

Emotionalities in Tension: From Militarized Masculinity to Forms of Relationship among Genders that Build Cultures of Peace*

[English Version]

Emocionalidades en tensión: de la masculinidad militarizada a formas de relación entre los géneros que construyan culturas de paz

Emocionalidades em tensão: da masculinidade militarizada às formas de relacionamento entre os gêneros que constroem culturas de paz

Received June 29, 2020, accepted December 7, 2020.

› To cite this article: Patiño-Gaviria, Carlos-Darío; Cadavid-Marulanda, Yuliana- María; Pabon-Valencia, Laura-Vanessa; Duque-Monsalve, Luisa-Fernanda; Sandoval-Casilimas, Carlos-Arturo. (2021). Emotionalities in Tension: from Militarized Masculinity to Forms of Relationships Among Genders that Build Cultures of Peace. *Ánfora*, 28(51), 17-48.
<https://doi.org/10.30854/anfv.28.n51.2021.720>
Universidad Autónoma de Manizales. L-ISSN 0121-6538. E-ISSN 2248-6941. CC BY-NC-SA 4.

Carlos-Darío Patiño-Gaviria**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7094-1955>

Colombia

Yuliana-María Cadavid-Marulanda***

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0940-0276>

Colombia

Laura-Vanessa Pabón-Valencia****

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7171-0788>

Colombia

Luisa-Fernanda Duque-Monsalve*****

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5362-6723>

Colombia

Carlos-Arturo Sandoval-Casilimas*****

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0675-1289>

Colombia

* Progress of the Doctoral Thesis in Psychology carried out by the main author, registered with the Research Directorate of the Universidad de San Buenaventura, Medellín, with registration 951-17.01. D01, carried out between 2015 and 2019. In this research, the people named in footnotes 3 and 4 acted as research assistants, as a requirement of the University when supporting research projects of its teachers. Professor Luisa Duque acted as a co-investigator, being a young researcher appointed by the USB in 2016 and continued in the project until 2019, assigned to the line of research in social psychology. Professor Sandoval has been the director of the doctoral thesis project.

** Sociologist from the Universidad de San Buenaventura Medellín. Master of education and Human Development. Research professor at the Universidad de San Buenaventura Medellín. Research group: Clinical and social studies in psychology. Email: carlospatiogaviria@gmail.com

*** Psychologist Universidad de San Buenaventura Medellín. Email: yulicm65@gmail.com

**** Psychologist. Universidad de San Buenaventura Medellín. Email: pabonvalencialaura@gmail.com

***** Psychologist. Master of Philosophy from the Universidad de Antioquia. Research Coordinator of the Faculty of Psychology of the Universidad de San Buenaventura, Medellín headquarters. Research group: Clinical and social studies in psychology. Email: luisa.duque@usbmed.edu.co

***** Psychologist. Doctor of Education from the Universidad de Antioquia. Research professor at the Universidad de San Buenaventura Medellín. Research group: Clinical and social studies in psychology. Email: carlos.sandoval@udea.edu.co

Abstract

Objective: to understand the historical horizon of the feelings that are produced regarding the provision of military service, antimilitarist resistance and masculinity alternatives in a peacebuilding and post-conflict context in Colombia. **Methodology:** the study was carried out from a constructionist perspective, with a hermeneutical orientation. Data were generated through participant observation, interviews, and focus groups with 10 groups of youth antimilitarists in different cities in Colombia. Some of the young men gave an account of their experiences serving in the military. **Results:** the study describes the ways in which the feelings and subjectivities of young people are molded in military socialization under the referent of hegemonic masculinity (HM). Likewise, the daily practices of resistance and peacebuilding of these young people are presented, possibly thanks to the subjective and affective transformations that occur by resisting the patriarchal and militaristic culture. **Conclusions:** antimilitarism, hand in hand with non-violence, configures human relationships of respect, love, solidarity, compassion, fraternity and tenderness (feelings that are repressed by the HM model), thereby favoring the change of militaristic values towards other values such as peace, equity and freedom.

Keywords: Feelings; Antimilitarism; Masculinity; Peace culture.

Resumen

Objetivo: comprender el horizonte histórico de los sentimientos que se producen con respecto a la prestación del servicio militar, las resistencias antimilitaristas y las alternativas de masculinidad en un contexto de construcción de paz y postconflicto en Colombia. **Metodología:** el estudio se realizó en perspectiva construccionista, con orientación hermenéutica. Se generaron los datos mediante observación participante, entrevistas y grupos focales con 10 colectivos de jóvenes antimilitaristas en diferentes ciudades de Colombia. Algunos de los jóvenes dieron cuenta de sus experiencias prestando el servicio militar. **Resultados:** se describen los modos cómo los sentimientos y subjetividades de los jóvenes son moldeados en la socialización militar bajo el referente de la masculinidad hegemónica (MH). Así mismo, se presentan las prácticas cotidianas de resistencia y construcción de paz de estos jóvenes, posibles gracias a las transformaciones subjetivas y afectivas que se producen haciendo resistencia a la cultura patriarcal y militarista. **Conclusiones:** el antimilitarismo, de la mano de la no violencia, configuran relaciones humanas de respeto, amor, solidaridad, compasión, fraternidad y ternura (sentimientos que son reprimidos por el modelo de MH), con lo que se favorece el cambio de los valores militaristas hacia otros valores como la paz, la equidad y la libertad.

Palabras clave: Sentimientos; Antimilitarismo; Masculinidad; Cultura de paz.

Resumo

Objetivo: compreender o horizonte histórico dos sentimentos que se produzem a respeito da prestação do serviço militar, da resistência antimilitarista e das alternativas de masculinidade em um contexto de construção da paz e pós-conflito na Colômbia.

Metodologia: o estudo foi realizado em uma perspectiva construcionista, com uma orientação hermenêutica. Os dados foram gerados por meio de observação participante, entrevistas e grupos focais com 10 grupos de jovens antimilitaristas em diferentes cidades da Colômbia. Alguns dos rapazes relataram suas experiências no serviço militar.

Resultados: descreve as formas pelas quais os sentimentos e subjetividades dos jovens são moldados na socialização militar sob o referente da masculinidade hegemônica (MH). Da mesma forma, são apresentadas as práticas cotidianas de resistência e construção da paz desses jovens, possíveis graças às transformações subjetivas e afetivas que são produzidas pela resistência à cultura patriarcal e militarista. **Conclusões:** o antimilitarismo, de mãos dadas com a não violência, configura relações humanas de respeito, amor, solidariedade, compaixão, fraternidade e ternura (sentimentos reprimidos pelo modelo MH), favorecendo a mudança de valores militaristas para outros valores como paz, equidade e liberdade.

Palavras-chave: Sentimientos; Antimilitarismo; Masculinidad; Cultura de paz.

Introduction

Is there a relationship between peacebuilding, new masculinities and anti-militarism? This question is asked in relation to political actions carried out by young people who challenge the performance of military service and advocate civil disobedience and non-violence. Answering it requires the support of different knowledge. Here, a critically grounded psychosocial perspective that seeks to understand the stakes against the use of weapons, the maintenance of war logic and the exaltation of warrior masculinity is appealed to, as part of alternative peace proposals among Colombians. Next, what the literature in social sciences has been raising regarding the complex nucleus of problematization is outlined: patriarchy/hegemonic masculinity/militarization/ the construction of peace relations.

Theoretical Framework

One of the categories that guides the construction of identity is gender (Rambla, 2002), which is reproduced through discourses and practices. It is based on sexual difference and determines the characteristics of masculinity as opposed to femininity (Connell, 1995). On gender as a category, as performativity and as a social construction (Héritier, 1996; Bourdieu, 2000; Butler, 2006) studies and reflections have been advanced. This research emphasizes the construction of hegemonic masculinities (HM), in the patriarchal organization of society, and its link with militarism.

Patriarchy is a system of gender relations that promotes a hierarchical order of the masculine over the feminine, the same one that holds a privilege that results in affective and bodily emergences in the relational spaces of the subjects involved, according to their personal and collective histories (Connell, 1995). Patriarchy promotes masculinity, called “hegemonic” (HM), used and reinforced by the militaristic culture. The HM has base beliefs, that is to say: a) a heroic bellicosity, the place allocated to others is the one of a potential adversary or humiliator; b) respect of the value of the hierarchy, associated with the internalization of the code of humiliation; c) superiority over women (Bonino, 2002).

Militarism is configured as a system of military domination that consists of the influence, presence of and penetration into various forms, norms, ideology and military purposes in civil society; its logic is determined by violent conflict resolution. It includes growing military spending (Ortega, Gómez, 2010; Molina, 2014), the number of troops (Isaza, 2013), arms purchases (Ortega, Gómez, 2010), provision of compulsory military service for young men (some countries include women), patrols on public roads and private armies (Yuste, 2004). In everyday life a hegemony of the military model grows, contributing to the reproduction of an exclusive gender system and a hegemonic masculinity model.

There are binding characteristics between patriarchy and militarism, such as the construction of male/female hierarchies and the protector/protected relationship (Espitia, 2018). While militarism establishes the friend/enemy logic, the latter being the object of elimination, patriarchy contributes with androcentric institutions that are based on obedience (Ospina et al., 2011). Articulated, militarism and patriarchy, they have the possibility of generating violence, discrimination and privileges, which preserve the status quo.

Affectivity has acquired investigative relevance in topics such as political emotionality (Bonvillani, 2013). This emphasis has been called "the affective turn"; some authors have generated distinctions between the concepts of emotion and feeling. For Rosas (2011), feelings are not reduced to secondary effects of immediate emotions, rather they constitute tendencies or affective dispositions referred to intentional objects that concern the subjects and for which some inclination or sensitivity is expressed. Feeling, unlike emotion, is always a cognition about what happens in emotion, a cognition about what excites us and that facilitates rational decision-making (Cruz, 2012). The feeling, therefore, is sustained in the interpretation.

Scheve and Ismer (2013) propose an understanding of collective feelings (they call them emotions) as the synchronic convergence in the affective response of individuals toward a specific event or object. On collective emotions, they emphasize the presence of four key mechanisms: a) group membership, b) the influence of lasting group feelings, c) the contribution of social norms to generate collective emotions, d) the contribution of cultural practices to the dissemination and validation of appropriate and expected feelings.

Here it is accepted that feelings have a collective character insofar as they inhabit the relational intersubjective space to which one belongs; as collective productions they inhabit the symbolic world, which is accounted for by the metaphors and expressions of everyday life, which are not logical but sensitive.

It is essential to be careful with regard to cultures of peace. Peace is more than the absence of war, it integrates the capacity to transform conflicts (Fisas, 2011). The creation of cultures of peace implies generating constructive

changes, reducing margins of violence, stimulating relationships based on equity and justice. That the world of daily life is a generative, constitutive and dynamic force of the public sphere has been proposed. Therefore, the construction of integral peace implies a horizontal dialogue between local experiences of peace, various social sectors and institutional agents – including the State – without restricting itself to the efforts made by the communities (Granados, 2021). From other approaches, peace constructions continue to be vindicated *from below*, such as the one shown in the study by Acosta-Navas (2021) with the leading women peace builders of Comuna 1 of Medellín, who transcend the discourse of liberal peace and take a critical approach to human rights, which builds peace in a feminine key, through community participation, exercising their leadership in the territory they inhabit, and making use of their popular knowledge.

Peace cultures question male cultures that value toughness and competition, legitimize violence as a way of managing differences and conflicts, and is associated with family abuse and domestic violence (Ubillos, Beristain, Garaigordobil, Halperin, 2011). While male cultures focus on individual achievement and honor valuation and are characterized by higher rates of collective violence, female cultures emphasize interpersonal harmony and communal relationships (Basabe, Valencia, Bobowik, 2011).

The culture of peace (de Rivera, cited by Basabe, Valencia, Bobowik, 2011) is defined based on a mosaic of identities, attitudes, values, beliefs, and institutional patterns that make people take care of each other, share resources, and live their differences. Therefore, it depends on social, political and cultural factors such as: education in the peaceful resolution of conflicts; respect for human rights; gender equality; political participation; acceptance of minorities; the free flow of information; freedom of expression; international peace; safety; and the promotion of values such as cooperation and mutual care.

State of the Art

The military institution is based on the existence of massive and permanent armies, a bureaucratic and hierarchical structure, a structured doctrine and the obligatory nature of military service (Zarzuri, Lecourt, 2007). The army is the military force organized for the defense of the State and the preservation of internal order. It implies a human grouping governed by hierarchy, discipline, honor and value; values that differentiate those who enter the ranks and are part of a secondary socialization process (Serrano, 1972).

Armies and barracks are configured as total institutions, characterized by confinement and tight control over the daily routines of those who compose them, subject to a control and surveillance regime that requires an adaptation of the identity and body of its members. Integrated subjects tend to experience a negative modification of their identities, as the conception that they had previously constructed of themselves in other social settings is endangered (Goffman, 2001).

Mabee and Vucetic (2018), following Mann, suggest that there are three types of militarism co-existing today: State/Nation militarism (armed forces under the figure of the State); the militarism of civil society (includes “vigilante” type paramilitary groups against crime or counterinsurgents, organized military violence supported by the State); finally, neoliberal militarism that involves the commodification of military activity, the privatization of defense at the hands of neo-mercenaries and security companies that compete in the market for weapons and high-end military technology.

Different authors see the military institution and militarism as a source of construction of hegemonic masculinities. The body is a constructed object with an appearance of masculinity, including: gait, posture, gestures, tone of voice; those who become the object of the formative work, in a kind of theatricality that includes at the same time the disposition of the other's body (Sirimarco, 2004; Sandoval, Otálora, 2015). Military training points to professional values, which arise “naturally” from the regulated relationship of command and obedience between superiors and subordinates, and from its ultimate purpose: the defense of the homeland (Ruiz, 2012). Those values would be: order, decision, rectitude, maturity, courage, and leadership. Therefore, the army does not refer only to the handling of weapons or the wearing of insignia, but also to a game of relationships, which are instituted as legitimate, and usually natural, establishing the recognition of the majority of the other; which means that the mandates do not give rise to an opinion or assessment of what is commanded (Pérez, 2015).

HM's style connotes the dominant position of certain men and the subordination of women (Connell, 1995, p. 12). Such male subjectivity is built by participating in different social spaces, in which a normative–evaluative–affective system prevails. In agreement, Garay (2014) supports the idea that masculinity implies accepting a series of impositions regarding the manifestation of affectivity, with feelings related to fear, sadness, and frequently, even tenderness. Bonino (2002) argues that the network of affections that is created around the beliefs of hegemonic masculinity, includes the illusion that one day the subject will be the authority and owner of someone/something. This network also comprises loyalty, honor, generosity (protectiveness), endurance/patience, admiration/fearful respect, and the pain of submission as well.

The same men who monitor and regulate a standard, respond to the masculine condition as something to be conquered. As Figuera (2005) points out, the dominant male model defends heterosexuality and actively rejects homosexuality as something to be avoided. The HM related to aggressiveness and violence naturalizes the figure of the military and superior man, “aggressive heterosexism” (Donoso, 2015; Rodríguez, 2011).

From a feminist perspective, Suárez (2015) studied how women's human rights are violated by paramilitaries who gave free rein to their machismo. She adds that young people joined paramilitarism to achieve their interests of exalting masculinity and power. Rodríguez (2011) and Hernández (2003) agree with this, demonstrating that, in wars, women are not only subjected to rape, but also a battlefield, both physically and symbolically. The anti-militarist group Women in Black from Belgrade denounced the use of force and violence in the Kosovo War, according to the experience of the warlike climate in Milosevic's Serbia (Hernández, 2003). Bjarnegård and Melander (2011) agree that gender roles glorify and reinforce militarism and legitimize the subordination of women.

One of the most striking characteristics of the HM is the need for man to approach the model of the warrior, the natural holder of power; society legitimizes him and gives rise to his domination over women and over other non-hegemonic masculinities. The internalization of such ideals and the symbols of omnipotence that accompany the configuration of this masculinity, are what justify the exercise of control and domination of it (Ruíz, 2003). In this context, subordinate masculinities are also created, an example is gay masculinity (Sharoni, 2008). On this, Gallego (2018) reaches the following conclusions: a) perpetuating the archetype of the warrior creating armies keeps gender violence in force; b) hegemonic masculinity threatens the dignity of man; c) not perpetuating hegemonic masculinity is the slogan of a conscientious objector in Colombia. Carreño (2019) also concludes that antimilitarism questions militarism and patriarchy,

especially gender relations, the production of the masculine and feminine, and the production of social differences based on the image of the military.

Finally, Henry (2017), as well as Parpart and Partridge (2014), and Sharoni (2008), from an intersectional perspective, are questioned by other types of domination that intersect with militarized masculinity (for reasons of race, ethnicity, sex, age, social class). Because the significance and practices associated with militarized masculinity are influenced as much by the context as by the social place and the political point of view adopted by men in relation to a political conflict (Sharoni, 2008). Within this framework, military service is created and imposed so that the "new heroes" act as defenders of "the mother country" (thus in feminine), dominate the weapons and make violence a method for the resolution of conflicts (Ruíz, 2003; Salazar, 2013; Theidon, 2009).

Problem Statement

As can be seen, there have been a series of approaches that question the construction of masculinity, the bases of patriarchy, and the different forms of domination, indicating the places of privilege, control and subordination of a masculine stereotype, over other options of masculinity and over the feminine with values, behaviors, warrior symbols, body formations, and in addition, in a framework of relationships in which patriarchy is equivalent to militarism. However, the authors do not sufficiently recognize feelings as constitutive of the military man, and when they do, they assimilate them to values, so affectivity is excluded from the possibilities of transformation of that masculinity in question.

This leaves room for the following assumption: those feelings are constituents of militarized subjectivities and have a social character, given their construction process, which is nothing other than a process of habituation and significance that is institutionalized in the set of social practices (Berger, Luckmann, 1986). Our frame of reference accepts that there are three feelings that are encouraged by the military institution: the ethical feeling of patriotism, associated with the defense of the community; the military spirit, related to efficiency; and the feeling of honor that has to do with the duty of cooperating with the strengthening of the army (Fernández, 1986). Furthermore, military practice attributes prestige to bravery (Rambla, 2002).

Now, there are two reasons reference has been made to all these ideas that circulate in the social science literature. One is to show that the theoretical and investigative tradition has acknowledged the relationships between masculinity and militarism. However, the fact that these come from places of confrontation regarding the effects of HM domination and power on women and on other masculinities – or, on other sub-alternated actors – the role of the emotions as a perspective on peace processes, for the sake of transforming such militarized masculinities has been neglected. The second is the concern regarding the contributions of feminist, new masculine, antimilitaristic (conscientious objectors) and critical social psychology (vis-à-vis the modes of expression of power) perspectives made toward the construction of cultures of peace arising from this study.

It is time to raise another assumption: the restructuring of masculinities is an option for peace as long as it also includes transformations in the ways of feeling and expressing human emotions. Deconstructing the militaristic patriarchy – and the inequalities it engenders – requires putting in check feelings of honor, bravery, courage, suicidal patriotism and humiliation of the other, and proposing others in accordance with equity, respect, solidarity.

Now, a process of recognition of male feelings by men, is a way to undertake the demilitarization of imposed affections, to build peaceful relationships (in the midst of conflict) and to resist this model that has been talked about. Feelings are the object of militarization when men are limited to experiencing them in the service of domination and repressing or transforming others. Therefore, connecting with their own emotions in other relational spaces, apart from the military, becomes a possibility of demilitarizing themselves (Theidon, 2009), transcending the honor and courage that military socialization gives men. Colombia has experienced this specific situation for decades, the armed conflict was protected by the imposition of emotionalities, such as revenge, hatred, resentment and social disgust, on others such as brotherhood, affection or trust.

The foregoing assumes that masculinity has to do with a set of articulated emotionalities, which exalt the military male model and limit the possibility of alternate male emotionalities being built. For this, affectivity is understood as a collective construction (Fernández, 2000), which crosses interactions and bodies (Bonvillani, 2013; Urzúa, 2011), becomes performative in relational practices (Belli and Íñiguez, 2008), integrates with collective ideals (Cruz, 2012; Rodríguez, 2008), they signify in public life and shape social ties (Nussbaum, 2014). Affectivity acquires a political character when it intervenes in the relationship of power and alliance, when it occupies the public arenas (Cefai, 2011), to promote relationship of domination or emancipation, and when it mediates relations between the genders.

For this reason, the present study has inquired about the historical horizon of the feelings that are produced with respect to the provision of military service, regarding the affections that accompany antimilitarist resistance, and the contributions that, from different feminisms and different alternatives of masculinity, can contribute to a proposal for the demilitarization of affections leading to the construction of cultures of peace (even between genders).

Methodology

This report is the result of a study conducted within the framework of a broader investigation into the sentiments that are produced among antimilitarists, who oppose the provision of compulsory military service and the imposition of a model of militarized masculinity. The general approach is interpretive (Vain, 2012), according to which subjects produce interrelated realities and interpretations (situations) on a historical horizon. A qualitative design is adopted (Creswell, 1994), which adopts the perspective of the known subject (Vasilachis, 2007), and the use of procedures to construct and analyze data expressed in reports and records of observations of actions in situ, through spiral moments.

The theoretical-methodological assumption is that human action, like its dimensions of gender and affections, become social, historical and performative constructions in constant tension. These aforementioned forms define places for subjects in power relationships and are carriers of frameworks for interpretation and action. It was also guided by a constructionist theoretical perspective following a hermeneutical approach.

According to the study problem, there are two methodological movements: one with antimilitarists from four cities in Colombia, and another with a set of research and reflections by authors from different national and international contexts. With the first movement we approach the actions and experiences of young people, adopting them as texts, on which communicable meanings must be built. Actions and experiences that are expressed in stories guided by a flexible and open interview guide, which unfolds according to the aspects discussed and emerging in it, without limiting it to a rigid structure. These themes changed over the course of the research, but they revolved around four axes: personal experiences in the army, antimilitarist actions, the role of

certain interpretive categories (patriarchy, conscientious objection, masculinity, non-violence) and shared feelings. The gradual observation on the actions and the informal conversations were giving rise to themes of the same.

An ensemble of organized groups was approached, each of which represents their way of placing themselves in relation to the antimilitarist proposal that follows. These groups were: Collective Action for Conscientious Objection (ACOC); District Process of Conscientious Objection (PD-OC), Bogotá; Medellín Antimilitarist Collective (KAM); Woven by Conscientious Objection; Kolectivo Clown Nariz Obrera (KCNO), Medellín; Antimilitarist Feminist Network, Medellín; Fifth Commandment, Barrancabermeja; and members of Mennonite and Evangelical churches in Barranquilla, Medellín, and Bogotá. In addition, activists from two campaigns participated: “Get off the truck,” from Medellín and “Without discretion,” at the national level, as well as antimilitarists present at the Second National Meeting of Conscientious Objectors (ENOC), held in Bogotá in 2014. Four young people participated independently, two who provided their service and two who refused to perform military service: one by Conscientious Objection, who was disqualified by a decision of a court of law, and another who abstained from appearing because of being against the military institution, without being a political activist. Their respective names are substituted to hide their identity.

For the information analysis, the categories were generated from analytical induction (Schettini, Cortazzo, 2015). The information obtained from conversations and field journal notes was previously thematized defining categories of affections: fear or panic, indignation, enthusiasm and power. Content organizing subcategories: homosexuality, masculinity, hegemonic masculinity, militarism, militarization, women, conscientious objection. Then categories of situations were constructed: militarism, militarization, resistance and patriarchy.

The analysis process was oriented by adopting the position of interpreters of the collaborators' stories, following a procedure of relating the testimonies to each other, in relation to the political context from which they assume their antimilitarist position, and as young people who refuse to "look like" strong and vigorous male soldiers. It was also assumed that their stories are not objective, but involve their shared ways of understanding the military experience, whether they have lived it directly or not. In this sense, it is possible to discover interpretative tendencies among young people that are codified as emerging categories, the same ones that exemplify the description of results.

For all this process, the procedures of investigative ethics that are specified in the informed consent were followed, in addition, different meetings were held with the participating group, where partial results of the research process were socialized.

Results

In what follows, what constitutes the military institution will be outlined from the understanding of conscientious objectors and antimilitarists.

Militarization: Obedient Men with Sculpted Bodies

The antimilitarist youthful subjectivity conceives of the army as the scenario where control and aggressiveness prevail over the soldier: "it began in itself as mental control, as here it is something else and here what the commander says is done; don't ask, do; do not question my orders, do" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017). In these spaces, those who exercise authority are those who define what is done and who the subordinates become: "the soldier has three mandates, what he orders, how he orders it and that his order is fulfilled" (Julio, ex-soldier, personal interview August 5, 2016). Discipline and routines act as tools of submission, where everything that works in that space must be aligned under the directive of authority, and guided by intimidation, fear of punishment and surveillance of the acts: "everything there is directed, lace your boots, take a shower, get dressed, polish, you always have another person who is telling you what to do" (Julio, ex-soldier, personal interview, August 5, 2016).

Military service is lived as learning submission and self-denial internalized through rituals. The uniform and the shave represent renouncing the construction of their own subjectivity, in this regard a young man points out: "The soldier has to be shaved every day, his hair cut, his nails cut, he has to have his boots shined" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017). In this way, the soldier is a metaphor for the logic of the army and his body becomes a territory of control and military shaping.

Obedience is the only modality connection for the soldier; whoever does not obey becomes the object of offense and intimidation by superiors:

Few had the character of saying 'I don't want to', the fact that you said no to a command, meant that the command would turn the entire squad against you and threaten you saying that they would inform the captain" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017).

Obedying without question is compliance to commands, action without reflection, which favors the formation of an aggressive and violent character: "it is what the one who gives orders says, the more obedient the soldier is, the cooler he lives" (Julio, ex-soldier, personal communication, August 5, 2016). This molding is legitimized by the family: "when I came home, I was already a very different person, yes; so I arrived and they [the parents] somehow they had a perception of me as, oh yes, a real, little man! My father happy" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017).

The army forms a legitimate community of men in which collective feelings are created, such as military honor associated with the duty to cooperate with the strengthening of the army, with its public prestige and popular recognition (Fernández, 1986).

By contrast, for the pacifists, the feeling is of frustration and betrayal of themselves: "being a soldier is stupid because I am a pawn of the State, you're not worth anything, the rifle is worth more than you, because that is something that they always ask you about, the rifle" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017).

The result of becoming a soldier is the configuration of the disciplined, virile and courageous man that allows us to understand how the patriarchal society reproduces the relational logic of the army and its typical emotionalities. For the antimilitarists, the army represents the scenario where the relationship is based on obedience and the observance of commands, which at the same time, becomes the language of the soldier. Self-denial and submission is understood as the commitment to make the army the means of socialization of men, not only obedient but also warmongers. Military culture is submission and not freedom.

These findings coincide with Goffman's approach (2001) regarding the effects of the total institution – in this case the army – concerning the subjects' identity and corporeality. As a consequence of the initiation ritual, the various losses – in their own name, the objects and daily interactions that made the subject's previous identity plausible – through humiliation, corporal abuse and continuous demands for examples of submission, a series of "humiliations" of self and negative transformations of identity, from which it is extremely difficult to recover. In short, militarization and militarism signify modes of relationship, action and symbolization, both share the same logic (control), and represent the patriarchal values of strength and domination. For the antimilitarists, it is in this logic where hegemonic masculinity is reinforced, emotionally questioned and rejected.

Masculinity, Symbol of Power Relations, Violence and Submission

In social settings where war practices are legitimized and reproduced, hegemonic masculinity is the only reference of “a real man”: “for them (men) if the practice of war is very involved, [what] makes you more masculine” (María, Kolectivo Antimilitarista from Medellín, personal communication, January 22, 2017). Violence is related to “masculine” values such as the exaltation of strength, virility, aggressiveness, manliness, sexism, homophobia, etc.

"Being crude, with a very violent temperament, they recognize you as whoa, a real man ..., more man" (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, 2017). "Young people who go to the army think it's macho, they think it's the man on the block" (ENOC, 2014).

The masculine value is inversely proportional to the feminine devaluation. While the feminine is natural, the masculine must be achieved and tested through acts of virility (Ospina, H., Muñoz, S. & Castillo, J., 2011). The cult of masculinity is characterized by physical and verbal transgression between men and sexual offense against women (Ruíz, 2003). In a war context, women are spoils of war and men, on the contrary, position themselves as beings of superiority, protection and domination, as an ex-soldier understands it:

The man is strong, he does not cry, he cannot be weak, he has to deny his emotions while the woman is sensitive, protective, caring and, therefore, also expresses herself as an extension of that construction of a man believing that it is necessary to take care of her, protect her, stalk her and control her (Julio, ex-soldier, personal interview, August 5, 2016).

From the antimilitarist side it is objected: “that qualifier marks a lot to women because... what do you mean we are weak?! We are so weak that we are capable of giving life” (Woman in National Encuentro Nacional de Objetores de Conciencia, Group Interview 3, June 15, 2014)

The rejection of homosexuals¹ is interpreted as a matter of chauvinist culture: “if you are homosexual it means that you are not a man, then we are not going to force you to do men's things” (Andrés, ex-soldier, personal interview, March 15, 2017). Faced with this logic of relationship, feelings of disgust are activated, and resistance to hegemonic masculinity through practices of collective solidarity is activated as well:

1. On the Todelar network, Admiral García (2012) expressed: “It would not look good a couple of soldiers holding hands, kissing, that runs against the common sense and against ethics, morality and that is more or less what we always look for it to be safe in the institution”.

"We relate to each other to be able to contribute to a change in this society because we are annoyed, we are fed up with this society, because it is a society where the rule that presides is that of the strong male over the weak, so from weakness we come together and become strong and en masse we confront the force." (Payaso 01, KCNO member, Objector, personal interview, June 15, 2014).

The questioning of hegemonic institutions and models of masculinity coincides with the emergence of feelings such as love, solidarity, and trust among antimilitarists; feelings necessary for the practice of resistance and for cultures of peace.

Everyday Life Peacebuilding: Other Emotions to De-militarize Life Emotional Transformations of Hegemonic Masculinity

Emotions are militarized when men are limited in experiencing them; therefore, connecting with their feelings, which are denied because they are men, makes de-militarizing them a possibility (Theidon, 2009). Emotions are valued by antimilitarists and conscientious objectors who resist the militarization of life. The passion of political struggle, the conviction and diversity of emotions (solidarity, friendship, frustrations, fears and joys) are mutually shared. They are politically created and are the drivers for empowerment (strength) and continuous collective struggles as well, thus considering that emotions are the motivational strength of awareness: "The legal procedure may not have any impact if the young person has not been empowered in his feelings, from everything that fear causes" (Member 03, ACOC, Bogotá, group interview, July 17, 2016).

Antimilitarists and objectors are exposed to a series of emotional experiences by different kinds of struggles: "I think, the conviction and the passion we had at that moment for such an issue led us to carry out those actions of resistance" (Jorge, objector, Mennonite Church, Barranquilla, personal interview, July 21, 2016). Direct action as political action (antimilitarist) is strengthened by the collective impetus which inspires courage despite fear. The achievements become reasons for satisfaction, pleasure and dignity (feelings of power) since the objective to be heard is accomplished: "one goes to different places and there are also those actions that are seeds to evoke passion in others" (Raúl, objector, Quinto Mandamiento, Barrancabermeja, personal interview, June 18, 2016). Their wagers for peacebuilding from scratch claim these feelings.

Regarding their practices of resistance to everything symbolizing militarism and barriers to expressing their masculinity, the antimilitarists claim to be mobilized by feelings of courage and serenity in order to create new relationship practices: "I love my friends very much and I have no problem kissing my group colleagues on the cheek. It is a relationship that we've nurtured over a long time" (Payaso 01, pponent, personal interview, May 15 2014).

In their experience resisting the militarization of life, bonds of brotherhood are established through the struggles in which antimilitarists participate, contrary to the mutual group understanding of violence which is common in the armies (Rodríguez, 2011). "One establishes a brotherhood similar to the theme of AgroArte. They are people with whom one has lived struggles [...] the ties of friendship in the army were somehow quite strategic ones." (Juan, unconfined, objectors, AgroArte, Medellín, personal interview, September 22, 2016). Those fraternal relationships within the group drive subjective transformations and strengthen the movement.

Feelings such as love and solidarity emerge in group work, alien to militarism and war: "I bet on other values of freedom, love, awareness, other things that definitely have nothing to do with such militaristic society." (Gloria, antimilitarist, Taller de Redacción de declaración de objeción. Campaña Bájate del Camión. May 7, 2015). It is a strong feeling; the action must be immediate as solidarity demands it: "It is time to stop this slaughter among partners and start listening to each other, learn from love and solidarity, companionship, begin to build culture among everyone" (Ana María, antimilitarist, Campaña Bájate del Camión. May 7, 2015. Taller de Redacción de Declaración de objeción, 2015).

The HM model involves suppressing the men's feelings and expressions that are usually considered "feminine." The antimilitarists, on the contrary, show love, solidarity and empathy toward their fellow group members, and others without gender distinction:

"I think this is also a way to directly face the patriarchal and macho system in which we have been taught to live, [...] it is to break schemes where I cannot hug my partner, [...] where I can treat the girl as a friend, I don't have to be the dominant male over and opposite her. It's time to stop this shit!" (Payaso, group interview KCNO, November 23, 2014).

Therefore, the expression of tenderness has been normalized among men and they refuse to follow the heteronormativity commands. They recognize and celebrate diversity in gender and sexual orientations, both with the group members and with all the people they interact with outside the institution. This flexibility is a daily peacebuilding exercise. As other researchers propose (Bonino,

2002), the transformation of hegemonic male identities assumes the vindication of an ethics of equality, based on respect for difference, the denial of militaristic values (honor, courage, virility, aggressiveness) and the daily life establishment of new values and ideals such as peace, equity, freedom and antidogmatism.

Horizontal Relationships Framed in Non-violence

In contrast to blind obedience and submission, young people follow other practices. They resist any explicit warmongering mandate (military service, wars) or implicit one (daily life militarization), and demand disobedience of social institutions that perpetuate patriarchal or militaristic practices. During their daily life, antimilitarist groups strive to create an environment of democratic coexistence to be free from any relationship of subordination, domination or instrumentalization. Therefore, they are not organized hierarchically; their relationships are characterized by horizontality, autonomy, freedom of thought, participatory decision-making, and debate of ideas. These characteristics guide antimilitarists in different parts of the country: "Here relationships are horizontal, we all have the same salary and equal contribution. There is no boss but there is a schedule. There is group commitment." (Member 03, ACOC, Bogotá, group interview, June 17, 2016).

"We, in a certain way, look for the construction of our daily life in our surroundings, [...] but not because of any political party guideline or orientation, rather it is our thinking, our autonomy, [...] we have neither commanders or leaders, because each of us contributes with something, [...] therefore, the *Kolectivo Antimilitarista* is a response to a vertical construction, but we have a horizontal one. We do not believe in militarism as an army does to solve conflicts, instead we do believe in dialogue." (Voz 04, *Kolectivo Antimilitarista* from Medellín, Group interview August 15, 2014).

In their relationships with others (groups, NGOs, agents of the State or the public force, armed groups), they assert their rights and express their political convictions. The antimilitarists exhibit a nonviolent position when confronting the institutions that represent warmongering and patriarchy:

"Thinking of a peaceful non-violent answer [...] to deal with injustices. It is more insubordination than an uprising involvement of raised weapons, [...]. It is non-violent because it is not put in the same field of force, [...] and if I am

going to speak with a military man, with an armed actor and I get involved in the same kind of violent and angry discourse, he will pick on me, because he does what he knows; our position is different” (María, Kolectivo Antimilitarista from Medellín, personal interview, January 23, 2014).

As with the antimilitarist groups, there are other options in Colombia. According to Campuzano (2018) they participate in daily peacebuilding processes, not only in public actions to confront the armed actors, but when they learn not to attack their peers in their families or communities, thus prioritizing dialogue as a dispute resolution mechanism. Here peace is not a speech, but a daily practice:

“We are going to create all the methods possible but never crossed with violence, [...] How do I establish relationships of affection, and what do I have to articulate above and beyond a policy of war? This is a policy that considers emotions and how are we going to adopt it. Because it is difficult, we live in a patriarchal, violent society that has accustomed us to some dynamics. Well, let’s try to break those dynamics little by little” (Miembro 01, ACOC, Bogotá, group interview, June 17, 2016).

According to these young anti-militarists, non-violence is a daily way of relating to others which is different from “peace” as a speech that can be manipulated by the State, that covertly continue to support warlike practices:

“Many times, they say that peace is based on dialogue and other things, however history tells us this is a lie, that is, whoever uses the peace speech is manipulating minds, and [...] They have manipulated them for centuries” (Voz 04, Kolectivo Antimilitarista from Medellín, Group interview August 15, 2014).

Claims on Gender Equity and Diversity

In the same direction of building a culture of peace, antimilitarists oppose the dominance over women which is evidenced in war contexts (Suárez, 2015). The historically constructed gender hierarchy determines the way of thinking about oneself and relating to others. This patriarchal scenario is developed in social, economic and institutional structures (Connell, 2018) where the interest in reproducing exclusion practices and upholding the privileges of masculinity prevails. This same order also conditions their daily life. This implies, primarily, a subjective transformation, even for women, to de-naturalize gender violence:

“When you understand that there is a dominating system, you get upset. Once you manage to interpret the logic of competition or the logic of suspicion of the holy whore ‘Who knows why they killed her? Who knows why they raped her?’ Once you start to interpret such logic [...] it becomes unacceptable” (Ana, Red Feminista Antimilitarista, Medellín, personal interview, October 18, 2016).

Violence against women becomes a reason of outrage and action. In antimilitarist groups, men promote equality of conditions vis-à-vis their partners, and on a daily basis, they strive to break down stereotypes, prejudices and gender roles that place women in social “inferiority.” According to Tidy (2015), antimilitarist groups require processes of self-criticism in order not to reproduce within themselves the gender privileges and subordinations that militarism sustains. The antimilitarists who participated in the study state that they reject all forms of violence against women in any public or private sphere of life. In this sense, they recognize that peacebuilding implies the dismantling of armies or illegal armed groups, and also the eradication of the mistreatment, objectification, sexual exploitation of women, and their stigmatization as “weak and inferior” beings at all levels: educational, labor, and cultural.

This is part of the efforts to build a “feminist culture of peace” (Checa, Cid, 2003) stemming from “pacifistic feminism” (Rodríguez, 2011), which argues that militarism reinforces male domination and that, in order to attack the root causes of war, it is necessary to erode gender inequalities. Indeed, some research has identified that gender equality contributes to peace building in post-conflict situations (Bjarnegård and Melander, 2011), unveiling male domination gives rise to the recognition of other forms of exclusion that are at the basis of armed conflicts (Connell, 1995). With all this, it is not strange that overcoming injustices derived from the gender hierarchy is a necessary moment of the construction of cultures of peace (Tidy, 2015). Hence the importance of the articulation

of the antimilitarist and feminist movements, and of the active participation of women in both fields:

“Women, also actors, recipients and promoters of militarization and machismo exercises [...] have a strong political role as subjects of social transformation. They also have a political-ethical stance against the war and this is different from accompanying a man who is going through the objection process [...] this is important in creating links between objectors and feminist organizations.” (Woman at Encuentro Nacional de Objetores de Conciencia, Group Interview N° 3, May 15, 2014).

Instead of contempt or hatred toward what is considered feminine or weak, antimilitarists express solidarity, which extends beyond their collective, as they often contribute to other social struggles such as those involving feminists, indigenous populations, rural populations issues, environmental, workers, and those of the LGBTI community among others. In this sense, attention has been drawn to the importance of the intersectional perspective of the movement (Henry, 2017).

Political and Artistic Practices as an Alternative to Militarization of Life

As mentioned previously, the military institution reinforces traditional gender roles, as well as the assignment of activities in the same logical scheme. In opposition to this predetermination, those who make up antimilitarist collectives frequently develop their life projects around activism, art, community participation or the construction of knowledge in the field of social sciences. The daily construction of peace becomes, as some say, a way of life:

“I have been working on reconciliation with victims and perpetrators, in other processes I am working on non-violence, in others on conscientious objection. For me, it is all one thing, a whole process with the objective of building peace. So, today I can say that [...] it is a way of life, for me it is that, not a paid job [...] it is almost like a calling.” (Jorge, objector, Mennonite Church, Barranquilla, personal interview, June 21, 2016).

Through their collective practices, especially artistic ones, young antimilitarists seek to spread their antimilitarist and antipatriarchal convictions and, in

that sense, to achieve the reconfiguration of their own subjectivity and that of their audiences:

“Although from the oral discourse we often do not have the capacity to express what we feel, a feeling of creativity is generated that is materialized in the artistic [...] we are denouncing, at the same time we are proposing another way of establishing this relationship” (Payaso 07, KCNO member, Workshop on anti-militarist sentiments, dramatization, September 19, 2015).

But it is not only about artistic practices; pedagogical, political, communicative and legal actions, and especially nonviolent direct actions, are also part of the practices of these young activists: "there is the whole issue of nonviolent direct actions as a manifestation of the need to touch people's sensibility through totally different actions that break the everyday routine" (Member 01, ACOC, Bogotá, Group interview, June 17, 2016).

All these actions generate a feeling of strength that accompanies the daily work of the activists. As has been argued, in their practices of resistance to everything that symbolizes the militarization of life, antimilitarists recognize affections as the motive of their resistance actions, since allowing themselves to feel and build relationships in affections such as love, solidarity and freedom makes it possible to transform the relational logic of militarized and patriarchal societies.

Conclusions

This study has been proposed that social relations in patriarchy are structured on a gender regime that consists of the imposition of classification rules that regulate social practices and determine the unequal distribution of power, which are extended throughout the constitution of androcentric institutions, such as the military institution, founded on relationships of authority and obedience (Yuste, 2004; Otálora, 2015).

As a patriarchal institution, the army produces and promotes an HM model. It promotes the socialization of obedient and warlike men who, because of a supposed obligation acquired with the nation, enter the military forces. There they are involved in relationships marked by threats, intimidation and submission, which in themselves become expressions of militarization.

The relational logic of the military institution are studied without delving into the affective spheres, particularly those who resist being part of war. However, in this research, feelings such as fear, frustration, self-betrayal, among others, make sense as transversal affects (and subsumed) into the military experience. This study has managed to understand, following the voices of antimilitarists – some of whom served in the military – that the army is experienced as an organization that socializes its members through routines and disciplines that govern and control bodies, having as a horizon of meaning the formation of a (masculine) identity based on military feelings such as honor, pride and strength. The army is a total institution, where an abstraction of civilian life takes place so that soldiers learn new routines and modify their behavior. The feeling body of the soldiers is the first territory of militarization, through rituals that seek the subjugation of subjectivity. Military socialization recognizes these bodies and their affects and engraves in them discipline as a virtue, so that they can become agents for the subjugation of others. Soldiers are trained to obey and be obeyed. In the total institution, suffering is the protagonist and physical sanctions are legitimized with a view to the formation of soldiers.

Young people who oppose this expression of the patriarchal system – their bodies being turned into objects of homogenization and uniformity, and their territories into spaces of control and subjugation – construct practices of resistance to war, militarism and hegemonic masculinity, with which they oppose the reproduction of authoritarianism and subjugation, in a horizon of construction of relationships based on values alien to military contexts.

In this context of resistance (as a totality), the reciprocal affections of solidarity – friendship, love, companionship – are constituted as an emotional support in the face of the suffering to which the youth bodies are subjected. The collectives, which are located outside the barracks, are formed with few members around a system of emotions, supported by the relationships within the barracks and the culture of peace they help to create.

As antimilitarists they question the State's discourse of "peace," and additionally become agents of peace building in everyday life, through the different practices they develop in their collectives that have an impact on their communities: Nonviolent direct actions, popular pedagogy, artistic, legal, and other actions.

In the relational spaces of the collectives, they experience transformations of their subjectivity and feelings, previously shaped by the militarist and patriarchal culture. In this scenario of relationships and daily dialogues they have understood that *resisting war and patriarchal discourse* means welcoming social actors historically excluded or invalidated, such as women, and questioning aspects such as gender roles. They recognize that women have an active role,

both in the delegitimization of the discourse of war and in its deconstruction, and that the profound inequality promoted by the HM is a form of violence.

Rejecting all forms of violence against women, giving expression to the "feminine" affections that patriarchal culture has made them repress, they construct identities, orientations and expressions of gender and sexuality that escape the impositions of that culture. They construct alternative subjectivities and corporealities associated with their political activism as antimilitarists and, in many cases, with their projects as artists or community leaders. Likewise, these young people oppose all forms of authoritarianism and build horizontal, democratic relationships among themselves, based on dialogue, freedom and consensus, thus materializing their convictions around non-violence².

In line with this, Sharoni (2008) proposes that changes in meanings and practices are not a matter of personal decisions or choices, nor do they take place in a vacuum, but are related to social and political ideals. For her, there is a great difference between masculinities that are formed in the context of domination and those that are formed in a context of emancipation.

2. For an extension of the concept of nonviolence (different from no violence), as a value and argument of pacifism, consult: López M., Mario (2004; 2013).

References

- Acosta-Navas, J. P. (2021). Mujeres lideresas constructoras de paz en la comuna 1 de Medellín: una aproximación a las paces cotidianas construidas desde abajo. *Ánfora*, 28(50), 75-102. <https://publicaciones.autonoma.edu.co/index.php/anfora/article/view/712/532>
- Basabe, N. De Rivera (Eds.). (n.d.). *Superando la violencia colectiva y construyendo cultura de paz* (pp. 69-1001). Fundamentos. http://www.psicosocial.net/historico/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=755-superando-la-violencia-colectiva-y-construyendo-cultura-de-paz&category_slug=justicia-verdad-y-reparacion&Itemid=100225
- Basabe, N.; Valencia, J.; Bobowik, M. (2011). Valores y actitudes: cultura de violencia y paz. In D. Páez., C. Martín-Beristain, J. L. González, N. Basabe, J. De Rivera. (Eds.), *Superando la violencia colectiva y construyendo cultura de paz* (pp. 69-1001). Fundamentos. http://www.psicosocial.net/historico/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=755-superando-la-violencia-colectiva-y-construyendo-cultura-de-paz&category_slug=justicia-verdad-y-reparacion&Itemid=100225
- Belli, S.; Íñiguez, L. (2008). El estudio psicosocial de las emociones: una revisión y discusión de la investigación actual. *PSICO*, 39(2), 139 -151. <https://core.ac.uk/reader/132084624>
- Berger, P.; Luckman, T. (1986). *La construcción social de la realidad*. Amorrortu.
- Bjarnegård, E.; Melander, E. (2011). Disentangling Gender, Peace and Democratization: The Negative Effects of Militarized Masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 20(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2011.565194>
- Bonino, L. (2002). Masculinidad hegemónica e identidad masculina. *Dossiers feministes*, 6, 7-36. <http://www.raco.cat/index.php/DossiersFeministes/article/viewFile/102434/153629>

- Bonvillani, A. (2013). Cuerpos en marcha: emocionalidad política en las formas festivas de protesta juvenil. *Nómadas*, 39, 90-103.
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4702061>
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *La dominación masculina*. Anagrama.
- Butler, J. (2006). *El Género en disputa: el feminismo y la subversión de la identidad*. Paidós.
- Campuzano, G. (2018). Infancias y juventudes en contextos de vulnerabilidad: Prácticas y sentidos de paz frente a múltiples violencias. In L. López, M. Salazar (Eds.), *Políticas de construcción de paz: tránsitos, tensiones y lecciones aprendidas* (pp. 89-104). Universidad Pedagógica Nacional; Fundación Centro Internacional de Educación y Desarrollo Humano (CINDE); Universidad de Manizales; Colciencias. http://ceanj.cinde.org.co/programa/Archivos/publicaciones/Coleccion_virtual/5_POLITICAS_DE_CONSTRUCCION_DE_PAZ.pdf
- Carreño, D.F. (2019). *Narrativas antimilitaristas de la objeción de conciencia en Colombia* [Master Thesis]. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Bogotá.
<http://repository.pedagogica.edu.co/bitstream/handle/20.500.12209/10934/TO-23635.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Cefai, D. (2011). Diez propuestas para el estudio de las movilizaciones colectivas. De la experiencia al compromiso. *Revista de Sociología*, 26, 137-166.
<https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-529X.2011.27491>
- Checa, V., Cid del Prado, R. (2003). Nueva Masculinidad: Identidad, Necesidades Humanas y Paz. Asparkía: *Investigación Feminista*, 14, 33-43.
<http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Asparkia/article/view/108678/155040>
- Connell, R. W. (1995). La organización social de la masculinidad. In T. Valdes, J. Olavarría (Eds.). *Masculinidad/es: poder y crisis* (pp. 31-48). ISIS-FLACSO: Ediciones de las Mujeres N° 24. https://scholar.google.es/scholar?hl=es&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=La+organizaci%C3%B3n+social+de+la+masculinidad&btnG=
- Connell, R.W. (2018). *Género: Desde una perspectiva global*. Universidad de Valencia Publications PUV.

- Crespo, E. (2018). Un enfoque social sobre las emociones. In J. L. Álvaro (Coord.). *La interacción social. Escritos en homenaje a José Ramón Torregrosa* (pp.165-183). CIS. <https://eprints.ucm.es/57172/1/Eduardo%20Crespo%202018%20Un%20enfoque%20social%20sobre%20las%20emociones.pdf>
- Creswell, J. (1994): *Research Design. Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. Sage.
- Cruz, A. (2012). La razón de las emociones. Formación social, política y cultural de las emociones. *Eleuthera*, 6, 64 – 81. http://eleuthera.ucaldas.edu.co/downloads/Eleuthera6_6.pdf
- Donoso, I. (2015). *Nuevas Masculinidades. Una mirada transformadora de género* [Undergraduate work]. Universitat Jaume. <http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/handle/10234/136546>
- Espitia, L. (2018). *La relación entre el patriarcado y el militarismo en la política de defensa y seguridad democrática (2002-2004)* [Master thesis]. Universidad Nacional de Colombia.
- Fernández, F. (1986). El perfil diferencial de la escala de valores de la institución militar. *Revista de estudios políticos*, 51, 79-126. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=26897>
- Fernández, P. (2000). *La afectividad colectiva*. Taurus
- Figuera, J. G. (2005). Elementos para el estudio de la sexualidad y la salud de los varones integrantes de las fuerzas armadas. In E. López, E. Pantelides (Comp.), *Varones Latinoamericanos. Estudios sobre sexualidad y reproducción* (pp. 47-80). Paidós.
- Fisas, V. (2011). Educar para una Cultura de Paz. *Quaderns de construcció de pau*, 20, 2-8. https://escolapau.uab.cat/img/qcp/educar_cultura_paz.pdf
- Fuerzas militares. (March 5, 2012). *Almirante Roberto García Márquez rechaza gays en la Armada Nacional*. <http://www.fuerzasmilitares.org/notas/colombia/armada-nacional/357-almirante-roberto-garcia-marquez-rechaza-gays-en-la-armada-nacional.html>

- Gallego, A. M. (2018). El arquetipo del guerrero como factor determinante para la creación de la masculinidad hegemónica. *Revistas Unaula*, 4(7), 59-78. <https://publicaciones.unaula.edu.co/index.php/indisciplinas/article/view/669/884>
- Garay, F. (2014). *El hacerse hombre en la guerra: la construcción de las masculinidades en el caso de Bahía Portete* [Undergraduate Degree Project]. Universidad del Rosario. <https://repository.urosario.edu.co/handle/10336/6375>
- Goffman, I. (2001). *Sobre las características de las instituciones totales. En Internados. Ensayos sobre la situación social de los enfermos mentales*. Amorrortu.
- Granados, A. (2021). Prolegómenos para un enfoque de paces cotidianas. *Ánfora*, 28(50), 17-44. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7808883>
- Henry, M. (2017). Problematizing Military Masculinity, Intersectionality and Male Vulnerability in Feminist Critical Military Studies. *Critical Military Studies*, 3(2), 182-199. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/79648/1/Henry_Problematizing%20military%20masculinity_2017.pdf
- Héritier, F. (1996). *Masculino/femenino: el pensamiento de la diferencia*. Ariel.
- Hernández, I.; Luna, J. A.; Cadena, M. C. (2017). Cultura de paz: Una construcción desde la educación. *Revista Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana*, 19(28), 149 – 172. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/rhel/v19n28/v19n28a09.pdf>
- Hernández; F. (2003). *Miseria del militarismo. Una crítica del discurso de la guerra*. Virus editorial. <https://viruseditorial.net/paginas/pdf.php?pdf=miseria-del-militarismo.pdf>
- Isaza, J. (November 20, 2013). Militarismo. *El Espectador*. <http://www.elespectador.com/opinion/militarismo-columna-459572>
- López M. (2004). Poder, política y noviolencia. In B. Molina, F., Muñoz, (Eds.), *Manual de paz y conflictos* (pp. 357-384). Universidad de Granada. http://www.ugr.es/~mariol/files/publicaciones/capitulos_de_libro/noviolenia/46.pdf

- López M. (2013), Introducción a la no-violencia. *Vectores de investigación*, 7(7), 12-21. <https://revista-vectores-de-investigacion.com/gallery/7%20rvi%207%20revista.pdf>
- Mabee, B.; Vucetic, S. (2018). Varieties of militarism: Towards a *Typology*. *Security Dialogue*, 1- 13. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0967010617730948?casa_token=AdKrXmye64gAAAAA%3ALQGAwhAT3ng6wJ1PGrAxoNDRWfIwBKepDoflDBX9roIoEu4KIXQkv24ayqrXl1YsXWxpn9QyMNgPg
- Molina, T. (April 21, 2014). El gasto militar en Colombia en un escenario de posconflicto. *El Espectador*. <http://www.elespectador.com/noticias/nacional/el-gasto-militar-colombia-un-escenario-de-posconflicto-articulo-487367>
- Nussbaum, M. (2014). *Emociones políticas: ¿por qué el amor es importante para la justicia?* Paidós.
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura. (s.f.). *¿Qué es la cultura de paz?* <http://unescopaz.uprrp.edu/documentos/culturapaz.pdf>
- Ortega, P.; Gomez, J. (2010). *Militarismo en América Latina*. Justicia i Pau.
- Ospina, H.; Muñoz, S.; Castillo, J. (2011). Red Juvenil de Medellín: prácticas de desobediencia y resistencia al patriarcado y al militarismo. In *Experiencias alternativas de acción política con participación de jóvenes en Colombia* (pp. 43-61). Center for Advanced Studies in Childhood and Youth, a partnership between the Universidad de Manizales and CINDE. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35215549.pdf>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura. (n.d.). *¿Qué es la cultura de paz?* <http://unescopaz.uprrp.edu/documentos/culturapaz.pdf>
- Otálora, M. (2015). *Llevar el ejército en el pecho*. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.

- Parpart, J.; Partridge K. (2014). Soldiering on: Pushing Militarized Masculinities into New Territory. In M. Evans, C. Hemmings, M. Henry, H. Johnstone, S. Madhok, A. Plomien, S. Wearing. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Feminist Theory* (pp. 550-565). SAGE. <https://sk.sagepub.com/reference/the-sage-handbook-of-feminist-theory/n32.xml>
- Pérez, C. (2015). Una lectura de la autoridad a propósito de tres registros de la experiencia de mujeres cadetes en la escuela matriz del Ejército de Chile. *Revista de la Academia*, 19, 187-208. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6073849>
- Rambla, X. (2002). Soldados con género: clase social y masculinidad en el entrenamiento militar. *INGURUAK*, 34, 147-166. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=698130>
- Rodríguez, T. (2008). El valor de las emociones para el análisis cultural. *Papers*, 87, 145-159. <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/26259>
- Rodríguez, M. (2011). Hegemonic Masculinity and Counter-hegemonic Feminist Discourses for Peace. *Prisma Social*, 7, 369-405. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3804917>
- Rosas, O. (2011). La estructura disposicional de los sentimientos. *Ideas y Valores*, 145, 5-31. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S0120-00622011000100001&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=es
- Ruíz, R. (2003). *Por una masculinidad sin violencia*. CEAMEG- Chamber of Deputies.
- Ruiz, J. A. (2012). Calidad en la educación militar, estabilidad en la democracia: un recorrido histórico por las aulas de la Escuela Militar colombiana. In H. Klepak (Comp.) *Formación y educación militar: los futuros oficiales y la democracia* (p.135-168). RESDAL.
- Salazar, O. (2013). *Masculinidades y ciudadanía: Los hombres también tenemos género*. Dykinson.
- Sandoval, L.; Otálora, M. (2015). Desarrollo corporal y liderazgo en el proceso de formación militar. *Revista Científica General José María Córdova*, 13(16), 33-53. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/recig/v13n16/v13n16a03.pdf>

- Scheve, C.; Ismer, S. (2013). Towards a Theory of Collective Emotions. *Emotion Review*, 5(4), 406-413.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258997923>
- Serrano, E. (1972). El Ejército, institución social, jurídica y política. *Revista de Estudios Políticos*, 185, 65-108.
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1710580>
- Schettini, P.; Cortazzo, I. (2015). *Análisis de datos cualitativos en la investigación social: procedimientos y herramientas para la interpretación de información*. Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Sharoni, S. (2008). De-Militarizing Masculinities in the Age of Empire. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 37(2), 147-164.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290741490_De-Militarizing_Masculinities_in_the_Age_of_Empire
- Sirimarco, M. (2004). Marcas de género, cuerpos de poder. Discursos de producción de masculinidad en la conformación del sujeto policial. *Cuadernos de Antropología Social*, 20, 61-78.
<https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1809/180913912005.pdf>
- Suárez, I. (2015). Violencia de género y violencia sexual del conflicto armado colombiano. *Cambios y Permanencias*, 6, 173-203.
<https://revistas.uis.edu.co/index.php/revistacyp/article/view/7097>
- Tidy, J. (2015). Gender, Dissenting Subjectivity and the Contemporary Military Peace Movement in Body of War. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(3), 454-472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2014.967128>
- Theidon, K. (2009). Reconstrucción de la masculinidad y reintegración de excombatientes en Colombia. *Fundación Ideas para la paz, Serie Working papers*, 5, 3-28. <http://www.bivipas.unal.edu.co/bitstream/10720/642/1/266-theidon%2C%20kimberly.pdf>
- Ubillos, S.; Beristain, M.; Garaigordobil, M.; Halperin, E. (2011). Agresión, odio, conflictos intergrupales y violencia colectiva. In D. Páez, D. Martín-Beristain, C. González, J. L.

- Urzúa, S. (2011). Cuerpos en confrontación. Hacia un análisis del cuerpo y las emociones en la manifestación política en Chile neoliberal. *Persona y Sociedad*, 25(2), 101-123.
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3752876>
- Vain, D. (2012). El enfoque interpretativo en investigación educativa: algunas consideraciones teórico-metodológicas. *Revista de Educación*, 4, 37-46.
http://fh.mdp.edu.ar/revistas/index.php/r_educ/article/viewFile/83/146
- Vasilachis, I. (2007). El aporte de la epistemología del sujeto conocido al estudio cualitativo de las situaciones de pobreza, de la identidad y de las representaciones sociales. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(3), 1-29.
<https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/74736>
- Yuste, J. (August 16, 2004). *Antimilitarismo y feminismo: el cuestionamiento a la cultura patriarcal de dominación*. Tortuga Animalist Group.
<http://www.grupotortuga.com/Antimilitarismo-y-feminismo-el>
- Zarzuri, R.; Lecourt, J. (2007). *Jóvenes, servicio militar y objeción de conciencia: notas introductorias*. Editorial Hombre Nuevo. http://www.archivochile.com/Poder_Dominante/ffaa_y_orden/Sobre/PDffaa sobre0025.pdf