Introduction

"WHERE IS ZAFER'S ARM?" demanded the voice from the TV rhetorically, conjuring a nationalist drama around a disabled veteran's missing limb. The question gave me goosebumps. I knew Zafer and recalled that he believed his amputated arm was buried in the backyard of a hospital.[1] As a nationalist specter, though, his arm was haunting the entire country.[2]

It was the winter of 2006. As the armed conflict between Turkish state security forces and Kurdish guerrillas escalated, nationalist fervor was being heightened through media reporting of "martyred soldiers" and "neutralized terrorists." I was watching a televised debate program[3] that featured my *gazi* (disabled veteran) interlocutors, whom the show called "unknown and unseen heroes who have sacrificed their arms and legs for the perpetuity of the state and the homeland." Overlaid with television banner ads for cell phone wallpapers of the Turkish flag and ringtones from mournful nationalist ballads, the opening line accompanying the theme music asked again, "Where is Zafer's arm?"

The program traversed an uneasy tension between the exigencies of the TV genre and the militarized nationalist cant and efforts at self-expression of its agitated guests. The celebrated television host, who under normal circumstances enjoyed provoking strife and disagreement, strained every nerve to regulate the discourse and quell the surge in affect.[4] He appeared to be disoriented by the disabled veterans' narratives, which rewound in time, made sudden jumps, changed tempo, and were interrupted by expressions of loss and pain. "Where does the blood we bleed go?" asked a disabled veteran in the middle of his life story, lapsing into silence. "Will they be able to fill in the endless void I feel?" asked another, leaving the host puzzled as to whom precisely the word *they* referred. Some guests grew impatient and started

shouting. "We are not disabled! We are gazis!" "Being seen and treated like we are disabled offends us!" "We don't want pity. We want respect!"

To contain his guests' resentment, the host resorted in the end to a clichéd strategy straight out of state propaganda crib sheets, urging them to speak through the idiom of sacrifice. When a disabled veteran framed his loss in terms of a willing sacrifice made for the survival of the state and the nation—such as when one said, "If allowed, I'll fight the terrorists even on my prosthetic leg"—the host asked the audience in the studio to give a round of applause. He encouraged disabled veterans to connect their own sacrifices to those made by past generations. "We inherited this land from our forefathers who fought in the wars of Gallipoli and Independence. When I die, I will be called to account before my grandfather." But even with such prodding and corralling by the host, his guests' remarks bordered dangerously on populist critiques of the state and of neoliberalism. "[The youth] should go and die fighting. It is better than dying for nothing here."[5]

The next morning, I met several of the program's guests at a disabled veterans' association I regularly attended. They were furious with the host for not allowing them to voice their everyday problems and, characteristically, they used the discourse of terrorism to express their feelings. "The host," they said, "is the real PKK terrorist!" They expressed even more exasperation with those veterans on the show who reproduced the masculinist and militarist banalities of state discourse. "This guy says he would fight on his prosthetic leg. What a weasel! Are we that stupid? We've already paid the price. I'm telling you, none of us would go back." Among the disgruntled was a vocal young man who went even further in his aggressive remarks. "My benefits have still not been approved. I feel worthless, as though I were a beggar! I can't take care of my wife and children. One day, a gazi will shoot a statesman dead," he exclaimed furiously. "He will!" The association head wagged his finger in disapproval and channeled the young man's rage and resentment back into nationalist politics: "If gazis are provided with adequate financial means, no one will be able to stop this nation's sons from fighting blindfold, no one will ever be able to stop Turkey. There are people trying to prevent this from happening. They are the ones who treat us like we are disabled. They are the people we fight against!"

The war-damaged bodies of disabled veterans are a ubiquitous but ambivalent presence in modern warring states.[6] Ambivalent because the disabled veteran body embodies the horrors of war yet is often mobilized militaristically as an icon of sacrifice, thereby serving as an affective and ideological impetus for further bloodshed. Ambivalent also because it occupies both the

center and the margins of normative masculinity, lionized through the masculine ethos of nationalism, while also being violently expelled from ableist forms of masculine privilege and public citizenship. Ambivalent, finally, because it inhabits an indeterminate space, a sort of "gray zone,"[7] where the distinctions and boundaries between perpetrator and victim, sacred and profane, hero and abject get puzzlingly blurred.

It is from this indeterminate space that *Sacrificial Limbs* tells the story of disabled veterans—gazis—of the Turkish Army injured while fighting as conscripts in Turkey's seemingly endless Kurdish conflict.[8] Since 1984, the Turkish state has waged counterinsurgency war and deployed over five million conscripted soldiers against the guerrilla army of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (Partiya Karkerên Kurdistanê, hereafter PKK) in a conflict that continues to define the political terrain in contemporary Turkey. Thousands of these young men have returned home with varying degrees of physical disability after being made into soldier-subjects of counterinsurgency in the mountainous geography of the armed conflict. This book explores the ways in which these veterans' gendered and classed experiences[9] of warfare and disability are hardened into politics. Chronicling veterans' postinjury lives and political activism, the book demonstrates how self, community, and the world-making practices of disabled veterans get tangled up with ultranationalist politics in contemporary Turkey.

Sacrificial Limbs is a study of the gendered relationship between embodiment and political subject formation in an ethnopolitically divided, war-torn nation. As such, it assays the processes by which conscript-cum-disabled veteran bodies are subjected to and become subjects of multiple forms of power and violence—first in counterguerrilla warfare, then in hospitals and communities of loss, and finally within the textures of lower-class urban life and political activism. The book indexes the ways in which disabled veterans fashion masculine political subjectivities as they remake a world unmade by war through intersubjective forms of care, fleshly intimacy, and activism. This newly assembled world is populated by supernatural beings, the ghosts of dead friends, shadowy political figures, and "terrorists," all affectively charged by the senses of crisis, betrayal, conspiracy, emergency, and agency. By bringing the reader into this magical realist world, this book illustrates how the bodily effects of ethnopolitical violence generate new forms of embodied subjectivity,[10] community, and political agency.

Although idiosyncratic to Turkey in certain ways, this book's story has much to say about wars and disabled veterans elsewhere. In retrospect, I see

that the seeds of this project were sown in 1989, when I saw Oliver Stone's *Born on the Fourth of July* in a movie theater in Istanbul.[11] Dramatizing the biography of the paralyzed Vietnam veteran and antiwar hero Ron Kovic, the film deeply impacted me as a teenager just discovering the undeclared civil war in my own country. The figure of the disabled antiwar veteran, lacking in Turkey, was in the back of my mind while conceiving this project, which came right on the heels of America's most unpopular war since Vietnam, the Iraq War and occupation. That twenty-first-century war had instigated another wave of veterans' peace activism,[12] beautifully captured in the 2007 documentary *Body of War,* which portrays the antiwar activism of paralyzed Iraq veteran Tomas Young.[13] But as soon as I entered the field, I realized that if there was any affinity between Turkey and elsewhere, it was not with post-Vietnam or post-Iraq America, but rather with interwar Germany, where disabled veterans' welfare activism and resistance to cultural stereotypes about disability had been intertwined with political demands for a strong state and the recognition of veterans' sacrifices.[14] Disdainfully painted as grotesque bodies in German artist Otto Dix's works (*War Cripples of 1920* being a prime example),[15] those disabled veterans, through their political activism, played a key role in the demise of the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazi Germany. Such historical convergences and divergences remind us that the interplay between masculinity and war disability does not propel veterans and their societies along a preordained trajectory of politicization. They thus underline the importance of understanding the sociocultural and ideological work it takes to make disabled veterans particular political subjects and perhaps hint at the work it would take to unmake such articulations.

MASCULINITY, DISABILITY, AND POLITICAL VIOLENCE

In a country with compulsory military service, any inquiry regarding war disability and masculinity must begin with an analysis of the ways in which the production of gendered and militarized bodies is knotted together with the making of the state, citizenship, and sovereignty. This story begins, therefore, where it all began for veterans—with conscription.

Compulsory military service is one of the most entrenched institutions in Turkey, thanks in large part to its imbrication with heteronormative masculinity. Enlistment is mandatory for all (temporarily) able-bodied male citi-

zens with the exception of openly gay and transgender men. Because draft evaders are all but stripped of their citizenship rights and because the completion of military service operates socially as a prerequisite for employment and marriage, all young men are expected to submit themselves to the sovereign power's grip if they are to become sovereign masculine citizen-subjects. Thus, compulsory military service operates historically as a key rite of passage into normative adult masculinity, sealing the heteropatriarchal contract between the state and its male citizenry.

Masculinity, the military, and the state are often construed as existing in harmonious and mutually affirming relations.[16] War disability, however, disrupts, attenuates, and subverts the possibility of such a political equation remaining unproblematic. For my interlocutors, conscription failed to deliver on its gendered promise. Confronting them with the intimate violence of the armed conflict, it instead brought about bodily loss and disability, turning them into what the ableist Turkish public calls "half-men" or "the half-dead." Nearly all the disabled veterans I knew hailed from poor working-class families and were further marginalized by being denied access to blue-collar wage labor, a situation that persisted until consolidation, in the early 2000s, of a special welfare regime for disabled veterans of the Kurdish conflict. This social and economic dependency resonated within Turkish society with the abject figure of the disabled street beggar and catalyzed their exclusion from the marriage market and forms of domestic and public citizenship. In short, through their embodiment of war disability, they were disenfranchised and stigmatized as gender-nonconforming bodies.[17]

Standing at the intersection of disability, class, gender, and sexuality, veterans' embodied predicaments are subjectively felt and socioculturally constructed as a masculinity crisis for which the state is accountable. In the following pages, I provide numerous examples of the ways in which this crisis is addressed and mobilized, and at times subverted, both by disabled veterans and by different social actors invested in ameliorating or instrumentalizing their social suffering.[18] Yet even as I highlight this strong sense of crisis, I want to resist the urge to simply equate disability with emasculation, and more so with feminization.[19] As I hope to show in this study, the relationship between masculinity and disability is much more nuanced and historically contingent, in this case on the vicissitudes of the armed conflict and the changing biopolitics of war disability.

Fracturing the militarized gender-production machine and state-enforced heteronormative and ableist conceptions of adult masculinity embedded in

compulsory military service, disabled veterans' gender trouble is a driving force behind political and biopolitical efforts to remasculinize them. Utilizing multiple forms of power and knowledge, state and medical institutions act upon the intimate details of veterans' lives, technoscientifically fixing their embodied capacities and refashioning them into productive and reproductive bodies. Nevertheless, the efforts to draw disabled veterans into the world of conjugal domesticity and heteroreproductive sexuality are not straightforward or unproblematic. I trace the quandaries entailed in this process across a variety of fields, ranging from nationalist representations, to TV mafia series, to veterans' intersubjective practices of care and fleshly intimacy, to veterans' welfare and political activism.

One idiosyncratic element of the state-led project to recuperate the (hetero)masculinity of disabled veterans is particularly important for the story told here. The state bestows on disabled veterans of the Kurdish conflict the honorific military title of Gazi, a religiously loaded and symbolically dense nationalist title that has historically been associated with medieval warrior-proselytizers of Islam and with Ottoman sovereigns and commanders, as well as with the founding father of the secular republic, Gazi Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk). Harnessing the Islamic models of warrior masculinity for the militaristic ends of the secular nationalist state, this symbolic act has provided the secular state with a much-needed religious legitimacy in the ongoing ethnopolitical conflict. Drawing the disabled veteran's body, violently made "unfit for military service" by injury, back into the militarist imaginary, the conferral of the Gazi title has also fixed veterans' masculinity crisis by inscribing them with a sanctified hypermasculine moniker, with the expectation that it will counter the gendered stigma of disability. In the process, the state has firmly anchored veterans' entitlements and welfare benefits to their status as transcendental political subjects who embody the unwavering military spirit of the Turkish nation. With their governmental remasculinization process tethered closely to the state's ethnic nationalist politics, disabled veterans have easily transitioned to ultranationalist politicization.

In contemporary Turkey, Kurdish conflict veterans' disabilities render their bodies simultaneously sacred and abject. Disabled veterans, especially amputees, are valorized as saintly gazi warriors—sanctified heroes and "living martyrs" who have attained the highest spiritual rank before martyrdom by sacrificing their bodies for the Turkish nation-state. Potent objects of nationalist reverence, their lost limbs are imagined through sacrificial discourses and imageries as bodily relics whose absence sanctifies the remainder-body of the

disabled veteran[20] and, by extension, the Turkish body politic.[21] But while their bodies and sacrificial limbs accrue political value that intensifies the governmental project of remasculinization, they are still stigmatized as beggar-like, dependent men who evoke pity and revulsion in a deeply ableist society. Subjected to the structural and symbolic violence of ableism, class inequality, and a rapidly neoliberalizing economy, they face anxieties about socioeconomic marginalization, discrimination, and emasculation. It is precisely this gendered double bind which structures their everyday lives and steers them toward political activism. Exploring the tensions between the ideological construction of the disabled veteran body and veterans' embodied experiences, this study pries open the dialectic between political rites of sacrifice and quotidian moments of desecration to reveal the generation of impactful nationalist affects. Condensed in the bodies of disabled veterans, these political affects have been culturally articulated and politically mobilized by a novel ultranationalist movement that has stamped the political culture of the country.[22]

In the 2000s, an emergent ultranationalist movement that had begun to challenge the hegemony of the governing neoliberal Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, hereafter AKP) cashed in politically on disabled veterans' embodied predicaments, taking on their work safety problems in state institutions (chapter 3) and their failed prosthesis payments (chapter 6) as pet political projects. Putting the government under fire for having compromised state sovereignty by pursuing membership in the European Union and peace negotiations with the PKK, the ultranationalist media presented veterans' welfare and disability problems as a manifestation of the government's betrayal. Explaining to disabled veterans why they are profaned by the same state that has sanctified them as gazis, this strategy has proved remarkably successful in interpellating disabled veterans within the circles I attended during my fieldwork. Hitching disabled veterans' arduous quest to recover their masculine sovereignty to the ultranationalist political agenda of "restoring" state sovereignty, ultranationalism has opened up a political space where the former soldiers who are now disabled veterans can once again become the masculine subjects of political violence in the name of sovereignty.

BODIES OF SOVEREIGNTY AND SACRIFICE

By following disabled veterans' political agency over a crucial period during which inter- and intrastate sovereignty relations were reconfigured through

Turkey's EU membership process and peace negotiations with the PKK, *Sacrificial Limbs* explores how sovereignty and sacrifice are co-constituted in an ethnopolitically divided nation. The chronicle of disabled veteran activism in this period concerns three bodies that are linked one to the other through a series of sacrificial transactions and sovereignty performances: the disabled veteran, the imprisoned PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan, and the scapegoated intellectual, the latter exemplified by the Armenian journalist Hrant Dink, who was murdered in the wake of ultranationalist protests against him. These sacrificial performances of sovereignty highlight the way that individuals' bodies become launching pads for the internal constitution of sovereign state power through violence.

Sovereignty has recently been reconceptualized in anthropology as a tentative form of authority grounded in violence.[23] Theorized as such, sovereignty is seen not as something that the state possesses but rather as a contingent and therefore unstable effect of the state's practice of creating itself as sovereign through the exercise of violence. Sovereign power needs to be constantly reenacted, reproduced, and reiterated in the matrixes of everyday life and people's encounters with state institutions, particularly through public performances of violence, to create a singular and stable sovereignty effect. The fact that sovereignty is not something given, but is itself a terrain of struggle over bodies, life, death, and afterlife, becomes especially palpable in an ethnopolitically divided nation like Turkey, where sovereignty relations undergo major recalibrations and where political struggles over sovereignty entail contestations over the meaning, affective resonance, and political value of bodies agentivized or victimized by violence.

That the body is the key site, target, and object of sovereign power, especially in times of war and political violence, is of central relevance in this story of disabled veterans' sacrifice-mediated relation with state sovereignty. Performances of sovereignty often manifest as violence inflicted upon the bodies of humans who are branded as threats, enemies, traitors, and terrorists. This macabre relationship between sovereignty and the body, which Achille Mbembe insightfully calls necropolitics,[24] finds its most elaborate exposition in Giorgio Agamben's notion of *homo sacer*.[25] Rejecting Michel Foucault's notion of sovereignty as an archaic form of power unseated by modern biopolitics,[26] Agamben suggests that sovereignty has been biopolitical from the very beginning. The founding act of sovereignty is the production of a biopolitical body, a bare life that is stripped of social, legal, and religious protection and included in the political order only through its

exclusion. Agamben theorizes this biopolitical body by using the ancient Roman concept of *homo sacer,* "the sacred man" in Latin, a man who has been abandoned by both divine and profane laws and may therefore be killed by members of the political community, with impunity, but may not be sacrificed because he has been stripped of the worth required for such a divine gesture.

Agamben's insights are especially valuable in an ethnographic context where the state is constantly engaged in the banishment of certain forms of life from the national community, condemning them to a death without funeral rites or mourning in order to assert its spectral power. Consider, for example, the now banalized counterinsurgency practices institutionalized in the context of the Kurdish conflict that serve to reduce certain citizens to the status of mere bodies: extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, burials of leftist militants and guerrillas in mass graves and potter's fields, secret interments, the persecution of mourners, and the destruction of guerrilla cemeteries.[27] Or more recently, consider how during the coup attempt in 2016, the state's official religious body, the Presidency of Religious Affairs (Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı), declared that no funeral services would be provided to coupists, who would be buried in a newly constructed "traitors' cemetery." The homo sacerization of certain bodies and populations, their production as bare life, is an essential practice in the Turkish state's efforts to exercise its authority.

As much as Agamben's framework is inspirational for the analysis of the nexus of violence and sovereignty, from the perspective of an anthropology of violence there is a strange side effect of the popularization of homo sacer as an analytical category. While recovering the ancient Roman figure of homo sacer as an example of the always already biopolitical nature of sovereign power, Agamben argues that the "sacredness of the sacred man consists not in any residual religious sense of the sacred but rather in the inextricable link between sovereign power and human existence." There is nothing sacred about the sacred man, he suggests, because homo sacer is a product of "an originary political structure that is located in a zone prior to the distinction between sacred and profane."[28] In order to bolster this argument, Agamben goes to great lengths to debunk anthropological notions of sacrifice and the sacred as misunderstandings and myths that have nothing to offer for our understanding of sovereign violence. In so doing, his theory leaves no room for grasping sovereignty's dependence on sacrifice in the production of homo sacer.

Sacrificial Limbs makes two interventions into Agamben's homo sacer paradigm. First, it places sacrifice at the center of understanding sovereign power. Especially in times of political violence and crisis, struggles over the meaning of violence and violently altered bodies become a key component of claims to sovereignty, which involve contestations not only over the monopoly of violence, but also over the "monopoly of sacrifice—that is, control over sacralized, transcendental loss."[29] Sovereignty claims embody presumptions about the meaning (or meaninglessness) of violent loss, assertions about whether violent loss has a transcendental dimension, and pronouncements about whether injured or dead bodies have some sort of worldly or otherworldly political and symbolic value beyond their immediate materiality. Sovereignty is the alchemy of making bodies sacred through the logic of sacrifice, as illustrated by the ways in which the socially abjected bodies of disabled veterans were officially rendered sacred in Turkey.

And here we arrive at my second intervention into Agamben's antisacrificial theory of sovereignty: The production of some bodies as homo sacer always depends on the sacralization of others in the name of whom the former can be rendered killable. The Turkish state's counterinsurgency regime, which I elaborate on in chapter 1, provides us with an exquisite example of this dialectic. The ethno-necropolitical structure of counterinsurgency has entailed two interlinked processes: the sacralization of Turkish soldiers and the homo sacerization of Kurdish guerrillas. The mirror image of the production of sacrificial gazi and martyr bodies has been the conversion of the guerrilla-body into a "carcass," an animality beyond human and divine orders.

A similar dialectic can also be observed in the political relationship between disabled veterans and the PKK leader Abdullah Öcalan. In 1999, Öcalan was captured by Turkish forces and put on trial in arguably the most elaborate ritual of sovereignty in the history of modern Turkey. A stage for the dramatic reenactment of the state's power over life and death and a "critical event"[30] for disabled veterans' activism, Öcalan's trial involved multiple sacrificial transactions that I analyze in chapter 5. One of those transactions was an exceptional act passed in July 1999 that officially sacralized disabled veterans by inserting them into the symbolism of sovereignty as gazis through the logic of sacrifice. The timing of the decree that constructed disabled veteran bodies as sovereign sacrifices in the midst of Öcalan's trial was not coincidental but symptomatic of sovereign power's body politics. The resignification of disabled veterans' bodily losses as sacrifices has been predicated on the

vilification of Öcalan as the embodiment of everything that stands against law and morality. Later, when Öcalan was drawn into the sphere of politics from his absolute abjectness during the 2009–15 peace negotiations between the Turkish state and the PKK,[31] the sacralization of disabled veterans would lose momentum, only to resume when negotiations failed and armed clashes recommenced with renewed vigor.

A deep, tacit knowledge of this sovereignty-sacrifice dialectic underpins disabled veterans' political activism. Disabled veterans often articulate a structure of feeling that their sovereign sacrifices are being betrayed when the state tries to reintegrate homo sacerized bodies into the body politic or does not kill them but simply lets them live. This "structure of feeling"[32] has played a key role in the emergence of their political activism. Disabled veterans' first wave of nationwide nationalist protest started right after Öcalan was sentenced to death in 1999 and then, when the death penalty was suddenly abolished as part of EU accession requirements, the penalty was commuted to life imprisonment.[33] After their unsuccessful campaign for the carrying out of Öcalan's death sentence, disabled veterans once again hit the streets during peace negotiations in 2009 when a group of Kurdish militants and guerrillas were allowed to enter the country as peace envoys. In spectacular protests, they publicly removed their prostheses in outrage, dramatically reenacting the sovereignty-sacrifice dialectic they embodied and thereby symbolically resacrificing themselves in the name of sovereignty.

During my fieldwork between 2005 and 2008, my disabled veteran associates joined an ultranationalist witch hunt against public intellectuals who voiced antinationalist opinions about the military, the Kurdish conflict, and the Armenian genocide. A key term that I deploy in my analysis of disabled veterans' political subjectification in this period is *sacrificial crisis.* The concept was originally coined by the French philosopher René Girard, who uses it to explain a mythic moment of a generalized state of violence that is characterized by the loss of socially salient distinctions of identity and alterity.[34] Endangering the entire social edifice, such moments of political crisis can only be resolved, according to Girard, through acts of sacrifice that channel, displace, and cathect violence onto an arbitrary victim. For Girard, such social production of a surrogate victim—a scapegoat—is the bare logic of sacrifice.[35] In chapter 5, I show how these protests against intellectuals are undergirded by a sacrificial substitution mechanism, whereby disabled veterans' anger and resentment were channeled onto the scapegoated body of the intellectual. Pondering the historical continuity between veterans' protests

against Öcalan and intellectuals, I also raise the possibility that the intellectual's body replaced Öcalan as a surrogate victim.

Building on the work of anthropologists Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss on ritual sacrifice,[36] I use sacrificial crisis in another sense too. Hubert and Mauss see the sacrificial victim as a means of communication between sacred and profane worlds. Sacrifice confers a sacred character—not to be confused with the character of the homo sacer, who is outside both sacred and profane laws—on the sacrificial victim, who both separates and unites the sacred and profane worlds and who thus has an ambiguous character.[37] Split between the stigma of disability and the symbolic weight of the title Gazi, the disabled veteran body is a perfect example of this ambiguity, which I analyze in chapter 3. This ambiguity is experienced and politically incited as an affectively charged staging of sacrificial crisis whereby the disabled veteran's officially consecrated body is desecrated through its symbolic contact with socially abject matter or persons: feces in janitorial work and the disabled street beggar. In chapter 6, I focus on how instances of veterans' prosthetic limbs being threatened with repossession due to financial debt are politically articulated by disabled veterans and the larger nationalist public as moments of sacrificial crisis and then folded into critiques of the government.

In this book, I show how these two senses of sacrificial crisis converge and amplify one another as they shape disabled veterans' activism. Through their political activism, veterans turn their dismembered bodies into spectacles of sovereignty and sacrifice, political surfaces upon which nationalist fantasies of unity and wholeness and the anxieties these fantasies breed can be projected. In these spectacles, veterans' sacrificial limbs take on a spectral form and haunt the country in a political phantom limb syndrome that yearns for the "indivisible unity"[38] of the body politic through the ritualized repetition of sacrificial violence.

NARRATIVE STRUCTURE

This book's narrative is organized around disabled veterans' biographical temporalities and follows their life course trajectories through a series of shocks, conversions, and transformations—from conscription and war, to hospitalization and disability, and thenceforth through processes of political identity, community, and agency formation and forfeiture. As such, the book traces a series of disjunctures that both permeate these young men's wartime

and postwar everyday lives and refashion their political attachments and disattachments and their relationship to the state, marked by the aesthetics of sovereignty, sacrifice, and debt.

Chapter 1, "Being-on-the-Mountains," explores the formations of the counterinsurgency military assemblage that structure disabled veterans' narrativized war experiences. The chapter illustrates how conscripted soldiers' shock experiences on the mountains leave lasting ideological, sensorial, and affective impacts on their bodies and psyches, impacts that will later be brokered into nationalist protest of a particular kind.

Chapter 2, "The Two Sovereignties: Masculinity and the State," analyzes the ways in which disabled veterans' bodies manifest, destabilize, and renegotiate the militarized sovereignty relationship between masculinity and the state, now ruptured in the Kurdish conflict by injury and disability. Having once been conscripted by the state so as to be sovereign social and political soldier-subjects, veterans find that disability has radically disrupted the course of their heteronormative adult masculinity. Together, the gendered social embodiment of war disability, biopolitical and medical regimes, media representations, and nationalist politics conspire to resituate disabled veterans' sovereign masculine subjectivities in a critical and rivalrous relationship with the state.

Chapter 3, "Of Gazis and Beggars," examines the sense of sacrificial crisis that emerges as disabled veterans navigate the gendered tensions between the stigma of disability in an ableist society and nationalist state symbols. Condensed in the diametrically opposed figures of the exalted gazi soldier and the abjected disabled street beggar, this crisis was experienced by disabled veterans as moments of political emergency in their everyday postinjury lives. The chapter concludes with a reflection on the ways in which disabled veterans come to feel class and disability issues as matters of sovereignty and ethnopolitics that are eminently amenable to conscription by ultranationalist political rhetoric.

Chapter 4, "Communities of Loss," explores the spatial, organizational, and affective infrastructure of disabled veteran activism, while also introducing the reader to some of the dramatis personae of my fieldwork. Predicated on the commonality of loss, activist communities formed jointly by disabled veterans and martyrs' families fashion new forms of belonging, political intimacy, and intersubjective fields of healing that are then harnessed to ultranationalist political agendas.

Chapter 5, "Prosthetic Revenge," follows the vicissitudes of disabled veterans' political careers as their subjectivities and subject positions are

transformed—first into national victim-heroes sacrificed in the name of state sovereignty; then into nationalist protestors pursuing a vengeful politics that demands state sacrifice of Kurdish, Armenian, and ideological "enemies of the nation" in exchange for the sacrifice they have made in the war; and finally, when betrayed by the state, into dismembered "sacrificial limbs" proper through their symbolic resacrifice in nationalist spectacles of prosthetic protests, a final gesture of sacrificial sovereignty aiming to restore, or even to become, the sovereign state. In the course of this process, the prosthesis emerges as the privileged object of disabled veteran activism and nationalist material political culture.

Chapter 6, "Prosthetic Debts," analyzes the brokering of gendered and militarized debt relations between disabled veterans and the nation-state through the lens of prosthesis repossessions—debt collection due to failed prosthesis payments. Illustrating how veterans get caught up in a new economy of indebtedness as they seek prosthetic rehabilitation in a changing welfare system, the chapter muses on the overlaps and frictions between the debt economies of capitalism and nationalist sacrifice under neoliberal militarism.

Finally, the epilogue illustrates how bodies disabled by political violence and charged with sacrificial aesthetics have proliferated in the Turkey of the 2010s against a backdrop of failed peace negotiations between the state and the PKK, the 2013 Gezi Park protests, the failed coup attempt of 2016, and Turkey's military campaigns in Syria. Such proliferation reflected a contested field of sovereignty and sacrifice within which disabled veterans of the Kurdish conflict were pushed to the background of the political scene through the ruling party's disinvestment from nationalist sacrifice, only to return with full force with the new Turkey's authoritarian-militarist performances of state sovereignty.