

This article was downloaded by: [24.53.252.171]

On: 29 January 2014, At: 15:52

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Democracy and Security

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fdas20>

### Christian Leuprecht (Ed.): Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity

Paul Griffiths<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institute of Arab and Islamic Studies, University of Exeter , UK  
Published online: 02 Mar 2012.

To cite this article: Paul Griffiths (2012) Christian Leuprecht (Ed.): Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity , Democracy and Security, 8:1, 97-99

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2012.653762>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

# Book Review

Paul Griffiths

---

Institute of Arab and Islamic Studies, University of Exeter, UK

Christian Leuprecht (Ed.): *Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2011).

The militaries' relation with the communities they represent and the role that has been envisioned for those military organs remains an open debate. As was made clear in *Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity*, edited by Christian Leuprecht, these relationships represent a dilemma for such states, especially in the context of strained resources as well as the question of the role of military in the present global situation.

The relationships have been strained by a number of characteristics, including the indigenous communities, such as in Canada; or ethnic minorities, as in the case of Dutch and UK forces. The strained resources are the symptoms of the economic situation in countries such as the UK. Moreover, a new role for the Western military is needed in the new security environment. Furthermore, recent developments suggest the United States seek others to be involved in the security environment by increasing defense spending. However, it must be clear what capabilities are more likely to be utilized and then focus any increased spending on such capabilities. Meanwhile, such militaries must also reinterpret their identity to fit better with the diversity of the communities that they represent. This is the area in which *Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity* provides a concise collection of research into the various approaches that military and police forces have taken regarding their diversity and its balance with cohesion. From this collection, it appears that most forces, whether military or civil, have sought to retain a level of cohesion in opposition to wider diversity. Leuprecht may be correct in his summarization that diversity has “payoffs for the organisation’s functional imperative,” but military organizations may consider it a worthy trade-off. And even if policies are revised, the barrack-level attitude may scupper the implementation of such strategies.

Articles in this source provide evidence of problems individuals from certain groups face in terms of joining and remaining within military organizations. Women face the discrimination and the limitations that have

been put in front of them by male colleagues and superiors for the necessity of operational cohesiveness as well as male group bonding, according to Basham. As Basham points out in her article, there are limitations in “managemen” approaches. From the points that were made, it was clear that the masculinity of male recruits was an underlying theme of the socialization within military organizations. Basham made a note of unruly behaviour of Fijian soldiers and acceptance of Fijian domestic violence in the UK. Having been recruited as a social block, the management of Fijian behavior was emphasized in place of non-Fijian behaviour, such as domestic violence by white British recruits. Gender was also examined by Davis in the case of Canada and the role of women in Canadian Armed Forces. Davies concludes that although the Canadian forces appear to have developed a level of integration, there is a limit rooted in the conceptualization of gender and a “dichotomous gender difference.”

Differentiation has not been limited to gender but also the recruitment of ethnic minorities and recruits from excolonies. The article by Mason and Dandeker made it clear that there was an uptake in the recruitment from overseas territories, while there was limited numbers from minorities within the UK. As was made clear, minorities within the UK felt the military was not for them. As Mason and Dandeker noted, the lack of recruits from the white British group has meant a recruitment drive was needed that could only be filled by recruiting from overseas.

There were a number of points that have been brought out by this volume through the case studies that I would like to expand upon. Militaries require a level of socialization for the purpose of effectiveness, while minority communities would not wish to compromise their identity. This inability to recruit people of minority communities may only widen the barrier between society and military. Although in the case of the UK, recently barriers may have been reduced by commemorating troops of minorities in past conflict. In terms of procedures, the military establishments appear to have been cautious in terms of the opening of roles to women and minority groups. Primarily, this has to do with the institutional identity of the Armed Forces and a reluctance to create altering identities.

Like any nation or ethnic group, such a change within the institutions would require altering of habits, behaviors, as well as official literature and procedures. This leads into my next point that the military want to be representative of the wider population, if it does not compromise recruit socialization and the military’s cohesion. Moreover, society itself is much more diverse than the military is capable of representing. In other words, the military has developed procedures of socialization along the myths that support identity formation for many of its members. To alter this situation, you would have to alter the thinking and identification of military personnel, especially

noncommissioned officers. Developing links between the military and society could be counteracted by the unchanging identity formation within militaries.

Organizational identity must move with the communities that they seek to represent, but such movements will not be allowed to be detrimental to the effectiveness of such organizations. Such compromising may not be strategically encouraged by governments because developed countries have been asked to involve themselves more in military interventions, given changing US policy. Given the financial constraints that have recently developed, it appears unlikely that the UK will seek to alter what appears not to be broken. The military is supposed to achieve its objectives, but also institutions need to recognize the issue of identity. Moreover, the states in question should evaluate their relations with minorities inside the country as well as overseas territories and former colonies, such as Fiji or Dutch Antilles. This raises the debate on the handling of the postcolonial legacy, whether states are excolonial states or excolonies. Australia has issues regarding aborigines, while the UK has minority communities that have family links with countries such as Pakistan and India. Although positive in outlook, *Defending Democracy and Securing Diversity* provided the evidence for supporting a diversification of recruitment for military personnel, but also highlighted the challenges and obstacles that face states as well as individuals.