



ONE OF THE GUYS: WOMEN AS AGGRESSORS AND TORTURERS

A Feminist Analysis?

by Jennifer Kelly

ABSTRACT

THIS ESSAY IS A BOOK REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF TARA MCKELVEY'S EDITED VOLUME *ONE OF THE GUYS: Women as Torturers and Aggressors*, a collection of essays that explores the role of women as perpetrators of violence in the wake of the Abu Ghraib scandal. This book review argues that the collection itself, as it is framed as a feminist interrogation of "women as torturers and aggressors," first, entirely eclipses the torture of Iraqi women at Abu Ghraib. Second, it naturalizes male violence in its sole and excessive focus on female violence. Third, it solicits the sense making of what took place at Abu Ghraib, which consigns torture to the past, maintains the illusion of the torture at Abu Ghraib as an anomaly, and resists interrogating the strategic use of torture in the context of empire. The compilation, then, while contentious and challenged by several of its own contributors, fails to address the historical complexity of the torture at Abu Ghraib.

Book Review: Tara McKelvey, ed. *One of the Guys: Women as Aggressors and Torturers*. Emeryville, CA: Seal Press. 2007. 300 pp. \$15.95.

TARA MCKELVEY'S *ONE OF THE Guys: Women as Aggressors and Torturers* is a compilation of essays exploring the role of women as perpetrators of violence in the wake of the Abu Ghraib scandal. The anthology chronicles the responses of various journalists, scholars, activists, and students in reaction to the torture at Abu Ghraib and, specifically, to the torture enacted by women. The collection begins and ends with essays delineating precisely why it is a feminist conversation. In her foreword, Barbara Ehrenreich laments the death of a "feminist naiveté"¹ after the Abu Ghraib scandal, a feminist assumption that imagined women as incapable of the kind of torture revealed in the photographic evidence from Abu Ghraib. Cynthia Enloe ends the text by congratulating the reader(s) for their participation: "By reading attentively, we join this feminist conversation."² We are reminded throughout that we are participating in a patently feminist dialogue, although the parameters of

that feminism are never explicitly laid out. Presumably, especially according to Ehrenreich's foreword, it is a feminist conversation because it is interrogating a "feminism based on an assumption of female moral superiority."³ According to McKelvey's own introduction, it is a feminist conversation because it is asking, "If we [as feminists] do want equality and opportunity, what are the implications for women? If we don't, what have we been fighting for?"⁴ It is also ostensibly a feminist conversation because it is implicitly asking throughout, *How could women do that?*⁵ Some of the essays in the anthology, however, profoundly complicate each of these questions and prove their insufficiency in understanding the historical complexity, the imperial logic, and the racialized and sexualized politics of what took place at Abu Ghraib, and what (although less frequently emphasized) continues to take place elsewhere.

"THE" WOMEN AT ABU GHRAIB: A FEMINIST ANALYSIS?

First, while the text purports to take "women" in the context of Abu Ghraib as its subject of analysis, only

certain women are central for most of the authors. Even though Angela Davis, in the second essay of the collection, maintains that "most contemporary feminist theorists and activists acknowledge that the category 'woman' is a false universal,"⁶ still many of the contributors to this volume go to great lengths to explain *how* Lynndie England and Sabrina Harman and Megan Ambuhl (in that order), *as women*, could possibly inflict this kind of treatment. Some contributors psychologize Lynndie England in efforts to explain her behavior. Eve Ensler proffers that she is probably a "working-class woman who's had very few choices in her life" and who has likely been "sexually abused or hurt in a fundamental way."⁷ Janis Karpinski, former commanding general of Abu Ghraib, argues that England is "slow" and was too enamored with (and controlled by) Charles Graner to make her own decisions.⁸ Others, like Francine D'Amico, level no criticism at the military as an institution, or at the invasion and occupation of Iraq, and emphasize explicitly that Lynndie England's actions are anomalous.⁹ One contributor, Erin Solaro, even argues that "we have lived to see the women of

our polity step fully out of the timeless tragedy of reproductive biology and into the normal passage of historical and political time, into the fullness of human worth and moral judgment."¹⁰ Clearly, the women to whom Solaro refers—those who have teleologically "entered" the "normal" present and, subsequently, the ranks of "human worth and moral judgment" through their ability to join the armed forces because they no longer die in childbirth—are the U.S. military police and their female superiors. For almost all of the contributors to this volume, these are the women who pose a dilemma for feminism.

The "other" women at Abu Ghraib, mentioned in only three essays of this twenty-five-essay volume, are the Iraqi women abused by U.S. soldiers within the prison. Lucinda Marshall writes, "Far more misogynistic [than sexualized torture of men by women as a weapon of war] is the almost total lack of attention to the ample evidence of sexual assault against Iraqi women at Abu Ghraib. Quite simply, sexual abuse against men is considered torture; sexual abuse against women by men is business as usual."¹¹ Similarly, Steven Miles asks, "Why are the pictures

of the degraded male prisoners at Abu Ghraib readily available when the pictures of degraded women prisoners are classified?”¹² Ilene Feinman also points to the omission of reports of tortured Iraqi women during and after the Abu Ghraib scandal.¹³ Beyond these isolated moments, the abuse of women prisoners at Abu Ghraib is almost entirely eclipsed, in this account and in accounts of Abu Ghraib at large, by the excessive focus on “Women as Aggressors and Torturers.”¹⁴ This excessive visibility, then, simultaneously occludes and condones histories of rape of women as a strategy of war. Feinman emphasizes that the Abu Ghraib scandal “forced our focus on women as torturers. This focus serves to reify the role of white men as torturers,”¹⁵ which, in turn, speaks volumes about the organizing logic of this collection of essays. Anne McClintock, in a recent lecture entitled “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu: Specters from Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib,” also calls attention to the hypervisibility of the female military police at the expense of the recognition of the Iraqi women tortured at Abu Ghraib. She emphasizes (as few of the articles in McKelvey’s compilation do) that only 200 pictures out of 1,600 were

released to the media. The inclusion of images of women prisoners being tortured and raped, McClintock suggests, would “rupture the logic of the legitimacy” of the war itself in both debunking the notion of the war as a “rescue mission” and revealing that we are not, in fact, “interrogating terrorists.”¹⁶ McClintock, then, not only reveals the omission of Iraqi women in debates around “what happened” at Abu Ghraib, but also points toward understanding the calculated logic of this omission, an exclusion necessary to maintain the façade of legitimacy in the “War on Terror.”

In thinking and rethinking the place of women within these representations and debates around Abu Ghraib, many of the authors in this collection organize their analyses around the question of equality, feminism, and women’s rights. In some analyses, these definitions are conflated and collapsed into one another; in others, they are separated and shown divergent. Angela Davis has argued elsewhere that feminism has been co-opted and reconfigured within the iconographic status of the Abu Ghraib scandal: “...young white women apparently taking pleasure in forcing nude Iraqi men to masturbate

is a strange but meaningful representation of the military as a site for the production of gender equality. Now women can participate in torture on a basis of equality with men.”¹⁷ Here, too, she warns of the danger in imagining the military as a “leveling institution” that grants “equal opportunity to kill, to torture, to engage in sexual coercion.”¹⁸ Here, Davis, along with several other authors in this collection, interrogates precisely what is at stake in a feminism that seeks unexamined equality. It is in addressing this question that most of the feminists contributing to this volume, while differing in their political and methodological approaches, can concur: what does it mean to engage in an assimilationist feminism that does not critique the institutions in which it seeks admission and equality? While this question is indeed an invaluable one, it still hinges on the assumption that the women who are central to a feminist analysis of Abu Ghraib are those doing the assimilating and not those subject to U.S. military occupation.

HOW COULD WOMEN DO THAT? RACE, SEXUALITY, AND CLASS ECLIPSED IN THE QUESTION

Angela Davis argues that if Barbara Ehrenreich and others are shocked by women participating in torture, it is not because of their belief that women are inherently more gentle, but because of the irrefutable evidence in the Abu Ghraib photographs that “there is a difference between the body gendered as female and the set of discourses and ideologies that inform the sex/gender system.”¹⁹ Similarly, Timothy Kaufman-Osborn argues that the Abu Ghraib photographs expose the “untenability of any essentialized account [of gender] that insists on its rootedness in anatomical equipment.”²⁰ The central question that informs the compilation, *Why would or how could women do that?*, then goes insufficiently answered (despite many efforts on behalf of the contributors) because it is a question whose answer is already written into the assumptions of the question itself. Additionally, the question, in its very structure, not only reifies male violence as natural, but also solicits the explaining away and sense making of the torture at Abu Ghraib.

Aside from the aforementioned psychologizing of Lynndie England, this explaining away takes the shape of three other predominant speculations: one, that the military police were exploiting the “cultural difference” of “Arabs” in their tactics; two, that the military police were influenced in their torture tactics by the excess of pornography in American culture; and three (although less prevalent), that the torture, and the media and policymakers’ propensity to solely blame the military police for the torture, was correlative to the military police’s lower social class positions. The essays in the volume address these questions in disparate ways. First, the contributors who reference Raphael Patai’s *The Arab Mind*—the text policymakers used to inform their torture tactics at Abu Ghraib—describe it as unequivocally racist and Orientalist. Although some authors in the volume explicitly critique this “social and political caricature of Arab cultures”²¹ and “...the belief in an allegedly ‘exotic,’ frail Iraqi masculinity, fraught with fears of nakedness and homosexuality,”²² several of them continue to engage the notion of the “Arab psyche”

or the “Arab mind.”²³ Jumana Musa, even while critiquing the heterosexist racism fundamental to the way in which torture was orchestrated and carried out at Abu Ghraib, still insists that the abuses revealed a “deeper knowledge of the Arab psyche,” reflected the breaking of “every gender and sexual taboo in the Arab world,” and demonstrated “a refined understanding of Arab and Muslim culture.”²⁴ Similarly, Riva Khoshaba, who speaks in this volume as an Iraqi native informant, identifies the “Iraqi ideal of a chaste woman”²⁵ in contrast with the comparatively “free” American woman. These contentions echo Seymour Hersh’s profoundly Orientalist claim, shortly after the photos were released, that “Such dehumanization is unacceptable in any culture, but it is especially so in the Arab world.”²⁶ Arguments like these position the U.S., in the words of Jasbir K. Puar and Amit S. Rai, as a “feminist and gay-safe” nation²⁷ while “the Arab world,” in contrast, is characterized by its alleged sexual and cultural misconceptions. Puar elaborates, specifically in the context of Abu Ghraib, that despite the homophobic, racist, imperialist, and misogynist performance

of violence by the military police, “the United States nonetheless emerges as more tolerant of homosexuality (and less tainted by misogyny and fundamentalism) than the repressed, modest, nudity-shy Middle East.”²⁸ In a lecture entitled “Torture, Photography, and the Question of Sexuality,” Judith Butler also reflects (as does Katherine Viner in this collection²⁹) upon the paradox of imagining the U.S. as intrinsically “feminist and gay-safe” by pointing to the fact that, when Bush was confronted with the photographs (in plural), he replied, “It is disgusting.”³⁰ Butler maintains that calling “it” “disgusting” kept “equivocation in tact”³¹ and allowed Bush to comment upon the torture and the homosexual acts of torture at the same time. Thus, while the U.S. consistently positions itself as a nation that endorses equality, feminism, and sexual freedom, the torture at Abu Ghraib, the plethora of reactions to it, and the ceaseless efforts to rationalize it, clearly belie this claim.³²

The ambivalence around questions of sexuality in the torture at Abu Ghraib is also reflected in the debate around whether or not the photographs reflect

pornography. Susan Sontag argues elsewhere that the “classic dominatrix imagery” of Lynndie England and the leash leads “you” to “wonder how much of the sexual tortures inflicted on the inmates of Abu Ghraib was inspired by the vast repertory of pornographic imagery available on the internet...”³³ In this volume, Lila Rajiva insists that “what happened in the detention cells was, of course, pornography.”³⁴ Lucinda Marshall reflects that “Perhaps what horrifies us and discomforts us the most is the blatant connection between pornography and the violence of war.”³⁵ For other contributors, this connection is anything but obvious or blatant. Laura Frost, for example, argues that “...to label the photographs as pornographic is to assert that they are, on the one hand, banal and typical or, on the other hand, deviant and isolated.”³⁶ Anne McClintock, too, argues that not only did “most” of the pictures not have a sexual theme, but also the pornography argument effectively “exonerates the government of culpability.”³⁷ The connection between the torture and pornography, endorsed by several contributors and criticized by others, thus elides the history of sexual

torture that has accompanied empire, imagines the abuse as ordinary and familiar, but also deviant and exceptional, and places the blame on pornography and the amorphous “internet” rather than the policymakers themselves.

Yet another, albeit much less explored, point of contention in the volume is that of the class position(s) of the military police. Feinman writes, for example,

There is a complex story of racialization here: that of the military police and clerks at Abu Ghraib, the majority of whom are white (and portrayed as “trailer trash whites”) and of the prisoners, who are Arab Iraqis. Moreover, in the United States, the presentation of homosexuality as deviance, and its violent performance as torture, underscored the heterosexism fueling the raging disputes about homosexuality and marriage.³⁸

Here, Feinman points to the competing racisms, classisms, and heterosexisms entwined in the practice of torture at Abu Ghraib that go unexplored in the simple characterization of torture as an extension of pornography. Feinman also, among a few others in the collection, points to the “use of subordinated and possibly subaltern figures as scapegoats for

our broader military-political practices,”³⁹ not to explain away their behavior, but to contextualize it. Additionally, Karen Greenberg, in describing Peter Morris’s play *The Guardians*, appreciates his care to contextualize the social positioning of the “American Girl,” based on Lynndie England, as poor, West Virginian, and ostracized, not to excuse her actions but to reveal the way in which her class and her ranking in the military created the conditions for her to become the face, or rather the scapegoat, of Abu Ghraib.⁴⁰

The conflicting and converging arguments in the collection over the complexity of the torture at Abu Ghraib, including those arguments that insist that there is little complexity and the abuse is easy to understand given the appropriate frame, reveal what Feinman calls the “need to continue to analyze the military as a hierarchical, deeply obedience-based institution that is still foundationally racist and masculinist and has no trouble absorbing women (of all colors) and men (of color) into that paradigm and utilizing their bodies as sexualized, racialized weapons.”⁴¹ In this way, any analysis cannot just blame racism, sexism, heterosexism, or classism alone, but must

consider their interrelation within the same analytic frame.

TRAVELING HISTORIES OF EMPIRE: CONTINUITIES, DISCONTINUITIES, AND LOGIC

These conflicting accounts, both in their statements and in their silences, reveal that an analysis of torture at Abu Ghraib and at other sites cannot be disaggregated from histories of empire. The argument that “bad apples” and “kids out of hand on the night shift” are responsible for the abuse and torture at Abu Ghraib mirrors arguments concerning the “failure” of reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and reveals the political work that the “unprepared” and “insufficiently trained” tropes can do. In *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, for example, Naomi Klein demonstrates that the insistence that Paul Bremer’s failures as the director of reconstruction efforts and the head of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq were due to inadequate preparation, rash decision-making, and severe understaffing hides the “unmistakable logical coherence” of his decisions.⁴² Here, too, the question of what “went wrong at Abu Ghraib,”⁴³ which continues to define it as

an aberration safely relegated to the past, eclipses the logic and rationale of torture in the context of empire.

Several of the authors in this collection (and many authors outside of it) work, conversely, to show the consistency of the traveling techniques of torture and violence within empire. Many of them do so in referencing Geoffrey Miller’s transportation from Guantánamo to Abu Ghraib in order to “gitmoize” the facility.⁴⁴ Others reveal the insidious travel of the CIA *Kubark* manual itself,⁴⁵ as well as the existence of typed notes, checklists, Rumsfeld-signed instructions, and manuals detailing precisely how military police were expected to “soften up” detainees.⁴⁶ Additionally, very few of the authors (Angela Davis, Ilene Feinman, and Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, although only in a footnote⁴⁷) mention the continuities between the institutionalized use of torture at Abu Ghraib and other sites of “extraordinary rendition,” and the routine use of torture in U.S. domestic prisons.⁴⁸ Anne McClintock also reveals this link in her contention that the U.S.’s “carceral systems of violence”⁴⁹ and its position as a “supercarceral state” are “historical continuities that have haunted U.S. history

from its inception.”⁵⁰ Elsewhere, Angela Davis asks us to “draw upon the history of the prison as a colonial institution profoundly linked to that earlier era of imperialism in understanding the ease with which new models of imprisonment developed in the United States—such as the supermax—travel around the world today.”⁵¹ The silence of many scholars, journalists, feminists, and activists, including the majority of contributors to this volume, on the connection between domestic and foreign prisons maintains the illusion of Abu Ghraib as an anomaly: an unexplainable mass of confusion, one that can only be understood through psychologizing the different players and guessing their motivations, one that protests can be leveled against, somehow, without also critiquing the war itself, the prison system itself, or the extralegality of the post-9/11 U.S. “state of exception” itself.

A DIFFERENT WHY: “WHY DOES THIS CONTINUE TO HAPPEN?”

Finally, as we have seen, some authors in this collection (Davis, Feinman, and Kaufman-Osborn, for example) signal a turn from the question, *How could women*

do this?, and illustrate that the question itself does not take into consideration the history or complexities of U.S. militarism.⁵² As a different question, Kristine Huskey in this volume and Anne McClintock in her lecture, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà-Vu,” ask “*Why*”—with the much corroborated knowledge that between 70 and 90 percent of the those arrested in Iraq were detained by mistake⁵³ (a statistic that many of the contributors to McKelvey’s volume acknowledge)—“*does Guantánamo still exist?*”⁵⁴ McClintock argues that these sites of “extraordinary rendition” exist in order to “make the invisible visible” by “producing bodies of the enemy.”⁵⁵ Judith Butler also argues that, in the dehumanization written into the project of renaming prisoners of war “detainees” and “unlawful enemy combatants,” and as all detainees are imagined as terrorists/ combatants and thus denied access to laws under the Geneva Convention, the photos from Abu Ghraib become “evidence not of human rights violations, but evidence that just punishment is being administered.”⁵⁶ Naming torture not as an incomprehensible anomaly, but, as Naomi Klein also insists, as a chillingly calculated,

consistent and planned punitive measure against resistance to U.S. imperialism, reframes the terms of this discussion and shifts the emphasis away from the shock that women could participate in the torture at Abu Ghraib to an understanding that Abu Ghraib is part of a larger imperial network, with a much longer history of violence and occupation.

In this way, *One of the Guys: Women as Aggressors and Torturers*, as a whole, fails to sufficiently address the historical complexity of the torture at Abu Ghraib. As it takes “women as torturers” as its subject of analysis, it eclipses the torture of Iraqi women prisoners. As it endeavors to psychologize the military police and investigate “what happened at Abu Ghraib,” it consigns the torture at Abu Ghraib to the past and uncouples it from the history of U.S. empire and U.S. militarism. Additionally, as it focuses solely on female violence, it leaves male violence “unmarked.”⁵⁷ The volume’s exceptional contributors, like Angela Davis, Ilene Feinman, Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, Lucinda Marshall, and Steven Miles, who challenge the framing of the anthology itself and argue against its implicit assumptions, indeed reveal the

ways in which the questions that frame the volume circumscribe its analytic potential. In spite of the objections posed by its own contributors, then, the collection as a whole reinscribes the subject of a feminist inquiry of the torture at Abu Ghraib as the female military police and not the female torture victims of the “War on Terror,” refuses to interrogate the strategic use of torture in the context of empire, and resists investigating state-sanctioned male violence as well as female.



Notes

- 1 Barbara Ehrenreich, “Foreword: Feminism’s Assumptions Upended,” in *One of the Guys: Women as Aggressors and Torturers*, ed. Tara McKelvey (Emeryville, CA: Seal Press, 2007), 3. Originally published in the *Los Angeles Times*, 16 May 2004, Editorial Section.
- 2 Cynthia Enloe, “Afterword,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 234.
- 3 Ehrenreich, “Foreword,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 4.
- 4 Tara McKelvey, “Introduction,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 15. McKelvey does not identify who comprises either the “we” or the “women” to whom she refers. The reader is left to assume that “we” are the feminists who have been “fighting” for a single goal (“equality”) and the only women who suffer the implications of “equality” are the selfsame feminists who have been fighting for it.
- 5 This question, although it definitively haunts the entire volume, is specifically addressed in Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, “Gender Trouble at Abu Ghraib?,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 151 (Originally published in *Politics and Gender* 1, no. 4 (2005), 597-619), in reference to Cathy Hong’s article, “How Could Women Do That?” in *Salon*, May 7, 2004, http://archive.salon.com/mwt/feature/2004/05/07/abuse_gender/.
- 6 Angela Y. Davis, “Sexual Coercion, Prisons, and Female Responses,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 26. Parts of this essay were originally delivered as a speech at the First Congregational Church of Oakland, December 2, 2005, and published in Angela Y. Davis, *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Prison, Torture, and Empire* (New York, NY: Seven Stories Press, 2005).
- 7 Eve Ensler, “I Still Don’t Get How You Could Put a Leash on a Human Being,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 18.
- 8 Janis Karpinski (as told to Tara McKelvey), “Lynndie England in Love,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 216.
- 9 D’Amico writes, “Most military men and women had no role in these incidents and are, according to recent interviews, as repulsed by what happened as are we civilians.” Francine D’Amico, “The Women of Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 49. Originally published in *The Post Standard*, May 23, 2004.
- 10 Erin Solaro, “Women and the Profession of Arms,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 109.
- 11 Lucinda Marshall, “The Misogynist Implications of Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 55.
- 12 Steven H. Miles, “Women Soldiers and Interrogational Abuses in the War on Terror,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 94. Jasbir K. Puar has asked a similar set of questions: “Why are there comparatively few photos of women, and why have they not been released? Is it because the administration found the photos of women even more appalling? Or has the wartime rape of women become so unspectacular, so endemic to military occupation, as to render its impact moot?” Jasbir K. Puar, “On Torture: Abu Ghraib,” *Radical History Review* 93 (Fall 2005), 26.
- 13 Ilene Feinman, “Shock and Awe: Abu Ghraib, Women Soldiers, and Racially Gendered Torture,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 57.
- 14 This over-representation is surprising also given that, as many of the essays in this volume concede, women only comprise approximately 15% of the military. See, for example, Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 64, and D’Amico, “The Women of Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 50.
- 15 Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 59.
- 16 Anne McClintock, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu: Specters from Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib” (Paper presented at “Reconstructing Womanhood—A Future beyond Empire: A Symposium Honoring Hazel V. Carby,” held at Columbia University, New York, NY, November 2, 2007).
- 17 Angela Y. Davis, “The Disappeared in Prison” in *Shock and Awe: War on Words*, eds. Bregje van Eekelen, Jennifer González, Bettina Stötzer, Anna Tsing (Santa Cruz, CA: New Pacific Press, 2004), 45.
- 18 Davis, “Sexual Coercion, Prisons, and Female Responses,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 26.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 25.
- 20 Kaufman-Osborn, “Gender Trouble at Abu Ghraib?,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 164.
- 21 Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 71.
- 22 Kaufman-Osborn, “Gender Trouble at Abu Ghraib?,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 160. Kaufman-Osborn is also, with Angela Davis, Ilene Feinman, and some other contributors, one of the few to explicitly call attention to the racial dynamics of white women abusing brown men (165). He is also the only contributor in the entire volume to name Hayder Sabbar Abd, the man in the Lynndie England/cigarette photograph, who almost all of the other authors mention (147).
- 23 Other contributors are more ambivalent. Lucinda Marshall, for example, while exceptional to this volume in her willingness to point out the abuse of Iraqi women, also engages in the psychologizing of “the Iraqi mind” in her statement that “In Iraqi culture, the abuse, intimidation, and sexual assault of a woman is considered to be a reflection on the manhood of her husband and male family members” and that a woman can face the crime of “even death” for revealing that she was raped. Marshall, “The Misogynist implications of Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 55.
- 24 Jumana Musa, “Gender and Sexual Violence in the Military,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 83.
- 25 Riva Khoshaba, “Women in the Interrogation Room,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 179.

- 26 Seymour Hersh, “Torture at Abu Ghraib,” *The New Yorker*, May 10, 2004, http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2004/05/10/040510fa_fact, 2 (accessed November 1, 2007). See also Jasbir K. Puar’s discussion of the Orientalism written into this claim: Puar, “On Torture: Abu Ghraib,” 15–16.
- 27 Jasbir K. Puar and Amit S. Rai, “Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots,” *Social Text* – 72 20, No. 3 (Fall 2002), 126.
- 28 Puar, “On Torture: Abu Ghraib,” 24.
- 29 Katherine Viner, “Feminism as Imperialism,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 171–172. Originally Published in *The Guardian*, September 21, 2002. Viner critiques the notion that the U.S. is a feminist nation, although she does not mention its self-representation as “queer-friendly.”
- 30 Judith Butler, “Torture, Photography, and the Question of Sexuality” (Paper presented as part of the Center for Religion and Media Distinguished Lecture Series, held at New York University, New York, NY, October 26, 2006).
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Although, as this volume illustrates, it is only “clear” for some: for others, like Erin Solaro, the evidence continues to reveal the “liberated” state into which the U.S. has “evolved.”
- 33 Susan Sontag, “Regarding the Torture of Others,” *New York Times*, May 23, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/23/magazine/PRISONS.html?ex=1400644800&en=a2cb6ea6bd297c8f&ei=5007&partner=USERLAND> (accessed November 9, 2006). Parts of Sontag’s article were also cited in both Anne McClintock’s and Judith Butler’s aforementioned lectures.
- 34 Lila Rajiva, “The Military Made Me Do It: Double Standards and Psychic Injuries at Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 227.
- 35 Marshall, “The Misogynist Implications of Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 53.
- 36 Laura Frost, “Photography/Pornography/Torture: The Politics of Seeing Abu Ghraib,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 136.
- 37 McClintock, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu,” November 2, 2007.
- 38 Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 58.
- 39 Ibid., 62.
- 40 Karen Greenberg, “Split Screens,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 37–44.
- 41 Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 69.
- 42 Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company, 2007), 344. Further, Klein maintains that “It was the theft of Iraq’s reconstruction funds from Iraqis, justified by unquestioned racist assumptions about U.S. superiority and Iraqi inferiority—and not merely the generic demons of “corruption” and “inefficiency”—that doomed the project from the start” (347). In this

volume, Karen Greenberg also writes, describing Peter Morris’s play, “The dark import of the play is that there is something logical, something consistent, and something almost predictable about what happened, and yet it’s excruciatingly, humanly sad” (39). She also writes, “*In confusion lies exculpability*” (43, emphasis mine). I think that these two observations—one, that we must recognize the “logic” of torture in terms of the purposes it serves, and, two, that we must recognize the ways in which narratives of confusion and ineptitude obscure this logic—are essential to understanding the ways in which torture and empire have historically traveled together.

- 43 Hersh, “Torture at Abu Ghraib.”
- 44 Aziz Huq, “Bitter Fruit: Constitutional Gender Equality Comes to the Military,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 131; Jumana Musa, “Gender and Sexual Violence in the Military,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 87; McClintock, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà vu;” Klein, *The Shock Doctrine*, 367.
- 45 The *Kubark* manual, or *Kubark Counterintelligence Interrogation* handbook, is the CIA handbook detailing “effective” methods of torture and information-extraction that include sensory deprivation, electroshock, hooding, late-night captures, beatings, and forced nudity (Klein, *The Shock Doctrine*, 39).
- 46 See Feinman, “Shock and Awe,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*; Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, “Gender Trouble at Abu Ghraib?,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*; McClintock, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà vu;” and Klein, *The Shock Doctrine*.
- 47 See footnote # 45 in Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, “Gender Trouble at Abu Ghraib?,” in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 255. He writes, “Several of the reservists at the center of the prisoner abuse scandal were assigned to Abu Ghraib precisely because they had experience working in American prisons. Within these prisons, abuse not uncommonly assumes forms very similar to those meted out at Abu Ghraib.”
- 48 This assessment does not include the occasional reference to the fact that Charles Graner and Ivan Frederick were both transferred from their positions as guards and correction officers at state penitentiaries, a fact that many of the authors in this collection reference, but do not further interrogate.
- 49 McClintock, “Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu,” November 2, 2007.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Angela Y. Davis and Gina Dent, “Conversations: Prison as a Border: A Conversation on Gender, Globalization, and Punishment,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26, no. 4 (Summer 2000), 1237.
- 52 Feinman, for example, writes, “...we perpetuate some of the worst abuses by our solitary and obsessive focus on the appalling notion that women would use their sexuality as a tool

in carrying out their mission as U.S. soldiers. We are outraged and embarrassed that women would use their sexuality to dominate and thus humiliate male prisoners of war. So we fashion them as victims of men's power, allowing us to gently elide the issue of U.S. military brutality and in effect normalize male soldiers' brutality by leaving it unmarked." Feinman, "Shock and Awe," in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 79.

53 Red Cross Report, cited in Mark Danner, *Torture and Truth* (New York, NY: New York Review of Books, 2004), 3. The Red Cross Report has also been corroborated by the Fay-Jones and Schlesinger Reports.

54 McClintock, "Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu," November 2, 2007. Huskey writes, "The overall treatment of the detainees [at Guantánamo] is a concerted effort by the government to 'break them.' Perhaps this goal, in theory, would be laudable or at least somewhat acceptable to most Americans if, in fact, these individuals had information that would prevent future attacks. But, as high-ranking U.S. officials have admitted, many were brought to Guantánamo by mistake and have no connection to terrorism." Kristine A. Huskey, "The Sex Interrogators of Guantánamo," in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 178.

55 McClintock, "Paranoid Empire and Imperial Déjà Vu," November 2, 2007. McClintock argues that the continued use of torture has everything to do with the "imperial paranoia" that distinctly characterizes the U.S.: the U.S. presents and imagines itself as simultaneously the "leader of globalization" and under the consistent threat of "terror and impotence." For McClintock, in order to abate paranoia, bodies must be produced as evidence of military triumph over the amorphous, invisible enemy of the "War on Terror."

56 Butler, "Torture, Photography, and the Question of Sexuality," October 26, 2006.

57 Feinman, "Shock and Awe," in McKelvey, *One of the Guys*, 79.