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The overwhelming message of existing scholarship on war and gender is that masculinity1 is crucial to the ways in which war2 gains its meaning and legitimacy in social life. This idea has even gained recognition in the international policy community, which has recently begun to take on board the view that masculinity can be seen as a significant explanatory variable in political violence and therefore as a problem that needs to be addressed by institutional actors seeking to limit levels of political violence in the twenty-first-century world (Breines, Connell, and Eide 2000).
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Hartsock (1989) argued that the ideology of masculinity, which, she claimed, reflected the interests

of particular elite groups of men across time, was the root cause of war and militarism in Western cultures.
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In the gender and war literature, there is a great deal of common ground in the range of values that provide the content of dominant ideals of masculinity in the context of the military and war. Barrett’s (2001) list in relation to the U.S. Navy includes risk taking, discipline, technological mastery, excitement operating machines, stoicism under hardship, absence of emotion, and rational calculation.
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In Van Creveld’s analysis, *feminization* has a double meaning. On one hand, *feminization* refers to the fact that there are now many more women in the professional militaries of advanced industrial societies; on the other hand, *feminization* refers to a process of decline in the capacity to engage in so-called real war. Evidence for the latter thesis is found in the decline of participation in major interstate conflicts by Western powers and the increasing use of the military for peacekeeping or humanitarian intervention purposes in the

post–Cold War period.
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 -feminization of war and militaries (Western countries)

The development of smart weapons, which can discriminate between legitimate and illegitimate targets; the zero casualty rates among the allies in the Gulf War; the reaction by the United States to the relatively small number of casualties in the humanitarian intervention in Somalia; and the choice of air strikes, rather than ground troops, for intervention in Kosova all signify a shift in the values underpinning the making of war, from a warrior culture (in which death in war is existentially meaningful) to one in which

human rights have come to dominate.
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-the development and changes of war, as it becomes more about technology than it does about the skills of the traditional warrior, strength, power and aggressiveness

-reduces the masculinity of war

\*\*gives more chance to women?

However, more fundamental is the shift that Coker argues is happening in war toward the posthuman. This shift is driven by the dominance of instrumental attitudes to war and the technologies now available, which increasingly (literally) take the human out of the field of conflict into a virtual environment, or which enable the management of the stress responses of soldiers through biotechnological means. For Coker, this means that the human element is taken out of war, and war loses its existential and social meaning.
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\*\* I wonder to what extent this really applies to soldiers who are over there; do they feel disconnected from their humanity once at war, and if yes, is it because of biotechnological means employed? And don’t these means bring another dimension to existential and social meaning, such as, how does the society (Canada) deal with the side effects of chemistries used in such wars (1st Gulf War)?

In all three of the previous cases, our understanding and evaluation of war is secured through its association with masculinity, made evident through the simultaneous contrast and continuity between different masculinized values and practices. The formal dependence of the valorization of one form of masculinity on its aberrant, pathological, past or future others is made very clear. War may be criticized from the standpoint of the human, but only when the human is a variant of the masculine, whether as cosmopolitan law enforcer, existential hero, or technology-savvy citizen.
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The crucial characteristic that is shared by all masculinity discourses is that they are not feminine. It is the fixed value hierarchy ascribed to masculine and feminine that provides the means through which discrimination between different forms of masculinity becomes possible. But it is also the fixity of the

masculine/feminine distinction that enables the differentiation of, for instance, courage, rationality, and discipline as different aspects or gradations of masculinity, that is to say, as having something in common as well as being hierarchically differentiated according to context. **In accounts of war and the military in the gender and war literature and in theories of the changing nature of war, the formal differentiation of war from the feminine is the flip side of the war–masculinity relation. And as with masculinity in a positive sense, it appears that the negative relation of femininity to war holds, regardless of what the feminine might mean.**
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 -contrast of masculinity and femininity in the military/war

\*Dallaire: the most known mentally affected person; honesty about the mission : “we failed because we did not care about you, etc), his belief that he would be

\*Start reading some testimonies from the field journalists; think of a matrix in which to categorize their answers: reasons of enrolment, nb of missions, what they talk about – kids, poverty, hate, admiration, saving kids, questioning humanity, feeling helpless, feeling challenged and useful, etc.

\*General Dallaire wanted to use himself as a self sacrifice to force the international community to act upon these atrocities, as a high ranking officer sanctioned by the UN as a commander of a UN mission would draw attention

The War Tapes:

-Call to arms, is a patriotic calling and desire

-desire to fight, training a football player and never getting to play

-politics, haliburton & KBR, making a profit through the military and the war

 -profit and money outweighs safety of all soldiers (regardless of American, Iraqi or others), however KBR employees are important

-the de-humanization of the enemy occurs in each war, through masking them with sand bags, calling them hodgies, anyone who isn’t American or American-like

-feeling of helplessness, against IEDs, mortars, suicide bombers and the unknowing

-perspective, the American culture and ideology vs the Iraqi society and culture

 -freedom fighters or terrorists

-groupthink, affects the soldiers and their mentality

-its only a deployment for them, they do come home, it ends for them it will not affect their everyday life

-the image of the soldier returning home and sitting on the couch, tired

-change and transformation of the soldier’s desire to go to War, never want to return, and believes it’s someone else’s turn to go over

-no one understands or cares what life is like over there, and what they experience

 -they change, people’s mentality change from those experiences