraint of the application of violent power upon individual bodies" (2007, 14).

To the extent that Hobbes can be said to contribute to theories of embodiment, it is in considering human community on the organic terms of the *body politic*. This is not an entirely original insight in itself—after all, it makes use of the ancient and medieval philosophy of the great chain of being that orders God and the sovereign king above human subjects. In setting up the figure of the sovereign state as a *body politic,* Hobbes naturalizes the boundaries of the political community in the boundaries of the human body.[2] The metaphor of the state as body allows for security threats being represented as bodily illnesses, contagions, or cancers, existential threats that threaten the "life" of the state (Campbell 2000[1992], 59). The body that is protected by the state as well as the body that is a representation of the state is not only a natural body, but also one that is

---

[2] Threats to the *body politic* are naturalized into diseases or deformations of the 'natural' body, such as associations that grow too powerful, are "like wormes in the entrayles of a natural man," (1996[1651], 230) and of divided authorities as "a man, that had another man growing out of his side, with a head, armes, breast, and stomach, of his own" (1996[1651], 228).

self-contained and self-governed, internally organized and bound by concrete borders. Security thus means establishing and protecting this self-governed body as an organism.

Furthermore, the representation of the state as a body stresses the unity of the *body politic*.[3] As an individual, the sovereign is not required to recognize any form of difference among his subjects—the *body politic* has one body and speaks with a single voice (Gatens 1996, 23). Sovereign power, invested in the 'artificial body' of the state, is constituted on the basis of a metaphor of the body as 'indivisible,' a singular totality Rousseau characterizes as the 'general will.' As in Hobbes, the sovereign state is constituted in analogy to a human body. "As nature gives each man absolute power over all his members, the social compact gives the body politic absolute power over all its members also; and it is this power which, under the direction of the general will, bears, as I have said, the name of Sovereignty" (Rousseau 1997[1762], 61). In naturalizing the state as a human body, Hobbes and other social contract theorists further naturalize the human body itself as a singular, indivisible entity whose freedom from violent death is paramount.

Hobbes's story of the foundations of the state calls our attention to the naturalization of political violence in a way that expressly relies upon analogy to a particular conception of the human body. As this body is considered natural, so too is the constitution of the state as body writ large. Just as threats to the human body's integrity

---

[3] Hobbes writes of the social contract, "a Multitude of men, are made *One* Person, when they are by one man, or one Person, Presented; so that it be done with the consent of everyone of that Multitude in particular. For it is the *Unity* of the Representer, not the *Unity* of the Represented, that maketh the Person *One*. And it is the Representer that beareth the Person, and but one Person: And *Unity*, cannot otherwise be understood in Multitude," (1996[1651], 114).

are seen as contamination, so too are border incursions and infiltrations that breach the state's control over its territory and people. Whereas sovereign power is constituted in order to protect life in realism, in liberalism, sovereign power is also recognized to be a threat to human life.

Violence and Liberal Subjects

Liberal political thought takes us away from Hobbes's pre-occupation with self-preservation to a concern with the cultivation of conditions for human achievement and flourishing. Self-preservation is not the primary purpose of political community, but rather, is a necessary condition for human flourishing as is evident by liberalism's emphasis on toleration and deliberation. The subject of liberalism is not only dependent upon a protected, healthy and 'natural' body, but is also a subject with exogenous interests and desires—a willing, speaking subject that can pursue his or her own interests in the public sphere.

This liberal subject is not only a body that is threatened by violence from outside of the sovereign state, but is always at least potentially threatened by the state itself. This is a central fear driving the liberal political tradition. Shklar writes, "liberalism's deepest grounding is in place from the first, in the conviction of the earliest defenders of toleration, born in horror, that cruelty is an absolute evil, an offense against God or humanity" (Shklar 1998, 5). Defining 'cruelty' as "the willful inflicting of physical pain on a weaker being in order to cause anguish and fear" (Shklar 1984, 8), it is this fear of cruelty that not only legitimizes the sovereign state and the rule of law, as in Hobbes, but

25

limits on governmental power to prevent the government from cruelty toward its citizens. State-sponsored torture, for example, reveals a tension between the state's imperative to provide security for its citizens and its duty to respect the moral status of individuals as subjects with a moral right over their own bodies. In liberal societies, "pain is not mere negativeness. It is, literally, a scandal" (Asad 2003, 107).

In the social contract, violence is disqualified from the public, domestic realm. The subjects of liberalism are motivated by a fear of violence and cruelty, but as such, they solve problems in the domestic realm by deliberation and the creation of a sphere of tolerance. They are subjects of reason, who do not resort to violence except in self-defense. For Hobbes, it is an inalienable right to defend oneself, even against the sovereign (1996[1651], 93). This is a right that cannot be contracted away, for it has to do with man's safety and security and so renders subjects as predominantly defined by a constitutive anxiety to preserve themselves. Violence in liberalism is figured differently. The possibility of violence provides the motive for founding a community that rejects it entirely and seeks to define humans in terms of their capacity for flourishing as evidenced in their abilities to deliberate and reason. The result is that violence is thought of as a violation of not only community standards but also inalienable rights. Sovereign power is not the means to security but rather a key threat to security.

Liberal norms of human rights are meant to provide the same protections for individuals against states as the sovereign provides against other citizens. Human rights are a statement of the limitations of government interference. The human rights that are considered *jus cogens* or 'non-derogable,' even in times of emergency or martial law, are

prohibitions against summary execution, torture, and slavery. Even in a state of emergency or 'state of exception,' the human rights regime stipulates the limits of sovereign power in killing, torturing, or enslaving the bodies of citizens. These non-derogable rights instantiate the body of the citizen as sacrosanct, as that which must be protected. The 'liberalism of fear' may therefore be understood as a political theory built upon the same concept of security for individual bodies as for the national state. While the concept of human rights is understood to entail many more freedoms than the absence of state-sponsored violence against the body, these basic 'non-derogable' rights form the basis without which no other rights or liberties could be enjoyed.

The concept of human security attempts to articulate this combination of state and individual security in which states are not only the protectors of citizens, but also a major source of insecurity for citizens. This concept, first developed by the United Nations Human Development Program in 1994, attempts to shift the referent of security from the state to the individual, and brings with it issues of health and welfare as well as the traditional freedom from violence. Security is re-theorized to encompass threats to the well-being of people, adding what had been considered development or economic issues to the security agenda. The doctrine of "responsibility to protect" has emerged as simultaneous challenge to, and reinforcement of, state sovereignty. This doctrine stresses that sovereignty is not absolute; states have a 'responsibility to protect' their own citizens against wide-scale violence and genocide. At the same time, the doctrine emphasizes that such human rights abuses are the state's responsibility to resolve before international actors may be involved (Bellamy 2009).

Human rights and human security are not only seen as foundational of the liberal state, but also serve as a pre-condition for the exercise of freedom. In the social contract, men's bodies are protected as a necessary means to allow reason to flourish. In order to live as free subjects, men's bodies have to be protected, inviolable. Ultimately, the liberal emphasis on the protection of human rights against the violence and cruelty of governments is founded on a similar conception of the subject as the subject of security, a subject whose political subjectivity is dependent upon the elimination of violence. The body, in liberalism, is a body whose natural functioning is protected and whose needs are met so that the subject can transcend such concerns to thrive and prosper according to his interests and desires.

As violence is disqualified within the political community, the subject is able to exercise his or her own reason in the service of his interests and pursuits. The subject has interests and preferences that are determined exogenously, and which he is entitled to pursue up until the point that he interferes with the same rights others enjoy. The subject of liberalism is a rational, autonomous individual who is entitled to a sphere of freedom from government interference. "Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign (Mill 1989[1859], 13). Similarly, Locke's liberal subject is the owner of his body. In the liberal political tradition in general, the body is a mechanical feature that is animated by the conscious mind. The body of the citizen (and the citizen's property, as an extension of his body) is an instrument for putting the mind's desires into action. The sovereignty of the subject means that the subject is a self-governed and

willing subject; the mind of the subject is in control and can freely interact in the world to pursue its own direction.

However, in order to be a sovereign, self-governing subject the liberal individual must possess reason, defined as freedom from bodily passions and other such impediments. Mill's canonical account on liberty, for example, excludes children, those in a state of dependency, barbarians and those in 'backwards states' (1989[1859], 13). Feminists have also noted how women were excluded from liberal subjectivity because they were believed to lack reason and judgment. Those whose bodies are outside of the standard set by white, bourgeois, heterosexual men are considered to be improperly embodied, and thus to be incapable of the reason required for full participation in public life. In short, only those inhabiting 'proper' bodies are considered to be full subjects. Bodies of workers, the colonized, enslaved, and women were marked as 'other' by constructions of class, race and gender, in contrast to the 'unmarked' body of the rational, white, upper-class man.

Sovereign violence is the form of the power to take life is disqualified from the public realm as a breach of the rights of (some) citizens to bodily integrity. While both realism and liberalism recognize the importance of sovereign power for providing protection to naturalized human bodies, liberalism also recognizes unchecked sovereign power as a threat to the security of the individual. Biopolitical practices of security, on the other hand, do not just protect humans as individual biological organisms, but promote the lives of the entire population by producing bodies as objects of knowledge. Biopolitical perspectives also challenge liberalism's presumption of the prohibition of

29

violence by noting that the naturalization of a realm of non-violence enables a realm of active intervention elsewhere.

Biopolitics, Risk and International Relations

In the Hobbesian conception of violence, sovereign power is constituted to protect life; humans no long have the right to kill, only the sovereign does. Realist and liberal conceptions of violence and bodies theorize security as protection from sovereign power, that is, the power to take life or let live. Security is understood primarily in terms of protecting bodies from this violent power, whether the sovereign power to kill comes from other people, other states, or the state itself. Such approaches theorize security as if sovereign power were the only threat to human life, in other words, as if security practices are not also biopolitical, that is, having to do with the contemporary politics of life. If Foucault is at least partially right in that sovereign power is complicated by practices of biopower, it means that we must be more attentive to bodies, and re-think on what terms the human to be protected is defined.

Biopower, in Foucault's work, comes to supplement and permeate sovereign power. Biopower's purpose is to supervise the health and promote life of the population as a subject. Foucault argues that biopolitics works through discourses of security, through the provision of security measures that are meant to eliminate the risk of violent death to citizens and to secure the life of populations from random elements. Rather than the right to take life or let live, biopower is the power to make live or let die (Foucault 2003, 241). Foucault considers biopower to be the power "to designate what brought life

and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculation and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life" (Foucault 1978, 143). Biopolitics is thus the management of life itself and works through making human life, "the basic biopolitical features of the human species" (Foucault 2007, 1), the object of expert discourses that enable certain interventions on bodies and populations. Biopolitics is not new: Foucault theorizes biopolitics from at least the start of the modern age. Biopower is also a key mechanism through which liberal politics works, through the creation of a realm of non-interference through which society, its economy and its population can circulate and function according to their natural tendencies.

If security works through biopolitical mechanisms, we must be attentive to bodies in at least two moments. The first is the production of the subject of security as a discrete, separate human body. Foucault locates the individualization of human bodies as a historical production rather than a natural, ontological fact as liberal discourses suggest. Bodies have become isolated, independent objects subject to intervention as a result of certain medical discourse (Foucault 1994 [1973]). Taking this serious requires us to be attentive to the social and political conditions under which certain bodies are made into objects that can be intervened upon to promote life in certain populations, such as through torture, force-feeding, security screenings, to name but a few examples.

The second moment that thinking about security as a set of practices of life points us toward is the emphasis biopower places on populations rather than individuals. Biopolitics does not deal with bodies at the individual level, but as population, in which bodies are general and universalized. While an individual might face a particular threat,

the population as a whole can be protected by the minimization of certain risky elements. Security, in its biopolitical constitution, means optimizing life by working to forestall risks, not just to individuals, but to the population as species—its continuation as a biological element that reproduces itself. Bodies, in this schema, are naturalized, constituted as biological entities whose functioning can be enhanced, and death postponed. Security, in liberal, biopolitical states is meant to actively intervene in order to promote these 'natural' functions. Security is thus not confined to the territory of the nation-state, but of a possibly broader milieu.

Biopower is first and foremost a moral framework that structures the practice of violence and the narratives of justification of that violence. Crucial to understanding the role of biopolitics in the contemporary world order is its dual nature, in that in order to foster life, it has to kill. Killing is necessary to promote life as it not only allows for the elimination of a biological threat to life but also makes the population stronger by removing various unhealthy elements (Foucault 2003, 255-6). Biopolitical practices of security take as their object a naturalized body to be protected, while a deeply 'unnatural' body is constituted as threatening. These 'unnatural' bodies are constituted as unreasonable, excessive bodies that cannot be dealt with through normal politics, but only through violence. In this way, contemporary practices of security produce certain bodies as normal and other as aberrant and unmanageable. Violence against these deviant bodies is made *necessary* in order to preserve these naturalized bodies. The indefinite detention and torture of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay is one such example of 'deviant' bodies being eliminated to promote life in others (although the prisoners are also being made to

live); the killing of suspected terrorists by drone attacks in Afghanistan and Pakistan is another example of threatening bodies being eliminated in the name of promoting the life of certain populations.

Conceptualizing violence and harm as 'risk' necessitates the political technology of 'expertise' in which decisions are made on the basis of expert knowledge by scientists or other specialists as a means of asserting control over the uncontrollable. As such, violence is framed as a technical problem to be managed rather than an existential threat or a violation of norms. When security is practiced through the biopolitical logic of risk-management, the subjects of security are not the juridical subjects of sovereignty as in realism or rights bearing subjects as in liberal conceptions of the security problematique, but biopolitical subjects—human life to be managed by various forms of technical expertise as an object of knowledge.

Risk is a theme characterizing all three modes of warfare discussed in depth in this project. The very nature of precision bombing is of calculated risk, in which specialized technologies are deployed to overcome the political problem of waging war while avoiding casualties of both soldiers and civilians. Likewise, torture and suicide bombing function under logics of risk. Torturers are virtually invulnerable to violence. Torture in the war on terror is justified by the logic that the infliction of pain will make tortured prisoners provide information that will be used to prevent terrorist attacks which may place ordinary citizens at risk of a violent death. Medical expertise is used to minimize the risk that the prisoner/patient will die of his treatment. Suicide bombing, on the other hand, is a mode of violence in which the perpetrator makes him or herself what

we may consider *infinitely* vulnerable. The suicide bomber accepts not the risk of death, but the certainty of death in order to inflict death and injury upon random people, as well as sense of vulnerability upon many more in the knowledge of possible future attacks. In each of these cases, expert knowledge is deployed in order to manage risks, from the technical and legal calculations of precision warfare, to the medical knowledge perversely deployed to ensure the health of torture victims, and to the contemporary industries of counter terrorist experts and technologies made to detect suicide bombers. Importantly, none of these strategies to shore up vulnerability are ever completely successful: suicide bombers and other terrorists find ways to circumvent security protocols, tortured prisoners die, and civilians are regularly killed by precision bombs. The political technologies of risk are an attempt to assert sovereignty and control, an effort that can never be entirely successful, as sovereignty itself is never absolute, but is a political practice that is always incomplete.

What this detour through Foucault and the evolution of risk allows us to see through these three modes of violence is the proliferation of technologies whose violence comes not through overt acts of aggression but through the perpetuation of the very vulnerabilities and instabilities they purport to suppress. These developments in the field of International Relations suggest the need for an understanding of violence that exceeds narratives of self-preservation, violation of social norms, or risk to be managed. I argue that violent practices of international relations produce the bodies that they affect. In this next section, I discuss the implications of theorizing violence as expressive.

Of course, not all that goes on in international relations takes place within the discourse of biopolitics. However, the three modes of violence I deal with in depth in this work are all implicated in biopolitical practices: torture and force-feeding are practiced at Guantanamo Bay (and presumably elsewhere) with justification along biopolitical lines; and precision warfare is correctly described as a biopolitical practice by its management of risks for some through increasing risks for others. Both these practices deal with calculating risks to populations. They also construct the human as a natural, biological entity that can be manipulated and intervened upon: torture by the use of medical knowledge to not only cause pain and disorientation but also to limit the stresses on the body to prevent death; and precision warfare by its logic of risk calculation of civilian casualties. Suicide bombing also expresses a relationship to the biopolitical by eschewing its logic. I theorize suicide bombing as a practice that disrupts not only liberalism's assumption of an individualized, self-contained body, but of the logic of protection, as the bomber refuses protection, making him or herself infinitely vulnerable in order to kill and increase the vulnerability of an other.

V. International Relations and the Expressivity of Violence

To say that violence is expressive of the instability of bodies and subjects is to say that the violence serves to make and remake subjectivities. We know that violence is bodily harm and injury, and that violence involves legal transgression. But it is more than this. As feminists and other critical theorists have argued, violence is also about social standing; it is used as a tool to reproduce hierarchies. Violence as expressive of excess and instability means that violence has political effects in constituting subjects, rather

than merely harming only pre-existing subjects or violating the rights of pre-existing subjects. To theorize violence as expressive of the instability of bodies and their place in the political community, we must conceptualize bodies as more than pre-political, biological entities that gain meaning through cultural interpretations; we must understand bodies themselves as not only material, but also socially produced. Existing IR theories have fallen short in explicitly theorizing the body in a way that allows for thinking of violence as expressive. In what follows, I explain my argument of the expressivity of violence, first by showing how constructivism has failed to theorize the body as properly social and I show how feminist theorizations of the body as ontologically precarious specifically contrast with the ways in which IR theory has theorized the body as natural and vulnerable to external violence. I conclude by summarizing how I argue in this work that bodies are both produced by the violent practices of international relations, as well as productive of them.

Bodies in Constructivism

While constructivists in International Relations challenge the rationalist subject whose interests are exogenous the subject of constructivist scholarship is still largely a modernist subject representative of the Cartesian division between mind and body. Constructivists have brought a deeper understanding to the study of International Relations by focusing on the social and political constitution of subjects, rather than assuming a rational actor with a pre-given set of interests, as liberal and realist theories do. While scholars sharing the broad label of constructivism have been influenced by a wide variety of different, often conflicting, schools of thought, constructivists generally

36

do not understand the body as politically constituted. Rather, the constitution of bodies falls outside the domain of politics. Alexander Wendt, in drawing the line between the constitutive role of 'ideas' in terms of norms, culture, and identities, leaves the human body outside the realm of politics as stable and material. The body, in Wendt's constructivism, serves as a 'brute fact' that is analogous to a state's territory. It thus has an independent material existence and is not constituted by ideas or discourses. Fearon and Wendt suggest that the internal structure of the body and its ability to move and act, serve as a "platform on which actorhood is constructed" (2002, 63). Fearon and Wendt write that while the meaning and social position of bodies varies, prior to the process of meaning-making, bodies must be structured by an internal organization in order to acquire meaning. For individuals, this is the body's biological structure. For states, the collective action of biologically given people is shaped by the structure of the state (2002, 63). As such, Wendtian constructivism parallels Hobbes's acceptance and reinscription of the 'natural body,' and the state's internal structure as analogous to a body.[4] While the embodiment of the subject certainly entails a constitutive vulnerability to violence, embodied subjectivity implies much more than a survival interest; it suggests the body as an inescapable aspect of our subjectivity, or our being in the world. Liberal constructivism theorizes the body as having 'integrity' whose protection is an intrinsic value to a normative international order based on respect for basic human rights (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, 907). Accepting the body as a material 'given,' upon

---

[4] Wendt uses the body as simile for the 'brute facts' of the state that are present regardless of the identity or social position of the state—just as the body has an internal structure and has basic needs in order to survive, so too does the state have a fixed territory and certain survival interests that are not malleable to social construction. Hobbes's metaphor of the state as human body is more metaphor than simile: the state is not like a body, but rather, *is* a body, albeit an artificial one, because it functions as a 'natural body'.

which our notions of agency are based, limits the ways in which subjectivity can be theorized in International Relations.

Feminist Conceptions of the Body

Feminists working in International Relations have complicated this picture of the relationship between the subject and body, but this critique has not overcome all of the problems of the modernist account of the body that constructivism reproduces. While feminism scholarship in IR has developed relatively independently from constructivism, Locher and Prügl (2001) are correct that feminism and constructivism share many ontological and epistemological assumptions about the world. Feminists, for example, theorize gender as a social construction as distinct from the biological fact of sex well before constructivism in IR was developed. However, feminists, like critical theorists more broadly, take these social constructions to create and reproduce social hierarchies through the production of ideologies and identities. Feminists not only believe that gender is a social construct, but that gender is signifier of power (Tickner 2001, 16; Locher and Prügl 2002, 116). Despite their concern with the power of social constructions to determine reality, the insistence of feminist IR scholars on a gender analysis that marks only the social construction of gender as politically relevant is a move that naturalizes bodily sex differences and, ultimately, is susceptible to the same reproduction of culture/nature and mind/body dichotomies as constructivist scholarship.

In contrast to the liberal myth of the autonomous, independent subject, in which vulnerability is infused with negative connotations such as dependency and weakness,

several feminists have suggested the vulnerable subject as basis for reconsidering the nature of political community. Feminists have argued that the actual experience of embodiment for all people is not of self-contained bodies demarcated from the world by the boundaries of the skin. The normative body is self-contained, and is culturally associated with white, healthy and able-bodied men rather than women, racial minorities, or disabled persons. Scientific and political discourses define non-normative bodies in terms of sickness, contamination, deformity and defilement. These non-normative, 'improper' bodies are seen as vulnerable and dependent, thus subject to medical and government intervention. For example, women, blacks, Jews, homosexuals were (and are) understood to be susceptible to (or constituted by, in the case of homosexuals) medical and psychiatric disorders (Young 1990, ch 5, Campbell 2000[1992], 87). In particular, feminists have argued that women experience their bodies in ways that do not conform to the modernist model of self-contained bodies. Women's bodies are figured as 'fluid' or 'leaky' (Shildrick 1997). Certain feminists have argued that vulnerability is a constitutive feature of the subject, as highlighted by Judith Butler in this chapter's epigraph.

Bodies are precarious not only in their physical vulnerability which requires external support for the maintenance of life, but also because of their production in political, social and scientific discourses. The subject's vulnerability arises from the condition of embodiment: our bodies are subject to illness and injury, and ultimately, death. Bodies are ultimately dependent upon external support to exist. Bodies are also to be considered precarious because they are composed of relations and ties between people.

Therefore, the precariousness of bodies is not limited to one side of the nature/culture divide, for our bodies are vulnerable and malleable in ways that cannot be easily drawn on either side of this dichotomy. For Butler, the body is not conceived of as the autonomous enclosure of the self. Butler writes, "Given over from the start for the world of others, it bears their imprint, is formed within the crucible of social life; only later, and with some uncertainty, do I lay claim to my body as my own, if, in fact, I ever do" (Butler 2004, 26). Bodily vulnerability to violence, as an extreme aspect of the social forming of the body, is a shared connection. The vulnerability of bodies should not be understood only as a matter of the potential for physical harm, but rather, as the basis for a relational ethics and ontology. We are not only vulnerable to violence by our bodies which can be harmed, but we are vulnerable precisely because we only exist in and through our constitution in a social and political world, in and through other bodies. This understanding of bodies provides a powerful critique of dualism in its recognition of bodily vulnerability as both material and social/political. Bodily precariousness as ontology also provides a new language for thinking about violence and vulnerability in IR: we are not only accountable for violence done to pre-given bodies and subjective, but are also implicated in the production of certain bodies as killable and certain bodies as protected or as 'livable'.

While the field of security studies is fundamentally about overcoming, containing, or applying rational controls to vulnerability (and more precisely, the *distribution* of vulnerability) the violence of the self's very founding reveals vulnerability to be an inescapable aspect of our being. Bodies, under the sign of sovereignty, are vulnerable

bodies seeking to eliminate this vulnerability through political action of constituting the sovereign state and the sovereign man under the regime of rights. Bodily vulnerability thus functions as that which simultaneously *must* be overcome, but which can never be overcome. The concept of risk in International Relations illustrates a logic that attempts to overcome this constitutive vulnerability through technological superiority and expert knowledge. Theorizing bodies as ontologically as well as physically precarious necessitates a different view of violence in IR, in particular, that violence expresses the instability of bodies in their social existence and relations to one another.

Violence as Expressive

Security, in both realist and liberal understandings, requires the subject's sovereignty over his own body. Discourses of security and rights are both constituted on the basis of protecting the body as a precursor for the establishment and enjoyment of rights and freedoms. Both of these understandings of violence have difficulty in grappling with the contemporary world. One might pursue the lines of inquiry into the subject's relation to the political community and the meaning of violence in a variety of ways. One contemporary scholar—Giorgio Agamben—has focused on the impossibility of stabilizing the meaning of violence. Agamben shows us that the meaning of violence is inherently political, and that both the realist and liberal conceptions of violence cannot be sustained. Agamben reminds us that our existence as fully-fledged political subjects depends upon the designation of others as 'bare life,' the quintessential political figure that offers a startling contrast to the nominal equality of the subjects of liberalism as well as the protections of the social contract.

41

In the logic of the national security state, life is de-politicized, reduced to survival. Security in this sense is concerned with the sovereign's duty to protect life from external threats and to make law that enables the sovereign to kill people for disobeying. 'Security' works to de-politicize life, rendering it a biological proposition of avoiding death. Thus, at the moment of founding of modern politics, a biopolitical notion of life, or 'bare life' is inserted. 'Bare life' is life stripped of social and political agency; it is biological life, the life of survival of the body. The figure of 'bare life,' or *homo sacer* is an object created by sovereign power (Agamben 1998, 6). The figure of the *homo sacer* is not life in a pre-political state of nature, but rather, the *homo sacer* is a form of 'bare life' that is produced by the sovereign power. At this point we are quite distant from standard IR conceptions of individual subjects and sovereign states.

The rest of this section is devoted to defining and explaining my argument of the expressivity of violence. I argue that violence is a manifestation of the instability and undecidability in the constitution and management of contemporary political subjects as *embodied* subjects. Rather than a reversion to a previous era, and betrayal of liberal political values, violence expresses the instability in the founding of subjects that is the result of the 'constitutive outside,' that provides the energy for the disruption and renewal of the ever-precarious subject. The embodied subject is vulnerable to violence not only as a body that can be harmed and killed by other bodies, but also through normative violence: the violence of norms that delineate what kinds of bodies are able to lead 'livable lives' and which bodies will be abjected as the inhuman 'constitutive outside'. Physical violence is only recognized as such when it takes place against those who

qualify as humans with a life; those who are 'bodies that don't matter' are not considered to properly suffer and their deaths are ungrievable.

In contrast to the liberal vision of eliminating violence from political life, Talal Asad (2003) reminds us that liberal, modern societies have never been free of physical pain and cruelty. It is not cruelty *per se* that is perceived as wrong, but excessive cruelty beyond what is needed to control and discipline subjects. Torture has been defined as the infliction of *unnecessary* cruelty and suffering (if it deemed necessary, it is euphemized as 'enhanced interrogation'), and certain technologies of war are considered to be unnecessarily cruel (such as chemical and biological weapons) as opposed to others (aerial bombardment). Excessive cruelty and pain inflicted upon subjects is seen as a sign of backwardness and a lack of civilization. Though we have mechanisms to regulate and redirect the exercise of violence, in fact, we have simply made the expression of these energies more civilized in their violent precision—through complicated legal rationales and procedures for 'enhanced interrogations' and through legally and technologically enabled bombings. We are shocked by expressions of political violence such as suicide bombings, which seem barbaric and irrational by comparison but which may in fact be a similar indication of the abject, or the excess, that haunts the seemingly uncorrupted subject.

Violence is thus not only a destructive practice that is to be avoided, nor only a rational course of policy, but rather, is also in some sense a creative force, as an 'outside' that is not fully expelled, that lingers and drives the production of bodies and subjects. Such violence challenges the myth of the sovereign man. It is a commonplace in political

theory that sovereignty exceeds legal codes. Sovereignty is performatively produced; that is, it is made to exist through practices, through the Schmittian decision on the exception, or Agamben's *homo sacer*, for two examples. Twentieth century political thought from Kantorowitz[5] to Foucault's performative theory of the sovereign has considered sovereignty something exceeding the law, bestowing the ability to inflict violence on others. The sovereign state is not only founded and maintained by violence or the fear of violence, but the sovereign man is produced by violent exclusions to maintain the appearance of wholeness and integrity. The appearance of sovereign men and sovereign states is thus predicated upon bodily vulnerability—for the sovereign to exist, bodies must be made vulnerable to the violence of the sovereign.

Our bodies, as the basis for political subjectivity, are politically constituted—they are effects of political discourses of violence and vulnerability, security and power. Violence is a means of reconstituting subjection as the expression of the excess that haunts the subject as evidence of the incompleteness of bodies whose form and function in the political community must be renewed. Against the modernist story of our bodies as physical entities and objects of knowledge that pre-existing politics, bodies must be made by becoming objects of knowledge. The appearance of the human as the object as well as the subject of knowledge is described by Foucault as a defining feature of modernity.

---

[5] Kantorowitz's invocation of "the king's two bodies," (1957) describes the duality of the body/state relationship, as modern sovereignty is constituted as an artificial body that transcends the individual or collective embodiment of the mortal body. While, in one sense, the sovereign is embodied as the 'natural' body that is born, lives and dies in the king or head of state, the sovereign's more important body is immortal, transcendent and cannot die. This second body is the state, the sovereign. As the sovereign has no material body, it must be made present through its actions on the bodies of others. While states may 'die,' that is, cease to function as sovereign entities, such death is not inevitable. Rather, the state is a transcendent, immortal body.

The invention of the human sciences, including the changes in the institutional structure of medicine described in *The Birth of the Clinic*, marked the human body as separate object of study from the other human sciences of such as sociology and psychology. Rather than the differences in bodies being 'natural', our bodies in all their differences are the products of knowledge/power (Foucault 1979, 28). The body as we know it is a creation of modernist discourses. Just as sovereignty orders the boundaries between inside and outside of the state, the inside and outside of the self are marked by the borders of the body. To be a subject means to be discrete and secure within the boundaries of the body, just as to be a state means to exercise autonomy a specific space. Modernism suggests that bodies are necessarily bound by the limits of the skin and that they are individual containers of selfhood. The skin forms the boundaries of the body, and bodily injury or death constitutes the primary evil. IR discourses about sovereignty and anarchy in the state of nature reproduce the modernist subject, naturalizing human subjects as individuated, cut off from other individuals and relating to others through violence and threat of violence (see Esposito 2008, 61).

Feminists argue that distinctions between mind and body and between culture and nature that form the foundations of knowledge are modernist constructions: these dualisms are not natural or self-evident, but rather sedimented historical discourses. In modernist discourses, the body is understood as the natural, biological counterpart to the superior realm of the mind, culture, and consciousness. This body is discrete and self-contained, a "clean and proper" (Kristeva 1982, 75) body untouched by the world of politics and culture. Finding an affinity with Foucault, feminists have argued that

45

modernist discourses do not reflect the reality of the body, but rather serve to construct the body as we know it. Judith Butler's statement that "there is no reference to a pure body which is not at the same time a further formation of that body" (1993, 10) is instructive here. Butler makes the point that gender discourses produce a seemingly natural sexed subject, a 'clean and proper body' through the exclusion of certain bodies that do not fit the sex/gender/sexuality matrix. In the production of what appears to be a stable, natural body, there is a founding exclusion. This exclusion produces "a constitutive outside to the subject, an abjected outside, which is, after all, "inside" the subject as its own founding repudiation" (Butler 1993, 3). The discrete, self-contained body is not a natural phenomenon, but is the result of discursive processes including, but not limited to, gender. The subject here is not the subject of realism or liberalism that is formed before the foundational moment of politics in the social contract or as a rights bearing subject, but is always in the process of formation.

As bodies are effects of politics, including violent practices of international relations, I argue that we can understand violence as expressive of the instability of bodies. Beyond the obvious harm to bodies caused by practices of IR in terms of injury or death, political violence makes and remakes bodies. For example, the force-feeding of hunger strikers is not about the underlying reality of the hunger strikers as mentally ill and in need of care, but rather, force-feeding produces the prisoners as unworthy dependents by referencing the force-feeding of psychiatric patients. Violence does not only make bodies, as I've said, but bodies are productive of practices of IR. In this way, bodies function in ways that cannot be attributed solely to the will of the subject. Through

their capacity to weaken and die despite medical intervention aimed at keeping them alive, and through the destabilizing effect that their obliteration, through suicide bombing for example, has on the body politic, bodies are capable of certain forms of political agency that surpass the assumptions that IR makes about subjects.

In arguing that violence is expressive, I am specifically *not* arguing that violence is the expression of ancient hatreds, nor the inevitable result of anarchy, nor is it a testimony of grievances. Violence expresses the instability of bodies as it is instrumental in the making and remaking of embodied subjects and their place in the political community. Nor do I argue that the instability or indeterminacy of bodies explains the variation in political violence, or the forms it takes. This instability of bodies is, at its root, constant, but it takes different forms. What I argue, rather, is that the role of violence in making and remaking relations between subjects through their embodiment is missing in the scholarly analysis we provide about violence.

Because of the work feminist scholars have done in demonstrating how bodies are produced by, and productive of, social and political relations, thinking through bodies from a feminist-inspired perspective can provide valuable insights about war, violence, and vulnerability, without necessarily reducing these concerns as something that specifically affects women or men as sexed bodies. Feminists have done much work on how bodies are always already vulnerable to the other, to the social and political construction, but are also resistant through regimes of desire and materiality. Bodies are vulnerable not just because they are essentially public—they can be seen, touched, and injured by others. Bodies are vulnerable because they are the part of the subject exposed

to the other, and thus vulnerability to all kinds of violence is embedded in the subject. Feminists have contested the existence of a private sphere that takes as its *sine qua non* the individual body (but which has not been understood to include the bodies of women). By re-politicizing bodies, feminist theory is a productive resource for thinking about our bodies as 'given over from the start' to vulnerability and political forces. In myriad ways, feminists have exposed our bodies as both fundamental to subjectivity and political themselves, the implications of which have not been fully explored in the field of International Relations.

Feminist theories of the body lead to a fuller conception of corporeality that has important implications for theorizing the relationship between violence, bodies, and subjectivity that need not be limited to theorizing gendered bodies in IR. As I argue in the next (second) chapter, feminist struggles to think about bodies as we know them as both produced by, and productive of, social and political relations can provide the basis for thinking about bodies in IR that draw upon, but are not reducible to, Foucaultian or other critical perspectives. Here, I focus on Judith Butler's work as not only one of the most influential, but also one of the most incisive and important theorizations of the embodied subject. The motivating questions of 'what makes for a livable life' that animates Butler's scholarship works in concert with feminist concerns that stem from the historical circumstances of women, racial and sexual minorities as not-quite fully political subjects. Butler's work, in conversation with other feminist theories of embodiment, provides a framework for accounting for bodily difference, for taking violence and vulnerability

seriously, and for undermining culture/nature and mind/body dualism in recasting how we think about bodies.

VI. Design of Dissertation

Building on the resources of two different disciplines—International Relations and feminist theory—this dissertation moves resolutely between theory and practice as it engages concrete international events to think about the embodiment of the human subject in practices of security and violence, and through that to interrogate concepts of sovereignty, security, violence, and vulnerability. The next chapter details feminist interrogations into the problem of embodiment and expands upon this chapter's elucidation of a material/cultural conception of the body that is simultaneously produced by and productive of International Relations. The remaining chapters are each oriented toward a specific mode of violence: torture, suicide bombing, and precision warfare. These chapters develop my argument of the expressivity of violence—that violent practices in international relations express the instability of bodies through their production of embodied subjects, and that violent bodies express the excess of the subject and are also productive of international relations.

Bodies are Produced by IR

Focusing on the ties between bodies and subjectivity illustrates how violence is not only a *destructive* force, but is *productive* in a variety of ways as well, constituting certain subjects and enabling or closing off political worlds and possibilities. By explicitly theorizing bodies as produced by practices of international relations, we can

view violence as more than a rational policy or something undesirable to be avoided if possible. More than 'broken' by violence, bodies are constituted as raced or sexed or belonging to a particular identity, constituted as objects of medical intervention, and are made to be 'killable' or 'torturable'. Through practices of international security, some people are effectively 'disembodied' and some are constituted as 'pure' or 'only' bodies, subjects whose existence is stripped of political agency and meaning, who are understood only in terms of biological processes of life and death. This affects who can be tortured or killed, and how, as well as whose lives are put at risk and whose lives are invulnerable.

For example, the 'terrorist' subject is produced and transformed through, among other practices, the violence of torture and force-feeding. Through the practice of torture, the tortured prisoner becomes to be embodied in such a way that he is *only* embodied; he is stripped of subjectivity and reduced to physical embodiment such that torture becomes rationalizable and calculable. Simultaneously, the torturer becomes 'disembodied,' as his or her body is not subject to violence or violation; it is no longer the self's vulnerable interface with the world. When prisoners attempt to resist by one of the only means of agency left to them, the refusal of food, they are force-fed, transforming them into dependent objects of biopower rather than fully political subjects exercising autonomy over their own bodies.

Biopolitical state security practices produce bodies by designating certain bodies as risks or threats, while other bodies are constituted as those to be protected. In a different context from the torture and force feeding of Guantánamo Bay, the terrorist subject is also produced by practices of surveillance and detection that purport to 'read'

the body for signs of ill-intent. By these practices, the terrorist is constituted as a dangerous body that must be separated from the *body politic*. In instances of what could be read as a failure to maintain the boundaries between dangerous bodies and protected bodies, suicide bombing and the following recovery efforts reveal the political work necessary to constitute what Kristeva calls the self's 'clean and proper body'. As I argue in chapter 4, efforts to identify and reconstruct the bodies of victims by ZAKA members and the Israeli Forensic Institute transform victims' bodies into meaningful political subjects as Israeli Jews. Efforts at recovering and identifying the bodies do more than reflect the subjectivities of victim and perpetrator: they work to establish them. As suicide bombing results in a shattering of bodies frequently rendering the victims indistinguishable from perpetrators, the bodies must be reconstructed from their condition as 'heaps of meat,' bodies without subjectivity in order to reconstruct the semblance of national wholeness and unity. The practices of ZAKA, the ultra-Orthodox organization that collects the bodily remains, and the Israeli government provide a case study of how the body is politically produced through practices of international relations, as well as how this constitution of bodies is directly tied to the formation and maintenance of the borders of the state and self.

Bodies are not only killed, but made to be 'killable' by practices of international relations. Some of the key political changes instituted by technologies of war do not only increase the lethal capabilities of governments, but also result in profound changes in the nature of human embodiment. Such technologies—including both technological systems like drones and political/legal methodologies such as summary executions—produce

certain bodies as killable targets and others whose deaths are seen as regrettable but inevitable. These instances, and many others, reveal our bodies to be deeply *unnatural*, shaped and molded by material and discursive practices associated with international security. Rather than harming or protecting natural, pre-constituted bodies, various modes of violence in international security produce bodies as we know them.

Bodies Are Productive of IR

If contemporary practices of international security compel us to not only focus explicitly on bodies, but also theorize bodies as effects of the interactions of the material and cultural (as I argue in chapter 2), we can see how the materiality of bodies is not only an effect of material/discursive practices. Rather, the bodies that are produced by international relations are also *productive* of IR; they play an agentic role in constituting practices of IR that cannot be reduced to the motivations of disembodied subjects.

The practice of "suicide bombing" provides a stark illustration of the manner in which bodies are themselves productive of world politics. I argue in chapter four that, more than being a deliberately destructive act, suicide bombing as a mode of violence can be theorized as an act of contamination. By violently destroying the self in order to kill others, the suicide bomber disrupts the sovereign, self-enclosed, individualized body of the modern state. Interpenetrating and merging the bodies of self and other, the 'nature' and 'technology' of body and bomb, and the 'inside' and 'outside' of the body, the body of the suicide bomber performs a politics of contamination. Suicide bombing thus has political effects that are not reducible to conventional understandings of political violence

as coercion. Thinking of suicide bombing as an embodied practice sheds light on the role of the body in international security; more than an object to be protected, bodies can be used to threaten security and disrupt the stable borders of the state.

The practices of recovering and reconstructing the bodies of victims and bombers in the wake of suicide bombings also illustrate how bodies can be productive of international relations. Such practices also do more than create the illusion that bodies are cohesive and self-contained. These bodily practices redraw the boundaries between identities and produce bodies as synecdoche for the state and nation: reconstructing bodies as whole and discrete performatively rebuilds the state as a whole and discrete body as well.

The categories of nature and culture are also disturbed in the bodies of the pilots in precision warfare, whether flying F-16s or piloting drones remotely. The bodies that are constituted as a result of technocultural practices allow for a redefinition for human visual and destructive capabilities. I argue in chapter five that this body, a 'cyborg' body, renders the bodies of militants and civilians 'killable' both in the sense that the material capacity exists to kill them, but, perhaps more importantly, they are rendered 'killable' in a political and normative sense through their exclusion from political life as bodies that matter. The cyborg bodies of precision bombers are productive of other bodies such that their embodiment allows some bodies to be subject to summary execution or anonymous death as collateral damage.

I close with a chapter that uses the framework for theorizing bodies that this work has developed in relation to Judith Butler's work to critique an emerging security paradigm, "Responsibility to Protect". I critique certain assumptions that this new norm enacts about bodies, subjects and violence, taking into account Butler's theorization of our bodies as ontologically precarious. I propose an ethical framework for thinking about violence that takes into account the messy realities of embodied personhood. I argue that conceiving of bodies as products of political relations, rather than as biological enclosures of the self, necessitates a re-conception of agency as the co-production of bodies and discourse, a form of agency that substantially alters conventionally thinking about the ethics of violence.

Chapter 2: *Feminist Theories of Embodiment*

While International Relations has neglected theoretical engagement with the body, feminist theorists have struggled with the question of subjects and bodies as an central problem in theorizing the roots of women's subordination and the possibilities of change. Perhaps the most influential formulation of the relationship between subjectivity and embodiment to come out of feminist theorizing is the sex/gender distinction in which one's sexed embodiment as male or female is irrelevant to one subjectivity; it is gender as a social and cultural phenomenon that determines subjectivities and composes power relations. While enormously important politically, the casting aside of bodies as politically irrelevant has limited this strand of feminist theorizing, especially in confronting the nature of biopolitical power. Contemporary feminist theorists, including Judith Butler, have challenged this abandonment of bodies and have striven to articulate a fuller understanding of the subject as embodied; as such, feminist theory's struggles to re-think bodies provide a basis for theorizing bodies, subjects and violence in International Relations.

In this chapter, I discuss how feminists have thought about the relationship between subjectivity and embodiment with particular reference to the work of Judith Butler, one of the most influential critics of the 'sex/gender system' and the naturalness of sex. I argue that her work, while requiring some qualifications and modifications, has enormous implications for the theorization of the embodied subject in relation to biopolitical practices of violence and security. Moreover, her work and that of contemporary feminist theory more broadly has implications for theorizing bodies that

are not limited to questions of sex and gender. In this chapter, I describe Butler's critique

of the concept of gender, and, through an engagement with her work and that of her

interlocutors and contemporaries, develop a method for thinking about bodies throughout

the rest of the work. I begin by describing the strengths and weaknesses of the 'sex-

gender' system, which theorizes women's subordination as cultural and therefore

changeable, but also limits feminist critique in important ways by reifying culture/nature

dualism and leaving 'the body' untheorized. In the remainder of this chapter, I draw out

elements of a critical methodology for theorizing embodiment from a feminist

perspective by an engagement with Butler and some of her interlocutors. Rather than

stating what the body 'is,' I derive several considerations for theorizing embodiment

from feminist struggles to articulate a method for thinking about bodies. Included is the

necessity to consider bodies as *both* material *and* cultural, as well as to consider bodies as

both *produced* through practices of power/knowledge and bodies as themselves

productive of politics. I conclude with a consideration of Butler's recent elaboration on

bodies as ontologically precarious and argue that this formulation is a productive

recasting of the body in relation to problems of security and violence.

I.   Sex/Gender

While International Relations has by and large accepted an ontology of bodies as

'natural' beings to be protected by state apparatuses, feminists have questioned the

'naturalness' of this body to be protected. The question of the ontological status of the

body is of particular concern for feminists, who have had to battle scientific and medical discourses of women's naturally bodily inferiority as well as the erasure of the potential of her intellectual achievements due to the bodily influences of hormones, reproductive processes, and muscular frailty. Feminist thought has challenged discourses of women's nature which considered women nurturing and motherly, and incapable of the abstract political, economic, or scientific thought that characterizes the full subject of liberalism. Discourses of women's natural vulnerability and weakness have constituted women as inherently in need of protection by the state; while men could partake in the provision of this protective state apparatus, not the least of which includes serving in militaries, women's exclusion from such institutions perpetuated their social, political and economic marginalization and dependency. Feminists have described the national security state as a gendered 'protection racket,' meaning that the state and the citizens it protects are gendered subjects. Specifically, the state is gendered masculine, while those who are 'protected' assume a feminine role. There is thus an unequal power relationship between the protector and the protected, with the security of the protected bought by their subordination to the protectors. As Iris Marion Young puts it, "Their protector position puts us, the citizens and residents who depend on their strength and vigilance for our security, in the position of women and children under the charge of the male protector" (Young 2003, 226-227). The bodies of the feminized 'protected' by practices of national security are a political liability for those whose bodies are seen to be vulnerable, weak, and inadequate.

Feminist critiques of liberalism are also based on the presumption of women's bodies as weak and inadequate; more specifically, women are seen as embodied subjects unfit for participation in the public realm. The feminist critique of liberal theories of politics and international relations is based on liberalism's presumption of a rational, universal and disembodied subject. Liberalism is founded on the protection of the naturalized body of the citizen, through the social contract and of the creation of inalienable rights which constitute a private sphere of non-interference from the government. The social contract protects the subject from external threats and makes domestic relations non-violent. This realm of non-violence enables the subject to pursue his interests through social relations that are freedom from the threat of violence.

Crucial to the subject of liberalism is the distinction between public and private spheres. The private sphere serves as a protected realm of government non-interference; one's body, one's family and one's home and possessions are considered to be in the private sphere, where one can be materially and emotionally sustained without government intrusion. The subject of politics, therefore, is the subject of the public sphere: this subject is the subject of reason, liberty, and autonomy. First, as a subject of reason, the subject has left behind his own particularities of embodiment or social relations and learned to think from a universal perspective. As such, the reasoning subject is much like the modern subject that is the creator of knowledge from a disembodied perspective.

Second, the liberal subject of politics is a subject of liberty. The free subjects of liberalism are self-directed and unfettered; they possess power rather than are effects of

power (as in Foucauldian models of subjectification). The free subject of liberalism is a subject unencumbered by necessity or duty. The liberal subject is thus free from responsibilities for family members and of the necessities of the body; these make the subject unable to exercise freedom. However, the distinction between the public and private sphere means that family burdens and caring labor are not barriers to freedom the government should abolish. Caring labor is privatized and feminized. Such duties, and the caring labor that goes with then (including the care for bodily needs) are necessary functions of the private sphere that the existence of the public sphere, and the free citizen who inhabit it, is built upon, and these roles of caring have been filled by women in almost any sexual division of labor (Fineman, 2008; Tronto 1993). Liberalism is thus not opposed to necessity or the body, but is dependent upon the relegation of these concerns to the private sphere of the family, and women's labor inside of it, in order to produce liberated subjects in the public sphere.

The subject of liberalism is also an autonomous subject, defined in opposition to the dependent subject. The autonomous subject can care for himself without others making claims on him for survival or protection. The autonomous subject is presented as prior to social relations: he is always an adult who can enter into contracts and decide which social relations to pursue. Of course, this view of the subject radically understates the degree to which humans are constituted by social relations; they are born into families and dependent upon adults (usually mothers) for material needs and the development of language and other social capacities. The representation of the subject as autonomous understates not only the importance of women's labor in the private sphere but the degree

to which adults are entangled in webs of social relationships as well as larger webs such as those of the economy. Like the free subject, the autonomous subject is dependent upon non-autonomous subjects based in familial relationships for emotional and physical support. In Locke's state of nature, for example, only men are always autonomous; women are always attached to men and children (Brown 1995, 148).

The autonomous subject is contrasted with the vulnerable subject. Vulnerability is not considered a universal attribute—only some people are vulnerable. Vulnerability is linked to discourses of dependence, victimhood and pathology, all viewed in negative terms. Vulnerability is also linked to certain 'populations' such as women, children, the elderly and infirm. These are stigmatized subjects who are designated as 'populations' (Fineman 2008). Vulnerability in liberal discourses is the opposite of freedom. The designation of vulnerable populations we can also relate to Foucault's concept of biopower: if vulnerability is a characteristic of certain populations (rather than a generalized condition), the government is enabled to intervene 'for their own good'. Feminists have engaged with nature of biopolitical rule insofar as it is based on the management of 'natural' bodies and populations. For example, feminists have critiqued natalist politics encouraging certain women of certain races, ethnicities, nationality or classes to bear children while women of 'less desirable' groups are discouraged from reproducing, sometimes to the point of being forcibly sterilized (Yuval-Davis 1997). Discourses of the 'natural' body and the natural vulnerability of women as a population are primary topics for feminists seeking to provide critiques of political theories that justify women's subordination.

Because of the use of discourses of women's natural bodily inferiority to justify subordinate political position for women, it is crucial for feminist to deny an ahistorical or essential subject based on an uncritical story of bodily morphology or composition. From this problem stems the 'sex/gender system,' a concept that feminist have used to differentiate between the nature/biology source of sex and the social/cultural source of gender as both an aspect of subjectivity and code for political power. Feminist theories of the 'sex/gender' conceptualize 'gender' as social and cultural phenomenon distinction from the natural, biological fact of 'sex'. From this vantage point, women and men may be marked by biological differences, but these differences are largely irrelevant: social factors are what determine the relevant differences between men and women.

Closely associated with the work of Simone de Beauvoir, the relegation of biology, or 'nature,' to the realm of 'sex' while social roles and individual personality characteristics are described as 'gender' has been a central tenet of feminist political thought for decades. Beauvoir's famous statement "One is not born, rather becomes, a Woman" (1989, 269) is a denial of an eternal, biological essence of what it is to be a woman. Beauvoir accepts certain biological facts about women—their smaller size and reproductive abilities, but she challenges the idea that women's biology is what makes her inferior socially, economically and politically. *Becoming* a woman, for Beauvoir, is a matter of the cultural portrayals of women and ideologies of womanhood that have created a romanticized view of femininity that women are compelled to emulate. Because of the culture they are raised in, women are denied subjectivity—she is 'Other' to man, made into an object. While 'man' stands for what is universally human, women are

particular, outside of the progress of human history and defined by their role in the eternal process of human reproduction.

Gayle Rubin's influential analysis in 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex" traces how women's oppression emerged in through social structures. She formulates the sex/gender system as "the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied" (Rubin 1996 [1975]). Such arrangements are necessary, due to the biological requirements of humans to organize reproduction, sexuality, and labor practices as an intrinsic part of material life. "Gender is socially imposed division of the sexes" (Rubin 1996 [1975], 121). Gender is created as women are exchanged by men. Women may be born anatomically female, but become the subjects 'women' when they enter into this exchange as 'gifts' versus 'givers'. Like Beauvoir, Rubin places emphasis on the ways in which children are raised. Rubin, like feminist psychoanalysts such as Chodorow (1997), describes psychoanalytic theories of the origins of gender identity not as a matter of biological necessity that justify the subordination of women but as a matter of a "phallic culture" that domesticates women by assigning them as primary care-givers (1996 [1975], 130-131). "If there were no gender, the entire Oedipal drama would be a relic" (Rubin 1996 [1975], 136-137). Contra Freud, women do not have 'penis envy' so much as they internalize their lower status—their subordination is not biological destiny, but a result of their social condition, which includes the institutions of marriage and heterosexuality. Like Beauvoir, Rubin is concerned with theorizing the social, rather than biological, origins of women's

62

oppression not only because such arguments are more persuasive, but because they enable a politics of social change aimed at equality and freedom from prescribed roles of gender and sexuality, as culture can change, where as biology is fixed.

Post-structuralist feminist theorizing also links women's subordination to a theory of culture, defined as meaning-making through linguistic practices. Post-structural feminist analysis theorizes the formation of the subject of 'women' through processes of linking and differentiation. 'Woman' is constituted through the linking of emotion, motherhood, simplicity, dependence and the body. These attributes are differentiated from those that constituted 'man': rationality, intellect, complexity, independence, and the mind (Hansen 2006, 19-22). 'Woman' exists as supplement to 'man,' she is a necessary part of society, but remains inferior and devalued. Feminist also conceive of gender as a discursive structure that links the historical devaluing of women to the categories associated with women through binary relations, pairs in which the devalued term is associated with femininity and serves as a foil to the valued, masculine term. Culture/nature, mind/body, active/passive, rational/irrational, objective/subjective are all gendered dichotomies. These discourses may structure meaning, but they are not stable or set in stone: as constructions, they are subject to political contestation. What has been devalued in one context may be valued in another context, or people may enact their own identities in ways that contradict these categorizations. Calling attention to the various practices that (re)produce these very dichotomies and pointing out the tensions and slippages is in itself a political act.

Overall, feminists have been concerned with the various ways in which women's oppression and subordinate status can be linked to various cultural practices—at stake is nothing less than the possibility for radical social change to enable women to attain full and equal status in society. As such, women's bodies (and men's, for that matter) must be viewed as irrelevant to their subjectivity, given the uses of arguments that have built upon notions of biological essentialism in justifying and 'naturalizing' women's inferior status. Even apart from the power of this argument of the cultural, rather than biological, roots of women's oppression, how the body is theorized either explicitly or implicitly has implications for the limits of our political imagination.

Sex/Gender and the Problem of Dualism

The concept of gender, especially its placement in a 'sex/gender system' is, and has been, tremendously useful for feminists for making formal strides towards women's political equality. If there is no 'natural' difference between men and women, women could, and have, demanded access to the public sphere in terms of political participation, education, employment and public office on the same terms as men. The concept of 'gender' has also enabled a cultural critique of the forces that deny women a subject position and make her only into an object. The critique of culture as gendered has also opened up a critique of the denigration of qualities that fall on the 'feminine' and devalued side of such dichotomies such as mind/body, culture/nature, active/passive, rationality/emotion, competition/cooperation, war/peace, strength/weakness, independence/dependence as well as showing how these concepts are not opposites, but are historically contingent constructions that can be challenged.

However, the concept of 'gender' defined in opposition to the concept of 'sex' also limits the possibilities for critique and political re-visioning in several important, and related, ways. First, the sex/gender distinction is complicit with philosophical dualism. Dualism assumes there are two main substances that are incompatible and incommensurable. Feminist philosophers have argued that dualism is phallocentric or masculinist; that is, privileging concepts associated with masculinity. In particular, the sex/gender distinction is complicity with Cartesian dualism in its reification of mind/body and culture/nature dichotomies. The Cartesian dualism between mind and body has left a cultural legacy that contemporary feminist theorists have attempted to overcome in a variety of different ways. In Cartesian dualism, the body had been disentangled from the mind. The mind is the engine, the sole site of agency, and the body driven by the mind. The body becomes a hindrance to be overcome in the name of objectivity and reason. While associations between women and corporeality have existed long before Descartes (such as in Plato [Grosz 1994, 5 Gatens 1996]), post-enlightenment thought has hierarchicalized mind/body and nature/culture divisions such that women were specifically considered to be less able to rise above natural passions; their bodies interfere with their minds. To put it another way, while the concept of gender has enabled a critique of dualism, the critique of dualism has also opened up a critique of the concept of gender itself as being problematically dualist.

Feminists interested in undermining culture/nature and mind/body dualism are not content with the framework of sex/gender, as it ascribes too much power to the idealism side of the idealism/material dichotomy, a founding dichotomy of Western scientific

65

thought that is deeply embedded in masculinism, or the privileged of masculinity. Because women, racialized peoples, working class people and differently-abled people have been associated with corporeality and denied subjectivity based on transcendence of the body, it is not enough to enable some individuals from these groups to ascend to the kind of transcendence of white, middle class, able-bodied men, as this strategy does not undo the historic association of certain groups with corporeality and the lack of subjectivity. "It is not adequate to simply dismiss the category of nature outright, to completely retranscribe it without residue into the cultural: this in itself is the monist, or logocentric gesture par excellence" (Grosz 1994, 21). In other words, there is something about the concept of 'gender' that reproduces the privileging of culture over nature, mind over body that is at least complicit with the political exclusion of, and devaluing of, women.

Second, related to this critique of dualism in the concept of 'gender' is the abrogation of the political critique of 'the body.' Biological discourses of the body are not without a politics, as many feminist scholars of science have argued. It is here that feminists have found some common ground with Foucault's critique of the sciences and of biopower more generally. Science is itself a human practice, rather than a privileged viewpoint on reality that itself is marked by masculinist concepts and practices. It represents a partial view of the world, rather than an objective, apolitical 'god's-eye view'. The epistemological basis of Enlightenment science with its roots in Cartesian dualism has as its subject a disembodied knower. This subject is free from the passions of the body who can therefore be a neutral observer of the world: a view from no-where.

66

Feminist philosophers and epistemologists have critiqued the assumption of an external reality that exists outside of the socially embedded processes of language and knowledge production. Thus, one cannot easily separate 'objective' reality from knowledgeable practices of a given time and place, and from a particular embodied perspective. Such critiques have been influential in formulating an epistemological critique of modernist epistemologies, including the dominant epistemologies of International Relations as being complicit with, and even perpetuating, masculinism (Haraway 1991; Harding 1991; Locher and Prugl 2001; Peterson 1992).

The rejection of biological determinism represented by the concept of 'gender' has led feminists to shy away from questions of the body as 'essentialist,' and abandoning the question of the body to the biological sciences. Feminists working in science and technology studies have been at the forefront of challenging the sex/gender system and its tacit acceptance of biological and otherwise scientific knowledge for defining women's bodies. Feminists also criticize use of science, especially biology, to assert an unassailable truth about the differences between women and women, by exposing the social and cultural basis for the construction of sexual difference in medical discourses (Fausto-Sterling 1992[1985]; Birke 1999; Fausto-Sterling 2000; Martin 2001; Lane 2009).

However, both feminists and non-feminists alike treat sexual difference as a matter of biology and thus not in itself subject to political critique. This poses limitations on the feminism in both scholarship and activism. It disqualifies studies about the interaction between mind and body, or their mutual constitution: "to reduce either the

mind to the body or the body to the mind is to leave their interaction unexplained, explained away, impossible" (Grosz 1994, 7). To relinquish theorizing about the body to scientific discourses is also to allow the body to be defined and "turn[ed] into a resource for appropriation in which the object of knowledge is finally itself only matter for the seminal power, the act, of the knower" (Haraway 1991, 197). It is to allow the body to be defined in terms hostile to feminist politics, and turned into a tool for the appropriation by capitalist, patriarchal, racist and imperialist forces. I turn now to the ways in which feminists have attempted to revision what it means to theorize the subject as an embodied subject in order to ground a politics of resistance to intertwined systems of inequality and oppression. The work of Judith Butler is highlighted as an important, if imperfect, theorization of the body as constitutively embedded in social norms and in relation to other bodies.

Part 2: Theorizing Bodies

In striving to theorize the constitution of the embodied subject, Judith Butler's work has been extremely influential both in feminist theory and critical theory more broadly. She is far from the only feminist doing thoughtful and extensive work on the problem of embodiment. Her work is not only influential, but also wide-ranging in its earlier concerns with gender and sexuality to later work on responsiveness and vulnerability in contemporary warfare. Of particular interest is her explicitly political and ethical concern with theorizing the conditions under which "livable lives" are possible for those whose bodily life falls outside of prevailing norms. In articulating a Butlerian theorization of the embodied subject, I do not make scientific or ontological claims about the nature of

bodies, which would only serve to limit potential avenues for thinking about embodiment. Rather, my motives stem from the political problems entailed in theories, either implicit or explicit, about bodies. My interest is in drawing lessons from these struggles within feminism to think productively about the politics of bodies in order to inform my own method for theorizing bodies in International Relations.

Bodies as Socially Produced

In order to contest the dualism of the sex/gender system, feminists have turned a critical eye toward discourses that purport to authoritatively describe bodies, especially women's bodies and discourses dealing with sexual difference. In short, they have not been content to allow the biological, medical, or psychiatric disciplines to provide a definitive account of 'the body' but have analyzed these disciplines as specific practices that have constituted bodies in particular ways. In short, feminists have argued 'the body' as we know it is an object that is the effect of knowledgeable practices. This is to say, there is no 'essential' or 'natural' body—the body does not constitute 'rump materialism' (cf. Wendt 1999, 130-132). The body as we know it is a function of historically specific modes of representing bodies—most relevantly, in dualist post-Enlightenment scientific discourses. Judith Butler's work on gender, desire, the subject and the body is complex and draws on a number of influences including Foucault and Derrida, yet is centrally concerned with undermining culture/nature dualism in theorizing the body as an *effect* of discursive practices. While her work has several limitations, a discussion of her contributions to theorizing the body will form the basis for my articulation of feminist contributions to theorizing embodiment. By theorizing bodies as socially produced,

feminists challenge the assumption of 'natural' bodies that exist apart from the discourses that represent such bodies.

Judith Butler's challenge to conceptions of the body as natural and ahistorical is based in her theory of gender performativity. While Butler's work is influenced by Foucault, she is also critical of Foucault's model of bodily inscription, pointing out that his concept of genealogy exempts the idea of a pre-discursive body from genealogical analysis, as it takes a historically imprinted body as its starting place (Butler 1989). In taking up this paradox of Foucault's work, Butler's theory of gender performativity also challenges the sex/gender theory in feminism which separates 'gender' as social and psychological from 'sex' which is biological and natural. Her work is both explicitly and implicitly an anti-foundationalist critique of the liberal model of the self, a speaking, self-conscious willing subject.

Butler's performative theory of gender argues that one cannot meaningfully distinguish between gender as a product of human ideas and culture, and sex, which is presumed to exist naturally as a brute fact outside of human influence. Butler describes how gender essentialisms make it appear *as if* sex is pre-discursively given (Butler 1990, 7). Gender, encompassing social, linguistic and symbolic practices, is therefore logically prior to sex. As Butler writes, "…this production of *sex* as the pre-discursive ought to be understood as the effect of the apparatus of cultural construction designated by *gender*" (1990, 7). Gender is therefore not an attribute of an already-existing individual, but a temporal process, a 'doing' that produces the effect of an intelligibly sexed subject. Butler's theory of performativity is thus a critique of the sex/gender division exemplified

70

by Beauvoir, in that is not only challenges the 'naturalness' of sex, but also the idea that gender is something that regulates, or restrains, an individual's behavior. Relying on Foucault's concept of regulatory power from the first volume of *The History of Sexuality,* Butler argues that gender is not a 'role' that constrains people's actions and appearances, but rather, gender constitutes subjects, so that there is no subject before gender. Butler writes, "Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeals over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being" (1990, 33). Contra Beauvoir—it is not possible to 'be' a woman, as there is no telos, no ending point to this process. Bodies are thus never quite 'complete' (see also Butler 1993, 2).

In this framework, the materialization of bodies is theorized as a product of discursive practices of gender, rather than gender being a social formation that is applied to pre-existing sexed bodies. For Butler, materiality is "*a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*" (1993, 9 emphasis in original). Along these lines, Butler asks, "to what extent does the body *come into being* in and through the mark(s) of gender?" (1990, 8). Gender as a discourse therefore exists prior to intelligibly sexed bodies. Performativity is similar to, but should not be conflated with a 'speech act.' A speech act brings about the state of affairs that is represented in the statement and is best understood as a declaration: "war is hereby declared," or "I now baptize you…" Speech acts bring about social facts, and thus have no bearing on the material world as such (Searle 1995, 34). Butlerian performativity, on the other hand, is concerned with the production of material realities,

71

and thus challenges the assumption that the sex of bodies as a material fact is outside the realm of politics. Discourse operates by constituting materiality and 'naturalness'. Acts are performative when they *constitute* the natural.

What Butler is doing cannot properly be called 'construction'; and she appears keenly aware of this critique of her work: from the first chapter of *Gender Trouble*, she critiques the sex/gender model for describing the body as if it were a passive medium or an instrument for the conveyance of cultural meanings (1990, 8). On the other hand, Butler does not argue that body has no materiality; rather, her point is that we cannot understand the materiality of the body outside of performative expressions of sex and gender. Butler writes, " 'Materiality' designates a certain effect of power or, rather, *is* power in its formative or constituting effects. Insofar as power operates successfully by constituting an object domain, a field of intelligibility, as a taken-for-granted ontology, its material effects are taken as material data or primary givens" (Butler, 1993, 34-35, see also Weber 1998, 80).[6]

Butler's articulation of the formation of the body is important politically for a number of reasons: first of all, it treats discourses of the 'natural body' as political, opening ground for challenging scientific discourses on gender, sex and sexuality. Second, it explains the process of materialization as cultural or discursive, and thus changeable—but not entirely agentic. Butler does not argue that people can switch gender identifications at will, or that they are 'performed' as in a role in a theatrical performance, a masquerade of the true self. Rather, practices of gender sediment over a period of time

to produce what appears to be stable and natural gender differences. Gender as an aspect of our bodily reality is not set—in fact, it requires constant work to uphold—but neither is it something an existing agent can change. Rather, it is core component of the subject itself—"there need not be a 'doer behind the deed,'… the 'doer' is variously constituted in and through the deed" (Butler 1990, 142).

Overall, Butler's formulation of gender performativity draws our attention to the deeply social constitution of our bodies and our gendered subjectivities. Theorizing our bodies as socially constituted means that power does not just act on our bodies, but forms our bodies and subjectivities in ways that we are not fully aware of or can control. Her work is a critique of discourses of the naturalness of bodies and works to sustain an anti-foundational political argument of the subject as an individual, autonomous agent. Such a theory of bodies and power is indebted to Foucault's concept of the productive power of discourse and has enormous political implications for the question of whose bodies 'count' as proper bodies.

Bodies as Sites of Power

Closely related to theorizing bodies as socially produced is the importance of seeing bodies as social points for the workings of power and domination. This point is perhaps the most consistent across the various disciplines that have experience 'the corporeal turn' in recent decades. The social forces that produce bodies are precisely forms of power; much of the recent scholarship on bodies in the social sciences and social theory has to do with the ways that bodies are objects and medium for, the workings of power.

Here, the influence of Foucault, especially his concepts of power/knowledge, discipline and biopower, is crucial for Butler and other feminists.

Foucault's work elaborates a conception of the body as a privileged site of the power/knowledge nexus, a historical body. Foucault's work has disputed the claim that there is any meaningful way to talk of the body outside of the nexus of power/knowledge. His concepts of disciplinary power and biopower as the "two poles around which the organization of power over life was deployed" (Foucault 1978, 139) revolve around the "anatomo-politics of the human body" (in the case of discipline) and regulation of the population in the case of biopower. Disciplinary power differs from prohibitive, or juridical, power by its operation in inscribing bodies with social and cultural norms, rather than threatening death. Through techniques of training, supervision, education and confession, bodies are made productive, docile, and even resistant. Biopower concerns the supervision and intervention regarding the biological processes of birth, mortality, health, and life expectancy—processes in which women's bodies are centrally located. Sexuality, for example, is the result of a biopolitical discourse, an inscription of power rather than an innate, internal 'secret'. By theorizing power as *productive* rather than restrictive, Foucault moves us away from thinking about bodies as naturally given objects that are acted *upon* by regimes of power and toward an attentiveness to the ways in which are bodies are we know them are the products of networks of power as well. "Useful" bodies shaped by the practices and regulations of militaries, schools and hospitals overlap with the 'intelligible' bodies of physicians and philosophers. Knowledge about the body is inseparable from the investments of power in bodies: "If it has been possible to

constitute a knowledge of the body, this has been by way of an ensemble of military and educational disciplines. It was on the basis of power over the body that a physiological, organic knowledge of it became possible" (Foucault 1980, 59). Foucault's method of geneaology is centrally concerned with theorizing power by examining how bodies are produced in society. "Genealogy, as an analysis of descent, is thus situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history's destruction of the body" (Foucault 1984, 83). While Foucault rarely discusses gender or sexual difference, feminist have found Foucault's concepts of discipline to be useful in showing how women have internalized certain forms of power through the disciplining of their bodies through diet, exercise, and adornment (Bordo 1993).

Furthermore, Foucault's concept of the episteme—a paradigm of knowledge production outside of which there is no way to evaluate evidence—has influenced scholars of sexual difference in thinking through the mutually reinforcement of regimes of the body and regimes of power. In particular, Thomas Laqueur's work has been particularly influential, tying scientific knowledge of sexual difference and reproduction to sexual difference as a product of modernity. Sexual difference as a dichotomous category has been part of the episteme only since the late 18th century. Before the seventeenth century, argues Laqueur, *gender* as we understand it, was an ontological category that assigned one a social rank, while *sex* was epiphenomenal (Laqueur 1990, 8). Laqueur charts the shift from the 'one-sex' model in which male and female bodies were hierarchically ordered versions of the same body to the 'two-sex' model as

horizontally ordered, incommensurable opposites. Women were considered to be lesser men, in the sense that all men and women were considered to have differing degrees of the same elements, and the dominance of certain elements determined one's sex. Sexual difference was conceived of as a matter of degree rather than kind in the one-sex model. The shift to a 'two-sex' model is only possible with a new epistemic model which at the same time was enabled by different political circumstances. "Sex, in both the one-sex and the two-sex worlds, is situational; it is explicable only within the context of battles over gender and power" (Laqueur 1990, 11).

Scientific discourses of male and female bodies have political consequences. Ann Towns discusses the one-sex model and the absolute disqualification of women from public life. Women's political disempowerment was based on their differentiation as ontologically distinct from men in the transition from the one-sex model to the two- sex model, and from absolutism to the age of Enlightenment and secularism in forms of political rule. In the one-sex model associated with absolutism, women's rule was tolerated if the woman in question was determined to have sufficiently masculine qualities. The two-sex model enabled women to be disqualified from public life. Constituted by the 'two-sex' model, 'women' were the opposites of men. Women could be defined in terms of emotion and weakness, apart from the reason and force that governed the state apparatus. Women as such could be excluded from formal state organizations (Towns 2010, 73-74). Importantly, the constitution of women's bodies has been central to the constitution of the modern state.

The work such as that of Laqueur and Towns is crucial for showing that the dichotomies such as mind/body, culture/nature and masculine/feminine that feminists routinely argue has led to the association of women with the body and nature are historically contingent, and are the product of particular scientific discourses. Furthermore, both demonstrate what is at stake politically in different conceptions of the body, and of sexual difference particularly.   This is a concerned that also animates Butler's work in her aim to interrogate the terms in which certain lives are made 'unlivable' as bodies that fail to matter are made abject. Norms of gender and heterosexuality produce certain bodies as intelligible; her goal is to question "what qualifies as bodies that matter, ways of living that count as 'life,' lives worth protecting, lives worth saving, lives worth grieving" (Butler 1993, 16). At stake in theorizing bodies in International Relations is not only, or solely, an epistemological matter; rather, feminist and other critical theorists have shown that how bodies are theorized, and even whose bodies 'count' as human bodies is a matter of great importance for the (re)production of power and governance.

The production of some bodies that 'count' as human while others do not implies that the forces that constitute bodies constitutes them as differentiated. Sexual difference is a key way that bodies have been differentiated, but it is not the only marker of bodily difference. In what follows, I describe the importance of theorizing bodies as multiple and differentiated rather than relying on a theory of 'the body' as if it were a universal category.

Bodies and Difference

The Foucaultian analysis of bodies being produced through regimes of power is not only open to criticism for putting forth a model of bodies that makes them passive mediums for the inscription of social and political forces, but also to the criticism that he does not take into account sexual difference in his work. Elizabeth Grosz (as well as Shildrick as in Shildrick 1997, 46-47) suggests that the problem lies in the failure to recognize the underlying bodies as sexually differentiated into male and female. While in his later writings (especially in the second and third volumes of *The History of Sexuality*) Foucault does differentiate between male and female bodies, his focus remains on male bodies. For Foucault's work to be relevant to women, his model of social inscription on bodily surfaces must be reworked to be inclusive of the patriarchal subordination and erasure of women. Grosz focuses on the imperative to not just theorize bodies per se, but bodies as marked by sexual difference. Grosz insists that given this lack of discussion, we must assume, that Foucault's neutral bodies refer to a masculine body because he does not challenge patriarchal culture. (Grosz 1994, 156). For example, Foucault's concept of biopolitics is rooted in the naturalization of the population. Biopower is geared at directing the population's healthy reproduction, yet Foucault does not take seriously the fact that these types of interventions are aimed primarily at women's bodies and affect women's roles as caretakers.

Foucault's analysis of the body in its lack of attention to sexual difference or other forms of bodily difference is not only flawed in its lack of attention to the bodily experiences of women, but, following from this, its inability to theorize aspects of bodily experience in general. Feminist theorists rooted in psychoanalytic or phenomenological

78

traditions have argued that bodily differentiation plays a key role in not only how the subject's existence is essentially embodied, but how the terms of bodily differentiation constitute the subject. Psychoanalytic perspectives fundamentally challenge the assumption of a pre-given, pre-social subject: the subject is formed in relation to a process of bodily differentiation that places it in an inescapable relation to other subjects and other bodies.

Psychoanalytic perspectives stress the subject's formation through the exclusion of an 'other'. The subject is then marked by the absent presence of this 'other'. This other remains outside of the subject, yet is still fundamentally a part of it. It is is a corporeal other, as the subject in his or her striving to become a separate, individuated subject requires the rejection of a maternal body. This rejection is form of melancholy, or loss, that *incorporates* the body (Butler 1990, 68). Butler's account of the production of a seemingly coherent identity necessarily entailing a loss is a useful way to understand the limits of the socially produced body. The materialization of bodies is never complete; it is a process that requires reiteration to maintain the effect of stabilization. The materialization of bodies is always insufficient, never complete. Butler writes, "the self only becomes the self on the condition that it has suffered a separation…That 'Other' installed in the self thus establishes the permanent incapacity of that "self" to achieve self-identity; it is as it were always already disrupted by that Other; the disruption of the Other at the heart of the self is the very condition of that self's possibility" (Butler 1997, 311). A body that seems complete and stable always entails the concealment of a loss. The subject becomes unitary and separated through regimes of prohibition—namely, the

incest taboo and taboo on homosexuality. These form the basis of gendered subjectivity as girls learn to identify with the mother and boys with the father. Feminist theorists have attempted to work with and through psychoanalytic concepts and theories in attempting to formulate the grounds of the subject 'women' who is not defined by 'lack' or inferiority.

Butler's work builds on psychoanalytic theories take the formulation of the subject though a relation to an 'other'—however, this model of subject formation is rooted in corporeality. The necessity of repetition, of repeated performance underscores the insufficiency of the regulative norms or individual performances to 'capture' or contain all the possibilities for action or experience. This failure refers to a realm of bodily experience which is not captured by discourse; or at least not yet. In the very instability of bodies, which necessitates the citational practices of materialization, there are openings for challenge. Another way of understanding this is of a necessary 'undecidability' between discourse and the body: bodies are 'in excess' of speech such that "speech can never fully convey the body, and the body is never constituted outside of speech" (Hansen 2000, 302). Not only does this statement reinforce the undecidability between the discursive and material, but it also indicates the loss in the production of the illusion of a self-contained body. This loss, or exclusion, is itself a form of violence at the core of the production of the subject.

Bodily difference is also a question of the normative body. As noted above in the discussion of bodies as a site for the workings of power and domination, the image of 'the body' is a normative one, in which a particular bodily configuration is given as

normative: such bodily norms are usually of adult, but young, healthy, male, cis-gendered, non-racially marked bodies. This is the body that is the 'natural body' or the body of the subject of liberalism. Butler describes these norms that constitute bodies as violent, in that their production includes an exclusion that makes certain lives and bodies unintelligible. Bodies that do not conform to the normative standard, or which defy the model of the singular sovereign individual living in a singular body, bodies which are marked by excess, lack, or disfigurement challenge and threaten the normative model of the body. They are what Julia Kristeva refers to as the abject. The abject is "both alien other who threatens the corporeal and psychic boundaries of the embodied self, and as an intrinsic, but unstable, part of the self resonates with the widespread cultural unease with bodily, and especially female bodily, fluids" (Shildrick and Price 1999, 7). The body as a container, as whole or self-contained, and as "clean and proper" (Kristeva 1982, 75) is a normative fiction— the abject, as "monstrous" (Shildrick 2002), or the "constitutive outside" (Butler 1993, 3) is the alterity at the margins that haunts us all. Furthermore, women's bodies in their constitution as leaky, fluid and possibly pregnant, do not conform to the normative model of the body and as such have served as a marker for bodily difference and otherness. As Braidotti remarks, women's bodies are "capable of defeating the notion of fixed *bodily form*, of visible, recognizable, clear and distinct shapes as that which marks the contour of the body." Women are "morphologically dubious" (Braidotti 1994, 80). Crucially, the abject as 'constitutive outside' of the body entails a recognition of the dependency of the seemingly whole, unmarked and uncontaminated body on the existence of abject bodies: the existence of male bodies are

dependent upon the existence of female bodies, white bodies on black bodies, heterosexual bodies on homosexual bodies, and so on. Bodies then, are not self-contained, independent entities, but are produced in relation to other bodies that remain an inescapable component that haunts any bodies that appear to be whole and autonomous.

Given the production of bodies is always in reference to other, abjected bodies, feminists have contested theories which presuppose a "neutral" or "universal" body and the masculine presuppositions that underlie these theories. The subject of modernism and of liberalism is a universal subject, able to transcend his body not only to become the subject of epistemology, but also the rational subject of politics. Feminists have pointed out that the supposed neutrality and universality of such a position is false, as these have been positions associated with masculinity and denied to women. Feminists insist that the body is read under the rubric of sex, which means that is it never neutral, but rather, is always dual or multiple as read through the problematic of sexual difference. In terms of sexual difference, Grosz concludes that "there is an irreducible specificity of each sex relative to the other, that there must be at least, but not necessarily only two sexes." (Grosz 1995, 77). This question of difference tends to be overlooked in discussions of 'the body,' in which 'the body' is constituted by various sets of forces, and so on. Irigaray famously claims that sexual difference is *the* question for our age (Irigaray 1993 [1984], 5). I take this concern to imply that bodies must be considered irreducibly multiple, with this multiplicity necessarily read more broadly to the different manifestations and expressions of bodies; bodies are not only gendered and sexed, but

they are racialized, sexualized, differently-abled, and marked by difference in other ways as well.

Feminist theorists such as Patricia Hill Collins, bell hooks and Audre Lorde have addressed the ways in which black women's bodies have been constituted and emphasized the need to theorize 'the body' in term of specific, contextual materialities. Spivak's statement about the social ordering of the body can also be read in this light. Spivak writes, "There are thinkings of the systematicity of the body, there are value codings of the body. The body as such cannot be thought" (Spivak 1989, 149). This statement, especially that "The body as such cannot be thought" I take to be not only a comment similar to Butler's insistence that bodily materiality is always a function of discourses of the body, but also that the body 'as such' does not, and cannot, exist given the multiplicities of bodies that the social order is concerned with. As Grosz comments: "[T]here is no body as such: there are only *bodies*—male or female, black, brown, white, large or small—and the gradations in between" (Grosz 1994, 19). When 'the body' is discussed in the singular, a universal body is assumed, and, as feminists have long documented, this universal body is figured as male. Thus, I will speak of 'bodies' rather than 'the body' in order to highlight the multiple bodies that inhabit the space of International Relations.

Theorizing bodies as differentiated draws our attention to the bodies that are excluded in assuming a generic or universal body, whether this body is thought of as a 'natural' body or a socially produced body. The bodies of realism or liberalism for example, as a self-contained body to be protected or a body that is an encumbrance to be

83

transcended can be seen not only as illusory but also implicated in the production of excluded or abject bodies. If some bodies are to be protected, their 'natural functioning' protected, what other bodies are excluded, produced as expendable or as always already dead or dying? If some bodies are constructed invulnerable, who is then made vulnerable? If some bodies can be overcome and ignored, who are constituted as *only* bodies, who exist as biological assemblages that breathe, suffer and die? If, as in Butler's famous pun, some bodies *matter*, which bodies then are the bodies that don't matter? These questions about the relational differentiation between bodies are vital questions about the practices of violence in International Relations that I explore in later chapters.

Theorizing bodies as multiple and differentiated also draws our attention to the relationality between bodies. This premise cautions us against reductionism in theorizing the embodied subject as a singular, autonomous entity and encourages us to think about bodies as social forces in and of themselves, as bodies do not exist independently from their production in discourse, or in their relationships with one another. I take up this implication in the next section which argues that bodies are not only produced by social forces in relation to one another, but possess a kind of agency in their materiality.

Bodies as Productive

In previous sections, I've described how feminists have challenged the exclusion of the body from questions of politics and the constitution of the subjects and argued that bodies as we know them are the result of discursive practices. These practices are bound up in power relations so that what bodies are produced as intelligible is a matter for

political interrogation and contestation. But, must bodies only be the objects or mediums for power? Feminist and other critical theorists have argued that to view bodies as object of power, as blank slates awaiting cultural inscription is to be complicit not only with nature/culture dualism, but with a particular and historically contingent production of the body and of nature as that which is 'always already dead' is a modern construction linked to the emergence of, and enabling, technological means of domination (Butler 1993, 4, (Foucault 1994 [1973]). To avoid dualism—or reducing the body to either essentially material or essentially cultural—feminists must be careful to think about the body in ways that take the body as material seriously, without, of course, slipping into the same dangers of biological essentialism that have provided the grounds for the denigration and subordination women and other groups marked by their association with the bodily. In order to avoid these problems, feminists must deny both a 'real' material body existing outside of human practices as well as a body consisting entirely of its social and historical presentations. In other words, "bodies and minds are not two distinct substances or two kinds of attributes of a single substance but somewhere in between these two alternatives" (Grosz 1994, xii). This section takes up the problem of the body from the other side of mind/body dualism: contra the Cartesian dualism that defines modern epistemology and subjectivity, bodies are also agentic; productive as well as produced, constituting as well as constituted.

The body, as conceptualized by Foucault or Butler, is a product of social and political forces—there is nothing inherent or essential to the body itself. However, several feminist theorists have accused Butler of relying on a pre-discursive body, or of

85

'discursive reductionism.' In other words, some feminist have the same issue with Butler as with Foucault: the appearance of a body that is a blank slate waiting to be written on and that is equated with nature as opposed to the culture of discourse (Butler 1993, 6-12). Butler insists that such critiques are premised upon the existence of some 'essential' body that can be known outside of particular discursive regimes: "there is no reference to a pure body which is not at the same time a further formation of that body" (1993: 10). In a response to her critics, she confronts the charges that "surely bodies live and die; eat and sleep; feel pain, pleasure; endure illness and violence" by admitting that there is something inescapable and necessary about these bodily experiences (Butler 1993, xi). Furthermore, Butler attempts to clarify what the 'outside' of discourse means to her: it is a 'constitutive outside' "that can only be thought—when it can—in relation to that discourse, at and as its most tenuous borders." (Butler 1993, 8) In other words, the body is not only language or discourse but we only have access to it through language. I take Butler's statement not to be that there is nothing material about the body, but rather, to undermine the dualism between discourse and materiality, and to emphasize the political work entailed in deconstructing the terms on which certain "bodies that matter" are produced and certain body/subject configurations are made thinkable or livable (Butler 1993, ch. 1, see also Lloyd 2006, 71-72).

Regardless of the merits of these critiques of Butler, feminists have in recent years been concerned with the ways in which bodies are not only *object*s of power, but *subjects* in some sense as well. Feminists have sought to reassess the relationship between the cultural and natural, mind and body, by overcoming what they see is excessive weight

granted to the cultural or linguistic in previous feminist work in theorizing the embodied subject. Such theories, often collected under heading of 'material feminisms' (see recent volumes edited by Alaimo and Hekman 2008, and Coole and Frost 2010) do not reject discursive and linguistic theories such as Butlerian performativity, but rather, seek to build on them to more radically undermine culture/nature dichotomies. Such theories are important in their attempts to formulate a space of agency for bodies and materiality more broadly, without falling into the trap of biological determinism. A key argument of this emerging movement is that nature "punches back" in ways that humans and their technologies cannot predict (Alaimo and Hekman 2008, 7). Materiality is re-theorized not as a limit to, or foundation for, cultural inscription, but as agentic in such a way that it cannot be ontologically separated from cultural or discursive forces.

Karen Barad's work is one of the most developed critiques of Butlerian performativity from this perspective. She persuasively argues that Butler's work is insufficient to undermine culture/nature dualism and strives to adapt Butler's basic thesis to account for the agency of the material, such as our fleshy bodies. Barad points out the ways in which Butler reifies the nature/culture dichotomy as agency is restricted to human social forces for the production of human subjects. In Butler's theory of performativity, Barad argues, social forces are still the causal agents while bodies await inscription. For this reason, Butler's performativity does not go far enough to undermine idealism.

Barad's project is to theorize performativity in such a way that takes materiality seriously because, "performativity is precisely a contestation of the excessive power

granted to language to determine what is real" (Barad 2003, 802). Barad's theory of "posthumanist performativity" is an attempt to restore agency to materiality, but not as a force existing outside of the productive powers of discourse: neither materiality nor discourse is given causal efficacy on its own, as opposed to dualist ontologies. Using quantum physics as her inspiration, Barad posits an account of phenomena as the basic epistemological unit that is not individual but relational. Barad argues that *phenomena* are the basic unit of ontology. *Phenomena* are not individual but relational, they are part of relations that do not precede these relations. These phenomena are constitutive of reality, as "reality is not composed of things-in-themselves or things behind phenomena but "things"-in-phenomena" (Barad 2003, 817). This view of performativity is similar to Butler's, but with the complication of both bodies and discursive practices intra-acting such that neither bodies nor discourse exist prior to one another. Rather, both bodies and discourses are formed in *intra-action* with one another to constitute a phenomenon of a sexed body. Not only humans, but nature, are attributed agency. Barad helps us move beyond Butler's notion of performativity by insisting that neither "words" nor "things" are ontologically prior, and each are produced in relation to one another in an ongoing series of intra-actions between apparatuses. Rather than iterative citationality, as in Butler's theory, Barad theorizes performativity as the iterative *interactivity* of matter in its becoming (2003, 828).

Barad's work is one example of feminist theorizing that attempts provide the grounds for theorizing about the relationship between materiality and social practices without reifying nature/culture dualism. While her work can be critiqued for its reliance

on the scientific discourses of quantum physics for much of its authority, the effect of her work is to challenge us to see the agency of materiality as necessary part of the equation of performativity—not on its own, but as part of an irreducible relationship with social practices. Predating Barad's work by more than a decade, Donna Haraway's work on the subject, body and technology in her figure of the cyborg drives home some of the same points regarding the intra-activity of culture and nature, but specifically addresses the challenges for feminist theorizing in the contemporary age of the primacy of capitalism and technology. Haraway's broad project of questioning "what counts as nature, for whom and at what costs" (Haraway 1997, 104) signals an important basis for the critique of bodies in their biopolitical constitution as natural elements.

Haraway's figure of the cyborg is model of culture/nature integration that does not presume the irreducibility of either 'culture' or 'nature' in terms of embodiment, but rather, focuses on how 'culture' and 'nature' are mutually entangled. In the figure of the cyborg, "nature and culture are reworked; the one can no longer be the resource for appropriate or incorporation by the other," (Haraway 1991, 151). The cyborg is a model of the subject that is not a 'pure' body or subject that is situated in opposition to the culture, economy or technological apparatuses it is embedded; it is part and parcel of the world.

With the possibility of being "exceedingly unfaithful to their origins" in a mode of late-capitalism dominated by militarism and technologism, (Haraway 1991, 151) the cyborg is a figure rooted in blurred lines between identities, culture/nature, and the human/animal and of course, between the biological and technological. The

political/material moment that shapes our ontology as cyborgs need not be rejected for some idea or purity, especially a return to a real or imaged feminist utopia or positive re-valuing of some notion of woman's essence based on her 'biological' body. Haraway writes, "[a] cyborg body is not innocent; it was not born in a garden, it does not seek unitary identity and so generate antagonistic dualisms without end (or until the world ends); it takes irony for granted" (Haraway 1991, 180). In taking on the myriad forms of cyborg embodiment, Haraway rejects the unity of gendered identities, that there is a subject called 'woman' or any other stable category. Haraway also encourages engagement with technologies theoretically and politically to recast the possibilities for life: technoscience has not only produced our bodies, but also has given us the grounds of our subjectivity, which we may use and subvert for our own purposes. Our bodies are always already deeply 'unnatural' yet still have material resonance.

Haraway puts forth a kind of performative understanding of bodies, specifically the bodies that are the objects of scientific and technological interventions. "The notion of a 'material-semiotic actor' is intended to highlight the object of knowledge as an active part of the apparatus of bodily production, without *ever* implying immediate presences of such objects, or, what is the same thing, their final or unique determination of what can count as objective knowledge of a biomedical body as a particular historical juncture. Bodies as objects of knowledge are material-semiotic generative nodes. Their boundaries materialized in social interaction; 'objects' like bodies do not pre-exist as such" (Haraway 1991, 208). Scientific practices are political practices that determine the form our bodies should be. At the same time, these practices do not fully constitute our bodies

90

or our political possibilities; these same bodies create different, and possible emancipatory, possibilities. "We need the power of modern critical theories of how meanings and bodies get made, not in order to deny meaning and bodies, but in order to live in meanings and bodies that have a change for the future." (Haraway 1991, 187). Undermining nature/culture dualism by challenging the sex/gender distinction necessitates understanding the object of knowledge to be a kind of agent in the production of knowledge about it (Haraway 1991, 198-199).

In her broad questioning of "what counts as nature, for whom and at what costs" (Haraway 1997, 104) Haraway presents important challenge for a critique of bodies in their biopolitical constitution. She challenges us to interrogate the category of the natural, to see it as always already embedded in a particular, and situated, political/material reality. Haraway also challenges us to view the costs of the category of the natural in terms of what politics are enabled, and what are disqualified. This is, to my mind, a question of the biopolitical, but one that surpasses the biopolitical. The question of the 'natural' is central to Haraway's figuration of the cyborg as well as in her later work on the human/animal distinction.

In the above discussion about the social production or materiality of bodies, it is clear that it is neither necessary nor possible to draw a line between the material or discursive, or between culture and nature—such distinctions are artificial and are the result of particular, contingent practices. However, the implications for the theorization of the subject become clearer: our bodies are not passive vessel for our minds, nor blank slates for the inscription of social structures. Bodies, in their various constitutions, exert

91

agentic forces on their own that are not reducible to minds or to discourse. Despite the trouble her own work faces in dealing with culture/nature dualism, Butler's statement that "understood as a broader concept, sexual difference has psychic, somatic, and social dimensions that are never quite collapsible into one another but are not for that reason ultimately distinct" (Butler 2004, 186) is useful for thinking about the overlapping yet distinct contours of materiality and social production in theorizing embodiment.

Having discussed several key aspects of feminist theorizing of the embodied subject from a post-dualist perspective—bodies as socially produced, bodies as marked by difference, and bodies as productive—as well as the political rationale and implications behind these arguments, I turn now to further elaborate on the importance of feminist theories of embodiment for undermining key assumptions of the stories that IR tells about bodies. I conclude by considering recent work by Judith Butler that advances on understanding of life as precarious and argue that this theorization provides a critique of liberal, biopolitical understandings of bodies.

Vulnerable Bodies and Precarious Lives

Both scientific models and liberal social and political theories are indebted to the notion that individuals are the units that make up the world. These individuals exist prior to the law and await representation, in language and in politics. Biopolitical understandings likewise posit both individual bodies and populations as pre-existing units awaiting political representation and intervention to protect them. Performative

understandings in which individuals come to appear as such as a result of specific social and political formations undermine these basic premises, and posit a way of thinking about bodies that is fundamentally relational and immanent: bodies as not self-contained in themselves or in their relations to others. Feminists have theorized our bodies as ontological vulnerable; a vulnerability that cannot be done away with and that stems from both the 'cultural' aspect of our bodies being embedded in social relations as well as the 'natural' or 'material' side of our bodies as needing care as well as subject to violence, illness and inevitable decline.

Butler's theorization of bodily life as fundamentally precarious is expressly concerned with the political and ethical implications of bodies as socially produced, marked by difference, yet also material and marked by material needs. Here, I argue that Butler's explicit concern with the conditions enabling people to lead 'livable lives' is not a recent development, but infuses her work as a whole. The precariousness and vulnerability of bodies is an ontological argument with a great deal of political importance; it is here that her work is in important ways a synthesis of the ways of thinking about bodies this chapter has enumerated.

Feminists have described vulnerability as a constitutive feature of subjectivity that arises from embodiment, as we all may be harmed, injured, or become ill. Our embodiment also necessitates care in infancy and childhood, as well as in old age (Fineman 2008). In *Precarious Life,* Butler makes a stronger statement than in her previous work about the ontological, rather than epistemological, status of bodies, in particular, that bodies are constituted by vulnerability—both in terms of the social

production of bodies, as site of desire and vulnerability to physical violence (Butler 2004, 20).

Butler's model of bodily precariousness posits bodies as always already requiring supplementation. By 'supplementation,' I mean first of all, that bodies have no independent material existence; they require food, water, rest and shelter and at certain points during the lifespan require care from others to survive. Secondly, bodies require supplementation in that they have no independent social or political existence outside of their discursive production. This is precisely the point of bodies coming to *matter*. In order to live a "liveable life" bodies have to be made intelligible through symbolic, cultural practices.   I've broken down these two points in a way that reproduces culture/natural dualism for clarity; Butler posits bodies as culturally and materially embedded in her concern with the social and political conditions for life.

Butler's concern with 'bodies that matter' and the conditions under which certain embodied subjects can lead 'liveable lives,' is, I argue, fundamentally a question about biopolitics. While the question of sovereign power—whose lives can be taken under what circumstances—is also embedded within this framework, it is the concern with biopolitical that makes Butler's contribution distinctive. The concern with 'bodies that matter' is another way of addressing Haraway's question of "what counts as nature, for whom and at what costs" (Haraway 1997, 104). Whose bodies are considered 'normal' and whose are marked by excessive or monstrous corporeality is not only political question of great import, but one that cannot finally be answered definitively. As Judith Butler writes, "the limits of constructivism are exposed at those boundaries of bodily life

where abjected or delegitimized bodies fail to 'count' as bodies" (Butler 1993, 15). Butler examines the relationship between bodily norms and culturally intelligibility, in terms of whose lives come to matter politically and who is excluded from mattering 'matter' in both her earlier works of *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies that Matter* and as well as in her more recent works *Precarious Life* and *Frames of War*. In terms of gender and sexuality, she writes of medical interventions into the lives of intersexed people as well as the violence that confronts queer and transsexual/transgendered people. Norms of sex and gender matter, because they foreclose, often violently, the kind of lives that are livable. Butler makes that point that this critique does not only extend to norms of sex and gender, but to "all kinds of bodies whose lives are not considered to be 'lives' and whose materiality is not understood to 'matter'" (Butler 1998, 281).

Bodies in their precariousness are not quite autonomous as they are in liberalism. Butler points explicitly to violence as a reason why we cannot consider bodies as fully autonomous individuals. Precisely because one's body can be injured and killed, we are bound to others in our vulnerability. Butler writes, "the body has its invariably public dimension. Constituted as a social phenomenon in the public sphere, my body is and is not mine. Given over from the start to the world of others, it bears their imprint, is formed within the crucible of social life" (Butler 2004, 24). Butler does not deny the importance of political struggles to articulate and defend a space of bodily autonomy for those who have been denied control over their bodies. Rather, here Butler emphasizes a body that is not conceived of as the autonomous enclosure of the self, but rather is the medium of relations with others—its boundaries are porous, as it can be violated, but can also

violate. It is from this discussion of Butler's work that I take this work's epigraph "the body implies mortality, vulnerability, agency: the skin and the flesh expose us to the gaze of others but also to touch and to violence" (Butler 2004, 26).

Butler's recent work is an eloquent statement of what is at stake in how we theorize bodies in relation to violence and loss that exist as an ever-present reality of social life. That the subject is bound to the other as a constitutive feature of his/her subjectivity, a subjectivity that therefore always already entails a loss but also in a radical relationality to alterity, is a consistent features of Butler's work and is most notably reformulated in *Precarious Life*. The precariousness of all bodies is exposed by paying attention to the 'constitutive outside' of bodies: the abject other that is included by its exclusion. These exclusions: the bodies of women, homosexuals, non-white, disabled bodies are central to the functioning of the system which sets male, heterosexual, white and healthy/able-bodied bodies as the standard, neutral, or universal body.

Like Fineman, Butler offers up on ontology of bodily vulnerability. Bodily vulnerability is not the characteristic of particular populations within the general population that call for additional government intervention and protection. Vulnerability, as theorized by Butler is a general condition of being an embodied subject. This vulnerability precedes the formation of the individual self. Humans, as always already produced in relationality to others who are similarly produced, are vulnerable to each other in ways that surpass physical violence. We are mutually entangled with each other such that we cannot separate. Our bodies themselves do not precede social entanglements, and thus we cannot consider an ethics of violence differently than existing

96

frameworks that separate bodily existence from power. Butler's Levinasian account suggests bodily vulnerability is not a problem to escape, but rather is a condition of our very being. Bodily vulnerability is not only a function of the body's materiality; its fragility and susceptibility to injury and death in biological terms; whether one is subject to such harm and physical coercion is a social matter—whether one's life is survivable is dependent upon how the body is socially constituted.

This social and relational ontology of the body suggests we bear a kind of responsibility for the lived experiences and livability of certain lives—but not as fully conscious, rational subjects. "If the ontology of the body reserves as a point of departure for such a rethinking of responsibility, it is precisely because, in its surface and its depth', the body is a social phenomenon: it is exposed to others, vulnerable by definition" (Butler 2009, 33). Humans, as always already produced in relationality to others who are similarly produced, are vulnerable to each other in ways that surpass physical violence. We are mutually entangled with each other such that we cannot separate. Our bodies themselves do not precede social entanglements, and thus we cannot consider an ethics of violence differently than existing frameworks that separate bodily existence from power. Butler's account suggests bodily vulnerability is not a problem to escape, but rather is a condition of our very being. Bodily vulnerability is not only a function of the body's materiality; its fragility and susceptibility to injury and death in biological terms; whether one is subject to such harm and physical coercion is a social matter—whether one's life is survivable is dependent upon how the body is socially constituted.

Conclusion

Feminists have struggled with the question of embodiment for explicitly political reasons: to interrogate discourses of the body in order to ground a politics aimed at ending women's subordination. However, the question of 'the body' and its place in politics and philosophy has proved complicated and thorny; feminists can neither simply claim nor disown 'the body,' or even 'women's bodies' as they have been constituted in modern and liberal thought but must struggle to theorize bodies as fully political. Theorizing embodiment from a feminist perspective, or drawing on feminist theories thus does not necessarily entail focusing solely on bodies as masculine or feminine. Questions of gender and sexual difference are clearly an important aspect of feminist theorizing about embodied subjectivity, but, I argue, a feminist theoretical perspective on embodiment is not limited to these questions. Butler's enunciation of the problem of the production of bodies in terms of whose body *matters* and who can lead a livable life is a question not only related to the intelligibility of the subject as properly gendered, but as a proper subject more broadly. Indeed, the next chapter does not deal with the questioned of gendered bodies except in passing; the two chapters that follow discuss gendered norms of bodies at greater length but the gendered body per se is not the focus of this work.

Judith Butler argues that sexual difference is not a foundation for feminism but rather, "*a question* that prompts a feminist inquiry, it is something that cannot quite be stated, that troubles the grammar of the statement, and that remains, more or less permanently, to interrogate" (Butler 2004, 178). Rather than reifying the nature/culture dichotomy that is at the core of the sex/gender distinction, a feminist perspective on

embodiment would advance a more profoundly deconstructionist project by considering how discourses and bodies are entangled in the practices of International Relations. This chapter has provided somewhat of a 'method' for theorizing the body from in terms of biopolitical security practices; in following chapters I look explicitly at several practices of political violence in International Relations in conjunction with Butler and her contemporaries attempts to 'think the body' in order to more fully come to grips with the relation between violence, embodiment and subjectivity in our contemporary world order.

Chapter 3: *Dying is Not Permitted: Sovereignty and Biopower at Guantanamo Bay*

Having outlined some of the key debates and terms on which feminists theorize the subject as embodied, I turn now to the first of three chapters each addressing a separate mode of contemporary violence. Practices of torture, hunger striking, and force-feeding present challenges to how international relations theorizes bodies and subjects, complicating both the notion of bodies as strictly material, organisms and of subjects of self-preservation. As such, these practices show both the need to think about security *biopolitically* in terms of the politics of life itself. Guantanamo Bay, one of the most controversial sites of violence in contemporary international relations is an example of the tensions between sovereign and biopolitical forms of the exercise of power in and through bodies and shows how violence practices not only harm bodies, but produce them as legible in a variety of ways. Bodily practices of torture, hunger striking, and force-feeding show, contra biopolitical understandings of bodies, the bodies that are the objects of various security practices are not natural and independently existing entities but exist in virtue of complex sets of relations in their material existence.

In the U.S. naval base at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, prisoners captured in Afghanistan and around the world are held in indefinite detention without a juridical decision as to their guilt or innocence. Since the time the detention center opened in July 2002, 775 prisoners have been brought to Guantánamo Bay, and around 175 remain in January 2011. They have been subjected to techniques that the George W. Bush administration referred to as "enhanced interrogation techniques" but that fit the legal definition of torture. While the Obama administration has disallowed torture, it has also

refused to close the prison at Guantanamo or give prisoners trials. As a protest against their treatment and detention, as many as 200 prisoners have undertaken hunger strikes. One hunger striker, Binyam Mohamed, said to his lawyer, "I do not plan to stop until I die or we are respected" (Leonnig 2005). In response, military officials have opted to force-feed these prisoners by inserting tubes into their stomachs through their nasal passages while restraining them. Defending this practice, military physician John Edmonson asserted, "I will not allow them to do harm to themselves" (Miles 2006, 110).

Hunger strikes have occurred at Guantánamo from the time the detention center opened. In June 2005, hunger strikes reached a peak, when between 130 to 200 out of approximately 500 prisoners at Guantánamo Bay began refusing food. The *New York Times* has reported that at least 12 prisoners have been subjected to force-feeding, while lawyers say the prisoners have reported 40 or more (Golden 2007). In January 2009, the *Times* of London reported that 44 out of the 248 inmates were refusing food (though visiting lawyers reported that more than 70 were on hunger strikes) (Reid 2009). During the Bush administration, these strikes took place in the context of practices that are widely considered to constitute torture, such as sleep deprivation, humiliation, and the use of stress positions. The Obama administration has not, as of May 2011, followed through on its promise to close Guantanamo Bay and has abandoned plans to try Khalid Shaikh Mohammad in a federal court in New York (Shane and Landler 2011).

The simultaneous torture and force-feeding of hunger striking prisoners points to the ambiguous role of 'the body' in contemporary, biopolitical security practices: the body occupiess an intermediary role between subject and object. By referring to the body

101

as object, I mean that the body is acted upon, injured or treated in a direct way, but also, that the body is produced, made into an object of knowledge by social and political forces that constitute the body as we know it. This is a more indirect way of making the body into an object. The body can also be considered a subject; that is, it has a sort of political agency in its own right that is not reducible to the will of the mind occupying it as in a Cartesian model of embodiment. The political dynamics of the violence of torture and force feeding in this context are best understood when read through the rubric of feminist theories of embodiment, which, as I argued in the last chapter, compel us to pay attention to the ways in which the body as we know it is both the product of social and political forces as well as itself an agent of politics.

The simultaneous torture and force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners points to the exercise of two distinct logics of power: sovereign power and biopower. By being tortured, the prisoners are objects of the sovereign's ability to act directly on their bodies or, in Michel Foucault's terms, to "take life or let live." However, the deaths of the detainees pose a limit for the exercise of sovereign power—simply put, they cannot be killed. Rather, the health of prisoners is closely monitored by medical professionals, and hunger-striking prisoners are force-fed in order to prevent their deaths, evidence of what Foucault calls the exercise of "biopower"—a technology of power that can, in Foucault's terms, "let die" and "make live" (Foucault 2003, 247) through the management of biological life and populations. This entwinement of military and medical discourses forces the prisoners to live as a particular type of subject. In other words, through the conjunction of torture and force-feeding, the prisoners' bodies are made into not only

102

"useful bodies" for providing intelligence but also "dependent bodies" that are not autonomous agents but recipients of care that must be efficiently managed. The practices of torture, hunger-striking and force-feeding demonstrate the ambiguous nature of bodies: neither solely cultural nor material, they are both produced by violent practices, and capable of producing politics themselves.

In the context of the war on terror, torture has been assessed in terms of its usefulness in providing citizens with short-term as well as long-term protection (Brecher 2007; Dershowitz 2002; Hannah 2006; Shue 1978). Torture is also justified by the crimes and identities of the terrorists—they are, in Rumsfeld's words, the "worst of the worst" (Seelye 2002). These two logics are contradictory, because the security rationale for torturing prisoners does not require the prisoner to be guilty of any crimes, only to have knowledge that could be used to save lives. In academic as well as policy debates, the hypothetical ticking-time-bomb scenario has structured the ethical question of torture in the war on terror; assuming that the guilty captive has the necessary knowledge, this scenario asks whether torture should be authorized in order to prevent the deaths of dozens or hundreds of civilians (people who are presumed innocent, just as the captive is presumed guilty). The ticking-time-bomb scenario also assumes that the torture will work, that causing the captive bodily pain will yield "actionable intelligence." The body of the prisoner is thus produced as a site of information to be gleaned in the most efficient way possible as well as a site for the exercise of sovereign power, the power to punish. But while the bodies of prisoners may be subject to violence for the extraction of information, they are also objects of care for the preservation of their useful lives.

103

Forcing hunger-striking prisoners to live does more than breach the state's moral obligation not to torture: torture and force-feeding serve to enact U.S. sovereign power while displacing vulnerability onto the individual subjectivity of the prisoners. Held in a legal and territorial gap and subject to torture for an indefinite period of time, the prisoners' existence is defined by an array of political technologies that refuse them even the choice to die in order to end their endless imprisonment. The exercise of torture at Guantánamo Bay and elsewhere by U.S. officials is not an instance of sovereign power exercised on a juridical subject, as portrayed in Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, but is rather a moment in the exercise of sovereign power though biopolitics on subjects produced not as liberal subjects of consent, nor economic subjects of rationality, but as a quasi-population of dependents who must be managed. In these cases, violence is best understood as *expressive*: the violence serves to create and reinforce subjectivities and relations of power between the U.S. military and the prisoners through the exercise of sovereign power on the bodies of prisoners. These uses of violence are expressive precisely because they enact and express U.S. sovereignty while undoing the individual subjectivity of prisoners who are held indefinitely. The use of torture and force-feeding expresses the troubled, uneasy relationship of sovereign power and biopower and highlights the sociality of violence as effecting the production of "worlds" or the possibilities of existence as a human subject.

In developing this argument, I first discuss the motivations for the use of torture in terms of Foucault's categories of sovereign power, discipline, and biopower in order to articulate the paradox of applying violence through torture while maintaining the health

104

of prisoners, including force-feeding hunger strikers. I then demonstrate how the exercise of sovereign power through torture meets with anxieties over injuring and killing the human body. I show how the use of hunger striking as a protest against torture and force-feeding makes use of the materiality of the body and its relationship to other bodies in a way that challenges liberal and biopolitical assumptions about the body and subject. In the final section, I discuss how anxieties that constitute the paradox of sovereign power and biopower are manifested in the force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners, an exercise of power that transforms prisoners from dangerous "enemy combatants" to a biopolitical subjectivity as recipients of care.

Torture as Sovereignty, Discipline, and Biopower

Why has the United States resorted to torture in its war on terror? Torture is something that liberal political communities are supposed to have left behind in their premodern pasts, rejected as an abuse of state power against vulnerable people. For Foucault, torture exemplifies sovereign power in the classical period. Torture was used ritually to extract confessions and punish criminals. If sovereign power is the power to "take life or let live," (Foucault 1979, 48) then the sovereign uses torture to punish in self-defense, and as such, the tortured body represents an enemy of the sovereign rather than a citizen. Torture marked the body directly and thus performatively established the power of the sovereign.

But in the war on terror, torture and indefinite detention in Guantánamo Bay take place not as part of a juridical discourse of truth and guilt but rather as a means for gathering ostensibly life-saving information and to quarantine dangerous subjects apart

from the U.S. population. While the use of torture in the detention camps at Guantánamo Bay at first glance appears to resemble the tactics of disciplinary power, torture in this context is more consistent with the exercise of sovereign power through biopolitics. The bodies of the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay, though subject to torture, cannot legitimately be killed.[7] Torture demonstrates a contradiction in the exercise of biopower and sovereign power: while sovereign power names the power to "take life or let live," and biopower names the power to "make live and let die" (Foucault 2003, 241) the simultaneous exercise of torture and force-feeding at Guantánamo Bay indicates the exercise of power that not only injures the body but refuses to kill or allow the death of the tortured body. In order to explain the contradictions of sovereign power and biopower in the exercise of torture at Guantánamo Bay, I first argue that discipline, while seemingly apparent in the prison setting, is not the primary logic of power operating. Rather, the logic of torture is biopolitical, meant to protect one population at the expense of a "risky" population. However, this explanation, too, is insufficient to account for the operation of Guantánamo Bay. Torture in this case is a practice of sovereign power, exercised through biopolitical techniques.

Insofar as Guantánamo Bay is a detention camp, with daily life managed and controlled, it would seem to exemplify disciplinary power—a mode of power in which people are not dominated directly, as in sovereign power, but are turned into docile subjects, their bodies micromanaged so that they will be useful and compliant. Unlike

---

[7] This is not to say that prisoners have not died at Guantánamo Bay, or that they have not been intentionally killed. Three prisoners who had been reported to have committed suicide in June 2006 are suspected of being murdered based on testimony from prisoners and former military personnel. See Horton 2010.

biopower, which works on populations, disciplinary power is centered on molding individuals. Several key techniques of disciplinary power described by Foucault are used at Guantánamo Bay, from the division of space into cells, the control of activities by timetables, and the organization of men by categories and ranks (Foucault 1979, 138-49). Prisoners are kept to a precise schedule of eating, drinking, washing, and saying prayers, with these activities denied to prisoners who engage in "bad behavior." These details of the regulation of prisoners' movements and activities in order to compel cooperation with interrogators are contained in a 263-page document on standard operating procedures at Guantánamo Bay.[8] The prisoners are subject to the documentation of every deviation from what is considered acceptable behavior in order to produce specific knowledge about each detainee in order to better manage all of them. Minute details about a prisoner's behavior are noticed and reported, an example of how disciplinary power "allows nothing to escape" (Foucault 2007, 45) in its quest to create docile subjects.

Sovereign power and disciplinary power produce the subject the sovereign purports to regulate, rather than reflecting a preexisting subject. Through torture, the body of the prisoner is made to signify the guilt of the prisoner, to make him into the social type 'terrorist'. Vulnerability is also located in the bodies of the prisoners through the practice of torture. Read as a performative practice as well as a violent injuring, torture works to make the torturer invulnerable and the torture victim into a vulnerable subject. As Judith Butler writes, "one locates injurability with the other by injuring the other and then taking the sign of injury as the truth of the other" (Butler 2009, 178).

---

[8] Camp Delta Standard Operating Procedures, Joint Task —Force Guantánamo, March 28, 2003.

Likewise, through force-feeding, the body of the hunger striker becomes intelligible as an irrational 'dependent'. The nominal purpose of torture at Guantánamo is to produce a docile, productive subject who will give information to interrogators. The "stress and duress" torture techniques, such as being kept in solitary confinement for days and lowering the temperature in their cells, are specific disciplinary technologies used to make prisoners submissive and useful to interrogators (Danner 2009).

However, the fact that Guantánamo Bay is to be kept out of the public eye suggests that something other than disciplinary power is at work. Both sovereign power and disciplinary power are meant to be visible: the former through spectacles that make the power of the sovereign present to the citizenry and the latter through the creation of a morality tale about a dangerous person being reformed and becoming an obedient person. The ambiguous legal place that the prisoners of Guantánamo Bay occupy points to difficulties in considering them strictly objects of disciplinary power. Peremptorily declared guilty by the United States, they have not been convicted and also are not subject to rehabilitation. Unlike a prisoner who breaks a social contract, the "terrorist" is a decidedly foreign subject, as evidenced by the difficulty in assigning the label "terrorist" to domestic perpetrators of political violence.[9] Even though international law is clear that everyone must have some status under the law (a disarmed person is either a prisoner of war or a civilian), the United States has claimed the special, extralegal status of "enemy combatants" for prisoners at Guantánamo Bay. Many prisoners at

---

[9] Following a wave of abortion clinic bombings in 1984, the FBI refused to investigate the crimes as terrorism. As such, there was no coordinated federal effort to stop the violence for more than a decade (Jenkins 1999).

Guantánamo have been held for more than seven years without charge or trial. The Bush administration has denied that even Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions applies to Al Qaeda detainees because the conflict between the United States and Al Qaeda is neither between states nor a domestic civil war (Yoo 2005, 49). Even though the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the 2006 case of *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* that the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay must be given fair trials, trials have yet to occur by 2011 for all but one of the detainees, and the Obama administration has de facto given up on trying the prisoners in civilian courts.[10] As the prisoners are not domestic subjects, the intended audience for detention and torture seems obscure. However, there is a way in which torture and indefinite detention play to a U.S. domestic audience—Americans are made to feel safe not only from terrorists but from the techniques of biopower. The torture of Guantánamo Bay prisoners, who are bodies of information, is consistent with the instrumental logic of biopower and the management of populations.

While the lack of juridical guilt and the indefinite detention of the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay indicate that disciplinary power is not the only, or even primary, technique of power, these very characteristics signal that techniques of biopower are being exercised. Biopolitics is a moral discourse that moves away from the political realm of the rights and obligations of individuals and toward a model of familial care in which the main justification of sovereign power is to provide for the health and welfare of its people. Biopower concerns itself with risk and chance events that affect

---

[10] Ahmed Khalfan Ghailani was acquitted in a civilian court in November 2010, of all but one of 280 charges against him related to the 1998 U.S. embassy bombings after being held in various CIA 'black sites' and Guantánamo Bay after his capture in 2004.

populations, such as diseases, famines, and the seemingly random violence of terrorist attacks. As the prisoners are detained on the basis of their assumed dangerousness to the United States if they were to be released, what they present is not an established danger but a risk of future danger. They are presumed to have the capacity to commit random, violent acts: in other words, the risk is that they will carry out violence that is itself constituted by chance and uncertainty in the form of a terrorist attack. The Justice Department has declared that the United States may detain prisoners not only if they are known or suspected of being agents of Al Qaeda or affiliated organizations but also if they are deemed to "constitute a clear and continuing threat to the USA or its allies" (Bradbury 2005b). Thus, aside from any evidence of involvement in a terrorist organization or the planning of terrorist acts, a person may be detained indefinitely on the declaration that he or she is dangerous to the United States. The prisoners are described as "the most dangerous, best-trained, vicious killers on the face of the earth," by US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (Washington 2002). The 'terrorists' are constructed as unfathomable in their mental states, as 'killing machines' in a discourse of savagery in opposition to civilization (Butler 2004; Howell 2007). These subjects of biopower are not necessarily the villains and enemies of society who break the law out of malice; rather, they are aberrations, whose threat to society is more diffuse and amorphous, (Foucault 2007, 7). They are not necessarily immoral subjects; they are amoral, as they cannot be rehabilitated into obedient domestic subjects.

Techniques of security are intended to minimize risk, and, to this end, torture has been deployed as a means of quickly obtaining information intended to prevent terrorist

attacks. Thus the use of torture is made consistent with the exercise of biopower. Yet torture is known to be ineffective as a tool for information gathering. In the United States, interrogation experts have long recognized that the victims of torture frequently provide inaccurate information, as tortured people often say whatever they believe their torturers want to hear (Rejali 2007; Thomas 2006; Glanz 2004). There is evidence that official documents cautioning against the utility of torture, even if it were deemed to be legal, were suppressed (Finn and Warrick 2009). Prisoners at Guantánamo Bay have made false confessions under torture, and those false confessions have provided the basis for ongoing torture of the original prisoner as well as others (Worthington 2009; Worthington 2007; Finn and Warrick 2009). The capture of failed airplane bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab in late December 2009 led to renewed calls for torture to be used to gather information from terrorist suspects, despite Abdulmutallab's willingness to cooperate with authorities. Likewise, the killing of Osama bin Laden in May 2011 has also reignited the debate over torture; however, there is no evidence that torture produced any information that helped to located bin Laden. Furthermore, interrogators involved in the case and even the head of the CIA, Leon Panetta, have denied that that information gathered by torture led to the capture of bin Laden (Shane and Savage 2011). Torture is known to be ineffectual at gathering accurate, useful information; and even if it were effectual, these doubts suggest there are other logics at play than a strictly strategic rationale.

The biopolitical rational for torture does not fit with the experience of the body being tortured. Torture relies on a calculation of pain, such that the precise amount can be

111

applied that will make the target "break," a logic of information based on biopolitical concepts of rationality and utility. While practices of torture make use of medical knowledge about bodies, the subjective experience of pain is not quantifiable. Humans vary greatly in their ability to endure pain. Pain is also not a singular, measurable experience but can take the form of many sensations, which may counterbalance one another (Rejali 2007, 446-450). As the experience of pain is subjective, it is difficult to quantify or control. The experience of psychological torture is even more difficult to predict. This incoherence between the logic of rational information gathering and the subjective nature of pain is at the heart of interrogational torture. The subjective experience of pain suggests that the infliction of torture is not entirely consistent with an exercise of biopower, as it cannot be properly ordered or structured

Biopolitics is also insufficient to explain the practices of torture at Guantánamo Bay because the prisoners are not being killed. In fact, the preservation of the lives of the prisoners despite their torture is at the core of the tension between biopower and sovereign power in the treatment of the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay. Foucault writes that the sovereign must make a distinction between who must live and who must die as a necessary component of the practice of sovereign power in biopolitical regimes (2003, 254-55). By this logic, in order to protect the lives of the domestic population, the source of risk must be killed. In the contemporary torture regime at Guantánamo Bay, however, sovereign power is exercised on "undesirables" in such a way that the object is not their deaths but their production as a particularly risky subject. Torture prevents its victims from having the kind of lives that biopolitics promotes in its positive form of furthering

the health and longevity of the population. In the practice of torture, "the violence can unfold as something irresistible, even unlimitable, except that the death of the vulnerable one… always does constitute a limit" (Cavarero 2009, 31). Biopower, in this sense, has not led to the intentional deaths of the prisoners but, rather, has imposed a limit on the extreme use of sovereign power—the power to kill. Bodies are tortured, but they are not allowed to die. Death operates as a limit on the torturer as well as on the agency of the prisoner. The prisoner cannot be killed because he must be made to speak. This limit suggests a different interpretation of the role of sovereign power and biopower than the interpretation of those who suggest that sovereign power produces a subject who can be killed.

It could be argued that a strategic rationale exists for the decision to simultaneously torture prisoners for information, but not to let them die: to allow their deaths would mean that the prisoners could no longer supply the information needed to save lives. The point of analyzing the practice of torture by the United States in this context is not to argue there is no strategic or instrumental logic being deployed, but to examine the assumptions that underpin the logic of torture to show how they constitute certain embodied subjects.

Furthermore, carried out behind closed doors, modern torture is an invisible spectacle in which the emphasis is not on the visual spectacle for an audience, but on an exchange of pain and information. The emphasis on the subject of torture 'breaking' and the release of certain kinds of information about the Guantanamo Bay prisoners (such as photographs showing prisoners in orange jumpsuits, shackled, wearing goggles and

113

kneeling on the ground) and suggests that part of the process is also performance of submission to the sovereign. The oxymoronic phrase 'invisible spectacle' suggests that torture as a performance of sovereign power is still being carried out, but because of the need to operate within the terms of biopolitics, this spectacle is muted, only carried out with a great deal of anxiety.

Torture as an Anxious Practice of Sovereign Power

As the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay have been declared enemy combatants who have no standing in international law, what then prevents the United States from killing them outright, as they might have done if they encountered these "terrorists" in a battle? Despite the insistence on the prisoners' lack of legal status, the prisoners' lives are officially protected. They may be tortured, but they must be kept alive. Foucault defines the paradigms of sovereign power as the power to kill or let live, and it is exercised directly on the body of the criminal in the form of pain and death (Foucault 1979: 48). Torture, in this reading, marks the body directly and performatively established the power of the sovereign by its ability to mark bodies in this way. Judging by its willingness to use violence, but its unwillingness to take lives or let the prisoners take their own lives, the United States appears troubled by the exercise of sovereign power.

In ancient Greece, torture could be used to release the truth from a slave's body but not a citizen's. Slaves (and women and barbarians) were bodies, pure materiality, while citizens had reason (Dubois 1991, 52). But the distinction between slave and free is unstable, not "given by nature." Judicial torture served to maintain the distinction, as only

114

the bodies of women and slaves were thought to be able to release truth through bodily pain. Torture served as a way of marking these social hierarchies. While the context and meaning of torture have changed, the use of torture to produce and sustain hierarchies of political subjectivities remains. Torture serves a similar function in the context of Guantánamo and the war on terror: it produces its own rationale by using pain to unmake the subjectivity of the prisoner while making present the power of the sovereign.

By the infliction of pain, torture produces hierarchical relations through its demonstration of the torturers' strength in an act of sovereign power. Elaine Scarry's *The Body in Pain* describes how torture can destroy the victim's subjectivity. Undergoing intense pain and unceasing questioning, the victim is reduced to the space of the "natural body" incapable of speech, of entering the symbolic realm of language. Scarry's thesis is that torture reduces the body to a world of pain. The extreme pain of torture is inexpressible in language, and thus the subject's world is unmade because the pain has no referent in the outside world. The victim's lack of language destroys his or her subjectivity. Scarry writes:

> It is intense pain that destroys a person's self and world, a destruction experienced spatially as either the contraction of the universe down to the immediate vicinity of the body or as the body swelling to fill the entire universe. Intense pain is also language-destroying; as the content of one's world disintegrates, so that content of one's language disintegrates; as the self disintegrates, so that which would express and project the self is robbed of its sources and its subject (Scarry 1985, 35).

Scarry presents a model of torture in which there are two distinct subjects: a torturer and a prisoner. The torturer becomes invulnerable, effectively disembodied, and comes to be identified with voice and world, while the prisoner experiences only pain and the body

(Scarry 1985, 36). The torturer speaks with the voice of the sovereign, and the victim, deprived of subjectivity, is made to speak as the sovereign wishes, making present the existence of the sovereign. The sovereign is made present in the body of the tortured, not by the death of the prisoner, but by the unmaking of the world of the prisoner.

Scarry's analysis of torture shows the extent of sovereign power in the twenty-first century. While her work has been criticized for its separation of language and body (Butler 1997; Bkare-Yusuf 1997; Rivera-Fuentes and Birke 2001), it powerfully demonstrates precisely how language and bodies are mutually entailed. Torture demonstrates sovereign power's ability to reduce bodies to materiality. In torture, the victim is made to "speak the name of the sovereign," in Paul Kahn's telling phrase (Kahn 2008, 42). Torture serves as the means not only of producing "truth" but also of making present the sovereign.

The tortured body is broken, but it must be kept alive so that it can provide information or labor. It must be able to speak or work. The imprisoned victim of torture is meant to provide information, his body made to speak, to subvert his own will to silence. As bodies reduced to pain, tortured prisoners are not liberal speaking subjects, able to make claims against the state. While torture is a bare display of sovereign power, it destroys the type of subject that would constitute that sovereignty. By disabling the prisoner's ability to speak, the US prevents the speech act that underpins the consent of the ruled that characterizes liberalism; rather, the prisoners are forced to speak with the voice of the sovereign. Neither can the subjects of torture be "remade" as Scarry's exemplars are, because they are not being prepared for reintegration into society. The

116

bare display of sovereign power destroys the very subjects of sovereign power. Scarry frames her discussion in terms of world-making and world-destroying. World-making and world-destroying can have multiple intended audiences, however. While the torture may be world-destroying for the tortured, it can be world-making for its intended audience in the United States and abroad in terms of its substantiation of U.S. sovereign power.

The torture of prisoners at Guantánamo Bay is an expression of sovereign power that is met with much anxiety in the United States. This anxiety is manifested in two modes of distancing the sovereign from torture: a geographic distancing and a political distancing. The special status, or lack of status, that the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay hold, as the United States declared, suggests that the United States could claim the sovereign right to kill as well as torture, as the prisoners are enemies outside the protections of any social contract. Yet the prisoners are maintained and sustained in camps. The prisoners must be held by the sovereign—witness the outcry from politicians over various proposals in 2009 to release Guantánamo Bay detainees in the states represented by these politicians. Likewise, there is great anxiety over the proposal for housing Guantánamo Bay prisoners in maximum-security prisons in the United States, despite the presence of other persons convicted of terrorism within these very facilities.[11] The prisoners, and their torture, must be kept at a distance from the sovereign. Anxiety over the status of prisoners who were captured in Afghanistan as suspected Al Qaeda

---

[11] Convicted foreign terrorists in the Supermax prison include Zacarias Moussaoui, the so-called twentieth hijacker; Wadih el-Hage, of the 1998 embassy bombings; and Ramzi Yousef, leader of the 1993 World Trade Center bombings. See Johnson and Pincus 2009.

members who pose a threat to the United States has led to the quarantine of these prisoners within U.S. control but outside U.S. sovereign territory. Since 2002, the U.S. government has used Camp Delta at the Guantánamo Bay naval base to house prisoners captured in Afghanistan and elsewhere, citizens of countries such as the United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Syria. Guantánamo Bay is not the only such site; others include Bagram Airfield in Afghanistan, numerous prisons in Iraq including Abu Ghraib, plus an unknown number of Central Intelligence Agency black sites in a secret internment network that comprises facilities in Thailand, Afghanistan, Morocco, Poland, and Romania (Danner 2009; Priest 2005). The political battle that raged when President Obama tried to have Khalid Shaihk Mohammad tried in a civilian court in New York City, an attempt that was ultimately withdrawn pivoted around, first, security fears over the danger that the presence of one highly restrained prisoner might cause (as part of a discourse of terrorists/ Guantanamo prisoners as fanatical killers). Underlying these fears, is the fear of more attention to the US torture regime and the fear of key evidence against Mohammad being excluded as it was gained under torture, leading to his release.

Torture is also distanced from the sovereign by the use of euphemism and official denial. Referred to as "enhanced interrogations," torture is not outright accepted. President Bush has famously stated, "we do not torture," while administration spokespeople and supporters vehemently assert the necessity of conducting these "enhanced interrogations." The Obama administration, while denouncing torture and

promising to close Guantánamo, has yet to do so, ostensibly pending acceptable alternative arrangements for the prisoners.

While torture violates liberal values prohibiting the illegitimate use of violence by states against citizens, it also appears necessary or at least useful in performing the presence of the sovereign. One key example of torture in reproducing sovereign power through the obliteration of subjectivity is the repeated waterboardings of several "high-value" prisoners. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was waterboarded 183 times and Abu Zubaydah waterboarded at least 83 times according to declassified Bush administration documents (Bradbury 2005b). The sheer number of waterboardings casts doubt on the official rationale of information gathering, as the likelihood that each successive waterboarding will make the subject more likely to share information he is holding back seems small, yet the rationale for the use of waterboarding remains that it will compel the prisoner to produce information. If the subject occasionally provides some information after waterboarding, the question then becomes at what point has he given all the information he has to give and how much of that information was false. This repeated performance of violence suggests an ongoing attempt at stabilizing sovereign power through the destruction of subjectivity. The medicalization of the torture techniques also shows unease with the practice of torture.

Torture as practiced in this context is dependent upon certain medical regimes of truth about the human body. Torture advocates cite the many safeguards in place to secure the life and health of the subjects of torture and medical professionals object to the violation of patient's rights as well as to the inherent harm of torture. Modern practices of

119

torture, unlike the ones Foucault describes as examples of sovereign power in *Discipline and Punish*, are designed to avoid leaving permanent marks on the body. The body of the torture victim is an intermediary rather than the object of the torture. Instead of the bloody spectacles of flogging, amputation, limb stretching, and beating associated with torture in the classical era, contemporary torture practices are aimed at bloodlessness and invisibility.[12] The torture techniques used by the U.S. military and its proxies include waterboarding, sleep deprivation, exposure to heat and cold, electric shock, sensory deprivation, intimidation by dogs, insects, and humiliation by sexual abuse (Bradbury 2005). These tactics have been labeled "stealth technologies" because they are difficult to document (Rejali 2003). The experiences of prisoners released from Guantánamo Bay and other detention sites suggest that different techniques were tried out in order to judge their efficacy at causing pain without seriously threatening the life of the subject (Danner 2009). Famously, the "Bybee memo" argued that to be considered torture, the pain inflicted had to be "equivalent in intensity to the pain accompanying serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death" (Yoo 2002). Such discourses indicate that, for torture to be acceptable, a biopolitical rationale must underwrite the practice of sovereign power.

The torture program has created, and made use of, a body of knowledge about the human body and what it can endure without dying. The complicity and assistance of medical personnel are essential to the practice of torture. The discourse of the biological

---

[12] Detainees have also reported being beaten at Guantánamo as well as other detention camps. These forms of abuse were intended to be kept secret and, unlike tactics such as sensory deprivation, stress positions, and waterboarding, have not been justified as crucial for information gathering.

body, in its physical limitations, not only is essential to the practice of torture but is produced from the knowledge gained through torture. Medical professionals are on hand to ensure that such torture tactics are not taken so far as to permanently damage the bodies of the victims (Miles 2006, 50-67). In fact, part of the reasoning as to why these "enhanced interrogation techniques" do not constitute torture is that medical personnel are present to ensure the safety of the prisoners. Memos from the Justice Department to the CIA's Office of General Counsel, for example, provide numerous assurances that no detainee will be subjected to treatment that is "counterindicated" by psychological or physiological evaluations. The Justice Department claims, for example, that "OMS [the CIA's Office of Medical Services] closely monitors the detainee's condition to ensure that he does not, in fact, experience severe pain or suffering or sustain any significant or lasting harm" (Bradbury 2005). This is not to say that prisoners subjected to torture techniques in truth do not experience "severe pain or suffering." Rather, this demonstrates the extent to which medical knowledge is integral to the practices of torture in not only producing effects on the prisoners but also attempting to limit harmful effects so that the prisoners are kept alive. The purpose of medical supervision is made clear in the statement of a CIA official speaking of Abu Zubaydah, "He received the finest medical attention on the planet. We got him in very good health so we could start to torture him," (Suskind 2006, 100).

Despite the protestations of the Justice Department, the attempt to conduct these "enhanced interrogations" in a perfectly controlled manner is based on the idea that health, life, and death are, in fact, controllable. As of 2006, at least nineteen prisoners

121

have died of their treatment at the hands of U.S. soldiers and interrogators, though the deaths of many more may have been covered up (Miles 2006, 71). More than one hundred prisoners have died in U.S. custody in Afghanistan and Iraq in the first three years of the war on terror, a number that is surely higher today, although the government has not released more recent information (Nanji 2005). The claims that the techniques used by U.S. forces do not cause severe or lasting harm have also been shown to be false (Physicians for Human Rights 2005). The dream of perfectly controllable violence, in which medical and legal safeguards prevent any lasting illness or harm despite increasing levels of deprivation, suffering, and violence, is a fantasy of sovereign power—the perfect gaze of the panopticon (Foucault 2007, 66). Bodies cannot be entirely controlled by sovereign power. In this space for accidents, the body resists sovereign attempts to manage it completely. The materiality of the body provides another space for resistance: the hunger strike.

Hunger-Strikes and the Body in Pain

Widespread hunger strikes at Guantánamo Bay began over allegations of mistreatment of the Koran and became a mode of resistance to the indefinite detention and ill-treatment more broadly (Worthington 2007, 271-76). Even in an environment in which sovereign power is exercised to a remarkable degree over the lives and bodies of prisoners, the refusal to consume food and water constitutes an act of resistance by the hunger strikers. In the face of a power whose goal is to keep prisoners alive but indefinitely imprisoned, the hunger strikers attack their own bodies by refusing to live

indefinitely in such conditions. Under conditions in which their worlds and subjectivities are being so destroyed, hunger strikes are the only way of enacting self-government. By harming their own bodies, they attempt to exercise power over meaning. In trying to martyr themselves, they deny the presence of the sovereign and assert their own sovereignty over their bodies. The hunger strikers' attempts to enact subjectivity comes at the cost of the very materiality of their bodies.

To demonstrate how the hunger strike exposes the inadequacies of IR's conceptions of the body, I return to Scarry's theorization of pain's unmaking of the subject to show its inadequacies in theorizing the potential of bodies to enact certain forms of politics. Scarry argues that the extreme pain of torture is inexpressible in language, and the subject's world is unmade because the pain has no referent in the outside world, it does not represent any 'thing'. Because of this lack of referentiality, the victim's lack of language destroys his or her subjectivity. The unrepresentability of pain means that the victim is unable to enter into the symbolic realm. This reading of the body in pain is limited because it does not posit any agency for the body. Veena Das' rethinking of the body in pain in reference to the tortured body is a fruitful opening into this problem and can help us to think about kind of political claim that the hunger striker makes in this situation. Das argues that pain is not so much a matter of its unrepresentability in language, as much as it is a call for recognition. The expression of pain is a call for recognition in the body of the other. The experience of pain cries out for the response of the possibility that pain could be reversed, that it could reside in your body instead of mine in a kind of remembrance or imagining (Das 2007). Language may

123

fail in expressing and communicating pain, but, such a failure is always present in language, as language must be removed from 'the thing' so it can fit into an existing signifier and therefore be mediated in language (Epstein 2010). A failure of the pain to be recognized as pain, as possibly reversible, is a failure of someone to be recognized as precisely human.

What this reading of Das suggests is that pain demonstrates that separateness or individuation between subjects and bodies is an accomplishment. This relationship between torture victim and torturer, whether that torturer is one or several people, or is connected to an entire state apparatus, can be thought of as exposing, and contributing to, a particular relationality in the acknowledgement of the realities of pain and the mutual constitution of ourselves as embodied subjects in a particular context that includes other embodied subjects as well. Thus, rather than creating distance between the 'superempowered' torturer and the radically disempowered prisoners, pain can connect both embodied subjects through an imaginary of pain. As Asad reminds us, "What a subject experiences as painful, and how, are not simply mediated culturally and physically, *they are themselves modes of living in a relationship*" (Asad 2003, 84). Pain is a way of possibly entering into a relationship—but what relationship depends upon the response to pain, how it is allowed to be expressed. Torture and other forms of violence are an exploitation of the primary vulnerabilities of bodies. Das and Asad give us a way of thinking about how we can differently establish relations and rethink connections— through attention to the material body in its social and political relations. The subject of torture in this way is not an autonomous subject trapped in his or her own bodies—or

transcending it in the imperviousness of the torturer, but bound in relations of recognition.

Thinking about bodies in terms of bodily relationships moves us away from thinking of justice in a Kantian, abstract sense but in a way in which we are not divorced from the social and political conditions we are acting in. The torture victim—whose torture and pain are hidden, denied and justified at the same time—turned hunger-striker contradicts the liberal presumption of the subject in international relations and enacts a bodily politics of relationality and recognition. In seeking recognition as a political subject his own painful demise, Binyam Mohamad and the other hunger strikers at Guantanamo Bay lay bare the contradictions and limitations in the way in which the subject is theorized in IR, especially in regard to matters of the biopolitical security state.

As a hunger striking prisoner in Guantanamo Bay, Binyam Mohamad said, through his lawyer, "I do not plan to stop until I die or we are respected." What Mohamad is calling for here is *not* a classical liberal appeal to the state on behalf of human rights so much as it is a call for *recognition* of the prisoners as political subjects by an international community. Indeed, had it been an example of the former it could be judged an immediate failure: the official response to Guantánamo protestors has been to force-feed the hunger strikers. Mohamad's actual statement, however, suggests the limits of the liberal political subject and the neoliberal politics of security in more broadly in his rejection of the preservation of his own body at the expense of recognition, a concept of relationality that would establish his political subjectivity.

By hunger striking, prisoners have been able to live their pain in a different relation to the liberal state, and to the international community. The hunger strikers are living their pain agentically, in a way that they are neither victimized by, and that, crucially, requires a material body that can not only experience pain, but weaken and die. The body of the hunger-striker is an excessive, hysterical body that makes pain manifest. The brutal domination of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay is based on 'stealth' techniques of torture calculated not to leave marks on the body and are also calculated not to lead to the death of the person being tortured. In contrast, the body of the hunger striker will weaken and die; it will manifest the signs of violence. It will show the effects of sovereign power, even if the sovereign power being exercised here is of the prisoner over his own body. The body of the hunger-striker is transformed into a weapon—in this way, officials are not precisely in wrong that this is a form of war, or at least, politics. This is a form of agency, however, that is not strictly based on decision by the conscious will of the subject but rather depends upon the unpredictability of the material body in its need for supplementation through sources external to itself. Hunger strikers may be able to prolong their suffering, but they cannot precisely control their body's reaction to denial of the necessary supplementation all bodies require to live. Bodies have an internal life all their own that we can never be free of. Hunger striking is a form of politics that reveals the liberal ideal of freedom from external control to be a kind of myth or a flawed presumption because it assumes we can leave our bodies behind. Hunger striking explicitly seeks *not* to leave one's body behind, but to make its functioning central to politics.

Also, Mohammed's invocation of a "we"—a plural subject— in his statement "I do not intend to stop until I die or we are respected" suggests a call not only for recognition of political personhood for himself as a human individual, but for the very possibility for a collective subject. The collective subject is disqualified in liberalism, at least in the public sphere (in contrast to the private sphere in which the family is the preeminent unit). Of course, by "we" Mohamed could be referring to an aggregation of individuals that were and are being held in Guantanamo Bay, but that is not necessarily what this statement *does*. What this statement *does,* in conjunction with weakening and damage to the body of the hunger-strike, is performatively invoke a collective subject deserving of recognition by an international community through the lived bodily vulnerability of Mohamed and the other hunger-strikers. This claim for recognition is also not a claim for the recognition of what Mohamed or the other hunger-strikers and prisoners already are, but also is a part of becoming something else in making that claim in relation to a collective subject and an international community (see Butler 2004, 44).

If we understand pain as a lived relationship with others, how one lives one's pain depends on that relationship and whether that pain is acknowledged as pain. Pain in this sense is not a private or passive experience. Pain is also not only a negative, something to be avoided as it is in liberalism. Pain can be lived agentically and with and through other people, in ways that cannot be understood through our frameworks for thinking about the subject as located only within a singular human body, or in a framework of Cartesian dualism, but can form the basis for responsibility and responsiveness. These hunger-strikes that bodies are not only produced by, and inscribed by power as the body of the

127

Guantanamo Bay prisoners is through the violence of torture and regimes of race, gender and sexuality that constitute the 'terrorist' but that these same bodies can be thought of as productive or agentic in their resistance to their constitution not only as subjects being forced to live, but as individuated as well. Such a way of living in one's bodies challenges the biopolitical terms in which bodies are being made to live by revealing the political and material supplementation required for 'natural' bodies to live. In response to such a response by the prisoners to the conditions under which they are being made to live, US officials have resorted to force-feeding the hunger strikers to continue their exercise of sovereign power through biopolitical strategies of 'making live'.

Force-Feeding and the Transformation of Political Status

To the American people and the rest of the world, hunger strikes and the force-feeding of hunger strikers are part of the battle over the meaning of the violence committed against prisoners' bodies. U.S. officials defend the use of force-feeding, which medical ethicists claim is a violation of human rights, by insisting not only that the hunger strike is a tactic of war but that they are force-feeding prisoners for the prisoners' own well-being. These seemingly contradictory logics of health and war are, in fact, part of the same logic of sovereign power. Only representatives of the United States are allowed to inflict pain and violence on the bodies of detainees—the detainees themselves are forbidden the same right. The exercise of biopower on the bodies of the hunger strikers is a perverse form of biopower's power to "make live," as it is exercised directly on the bodies of the negative subjects of biopower, the dangerous bodies of "terrorists."

128

Force-feeding has the effect of making the "terrorists" legible and forces a type of normative status onto them, as infantilized "dependents." This effort is aimed more at an American audience as well as a broader global audience, in terms of assuring people of the safety and efficacy of such techniques of biopower.

The hunger striker is neither a juridical subject of sovereignty nor the liberal, rational subject of biopower but a dangerous subject who is attempting to reconstruct a political subjectivity. Given that "terrorists" are not considered to act rationally, torture is somewhat paradoxical under the biopolitical rationale of seeking information through the infliction of pain and discomfort. To inflict pain upon a "terrorist" is to expect that person to act rationally to preserve his body from pain and injury and provide the information the interrogators seek. By courting death through hunger strikes, the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay refuse this attempt to normalize them. They resist sovereign power's rights over life and death as well as biopower's determination to ensure life (Foucault 2003, 247-48). The liberal subject as a rational, willing subject must single-mindedly strive for his self-interest. This also cannot meaningfully describe the hunger-striking prisoner, who suffers pain and harms his own body, eventually leading to his death if he is not force-fed.

The force-feeding of hunger strikers not only robs the prisoners of one possibility of enacting sovereignty over their own bodies but also has the effect of forcing normative status on them, not as moral subjects but as dependents of the state. They are made into legible subjects who, it might be said, never had it so good. The military reports that the detainees are fed very well and are gaining weight. Chief Petty Officer Colleen M.

Schonhoff, who is in charge of preparing food for the detainees, stated, "I like to believe they're eating a lot better here than they were wherever they were before they got here. We take pretty good care of them" (Williams 2002). Lindsay Graham, Republican of South Carolina, has stated that the Guantánamo Bay detainees receive better treatment that the Nazis did because the Supreme Court ruled that the prisoners were entitled to habeas corpus (Raju 2008). Senator Jim Bunning, Republican of Kentucky, was impressed to learn that the detainees "even have air-conditioning and semiprivate showers" (Kirkpatrick 2005). Michael D. Crapo, Republican senator from Idaho, reported that the military personnel at the camp "get more abuse from the detainees than they give to the detainees" (Kirkpatrick 2005). Democratic senators Richard Durbin of Illinois and Ron Wyden of Oregon have also given assurances regarding the treatment of the prisoners after a visit to Guantánamo Bay. By affirming the camp's relative comfort, despite the complaints of prisoners, these accounts reinscribe the prisoners as a quasi-population in need of management, even though they neither are domestic subjects nor they are intended to be a permanent population.

The use of force-feeding to keep hunger-striking detainees alive indicates a transformation of the political status of the prisoners from enemy combatants, to terrorists, to a quasi-population. Force-feeding makes the prisoners into objects of medical knowledge, a prerequisite for making them into objects that can be managed as dependents of the sovereign state. They are transformed from illegible terrorists into threats that are being managed competently. The force-feeding is conducted by medical professionals who are screened before they are deployed to Guantánamo to make certain

they don't have moral objections to force-feeding (Miles 2006, 110). Around February 2006, the military began using restraint chairs to hold the prisoners while they were being force-fed. These chairs resemble dentist's chairs with restraints for the arms, legs, head, and torso. The military says they are necessary for the safety of the prisoners as well as to prevent them from throwing up after the feeding. Journalists have reported on the use of unnecessarily large nasal tubes that cause extreme pain and bleeding when forcibly inserted (Fox 2005). Overfeeding, which causes cramps, nausea, and diarrhea, is also frequently accompanied by prolonged restraint in these chairs, ostensibly to ensure absorption of the nutrients and prevent self-induced vomiting.

Outside the terms of any social contract, the "terrorists" are transformed into subjects of a minimal exchange in which information is traded for the sustainment of life. This exchange is far from the liberal ideals of equal and autonomous subjects contracting with one another. By force-feeding the hunger-striking prisoners, the United States makes its sovereign power present over the bodies and lives of prisoners. In a fully biopolitical regime, not permitting the deaths of prisoners is central to the logic of sovereign power. Force-feeding is justified in biopolitical terms of preserving the lives of the prisoners and produces the prisoners as a quasi-population to be managed by doctors and administrators. A Pentagon spokesperson has responded to charges of ill-treatment in force-feeding by saying that Defense Department officials "believe that preservation of life through lawful, clinically appropriate means is a responsible and prudent measure for the safety and well-being of detainees" (White 2006). In a facetious dismissal of accusations of abuse, one report asserted that hunger strikers were said to be given a

131

choice of colors for their feeding tubes and lozenges to soothe their sore throats (Zagorin 2006). Hunger-striking prisoners are force-fed if they have refused sixty-three consecutive meals or have not eaten for twenty-one days, or if they drop below 85 percent of their healthy body weight. A doctor's approval is also needed, in the latter case (Reid 2009). Dr. William Winkenwerder, assistant secretary of defense for health affairs, insisted, "There is a moral question. Do you allow a person to commit suicide? Or do you take steps to protect their health and preserve their life? The objective in any circumstance is to protect and sustain a person's life" (Golden 2006). Officials have defended the force-feeding of prisoners by claiming "it is our responsibility to make sure that the detainees are kept in good health" (Golden 2006). To suggestions that the policy of force-feeding violates the ban on "outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment," of Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, officials have responded by invoking the language of Common Article 3, which states "the wounded and sick shall be collected and cared for" to justify the force-feeding of prisoners (Mitchell 2009). While medical ethics and Defense Department guidelines allow for force-feeding only for cases in which immediate treatment is necessary to prevent death or serious harm (Department of Defense 2006), the fact that the prisoners are healthy enough to need restraint suggests that force-feeding was being done well before the lives of prisoners were in danger.

Military officials also claim that hunger strikers are operating under a strategic logic, as agents of Al Qaeda continuing their battle against the United States even while in prison. A *Time* magazine articles reports: "Harris [Defense Department spokesperson]

132

argues the camp will be needed for the foreseeable future, and that refusing to eat is not a cry for help, but a ploy drawn from the al-Qaeda playbook calculated to attract media attention and force the U.S. government to back down." Harris is also quoted as saying, "The will to resist of these prisoners is high. They are waging their war, their jihad against America, and we just have to stop them" (Zagorin 2006). The same article equates the hunger strikes with suicide attempts, arguing that both similarly seek to bring negative attention to Guantánamo so it will be shut down. Another spokesperson for Guantánamo Bay, Robert Durand, said, "The hunger strike technique is consistent with al-Qaeda practice and reflects detainee attempts to elicit media attention to bring international pressure on the United States to release them back to the battlefield" (Melia 2007). Durand also denied that the hunger strikers have made any specific demands or requests. Officials have declared the hunger strikes to be "acts of war." The framing of hunger strikes as part of the "al-Qaeda playbook" indicates the instability of the prisoners' new status as a quasi-population. This line of argument keeps the logic of both biopower and sovereign power in play. Against arguments that force-feeding is an abuse of sovereign power, the idea of hunger strikers as enemies and terrorists can be invoked. Against arguments of violating the human rights of prisoners, the biopolitical logic of preserving the lives of prisoners under the care of the United States may be invoked. Thus, the force-fed hunger strikers occupy an unstable position as not-fully-terrorist enemies but not fully members of a population to be managed either.

While doctors have been involved in the force-feeding of prisoners at Guantánamo Bay from the beginning, ostensibly to ensure the safety of the prisoners,

they have also led the charge against the practice of force-feeding hunger-striking prisoners under the banner of human rights. More than 250 medical professionals have signed an open letter to the *Lancet*, a British medical journal, demanding an end to force-feeding as a violation of the medical ethics of the American Medical Association and the World Medical Association. According to the codes of ethics of both organizations, force-feeding is considered an "assault on human dignity" so long as the prisoners or patients are capable of making an informed decision (Nicholl 2006). This view is premised upon understanding hunger strikes not as a form of suicide but as a form of political protest—as essentially the political speech of a rational subject. Medical ethicists have also condemned the force-feedings by specifying the duties doctors have to patients who decide to undergo hunger strikes: above respecting the sanctity of life and the health of the detainees, physicians are obliged to respect the autonomy of patients who freely choose to go on hunger strikes and understand the consequences of their actions (Nicholl 2006; Physicians for Human Rights 2005). The labeling of force-feeding as torture per se, aside from the brutal measures used in its execution, is premised upon the Enlightenment view of the subject as an autonomous will that controls the body. It is also premised upon a liberal subject that is *homo œconomicus*, with preexisting preferences and interests that the government cannot prevent him from pursuing. Medical ethicists insist that the refusal of food in this context is a matter not of pathology, psychological or otherwise, but of free choice. Medical ethicists consider force-feeding of competent persons, which intervenes in this control over the body, to constitute torture through an abridgement of the rights of hunger strikers.

In the discourse of medical ethics, hunger strikers are positioned as patients (as opposed to enemy combatants continuing their battle in prison) for whom certain rules govern relationships with doctors. The main object is the prisoner/patient and his subjectivity as a rational bearer of rights. Force-feeding, medical ethicists insist, is permissible only when it is first of all necessary for the health of a patient who is unable or refusing to eat and, second, when the refusing patient has been deemed mentally impaired and unable to understand the consequences of not eating and drinking. Force-feeding becomes a matter of psychiatry, in which doctors must determine if the patient is sufficiently rational to freely make the choice to refuse food. This medical discourse is inseparable from a liberal discourse of individuals as rights-bearing subjects, so long as they are deemed rational.

However, the discourse of force-feeding articulated by the military doctors and spokespersons suggests not an autonomous, rational subject with rights but rather a deranged subject who needs to be protected from himself. By force-feeding the hunger-striking prisoners at Guantánamo Bay, military personnel are not so much violating liberal principles of a subject's rational control over his or her own body but producing the detainees as irrational and "insane," in need of care and management. Judith Butler argues that the indefinite detention of the prisoners at Guantánamo Bay is comparable to the indefinite detention of patients in mental institutions (2004, 72). Some hunger strikers are held in Guantánamo Bay's psych ward as suicidal and are under constant surveillance (Melia 2007). If the indefinite detention of mental patients is a suitable model for the indefinite detention of prisoners, then there is a corresponding analogy to the mental

135

status of both kinds of patients. An advertisement from the company that makes the restraint chairs is accompanied by the slogan "It's like a padded cell on wheels" (Golden 2006). Force-feeding through nasal tubes is widely used with comatose patients or those suffering from psychiatric diseases. In these situations, it is not seen to be problematic, because such persons are deemed incapable of making rational decisions on their own behalf.

If the mental status of the hunger strikers is unfathomable and outside the bounds of accepted, civilized thought, then the detention and force-feeding can be justified. As figures of madness and dependency, the hunger striking prisoners at Guantanamo Bay can be more comfortably detained indefinitely. Produced as both irrational and dependent the prisoners do not need to be acknowledged as deserving the minimal human rights of trials to determine their guilt or innocence. However, it is not the preexisting mental status of the prisoners that leads to their indefinite incarceration and force-feeding; rather, it is the practices of detention and force-feeding that produce the prisoners as subjects of irrationality and unfathomability. This is consistent with the production of "terrorist" subjectivity, but with an added dimension of social responsibility. When we consider the military discourse of hunger striking as a tactic of war, the fact of hunger striking is not what is produced as unfathomable or unknowable; it is the minds of the prisoners themselves as agents of al-Qaeda that are produced as irrational and uncivilized. Once the prisoners and the hunger strikers in particular are produced as irrational subjects, then the state is authorized to intervene to "make live." The hunger strikers are figured not as dangerous but infantile, in need of the benevolence of the United States in order to

136

remain alive. The production of hunger-striking prisoners into dependent figures of unfathomable moral and mental status not only has implications for the treatment of the prisoners but, perhaps more crucially, also has the effect of making the United States more comfortable with its exercise of sovereign power against its own liberal norms.

The dual techniques of sovereign power and biopower can be used to understand the transformation of the political status of American citizens. Aside from managing the prisoners, the force-feeding of hunger strikers serves to assure Americans that the technologies of biopower are safe—that they need not be concerned with interrogational torture nor suspect prisoners' rights are being violated by force-feeding. Months and years after September 11, 2001, instead of decrying the decadence and complacency of American society that helped allow the attacks to occur, the discourse shifted to recapturing a sense of urgency and unity of purpose in addressing the threat of terrorism. Two years after September 11, President Bush stated in a speech that "the enemy is wounded, but still resourceful and actively recruiting, and still dangerous. We cannot afford a moment of complacency. Yet, as you know, we've taken extraordinary measures these past two years to protect America" (Bush 2003). Some of these extraordinary measures include authorizing torture. The war on terror, as officials frequently reminded Americans, is a long, if never-ending war. The threat of terrorism is to be considered ever present, and everyday life is to be rearranged around the prevention of terrorist attacks. As one official said, "It is just a fact of life and we have to deal with it" (Baker 2002). Producing the prisoners as not only vaguely dangerous but also dependents in need of

care makes Americans feel safe that the threat of terrorism is not only being managed but being managed in a humane way.

The act of force-feeding transforms the moral status of the hunger-striking prisoners from "enemy combatants"—figures outside any social contract—to humans susceptible to management, of minimal interrelations. While force-feeding suggests that there is something incurably pathological about the "terrorists," it does not necessarily indicate their exclusion from any body politic (cf. Howell 2007). In sustaining the lives of hunger strikers by this means, the prisoners are included in the body politic in a way that produces them as figures of dependency. The threat of terrorism is thus managed by taking away freedom of speech in exchange for the speech of information. While medical ethicists attempt to assert that the prisoners are liberal subjects of rights, the continued force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners makes the prisoners a symbol of diffuse danger on the border of political community. At the same time, it assures Americans that they are safe from the threat of terrorism because the terrorists are being managed competently. From this argument, we can read the Obama administration's delay in closing the prison at Guantánamo as based on not only operational difficulties but difficulties in assuring the American people as well as Obama's political opposition that the former Guantánamo Bay prisoners would pose no threat if housed domestically. Force-feeding gives rise to a new understanding of Senator John McCain's 2005 statement against torture in response to an admonishment about the nature of the terrorists: torture "is not about who *they* are. It's about who *we* are" (Herbert 2005).

Conclusion

138

The practice of torture and force-feeding tells us little about the people we torture but much about the troubled exercise of sovereign power in a liberal, biopolitical society. Torture and the force-feeding of hunger-striking prisoners not only strip the prisoners of subjectivity but remake U.S. subjectivity. By constituting the prisoners of Guantánamo Bay as figures of indefinite captivity and dependency rather than as killable enemies or untenable risks, the United States exercises its sovereign power in a way that assures its American audience of the safety and desirability of biopolitical techniques, thus reforming the political status of American subjects as well as the "terrorist" subjects who must be held but kept at bay, tortured yet kept alive.

The broader issue here is of the undecidability of the subject position of the prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay. Their uncertain status means that their subject positions must be produced: through practices of torture and force-feeding on the bodies of these prisoners, they are transformed into 'terrorists' and then to irrational dependents. The violence is thus not only destructive to the bodies of the prisoners, but productive in the sense that it transforms these bodies into particular kinds of subjects.

In terms of my overall project, this chapter has done two main things. First, it has unsettled the realist and liberal assumptions about the subject as self-preserving, 'natural' and pre-existing politics, as well as speaking and willing though theorizing the effects of violence on the subject as an embodied subject. Second, it has begun to introduce an alternative theorization of the body in International Relations by showing how bodies are both produced by discourse and by violence (in terms of the subjects of both 'terrorist' and 'dependent') as well as bodies that are productive (as the bodies of hunger-strikers).

Both of these points indicate a model or theorization of bodies as not existing in their own right; they require supplementation either in terms of their social and political designations (as 'terrorist,' 'dependent,' or even as 'individual') as well in their material needs to sustain life. In the next chapter, I continue to develop an alternative theorization of bodies in International Relations by theorizing the practice of suicide bombing as an embodied practice that has political consequences that are not reducible to the will of subjects.

Chapter 4:

Explosive Bodies: Suicide Bombing as an Embodied Practice and the Politics of Abjection

If the previous chapter complicated the story of sovereign practices of security by showing how they were infused with biopolitical rationality, this chapter argues suicide bombing is a practice that explicitly disavows the biopolitical imperative of the body and makes a mockery of its configuration of bodies. This chapter provides another 'case study' to demonstrate the 'natural' body of biopolitical security politics is actually a specific, political effect of certain practices. Both the practices discussed in the last chapter—torture, hunger striking, and force-feeding—as well as suicide bombing can be understood as practice of violence that explicitly engage and work through the biopolitical. Torture destroys and subjectivity of the target through pain—but in the context of the war on terror, the target is not supposed to die. Rather, the tortured person is suspended in a very diminished capacity for agency, unable to even refuse food or end his own life. The torturers, meanwhile, are virtually invulnerable—they are not at risk of violence themselves while they inflict pain ostensibly to provide information that will be used to prevent terrorist attacks aimed at killing American soldiers and civilians. Suicide bombing, on the other hand, is a mode of violence in which the perpetrator makes him or herself what we may consider *infinitely* vulnerable by accepting certain death in order to inflict not only death and injury upon a few, but vulnerability upon many more. Moreover, the immediate aim of suicide bombing as a form of violence is not the

141

prevention of injury and death to a population as in the contemporary torture regime, but quite the opposite: the destruction of life in a violent, public manner.

The regime of biopower is especially visible in the literature on suicide bombing, which is far more puzzled about the willingness of suicide bombers to take their own lives rather than to kill others. This makes sense, given that taking life on behalf of the state or is sanctioned in war. The willingness to kill, and to risk one's own life to do so is assumed to be unproblematic, insofar as this relationship of the distribution of life and death in political violence is associated with wars of the state, fought on behalf of sovereign power. Purposefully taking one's own life is seen as fanatical, while risking one's life on behalf of a cause is seen as a noble sacrifice. In this way, the suicide bomber is similar to the hunger striker, as neither conforms to the model of the self interested, self-preserving subject. Committing a suicide attack is a transgression not only against the moral prohibitions on murder and suicide, but upsets the biopolitical inclination to remove violence and death from the public sphere. Taking one's own life to kill others is a rejection of the sovereign control over life and death as well as the biopolitical imperative to foster life.

At the moment of the bombing, the bodies of suicide bombers are obliterated, as are the bodies of those nearest to the bomber. These bodies, once constituted as whole and autonomous vessels of subjects, become, in Adriana Cavarero's phrase, "heaps of meat" (Cavarero 2009, 98). This phrase is revealing of the one of the consequences of suicide bombing: the separation of self and body so that only bodies are left behind, rendered inhuman by violence. This act and efforts at both preventing and dealing with

142

the aftermath of the bombing, provide a window into the production of bodies, subjects, and states. To further complicate the model of the body that IR provides, bodies are shown not only to be thoroughly *unnatural* in their intrinsic political and material supplementation, but as only ever partially and impurely differentiated from one another and the political conditions of their existence. Biopolitical regimes of security, which attempt to minimize risk to the natural functioning of bodies, are disrupted by the practice of suicide bombing not only through the injuring and killing of bodies, but through the work that suicide bombing does to make apparent that the natural, biopolitical body is a deeply *unnatural* body.

Suicide bombing troubles the broad narratives that International Relations tells about the practice of political violence. First, it upsets the assumption of the subject driven by self-preservation and the cultivation of the 'good life,' motivations that define realist and liberal narratives of political community. While self-sacrifice in military or altruistic endeavors is hardly unknown, what sets this mode of violence apart is the centrality or even necessity of the death of the bomber in carrying out a mission. IR theorists argue that the use of suicide bombers may be strategically rational from the perspective of a particular campaign. Crenshaw (2007), Bloom (2005), Hoffman (2003), and Pape (2005) all discuss the rationalities of terrorism in terms of the preconditions, grievances, and organizational strategies that explain why a group engages in terrorism, and suicide terrorism in particular. O'Rourke's research on female suicide bombers is similar, as she argues that women are used as suicide bombers because, among other reasons, they are less likely to be apprehended before they strike (2008). However, this

mode of violence is hardly rational from the perspective of self-preservation and the avoidance of pain and injury to the bomber.

Second, IR theorists have attempted to explain suicide bombing by probing the meaning that this form of violence has for particular communities, whether through the concept of martyrdom in Islamic societies or sacrifice on behalf of the nation. The subjectivity of the terrorist, specifically the suicide bomber, is thought of in terms of radical otherness or radical sameness—s/he is either a savage 'wild man' whose motives are incomprehensible to the rational actor, or s/he is a rational actor, or part of a rational organization, and is merely choosing one military strategy among many for its effectiveness.[13] While this mode of violence is linked in popular discourses to radical varieties of Islam, locating the origins of this form of violence to particular religious contexts is of limited value because suicide bombing is a tactic employed by organizations espousing a variety of faiths as well as secular organizations.

In this chapter, I set aside the question of motivations or 'causes' of suicide terrorism that dominate the International Relations literature on this subject. This literature assumes causal rationality, and construct terrorists as either fanatical, irrational subjects or as strategic actors. In this chapter, I argue that there is more to practice of suicide bombing than these stories of motivations can tell us, especially in understanding the special horror and fascination this form of violence seems to hold over the

---

[13] These portraits of the suicide bombers are often conflated. As Slavoj Žižek has pointed out, attributing the motivations of the suicide bomber to the access to dozens of virgins in the afterlife as a type of rational reason ends up portraying the suicide bomber as a ridiculously strange 'Other' (Žižek 2008, 83).

imagination. I examine the phenomenon of suicide bombing[14] as a practice that disrupts the presumed coherence of bodies, states, and subjects, as well as practices of bodily recovery in the aftermath of such bombings that attempt to re-establish such coherence. Rather than attempting to figure out the 'mind' of the suicide bomber in terms of his or her motivations, my analysis centers on the bodies of the bombers and the victims. I am interested in the productive effects of suicide bombing, that is, what can we learn about this mode of violence if we theorize bodies as productive and agentic? I ask what kind of politics is expressed, or produced, by suicide bombing and the practices of recovery and burial that follow as embodied practices. I theorize agency not only as the actions taken by a self-directed subject, but as the effects of such actions, regardless of the intention, stated or otherwise, of the actor perpetrating them. This introduces an element of contingency—the effects of actions may not be consistent with the intentions of the actor. In this sense, bodies may be considered agentic, whether or not such practices are intended or not (see also Bially Mattern [under review], 10-11)

I argue that suicide bombing can be viewed as a material/symbolic act that has performative effects. Suicide bombing is an act of sacrifice, but not necessarily in the narrowly religious or nationalistic sense. By 'material/symbolic,' I refer to the act of bodily sacrifice that enacts meaning and identity. In this way, the act of sacrifice

---

[14] The language used to describe this phenomenon is inherently political. Some scholars feel 'suicide bombing' is too narrow a term to address the range of tactics that require the death of their perpetrators, and use the term 'suicide missions'. Others use the term 'suicide terrorism,' 'suicide killer' or 'homicide bomber.' These latter three are considered to be biased against the various groups who use these techniques. Some groups have referred to such acts as 'martyrdom operations,' a term which seems euphemize the actions. In light of these controversies, I use the more familiar terminology of 'suicide bombing' because I intend the more narrow meaning of the term for the purposes of this paper and because of its very familiarity. It is my intention to take this widely discussed phenomenon and delve into an undertheorized aspect of it; the bodily politics of the suicide bomber.

collapses the distinction between word and deed, as it performatively enacts (or disrupts) a symbolic and political order. Suicide bombing is thus not only a destructive act of killing oneself in order to kill others, but also can be understood as productive act as well. It does this by obliterating the borders of the body, borders that are produced by social and political forces. The bodies produced in this moment as lifeless flesh, as corpses, are a source of horror and disgust. They are what feminist psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva calls 'abject'. By gathering the bodily remains of suicide bombers and victims, the practices of the Israeli organization ZAKA also participates in an economy of bodily sacrifice to reconstitute both bodies and community, acts that can be compared to the performative effects un-reconstructed remains of the 9/11 bombers, as well as the methods of detecting suicide bombers. Suicide bombing thus becomes a site that reveals how power molds, shapes, and constitutes the borders of the body and the state simultaneously. Abjection, as an account of the lived experience of the body, provides an understanding of the power projected and revealed in the practice of suicide bombing. Thus the sacrifice in this context is not a religious ritual *per se*, but refers to formation of the self through the exclusion of the bodily aspects of the abject, and of the disruption of the self by the abject that haunts the self, making it permanently vulnerable. Suicide bombing expresses how the both the contours of the state and the gender order are tied to the production of bodies.

I begin by describing the suicide bomber in connection to the concept of abjection and relate this concept to the bodily practice of the suicide bomber as a body that defies order and boundaries. I then discuss the implications of this politics of abjection for

conceptualizing the relationship between bodies and the state, positing an economy of sacrifice and purification as integral aspects of the simultaneous production of bodies, subjectivities, and states through the attempted elimination of the contaminating abject through the work of ZAKA, work that has implications for the status of the ultra-Orthodox Haredi community in Israel. I consider the efforts made at resignifying the body of the female suicide bomber as an effort to reinstate the gender order that the violent female body challenges. I next turn to the production body of the suicide bomber to the practices of detection at borders and checkpoints, showing how the body of not only the suspected bomber, but also the bodies that are meant to be protected are produced as always already abjected by technological and medical discourses.

I.   The Abject Body of the Suicide Bomber

The body of the suicide bomber may considered 'abject,' that is, a 'constitutive outside' or what is sacrificed in order to bring about the appearance of unity and completeness of the self Thinking about the bodies of suicide bombers as abject allows us to think about the act of sacrifice in a non-romanticized way. Sacrifice is thus theorized in a way that does not reinstate a regime of purity and wholeness for that which is sacrificed, as do narratives of martyrdom as sacrifice for God and country (see Oliver 2006). Sacrifice, in the sense of abjection, acknowledges the necessary failure of the loss to bring about unity, as the expulsion of abject lingers and haunts the self, whether the individual or the state. Theorizing the body of the suicide bomber as abject allows us to grasp the implications of this form of violence in ways that are occluded by conventional

147

treatments of this subject. Namely, the suicide bomber as abject expresses a symbolic power that exceeds strategic calculations, as well as the work necessary to maintain the appearance subject/body coherence, that is, of a singular, complete subject residing in a whole, solid body.

Abjection

Abjection describes the formation of subjectivity through the production of the boundaries of the self, and of the society. This process originates in the child's Oedipal drama, but the usefulness of the concept of abjection goes beyond the psychology of an individual to describe the formation of the boundaries the self more broadly. By expelling the abject, the self creates the boundary between the abject and itself—the expulsion of the abject is a necessary step in the formation of the self. This is not a singular process; the abject haunts and threatens the borders of the self by attraction and fascination, while the self is also vigilant to maintain the borders of the self for fear of such a collapse. In the process of self-formation, "I expel *myself*, I spit *myself* out, I abject *myself* within the same motion through which "I" claim to establish *myself*," (Kristeva 1982, 3). This passage exemplifies the abject as neither subject nor object: the abject is part of the 'I' insofar as the 'I' must expel it in order to create the boundary that defines it. The abject represents a part of the self that must be rejected in order to *become* a self. The abject, though expelled, is thus an essential part of the self, lingering or haunting the unconscious, rendering it permanently vulnerable to disruptions. This, this act is never complete, it is always a process requiring maintenance.

148

Four aspects of the story of abjection are relevant to this discussion: the rejection of corporeality, the maternal body, the abject as not adhering to boundaries, and the question of essentialism. First, the abject is founded on an attempted rejection of corporeality, stemming from the separation of the self from oneness with the maternal body. Kristeva writes,

> The body's inside…shows up in order to compensate for the collapse of the border between inside and outside. It is as if the skin, a fragile container, no longer guaranteed the integrity of one's 'own and clean self' but, scrapped or transparent, invisible or taut, gave way before the dejection of its contents. Urine, blood, sperm, excrement, then show up in order to reassure a subject that is lacking its 'own and clean self' (Kristeva 1982, 53).

The abject is formed in a sacrificial economy, that is, the abject is what is sacrificed in order to create the self. A second key point about the abject is that the abject that is sacrificed is linked to a maternal body. In Kristeva's theory of the abject, the oneness with the maternal body is what is sacrificed, or made abject. The abject is founded by the patriarchal law of the Father through the incest prohibition which requires the subject to exclude the mother's body in order to properly become a subject. In Kristeva's words, "abjection preserves what existed in the archaism of pre-objectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be…" (Kristeva 1982, 10). Kristeva's theory of the abject is based on the sacrifice of what is constituted as feminine, and thus, what is abject is considered feminine.

Third, abjection does not refer to corpses or bodily fluids per se, but rather, that which does not obey borders and challenges the existence of such borders. Abjection works symbolically to expose the psychic, social, and political work necessary to preserve the illusion of whole bodies with unbroken surfaces, bodies that are made to appear whole on the basis of expelling the abject. The abject is what must be expelled

149

maintain the "self's clean and proper body" (Kristeva 1982, 75). By forcibly erupting the abject, making us aware of it, the practice of suicide bombing brings to light the work needed to maintain the illusion of the wholeness of bodies. The presence of the abject reminds us of the precariousness of bodies and subjectivity, and their indebtedness to one another in ways that collapse the distinction between self and body, nature and culture, life and death. As Elizabeth Grosz writes, "the abject demonstrates the impossibility of clear-cut borders, lines of demarcation, division between the clean and the unclean, the proper and the improper, order and disorder" (1990, 89).

Fourth, while some feminists have argued that Kristeva's theory of the abject is essentialist, the concept of the abject need not be rejected on these grounds. Such criticisms necessitate an adaptation of this concept (but not a complete rejection). Judith Butler, for example, has taken issue with Kristeva's location of the abject in the female body, arguing that this relies upon an essential maternal body, that is, a body that is already female, before the self comes into being. This body would then be 'essentially' female, its sex existing before its constitution as a subject. Butler argues, rather, "the female body that [Kristeva] seeks to express itself is a construct produced by the very law it is supposed to undermine" (Butler 1989, 117). Drawing on Foucault, Butler reverses Kristeva's causal formulation that takes maternity to be essential to the female subject. Rather than culture or the symbolic arriving from the repression of a pre-discursive maternal body, Butler argues that the norm of maternity for women functions to generate the subject of women, rather than serve as a prohibition of certain actions for pre-existing women. As Butler writes, "…this production of *sex* as the pre-discursive ought to be

understood as the effect of the apparatus of cultural construction designated by *gender*,"

(1990, 7). Gender is therefore not an attribute of an already-existing individual, but a

temporal process, a 'doing' that produces the effect of an intelligibly sexed subject. There

is thus no need to reject Kristeva's position that culture and the symbolic structure are

founded on the exclusion of the feminine if the 'natural body' or Kristeva's maternal

body is considered to be historically produced, specifically as the effect of a historically

situated economy of sexuality (Butler 1990, 92). Abjection can be considered a discourse

that constitutes sexed bodies, rather than a result of sexed bodies. It is this matrix of

heterosexuality constituting the suicide bombers as brides and mothers that links them to

abjection and femininity.

However, we also need not insist that the social and cultural forces that make up

'culture' are the sole causal forces, and that the materiality of bodies plays no role in

constituting the abject or the sexed body, as Butler's theory does. Karen Barad points out

the ways in which Butler reifies the nature/culture dichotomy as agency is restricted to

human social forces for the production of human subjects. In Butler's theory of

performativity, Barad argues, social forces are still the causal agents while bodies await

inscription. Barad's project is to theorize performativity in such a way that takes

materiality seriously as "performativity is precisely a contestation of the excessive power

granted to language to determine what is real" (2003, 802). Specifically, she describes

how the materiality of bodies comes to play an active role in the discursive production of

bodies, rather than a basis for the passive inscription of social forces. Barad's theory

posits a kind of agency for materiality without backtracking on Butler's work and

insisting on a pre-existing 'reality' of the body in her theory of the 'intra-activity' between materials and discourses.[15] Reading the abjection of the suicide bomber through Barad's ontology of 'interactivity' allows us to understand 'culture' and 'nature' as mutually constitutive, such that we need not suppose the pre-discursive existence of female bodies or of a 'abject,' but rather that these two concepts mutually comprise one another. The mixture of culture and materiality, theorized in such a way that neither is ontologically real absent the other is a particularly useful way of dealing with the problem of the culture/nature dichotomy in theorizing bodies as sexed or raced.

Overall, these critiques/readings of Kristeva show that linking the abject to the feminine may be understood as a contingent, though highly sedimented, material/discursive formation. The symbolic threat posed by the suicide bomber to the order of "clean and proper" bodies and states is suggested by the abject as the sacrificed, but haunting, specter of corporeality and femininity.

Suicide Bombers as Abject

While the broad category of 'terrorist' may be associated with a certain kind of formlessness that is linked to abjection, the suicide bomber as a sub-type of the 'terrorist' is even more strongly linked to the abject. As discussed in chapter three, the figure of the 'terrorist' is associated with a discourse of formlessness, a discourse that reveals the 'abject' status of the terrorist. The terrorist, especially the suicide bomber, does not respect public boundaries, whether state borders, laws, or moral prohibitions on killing

---

[15] Barad's work and its relation to Butler's performativity are discussed in depth in chapter 2.

and suicide. His or her violent acts are, by definition, not tied to the legitimacy of the state and are considered to be unchained to morality as well in their targeting of random civilians. Terrorist organizations are loosely connected cells, operating underground and across state borders. Their operations are thought of as 'shadowy' and 'amorphous'. The body of the suicide bomber, as one kind of 'terrorist,' brings another dimension to this formlessness, as the bomber's own body is made to explode, to exceed its own boundaries in order to destroy and wreck havoc. By randomly destroying the integrity of the bodies of citizens, the suicide bomber exposes the failure of states to provide security in terms of protecting its citizens from harm from external sources. In short, the suicide bomber collapses two boundaries simultaneous: the boundaries between states/national communities and between individual bodies.

Suicide bombing is not only an act that collapses the inside and outside of the body's surfaces, but does so in order to cause the same damage to other bodies. More so than other forms of violence, suicide bombing is a particularly intimate form of killing that brings the bodies of victims and perpetrators together in death, injuring and killing in such a way that collapses the inside and outside of bodies, resulting in a gory spectacle. This evokes not only the corporeality that haunts the subject, but also points to the fluid boundaries between bodies. In deploying a means of violence that shatters the body's (illusory) wholeness, literally reducing it to both a corpse and fluid bits, the violence of the suicide bomber transforms the self into the abject—while transforming his or her victims into symbols of the abject as well. Gayatri Spivak writes of suicide bombing, "Suicidal resistance is a message inscribed on the body when no other means will get

153

through. It is both execution and mourning, for both self and other. For you die with me for the same cause, no matter which side you are on" (2004, 95). The dissolution of the self by exploding the body erases boundaries between self and other as the body of the bomber in its flesh and blood merges with the anonymous others that it targets. The suicide bomber not only pulverizes the boundaries of the illusory self-contained body, but breaches the boundaries that separate bodies from one another, and that separates political identities from one another. It is an act not only of destruction, but of *contamination*. Its message is not only that absolute security of the body's integrity is impossible but also, that the integrity of the social and political order is impossible. It is the violent eruption of the abject, of a feminine symbolic, that has been disqualified in national security state that values the impermeability of its border and the absolute safety of its citizens above all else.

The figure of suicide bomber is not only of formlessness, but of contamination. Terrorists have to be isolated and kept from contaminating and infecting the self. One reason the US holds suspected terrorists at Guantánamo Bay is out of fears of contaminating the US *body politic*. Similar outcry was leveled at the plans to try Khalil Shaik Mohammad in a civilian court in New York City for his involvement in planning the suicide attacks of 11 September 2001, plans which the Obama administration has put on hold. Among the reasons given for why he should not be tried in a civilian court is the fear that he will use the trial as a platform for spreading his ideas and propaganda. This fear is not based in the possibility that his words may prove persuasive to large numbers of people, but rather on some sense of his words contaminating those who may hear

154

them. The construction of the terrorist as figure of contamination is also evident in the political taboo against negotiating with terrorists, or attempting to understand their point of view. The axiom that "we do not negotiate with terrorists" represents this same sense of the terrorist as abject. While a strategic rational exists for this policy, the statement signals a sense of any contact with terrorists as morally polluting. The abject, contaminating nature of the suicide bomber is tied to his or her transgression of the categories of the natural/artificial and inside/outside. By contamination the 'natural' order of things, the suicide bomber is a threat to the biopolitical functioning of the state and society.

Nature, Culture, Technology and the Suicide Bomber

The body of the suicide bomber is a monstrous body, defying the modernist conception of the body that's wholeness and integrity is so taken for granted that it can be transcended, whether in a Cartesian thinking subject or a liberal deliberating subject. The monstrous figure of the suicide bomber suggests a non-normative bodily morphology that calls into question the perceived naturalness of the normative body.   Suicide bombing reverses the modernist conception of the body in which the inside is mysterious, hidden, and the outside, the skin, is what is presented to the world. The skin is a container for the inside and for the subject, which is located therein. The act of suicide bombing as well as attempts to detect and thwart suicide bomber are involved in a complicated series of acts that challenge the liberal, humanist subject and his relationship with his body.

The suicide bomber also becomes an abject figure by blurring the boundaries between nature and culture, biology and technology. The suicide bomber as such exists at the point of concealment of a bomb on, in, or about the body of the bomber. The body of the suicide bomber is not a 'natural' body, but rather an amalgam of flesh and metal, biology and technology. The bomb carried by the suicide bomber is a form of technology concealed in 'natural' body. The 'natural' body and the clothing worn by the bomber conceal the bomb. Clothing, as a cultural layer worn on the body that signifies a particular identity—of gender, of status, of religious or culture—is meant to conceal the 'true' identity of the bomber. The suicide bomber must break the 'law' to carry out his or her mission. They must 'pass' in order to elude security measures and hide their intentions as well as their bombs. Bombers have dressed as Orthodox Jews, and women have pretended to be pregnant, for example, in order to escape close scrutiny and better conceal bombs. The bombs become part of the bodies of the bomber, not only at the moment of detonation, but in an act of incorporation into the bomber's bodily presentation, a presentation necessary for the mission to be carried out. Suicide bomber Wafa Idris's statement, "my body is a barrel of gunpowder that burns the enemy" (quoted in Hasso 2005, 29) captures this sense of the blurred boundaries of body and technology in the practice of suicide bombing. In this way, the bomb plays a different role than a gun, a knife, or a grenade, which extends and enhances the destructive capabilities of the body. It is part of the body and the body is part of the weapon.

The explosion of the bomb is the moment of bringing to light that which is hidden—not only in the true intentions of the bomber, but what is hidden in bodies as

well. In the gory scene of a bombing, the insides of bodies, once hidden by skin, are on full display. In its use of the body of the bomber as a projectile, the suicide bomber becomes a monstrous figure of ambiguity between nature and culture, and in its unreason, between animal and human. Very recently, suicide bombers have taken the concept of the 'human bomb' a step further, and have placed bombs inside human bodies, both corpses and live bombers (Cavarero, 2008: 96, Gardner 2009). From the amalgamation with the metal and other bomb components, to the moment of detonation, the suicide bomber is a body in transformation, a becoming-body rather than a permanent fixture. As such, the suicide bomber evokes the bodily horror of the inevitable bodily disintegration and death, even for those who are not threatened by this form of violence. Of monstrous bodies like the suicide bomber, Margrit Shildrick writes, "in view of the lack of definition, and the potential leakiness across borders, the monstrous body is not just deviant in itself, but is characteristically metaphorized as dangerously contagious, capable of speaking its own confusion of identity" (2002, 68). The threat of suicide bombers as monstrous bodies, apart from the obvious ability to harm, lies in its capacity to contaminate, to spread dis-order and the disintegration of identity.

Some might argue that to theorize the body of the suicide bomber as an abject, monstrous body is to denigrate this form of political violence as especially heinous compared to other forms of warfare that have similar, or worse, dangers for civilians (see Asad 2007). Such an argument, however, would require us to accept the logic of abjection; that what is abjected is bad, filthy, unnatural and the like. We couldn't see abjection as a possible strategy, or, more to the point, as something that not only makes

social and political boundaries visible but also something that moves to erase these boundaries. Accepting the logic of abjection means that the presence of the abject is seen as *only* something that is repulsive, not as something that challenges the boundaries of the clean and proper itself.

One of the aims of this chapter is to theorize the body of the suicide bomber as productive in ways that are occluded by the question of "why do they do it?" that dominates both the scholarly literature and the popular press on the topic of suicide bombers. Thinking of what the body of the suicide bomber *does* rather than what the bomber or his or her sponsoring organization intends leads us to think about bodies themselves as a type of agent, particularly as bodies-in-becoming in ways that challenge our conception of the body as self-contained and self-governing. In their ability to disturb boundaries between bodies, between inside and outside, nature and culture, and between states, bodies are a source of symbolic contamination that reveals the work necessary in upholding boundaries in the first place, boundaries that security practices are driven to maintain control over.

II. Abjection, Borders and the State

In the destruction of bodies in a way that seems meant to bring about the greatest possible damage, bodies are separated from political subjectivity, and thus, made abject. Such bodies are akin to the figure of the *homo sacer* (Agamben 1998), in that they are included in the body politics by means of their exclusion. The mangled corpses that are left behind after a suicide bomber are sacred, in the sense that the act of the suicide bombing has defiled them so that the bodies are no longer 'clean and proper'. The

practice of handing such defiled remains demonstrates the dual nature of bodies; at once both material and symbolic, natural and cultural.

The abject threatens not only the borders of the body, but the border of the social and symbolic order as well. The borders of the symbolic order are maintained by ritual purification. In cases of suicide bombing this ritual purification is undertaken in relation to the treatment of the bodies of the suicide bomber and his or her victims. The public nature of a suicide bombing makes the abject bodies of the bomber and his or her victims into a spectacle that exposes not only the instability of bodily integrity but the instability of the political order as well. As a public spectacle, it evokes the sacrificial logic of sovereign power, in which sacrifice is necessary to constitute the political order (see Foucault 1979). The recovery and burial of the bodies is a ritual that imbues the bodies with subjectivity through another form of sacrifice. The presence of the abject signals disorder and pollution, not just in the bodies involved, but the social order as well. To return society to a state of perceived order, rituals must be undertaken to cleanse society of the pollution. As such, the recovery of bodies does more than attempt to re-establish subject/body coherence, but the appearance of integrity of the state as well. The work of ZAKA in Israel (and recently, around the world) is a particularly striking example of the effort deployed to maintain the semblance of subject/body/state coherence, an effort that has repercussions for the inclusion of the Haredi community in the body of the state.

Re-subjectification of bodies

In Israel, a society known as ZAKA (an acronym for Identifiers of Victims of Disaster in Hebrew) is made up of volunteers who not only treat survivors, but also remove, identify, and bury body parts after bombings and other sudden deaths. ZAKA is the only organization that is authorized by the state to handle the recovery and identification of body parts,[16] having been entrusted with this duty which is normally undertaken by state institutions. ZAKA members are trained by the Israeli police and Magen David Adom (the Israeli Red Cross) in paramedic skills, proper management of forensic evidence, and Jewish law regarding the treatment of deceased. Officially formed in 1995, ZAKA grew out of an informal network of Haredi (ultra-Orthrodox) volunteers who would gather at scenes of mass casualties (usually bomb attacks) to ensure the bodies, regardless of the religion of the deceased, were being treated in accordance with Jewish law.

ZAKA effectively undertakes a purification ritual of making clean and proper what was disordered and defiled. ZAKA volunteers are motivated by a desire that the bodies of victims be treated with respect. Showing respect means, first, that the bodies are covered up, restoring the hiddenness of the inside of bodies that bombers brought into the open. According to one volunteer, "if [the body] is visible, and everyone can see it, this is a lack of respect, shameful, and is why the first thing we do is to cover the body" (Stadler 2009, 146). Second, ZAKA strives to ensure that all body parts are recovered so that they can be buried according to Jewish law. They will spend hours ensuring that no blood or bits of flesh are left behind. ZAKA takes responsibility for locating, reassembling, and transferring victims' bodies to the Israeli Institute of Forensic Science,

---

[16] Zaka's homepage, http://www.zaka.us/show.asp?PID=23

where they are identified using a variety of methods, including dental records and DNA analysis. In interviews, ZAKA volunteers frequently mention concerns that dogs, birds, or ants will consume human flesh, or that blood will be washed away by hoses (Ginsburg 2003; DiManno 2003).   By treating bodies in accordance with Jewish religious law, ZAKA re-signifies bodies are human and *Jewish*, not 'heaps of meat'.

The bodies of the suicide bombers are also treated with respect, despite whatever misgiving volunteers may have. Body parts of suicide bombers that can be identified are given to the army to give back to the families of the bombers, if possible. As one ZAKA volunteer explained, "It is written in the Torah that each one should be buried properly in a Jewish cemetery,…. but it is not important if it is Jew or a Gentile, more specifically, it is written that all men have been created in God's image, even if he is the suicide bomber… by the very fact that he is a human being, all his organs should be gathered and buried, and this is exactly what ZAKA does" (Stadler 2006, 846).

The severed flesh left in the wake of suicide bomb renders such bodies unidentifiable under the regimes of religion, nationality, gender or race. Stripped of their production as certain types of political subjects, the parts of bodies that cannot be identified with any particular subjectivity are buried according to Jewish traditions. Given the nature of suicide attacks, many times it is difficult if not impossible to distinguish between the bodies of the perpetrator and the bodies of the victims. Frequently, the bodies of both the bomber and some of the victims are so mutilated as to be indistinguishable, despite the training of members of ZAKA in the latest forensic technologies. In such cases, unidentified pieces are buried in a common grave according

to Jewish tradition. One volunteer explains, "Although they are dead, we still honor every part of the body, every piece of flesh has to be brought to burial. Flesh we can't identify we bury together. Pieces of flesh are put in bags and the bags are buried in a special grave in the local cemetery" (BBC 2002). After death, the bodies of victim and perpetrator alike are re-inscribed with political and religious meaning through the care given to treat each body fragment as Jewish.[17] While the act of suicide bombing is an act of sovereign power that mutilates and destroys bodies, the practice of collecting all body fragments and fluids is an example of power regulating the body, turning objects only identifiable from a medical or anatomical viewpoint into remnants of a human subject. These actions are an attempt to (re)produce the body fragments as belonging to properly human subjects with a national and religious identity, an act which can never be completed, as these bodies cannot be made whole again, nor can they be entirely separated from that of the suicide bomber. While the bodies cannot materially be made whole (and of course cannot be brought back to life) they are made symbolically whole again, made into human subjects by identification and burial practices.

ZAKA volunteers explain their work in terms of a religious imperative that bodies should be treated like the Torah, that the damaged corpse must be reconstituted, put whole again. A volunteer explained this through the corporeal nature of the Torah: "The scroll of the Torah is something physical, corporeal… A piece of leather or parchment that is used to write the sacred words of the torah is not sacred until we begin writing the sacred words….If a book of Torah is, God forbid, burned, a Jew will definitely hurry to

---

[17] Of course, not all victims are Jewish; approximately 25% of Israelis are Arab or members of another minority group.

save it with all his soul" (Stadler 2009, 143). This connection between the sacredness of the Torah and the human body is also seen in ZAKA's practice of recovering damaged or destroyed Torahs as part of their recovery mission, such as from synagogues damaged in Hurricane Katrina. For members of ZAKA, remaking a body into a subject, specifically, a Jewish subject, is an imperative of their own understanding of themselves as Jewish subjects. The practices of ZAKA do not only entail the symbolic re-constitution of individual bodies, but are implicated in the re-constitution of national bodies as well.

Bodily Sacrifice and National Community

The reassembly of shattered bodies is a performative way of reassembling the cohesion of the world—not only of the subject, but of the community and state as well. As Kristeva writes, "the body must bear no trace of its debt to nature: it must be clean and proper in order to be fully symbolic," (Kristeva 1982, 102). The body fragments collected and identified by ZAKA are a synecdoche for the community and nation, and the reassembly of them is an effort to remake the solidity and integrity of the state.

ZAKA's politics in signifying the bodies of Jews is tied to the practices of burial in Israeli society more broadly. Of particular relevance for comparison is the treatment of deceased IDF (Israeli Defense Force) soldiers. Narratives of religion and nation played out over the handling of bodies of soldiers. While the bodies of victims of suicide bombing are collected to ensure the treatment of all flesh as human and divine, the bodies of soldiers are given even more care to ensure their representation of the nation and as generalizable 'sons' belonging to all of Israel, not only as Jews or as members of

particular families (M. Weiss 2002). The bodies of soldiers, like the bodies of victims of terrorism, are imbued with symbolic meaning. This is not, in itself, particularly surprising as the memorialization of soldiers killed in war as a sacrifice to the nation is a common state practice. What is interesting, however, is the relationship between the practices of handling the bodies of IDF soldiers and the bodies of victims of suicide attacks.

Disposing of the dead in accordance with Jewish law is the providence of the *Hevra Kaddisha*, or Communal Fraternal Burial Society, in Israel for Jewish citizens, both secular and religious, which is sometimes the cause of tension and resentment at their control over the regulations regarding burial and the fees involved (Stadler 2009, 33). When military deaths are involved, the situation becomes even more complicated. Dead soldiers are officially the responsibility of the army chaplaincy, although the Institute of Forensic Biology has argued that those killed in combat should be brought to them for an official conclusion on cause of death, something army chaplains are not qualified to determine (M. Weiss 2001, 47). The bodies of Israeli soldiers are not autopsied without permission from families, even though the true cause of death may not be attainable without an autopsy. Combat casualties are buried according to *halakhah*. The bodies of soldiers are treated separately and differently from those of the general population. There is a "skin bank" available for the bodies of soldiers that may need them (from the bodies of non-soldiers) for reconstruction purposes, but no tissue from soldiers may be contributed to this supply. Samples of tissue or fluids may not be taken from soldiers for testing as they are in other deaths (to be returned to the graves of the deceased later). Their bodies are also 'perfected' in that they are treated specially to look

whole and without injury (M. Weiss 2002, 59-60). This, 'perfect' or 'whole' body is of course, an unobtainable ideal—dead and mangled bodies cannot be brought back to life, nor can 'actual' bodies ever manifest true perfection. The practice of attempting to reassemble, to make 'perfect' is a means of attempting to cleanse the contamination of the corpse, the impure abject that can never be gotten rid of, either in the perfectly constituted body or the perfectly constituted state. Soldiers' bodies, as specific representatives of the state, must be as close to perfect as possible.[18]

The work of ZAKA takes place in an economy of bodily sacrifice and martyrdom. ZAKA volunteers are at risk from secondary attacks aimed at first responders by rushing immediately to the scene of attacks; several volunteers have been injured or killed from such attacks. Volunteering for ZAKA also involves transgressing the community's norms against touching corpses. Blood, corpses, and body parts are considered to contaminate the land of Israel and the people, and those who touch them are required to undergo purification rituals (Stadler 2006, 848). ZAKA volunteers recover every drop of blood and body fragment, but handling the bodies of the dead is considered a "true kindness" and a religious duty. This is considered a sacred task and an act of piety (Stadler 2009, 143). Volunteers also violate strict prohibitions against working on the Sabbath. Said one

---

[18] Some of this residual contamination in constituting the Israeli/Jewish body is seen in the tension between Jewish religious law and the state, as seen in the burial of IDF soldiers. While bodies of all soldiers are treated as Jewish and buried according to *halakhah*, IDF chaplains adhere to Jewish law and only those deemed to be properly Jewish may be buried in Jewish cemeteries. Lev Paschov was killed while on duty in August, 1993. An immigrant from the former Soviet Union, his body was initially interred in Jewish cemetery, and then exhumed and re-interred when it was discovered that although Paschov was eligible for Israeli citizenship due to his Jewish father, his mother was a gentile. He was thus not considered Jewish by *halakhah* (Cohen, 2008, 118). There is evidence to suggest that the strictness to which these rules are applied may be decreasing in recent years. Ilan Sviatkovsky, an immigrant from Uzbekistan who was killed in the Gaza strip while serving in the IDF, was granted a Jewish burial despite his incomplete conversion (Magnezi 2010). He has been enrolled in the 'Nativ' program, which offers a 'fast-track' to conversion for service members who are not considered properly Jewish according to *halakhah*.

ZAKA volunteer who was part of the rescue mission after the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, "we are desecrating Shabbat with pride" (Levy 2010). The work of ZAKA can thus be seen as a sacrifice made on behalf of the broader community not only to fulfill a commandment, but to solidify and instantiate the boundaries of the Israeli/Jewish people by keeping human remains from lingering in the public sphere. By reconstituting bodies, ZAKA members redraw the boundaries between the sacred and profane, between Jew and gentile. Because of the contaminating nature of corpses, ZAKA members operate in a symbolic economy of sacrifice and martyrdom, an economy that has a similar logic to that of the suicide bomber's own form of contaminating sacrifice. Both partake in defilement by association with the abject as part of a political logic of disruption or reproduction of a political order. As such, the bodily sacrifice of ZAKA members plays a role in the incorporation of the Haredim in Israeli society.

While ZAKA officials state that the organization is open to men and women from all backgrounds and faiths, virtually all members are male Haredim. The organization is overseen by a panel of seven Haredi rabbis (Ginsburg 2003), and most members are recruited at yeshivas and by word of mouth. Married men are preferred as they are seen to be more emotionally stable (Ginsburg 2003). The Haredi are frequently criticized by other Israelis as 'parasites' because of their reliance on public welfare and their avoidance of mandatory military service. They are also resented because of what is seen as their disproportionate influence on Israeli politics and policy. In response to widespread criticism, Haredim argue that study of the Torah is necessary to protect Israel in a moral and spiritual sense. The Haredi community sees itself as serving and

protecting Israeli society through their sacrifices and ascetic practices (Stadler 2007, 163). Their way of life is sacrifice for the nation that is viewed as just as corporeal as soldiering, as it is directed against carnal temptations. Haredi communities are traditionally anti-Zionist and perceive secular Israeli society as contaminating (Stadler 2007). Service in the army in particular is seen as corrupting for *yeshiva* students because, among other reasons, men are required to live in close quarters with women (Stadler and Ben-Ari 2003). Haredi women are not drafted, and Haredi men receive deferments on their conscription while studying at *yeshivot*, which has subsequently led to a dramatic increase in both the number of *yeshiva* students as well as the length of time in which they study.

The service of ZAKA has made strides in reducing tensions between the Haredi community and non-Haredi citizens of Israel. Their presence at the public scenes of bombings, as well as other mass casualty incidents has generated respect for the work of ZAKA and the Haredi community more broadly (Ginsburg 2003). ZAKA's founder, Yehuda Meshi-Zahav was asked to light a torch at Mt. Herzl on Israel's Independence Day, marking an acceptance by mainstream Israel. ZAKA members have also built up good will around the world by using their paramedic training and expertise in identifying bodies to assist in disasters and attacks worldwide, such as in the 2005 Southeast Asian tsunami, the 2008 Mumbai terror attacks, the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti. They were also brought into help identify the remains of the astronauts killed in the 2003 Columbia shuttle explosion, including one Israeli. ZAKA has also involved in search, rescue and recovery of Jewish and Israeli people

167

around the world, including in a helicopter crash in Mexico, and an Israeli citizen lost in Amazon. In these cases, ZAKA members have departed from the usual Haredi rejection of Zionist politics by their insistence on being recognized as providing a service in the name of the state of Israel (Levy 2010). These examples of ZAKA's efforts around the world demonstrate how ZAKA's sacrificial work has served to make inroads toward the incorporation of the Haredim into Israel's *body politic*. This example points toward the mutually reinforcing connection between bodies, sacrifice, and the state: through the bodily sacrifice of ZAKA members, not only are the bodies of victims of suicide bombing (re)signified as humans and members of a political and religious community; but the Haredim, once excluded (at least partly by choice) from the Israeli state, have gained a measure of acceptance through this form of bodily sacrifice as well.

The (Un)Reconstructed Remains of 9/11 Bombers and Their Victims

The handling of the remains of the 9/11 hijackers and their victims poses an instructive counterexample to the handing of the bodies of suicide bombers and their victims in Israel/Palestine. Families of the victims of the World Trade Center's collapse on September 11, 2001 have expressed concern that the bodies of the hijackers would be mixed in with the bodies of their loved ones. Kurt Horning, whose son Matthew was killed in the WTC on September 11, 2001 and who co-founded the group WTC Families for Proper Burial, remarked, "It would be sadly ironic if they ended up being properly buried or sent to a Muslim country when many of the remains of the victims remain buried in a garbage dump" (Winter 2009). Horning's group supports the evacuation of

168

the landfill on Staten Island where debris from the World Trade Center was buried, believing it may contain identifiable remains. The medical examiner's office has made efforts to distinguish and separate the tiny fragments of tissue and bone belonging to the hijackers from the body fragments that cannot, or have not yet been identified. However, the task of completely sorting out the hijackers from the victims is deemed impossible because of how small, damaged, and scattered the body fragments are. The remains of the hijackers that have been identified are separated and sequestered in evidence lockers in undisclosed locations in New York and Virginia. To date, the remains of 13 of the 19 hijackers have been identified by DNA, although the FBI has refused to say which have been identified (Winter 2009). No official determination has been made about what to do with the remains, which have not been requested by any of the hijacker's families or governments (Conant 2009).

The desire to separate the remains of the 9/11 hijackers from the remains of their victims mirrors the efforts at distinguishing suicide bombers from their victims by ZAKA and the Forensic Institute in Israel. However, in contrast to the way in which remains are handled Israeli Forensic Institute, the remains of the 9/11 hijackers seem to be treated in such a way to ensure that they remain unpurified, un-subjectified, still 'heaps of meat.' Robert Shaler, who was the head of New York's Department of Forensic Biology at the time of the attacks, reported of the families of the victims, "they did not want the terrorists mixed in with their loved ones. These people were criminals and they did not deserve to be with the innocent victims. No one knows what will happen, but I don't think they should be buried on American soil" (Winter 2009). The mention of 'American

soil' points to the bond between bodies, subjects and states and suggests that burying bodies that have been identified as the suicide bombers' in the United States is a disruptive, polluting act. The practices of identifying and burying the remains has resulted in the 'purification' of the remains of the victims, but lacks ZAKA's efforts at treating all remains as human. These un- reconstituted bodies remain 'heaps of meat,' lying in limbo as something other than human. While these abjected bodies remain unsignified, a great deal of effort has gone into interpreting and narrativizing other bodies: the bodies of female suicide bombers.

III.   When the Bomber is a Woman

The issue of female suicide bombers has spawned a great deal of media attention and commentary as well as a sudden expansion in academic books and articles. Women's participation in suicide missions has been of particular interest to feminists and gender theorists in International Relations because it appears to upset traditional gender roles in which women are victims, rather than perpetrators, of political violence (see Bloom 2005; Sjoberg and Gentry 2007; Oliver 2007, 2008; O'Rourke 2008).

In this section, I detour from this framing to focus on the politics of the sexed embodiment of the suicide bomber. I argue that what is interesting about the phenomenon of women as suicide bombers is not that women necessarily have different motivations for suicide terrorism, but that the symbolic politics differ when the suicide terrorist is embodied as a woman. As women are constituted by a different relationship to corporeality than men in western culture, the suicide attack perpetrated by a woman

170

represents a somewhat different politics that is not reducible to questions of agency or exploitation. In short, rather than the motivations of women who carry out suicide bombing, this section focuses on the performative effects of the disintegration and reformulation of female bodies.

The simultaneous surprise, horror and fascination evoked by suicide bombers is linked to the presence of the corpse, especially mutilated corpses of victims and the bomber, whose body has lost its integrity as a whole. The associated of the suicide bomber with abjection is amplified in the presence of a female suicide bomber. The women's body, already associated with the abject, is made into a corpse, "utmost of abjection" (Kristeva 1982, 4) as it makes others into corpses as well. The female suicide bomber does more than breach the boundaries between inside and outside of the body, but simultaneously disrupts and reinforces constructions of gender and women's embodiment by situating the polluting, contaminating bodies of women, already constituted as abject, in a public setting, making this form of abjection no longer hidden or lingering on the periphery, but very public and visible, as women's bodies are usually not. As discussed above, the association of women's bodies with abjection is not essential, but rather, the result of specific material/discursive productions.[19]

While bodily fluids in general are seen as abject and contaminating, men's and women's bodily fluids are not seen as contaminating in the same way or to the same extent. In Kristeva's writings, the abjection toward the signs of sexual difference—specifically, menstrual blood—is distinguished from the abjection typified by bodily waste, the corpse. While excrement evokes a threat stemming from outside the self,

"menstrual blood… stands for the danger issuing from within the identity (social and sexual); it threatens the relationship between the sexes within a social aggregate, and through internalization, the identity of each sex in the face of sexual difference" (Kristeva 1982, 71).   The threat of abjection that menstrual blood poses may perhaps best be thought of as related to the emphasis on women's reproductive capacities as the locus of sexual difference. This emphasis is not, as Grosz reminds us, natural or inevitable, as many zones of the body could be taken to represent the essential difference between the sexes (Grosz 1994, 196). Menstrual blood, as the mark of reproductive maturity, comes to mark not only sexual difference but the female body as constituted by seepage and leakiness more broadly. By their association with signs of the abject, women's bodies have been discursively produced as bodies of fear and contempt. Women's bodies have been produced as fluid, as 'seepage,' and as formless and amorphous, posing a threat of engulfment (Grosz 1994, 203).   Their bodies are associated with monstrosity, in their potentiality for pregnancy and its rapid morphological changes, in the troubling of the body as closed, autonomous, and secure in its boundaries, a normative image of what the body should be that is consistent with representations of the male body (Shildrick 2002).

The presence of women in the public sphere, let alone seemingly violating gendered roles of women's passivity and victimhood, does not only upset the supposed unity of the body (which women are never fully identified with) but also exposes women's bodies in their most 'monstrous' form, the terrifying formlessness that haunts the self. The figure of the female suicide bomber reproduces the production of women's bodies as abject, but provides a challenge to the exclusion of women from the public

172

sphere and from committing acts of political violence. However, in violent of the bombing, the bomber's body is stripped of its political subjectivity, including its gender status in its transformation to a 'heap of meat'. In the wake of this fearful physical and symbolic disintegration, steps must be taken to re-construct the borders of the body and community, as well as the gender order, in order to secure the self from the threatening presence of the abject.

As discussed above, the body of the suicide bomber is, in the moments after detonation, a 'heap of meat,' a body whose constitution in the symbolic order has been disrupted by the collapsing of the borders between inside and outside. Representing a radical separation between subjectivity and body, the suicide bomber and his or her victim(s) must be re-signified as part of an on-going, citational process that constitutes not only religious or national subject, but sexed and gendered subjects as well, through not only the act of the suicide bombing, but in the signification of those bodily actions after the fact. Sometimes this signification happens in advance of the bombing, and is undertaken by the bombers themselves. In their testimonies, the women describe their actions in terms of seizing the reigns of political militancy. As one female suicide bomber said on her video testimony, "I've chosen to say with my body what Arab leaders have failed to say" (Hasso 2005, 29). Ayat al-Akhras said in her video testimony, "I say to Arab leaders, stop sleeping. Stop failing to fulfill your duty. Shame on the Arab armies who are sitting and watching the girls of Palestine fighting while they are asleep" (Hasso 2005, 29). By killing and dying for their nation, these women challenged the gendered protector/protected dichotomy in which men fight wars to shield and protect women, who

173

are in turn expected to be grateful and unquestioning of men's efforts (see Elshtain 1995[1987]; Sjoberg 2006). However, at the same time, the framing of their suicide mission as a wake-up call to male leaders reproduces gendered roles of politics and war: both are the proper realm of men. Thus while her actions transgress gender roles, al-Akhras's statement serves to interpret her actions as feminine, and even compelling traditional gender roles in her words cajoling Palestinian male leadership. Other representations of the female suicide bombers serve to constitute them as wives and mothers in a heterosexual symbolic system.

The female suicide bomber is frequently represented as a bride. The female suicide bombers of the Syrian Socialist National Party (SSNP) were glorified as "Brides of the South" (O'Rourke 2008, 695) and Palestinian female suicide bombers have been referred to as "Bride[s] of Palestine" (Naaman 2007), or as "Bride[s] of Heaven."[20] Female suicide bombers are also represented as mother, submissive and self-sacrificing on behalf of the nation. In the case of female suicide bomber as mother, the bomber is seen as metaphorically procreating through her actions: as one commentator on the first Palestinian female suicide bomber Wafa Idris proclaimed, "She bore in her belly the fetus of a rare heroism, and gave birth by blowing herself up!" (quoted in Cunningham 2009, 568). In both of these, the violence of women is made sense of by placing it in gendered and heteronormative narratives. The female suicide bomber is subjectified according to gender and heterosexual norms as wife and mother.

---

[20] http://www.imra.org.il/story.php3?id=10189. Al-Wafd (Egypt), February 1, 2002, as cited in Al-Quds Al-Arabi (London), February 2, 2002.

The female suicide bomber marked as 'pregnant' is figured as not only a mother-to-be marked by her gendered embodiment, but a particularly monstrous embodiment—a body that is not quite one, not quite two. The pregnant body is deformed from within, not from an external threat. The pregnant female body also problematizes the boundaries between self and other, becoming an improper, abject body (Shildrick 2002, 31). As such, the pregnant woman is a source of fascination, but also fear and dread. The female suicide bomber as 'pregnant' is an ambiguous figure, representing the heterogeneous space pre-existing the division between self and other, but also, through the act of giving birth, of expulsion of the other from the self (the mother's body being expelled, abjected).

The constitution of female suicide bombers as maternal subjects by public declarations after their deaths is made clear by the following statement published about Wafa Idris, "what is more beautiful than the transformation of a person from a chunk of flesh and blood to illuminated purity and a spirit that cuts across generations?" (quoted in Cunningham 2009, 568). The discourse of the female suicide bomber after her death takes a body that is abject, stripped of subjectivity, and remakes it into a maternal, reproductive figure, akin to the "mother of the nation" that characterizes the role of women in nationalist discourses (Yuval-Davis 1997, 23). Her body is thus (re)produced as a sexed body under the regime of heteronormativity, 'purifying' it from any contamination of gender roles. The gendering of the bodies of female suicide bombers as well as the construction of the bodies of the victims of suicide bombers as Jewish in Israel demonstrate the work that takes place both before and after the bomb to inscribe bodies with political subjectivity, as members of a community that must be reconstructed.

This work suggests that the project of constituting bodies is ongoing, both in terms of gender and in terms of the state.

IV. Abjection and the State

As suggested above, the procedures for handing the bodies of victims and bombers is not only about restoring the coherence of subjects and bodies, but about constructing the state as a unitary, coherent and bordered entity as well. In some senses, the state is analogous to a body, writ large. The state itself is often represented as a body, most famously in Hobbes's figure of the Leviathan. The Leviathan is an artificial man, represented as a body comprised of different organs (institutions) and lead by the mind or the head (the sovereign). The state is constructed as a unitary body politic, made by the fiat of men and excluding women. Its embodiment suggests the image of a masculine body (Gatens 1996, 22-24). The state as a body is constituted as secure when its boundaries are impermeable rather than leaky or fluid (metaphors used to describe women's bodies). The phrases 'weak' or 'failing' states suggest states that cannot contain their borders, thus conjuring images of the aging or disabled body, an abject, vulnerable body marked by a loss in integrity.

The state, represented as the *body politic*, is threatened by injury or disease. Irruptions in the state's "clean and proper body" are metaphorized as diseases or injuries, and thus linked to discourses of danger (Campbell 2000[1992]). The borders of the state are policed in a manner similar to the borders of bodies.[21] Not only is the state produced

---

[21] The body is not necessarily only synecdoche for the state, but for any political community. This point is made by Mary Douglas in her classic work *Purity and Danger:* "The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious…We

by the expulsion of the abject in the abstract, as a process 'analogous' to the gendering of the body, or in rejection of that which can be represented as dirty or defiling (Campbell 2000[1992], 10, 81), but the state is also produced by the policing of the boundaries of human bodies. Suicide bombing and the recovery/identification of bodies as an embodied practice reveal the construction of the state as *body politics* to be something more than metaphor or model; the boundaries of state sovereignty are produced though sacrificial politics of abjection not only in a metaphorical sense, but rather, through the production of abject bodies. The treatment of the bodies of dead IDF soldiers as 'perfectable' bodies made to appear 'whole' and 'uniform' in death is part of a narrative that constructs these bodies as synecdoche for the nation, in which the body and nation "become one," (M. Weiss 2002, 63). By constructing the body of the soldier the borders of the state and nation are simultaneous (re)produced. These borders are not only produced through practices that render 'broken' abject bodies 'whole,' but through the production of certain bodies as always already abject. Measures taken to prevent terrorism, and suicide bombing in particular, reveals the constitution of the state through the process of abjection.

The ability to police borders is a constitutive element of states. Biopolitical security practices in specific stress the control over the circulation of various flows of people and goods. Suicide bombing makes a mockery of the integrity of these borders and the state's control over the movement of bodies, showing them to be a pretense. While modern occupations are fundamentally concerned with the spatial segregation and

cannot possibly interpret rituals concerning excreta, breast milk, saliva and the rest unless we are prepared to see in the body a symbol of society, and to see the powers and dangers credited to social structure reproduced in small on the human body" (1966, 116).

containment of bodies, the suicide bomber commits a double disruption of the body politic by breaching the borders of both bodies and state boundaries. The checkpoint, whether at a border or an airport, serves to construct the border in the name of keeping citizens safe. At checkpoints, bodies are examined and decisions made as to the destructive potential of each body. At other times and places where large numbers of people congregate, various techniques and technologies have been developed to discern the dangerous, destructive body of the terrorist from the body of the potential, but not yet, terrorist. The uses of various technologies to not only turn the body into a bomb, but to detect the bomber leads to important questions regarding the constitution of the body and the production of certain (il)liberal subjects. The methods and technologies of detecting terrorists, and especially suicide bombers concealing explosive on their bodies, can be read as an effort by the state to keep its own body intact by rendering suspect bodies always already abject. Various surveillance technologies that read bodies for signs of danger or deviance are an integral part of global biopolitical governance.

One of the tensions in the biopolitical security problematic of protecting bodies is apparent in the use of certain technological apparatuses to detect certain threats, specifically those associated with suicide bombers. These tactics attempt to reconstitute the body as a mechanistic Cartesian body that can be mapped for evidence of the mind that controls it. Governments use technologies that can supposedly 'read' bodies in attempt to detect suicide bombers. This technology being developed and deployed cannot only detect bombs, but can supposedly read the body to detect the intentions of the

subject. Such risk management technologies do more than 'detect' suicide bombers. These techniques produce the abject, biopolitical bodies they purport to reveal.

In addition to the biometric technologies in place to track visitors and immigrants to the United States, a plethora of new technologies are being created to detect terrorists based on the premise that the bodies of terrorists emit signs that can be read to reveal the true intentions of terrorists. Instruments that analyze a person's gait or body temperature are being used or are in development for detecting potential suicide bombers. Called "Project Hostile Intent," a new system is being tested by the US Department of Homeland Security monitors heart rate, skin temperature and breathing in an effort to detect potential terrorists. Radar beams can track the gait of people moving through crowds in order to detect whether a person is carrying a heavy object. Such technologies are based on the assumption that not just the weapons the body carries can be detected—as in the use of bomb-sniffing dogs—but that the dangerous body itself can be detected. Despite one researcher's insistence that such detection technologies are "a new way of using surveillance that looks at activities, instead of looking for people," (Nitkin 2007). Another machine, called "The Future Attribute Screening Technology," or FAST, works like a polygraph by looking for anomalies in body temperature, pulse and breathing. Unlike a polygraph, however, the FAST machine works when people walk by a set of cameras, rather than when they are hooked up to a machine answering questions (Frank 2008). Such readings would supposedly provide information about which persons were agitated. The project manager claims, despite criticism that agitation or anxiety could be signs of many other conditions and circumstances besides hostile intent, that the system

makes use of research that can purportedly distinguish between planning to cause harm and merely being annoyed or anxious. Technologies to read the 'signs' of the body are being developed and tested in addition to the use of full-body scanners. These scanners, previously deployed in Europe, were not supported in the United States until the December 2009 failed attack of the 'underwear bomber.' After this attempted attack, the US Transportation Security Administration plans to add 300 full-body scanners that produced detailed images of human bodies to airport security (Arnold 2010)

Technologies such as the FAST and full-body scanners do not search for a bomb, but search for clues in the body of a dangerous, or more precisely, 'destructive' body. These detection systems render the body as something that can be read, truth can be discerned through observation. Such technologies reduce the human body to an organism that consists of biological functions such as pulse, breathe, gait, and temperature: activities of bodies, rather than people. What was invisible is made visible through x-rays, video cameras and other machines that penetrate the body beyond the surface to read its signs in body temperature, breathing, and pulse. These technologies embody a discourse in which the technological gaze can penetrate the body and make it transparent. In 'seeing' the human organism in greater depth is meant to translate into 'seeing' the subject as dangerous or not. Determining the level of risk of a subject is a matter of reading further and further into his or her body. The surveillance of suspicious bodies constitutes bodies in a medical discourse that effects a radical separation of mind and body. In the words of one headline, travelers are "chalky aliens" in the view of the scanner operators (Hawkins 2010).

It is not only these technologies, but the knowledgeable practices of which these surveillance tools are a part, that constitutes the suspicious and destructive bodies. These technologies are not just about seeing further and more accurately into what the body conceals, but rather, are bound up in power relations that constitute both the knowing subject that interprets the signs from the scanners and X-Rays into a judgment about the riskiness of a particular, individualized body. This anatomo-clinical gaze has the structure of *invisible visibility* (Foucault 1994 [1973], 165). This gaze has an epistemological foundation that conceives of the body not as a surface, but as a three dimensional space. This body that is 'seen' through the use of such high-tech devices is not an embodied subject, but a body as a corpse, transformed into an object. As in the shift from a disease as a specific set of symptoms through time, to the conception of symptoms as signs of an underlying pathology that is the 'disease,' so too does the modern, medical discourse of the body constitute the search for detection of destructive, terrorist bodies. These symptoms observed by people operating surveillance technologies are only temporary signs, because it is only death that reveals, in Foucault's words, the "luminous presence of the visible" (1994 [1973], 165). The transparent body is the corpse; life shields the truth by limiting the signs that can be perceived. The body of the (suspected) terrorist is produced by these technologies as an 'abnormal' or 'pathological' body, the corpse that is the 'truth' of the suicide bomber. The practice of detecting suicide bombers by 'reading' their bodies through technological lens produces not only the suicide bomber, but everyone suspected of being a suicide bomber (potentially everybody, but especially men presumed to be Muslim) as already an abject body. Bodies individualized and dissected

are not the vital, living bodies that make up the population that biopolitics seeks to secure, but are, in a sense, always already dead.

In attempting to reveal the 'truth' of bodies, the bodies of suicide bombers (and all potential suicide bombers) are constituted as abject. These risk management technologies that attempt to eliminate the wounding of bodies, and the wounding of the *body politic* thus partake in a politics of inscribing bodies as always already polluted and profane. These state practices of surveillance that are aimed at protecting natural bodies thus must in fact *produce* bodies as legible bodies to be read, practices that produce bodies as de-subjectified abject beings. Such practices reveal the 'natural' bodies of biopolitics to be not only an effect of particular practices, but also always already outside of the domain of life.

Conclusion

The embodied practice of suicide bombing and efforts at identifying/producing the bodies of suicide bombers and their victims reveals the *unnaturalness* of bodies and the political work that is necessary to constitute the illusion of a whole and complete body. The suicide bomber collapses distinctions between subjects and bodies, nature and culture, technology and biology, inside and outside. As an abject body, the suicide bomber points toward a rethinking of bodies and borders in International Relations.

By violently erasing the boundaries between the inside and outside of the body, the suicide bomber calls into question the model of the body as a self-contained vessel for the subject. The threat the suicide bomber poses is not only the sovereign threat of taking

lives, but of contamination, of the abject disrupting what has been constituted as the natural functioning of bodies and the circulation of populations. Efforts at reassembling and reconstructing the bodies of victims and perpetrators of this practice also show the self-contained body that is the body of IR to be an effect of material and discursive practices. By confronting us with the abject that haunts the production of subjects and state, suicide bombing becomes a site in which the sacrificial economy that constitutes bodies and the state becomes visible. This form of violence is thus a provocative site for reconsidering the constitution of bodies, subjectivities, and states in International Relations from the perspective of feminist theory, which argues the presumed coherence bodies, subjects, and states to be an ultimate illusory effect of material and symbolic practices.

Having shown both the self-governed body of liberalism and the 'natural' body of biopolitics as an illusory effect of political, symbolic practices made apparent in the aftermath of the violence, I now move toward to consider the naturalness of bodies more directly through the violence of precision warfare. In doing so, I not only duplicate the move of this chapter to consider bodies as both material and symbolic, but return and expand upon the theme of bodies as not only produced and made legible by social and political practices, but also *productive* of certain politics as well.

Chapter 5: *Body Counts: The Politics of Embodiment in Precision Warfare*

RPAs [remote-controlled drones] are now part of our DNA.

--Major Bryan Callahan (Pitzke 2010)

In the last chapter, suicide bombing and the associated practices of the handling of bodily remains as well as state security practices were shown to illustrate that the self-contained body of liberalism is not an ontological given, but an effect of political practices surrounding the abject and abject bodies. The previous two chapters also dealt with the ways that practices of security render bodies coherent and legible, whether as 'terrorist' subjects or 'dependents' or as Israeli/Jewish or always already abject bodies. This chapter continues the denaturalization of the liberal, biopolitical body, focusing on how the 'natural' body, a body defined by its biological functioning and whether it lives or dies, is destabilized by the very forces that are meant to protect this natural body. This tension expresses an important instability of the violence of liberal states; protection of the natural lives of citizens is built upon the production of 'unnatural subjects' not only monstrous bodies of terrorist but the unnatural cyborg bodies of bombers. Bodies are not only 'unnatural' but are productive. That is, they are not only constituted by political forces, but are themselves constituting.

In this chapter, I analyze precision warfare as a liberal, biopolitical mode of warfare. Precision warfare is characterized by the use of precision guided munitions (PGMs, or 'smart bombs') and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or drones. While the term 'precision warfare' refers to a mode of violence of violence, precision wars are

waged as a form of global liberal governance (Dillon and Reid 2001). Against the stated logic of this type of warfare, in which technologies are used to spare the lives of 'our' soldiers as well as civilians, this chapter argues that it is not 'natural bodies' that are protected or killed through these practices, but rather multiple bodies are produced by material/discursive practices in relation to one another as well as technologies and discursive practices. In this theorization, we see the violent practices of precision-bombing as performatively constituting the figures of the precision bomber, the targeted terrorist, and the vulnerable civilians are not prior to the practices of precision-bombing, but exist in relation to one other as the result of the constitution of bodies in liberal practices of precision warfare.

The use of precision-guided munitions has been defining characteristic of the post-Cold War military in the United States. The precision-guided bomb and the unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs, or 'drones') are probably the most celebrated result of the so-called revolution in military affairs, or RMA. The goal of precision warfare is absolute discrimination between combatants and civilians, a feat that depends upon absolute knowledge of the difference. Precision is about faith in technological solutions to the problem of discrimination: how to learn who is a civilian and who is a combatant, and how to spare civilians while killing combatants. Precision weapons are intended to destroy targets with two specific advantages. First, they are cost effective, despite the high price of the technology, because targets can be destroyed in one sortie, and sometimes even multiple targets, whereas in the past (in World War II or in the Vietnam War), dozens if not hundreds of sorties were required. Second, targets can be hit without

185

as much risk to the civilian population. Thus, military planners will attempt to destroy targets within cities or residential areas, targets that may have been off limits in the past. PGMs have increased as a percentage of total bombs dropped from 7 percent in the first Gulf War in 1991 to around 60 percent in the initial incursion into Afghanistan in 2001-2002. More recently, drones have been used not only for surveillance, but have been armed with missiles to fire on targets. Currently, the US and Israel are the only two countries to use drones as weapons. The UAVs have been used to kill by the US Air Force in Iraq and Afghanistan, and by the CIA in Pakistan (Shane 2009). The drone strikes in Pakistan since 2006 are estimated to have killed about 20 top al-Qaeda leaders, 250-400 lower level militants, and 250-320 militants (Bergen and Tiedeman 2009).

Precision warfare is very attractive for the provision of security in liberal states for three related reasons. First, by using these technologies, civilian deaths are transformed from 'massacres' to 'accidents,' and warfare can be presented as much more humane. Second, precision warfare takes place in a discourse of risk-management and is therefore is driven by a biopolitical rational of state power. Third, there is no risk to the pilots or drone operators, so the purveyors of violence are essentially disembodied.

First, in discourse of precision warfare, the deaths of civilians occupy a substantial, if not crucial, role. The sparing of civilian lives is given as a key rationale (second only to protecting the lives of servicemen and women) for the development and use of precision weapons. Wars are to be fought 'humanely': for humanitarian purposes and waged with humane weapons and techniques (Coker 2001). Certainly the shift from the area bombing of World War II and Vietnam to the precision bombing of the Gulf

War, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq may parallel the shift from punishment to more 'humane,' biopolitical forms of warfare, in which preservation of (certain) lives is necessary for the strategic and political success of the war. This allows for the greater use of military force on behalf of 'humanitarian' projects because force can be deployed with less harm to 'innocents,' and citizens can be assured that due effort and care is being taken to spare the lives of civilians. When civilians are killed, their deaths are not caused by the intentional killing of sovereign power, but are naturalized as unavoidable accidents, an inevitable if regrettable outcome. The use of force on behalf of universal values such as human rights and the prevention of genocide can thus justified.

Second, the technologies of precision warfare are governed by a logic of risk management and minimization that is well suited for liberal, biopolitical governance. Precision bombing, like its less accurate predecessor strategic bombing, is an exercise of sovereign power by deciding who will die and who shall be left alone to live. The pursuit of precision in exercising this power is about the dream of perfect vision, perfect knowledge, and communication of that knowledge. The vision of precision bombing, of perfect accuracy in targeting conveys a desire for absolute sovereign power—a desire manifest in the use of PGMs to target specific individuals, thus blurring the line between bombing and execution. The exercise of this sovereign power is made possible by various biopolitical networks of surveillance and precision targeting on behalf of war ostensibly fought for humanitarian reasons. Precision warfare is especially suited for a biopolitical approach because very nature of precision bombing is of calculated risk, both in terms of the probability of hitting a target accurately and in the risk to civilians. The CEP, or

circular error probability, is how 'precision' is measured in laser or GPS guided munitions. The CEP measures the average distance from a target that the bomb will hit in terms of fifty percent of hits within a certain radius, and such probabilities have been increasingly steadily.[22] Precision warfare also makes calculations about the risks to civilians, as targeting decisions are dependent upon an assessment of possible civilian casualties weighed against the importance of the destruction of the target. Doctrine of risk-management entail bureaucratic and technocratic forms of governance that is dependent upon the production of a vast amount of information about the governed. Air power is especially useful for this; as the 'bird's eye' or 'God's eye' optic has been crucial for the state's management of its territory, as well as the colonizer's management of its colonies.

The third key advantage to the techniques of precision warfare to liberal, biopolitical states is the invulnerability of the bombers and their effective 'disembodiment'. The precision bomber, like the torturer, accepts virtually no risk, especially when the precision bomber is a drone. The risk is entirely displaced to the target and surrounding population. In precision warfare, war is no longer, as Scarry writes, "a reciprocal activity for non-reciprocal outcomes," (Scarry 1985, 85). In seeking to eliminate the risk of bodily injury to the armed forces involved, the non-reciprocal injuring that takes in precision warfare make this form of violence akin to torture. If the

---

[22] One of the first precision tools, the Norden Bombsight, was said to be able drop a "bomb into a pickle barrel," but its accuracy was measured in percentage of bombs hitting within a 1,000 meter radius of the given target (McFarland 1995). The mean CEP in Gulf War was 100 feet, (Easterbrook 1991) while the mean CEP of bombs dropped in Iraq in 2003 was twenty-five feet, meaning that even if the bombs hit where they intended to, massive amounts of damage nearby the target will like ensue. Combined with intelligence errors, targeting errors, and GPS errors, 'precision' missiles that can take out targets cleanly with little risk to the surroundings are largely a myth.

goal of precision warfare is to minimize or eliminate the risk of bodily harm by making the bodies of one side invulnerable, while maximizing the vulnerability of the target population, war is no longer essentially justified by sacrifice. Singer writes, "[Unmanned weapons systems] are the ultimate way to avoid sacrifice" (Singer 2008, 312). Sacrifice is not seen as necessary aspect of waging war, but an unnecessary tragedy. Soldiers are, of course, killed in precision wars (although not usually those directly involved in bombing campaigns) and their deaths are mourned by the state and acknowledged as sacrifices. The distinction I would make here is of the necessity of sacrifice. Because technology makes it possible to avoid the deaths of soldiers, when soldiers do die, it is figured as a tragedy and a loss, rather than a sacrifice. The loss of a soldier also takes on an economic component in the resources necessary to train soldiers to the fight technological wars (see Cavarero 2008, 94). Because of the real or perceived intolerance of the citizens of Western states to the deaths or injuries to their own soldiers, contemporary warfare has been described as 'post-heroic' (Luttwak 1995). Violence and pain are seen as unnecessary, and purely negative with no positive connotactions in liberal societies (Asad 2003). As such, technological solutions to the problems of waging war without incurring deaths or bodily injuries are especially attractive.

The condition of embodiment, that is, the inescapability of living *as* a body, means that one is subject to violence and injury. An avoidance or escape from this vulnerability, especially in an activity such as war in which injury is precisely the point, is an effort to transform one's own body not only to enhance its capabilities, but to overcome its weaknesses. While in war, one's body is both an advantage in that it is a

189

tool of violence as well as an object that can be injured, in liberalism, the body and its desires, vulnerabilities, and passionate attachments are to be disavowed. Bodies are at best instruments and are more often encumbrances. Feminists have argued that in liberal political theory and in the practices of liberal states, an inability to overcome one's bodily passions and vulnerabilities is a disqualifier for political life. Precision warfare reproduces this attempt to separate the subject from his body, in order to make him a more effective agent for the spread of liberal values, and a more perfect liberal subject in reducing the burdens and impediments of the body. This disembodied way of fighting war means that the pilots will not become maimed or killed, showing the costs of war or symbolically demonstrating the weakness of the states or ideals they fight on behalf of. [23]

As 'disembodied,' the precision bomber or drone operator is seen as a 'de-gendered' or 'post-gendered' subject, in which it doesn't make a difference if the pilot or operator is a male or female (almost all are male, however). The 'disembodiment' of the pilot or operator also means that he is not confined to the particularities and limited vision of his body; the satellite systems and the drone's video cameras mean that the bomber's eye view is the God's eye view of objectivity. Its vision is cartographic; viewing the world from above in order to carefully manage the land and the population (Scott 1998).

While critics of precision warfare illustrate how these techniques are not as precise as they are often portrayed and often kill dozens or even hundreds of civilians at a

---

[23] However, many drone operators experience post-traumatic stress disorder although to a lesser degree than combat troops do.

time, this work does not challenge the status of bodies as only important in regards to how they may be killed. Like the mainstream literature, much of the critical literature on precision bombing is complicit in the erasure or the representation of bodies as biological objects in international relations. One of the most important feminist contributions in theorizing the body is work that highlights the ways in which strategic thought in International Relations ignores and in fact, necessarily obscures the gruesome realities of war and its impact on the human body. Critical projects such as those intent on demonstrating the 'myth' of precision bombing are similar in some respect to the feminist project of making visible the injurious nature of war as a counter to the narrative of glorious and humane war. Both of these critical projects suffer from a similar limitation in their the treatment of bodies as biological entities to be counted, identified and shown as an example of the brutal, violent nature of war. While such projects attempt to 'humanize' war (to varying degrees of success), the 'human' that they show is an injured body, a corpse, a body defined by its relationship to physiological harm or death. This kind of attempt to re-value bodies in opposition to strategic thought does not fundamentally challenge the biopolitical reduction of the human to biological being, and thus erases the sociality of the body as it lives or dies. The body is still constituted as the opposite of abstract, strategic rationales.

In the previous chapter on suicide bombing, I argued that the explosive body of the suicide bomber and the various practices of handling the bodily remains of victims and perpetrators demonstrate that bodies are both material AND symbolic, and that their constitution as self-governing and self-contained is normative ideal requiring political

191

work to sustain rather than an ontological fact. Moving now from an intimate form of violence in which the death of one person is required to kill others to a form of violence in which the killers are shielded from the risk of death or injury, we might expect to see in this mode of violence a sharper image of bodies as natural entities, independent and isolated from one another. However, what becomes apparent is that the bodies of precision warfare—bombers/drone operators, targets and civilians, are in fact mutually constituting—the cyborg embodiment of the precision pilot makes possible the political conditions of life and death for both the targets and civilians.

Precision warfare is a discourse that is performative of a biopolitical, statist moral order which allows for killing some people intentionally and allows for the deaths of some as 'accidents' at the hands of bombers and planners who are seemingly omnipotent. If noted at all, the deaths of civilians are 'accidental,' and they remain unseen, their deaths ungrievable and uncounted as a means of official policy, their deaths the "boundaries of bodily life where abjected or delegitimized bodies fail to 'count' as bodies" (Butler 1993, 15). These people are the abject bodies that reveal the workings of power and the current political order. Rather than an effect of the distance between bomber and victim, the killability of the victims can be read as a result of social/material intra-actions. A reading of precision bombing given the framework for theorizing bodies that I've articulated in chapter two as cultural and material, socially produced and productive/resistance as well marked by difference, tells a different story about bodies and precision bombing than the usual narrative. Rather than allowing for the deaths of some bodies in order to spare the lives of others, this chapter describes the multiple

192

bodies produced by material/discursive practices that theorize bodies as produce in relation to one another as well as technologies and discursive practices. In this theorization, we see the violent practices of precision-bombing as performatively constituting bodies marked by race, and 'killability' as well as omniscience and god-like sovereign power. These figures are not prior to the practices of precision-bombing, but exist in relation to one other as the result of the intra-action between discursive practices and the materiality of bodies and technology.

Cyborg/Prosthetic Bodies

Critics of precision warfare have devoted much attention to how the physical distance between the bombers and the bombed supposedly makes it psychologically easier to kill because the killers don't see those they kill. War is thus abstract, not much more morally problematic than playing a video game. However, in contemporary precision warfare, especially in the use of weaponized drones, the sophistication of surveillance technologies means that the humans targeted are not necessarily unseen as they may be from an F-16 or B-52. The military and civilian personal in charge of launching bombers from either airplanes or drones can often see clearly what is happening on the ground through sophisticated video cameras that transmit the images distances of thousands of miles away so that command centers can view the action and determine whether to fire weapons. Drone pilots report being able to clearly make out the images of people projected on their screens from the drones flown 7,500 miles away. Drone pilots also report feeling more intimately involved in combat than they did flying airplanes. Captain Mark Ferstl, stationed at Creech Air Base in Nevada, told a reporter,

"When I flew the B-52, it was at 30,000 to 40,000 feet, and you don't even see the bombs falling…Here, you're a lot closer to the actual fight, or that's the way it seems" (Zucchino 2010). The people who are targeted by drones, on the other hand, often cannot see or hear the drones at all. Predator drones, for example, hover three miles above the ground over Afghanistan (Muir 2010). This gaze is the gaze of the panopticon, a one sided gaze that has as its ideal perfect knowledge and control, in which the source of the gaze cannot be seen (Foucault 1978, 200-201). This role of the gaze suggests that it is not the abstraction or distance from the targets per se that is a necessary condition for killing, rather, it is the masculine cyborg (dis)embodiment that enables such killing.

The production of visual realities is ultimately about an epistemological position that produces certain legible bodies. Bodies must first be made intelligible as objects of knowledge in order that certain forms of intervention can be made—in the practice of precision warfare, 'intervention' means that certain bodies can be killed or not. The visual practices needed to project force internationally while upholding liberal values have resulted not only in the transformation of the objects of this gaze, but in the subjects that produce this gaze as well. In this, the embodiment of the precision bomber is shown to be productive of the bodies of 'terrorists' and 'civilians.'

The production of the body of the precision bomber begins at the military, which has been, and is, a profound site of the formation of the masculine body. The militarized masculine body has been formed through rigorous training and discipline. The military has also formed masculine bodies by serving as an ideal for males to aspire (Goldstein 2001, ch. 5; Hooper 2001, 82; Weiss 2002, 46). One iteration of the militarized masculine

194

body is the body of technology, a body defined by its skilled melding with technology. While this body is associated with the advanced technologies of contemporary warfare, the soldier as a site of technological transformation of the body is not a new phenomenon: eighteenth century military training constructed bodies as interchangeable machines and objects of discipline (Foucault 1979, 153). The intermeshing of bodies and machines in warfare has been brought to new heights in the development of advanced technologies to enable precision bombing. The human/machine integration into the machinery of war has perhaps reached its current zenith in the piloting of planes and operating of drones designed to drop precision bombs. Foucault's theory on the relationship between bodies, machines and power has its limitations for theorizing this particular human/machine integration, in that his work implies the separate existence of bodies and machines prior to their fastening through disciplinary practices. Such a theorization preserves the existence of a natural human body that is modified by technology.

Donna Haraway's figure of the cyborg is a model of culture/nature integration that does not presume the irreducibility of either 'culture' or 'nature' in terms of embodiment, but rather, focuses on how 'culture' and 'nature' are mutually entangled. In the figure of the cyborg, "nature and culture are reworked; the one can no longer be the resource for appropriate or incorporation by the other" (Haraway 1991, 151). In this way, the bodies produced by precision warfare are not strictly those of biological humans operating advanced technologies; nor are we capable of positing the 'bare life' of those subjected to the all-seeing gaze and tremendous destructive capability of precision

warfare and its cyborg denizens. Rather, we are called upon to see the ties between them in their co-production. Haraway writes, "bodies as objects of knowledge are material-semiotic generative nodes. Their boundaries materialize in social interaction. Boundaries are drawn by mapping practices; 'objects' do not pre-exist as such" (Haraway 1991, 200-201). Haraway's figure of the cyborg compels us to be attentive to the boundaries that separate the 'human' from the 'machine,' and the 'person' from the 'bomb'. "The machine is not an it to be animated, worshiped and dominated. The machine is us, our processes, an aspect of our embodiment" (Haraway 1991, 180). If we are the 'machine,' we are no longer the naturalized bodies of biopolitics whose organic functioning the government must not interfere with, but a complexly embodied subject whose boundaries are drawn in and through technologies and other bodies.

For example, one ongoing feature of the literature on precision warfare and the RMA in general is to what extent humans are still 'in the loop' in the weapons systems. While the ultimate goal and vision of the RMA is the total elimination of human from the space of battle, others are concerned with the effects of total automation. In both cases, 'the human' is conceived of as a known quantity, existing in a zero-sum relationship with material, technological forces. The more technological, the less 'human' war is becoming. This concern regarding the relationship between humans and technology is especially prevalent in the issue of UAVs, or 'drones.'

UAVs are a more extreme example of a human/technological assemblage. First used in combat in the NATO operation in Kosovo in 1999, UAVs were once used to extend the optical abilities of humans through surveillance. Now, UAVs are being used to

kill. The first reported kill of an UAV was on September 1st, 2007, when a laser-guided missile on a Hunter was called in to kill two men who were reported to be placing a roadside bombing in Iraq (Osborn 2007). On the use of UAVs for targeted assassination, one source reported: "Last summer [2006] *precision* targeting linked to modern military avionics took center stage in the global war on terrorism. Viewers tuned into news accounts featuring F-16 targeting pod imagery of the air-to-ground *precision-bombing* attack that killed leading terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in Iraq" (New Era for Military Avionics 2007). The spectacle of this assassination is emphasized in reporting how television viewers were included as they watched footage of the targeting. The use of drones takes the concept of a 'spectator-sport' war (McInnis 2002) to a new level, as not only Western citizens experience war as spectators, but the very pilots of the drones are spectators as well, guiding the drones in Afghanistan and Pakistan from Air Force bases in Nevada. The transfer of drone imagery to television encourages the interpolation of those watching with point of view of the state, to replicate the 'God-trick' and identity with the state's power to kill in their name, or as a warning to those who would defy the state. The television views thus become part of this same human/technological assemblage.

Rather than being replaced by technology, the bodies of pilots are becoming integrated into a system as a fragment of what Foucault refers to as "mobile space," (Foucault 1979, 164). The bodies of pilots are not, as in the case of the flying Aces of World War I, defined by strength or bravery. In fact, many of the drone pilots are not military personnel, but civilians including intelligence agents and private contractors

(Mayer 2009). The technology of the airplane, surveillance and weapons system, rather than 'taking the human out of the loop,' extends the body, or rather acts as a phenomena that comes into being with its biological and technological capabilities. For example, a handful of Special Forces troops and CIA agents were able to kill more enemy fighters in the Shah-i-Kot Valley in Afghanistan than the rest of the 2,000 US troops in the area by using binoculars and laser pointers to triangulate the source of weapons fire, and then calling in air strikes (Mahnken 2008, 198). Rather than the loss of the human in war, we are seeing the human in war transformed into a 'cyborg' system of technological capabilities.

"Prosthesis" is a technological term that is useful for understanding the ways in which technology performatively enables the cyber-subjectivity of the precision bomber. A prosthetic is mechanical contrivances adapted to reproduce the form, and as far as possible, the function, of a lost or absent member.[24] Elizabeth Grosz asks the question of whether a prosthetic is meant to correct a deficiency or a lack in the body, or whether the purpose is to supplement the body, giving it capabilities that exceed what is considered the norm (Grosz 2005, 147). If there is no such thing as a 'natural body' outside of the knowledge practices that constitute bodies, how then can we draw the line between what is 'natural' to the body and what is a human contrivance? Even if we could imagine a body in a 'state of nature' outside of sociality, that body is not self-sufficient, capable of existing without outside intervention. This is what Judith Butler has in mind when she

---

[24] Prostheses are also very relevant in a more literal sense, given that six percent of injured American soldiers fighting in Afghanistan or Iraq have lost limbs, a figure twice that of past wars. Tom Philpott, "Rise in Survival Rates," http://www.military.com/forums/0,15240,80183,00.html

describes bodies as ontologically 'precarious': bodies not only depend on their relations with others for their very existence, both in terms of defining the boundaries between bodies and in terms of the care necessary to sustain life, but bodies will necessarily cease to be, and are thus are at risk of death at any time (Butler 2009, 30). Bodies are precarious precisely because they cannot exist independently of their environment. The precariousness of bodies suggests, on one level, that the use of technology to increase human capabilities is not a matter of adding on a layer of technology to an already existing, pre-defined biological platform. Rather, the integration of biology and technology in the figure of the 'cyborg' suggests not an addition or subjection of the human, but a reconfiguration of subjectivity into the posthuman.

Embodiment involves a mechanical/semiotic contrivance to create the illusion of a functioning whole, when it never existed outside of this contrivance in the first place. Bodies, in whatever 'organic' or 'technological' form are pre-requisites for knowledge; their bodily constructions set the stage for the knowledge they produce. The cyber-embodiment of the precision bomber or drone operator sets the stage of the production of knowledge of the human subjects that are susceptible to the bomber's violence. As many scholars and commentators have noted, the experience in the West of the Gulf War of 1991 was of the 'bomb's eye' perspective in which television viewers watched the war from the back of a bomb. This 'bomb's eye view,' or the technology-aided view of the earth from satellites enhances 'natural' human vision for a super-human, cyborg subjectivity. The equation of the eye with the mind, feminist philosophers have pointed out, has a long history. The seeing eye is the privileged means of representing the object

of knowledge, creating in this performative process a knowing subject and a body as the object of that knowledge. It is not just biotechnology that wields this power, but instruments of war and destruction as well. Feminists challenge the objectivity of this form visual knowledge, denying the notion that vision is somehow unmediated and apolitical, even by 'one's own eyes'. Rather, visual capabilities are a crucial aspect of political subjectivity, and vision is always embodied. The metaphors of vision associated with satellite imagery and the perspective of pilots and bombs appears to be tied to a disembodied subject, a view from no-where and everywhere at the same time. "Vision in this technological feast becomes unregulated gluttony; all perspective gives way to infinitely mobile vision, which no longer seems just mythically about the god-trick of seeing everything from nowhere, but to have put the myth into ordinary practice" (Haraway 1991, 189). This 'myth' put into practice is the Cartesian mind/body separation that divorces vision and knowledge from bodies, and this myth is put into practice in the apparatus of precision bombing.

The 'god-trick' of the view from nowhere has played an essential role in modern state-building and colonial practices as a way to manage unfamiliar territories by mapping them and producing usable knowledge. Envisioning the territory from above is useful primarily to state elites interested in administering the land and remaking it so that is it more easily managed and ensuring the success of possible military action (Scott 1998, 55-57). The vision of the airplane, satellite and drone is a vantage point of absolute power; it is similar to the disembodied vision of the medical gaze into the body,

producing bodies and territories as intelligible and knowable from the outside, and ultimately, making these objects manipulable.

While many are concerned about the loss of soldiers lives in conflicts, especially in counter-insurgency efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, others are also concerned with taking the human out of war and the problems associated with humans being too far 'out of the loop'. For example, in 2006, Raytheon announced improvements to the control system to make it resemble an airplane cockpit in order to improve the pilots 'situational awareness.' This move was undertaken to reduce potential accidents, which until that point were largely attributable to pilot error.[25] In the summer of 2008, Raytheon announced a new console for 'pilots' of unmanned aerial vehicles. This console system differed from the old one, in that it replaced a keyboard with a video-game type console based on a discovery that "thumbs are the most energy-efficient and accurate way to control an aircraft" (Associated Press 2008). The new consoles also greatly enhance the view of the 'pilots' with digital images for a nearly 180 degree view. In the future, Raytheon hopes to make the console and the chair vibrate to reflect the sensation of turbulence and landing. Proponents of the use of drones cite not only their ability to perform dangerous missions, but also the fact that humans are still 'in the loop,' as UAVs are operated at a control center in Nevada. While attempting to fix some of the 'pilot error' with new technologies, the aim is not to replace the human, but rather to enhance pre-existing human capabilities; relying on the making the controllers feel more like being in the cockpit of a plane. The use of UAVs extends human capabilities even

---

[25] Raytheon Announces Revolutionary New "Cockpit" for Unmanned Craft. www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/micro_stories.pl?ACCT=1499.

further. Besides surveillance, drones are now weaponized, capable of being used not only to locate targets, but to fire on them as well. Drones can also be used on missions that would surpass human capabilities in endurance. Most drones can remain airborne for 24-48 hours, and a drone that could remain operational for up to five years is currently under development (DARPA 2008).

Precision bombing is dependent upon 'sight' beyond unenhanced human capabilities in order to be classified as 'precision' at all. Precision bombing reproduces the illusion of a disembodied subject with not only a privileged view of the world, but the power to destroy all that it sees. The cyborg bodies of precision bombers, relying on God's eye views enhanced with prosthetic technologies of sight, are produced as masterful, yet benign, subjects, using superior technology to spare civilians from more risky forms of aerial bombardment. The drones have also been described in benign terms by soldiers on mission on the ground in Afghanistan as unseen guardians and protectors of soldiers; drones have been used as a look out so weary soldiers could sleep (Zucchino 2010). Drones as 'guardian angels' is the partial enactment of the state's dream of total surveillance in the interests of management; portrayed as benign and helpful, instead of as killing machines, the use of drones as surveillance technologies is produced even as 'motherly' in a benign metaphor of parental love, as a mother watches over her children sleeping.

The technologies of precision bombing personify this 'god-trick' in various ways. First, precision bombing is dependent upon 'sight' beyond unenhanced human capabilities in order to be classified as 'precision' at all. The two main types of precision-

guided munitions are laser-guided and GPS-guided. In the former, a laser is used to point to a target and the missile follows the path of the laser to 'see' its way to the target. In the latter, satellites send information to correct the path of bombs, which are also equip with back-up systems in case this technology fails. GPS- guided bombs are generally more 'accurate' because they function regardless of weather conditions. The ever increasing clarity of GPS systems, including its ability to target at small and smaller CEPs point to a greater drive toward accuracy and a minimization of risk of error, such that even 'mistakes' fall within acceptable contingency parameters. Thus, the god-trick of 'sight' from everywhere is relegated to GPS systems and UAVs which are used to collect information, to substitute for eyes when it is too dangerous or difficult to obtain knowledge another way. This is a disembodied subjectivity, seemingly divorced from vulnerability or limits to its view or power.

The cyborg-ization of the soldier is simultaneously redrawing and reconstituting the gendered culture/nature and mind/body dichotomies. While the soldier has been constituted as a dominant figure of masculinity, the cyborg subjectivity could be considered a means of de-gendering the soldier, as bodily difference between males and females are made less relevant in an environment that promotes technology as a solution to fallible human bodies. Whereas at one point, the use of technology in warfare was considered to be un-manly, dishonorable, and diminishing the warrior spirit that marked the superiority of a nation's men (Wilcox 2009, 221-225), technology is now inscribed as masculine. Technology, as 'culture' or 'mind' is not only the righteous warrior, but the protector of the feminine: here, not only the 'beautiful souls' (Elshtain 1995 [1987]) of

the women and children back at home, but the body of the soldier. Precision warfare represents the Enlightenment dream of transcending the body, with wars being waged on video screens. It is the technology that is the instrument of violence, not the bodies of soldiers. The soldiers of precision warfare can thus maintain the identity of 'just warriors' who are law-abiding and chivalrous in their attempts to spare civilians and serve as 'guardian angels' for ground troops. As a 'cyborg' the pilot or drone operator is also post-gender; his or her sexed embodiment is irrelevant to performing the tasks at hand, and to his or her integration into the technological system.

Biopolitics constitutes a necessary, but not sufficient condition to describe the state of affairs in precision warfare. Foucault's biopolitical state naturalizes the body and the population, while the cyborg bodies of the precision bomber and drone operators are specifically unnatural bodies. Haraway writes that the cyborg 'simulates' politics. 'Simulates' here has multiple, interacting meanings. To simulate is to make a copy, but is also to create, to materialize. The politics the cyborg simulates are based on the biopolitics of protection and the domination of the machine, but this reproduction is not flawless, it is inauthentic. The cyborg-ness of the precision bomber infuses the 'natural' body of the bomber and makes it something else entirely.

Cyborgs, in their leakiness between human and technology, resist the biopolitical tendency to naturalize life. While precision warfare seems to represent the ultimate in the liberal dream of warfare: disembodied, autonomous, and invulnerable, a cyborg reading suggests this reading is flawed. Precision warfare is predicated upon the development of a subject that blurs the boundaries between human and machine. If the liberal state

204

exercises its task of the protection of the natural lives of its population and its own sovereign existence through precision warfare, some of its foundational assumptions of the subject are undermined. The 'prosthetic' nature of the precision bomber means that his or her body is not autonomous, but rather is dependent on the supplementation of technology. The body, as natural, autonomous and protected by the state, is only possible once it is made *unnatural* and dependent upon technological supplementation. Such bodies are not only constituted by precision warfare, but constitute other bodies in their turn.

Precision Warfare and "Bodies that Don't Matter"

The victims of precision warfare fall into two categories: 'terrorists' targeted for killing, and the population that is accidentally killed either directly from the bombs or indirectly from the infrastructural damage that is a major purpose of military campaigns. These bodies are produced in mutual entanglement with the bodies of the precision bomber—these bodies do not exist on their own, but rather in inter-relation to each other. The bodies of 'terrorist' or of 'civilians' do not pre-exist their production in relation to cyborg bodies; they are made into objects of violent intervention through the practices of precision warfare.

Bodies of Terrorists

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault recounts how techniques that were invented to forge men into soldiers in order to win wars became the basis for similar techniques to subdue the domestic population. In particular, bodies are individualized in space and

205

time. This tactic can be seen in the demarcation of spaces as 'military' or 'civilian'. It has been argued that the norm of discrimination between civilians and combatants is strengthening and technological developments in precision bombing have made it easier to distinguish between civilians and combatants (Thomas 2006). Precision bombing allows for greater penetration of this tactic; once entire cities were considered to be 'civilian' and therefore morally suspect as bombing targets, now specific buildings within residential areas can be targeted. For example, in the Second World War, flying during the day with good weather conditions, it still sometimes took thousands of bombs for a few to reach their intended targets, which sometimes were defined in terms of hundreds of square acres (McFarland 1995, 160-195). In the Gulf War, bombs could famously take out single buildings, leaving others on a city block free of damage. The technology of precision warfare has now made it possible (theoretically) for the state to distinguish particular individuals in space, rather than neighborhoods or buildings; precision warfare has now allowed the state to demarcate, and kill, individual bodies. Precision bombing has made not only specific populations the targets of bombs, as in the aerial bombardment of the Second World War, but also has individualized the targets.

Targeted assassinations, which are perhaps better known as summary executions instead of the euphemism of 'extrajudicial killings,' form a significant component of recent counter insurgency and counter terrorism wars. This kind of violence differs from the lethal force used by soldiers in battles, in that the targeted is identified in advance. Rather than soldiers being allowed to kill any combatants, in these summary executions the state has authorized the killing of specific, named individuals (Plaw 2008, 4). The

206

targets of these summary executions are (mostly) the same as those deemed to be 'enemy combatants' who are not given the rights of prisoners of war. The category of 'enemy combatant' enabled the Bush administration to detain hundreds captured in Afghanistan in camps at Bagram and Guantanamo Bay, on the basis that neither persons affiliated with al-Qaeda nor the Taliban were representatives of a functioning state (Yoo 2002; Bybee 2002).

Quite apart from the concealed nature of biopolitical warfare and the hidden deaths of civilians, the body of the suspected terrorist is subject to the very public punishment of sovereign power. Summary executions can be usefully read as an extension of risk management, biopolitical warfare. On January 13, 2006, a UAV attempted to kill al-Zawahiri and aides in Northern Pakistan. In April of 2003, US also tried to kill Saddam Hussein and some of his sons at a restaurant using precision targeting. Saddam and the others weren't there, and fourteen civilians were killed. On January 8th, US deployed air strikes in Somalia against a group believed to be al-Qaeda. Targeted killing is legal in Israel, and has been used against several leaders of Hamas. UAVs are now used to carry out targeted killings in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Killings of high-profile al-Qaeda leaders, when successful, are frequently widely reported as triumphs in the war on terror. Despite Defense Secretary Rumsfeld's declaration that "we don't do body counts on other people" reports about progress of the counter-insurgency in Iraq, for example, frequently reported the number of those claimed to be 'enemies' who were killed (Graham 2005). While the number of civilians killed by drones is widely disputed, the targets killed are counted and triumphantly reported in the press.

The military advantage in using precision munitions and drones to carry out attacks on known and suspected militants is obvious: assassinations can be carried out without risking the lives of members of the CIA or Special Forces. This tactic is justified by references to terrorists hiding in remote parts of the world that are inaccessible to US troops or any sovereign government. Furthermore, while it is illegal for an agent of the United States to carry out an assassination, the use of missiles and drones to carry out summary executions has not generally be defined as 'assassination'. Rather, it is framed as an extension of battlefield combat, especially in the ongoing global war on terror. The US Congress has endorsed Bush's post-9/11 policy authorizing the CIA to kill members and affiliates of Al Qaeda, using a rationale of "anticipatory self-defense" similar to Israel's rationale for similar killings (Mayer 2009). The Obama administration has continued this policy and dramatically increased the use of drones to kill in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The use of targeted killings by missile or drone is generally framed as an alternative to the deployment of US troops to kill or detain the suspect. While eliminating the risk to the potential captors, targeted assassinations also eliminate the option of taking suspects into custody, in which they might be questioned, held as a prisoner of war, or charged with a crime in order to stand trial. They occupy a different status than the prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay, who are subjected to torture, indefinite detention, and force-feeding to keep them alive, but subjugated. The targets represent not an enemy who must be coerced into surrendering or a fugitive who must be brought to justice, but the subject of extermination. This is the relationship that Foucault designates as racism,

208

which is a way to mark the "break between what must live and what must die" (Foucault 2003, 254) and also, of the necessity of the death of some to secure the lives of others. The health of one population (the cyborg warriors and those they ostensibly protect) is made possible by the death of another population (the 'terrorists'). However, the terrorists are not figured as a population per se, but rather a set of individuals who are marked as those who have or would disregard the sovereign's law, and must be publically, bodily, punished as a means of re-establishing the presence of the sovereign (Foucault 1979).

The use of drones continues the extension of the space of the battlefield as well as the time of war indefinitely. By surpassing the limits of the 'normal biopolitical body' through the inculcation of cyborg subjectivities invested with sovereign power over life and death, precision warfare is a means of constituting the global reach of the panopticon: "the oldest dream of the oldest sovereign" (Foucault 2007, 66). Sovereign power over the individualized bodies of terrorists is exercised simultaneously with the biopolitical rationality of risk management that characterizes the 'accidental' deaths of civilians who are killed as a result of the high-tech targeting of terrorists. Successfully waging the indefinite war on terror seems to depend more and more on the use of precision warfare, especially drones. Leon Panetta, the CIA director, has said that the drones are "the only game in town" in terms of effectively waging war in Afghanistan and Pakistan (Mayer 2009). Drones are used in cases in which other forms of sovereign power are unavailable, primarily in the 'ungovernable' regions of Pakistan and Afghanistan, in which the government is unable or unwilling to capture or kill terrorist/enemy fighters itself, and the geography makes occupation more difficult.

Furthermore, the scope of the sovereign power that the drones enable is not only unlimited geographically, but also is not restricted based on the citizenship of those who may be designated targets. The Obama administration has authorized strikes against Anwar al- Awlaki, a Muslim cleric who is a US citizen and is presumed to be in Yemen. In defense of this decision, one counterterrorism official said, "American citizenship doesn't give you carte blanche to wage war against your own country. If you cast your lot with its enemies, you may well share their fate" (Shane 2010). In a New York Times article, al-Awlaki is compared with German Americans who fought with the Nazis in World War II as well as Nazi propagandists. Given the existing laws of war, neither of these are appropriate analogies; al-Awlaki is not alleged to be directly participating in hostilities, and being a 'propagandist' does not make one legally 'killable' as combatants are. Marking him for death is the performative act of the sovereign, making an exception out of al-Awlaki outside of US and international law, a death that would be much most difficult for the US without the ability to kill him by drone attack.

This power of individualizing targets has broadened as well; with drones being used to target and kill not only individuals who are deemed to be leaders among the 'enemy combatants,' but lower level 'foot soldiers' as well. A 'rule of thumb' used to be that the CIA had to have enough intelligence on a subject to know his name in order for a suspect to be targeted. This is no longer necessary, as acting as if you pose a threat is now enough to be targeted for a drone killing (Muir 2010). Lower-level militants are now being targeted, especially Pakistan. A recent study shows that only six of the forty-one drone strikes by the CIA in Pakistan (as of Fall 2009) have been al-Qaeda members. The

rest were aimed at Taliban, while it took 18 different strikes to killed one man, Baitullah Mehsud. One report suggests that, while the media has emphasized high-level al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders such as Ayman al-Zawahiri, more than twelve times as many mid or low level fighters have been killed by drones as named targets (Entous 2010). The Obama administration has also broadened the list of "approved targets" to include about fifty Afghani drug lords accused to helping to finance the Taliban (Mayer 2009). While the drones serve as a means of summary execution when targeting al-Qaeda or Taliban leaders, when used against run-of-the-mill militants, this form of violence resembles the use of cannon or other artillery in war, rather than a targeted assassination.

The mobility and visual capabilities of drones, combined with the option of lethal force, make drones an attractive option that enables the greater practice of sovereign power at less cost and less risk to US military personnel. The Pentagon has stationed Reaper drones in the Horn of Africa where militants in Somalia or Yemen as well as pirates may be targeted in the future (Entous 2010). Unarmed drones have also been used to patrol the US/Canada and US/Mexico border (Davey 2008). The use of drones to conduct surveillance and possibly deliver lethal force is a tool not only of sovereign power, but also of the productive power of visual technologies as active components of cyborg bodies to produce particular subjects.

Al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters have been transformed from 'enemy combatants' that are made into subjects of dependence at Guantanamo Bay that are not precisely Agamben's *homines sacri* because they are not only indefinitely detained, but indefinitely sustained through force-feeding. As targets in precision warfare, their deaths do not

constitute murder, and they are also celebrated as a triumph of the state's ability to demarcate individuals in space and use lethal force against them.

"Patterns of Life"

In 2010, the CIA carried out 118 drone strikes, killing between 2 (most likely estimate) and 13 (very generous estimate) foot soldiers (Miller 2011). CIA has admitted that over 500 people have been killed, describing them as low-level militants. The New America Foundation estimates over 600 people have been killed in 2010. Civilian casualties have apparently dropped, from 25% to 6%. In February 2011, the Washington Post reported that the CIA has shifted its targeting procedure to focus on militants who meet a criteria kept secret, but which is referred to as a 'pattern of life' that includes certain 'signatures' such as traveling in or out of an Al Qaeda compound (Miller 2011). "Pattern of life" analysis was also used as evidence in the decision to decimate an Afghan village using 25 one-ton bombs (Ackerman 2011).

The critique of the 'pattern of life' criteria is not so much that some of the people identified by this technology may be 'misidentified' and not actually be al-Qaeda or Taliban militants, though this is certainly a concern. On one level, we might critique this kind of criteria as straying from the traditional just war as well as IHL criteria from determining who is a combatant and thus a legitimate target, as this criteria is notably looser from the standard of providing 'material support' for hostilities. What I am more interested in, however, is what the use of 'pattern of life' analysis reveals about the nature of contemporary warfare. Aside from designating certain people as terrorists and

marking them for death individually, this kind of criteria means that sovereign power can be used to target certain people without connecting them to the discourse of 'terrorism' explicitly. Here, the use of drones to target certain bodies based on a kind of biopolitical discourse—the term 'life' also connects the regime of precision warfare with biology and ecology—a naturalized, biopolitical discourse suggesting a kind of transformation from the subject position of terrorist, to a more vague designation of 'undesirability'. Marking people for death—for elimination—based on this 'pattern of life' suggests that precision warfare is being used not only on behalf of sovereign power's ability to punish and kill globally, but of the ability and desire to kill based on a particular way of being in the world, that, while not articulated in racial terms, uses language associated with biology to designate a population marked for death.

The racist past of aerial bombardment is relevant in constituting certain populations as those who can be marked based on a 'pattern of life.' Strategies of airpower evolved as low cost, low casualty way to manage empires and subdue natives, aided by the modern epistemological framework that privileges the objective 'view from no-where' over local knowledge and uses this perspective to re-make societies (Scott 1998). While airplane bombs accounted for only a tiny percentage of the European lives lost in World War I, aerial bombardment played a key role in colonial wars, both in overthrowing native rule and fighting against independence movements. The use of bombs against Mohammed Hassan (the "Mad Mullah") in Somaliland, in the border lands of India, and against Egyptian revolutionaries are but a few examples. It wasn't until the second world war that 'civilized' peoples could be bombed. The apparent

unacceptability of certain 'patterns of life' and the need to re-make the world and destroy those who are not complicit represents continuity with colonial struggles to manage 'ungovernable' lands and reform native populations. The visual abilities that accrue to cyborg precision bombers make not only the exercise of sovereign power possible through the biopolitical imperative to kill some so that others might live, but also enable the killing of others to be understood as accidents, outside of political accountability, in the realm of the naturalized disaster of more akin to a tornado or an epidemic.

Bodies of Civilians

While the 'terrorists' are targeted for death, a large number of the people actually killed in precision warfare are civilians. The 'spectacle' of punishment in bombing is the destruction of buildings and non-human targets; the death of people, whether soldiers or civilians with some important exceptions, is hidden from view. Where the just war tradition sees death in war as glorious sacrifice on behalf of the nation, death is a mistake or an accident in precision warfare (Elshtain 1995 [1987]). Apart from the much discussed 'CNN effect' in which Western countries are seen to be reluctant cause civilian casualties or endure casualties of their own military forces due the supposed lack of political support for such missions, the avoidance or hiding of death can be seen as part of a broader process of liberal warfare. Challenging this vision of the perfectability of war, Beier argues "there is an indeterminacy inherent in the use of precision-guided munitions (PGMs), even when the weapons themselves perform as intended" (Beier

2006, 267). While the military stresses the procedures used to distinguish civilians from the intended targets, drones reportedly kill ten civilians for every militant death (Byman 2009).

By privileging the question of just how 'precise' precision weapons are, both proponent and critics of precision warfare operate in the discourse of risk in which death and destruction are probabilistic rather than absolute. The deaths of civilians and 'our' soldiers are carefully managed. Patricia Owens argues that the 'accidents' in precision bombing that kill scores of civilians are not really 'accidents' per se, but are rather part of a discourse associated with technological progress legitimizes such civilian deaths under the guise of 'accidents' (Owens 2003). 'Accidents' furthermore help sustain the hegemonic status quo in which US and NATO campaigns are framed as 'humanitarian'. The portrayal of civilian casualties as 'accidents' by officials and in the popular press along with constant claims of military planners of the precautions taken to avoid civilian casualties serve to shield politicians and the military from responsibility for these civilian deaths. 'Accidental' deaths are seen as inevitable even with the most precise weapons are used. The word 'even' here is instructive. Accidental massacres are attributed to human, not technological error. For example, the attack on Al-Firdos bunker in which three hundred civilians were killed is described as one of the most precise of the war: an intelligence failure as to the facility's use was the only thing preventing this mission from being a complete success (Rip and Jasik 2002, 321). The bombing of the Chinese embassy in Sarajevo has been attributed to the use of outdated maps or to improper targeting information. The infamous bombing of a wedding party in Afghanistan has

215

been attributed to errors made by the ground spotters. Thus, even when technology enables the accidental massacre, it is ultimately not to blame, it is human error that causes the technology to fail. Humans are fallible, but machines and more importantly, the ideology that the machine represents, are not fallible. The machine represents the highest ideas of rationality and perfectibility. To replace the human with the machine is ideologically to remove risk, contingency from the battle space and to have total control.

Those to whom violence is done to 'accidentally' are constituted as 'bodies that don't matter'. Civilian deaths are considered tragic, but acceptable. "While any loss of civilian life is deplorable, the relatively few non-combatants killed by bombing attacks— Human Rights Watch estimates 500—is nonetheless remarkable for such an intense air campaign" (Meilenger 2001, 78-79). This number has been recorded for the air war over Kosovo by a human rights organization, while in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, government officials have refused to keep count of civilian deaths, referring to the difficulties in ascertaining an 'accurate' count. One UK official said, "It should be recognized that there is no reliable way of estimating the number of civilian casualties caused during major combat operations" (BBC 2005). The deaths of civilians are not in view of either the bombers or the viewers thousands of miles away who witness the war through a media restricted from showing the caskets of dead soldiers returning to the United States (Milbank 2003; Stolberg 2004)·. The Pentagon has also disavowed the possibility of ascertaining how many civilians have been killed despite the existence of many techniques for counting civilian dead (Norris 1991, 228). The limits of the discourse of precision can be seen in the contrast between the capability to bomb

216

buildings accurately, but not count civilian deaths accurately. The discourse of the unknowability of body counts distinguishes precision warfare from prior modes of warfare. By means of contrast, in the Vietnam War, progress was often measured by 'body counts' of the number of enemies (or suspected enemies killed). Accordingly, very precise records were kept of the number of deaths. The Iraq Body Count is one attempt to counter the erasure of the civilian death. The IBC uses confirmed media accounts of violent deaths in order to conservatively estimate the number of civilians killed in Iraq, while also providing information on the circumstances of their deaths and biographical information about the victims. The IBC differs from other estimates of civilian deaths in IRAQ, notably the Lancet study (Roberts 2004), in that it does not use estimates but insists on recording actually, verifiable deaths.

In the discourse of precision warfare, the difficulty of distinguishing between civilians and combatants is presented as an epistemological problem of insufficient vision in surveillance, or insufficient intelligence. In other words, distinguishing between civilians and combatants, and only killing combatants, is possible with better information. The God's eye vision of precision warfare is not only the perspective of the pilots, but is an epistemology that constructs absolute knowledge as finite and attainable. However, epistemologies do not only produce objects of knowledge, but produce 'unknowns' as well. The lack of precise body counts, as well as the difficulty in distinguishing between civilians and combatants in precision warfare should not be understood as a temporary shortcoming in a progression of ever-increasing knowledge, but as an actively produced ignorance (see Tuana 2004 and Scott 1998, 12-13 for other examples of activitely

217

produced ignorances). Applied to 'body counts,' the difficulties in accurately calculating the number of civilian and combatant deaths are not a matter of unreliable systems of measurement and the methodological and political issues surrounding attempts to enumerate casualties, but rather the result of a discursive system that actively produces the 'accidental' deaths of civilians as un-knowable, as a matter of the unreliability of counting practices or enemy propaganda, in short, of the failure of the very state whose failure brought about the bombings in the first place.

The bodies of civilians are produced as 'unknowable' in another material sense, in terms of being rendered unrecognizable by the massive amounts of firepower they are subject to. Between 70 and 100 civilians died in one airstrike in north Afghanistan in September 2009 when NATO targeted two fuel tankers that the Taliban had hijacked, but, having gotten them stuck in a riverbed, decided to give to impoverished villagers who struggled to stockpile fuel for the winter. The bodies were mangled and scorched beyond recognition; because the bodies were unidentifiable, village elders asked grieving relatives how many members they had lost, and distributed one body to match each one lost so they could be buried and grieved, with body parts given when bodies had run out with families still missing relatives. One man said, "I couldn't find my son, so I took a piece of flesh with me home and I called it my son" (Abdul-Ahad 2009). The discourse of the 'unknowability' of civilian deaths neglects the horrific nature of the violence of precision warfare that makes deaths unknowable to states, but even unknowable to those most affected.

The 'unknowability' of civilian deaths is related to their production as homines sacri, sacred men. Agamben's figure of homo sacer is a person who can be killed without the death being considered a homicide (Agamben 1998). The homo sacer has been constituted by sovereign power as 'bare life,' biological life without political significance. This concept has different implications from the concept of 'civilian'. Whereas civilians retain their status as persons whose right to life is to be protected under international law, the state of exception that characterizes war, and especially precision warfare, has made the civilian into a figure whose life has no political significance. 'Bare life,' however, has entered politics by the very nature of precision warfare that takes the protection of citizens on one hand, and the civilians in physical proximity to the enemy fighters on the other, to be major political concerns. To be relevant insofar as they live or die, to be enumerated in 'body counts' is to be sacred life, that is, killed without the religious overtones of sacrifice. To avoid killing civilians a key rationale for the development and use of precision weaponry, yet, it is due to the practices of precision warfare that that civilians are made killable in the first place.

In contrast to the masculine, cyborg subjectivity of the precision bomber and drone operator, 'civilians' are considered feminine figures. The gendering of the concept of 'civilian' has a long history, as war-fighting has remained an almost-exclusively male province. Women, considered to be inherently weak and defenseless, served as the quintessential civilian as someone who not only is not, but cannot be a threat (Kinsella 2005). The phrase 'women and children' is often used synonymously with 'civilian' such that men who are not taking part in hostilities are often assumed to be combatants or at

least potential combatants. The gendering of civilians is an effect of practices of precision warfare, as one methods drone pilots use to determine whether or not they have hit their target is to check for the bodies of women. As women are presumed to be non-combatants, the presence of women killed at the scene is read as a missed target and the death of non-combatant (Entous 2010). As *always already* civilians in the discourse of precision warfare, women's bodies are not safe from being killed, but are not targeted. What, then, constitutes a woman's body under these conditions? Clothing associated with women? A particular hair style? Lack of a beard? Evidence of breasts or genitalia in the aftermath of a bombing? Precision bombers are being asked to determine whether someone is a civilian or a combatant based on their embodiment as male or female (female as definitely not combatant, male as possibly not a combatant). The point here is not whether men or women suffer more from these strategies, but a question of the basis targeting decisions are made, and what assumptions about sex, gender, culture and embodiment are being deployed in order to make these life and death decisions.

As a population, 'civilians' are understood as in need of protection, as they are 'innocent' of the violence of war. Yet, the civilians of the enemy population are not afforded the same status of protection as 'our' civilians, on whose behalf the war is fought. The bodies of civilians are those who are 'allowed to die' rather than those who are made to live, or those who must die, in the terms of Foucault's logic of biopolitics as a form of war. Their appearance politically as 'mere bodies' or 'bare life' not only reveals the political work needed to strip their bodies of subjectivity, but also the interconnection between the bodies of civilians and the bodies of cyborg soldiers. The bodies of civilians

are produced in relation to the production of cyborg soldiers. order for the military personnel to commit violence from afar, from a nearly disembodied 'video game' manner, the bodies of civilians are produced as biopolitical bodies who live or die as a matter of rational calculation and risk management. Subjected to the aleatory nature of precision weapons and complicated formulae factoring into targeting decisions, including the weather and how much a threat the intended target is, the civilians are not individualized as the targets of the bombs are. They exist only as members of a population, whose management entails not the injunction to 'make live' but rather the minimization of threat, rather than a serious effort at its elimination.

Counting Bodies

While counting bodies is one step toward a critical analysis of precision warfare, the mere counting of bodies does not necessarily challenge the production of certain bodies as killable, especially as such numbers are compared (3,000 US soldiers killed in Iraq versus 3,000 killed on September 11th, Iraqi civilians killed by Coalition forces versus Iraqi civilians killed by Saddam Hussein). As one theorist noted, "common practices of reporting casualties have become so normalized that they at once obscure and reproduce the workings of geopolitical power that frame these numbers" (Hyndman 2007, 38). Just as in how the imaging capabilities of satellites and drones make it possible to view individual people targeted, yet this does not necessarily bring about greater sensitivity and reluctance to use force, the enumeration of deaths does not necessarily constitute a politics of re-humanizing or 'subjectivizing' those who have been made into 'mere bodies'. Butler echoes this concern, arguing that the act of representing, or 'seeing'

221

the other is not enough to ensure the humanization of the subject. Subjects produced as 'bare life' for example, are constituted "life unworthy of being lived" (Agamben 1998, 138-139). It is not the 'human' that is represented, but rather, the 'human' is the limit of the possibility of representation. What has been produced as 'inhumane' or outside of the bounds of humanity cannot be brought in by representation. For Butler, following Levinas, "The human cannot be captured through the representation, and we can see that some loss of the human takes place when it is 'captured' by the image" (Butler 2004, 145). The representation of suffering beings does not necessarily bring them into the ethical moment, but rather, representation practices can be used to produce some humans, some bodies, as 'other,' as lives not worth mourning. The 'human' exceeds representation because representation is what brings 'beings' into being; a process that forces the question of the ethical from the deployment of sovereign, physical violence *per se* to questions of ethical representational, boundary-producing practices. The precision bomber as 'cyborg' suggests that both bomber and the people on his/her screen are flows of information on a screen—existing as texts or codes. The 'visibility' or production of certain subjects through their integration in informational frameworks constituted by the practices of precision warfare suggests that a greater emphasis on 'seeing' the victims of warfare is not an adequate critique: it is the 'coding' of such people that matters.

While precision warfare produces civilian casualties as something 'unknowable,' it also produces certain other kinds of harms as unknowable and ungrievable as well. Precision warfare often causes long-term infrastructural damage from the targeting of electrical plants which power hospitals and water-treatment facilities. While this targeting

222

may kill few people immediately, the long-term deaths and illnesses from lack of medical care, clean water and other necessities of life are also considered uncountable. Precision warfare demonstrates that increasing vision, or bringing representation of bodies into to the public sphere is not enough, because this vision is always embodied through a particular subject.

Conclusion

This chapter has probed the political implications of the mutually entangled bodies of cyborg precision warrior and the killable bodies of 'terrorists' and 'enemy combatants' (a category that is becoming too broad to fit any single characterization other than 'killable'). By mutually entangled, I mean that the physical/political production of these bodies with certain capabilities and powers comes in terms of the formation of other bodies. There is no 'terrorist' marked for death by a hovering drone without a cyborg drone pilots, nor are there 'accidental' unnamed, uncounted and uncountable, deaths of civilians (a concept that is also inadequate when the category of 'marked for death' is so broad to include those who might otherwise be counted as civilians). These bodies exist only in relation to one another, the sovereign power of the cyborg warrior existing only by the performative force of its ability to view the movements of, and launch missiles at, people half a world away. Precision warfare thus simultaneously produces a subject that is invulnerable and subjects that can or must die, but at the same time, erases responsibility for this very regime.

In a regime in which the biopolitical operates with such force, the 'natural' bodies that biopower works to secure are shown to be *unnatural* bodies, constituted in reference to historical political conditions and divergent material capabilities. "There is no unmediated photograph or passive camera obscura in scientific accounts of bodies and machines; there are only highly specific visual possibilities, each with a wonderfully detailed, active, partial way of organizing worlds" (Haraway 1991, 190). Precision warfare, as producing and making use of particular bodies with particular embodied visions, organizes and makes legible a world of individual targets and accidental deaths of civilians. It is these unnatural bodies that constitute the biopolitical practice of precision warfare as a tool of 'humanitarian' global liberal governance. In the next chapter, I take this project's overall themes of the problems of embodiment in biopolitical security practices, including the naturalization of bodies, bodies as material and cultural/political and bodies as precarious, and bring them to bear on an emerging doctrine of security: the "Responsibility to Protect".

Chapter 6: *Vulnerable Bodies and "Responsibility to Protect"*

--If the ontology of the body serves as a point of departure for such a rethinking of responsibility, it is precisely because, in its surface and its depth, the body is a social phenomenon: it is exposed to others, vulnerable by definition (Butler 2009, 33).

In this chapter, I show how the theorization of bodies I've developed in this project can be applied to critique an emerging framework for understanding and addressing contemporary security threats: the doctrine of "Responsibility to Protect," often abbreviated R2P. Given the theorization of bodies this work has developed of bodies as unnatural, constituting and not contained in themselves nor in their relations to others, we can now think about bodies in connection to R2P in such a way that challenges the terms of 'responsibility' by thinking about not only harm done to existing bodies, but the production of certain bodies as those that can be harmed. Specifically, I attempt to think through the paradigm of R2P from Butler's concern with the social and political conditions governing livable lives, a concern that animates her work from earlier work on gender and heterosexuality in *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies that Matter* to her more explicitly political and ethical writings *Precarious Life* and *Frames of War*. I show that thinking through the ethical implications of R2P from the perspective of normative violence has broader implications for the way in which we think about ethics and responsibility.

In this work, I've argued that bodies are unstable, requiring supplementation in a variety of ways. Sovereign power is one form of supplementation of the body in so far as sovereign power is necessary to live a natural life free of violence, deprivation and an

225

early death in the Hobbesian state of nature. In biopolitics, the 'natural bodies' that constitute the populations are, as I've argued, precisely *unnatural* bodies that must not only be managed, but also *known,* that is, constituted as objects of knowledge in order to survive and thrive under responsible stewardship. Their existence *as* bodies places humans in the 'unnatural' realm of the cyborg (see also Butler, 2004b, 13). Bodies are all monstrous, and the cyborg is indeed its logic (Haraway 1991); but the forms this unnaturalness takes matter quite a bit. The bodies of precision bombers are deeply unnatural; but unlike the unnatural bodies of suicide bombers, they are more like gods than monsters in their virtual immunity from harm and god-like powers of vision and destruction. The frameworks this work has developed for thinking about bodies, subjects and violence suggest that ethical accounts of political violence take into account more than the injuring or killing of natural bodies, but that social relations—including security practices—are implicated in producing these bodies as seemingly natural organisms and producing some as killable while others must be made to live.

Butler's thesis of bodily vulnerability and ontological precariousness is an argument that bodies do not exist in their own right, but rather exist only in virtue of certain conditions that make them intelligible as human. Humans are not only vulnerable to violence as natural bodies which can be harmed, but are vulnerable precisely because they exist only in and through their constitution in a social and political world, in and through other bodies. Human bodies are vulnerable to each other precisely because there is no 'we' nor 'I' outside of the other. Butler writes, "if the ontology of the body serves as a point of departure for such a rethinking of responsibility, it is precisely because, in its

226

surface and its depth, the body is a social phenomenon: it is exposed to others, vulnerable by definition" (Butler 2009, 33). This statement serves as the epigraph to this chapter because it highlights the connection between rethinking the body and rethinking the terms of ethics and responsibility that attend to us as embodied subjects. Having shown how bodies can be rethought as unstable and precarious in their ongoing formation in relation to one another, I turn to a critique of the recent revision of the concept of sovereignty that defines sovereignty as the 'responsibility to protect' rather than an absolute right of non-interference in domestic affairs.

Responsibility to Protect

Recently, the doctrine of 'responsibility to protect' has been promoted as a norm that encourages states to override the principle of state sovereignty in order to stop genocide and other 'mass atrocities' (Bellamy 2009). Set up by the Canadian government, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) promoted the concept of 'responsibility to protect' as way of resolving the debates in the 1990s over humanitarian intervention.

The Rwandan genocide, the killing of over seven thousand men and boys at Srebrenica, ongoing rapes and the killing of civilians in Darfur and the DRC are all instances of the kinds of mass violence that the doctrine of R2P was initiated to prevent; R2P develops a framework to provide guidance to the international community on how to address such atrocities. This norm essentially makes sovereignty conditional upon upholding certain standards of human rights. If we are seeking, then, to determine who is

sovereign, that is, who has the right to let live or kill without it counting as murder, we might locate this power in NATO or its most powerful member states. However, we might also see this, as its proponents do, as making human life sovereign, as the pre-eminent political value. R2P represents a biopolitical logic by defining sovereignty as responsibility.

R2P was formally adopted at the 2005 World Summit. The Outcome document for this summit states "Each individual state has the responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity" (quoted in Bellamy 2009, 66). Military interaction is not intended to be the first step to address such atrocities, rather, other coercive measures are to be taken first including diplomacy, sanctions, or the use of judicial instruments such as the International Criminal Court. R2P formally includes not only the 'responsibility to react' in terms of the international community's use of military or other forms of intervention, but the 'responsibility to prevent' of both states and the international community to monitor emerging situations and the 'responsibility to rebuild' such that, in the case of the use of force to stop or prevent mass atrocities, the international community must remain involved in efforts to rebuild and fix the damage caused.

R2P is a development of a broader agenda in international politics to re-define security from the protection of the state to the protection of the individual. The concept of 'human security' has, in the past few decades, become a relatively frequently invoked term in the international community and especially the UN to change the referent of security from the state to the individual person, and specifically the ways in which

individual human life is insecure. While the human security approach strives to change the conceptual apparatus, it relies on the established logic of security, as human bodies are produced as objects to be protected from outside threats, just as states are in conventional international security discourse. The agenda of human security emerged in the post-Cold War shift from what was considered 'traditional' security threats of interstate war to 'non-traditional' security issues such as civil war, genocide, terrorism, the use of indiscriminate weapons of landmines and cluster-bombs and even non-violent causes of bodily vulnerability, like the lack of food and clean water as well as health issues including the HIV pandemic. "Security is about confronting extreme vulnerabilities—not only in wars but in natural and man-made disasters as well" (Kaldor 2007, 183). In 'human security' the focus is on the dying, suffering bodies of people located someplace else, in the Third World, the Global South, the (former) colonies. These are de-politicized bodies, bodies to be kept alive, to be fed and healed. They are bodies that are the objects of Western intervention to save, as their states have failed to save them. As such, R2P is a conception of security that reinforces the paradigm of sovereign power.

R2P conceives of the security problematic as one in which pre-existing subjects are bodily harmed by other pre-existing subjects. The threat here stems from a theorization of the security problematic as constituted by the threat of sovereign power: the power to take life or let live. The problem R2P is meant to address is the abuse of this power to take life. R2P is meant to prevent and address violence against individuals, either by the government itself, or violence that the government cannot or will not stop.

R2P is a vision of security from the perspective of sovereign or juridical power. R2P implicitly theorizes bodies and security in ways that are familiar in the mainstream of security studies; natural bodies that will live unless they are intervened upon by outside forces that would injure or kill them.

R2P enshrines the concept that rights-bearing individuals are the basis from which state sovereignty is derived. State sovereignty is redefined as not an absolute principle of non-interference from other states, but as a responsibility. Non-interference is made contingent upon government's protecting the rights of their citizens. As stated by the co-chairs of the ICISS, "it is now commonly acknowledged that sovereignty implies a dual responsibility: externally, to respect the dignity and basic rights of all the people within the state. In international human rights covenants, in UN practice and in state practice itself, sovereignty is now understood as embracing this dual responsibility. Sovereignty as responsibility has become the minimum content of good international citizenship" (Evans and Sahnoun 2002, 102).

This is a shift from prior definitions of sovereign. First, sovereignty makes all states equal and allows them to wage war. Sovereignty is what enables states to use violence. Sovereignty is now re-understood to entail protection of sovereign citizens. We are still within the terms of sovereign power, but R2P is a way in which security is now also articulated in biopolitical terms. Evans and Sahnoun write, "at the heart of this conceptual approach is a shift in thinking about the essence of sovereignty, from control to responsibility" (Evans and Sahnoun 2002, 101). The reformulation of sovereign as responsibility casts sovereignty in biopolitical terms: no longer the power to take life over

230

a specific territory, sovereignty is a beneficent form of patriarchal power, governing the population with its best interests in mind (Foucault 2007, 100, 129). The language of R2P documents specifically list mass atrocities of genocide and ethnic cleansing as well as widespread deprivation such as starvation and lack of clean water as failures to protect. Such phenomena take place not at the level of individuals, but at the level of population. By recasting sovereignty as responsibility, R2P installs a biopolitical understanding of sovereignty as promoting the lives of citizens as a population of organisms; preventing mass violent deaths and ensuring proper circulation of basic necessities.

The biopolitical, as that which takes control of life processes collapses such a distinction between war and politics that sovereignty produces in its reserving of violence and war for itself. The biopolitical critique of security practices focuses our attention on the ways in which security not only forbids—in terms of forbidding certain forms of violence, but is also productive. As Foucault said in one of his lectures, "Politics is the continuation of war by other means. We should not consider the elimination of violence to be a world without domination, we need to think in terms of what subjects are produced through these practices" (Foucault 2003, 15).

While we might fruitfully describe R2P in terms of the biopolitical nature of contemporary security practices, this critique is not sufficient to account for proliferation of this new norm and its consequences for thinking about ethics and responsibility in terms of embodied subjects. A biopolitical critique of R2P calls upon us to be attentive to the workings of power in producing certain kinds of subjects, and, importantly, certain kinds of bodies who are vulnerable or invulnerable. The feminist frameworks of

embodiment I've been working with call attention to the ways in which objects of intervention under R2P have to be made intelligible a certain kinds of bodies. Just as various technologies are involved in producing certain bodies as intelligible as 'civilians' and 'targets,' in the case of precision warfare, or through violence as terrorists who can be tortured or irrational figures who can be force-fed, certain knowledgeable practices are implied in producing a certain people as the objects of intervention. A vast literature exists in International Relations on the question of 'humanitarian intervention' and why certain atrocities affecting certain people at certain times have been deemed eligible for intervention while others have not been. The contribution of my work in theorizing bodies in International Relations is not only to call attention to how certain bodies are produced intelligibly as 'lives worth saving' but also to think relationally about bodies. The production of certain bodies as lives worth saving is bound up in the production of other bodies as not worth saving, or other bodies who deserve to die. Furthermore, what is even less frequently discussed in the International Relations literature is what the production of certain bodies as vulnerable lives that need saving, and other bodies as lives already lost, implies about an 'us,' the people who debate such issues in international forums and write about them in the academy under the auspices of the discipline of International Relations. Judith Butler's work speaks eloquently to these points, especially in her thesis of bodies as ontologically precarious.

In thinking about the political/ethical question of creating and sustaining the conditions for 'livable lives,' there is a way in which we can read R2P as precisely the kind of increased recognition of humanity, of 'humanness' of subjects that allow us to

recognize their lives precisely as lives worth living. One might argue that R2P is acknowledgement of the precariousness of life, as it is an acknowledgement of responsibility for the preservation of lives that are not our own. It is an attempt to see the destruction of lives in distant places as grievable, as lives worth living. In her recent writings on bodily precariousness, Butler specifically addresses 9/11 as an injury to the US as a subject, and subsequent wars as a way of trying to shore up the US as an invulnerable subject by maximizing vulnerability for others. Butler presses bodily vulnerability as a generalizable condition to encourage a more thoughtful and less violent approach to the question of ethics and responsiveness in the face of violence. There is a way in which, given the emphasis on egalitarianism in recognition of mutual vulnerability, the doctrine of R2P is a way of doing precisely what Butler, or a particular reading of Butler, would have us do. In contrast to the practices of torture and precision warfare which seek to eliminate bodily vulnerability by maximizing vulnerability for others, R2P appears to be about seeking greater bodily security for all. R2P is about lessening the consequences that being born within certain political borders has on the precariousness of life, specifically death in genocide or other mass atrocities, and the expansion of the number of people whose lives 'matter' politically. R2P is only possible in a world in which the definition of people whose lives are worth saving is expanded beyond the state, or from the perspective of a Euro-American centric world, to non-white, non-Christian peoples (Finnemore 2003). Butler even suggests military interventions to stop genocide may be justified at one point. This is a plausible interpretation of Butler

insofar as it seeks a more egalitarian understanding of whose lives are worth living and whose lives are worth saving—an expansion of the possibilities of 'livable lives'.

However, a reading of Butler's concept of precariousness as well as the theorization of bodies put forth in this project in light of contemporary debates over the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect gives us pause before too quickly celebrating this recent development of international law and diplomacy. We must be careful to distinguish an approach that takes seriously bodies as produced by, and productive of, international relations, from a model of the humans as rights-bearing subjects, as a celebration of R2P as an expansion of the ability of the international community to protect human rights would entail. Butler's formulation of the question of ethics—drawing on her theory of the formation of embodied subjects—stresses ethics is not only matter of inclusion and exclusion of individuals into particular communities as subjects with particular rights. Butler writes, "It is not a matter of simple entry to the excluded into an established ontology, but an insurrection at the level of ontology, a critical opening up of the questions, What is real? Whose lives are real? How might reality be remade?" (2004, 33). Such an approach would question the portrayal of R2P as a process that increases recognition of certain subjects who are *already* constituted by a certain set of rights, including the right to be protected from sovereign violence. R2P poses a sovereign subject, but locates it in the individual rather than the state. It is the individual that should not be impinged upon, that should not suffer violence—it is not the state that should be left alone. The individual as a subject whose rights to bodily integrity and

inviolability are sacrosanct is precisely not a subject constituted by vulnerability, it is the natural, biopolitical body of IR this work has critiqued.

Butler's account of the production of the embodied subject and the kind of ethical response that is entailed in such an understanding of bodies compel us to consider the co-production of differentiated embodied subjects. Crucially, to understand the body as precarious is not to understand the body as at risk in the sense that its integrity and autonomy are threatened from outside forces. The relationship of R2P to the sovereign state and the sovereign individual presumes coherent, pre-existing subjects in way that denies primary vulnerability. Butler's concept of normative violence—the violence that attends to the formation of the subject, stands in contrast to this model of embodiment. Understanding the subject as constituted by violence, and by vulnerability to violence as a generalizable phenomenon rather than a characteristic of certain groups suggests a re-thinking of the question of agency and responsibility. I start with a consideration of Butler's concept of normative violence as a way of relating the process of subject formation to the issue of violence. I then work through the issues implied by this relation to R2P and the different subjects that R2P produces: a subject to be saved, a subject that can do the saving, and an inhuman subject that can be killed in order to save others. I close with a consideration of how question of normative violence suggests a re-orientation of ethical thinking in International Relations.

Normative Violence

A critical examination of R2P through the tools for understanding embodiment this work has made use of would thus entail not only a critique of violence as injuring, as something to be avoided except as a last resort in defense of the lives of citizens. It would also require critical examination of the violence of *norms*. Feminist theory teaches us that expressing certain bodily styles makes for a livable life. What constitutes an acceptable bodily style is not given in nature, it is a social production, and one with a great deal of power behind it. This concern is expressed in Butler's work in *Gender Trouble* in terms of the ways in which norms of gender and sexuality render some lives impossible or unlivable. Those who are 'doing' their gender right are often thought of as human, unlike those who 'do' gender 'incorrectly' or fail to live up to normative bodily standards. These are the abject, or the constitutive outside, that haunt the seemingly coherent subject. The very concept of 'human life' requires a relationship with the category of the nonhuman (Butler, 2004b, 13). The naming of the 'human' implies the naming of that which is not human, the drawing of a boundary demarcating the constitutive outside, the inhuman (Butler 1993, 8).

The ethical and political question of 'livable lives' is a struggle about norms. "The body is that which can occupy the norm in myriad ways, exceed the norm, rework the norm, and expose realities to which we thought we were confined as open to transformation" (Butler 2004b 217). This is not a definition of the body per se, but an account of the centrality of norms to Butler's work, and of the essentialness of the body as lived in and through norms as the site of the politics of livable lives. Normative violence in this sense is not about the violence that attends to pre-given subjects, but

236

about violence that occurs prior to the formation of the subject. Violence forms the subject in terms of the violent exclusion of the abject. Violence is also implicated in the formation of subjects relative to the various modes of violence under consideration in this project—torture, suicide bombings, the precision warfare of bombs and drones as well as many more. These are bound up in norms that make us who we are, so that we are never fully in control of subject positions or whether we are recognized as humans at all. Butler insists that while we are formed from violence, that is, made intelligible or partly intelligible and subject to certain kinds of social risks through the violence of norms, we do not have to perpetuate this violence (Butler 2009, 167). Having been formed through violence, we have access to modes of non-violence that can pertain not only in the injunction not to harm individuals in terms of the use of sovereign power to hurt or to kill, but the use of non-violence in terms of our own implication in the possibilities of embodied subjects leading livable lives.

The prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay exist in such conditions of 'unlivability'; tortured, denied status under international law and held indefinitely, with measures taken even to prevent their suicide or protest by hunger-striking. Such violence happens to subjects that have already been 'derealized,' or made into 'bodies that don't matter,' through their designation as 'enemy combatants' and 'detainees'. Their torture then, isn't considered torture as this is an injuring of a subject that has already been subject to normative violence that posits these people as outside of the bounds of the recognizably human. Normative violence is connected to violence as we usually thing of it, as normative violence, in that if "violence is done against those who are unreal, then, from

237

the perspective of violence, it fails to injure or negate those lives since those lives are already negated" (Butler 2004, 33). By denying that the treatment of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere (especially Abu Ghraib) constitutes torture, but is rather 'ill-treatment' or 'abuse,' the humanity of those who have suffered this violence is also denied, as torture names a practice against a human subject, against whom violence is always a violation. Violence against the targets and bystanders of precision warfare also fails to count against these 'bodies that don't matter,' as these bodies are constituted as ungrievable, killable bodies by the production of the bodies of precision bombers and drone operators as invulnerable through their production into legal and technological system of protection and enhanced killing capacities.

If we consider bodies as produced by particular social and political circumstances, and even more importantly, bodies as requiring supplementation in terms of certain conditions to make life livable, we are pushed to consider the conditions that not only create the possibility for mass atrocities, but also the conditions that make certain lives eligible for supplementary protection by an 'international community'. Butler insists that bodily precariousness is not about some lives being precarious while others are not. The condition of being an embodied subject entails supplementation, both materially in terms of bodily needs and a certain set of social conditions that sustain lives as livable. "The very idea of precariousness implies dependency on social networks and conditions, suggesting that there is no 'life itself' at issue here, but always and only conditions of life, life as something that requires conditions in order to become livable life and, indeed, in order to become grievable" (Butler 2009, 23). Because bodies are vulnerable and indeed,

mortal, there can be no such thing as a 'right to life' itself: there are only conditions for sustaining life, and creating the social and political conditions for livable lives.

In taking bodies seriously in their social and political production as intelligible 'bodies that matter' or as abjected bodies, we see in R2P a practice that (re)produces three types of embodied subjects. First, there are certain subjects, certain bodies, that are the bodies of protection—that states must protect, or in the case that states cannot or will not protect, that other actors are called upon to protect. This schema also implies a subject that is the agent of protection, empowered to use force in order to eradicate violence—that is, a sovereign subject who designates who must live and who must therefore die. There is also the subject that may be killed so that others might live, the lives that can be sacrificed and who are the face of inhumanity. In considering the role of normative violence and R2P, I start by considering the production of the bodies to be saved as those who are already lost.

The object of the intervention that R2P produces are subjects whose lives are being lost, not only as individuals, but members of populations. They are the victims of ongoing genocides, massacres, and other atrocities. R2P sets the standard for intervention as "actual or anticipated" large-scale loss of life or ethnic cleansing, which may include killing, expulsion, rape, or "acts of terror" (Evans and Sahnoun 2002, 103). They are those who states have failed to protect them, or who are actively targeting them in either a failure or abuse of sovereign power. They are not subjects of agency, but are bodies that breathe, suffer and die, who are 'just bodies'. They can then become civilians that are lost, because they are always already lost. Mbembe writes, "in our contemporary world,

239

weapons are deployed in the interest of maximum destruction of persons and the creation of *death-worlds*, new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life conferring upon them the status of *living dead*" (Mbembe 2003, 40). His thesis amends Foucault's biopolitical concept and formulates contemporary politics as *necropolitical*. The lines between war and politics are blurred as they are in biopolitics, but power does not only "make life live" but creates certain categories of the living dead, as those always already dead, subject to massacre, but it is a massacre of those already dead.

Like Butler's concept of bodily precariousness, Mbembe calls attention to the social and political conditions that differentially structure risk and vulnerability and in particular, formulates massacres and atrocities of the sort that R2P is meant to address not as a failure of sovereign power to recognize human rights. Rather it is precisely due to certain practices of sovereign power that certain bodies are made killable, already socially dead. R2P is meant to protect bodies that have, in Butler's terms, failed to materialize as 'bodies that matter'. They are the abject bodies that inhabit 'unlivable' zones of social life (Butler 1993, 3). By recognizing certain bodies as in need of saving from forms of sovereign power, R2P is complicit in a regime that recognizes certain people as *only* vulnerable bodies that need protecting from sovereign power, who are thus different from those empowered to save them. They are only the naturalized bodies of biopolitics, the objects of intervention and various representational practices depicting them as bodies to be saved. A focus on 'saving' these bodies is limited in its ethical imagination to the terms of 'responsibility': it is a responsibility to save only those who

have already been deprived of the social and political conditions of a 'livable life,' who have been marked out as targets for genocide and ethnic cleansing, whose lives are the abject that must be expelled.

From the perspective of bodies as ontologically precarious, focusing on the vulnerability of certain bodies in their constitution of always already vulnerable is not sufficient to 'solve' the problem of vulnerability. It does not acknowledge the vulnerability of those killed or injured in an effort to save others, and also does not acknowledge the precariousness of those who are 'protected,' whose states are presumably doing a good enough job, the citizens of states who are presumed interveners. Such people are still vulnerable themselves, but R2P is a framework that does not acknowledge this vulnerability. I turn next to the question of vulnerable bodies and, in particular, the implications for the denial of such vulnerability.

Vulnerable Bodies

R2P presumes people are made vulnerable by sovereign violence and that by removing state sovereignty as a shield, people will be less vulnerable and more secure. As the last section discussed, R2P locates vulnerability in states that fail in their biopolitical responsibility to provide protection. As a next resort, R2P posits an agentic subject above the state, the 'international community' who can act, including through the use of violence, to eliminate violence and protect vulnerable people. On what terms does this actor assume this kind of agency over life? Taking seriously the critique of exogenous, natural, and fully self-conscious actors I've developed throughout this work,

as well as the reformulation of bodies as produced in and through social relations and in relation to other bodies means that we cannot consider this agent to pre-exist its establishment as a 'protector of last resort'. This sovereign subject, in its presumed agency, is a subject whose own vulnerability is erased and is constituted as an 'invulnerable' subject. Individual bodies that represent the 'international community' may be killed in such interventions, but the subject of the 'international community,' is constituted as a sovereign subject that can never be killed. As such, it is a disembodied subject akin to the "king's two bodies": the sovereign has the power to inflict violence but is immune from suffering from it—even though the individual king may die, the sovereign subject is immortal.

To take Butler's vulnerability thesis seriously is to challenge the designation of some populations as vulnerable and others as invulnerable; vulnerability is a generalizable condition that is constitutive of what is means to be an embodied human subject. In locating vulnerability to violence 'elsewhere' and the question of 'responsibility' as located in a more secure, 'invulnerable' subject of the state or the international community is to neglect how the subject that is presumed to provide security in the event of state failure is also, by definition, a vulnerable subject. This 'invulnerable' subject is not literally impermeable to violence, rather, I use the term 'invulnerable' in this sense to indicate a denial of the embodied subject's constitutive vulnerability not only to violence as we commonly understand it, but also to normative violence in the social and political formation of the subject. This 'invulnerable' subject is a fully agentic subject whose violent formation is obscured.

Butler's thesis of the embodied subject as vulnerable suggests a critique of the terms of agency that R2P implies. The discourse of R2P locates agency in two places: an 'international community' and the people/states that are doing the harm that constitutes the failure to protect. Agency is thus posed as a matter of pre-given subjects acting on the world. Certainly there are feminist and post-colonial critiques to be made of the discourse of 'saving' those in foreign lands as ignoring, undermining, and erasing the agency of those on the receiving end of various forms of aid, and these are important critiques. However, Butler's concept of normative violence and her conceptions of precarious subjects and bodily vulnerability suggests a somewhat different critique of agency. Butler's work argues against conceiving of subjectivity as autonomous agency and self-consciousness, and rather, argues for a model of subjectivity as an ongoing process of becoming that never quite results in independence or autonomy. The subject who is in a position to decide or deliberate over whether a state is meeting its obligations under R2P, or who is empowered to act to protect those lives being lost or threatened is not isolated from the processes of normalization, or social and political production as a certain kind of embodied subject. Furthermore, this subject, like other subjects is formed in relation to others and norms in ways that can never be fully grasped. In analyzing R2P, we must then not neglect to consider the norms that constitute certain subjects as agentic, as saviors and protectors. While such subjects may not be, strictly speaking, invulnerable in terms of imperviousness to violence, in this scheme their precariousness in terms of their formation in and through social relations is denied. Such subjects are formed in a history that they did not choose, but are formed nonetheless. As Butler writes, "the very capacity

to judge presupposes a prior relation between those who judge and those who are judged" (Butler 2005, 45). The formation of this subject of invulnerability includes the exclusion of the abject as the 'constitutive outside' of the subject; for this subject—the 'international community'—to appear as a coherent subject vulnerability must be shifted elsewhere—onto both vulnerable subjects who need saving as well as to inhuman subjects who can be killed.

Butler establishes the constitutive vulnerability of our embodiment in her sentence: "the body implies mortality, vulnerability, agency: the skin and the flesh expose us to the gaze of others, but also to touch, and to violence" (Butler 2004, 26). In her essay "Besides Oneself: On the Limits of Sexual Autonomy" Butler continues: "The body can be the agency and the instrument of all these as well, or the site where 'doing' and 'being done to' become equivocal" (Butler 2004, 21). In this follow up to her sentence of the physical and social vulnerabilities of the bodies, Butler acknowledges that these very same bodies are instruments of the violence, neglect, objectifications and death, through our embodied gaze, through the use of our bodies to commit acts of violence. They are agents of various forms of violence as well, as our consciousness may not be aware of the violence we cause, and is also fundamentally constituted, given over to, forms of political and social determination of our embodied selves that we cannot control. Our bodies as the site were "doing" and "being done to" make them the site in which power relations are complicated precisely because it is the site in which both occur simultaneously, blurring the lines between agency and passivity. Bodies as simultaneously active and passive, inscribed by exterior forces yet productive of agency

244

as well can be seen in the painful body of the hunger striker. The body can be a witness, and in one's own marking and refiguring of the body, violence can contribute to the re-subjectification of bodies.

Butler's approach suggests we have to locate agency in the conditions that formed particular agents, but that this does not mean that they are absolved of responsibility—we are never *completely* formed by conditions. We should ask ourselves, what performances of the 'natural' are occurring that cover over, and hide the constitutive vulnerability of those who are constituted as 'responsible' subjects rather than subjects needing protection? As the "power to produce what it claims to represent" performativity suggests a double movement: it not only produces an effect of the natural and inevitable, but also, conceals this construction as it appears to be natural. One's formation as a subject is ongoing, iterative and citational—as it is never complete, the subject can be reformulated over time. Certainly, the histories that constitute certain subjects as wielders of various forms of violence are important here, whether the subjects of violence are those that perpetrate and threaten the mass atrocities that R2P is meant to address, or the subjects of violence who would use force in order to stop such atrocities. Such histories do not mean that there is *no* question of responsibility or that people cannot be held accountable for their actions. Butler's vulnerability thesis suggests that locating responsibility in sovereign subjects is not the *only* way of thinking about responsibility, and that ethics requires more than the presumption of sovereign subjects.

After all, as Butler writes, "if the violent act is, among other things, a way of relocating the capacity to be violated (always) elsewhere, it produces the appearance that

245

the subject who enacts violence is impermeable to violence" (Butler 2009, 178). By locating violence 'somewhere else,' in places that have always already failed to accede to the norm of sovereignty, R2P, then, has the effect of (re)producing certain subjects as invulnerable. The violence that R2P proposes and enables—in the sense of military force used to end or forestall genocide or ethnic cleansing—is productive in the sense that it produces both the subjects perpetrating this violence as invulnerable and the subject that are the target, or possible victims, of such violence as always already vulnerable, or even already dead.

R2P (re)produces this break between vulnerable and invulnerable subjects in part by distinguishing between zones of regular politics, in which states are fulfilling their biopolitical responsibilities and certain 'death-worlds' in which life is not promoted, but is taken in a failure or a perversion of the state's responsibilities to foster and regulate life. Created by a committee established by the United Nations through Canada's leadership, the norm of R2P and its accession took place under conditions that have been demarcated as normal politics: the deliberation and consensus of rational subjects with particular sets of interests. R2P then takes place as an aspect of politics far from the circumstances it is meant to address: the realm of unreason and violence of war, especially wars that turn on citizens and civilians and subject them to mass killing. R2P sets up a mechanism in which the reason of politics can intervene in the unreason and passion of such wars and bring them back to normalcy, back to the political. It enacts a division between the stable worlds of sovereignty and impermeability to violence and the violent worlds in which bodies are always already vulnerable.

In making this break, R2P simultaneously supports and challenges state sovereignty. First, it supports state sovereignty by emphasizing that it is first and foremost the state's responsibility to protect its citizens. In cases of civil war leading to massacres and other such atrocities, the territorial state is to be supported in its efforts to stop the violence. R2P only challenges state sovereignty by insisting that when states cannot or will not stop this violence, that the international community then has a duty to provide the protection the state is not providing.

Security, in the regime of R2P, is defined as protection is from violent death in the hands of, or with the complicity of, the state. (R2P suggests that the international community may be involved in efforts to prevent and end famine or other kinds of material deprivations, but force is only justified by genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity). As I've mentioned previously, this is a judicial notion of security, in which the body of security is an exogenous, natural body that is free to go about its business in the absence of violence. By reproducing the sovereign state, R2P reproduces this 'natural' body. This paradigm of security is somewhat Hobbesian, in which violence can only be used by the sovereign, who is morally obligated to protect citizens from foreign threats. The difference is that, in Hobbes, threats come from the outside of the state, whereas in R2P and in the ways that contemporary security problems are defined more broadly in terms of human security, the threats to security come from inside the state. Sovereign power is thus extended to the international community to protect populations. The sovereign is not only he who has the right to kill without committing a murder, (as defined by Foucault and Agamben) but he who bears some kind of

responsibility to the citizens he represents to protect them—to kill so that they might live. The sovereign power to wage war in defense of the people produces certain bodies whose lives are to be protected, others whose violence is justified in defense of these lives, and yet others who must exist as both threatening and killable in order to justify this political arrangement.

R2P also instantiates a liberal vision of disqualifying violence from the domestic realm. The subject does not owe strict obedience to the sovereign, the subject to be protected is the individual subject of rights. R2P is an insistence that states do not have the right to use violence against their own citizens and must uphold their protection from violence both internally and externally: sovereignty as responsibility is duty to provide care and protection for citizens. Sovereignty is ostensibly being reformed to no longer include the equality of all states in their right to wage war against one another. To an extent, this is a reformulation of an older norm in which 'civilized' states could wage war against one another, but the colonies, or frontiers which are not properly constituted into states. are the zone of exception from which the law can be suspended, and violence outside of the law can be perpetrated (see also (Mbembe 2003, 24). Redefining sovereignty in the biopolitical terms of responsibility means that the violence of military intervention is defined in terms of the civilized order of 'the international community' against the inhuman violence that spurs such interventions.

Redefining state sovereignty from a concept of absolute authority over a defined territory to a duty to protect individuals from widespread violence also implies a reshaping of the constitutive relationship between the human body and the state. The

boundaries of the state have been imagined, and conceptualized, as akin to the skin of the human body as the boundaries between the inside and outside, and between different states and bodies. As I argued in chapter 3, the human body as self-contained, with the skin marking a solid boundary between inside and outside and demarcating one subject from another is not a natural or ontological fact but the result of various political, symbolic practices. In short, this is contingent articulation of what bodies are, not an essential truth of bodies. Likewise, the state as *body politic*, an entity modeled on this self-contained body is an effect of various political discourses. R2P reproduces this logic, denying the constitutive vulnerability of human bodies as well as the particular histories and articulations of this model of the state.

Having theorized bodies and states as mutually productive in terms of their solid borders and the strict demarcation between like units, the doctrine of responsibility to protect can be seen as an attempt to discipline states into enacting just such a model of governance. Of chief concern here is the concept of the failed state, or state with 'ungoverned' or 'ungovernable' regions where the central government does not exercise effective control over the borders. Here, the primary examples given are Somalia for a failed state, and Pakistan and Yemen as states with ungoverned regions. Such states are the constitutive others, the 'abject' that constitutes liberal states in the West as the norm, the "clean and proper" subjects whose bodies—both in terms of the bodies of their citizens and states as *bodies politic*—are inviolable. If some lives are deemed 'unlivable' or 'ungrievable' because of the failure of their bodies to live up to the norm, these are the

states whose existence *as* states is unlivable because of a similar failure, who are then subject to violence that is considered legitimate.

If it is the human who is the sovereign subject, as R2P would have it, then an injury to this subject can lead to sovereign practices of violence to locate injury elsewhere. If the subject then becomes a subject identified with this injury, it becomes a subject who legitimates its own violence to avenge its injury. Butler is especially concerned with the injury of 9/11 and the wars that were undertaken as a result, but her writings on the charge of anti-Semitism and critiques of Israeli state policy suggest the myriad historical injuries suffered by Jewish people and especially the Holocaust can be taken as similar examples to the US wars in response to 9/11 as attempts to use violence to deny a constitutive vulnerability and instead shore up one's own sovereignty by inflicting violence on others. R2P works somewhat differently than these two examples, in that it is not the injury suffered by a subject that is used to legitimate violence, but rather, the injury to *other* subjects that is used as a potential reason for the use of violence on their behalf. There is, undoubtedly some measure of solidarity involved here. However, might we also see this relationship as a defense not only of particular sovereign subjects, but also of sovereign subjects and sovereignty itself? Attempts to eliminate vulnerability in shoring up sovereign power and sovereign subjects are only displacements and denials of the vulnerability that attends to all human subjects. By recasting sovereignty as responsibility, the sovereignty of the individual, the state, and the international community are all reproduced, albeit through biopolitical terms.

Sovereign power is reaffirmed in such a way that it can be exercised not only against domestic subjects, but against subjects that are deemed to lack humanity.

Subjects of Inhumanity

The production of humanity as subjects to be saved, who must be made to live by subjects who are always already alive, and invulnerable implies a constitutive other, an 'inhuman' subject. This inhuman subject is primarily those who perpetrate the crimes of genocide or ethnic cleansing on behalf of the state or whom the state cannot or will not prevent from committing such crimes. In constituting the invulnerable subjects of 'the international community' that speaks on behalf of humanity in terms of human rights and human security, these subjects of inhumanity are the abject, that which is excluded as the founding repudiation of such a subject. To have a humanity that is embodied, we have to have an inhuman embodiment as well (Devji 2008, 26-27). The naming of the 'human' entails drawing of a boundary demarcating the constitutive outside, the inhuman (Butler 1993, 8). The subject of the 'international community' is linked to an older discourse of civilization that speaks on behalf of the human, claiming it represents humanity against an inhuman(e) other (Butler 2004).

The condition of 'inhumanity' in the contemporary world order cannot be separated from the sovereign foundation of the state in protecting the 'natural life' of citizens. States involved in not just directly killing people, but committing genocide—the killing of populations—are subject to military intervention. In the war on terror, as in so many conflicts, the enemy is seen as synonymous with a particular callousness and

inhumanity toward human life. The Taliban's lack of respect for human life and the abysmal conditions in Afghanistan leading to premature deaths under Taliban rule are both justifications given for US-led military operations in Afghanistan (Elshtain 2003, 60). Condemnation of the practice of suicide bombing is focused on the celebration of the deaths of 'martyrs' who are willing to die in order to kill non-combatants. Similar conditions constitute the inhuman others of R2P, as interventions are justified in terms of the lack of respect for life and subsequent mass killings. Killing or failing to prevent the deaths of populations, under the doctrine of R2P, makes one a legitimate target of violence, as does "acts of terror" although violence is not intended as the first step to addressing such atrocities. As those who can be killed, the existence of such subjects of inhumanity blurs with the populations that R2P attempts to save, the people who are already targets of extermination, who are already socially dead. Under such conditions, the vulnerable bodies of the population in need of protection can be killed as 'collateral damage' in attempts to save them by using violence against their killers: both are already constituted as bodies that don't matter. The broader implications of this include the legitimation of violence against those who are deemed to have insufficient respect for life. Importantly, this 'inhumanity' in not protecting life in R2P only applies to the domestic population; one might ask why states that do not exhibit the kind of respect for the lives of populations in *other* states may be subject to the same sovereign violence.

This is, of course, not a defense of genocide or any other violent practices but an examination and critique of the terms in which R2P constitutes certain forms of violence as ethical. We may have very good reasons to do so, to make decisions to use force to

stop genocide, but this kind of decision does not exhaust our ethical responsibilities. The question of normative violence—the violence that attends to the formation of subjects is another site of our ethical responsibilities. Butler's turn to Levinas can be seen in light of the concern with normative violence and her rejection of methodological individualism—that individuals are the basic unit of ontology and thus, ethics. The question of how one responds to other humans fails precisely when the subject of the address is not recognized as human. Her engagement with Levinas is a way of struggling with the question of ethics not only as a question of how one treats existing individuals, but of a responsibility that attends to the subject that pre-exists the subject's very formation. It is a sense of violence that is prior to violence as we usually understand it.

Butler's use of the Levinasian face is a way of addressing the problem of normative violence, the violence that attend to the formation of subjects rather than injuring a subject that already exists. The Levinasian concept of the face posits discourse as arriving before we do, before we are formed as subjects. The face is the *bodily* aspect of the other, but like the subject, it is not a self-contained, clearly delineated body. Butler uses the terminology of exposure when discussing the vulnerability of the body; bodies as exposed to others, and bodies as exposed to the gaze, to touch and to violence (2004, 26). The face represents the normative violence that is always present as a possibility. Yet, the face is a responsibility that one cannot avoid, as its call is part of the discursive structure that produces the self. In the confrontation with the face, the subject-in-becoming is called to non-violence through a responsibility to this other. Butler extorts: "Let's face it. We're undone by one another. And if we're not, we're missing something"

(2004, 23). In these lines, Butler addresses the reader directly, even beyond author-audience structure of academic writing. By this direct address, Butler does what grief, what the 'face' stands for: her address interpolates the reader into a subject constituted with this responsibility, and constituted in the precariousness that is social and political life as well as bodily existence that is made possible through relations with others.

In theorizing our bodies as ontologically precarious, the question of ethics becomes not a condemnation or defense of subjects of inhumanity—the murderers, perpetrators of genocide, or terrorists—but of reflection about the processes in which subjects become human or not, and the terms of humanization, as this is ultimately the question about how certain bodies come to 'count' and the terms on which livable lives are established. As a matter of ethics, this becomes a matter of how we recognize the vulnerability in ourselves and in other subjects. Vulnerability has to be recognized in order to restructure the field of ethics (Butler 2005, 43). In the process of recognition, neither side is precisely what one was before. This means that one cannot recognize another subject as vulnerable without re-thinking one's own subjectivity relative to vulnerability. Recognition is the process "by which I become other than what I was and so cease to be able to return to what I was" (2005, 27).

We perform recognition of vulnerability by various practices, such as speech-acts acknowledging vulnerability and various representational practices of vulnerability. Striving for recognition is not a claim to be recognized as we are—for before we are recognized, we are in sense outside of subjectivity-- but in making a claim, we are in a process of becoming something else (Butler 2004, 44). Here we see more implications of

the hunger strikes at Guantanamo Bay and the statement of Binyam Mohammad "I do not intend to stop until I die or we are respected". This is speech act that is made by a body being made to perform weakness and vulnerability—a body that will weaken and die, whose precariousness is being made to be acknowledged. Butler writes, "To say that a life is precarious requires not only that a life be apprehended as a life, but also that precariousness be an aspect of what is apprehended in what is living" (Butler 2009, 13). Speech-acts and other representation practices are necessary but perhaps not sufficient conditions for the humanization of subjects in their precariousness *as* humans. In order to think about the social and political conditions for 'livable lives,' I turned question of representing the other, especially the vulnerable other, the other that is always already wounded, as a means of thinking about what form responsibility may take given an ontology of generalized precariousness, rather than an ontology of self-contained individuals.

The representation of injured or killed bodies, or those who have been excluded from the normative frameworks constituting 'livable lives' is not sufficient to counter the production of these lives as 'unlivable' or 'ungrievable'. As I argued in the last chapter, the 'human' is what is brought into being by representation, and therefore the category of the 'human' exceeds representation. The unlivability of certain lives is not a matter of a lack of information, or a discursive failure to produce such knowledge, rather, as with the deaths of civilians, ignorance in this instance has been actively produced. Thus, the problem is not only that the media does not report on the human suffering of war— especially of the 'other' side or that until recently, photographs of coffins of soldiers

255

killed in the US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were forbidden from being photographed. The circulation of representations of broken bodies, and the use of wounded and killed as consequences of war may be necessary and important for any number of political projects, not the least of which is bringing to light the costs of war which are so often papered over.

However, there are some problematic aspects in focusing on wounded and dead bodies in as a way of 'humanizing' the victims of violence that applies to questions of ethics, violence and representation more broadly. Such images may provoke horror and disgust: this may be useful if it is a first step to recognize the commonality and mutual vulnerability, but the horror and disgust that is the felt response to the presence of the abject does not necessarily lead down this path. It is possible, even likely, that the revulsion that accompanies images of broken bodies can lead to a desire to buttress one's own sense of stability through various forms of rejection. Such images may also provoke pity, which is a kind of ethical response, is also a response implicated in hierarchical relations. The visual record of abuse, such as the photographs depicting torture at Abu Ghraib, may extend the torment, as the recording of the torture was an integral part of the humiliation and shaming (see Dauphinee 2007, for example), and some people take a perverse pleasure in such images. However, this does not also mean that the absence of such images is ethically and politically unproblematic either. What is perhaps necessary but not sufficient is an inquiry into what Deleuze referred to in his concept of the visual as that which "distributes what is seen and who sees" (Deleuze 1988, 58). Precision warfare, as a form of violence that relies heavily on particular configurations of bodies,

weapons, and visual technologies is one site the use of representation to produce bodies as human or inhuman; another site that functions in overlapping way is the surveillance technologies used to detect 'dangerous bodies' such as those of suicide bombers.

The representation of suffering beings does not necessarily bring them into the ethical moment, but rather, representation practices can be used to produce some humans, some bodies, as 'other,' as lives not worth mourning. Images of broken human bodies do not always generate pity and compassion: the widely distributed images of the bodies of the sons of Saddam Hussein were used to demonstrate American power. The controversy over whether or not photographs of Osama bin Laden's corpse should be distributed demonstrates a similar principle: concern over the 'unseemliness' of trumpeting images of a man's death and the possibility that outrage over such triumphalism would bring about more violence. Representation always entails a 'loss,' a gap between the subject's desire and what can be expressed in words or other symbolic representations. It is not the 'human' that is represented, but rather, the 'human' is the limit of the possibility of representation. Bodies are 'in excess' of speech such that (in Hansen's paraphrase of Butler) "speech can never fully convey the body, and the body is never constituted outside of speech" (2000, 302). What has been produced as 'inhuman' or outside of the bounds of humanity cannot be brought in by representation. The 'human' exceeds representation because representation is what brings 'beings' into being; a process that forces the question of the ethical from physical violence per se to questions of ethical representational, boundary producing practices. In thinking about the problem of ethics from a perspective of mutually constituted bodies and normative violence, we are called

257

not only to be responsible for the protection of those we can see, that we have been made aware of through representational practices and speech-acts, but for the ways in which various subjects are produced *as* human or inhuman.

How Responsibility is Restructured

The core conclusion that the above discussion suggests is that ethics and responsibility cannot *only* be considered a matter of responding to others as if 'we' and 'they' existed as socially and politically separate entities. By taking embodiment seriously as an effect of, and cause of, entangled engagements, responsibility is re-thought as accountability for who and what 'matters' in the world, and who or what does not matter. We are mutually entangled with each other such that we cannot separate. Our bodies themselves do not precede social entanglements, and thus we cannot consider an ethics of violence differently than existing frameworks that separate bodily existence from power. Rather than ethics being conceptualized as the proper treatment of others, "ethics is therefore not about the right response to a radically exterior/ized other, but about responsibility and accountability for the lively relationalities of becoming of which we are a part" (Barad 2007, 393).

The broader implications of theorizing bodies as precarious and bound to one another in their production as seemingly autonomous entities is that the question of ethical responsibility lies not only in protecting or rescuing those who have been constructed as "grievable" but to challenge those discursive practices that constitute some

people as grievable tragedies in death, others as justifiably killable. Because we are formed through the violence of norms, it is incumbent upon us to resist imposing the same violence on others (Butler 2009, 169). Butler posits a mode of protection, but it is clear she does not mean, or does not only mean, the protection of an existing body from violence. Protection from violence is also a struggle with the social and political norms that structure the production of livable lives: to be responsible, to protect from violence in this instance is to work to lessen the violent effects of the norm, to trouble the power of bodily norms to mark certain lives as unlivable and unreal. Responsibility is about where the "cut" between self and other is made. We do not have recourse to the "god's eye view", to approach the question of ethics in terms of a disconnected appraisal of a situation in which 'we' have no part in. Our constitution in and through the world is not only a matter of our perspective being limited or partial. Our subjectivity is a material engagement in the world, creating it as it produces knowledge about it. Taking seriously the bodily precariousness means being attentive to the discourses that produce certain subjects as inhuman or as 'only bodies' as well as those that would deny bodily vulnerability.

Conclusion

International Relations has failed to develop a language to talk about bodies and the bodily nature of the subject. This has led to theoretical impoverishment as bodies are implicitly conceived of only as natural organisms and the passive objects of violence. The broad purpose of this work, consistent with a reflexivist or critical methodology, is to make knowledge claims that can undermine themselves—such that knowledge about how some bodies are constituted as 'bodies that matter' can contribute to the undermining of political processes that produce some bodies as 'bodies that don't matter'. To show how bodies are constituted (and are also constituting), I've engaged with contemporary security practices as not only juridical practices of sovereign power, but also biopolitical practices that structure life and death. As such, this work has critiqued the concept of sovereign violence—that violence is something that harms a pre-existing body—in both realist and liberal accounts of violence in International Relations. In doing so, I also address conceptions of the subject that realists and liberals share: that the subject is self-preserving, self-contained and self-governing and that bodies are natural and individual. Overall, I've advanced the thesis that taking the biopolitical constitution of security seriously necessitates more theoretical attention to bodies, both as individualized bodies and aggregated into populations.

Such a deeper theoretical engagement can be found by reading contemporary security practices through the various interventions feminists have made in theorizing subjectivity as fundamentally embodied. Judith Butler's work is particularly significant to this branch of feminist and political theory. From her early work on bodily materiality as

a gendered performance to her more recent work theorizing bodies as ontologically precarious, Butler's work provides an incisive vision not only of the political roots of our bodily constitution, but also of the ethical significance of that constitution. There are three 'levels of analysis' this work engages in—an argument about how power works in International Relations, an intervention at the level of methodology, and a set of empirical claims. The rest of this conclusion is intended to clarify these contributions.

On the first 'level of analysis' my dissertation is an intervention about the way we think about power and agency. My argument, at one level, is that violence is not only about sovereign power in terms of the use of violence to compel or to punish already-existing subjects who are vulnerable to such threats or the use of violence because their survival depends upon the survival of their bodies. Violence is also about productive power; that is, the power to create certain categories of subjects. Violence is performative in this understanding; it produces bodies as intelligible subjects, as 'useful bodies' or unintelligible 'bodies that don't matter'.

However, I also modify, or add on to this position the notion that bodies themselves are productive or agentic. I argue that bodies are not only the passive objects of violence as in traditional security studies, or made into objects of knowledge and intervention as in biopolitical understandings of security, but also exert a form of power on their own. The impetus for theorizing bodies as both objects and subjects of power stems from recent work in feminist theory, as described in Chapter 2. This intervention about power and agency also stems from the critical methodology of this project; as various feminists have argued, theorizing bodies as if they are blank slates only awaiting

inscription by social and political forces reproduces the centrality of culture over nature and mind over body, further entrenching the dualism that has contributed to the subordination of women and other identity categories that have been linked to 'the body'.

This argument about violence, power and agency is also a parting with certain strands of feminist theory, and the theorization of bodies as victims or objects of power. Gender is a code for power in feminist IR, such that qualities associated with masculinity are more highly valued. As gendered relationships are unequal across different societies, gender becomes a signifier for power. This argument suggests that gender is an important concept in social and political theory in that, regardless of the sexed body of particular individuals, gender in social life privilege concepts and qualities associated with masculinity. Gender thus serves as a shorthand or shortcut, naturalizing certain forms of thought and action as desirable (those associated with masculinity) over others (those associated with femininity). Power, in one sense, is *signified* by gender. Gender is conceived of as a form of structural power.

Highlighting bodies as sites of power (as I do in the literature review in Chapter 2) points us toward another way of understanding gender and power. Power is not only located at the level of ideas, language or structures of thought, but at the level of bodies themselves. The argument I'm making is not that gender as a signifier of power that means women's bodies are less valued than men's. Rather, our bodies as sites of power mean that power works in and through bodies to produce them as we know them— whether we are protected 'bodies that matter' or are torturable bodies, or killable bodies, 'bodies that don't matter'. Post-structuralist feminist work in International Relations is

mostly focused on analyzing representations of the bodies of men and women and how these representations are deployed to create certain identity categories and promote certain policies. Such work on *representations* of bodies reproduces the sex/gender distinction that leaves bodies as natural organisms outside of their political interpretation. I argue that bodies themselves as products of power, and what's more, that such bodies have a form of agency as well.

As such, my dissertation does not only make an argument about power in reference to feminist theory in International Relations, but also about the ways in which bodies and subjects are formed in and through power more broadly. The critique here is not only of traditional IR scholarship that leave bodies implicitly theorized as only biological objects that breathe, suffer and die, but also of various strands of critical IR that analyzes bodies, either similarly or in populations as produced through relations of knowledge/power.

This argument about the body in relation to power and agency in IR is closely entangled with a set of empirical claims about the nature of bodies. In chapter 3, the body as both subject and object of power is shown through the practices of torture and force-feeding and in reference to Foucault's concepts of sovereign power and biopower. The bodies of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay are produced as 'enemy combatants,' both 'tortureable' and 'useful' (for information) through the practice of torture as an act of sovereign power. Torture is a performative act of violence that produces these bodies through acts of violence. Such bodies are also produced as vulnerable bodies in a transaction that locates vulnerability in the bodies of the tortured, while producing the

torturer as invulnerable. However, biopower is simultaneously at work; placing certain limits on torture. The intervention made on the level of the embodied subjectivity of the prisoners as well as the agency bodies comes through the discussion of hunger striking and force-feeding. Hunger-striking must be understood as a form of embodied agency not only because the subject uses the body as a political tool but that this form of agency makes use of the body in ways that depend upon the body's own materiality, vulnerability and unpredictability to function as it does politically, refuting IR's assumption of self-preservation and the biopolitical imperative to live.

The chapter on suicide bombing explicitly addresses the agentic nature of bodies. Bodies are theorized as agentic because they has the ability to make the abject present, and through the practice of suicide bombing, to violently undermine the boundaries between bodies and between culture and nature, inside and outside. The next move, after theorizing bodies of suicide bombers as abject and therefore *productive* in a sense is to show how bodies are produced by practices of security—how they are resubjectified from their status as a 'heap of meat' by conscious efforts. Because the abject pre-exists the subject, the agency of the body in suicide bombing is necessarily a form of agency that cannot be reduced to the will of a self-governing subject.

In the last two chapters, on precision warfare and R2P, power and agency are understood in terms of the embodied subject as mutually entangled with other subjects. In these chapters, I've made explicit what was hinted at before in terms of the relationship between torturer and torture victim. Here, the production of bombers, targets, and civilians, as well as the subjects empowered to use violence to protect those designated as

264

in need of saving, and subjects of inhumanity from the chapter on R2P as argued to be mutually constituted. The bodies of bombers especially represent examples of embodied agency as their 'superhuman' abilities do not only allow them to use violence in new ways, but produced new categories of embodied subjects in the targets they kill. Such embodied subjects can be compared the sovereign, invulnerable subjects of R2P, each created in relation to vulnerable, killable or 'already dead' subjects.

My dissertation is at another level a methodological intervention. On this level, the project seeks to answer the question of what it would look like to take feminist theorizing about subjectivity as constitutively embodied seriously in international security studies. In other words, how would theorizing about violence in IR change if our model of the subject was of a subject embodied along the lines I develop in chapter 2, based on Judith Butler's thesis of constitutive vulnerability and precariousness of the subject. This intervention is motivated by a critical impulse to show how IR is indebted to a specific model of the subject, and more specifically, a model of how subjects and bodies are related.

In the terrain of International Security Studies, certain assumptions are made about the subject and its relationship to the body—which I clarify in the introduction. While bodies as implicitly conceptualized as individuated biological entities, realist, liberal and constructivists have different additional assumptions about the subject, whether it is a self-preserving subject, a willing, speaking subject with exogenous interests, or a subject constituted by an identity that requires adherence to social norms. In none of these cases is the subject theorized in relation to his or her embodiment, except

insofar as bodies make one vulnerable to violence and bodies as a hindrance to overcome in pursuit of one's goals.

Feminist theory in IR reproduces this neglect of bodies, and implicit theorization of bodies as apolitical organism through their reliance on the concept of 'gender' as it is defend in opposition to 'sex'. Feminist IR has a particular model of the subject as gendered, that is, broken into dichotomous characteristics associated with masculinity and femininity. Traditional IR has presumed a masculine subject characterized by autonomy, rationality, power and the public sphere (Tickner 2001, 15). The subject is characterized by a hegemonic masculinity, a hierarchy of masculine traits that intersects with race, class and sexuality. Characteristics associated with femininity such as dependency, weakness and emotion are subordinated. The feminist IR critique of the subject of IR is a critique not only of individuals as gendered subjects, that is, subjects who are socialized into particular masculine and feminine identities that prescribe appropriate and desirable behavior for according to one's biological sex. It is also a more structural critique of the discourse of International Relations and of politics and culture more broadly that privileges traits and qualities associated with masculinity. Feminists working in International Relations have been concerned with the ways in which security as it has been understood by traditional International Relations as well as practiced on the world stage has resulted in increasing *insecurity* for individuals, particularly those who are already the most marginalized in societies including women, children, the poor and racial/ethnic minorities. My work contributes to this by theorizing how the production of embodied subjects by practices of international security make some lives 'unlivable,'

266

unworthy of protection, and others lives into biopolitical populations to be intervened upon to 'make live'. Analyzing the politics of bodies per se rather than gendered constructs is necessary to overcome entrenched dualisms of mind/body and culture/nature that the emphasis on gender as a social, cultural, and/or linguistic construct overlooks.

Against this backdrop, my work is about analytically constructing a model of the production of embodied subjects in International Relations. The cases are not 'tests' for this model, because they are used to construct the model itself. The model here, is, with various modifications, Judith Butler's account of subject formation. This model is contrasted with a modern, liberal account of the subject as disembodied—as well as a particular feminist model that holds bodies as apolitical, biological organisms—to show a greater depth of understanding of empirical events in international security. There is also another aspect of this project, a critical/reflexivist project that seeks to illuminate the historical processes that structure the present. This aspect of the work is reflected in the overarching theme of the formation of various kinds of embodied subjects in and through violence and other practices of international security, subjects that are formed through forms of normative violence to become bodies that matter or 'unlivable lives'.

Consistent with my engagement with Butler's work, a project that specifically attempts to theorize the formation of embodied subjects with an eye toward social transformation, with making it possible for more people to live 'livable lives,' my dissertation brings this political project to bear on practices of international security, including practices of theorizing about international security. It is a reflection and clarification of common practices, including the 'common knowledge' of international

267

security. Operating at the juncture of feminist theory and International Relations, it takes the reflexivist/critical impulse of feminist theory and brings it to bear on the practices of international security by clarifying the common assumptions that underpin practices such as torture, force-feeding and precision warfare, in order to provoke a changed perspective and political action regarding these forms of violence. This works out slightly differently in the chapter on suicide bombing. In this chapter, I present suicide bombing as an embodied practice in a way that ascribes agency to bodies outside of the intentions or motivations of agents in the way that agents are understood in a behavioral or rational-choice model, or a 'culturist' model that seeks explanation in cultural or religious beliefs. Overall, the clarification of assumptions underpinning various forms of violence is aimed at showing a systematic bias against theorizing bodies, a bias which is linked cultural codes associating the body with women and racial and sexual minorities.

In the chapter on torture, I pick up the thread of the body as individual and transcendable and argue that the political practice of hunger striking is evidence of the limitations of this model of the subject, as the hunger striker relies specifically on his or her body, and, in the statement of one of the hunger strikers, presents a model of subjectivity that is not individual, but collective, and of a subject that is not self-preserving. At the level of a reflexive/critical methodology, claims like the use of Das's reading of Wittgenstein to offer a new interpretation of the tortured body are meant to suggest an alternative reading that can lend itself to the dismantling of certain models of the subject on behalf of those with greater potential for political transformation. One objection to my analysis could be that this interpretation may have nothing to do with

what Mohammad meant by "I will not stop until I die or we are respected." Since Mohammad has been released to Britain, one could interview him to find out what he meant. However, as in the chapter on suicide bombers, my purpose is not to find out the true meaning of practices as the agents understand them, but rather to interpret events in such a way as to challenge the dominant model of the subject in International Relations. My purpose here is not to show that subjects *can't* be individuals, or that the model of the subject as rational, self-preserving mind is always wrong, but that other ways of thinking about the subject are possible, and are neglected.

Chapter four, on suicide bombing, challenges the assumption of the individuated, self-governing body through theorizing suicide bombing as a practice. I bracket the question of the motivations of actors, which is widely discussed in the literature to show at least part of what such behavioral analyses are missing by not theorizing bodies as themselves productive of politics. Methodologically, I ask what bodies *do* outside of the intentions of willing subjects. The abject is one place to start, because the abject has to do with the process of forming seemingly complete and coherent subjects. The abject logically pre-exists the subject, while remaining the 'constitutive outside' of the seemingly coherent subject, remaining to haunt it. By theorizing the body of suicide bombers as abject, as blurring the boundaries between self and other, nature and technology and inside and outside, the body of the suicide bomber can be theorized in a way that doesn't reproduce the model of the subject as self-governing.

In the chapter on precision warfare, the use of Haraway and Grosz to supplement my engagement with Butler is intended to more fully flesh out the implications of a

269

technologically embodied subjectivity and place Butler's thesis of the constitutive vulnerability and dependency of subjects as embodied in explicit references to the need for 'artificial' supplementation of 'natural' bodies. This makes the use of drones or other forms of extension of human senses and capabilities to be a development along a continuum rather than a radical departure in the way we think about human subjects. My argument that the bodies of bombers, targets, and civilians are produced as protected or killable in relation to one another is subject to counterfactual analysis. Is it plausible to believe that we would have 'targets' as they are constituted in precision warfare without drone operators and the political/legal apparatus that enables them? Likewise, would we have 'collateral damage' as 'bodies that don't matter' in the absence of such form of technologically enhanced human embodiment? I theorize the visual abilities of precision bombers as a form of their embodiment, without which none of this would be possible— but this methodological move needs to be made clearer. What this particular move is meant to enable in terms of a politics of resistance is a challenge to the way we think about ethics and the use of violence, a theme that, having opened this door, I take up in the next chapter, chapter 6.

This reflexive/critical methodology is most evident in the chapter on R2P, and in the chapter on torture. In chapter 6, which addresses the new norm of sovereignty called the "Responsibility to Protect," I use Butler's thesis of the constitutive vulnerability of the embodied subject to critique the terms on which R2P re-writes sovereignty on a global stage. First I explain how R2P conceptualizes the security problematic in terms of pre-existing bodies that are harmed by other subjects, and that the recasting of

270

sovereignty as responsibility enshrines a biopolitical concept of sovereignty. My next move is to take Butler's concept of bodily vulnerability and precariousness and argue that, to take this concept of embodied subjectivity seriously is not only about seeking to save more lives from widespread violence as a matter of the rights of pre-existing individual but to consider the terms in which certain subjects are produced through normative violence. This part of the chapter is also a culmination of the previous three chapters in making the issue of the production of different types of bodies—torturable enemy combatants, gendered and religious/national subjects, targets and collateral damage—explicitly about the issue of normative violence in producing subjects who can lead 'livable lives' and those who are produced as 'bodies that don't matter'. Here also, the connection between the methodological issue of interpreting embodied subjects as precarious and questions of agency and power is drawn, as agency is redescribed as not a matter of individual subjects but an ongoing process of subjectification in relation to other embodied subjects. This interpretation enables the next move I make, which is to re-frame the question of ethics and responsibility in terms of responsibility and recognition in relation to normative violence as well as violence that attends to existing subjects.

On a third level, the level of empirical claims, I make a specific intervention set against a backdrop of security defined in not only traditional nation-state terms, but biopolitically as the health and well-being of the population as an object of knowledge as well. Here, my purpose is to make a set of claims about violence in the contemporary world and how theorizing bodies in the ways I've set out in the previous level—bodies as

produced by, and productive of, international security practices—enables us to see bodies as *unnatural* and reinforces the ontological parameters of embodied subjects I've set out—subjects as constitutively vulnerable in their embodiment and in their relations to other embodied subjects. On the level of empirical analysis, the three chapters—torture/force-feeding, suicide bombing, and precision warfare—build toward my overall narrative of the *unnaturalness* of bodies and their constitutive vulnerability. This model contrasts with the implicit biopolitical understanding that is prevalent in contemporary politics especially around issues of security. In making the broad empirical claim that bodies are unnatural, requiring material and political supplementation to exist as 'bodies that matter,' I set up my claim that violence is expressive of this instability of bodies—that in its 'regular' form that we're familiar with—physical harm to pre-existing bodies and as normative violence, it contributes to the making and unmaking of various embodied subjects.

The story I tell in chapter 4 is of the embodied practice of suicide bombing and the efforts at recovering and reconstituting bodies that challenges the assumption of bodies as naturally self-contained and distinct some one another. The individuation of bodies is shown as a political effect, as part of the process of subject formation. In particular, it is a case of the vulnerable, embodied subject that is the centerpiece of my dissertation. Kristeva conceptualizes the formation of the subject in reference to an 'other'—a common enough theme in post-structuralist theorizing in IR. What is unique about Kristeva is that the self-other relation is specifically embodied—not just at the level of 'identity groups' or similar. In this specificity in referencing human bodies Kristeva

takes us to a literally visceral level of the material body and its borders, and of the disgust and revulsion felt at that which supersedes or breaches these borders such as the corpse and bodily fluids. This makes her account of subject formation a powerful way of addressing the agency of bodies in the practice of suicide bombing, in which bodies are intentionally blown apart. Here, unlike in the chapters on torture/force-feeding and precision war, there isn't an empirical puzzle that I'm providing an answer for; rather, this chapter is primarily focused on the 'level of analysis' of power relations and the methodological intervention of a feminist critical or 'reflexivist' epistemological stance of creating knowledge to enable resistance or progressive change. Thus, the question that 'abjection' is the answer to is 'what is a way of thinking about suicide bombers that does not solely focus on the 'minds' of the bombers/organizers?' As I've argued in chapter 2, theorizing about bodies as unnatural and agentic is linked to various struggles to overcome the subordination of women, racially marked people and other groups that are linked to 'the body' and irrationality.

Judith Butler modifies Kristeva's psychoanalytic account of embodied subject formation in several ways, and the Butler makes it more general—as 'constitutive outside' rather than 'abject' and by doing so takes us away from an essentialist maternal body that is the primary object of abjection. The addition of Judith Butler to modify Kristeva's work is intended to counter objections to Kristeva's use of an essential maternal body to ground the abject. It would, of course, be highly problematic to argue the discursive production of bodies by relying on a concept that asserted the essentialness of the feminine, maternal body. Butler's re-working of Kristeva's concept of the abject as

the constitutive outside of the subject—that which is expelled but remains essential to the subject as its founding repudiation that remains to haunt the subject—broadens the applicability of this account. IR theorists such as David Campbell in *Writing Security* have used Butler's revision of the subject formation as the drawing of boundaries between self and other in a way that is *analogous* to production of seemingly solid borders of bodies, between inside and outside of the body and between separate bodies. The distinctiveness of both Kristeva's and Butler's approaches lie in the specifically embodied nature of the subject. The subject's formation is inextricably linked to the production of the borders of its body. Kristeva and Butler's engagement with psychoanalytic approaches here is crucial—the subject as a seemingly (or in the process of becoming) individuated subject is an embodied subject that strives to maintain the border between inside and outside of his/her body, and between other bodies. Broader applications of this model of subject formation lose something by drawing an analogy between the embodied subject, and, as in the example of Campbell's *Writing Security*, the state's identity as produced by practices of 'othering'. Bracketing the question of whether we can take the human body as ontologically distinct or with a meaningful independent material existence, I engage with Kristeva because of her emphasis on the untidy, repellent and disordered nature of bodily life and the subject's inextricable dependence on, and susceptibility to, injury based on the embodied nature of the seemingly coherent, willing subject, a bodily nature that is repudiated and is attempted to be buried or papered over, not only by the subject, but in social theories (specifically IR in this case) as well.

I read the practice of suicide bombing in reference to the self-willing subject through Kristeva's concept of the abject precisely because of the bodily nature of the abject—that which refuses to obey boundaries, in order to make empirical claims about suicide bombing as a political practice. Talal Asad also references the abject in terms of suicide bombing in order to theorize about why this form of violence is considered particularly horrifying to certain audiences. My aim in describing suicide bombing in terms of the abject is somewhat different (despite how I may have described my project at various points previously). Here, my aim is to describe the political effects of suicide bombing as an embodied practice that, if we accept a Kristevan or even Butlerian version of subject formation, we can make certain empirical claims about bodies that become evident. For example, we can see bodies as both material and symbolic, and we can make empirical claims about the self-governing body with coherent borders being an effect of political practices rather than a natural state of being.

The chapter on precision warfare relies on a comparison with the argument of that killing in war is made possible by increased physical or psychological distancing from the person being killed. In regard to precision munitions specifically, the argument is frequently made that the distance and the bombers not being able to see the people they are killing enables both the people in change of pulling the triggers and a broader domestic audience to feel that this is a legitimate way of waging war. Because the bodies of targets and civilians are frequently quite visible, the 'psychological distance' argument is shown to be insufficient. Precision warfare also replies upon a particular biopolitical understanding of the ethics of violence, in that it is acceptable to 'accidentally' kill

certain people in order to target others. The empirical claims are based the argument that the bodies of bomber, targets, and civilians are mutually constituted—that is, we cannot understand the production of each, with their own relationship to bodily vulnerability, without the others. The empirical argument about 'cyborg' bodies is based not only on the argument that bodies are logically dependent on materials and care outside of themselves to exist, but that this is a matter degree when one considers the bodies of bombers as technologically enhanced through war rather than removed or separated from the battlespace from technology.

There are fewer empirical claims made in the final chapter on R2P. This is partly due to the fact that this is a new norm of which there are few if any instances of it being put into practice. Mostly, however, the purpose of this chapter is to show the payoff of theorizing bodies from the perspective of constitutive vulnerability and precariousness to think about the implications of these new norms. Furthermore, given the work done on arguing that bodies are produced and productive of IR, as well as the empirical work in demonstrating the unnaturalness of bodies and their dependence on one another for existence, both materially and politically, this chapter demonstrates how this particular way of understanding embodied subjects paves the way toward a reconsideration of the bases for thinking about violence, ethics and responsibility in IR. Ethical questions about violence and international relations do not only revolve around the use of force in regard to harming pre-existing bodies, but must take seriously the question of normative violence as well, in particular, how norms constitute certain bodies as 'livable lives' or as abject 'bodies that don't matter' that may be injured or killed. Importantly, the

276

ontological entanglement of human bodies—that bodies only exist in relation to other bodies—underscores the ethical importance of theorizing bodies in IR as both precariously in their material and social instantiations. That bodies are produced in and through other forms of embodiment poses a challenge not only to theories of violence in International Relations but also to the ethical frameworks for assessing the legitimacy of such violence.

Bibliography

Abdul-Ahad, Ghaith. ""I took a piece of flesh with me home and I called it my son"." *Guardian.* September 12, 2009. http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/sep/11/afghanistan-airstrike-victims-stories/print (accessed May 24, 2010).

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer.* Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Alaimo, Stacy, and Susan Hekman. "Introduction: Emerging Models of Materiality in Feminist Theory." In *Material Feminism*, edited by Stacy Alaimo and Susan Hekman, 1-19. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Arnold, Chris. "TSA To Expand Use of Full-Body Scanners." *NPR.* January 8, 2010. http://www.wbur.org/npr/122289282 (accessed January 10, 2010).

Asad, Talal. *On Suicide Bombing.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

—. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Aviation Week and Space Technology. "New Era for Military Avionics." January 15, 2007: 20.

Baker, Al. "For Emergency Official Touched by 9/11's Horrors, Fears of Complacency." *New York Times*, May 21, 2002: A.

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Barad, Karen. "Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2003): 801-831.

BBC. "Counting the Civilian Cost in Iraq." June 6, 2005.

Barad, Karen. "Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2003): 801-831.

Beier, J. Marshall. "Discriminating Tastes: 'Smart' Bombs, Non-Combatants and Notions of Legitimacy in Warfare." *Security Dialogue* 34, no. 4 (2003): 411-425.

—. "Outsmarting Technologies: Rhetoric, Revolutions in Military Affairs, and the Social Depth of Warfare." *International Politics* 46 (2006): 226-280.

Bellamy, Alex. "No Pain, No Gain? Torture and Ethics in the War on Terror." *International Affairs* 82, no. 1 (2006): 121-148.

—. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse?: The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq." In *Ethics and International Affairs: A Reader*, edited by Joel Rosenthal and Christian Barry. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2009.

—. *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Effort to End Mass Atrocities.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.

Bergen, Peter, and Katherine Tiedeman. *Revenge of the Drones.* New America Foundation, 2009.

Bially Mattern, Janice. "Emotional Practice in World Politics." In *The Practice Turn in International Relations*, edited by Emmanual Adler and Vincent Pouliot. Under Review (As of March 2010).

Birke, Lynda. *Feminism and the Biological Body.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.

Blakely, Ruth. "Why Torture?" *Review of International Studies* 33 (2007): 373-397.

Bloom, Mia. *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Bordo, Susan. *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

Bradbury, Steven G. "Re: Application of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2340-2340A to the Combined Use of Certain Techniques in the Interrogation of High Value al Qaeda Detainees." *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel.* May 10, 2005. http://luxmedia.vo.llnwd.net/o10/clients/aclu/olc_05102005_bradbury46pg.pdf.

—. "Re: Application of United States Obligations Under Article 16 of the Convention Against Torture to Certain Techniques That May Be Used in the Interrogation of High Value al Qaeda Detainees." *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel.* May 30, 2005. http://luxmedia.vo.llnwd.net/ o10/clients/aclu/olc_05302005_ bradbury.pdf.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Bush, George W. "Remarks by the President on Homeland Security." *Office of the Press Secretary.* September 10, 2003. http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030910-6.html.

Butler, Judith. "Foucault and the Paradox of Bodily Inscription." *The Journal of Philosophy* 86, no. 11 (1989): 601-607.

—. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York and London: Routledge, 1990.

—. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'.* New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

—."Imitation and Gender Insubordination." In *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*, edited by Diana Tietjens Meyers. 1997.

—. *Excitable Speech: The Politics of the Performative*. London: Routledge, 1997.

—. "How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview with Judith Butler." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 23, no. 2 (1998): 275-286.

—. *Precarious Life: The Power of Mourning and Violence.* London and New York: Verso, 2004.

—. *Undoing Gender.* New York and London: Routledge, 2004.

—. *Giving an Account of Oneself.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.

—. *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* London: Verso, 2009.

Buzan, Barry. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era.* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Campbell, David. *Writing Security: US Foreign Policy and the Politics of Difference.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000 [1992].

Card, Claudia. "Rape as a Weapon of War." *Hypatia* 11, no. 4 (1996): 5-19.

Carpenter, R. Charli. *Innocent Women and Children: Gender, Norms and the Protection of Civilians.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press, 2006.

—. "'Women and Children First': Gender, Norms and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991-1995." *International Organization* 57 (2003): 662-694.

Cavarero, Adriana. *Horrorism: Naming Contemporary Violence.* Translated by William McCuaig. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Chodorow, Nancy Julia. "Gender, Relation, and Difference in Psychoanalytic Perspective." In *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*, edited by Diana Tietjen Meyers, 8-20. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Cohen, Stuart. *Israel and its Army: From Cohesion to Confusion.* New York: Routledge, 2008.

Cohn, Carol. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12, no. 4 (1987): 687-718

Coker, Christopher. *Humane Warfare.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Conant, Eve. "Remains of the Day." *Newsweek*. January 12, 2009. 43-45.

Crenshaw, Martha. "Explaining Suicide Terrorism: A Review Essay." *Security Studies* 16, no. 1 (2007): 133-162.

Cunningham, Karla. "Female Survival Calculations in Politically Violent Settings: How Political Violence and Terrorism are Viewed as Pathways to Life." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 32, no. 7 (2009): 561-575.

Danner, Mark. "US Torture: Voices from Black Sites." *New York Review of Books*, April 9, 2009.

Das, Veena. *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007.

Dauphinee, Elizabeth. "The Politics of the Body in Pain." *Security Dialogue* 38, no. 2 (June 2007).

Davey, Monica. "Drone to Patrol Part of Border With Canada." *New York Times*, December 7, 2008: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/08/us/08drone.html.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Foucault.* Translated by Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Department of Defense. "Medical Program Support for Detainee Operations, DoD instruction no. 2310.08E." June 6, 2006. http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/231008p.pdf (accessed April 11, 2010).

Dershowitz, Alan. "Want Torture? Get a Warrant." *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 22, 2002: A-19.

Devji, Faisal. *The Terrorist in Search of Humanity: Militant Islam and Global Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Dillon, Michael, and Julian Reid. "Global Liberal Governance: Biopolitics, Security and War." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30, no. 1 (2001): 41-66.

DiManno, Rosie. "Cleaning Up the Carnage When Terror Strikes in Israel." *Toronto Star*, May 5, 2003.

Dingley, James, and Marcello Mollica. "The Human Body as Terrorist Weapon: Hunger Strikes and Suicide Bombers." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 30 (2007): 459-492.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* New York and London: Routledge, 1966.

Downes, Alexander B. "Desperate Times, Desperate Measures: The Causes of Civilian Victimization in War." *International Security* 30, no. 4 (Spring 2009).

Dubois, Page. *Torture and Truth.* New York: Routledge, 1991.

Easterbrook, Gregg. "Robowar." *The New Republic*, February 11, 1991.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1995[1987].

Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

—. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

—. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.* Berkely: University of California Press, 2000.

Entous, Adam. "Special Report: How the White House Learned to Love the Drone." *Reuters.* May 19, 2010. http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE64H5SL20100518 (accessed May 29, 2010).

Epstein, Charlotte. "Who Speaks? Discourse, the Subject and the Study of Identity in International Politics." *European Journal of International Relations*, 2010: 1-24.

Esposito, Roberto. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Trans. Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Evans, Gareth, and Mohamed Sahnoun. "Responsibility to Protect." *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 6 (2002).

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Women and Men.* 2nd Edition. New York: Basic Books, 1992[1985].

—. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality.* New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Fearon, James, and Alex Wendt. "Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View." In *The Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons, 52-72. London: Sage Publications, 2002.

Fierke, K. M. "Agents of Death: The Structural Logic of Suicide Terrorism and Martyrdom." *International Theory* 1, no. 1 (2009): 155-184.

Fineman, Martha Albertson. "The Vulnerable Subject: Anchoring Equality in the Human Condition." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 20 no. 1 (2008).

Finn, Peter, and Joby Warrick. "In 2002, Military Agency Warned Against 'Torture'." *Washington Post.* April 25, 2009. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/24/ AR2009042403171.html (accessed August 17, 2009).

—. "Torture of Abu Zubaida Produced False Leads." *Washington Post*, March 29, 2009.

Finnemore, Martha. *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

—. and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 887-917.

Foot, Rosemary. "Torture: The Struggle over a Peremptory Norm in Counter-Terrorist Era." *International Relations* 20, no. 2 (2006): 131-151.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1.* New York: Random House, 1978.

—.*Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Edited by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

—. "Body/Power." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

—. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *The Foucault Reader*, by Michel Foucault, edited by Paul Rabinow, 76-100. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

—. *The Birth of the Clinic.* Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books, 1994 [1973].

—. *'Society Must Be Defended'.* Translated by David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.

—. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78.* Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstroke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

—. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France.* Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstroke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Fox, Ben. "Guantanamo Hunger Strikers Say Feeding Tubes Employed as Punishment." *Associated Press*, October 20, 2005

Frank, Thomas. "Anxiety-Detecting Machines Could Spot Terrorists." *USA Today*, September 18, 2008

Gatens, Moira. *Imaginary Bodies: Ethics, Power and Corporeality.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Ginsburg, Mitchell. "Enduring Horror." *Jerusalem Report*, September 22, 2003: 12.

Glanz, James. "Torture is Often a Temptation and Almost Never Works." *New York Times.* May 9, 2004. http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/09/weekinreview/the-world-torture-is-often-a-temptation-and-almost-never-works.html.

Golden, Tim. "Guantanamo Detainees Stage Hunger Strike." *New York Times*, April 9, 2007.

—. "Tough U.S. Steps in Hunger Strike at Camp in Cuba." *New York Times*, February 9, 2006.

Goldstein, Joshua. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001

Graham, Bradly. "Enemy Body Counts Revived." *The Washington Power*, October 24, 2005: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/23/AR2005102301273.html.

Gregory, Derek. *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Grossman, Dave. *On Killing: The Psychological Costs of Learning to Kill in War and Society.* Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1995.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

—. *Space, Time and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies.* New York and London: Routledge, 1995.

—. *Time Travels: Feminism, Nature, Power.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005.

Gusterson, Hugh. *People of the Bomb: Portraits of America's Nuclear Complex.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Hansen, Lene. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

—."Gender, Nation, Rape: Bosnia and the Construction of Security." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3, no. 1 (2001): 55-75.

—."The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 2000.

Hannah, Matthew. "Torture and the Ticking Time Bomb: The War on Terrorism as a Geographical Imagination of Power/Knowledge." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96, no. 3 (2006): 622-640.

Haraway, Donna. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*, by Donna Haraway, 149-182. New York: Routledge, 1991.

—."Situated Knowledges." In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*, by Donna Haraway, 183-202. New York: Routledge, 1991.

—."The Biopolitics of Postmodern Bodies." In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women*, by Donna Haraway, 203-230. New York: Routledge, 1991.

—. *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium.FemaleMan_Meets_OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience.* New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Harding, Sandra. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hasso, Frances S. "Discursive and Political Deployments by/of the 2002 Palestinian Women Suicide Bombers/Martyrs." *Feminist Review* 81 (2005): 23-51.

Hawkins, Robert J. "You're Nothing But a Chalky Alien to TSA Scanners," *San Diego Union Tribune.* August 31, 2010. http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2010/aug/31/youre-nothing-chalky-alien-tsa-scanners/

Herbert, Bob. "Who We Are." *New York Times.* August 1, 2005. http://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/01/opinion/01herbert.html.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan.* Edited by Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996[1651].

Hoffman, Bruce. "The Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *The Atlantic Monthly* 291:5 (June 2003): 40-47.

Hooper, Charlotte. *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Horton, Scott. "The Guantanamo 'Suicides': A Camp Delta Sergeant Blows the Whistle." *Harper's.* January 18, 2010. http://www.harpers.org/archive/2010/01/hbc-90006368 (accessed January 20, 2010).

Howell, Allison. "Victims or Madmen? The Diagnostic Competition over "Terrorist" Detainees at Guantanamo Bay." *International Political Sociology* 1, no. 1 (2007): 29-47.

Human Rights Watch. *Precisely Wrong.* http://www.hrw.org/en/reports/2009/06/30/precisely-wrong-0, 2009.

Hyndman, Jennifer. "Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq." *The Professional Geographer* 59, no. 1 (February 2007).

Irigaray, Luce. *An Ethics of Sexual Difference.* Translated by Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993 [1984].

Jenkins, Philip. "Fighting Terrorism As If Women Mattered: Anti- Abortion Violence as Unconstructed Terrorism." In *Making Trouble: Cultural Constructions of Crime, Deviance, and Control*, edited by Jeff Ferrell and Neil Websdale, 319-46. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter, 1999.

Johnson, Carrie, and Walter Pincus. "Supermax Prisons in the US Already Hold Terrorists." *Washington Post*, May 22, 2009.

Jordan, James. "9/11 Victims Identified with DNA Tests." *Sky News.* January 8, 2010. http://news.sky.com/skynews/Home/World-News/September-11-New-York-World-Trade-Centre-Attack-Victims-Identified-After-DNA-Tests/Article/201001215516767?f =rss (accessed May 15, 2010).

Kahn, Paul W. *Sacred Violence: Torture, Terror and Sovereignty.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.

Kaldor, Mary. *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention.* London: Polity, 2007.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kessler, Oliver and Werner, Wouter. "Extrajudicial Killing as Risk Management." *Security Dialogue*, 2008: 289-308.

Kinsella, Helen. "Securing the Civilian: Sex and Gender in the Laws of War." In *Power and Global Governance*, edited by Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, 249-272. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kirkpatrick, David D. "Senators Laud Treatment of Detainees in Guantanamo." *New York Times*, June 28, 2005.

Lane, Riki. "Trans as Bodily Becoming: Rethinking the Biological as Diversity, Not Dichotomy." *Hypatia*, 2009: 136-157.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Leonnig, Carol. "More Join Guantanamo Hunger Strike." *Washington Post*, September 13, 2005: A.

Levy, Amit. "ZAKA mission to Haiti 'proudly desecrating Shabbat'." *Israel News*, January 17, 2010.

Lewis, Jeffrey. "Precision Terror: Suicide Bombing as Control Technology." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 19 (2007): 223-245.

Lloyd, Moya. *Judith Butler: From Norms to Politics.* Cambridge, UK: Policy Press, 2006.

Locher, Birgit, and Elisabeth Prugl. "Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground?" *International Studies Quarterly* 45 no. 1 (2001): 111-129.

Luttwak, Edward. "Toward Post-Heroic Warfare." *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995): 109-122.

Magnezi, Aviel. "Golani Soldier Gets Jewish Burial Despite Incomplete Conversion." *Ynet News.* March 28, 2010. http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3869405,00.html (accessed May 15, 2010).

Mahnken, Thomas. *Technology and the American Way of War Since 1945.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Martin, Emily. *The Woman in The Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2001.

Mayer, Jane. "The Predator War." *The New Yorker*, October 26, 2009.

Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11-40.

McFarland, Stephen. *America's Pursuit of Precision Bombing, 1910-1945.* Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.

McInnis, Colin. *Spectator- Sport War.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2002.

McKeown, Ryder. "Norm Regress: US Revisionism and the Slow Death of the Torture Norm." *International Relations* 23, no. 1 (2009): 5-25.

Melia, Michael. "More Gitmo Detainees Join Hunger Strike." *Associated Press.* January 8, 2007. http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2007/01/08/international/i152839S55.DTL (accessed August 8, 2009).

—. "Yemeni Official: Gitmo Inmate Died of Asphyxiation." *Associated Press.* August 1, 2009. http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=8229664.

Meilenger, Philip. "A Matter of Precision." *Foreign Policy* (123), March/April 2001: 78-79.

—. "Precision Aerospace Power, Discrimination and the Future of War." *Aerospace Power Journal*, Fall 2001.

Milbank, Dana. "Curtains Ordered for Media Coverage of Returning Coffins." *Washington Post*, October 21, 2003: A23.

Miles, Steven H. *Oath Betrayed: Torture, Medical Complicity, and the War on Terror.* New York: Random House, 2006.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty and Other Writings.* Edited by Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1859]1989.

Miller, Greg. "Increased U.S. Drone Strikes in Pakistan Killing Few High-Value Militants." *Washington Post*, February 21, 2011.

Milliken, Jennifer, and David Sylvan. "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets and Chic Theories: US Bombing Policy in Indochina." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30, no. 6 (1996).

Mitchell, Luke. "Six Questions for Cynthia Smith on the Legality of Force-Feeding at Guantanamo." *Harper's.* June 4, 2009. http://harpers.org/archive/2009/06/hbc-90005110.

Moon, Katherine H. S. *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Moser, Caroline O. N., and Fiona C. Clark. *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence.* New York: Zed Books, 2001.

Muir, David. "Inside the Drone War: On the Ground and in the Virtual Cockpit with America's New Lethal Spy." *ABC News*, January 12, 2010.

Nanji, Ayaz. "Report: 108 Died in U.S. Custody." *CBS News.* March 15, 2005. http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2005/03/16/terror/main680658.shtml?cmp=EM8 706.

Neumann, Iver B. "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31, no. 3 (2002): 627-651.

Nicholl, David. "Forcefeeding and Restraint of Guantanamo Bay Hunger Strikers." *Lancet* 367 (March 2006).

Nitkin, Karen. "Walking like a Bomber." *Technology Review*, January 17, 2007.

Norris, Margot. "Military Censorship and the Body Count in the Persian Gulf War." *Cultural Critique* 19 (1991).

Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender, and the Family.* New York: Basic Books, 1989.

Oliver, Anne Marie. "Brides of Palestine." *Salon.com.* July 20, 2006. http://www.salon.com/mwt/feature/2006/07/20/suicide_bombers/print.html (accessed January 29, 2010).

Oliver, Kelly. *Women as Weapons of War: Iraq, Sex and the Media.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Oliver, Kelly. "Women: The Secret Weapon of Modern Warfare?" *Hypatia* 23, no. 2 (2008): 1-16.

O'Rourke, Lindsey. "What's Special about Female Suicide Terrorism?" *Security Studies* 18, no. 4 (2008): 681-718.

Osborn, Kris. "Army Records First UAV Kills." *Air Force Times*, September 17, 2007.

Owens, Patricia. "Accidents Don't Just Happen: The Liberal Politics of High Technology 'Humanitarian' War." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 2003: 595-616.

Pape, Robert. *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Pape, Robert. *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism.* New York: Random House, 2005.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Peterson, V. Spike. "Introduction." In *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, edited by V. Spike Peterson. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publications, 1992.

Peterson, V. Spike. "Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 21, no. 2 (1992).

Physicians for Human Rights. *Break Them Down: Systemic Use of Psychological Torture by US Forces.* Cambridge, MA: Physicians for Human Rights, 2005.

Pitzke, Marc. "Interview with a Drone Pilot." *Spiegel Online.* March 12, 2010. http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,682420,00.html (accessed May 10, 2010).

Pouliot, Vincent. "The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities." *International Organization* 62 (2008): 257–88.

Priest, Dana. "CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons." *Washington Post.* November 2, 2005. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644.html.

Plaw, Avery. *Targeting Terrorists: A License to Kill?* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Press, Darryl. "The Myth of Airpower in the Gulf War and the Future of Warfare." *International Security* 26, no. 2 (Fall 2001).

Raju, Mana. "Graham: Detainees Get Better Treatment than Nazis." *The Hill.* June 12, 2008. http://thehill.com/leading-the-news/graham-gitmo-detainees-get-better-treatment-than-nazis-2008-06 12.html (accessed August 12, 2009).

Reid, Tim. "One in Five Guantanamo Bay Detainees Is On Hunger Strike." *Times (London)*, January 15, 2009.

Rejali, Darius. "Modern Torture as Civic Marker: Solving a Global Anxiety with a New Political Technology." *Journal of Human Rights* 2, no. 2 (2003): 153-171.

—. *Torture and Democracy.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Reuter, Christoph. *My Life is a Weapon: A Modern History of Suicide Bombing.* Translated by Helena Ragg-Krikby. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Rip, Michael Russell, and James M. Jasik. *The Precision Revolution: GPS and the Future of Aerial Warfare.* Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2002.

Rivera-Fuentes, Consuela, and Lynda Birke. "Talking with/in Pain: Reflections on Bodies Under Torture." *Women's International Studies Forum* 24, no. 6 (2001): 653-68.

Roberts, Les et. al. "Mortality Before and After the 2003 Invasion of Iraq: Cluster Sample Survey." *The Lancet* 364 (2004): 1857-1864.

Roberts, Michael. "Suicide Missions as Witnessing: Expansions, Contrasts." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 30 (2007): 857-887.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*. Ed. and trans. V. Gourevitch. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997 [1762].

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on a 'Political Economy' of Sex." In *Feminism and History*, edited by Joan Wallach Scott, 105-151. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996 [1975].

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body In Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schatzki, Theodore. "Introduction: Practice Theory." In *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, edited by Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina and Eike von Savigny, 1-14. New York and London: Routledge, 2001.

Schelling, Thomas. *Arms and Influence.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.

Seelye, Katharine Q. "Some Guantanamo Detainees Will Be Freed." *New York Times*, October 23, 2002.

Serwer, Adam. "Tortured Talking Points." *The Guardian.* December 30, 2009. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2009/dec/30/torture-bomb-flight-253.

Shane, Scott. "U.S. Approval of Killing of Cleric Causes Unease." *New York Times*, May 13, 2010.

Shane, Scott, and Charlie Savage. "Bin Laden Raid Revives Debate on Value of Torture." *New York Times.* May 3, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/04/us/politics/04torture.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=torture%20bin%20laden&st=cse&gwh=116DF161F6C7E3F47CE746A4AEBF02DF (accessed May 21, 2011).

Shane, Scott, and Mark Landler. "Obama Clears Way for Guantanamo Trials." *New York Times.* March 7, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/08/world/americas/08guantanamo.html?ref=guantanamobaynavalbasecuba&gwh=D728E42FED7C0A07C7938345FC1902DD (accessed May 25, 2011).

Shaw, Martin. "Risk Transfer Militarism, Small Massacres and the Historical Legitimacy of War." *International Relations* 16, no. 3 (2002).

Shildrick, Margrit. *Embodying the Monster: Encounters with the Vulnerable Self.* London: Sage, 2002.

—. *Leaky Bodies and Boundaries: Feminism, Postmodernism and (Bio)ethics.* London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

—. and Janet Price. "Openings on the Body: A Critical Introduction." In *Feminist Theory and the Body*, 1-14. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Shklar, Judith. *Ordinary Vices.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

—."The Liberalism of Fear." In *Political Thought and Political Thinkers*, by Judith Shklar, edited by Stanley Hoffman, 3-20. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Shue, Henry. "Torture." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 7, no. 2 (1978): 124-143.

Singer, P. W. *Wired For War:The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21ˢᵗ Century.* New York: Penguin Press, 2009

Sjoberg, Laura. *Gender, Justice and the Wars in Iraq.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.

—. and Caron Gentry. *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics.* London: Zed Books, 2007.

Skjelsbæk, Inger. "Sexual Violence and War: Mapping Out a Complex Relationship." *European Journal of International Relations* 7, no. 2 (2001): 211-237.

Smith, Thomas. "The New Law of War: Legitimizing Hi-Tech and Infrastructural Violence." *International Studies Quarterly* 46 (2002): 367-376.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "'In a Word', interview with Ellen Rooney." *differences* 1, no. 2 (1989): 124-56.

—. "Terror: A Speech after 9-11." *boundary 2*, 2004.

Suskind, Ron. *The One-Percent Doctrine: Deep Inside America's Pursuit of its Enemies Since 9/11.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006.

Stadler, Nurit. "Playing with Sacred/Corporeal Identities: Yeshivah Students' Fantasies of Military Participation." *Jewish Social Studies: History, Culture, Society* 13, no. 2 (Winter 2007): 155-178.

—. "Terror, Corpse Symbolism and Taboo Violation: the 'Haredi Disaster Victim Identification Team ("ZAKA") in Israel." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12, no. 4 (2006): 837-858.

—. *Yeshiva Fundamentalism: Piety, Gender and Resistance in the Ultra-Orthodox World.* New York: New York University Press, 2009.

—. and Eyal Ben-Ari. "Other-Worldly Soldiers? Ultra-Orthodox View of Military Service in Contemporary Israel." *Israel Studies* 9, no. 4 (2003): 17-48.

Stiglmayer, Alexandra, ed. *Mass Rape: The War against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Tickner, J. Ann. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Thomas, Ward. *The Ethics of Destruction: Norms and Force in International Relations.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Towns, Ann. *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Tronto, Joan. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Tuana, Nancy. "Coming to Understand: Orgasm and the Epistemology of Ignorance." *Hypatia* 19, no. 1 (Winter 2004): 194-232.

Walt, Stephen. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (1991): 211-239.

Washington, Wayne. "Rumsfeld Defends Detainee Conditions." *Boston Globe*, January 28, 2002: A1.

Weiss, Gail. "The Abject Border of the Body Images." In *Perspectives on Embodiment*, edited by Gail Weiss and Honi Fern Haber. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Weiss, Meira. *The Chosen Body: The Politics of Embodiment in Israeli Society.* Stanford, CA: Standford University Press, 2002.

—. "The Body of the Nation: Terrorism and the Embodiment of Nationalism in Contemporary Israel." *Anthropological Quarterly 75* no. 1 (2002): 37-62.

White, Josh. "Guantanamo Force-Feeding Tactics Are Called Torture." *Washington Post*, March 1, 2006: A.

Wilcox, Lauren. "Gendering the 'Cult of the Offensive'." *Security Studies* 18, no. 2 (2009): 214-240.

Williams, Rudi. "Detainees Eat Well, Gain Weight on Camp Delta's Muslim Menu." *American Forces Press Service.* July 3, 2002. http://www.defenselink.mil/ned ws/newsarticle.aspx?id=43686 (accessed August 18, 2009).

Winter, Stuart. "Remains of 9/11 Killers Found." January 11, 2009. http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/79402/Exclusive-Remains-of-9-11-killers-found (accessed May 15, 2010).

Worthington, Andy. "A Truly Shocking Guantanamo Story." *Andy Worthington.* September 9, 2009. http://www.andyworthington.co.uk/2009/09/30/ a-truly-shocking-guantanamo-story-judge-confirms-that-an-innocent-man-was-tortured-to-make-false-confessions/

—. *The Guantanamo Files: The Stories of 774 Detainees in America's Illegal Prison.* Ann Arbor: Pluto Press, 2007.

Yoo, John. "Memorandum to Alberto Gonzales." *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel.* August 2, 2002. http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/docs/memo-gonzales-aug1.pdf.

—. "Memorandum to Willian Haynes II, January 9,2002." *The Torture Papers: The Road to Abu Ghraib.* Edited by Karen Greenberg and Joshua Dratel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Young, Iris Marion. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." *Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society* 29, no. 2 (2003): 15-35.

—. *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation.* London: Sage Publications, 1997.

Zagorin, Adam. "At Guantanamo, Dying Is Not Permitted." *Time.* June 30, 2006. http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1209530,00.htm.

Zarkov, Dubravka. *The Body of War: Media, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Break-Up of Yugoslavia.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections.* New York: Picador, 2008

Zucchino, David. "Drone Pilots Have a Front-Row Seat on War, from Half a World Away." *Los Angeles Times.* February 21, 2010. http://articles.latimes.com/2010/feb/21/world/la-fg-drone-crews21-2010feb21/4 (accessed May 20, 2010).