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Infantry NCO (Non Commissioned Officer) in Bosnia: “Infantry is the ‘Tour of

Duty,’ it is walking in the woods with real men, camouflaged, with gear and

with…your weapon ready…if you see the enemy you…attack him…rain or no

rain it doesn’t matter, you must do it. This is infantry, sleeping outside, having a

tough time, hardly eating, hardly sleeping and only fight. Yes, fighting – this is

the infantry.”

-pp. 1

Moreover, in many societies the military is still widely considered to be the bastion of male identity and the place where “boys” are turned into “men” through the construction of military service as a rite of passage into manhood (Arkin and Dubrofsky 1978; Ben-Ari 2001; Enloe 1988: 15; Sion 1997).

-pp. 1-2

Within this rite recruits are required to express attributes identified with

combat roles such as emotional control, composure, risk-taking, endurance and fortitude

in the face of difficulties. Therefore, it is participation in combat that is considered by

soldiers to be the main test through which military masculinity is achieved (Badinter

1995; Enloe 1988; Morgan 1994; Sion 1997).

-pp. 2

Infantry soldiers have a more

prestigious and masculine self-image than artillery, whose self-image is shaped in the

shadow of the infantry as second best:

-pp. 7

Infantry soldiers have a stronger professional pride and a higher self-esteem. Most of them chose the infantry and were satisfied with their decision. They perceive the infantry

as the only “real” military service, real in the sense of doing a physical and dirty job that

involves direct confrontation with the enemy and therefore with danger.

-pp. 7

-idea that relates masculinity to the life of a soldier; danger, fighting, and physically/mentally demanding

The army is a masculinized organization, in which masculinity is highly valued and which disproportionately benefits male soldiers. **The army's organizational logic assumes that soldiers are male**, even if this is not explicitly stated.

-pp. 9

This does not mean that men are essentially made for war and women for peace, as

some scholars argue (DeGroot 2001; Salla 2001). Rather, that the military as a

masculinized organization highly values combat traits which are perceived as masculine.

Hence, despite far-reaching political, social and technological changes, the warrior still

plays a key symbol of masculinity and obtains the masculine hegemonic image in the

military (Cameron 1994; Morgan 1994).

-pp. 9

Literature on soldiering argues that combat masculinity is constructed mainly through

discipline and obedience to military hierarchy, which demands a high level of selfcontrol,

both physical and mental (Ben Ari 1998; Sasson Levi 2002; Sion 1997).

-pp. 17

Performing well in battle and showing endurance, self-control,

perseverance and composure become an indicator, a mark that one has successfully

become a man (Sion 1997; Ben-Ari, 1998). Very little has been written, however, on

soldiers who perform other roles than combat (Sasson-Levi 2002).

Soldiers' masculinity in Grizzly and Bulldog is based on mastering emotions. Yet, since

their main challenge is not combat but rather performing monotonous and boring jobs in

harsh conditions, their main challenges are to handle boredom, bad weather and lack of

sleep without complaining.

-pp. 18

No matter how hard the conditions were, the expectations from soldiers in Grizzly *and*

Bulldog were that they should not openly complain. They often used the word

*overdrijven* to describe soldiers who “overreact” or “exaggerate” emotionally.

-pp. 18

-as the quote above illustrates as well, this may be the cause for the hard headedness, stubbornness and refusal for help with soldiers, as they feel it makes them less masculine (less of a man)

\*\*Your last quote tells me that you are starting to get somewhere with the concept of masculinity; as you wrote above, masculinity is self sacrifice for the fellow soldier, but with no tear, and with no intention to help the weak and weeping one.

Do they admire this strength and desire to self sacrifice in their enemies? In the CMJ 9:4 (2009; not out yet), one of the authors talks of the Afghanis like if they were all heroes; he talks of what we should learn from them; a little bit like the Iroquois who wished to become as courageous as Brébeuf by becoming him, by drinking his blood. Who will typically respect the enemy, who will typically want to eliminate all of them? Linked to Rank, trade, experience?

-Soldiers that go on deployment, mostly in 3rd world countries that are poor, seem to leave with strong beliefs of the reason for their deployment “to promote democracy in this underdeveloped country” however quite a number of soldiers return and tell stories of how they admire the country’s culture

-right now in Afghanistan soldiers are returning with the attitude that the Afghani culture/beliefs of a strong community relationship is much better than our materialistic view of the world

-the reason why these soldiers may develop these attitudes is because they unknowingly share a common relationship with these Afghanis, as they live in a poorer country they value materials lesser than us and they value each other and the community in much higher regards

-This is exactly what the soldier experiences during tours, as they are ripped away from their houses, cars and other “valuable” items and are left with their kit and the soldier next to them

\*-is there a difference between the regular infantry soldiers, and the Special Forces operating in theaters of war?

-in Bravo Two Zero, the author does not seem to have that common attitude of detest for others (civilians) that have not experienced what he has experienced, as he reminds himself constantly that is the reason why they pay him? Whereas some soldiers returning for their tours are upset with their children for refusing food

-Is money an issue for the professional soldier?

\*\* this quite legitimate question reminds me that we should ask this question somehow (indirectly) and write down a table of the reasons why people got enrolled (challenge, money, did not know better, sports, cohesion, etc), and see if these motivations are linked to a specific type of reaction to war (challenged or not; sensitive or not to the sum of money they get paid, or traumatized by the fact that their wealthy family and friends complain in front of food, etc.)