
An Intimate History Of Killing

An Intimate History Of Killing
by Bianca & Newton

Downloaded from
www.everybodystreet.com
by Bianca & Newton

THE UNSPOKEN REALITY OF COMBAT

For centuries, warfare has been romanticized through epic poems, stirring patriotic anthems, and blockbuster films. We celebrate the strategist, honor the fallen, and glorify the victory. Yet, there remains a profound silence around the most fundamental act of the battlefield: the act of killing itself. This silence is not accidental. It stems from a deep, collective discomfort with the gap between our civilized self-image and the primal reality of taking another human life. To understand war, and indeed to understand a profound aspect of the human condition, we must move beyond the maps and tactics and look directly at the psychological and emotional experience of the individual soldier. This exploration of what can be truly called **An Intimate History Of Killing** reveals a narrative far more complex, disturbing, and essential than any strategic overview could ever capture.

The term "intimate" is deliberately chosen. It strips away the clinical jargon of "collateral damage" and the abstract language of "engaging the enemy." It forces us to confront the act not as a statistic, but as a deeply personal, physical, and psychological transaction between two human beings. This is not a history of generals or politicians, but of the men and women on the front lines

who are asked to perform what is arguably the most unnatural act a human can commit. By examining this intimacy, we begin to understand the mechanisms that enable killing, the profound psychological scars it leaves, and the strange, often contradictory, emotions that accompany it.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF KILLING IN COMBAT

Pre-Industrial Warfare: The Face-to-Face Encounter

To grasp the evolution of the intimate history of killing, one must look at the nature of conflict before the industrial age. For most of human history, combat was a brutally personal affair. A Roman legionary stared into the eyes of his foe as he thrust his gladius. A medieval knight felt the shudder of his lance penetrating armor and flesh. A musket-wielding soldier of the 18th century stood in a line, mere yards from the men he was ordered to shoot. In these eras, the act of killing was unavoidable, direct, and sensory. Soldiers saw the blood, heard the screams, and felt the physical resistance of a body ending its life. This closeness created a powerful psychological barrier, often leading to a phenomenon known as "intentional

miss" where soldiers would deliberately fire over the heads of the enemy rather than take a life.

The Industrialization of Death

The 19th and 20th centuries brought a revolution in military technology that fundamentally altered this dynamic. The machine gun, the long-range artillery shell, and ultimately the aerial bomb introduced a tragic paradox: they made killing far more efficient while simultaneously creating a psychological distance between the killer and the killed. A World War I artilleryman could fire a shell that killed dozens of men he would never see. A B-17 bombardier over Germany released his payload on a factory complex, trying not to think about the workers inside. This distance, while protective for the psyche, created a new kind of moral hazard. The intimacy was lost, replaced by a bureaucratic and mechanical process. However, as the historian Joanna Bourke argues in her seminal work, from which this concept is drawn, the infantryman in the trench, the soldier clearing a bunker, or the pilot in a dogfight still experienced a profound intimacy with their actions. The distance was never total.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE SOLDIER

Overcoming the Resistance to Killing

One of the most startling findings in the study of military psychology, famously highlighted by Lt. Col. Dave Grossman in *On Killing*, is that humans have a powerful, innate resistance to killing members of their own species. Studies of historical battles showed that a shockingly high percentage of soldiers—sometimes fewer than 20%—would actually fire their weapons with the intent to kill. The rest would fire over heads, into the ground, or not fire at all. The modern military, recognizing this, has fundamentally changed its training methods. The goal is to create a conditioned, reflexive response through "battle inoculation." Soldiers no longer train on bullseye targets; they train on human-shaped silhouettes that pop up and fall down. The process is designed to bypass the conscious brain and make the act of aiming and firing at a human form an automatic, conditioned behavior. This systematic dismantling of the natural aversion to killing is the first and most crucial step in an intimate history of killing. It is a deliberate reshaping of the human psyche.

The Role of Dehumanization and Ideology

To further bridge the gap between a peaceful citizen and a killer, militaries

and nations rely on powerful psychological tools: ideology and dehumanization. The enemy is no longer a person with a family and hopes; they become a "gook," a "jap," a "haji," or a "commie." They are labelled as a faceless, subhuman threat. This linguistic and cultural framing is essential. It provides a moral justification for the act. The soldier is not killing a man; they are destroying a symbol of evil, protecting their comrades, or serving a greater national purpose. This narrative overlay is a crucial layer in the intimate history, as it helps the killer make sense of their actions in the aftermath. However, as countless memoirs attest, this ideological armor often cracks upon close contact with the reality of the enemy's humanity.

THE INTIMATE ACT: CLOSE-QUARTERS COMBAT

While technology has pushed killing to a distance, the reality for many soldiers, especially in counter-insurgency and urban warfare, remains horrifyingly close. This is where the "intimacy" is most raw. It is the soldier who clears a room in Fallujah, the Marine who engages a sniper in the jungles of Vietnam, or the paratrooper fixing a bayonet in the hedgerows of Normandy. In these moments, there is no abstraction. The soldier sees the whites of the enemy's eyes, hears their ragged breath, and registers their fear. The kill is not a button press; it is a physical struggle, a bloody, immediate, and sensory event.

Veterans often describe these moments with a strange, dissociative clarity. Time slows down. Sounds become muffled. The world narrows to a single, focused point. This is the brain's defense

mechanism, a way to compartmentalize the overwhelming trauma of the event. The aftermath is often even more complex. Contrary to the image of the remorseless killer, many soldiers report feelings of intense relief, elation, or a profound, almost spiritual bond with the comrades they protected. This is not a celebration of death, but a primal biological and psychological response to surviving a life-or-death struggle. This contradictory mix of revulsion, pride, and relief is a core component of the intimate history of killing.

THE AFTERMATH: TRAUMA AND THE WEIGHT OF MEMORY

Post-Traumatic Stress and Moral Injury

The act of killing does not end when the trigger is pulled. For many, it is just the beginning of a lifelong struggle. The psychological toll of taking a life is the most enduring element of its intimate history. This goes beyond the classic symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Many clinicians and researchers now speak of "moral injury," a deep-seated wound to the soul that occurs when a person perpetrates, witnesses, or fails to prevent an act that transgresses their own deeply held moral or ethical beliefs. A soldier who was raised to value all life is suddenly faced with the fact that they have taken one. This creates a shattering cognitive dissonance. The guilt is not just about fear or survival; it is about a fundamental violation of the self. The flashbacks are not just of the danger, but

of the face of the dead man, the sound of his last breath, the specific, horrifying details of the life they extinguished.

The Silent Return Home

One of the most tragic elements of this history is the silence that greets the returning killer. Society wants to thank the veteran for their service but is profoundly uncomfortable with the details of that service. The veteran is trapped. They cannot share the burden of their intimate experience because it is too dark, too graphic, too morally ambiguous for civilian consumption. This silence compounds the isolation and the trauma. The killer is left alone with their memories, unable to reconcile the person they were with the act they committed. Support groups and therapy often focus on breaking this silence, allowing veterans to share their intimate history of killing with others who understand, not to excuse the act, but to integrate it into a new, survivable sense of self.

GENDER AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE KILLER

An intimate history of killing must also confront the issue of gender. For most of history, the act of killing in combat has been an almost exclusively male domain, closely tied to traditional notions of masculinity. The "warrior" is the ultimate male archetype: strong, stoic, protective, and lethal. Men are often raised with the understanding that their willingness to kill in defense of their nation or family is a measure of their manhood. This creates an immense pressure. To flinch, to refuse to kill, or to

show the emotional aftermath is to be "unmanly." This has historically led to a culture of silence and emotional suppression that has caused immense suffering.

Today, as women integrate into combat roles, a new dimension of this intimate history is being written. Female soldiers face the same psychological hurdles of training and the same close-quarters traumas, but they navigate them within a different social and psychological context. They must often contend with stereotypes that see them as less capable of violence or more fragile in its aftermath. Their experiences challenge the traditional male-centric narrative and force a more universal examination of what it means for any human being—regardless of gender—to take the life of another. The act of killing does not discriminate, but society's reaction to the killer often does.

THE FUTURE OF INTIMATE KILLING: DRONES AND REMOTE WARFARE

The ultimate extension of technological distance is the modern drone operator. Sitting in a climate-controlled trailer in Nevada, a pilot flies a drone over Afghanistan, watching a live feed of a target for hours or days. They see the target playing with their children, eating a meal, and talking with friends. Then, they receive the order, and with a click of a mouse, they end that life. The distance is physical, but the intimacy is arguably greater than ever. The operator has a high-definition, real-time view of their target in the moments before death. They see the aftermath in excruciating detail. This creates a unique psychological burden. They are part killer, part spectator. They return home

to their suburban family every night, carrying the visual memory of the life they ended. This is the newest, and perhaps most disconcerting, chapter in the intimate history of killing, where geographic distance is completely uncoupled from psychological proximity.

CONCLUSION: THE UNFORGIVING MIRROR

To study **An Intimate History Of Killing** is to look into a profoundly unforgiving mirror. It reveals that the act of taking a human life is anything but simple. It is a complex interplay of instinct, training, ideology, technology, and chance. It is an act that is simultaneously reviled and glorified, hidden and celebrated. For the individual who performs it, it is an act that can

never be undone, a permanent fixture in the landscape of their soul. By understanding this intimacy—by acknowledging the psychological mechanisms that enable it, the trauma that follows it, and the moral complexities that surround it—we do not excuse or glorify killing. Rather, we honor the humanity of those who are asked to do it. We break the silence that surrounds them. We see them not as faceless warriors or heroes on a pedestal, but as flawed, complex human beings who have borne a weight that most of us will never understand. This intimate history is not a celebration of death, but a profound elegy for the human cost of conflict, written on the psyche of every soldier who has ever been asked to take a life.