

Critical thinking on double protection dissonance

[Sociology](#), [Women](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

“ Gays in the Military: Texts and Subtexts.”

The article is discussing the mixed reactions that are always presented by different people on the existence of homosexual or gay men in the military. Dating back in World War II, homosexuality among men in the military was considered a serious offence that could warrant severe punishment. As the years roll by, different views and opinions have been put forth to justify whether gays should or should not be allowed in the military, in tandem to this, the raised opinions are hugely related to the civil society, moral standards, manhood and sexuality of men.

Discussion

Sexuality among the military men proves to be an exceedingly intriguing point in the article worth discussing. It is with clear conscious that military men are human beings, and they possess feelings, especially sexual feelings, just like any other human being. Thence, it becomes forthrightly proper for military men to get intimate and explore their sexual pleasure, which is analogous to Cohn affirmation that for sustenance of the culture of binary conception of sexuality to occur, both homosexual and heterosexual must participate in the activity (141).

Despite the contagious aspects highlighted in the article, there a lot of muddles and there is no clear stand to whether the author is supporting or not, the idea of allowing gay men in the military, and this renders the article quite an unappealing. Similarly, the author has never elaborated the central effects of introducing gay men in the military or phasing them out of the military, and this does not address the gravity of the issue; hence the reader

will not be able to know whether gay men can strengthen or disable the army. In line with this, the religious prospect is not taken into consideration, while addressing the issue, and since religion and culture aid in defining and stating morals, it becomes downright essential for it to be highlighted.

“ A(nother) dark side of the protection Racket: Targeting Women in Wars.”

The article is majorly concerned with the plight of civilians, especially women and children during war. The authors expatiate that civilians are the key targeted groups by combatants, and they are victimized in a plethora of ways. In light with this, the victimizations have been evinced as deliberate, and that during the war any form of victimization, tends to an attack on the property and pride of the masculine enemies. Similarly, women and children are portrayed as symbols that need protection and men as the protectors, thus justifying the need and act of war.

Discussion

Rape as a form of victimization among women during war is a detrimental issue, and this makes the article a remarkable piece of literature to read, since it expresses the critical issues in war. In light with this, women and men are given different roles in a nation, in that women are evinced as beautiful souls, where as men are looked upon as warriors (Sjoberg and Peet, 168), and through this, women are delineated as the pride of the country, and men their protectors. In conjunction to this, national humiliation is chiefly exhibited through rape, thence affirming the symbolic role of women as the pride of the nation.

Anybody in a clear state of mind will corroborate and concord with all the facets discussed in the article. The authors are particularly elaborate, sequential, and they have expounded on the key issues of victimization of women and war. Moreover, the authors have discussed an extremely decisive issue that has been witnessed in most of the countries all over the world. Further, the language used is uncluttered and understandable, and the authors have also given instances and stories on people who experienced the victimization, thus putting more emphasis on the issue.

Works Cited

Cohn, Carol. "Gays in the Military: Texts and Subtexts." 129-149

Sjoberg, Laura and Peet, Jessica. "A(nother) dark side of the protection Racket: Targeting Women in Wars." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13. 2 (2011): 163-182. Print.