

“One of the Guys”: Military Women, Paradoxical Individuality, and the Transformations of the Argentine Army

Máximo Badaró

ABSTRACT In this article, I examine institutional life in the Argentine Army today from the perspective of female soldiers, with particular emphasis on the opportunities for agency available to these women in the army and the possibilities of institutional change they unintentionally produce. I show how female soldiers have made possible the concept of a military subject open to values from different dimensions of their identities. The agency of these female soldiers does not contain any explicit intentionality to resist or subvert institutional norms and values associated with military masculinity; rather, this agency is to be found in the different kinds of individuality that female soldiers bring into view inside and outside the army. Through their practices, ideas, and conceptions of military activity, female soldiers pave the way for discussing a key dimension in the redefining of the relations among the armed forces, the state, and society at large in present-day Argentina: soldiers as citizens. In this way, the experiences of women in the Argentine Army mirror internal changes within the military institution, where they also chart the scope, ambiguity, and contradictions present in the ongoing democratization of Argentine society. [*military women, Argentine Army, female agency*]

RESUMEN En este artículo analizo la vida institucional del Ejército Argentino actual desde la perspectiva de las mujeres militares, énfaticando en las oportunidades de agencia disponibles para estas mujeres en el ámbito militar así como en los cambios institucionales que ellas involuntariamente contribuyen a producir. En el artículo muestro cómo estas mujeres han hecho posible el surgimiento de una concepción del sujeto militar que se encuentra abierta a la valoración de diferentes dimensiones identitarias. La agencia de las mujeres militares no contiene una intencionalidad explícita de resistir o subvertir las normas y valores institucionales del Ejército Argentino asociados con la masculinidad militar; por el contrario, esta agencia radica más bien en los diferentes formas de individualidad que ellas ponen de relieve tanto dentro como fuera del ámbito militar. A través de sus prácticas, ideas y concepciones de la actividad militar estas mujeres abren el camino para la discusión de una dimensión clave en la redefinición de las relaciones entre las fuerzas armadas, el estado y la sociedad en la Argentina actual: los militares como ciudadanos. Las experiencias de las mujeres en el Ejército Argentino reflejan tanto los cambios internos de la institución militar como los alcances, ambigüedades y contradicciones del proceso de democratización de la sociedad argentina. [*mujeres militares, Ejército Argentino, agencia femenina*]

In early 2004, retired General Arévalo and I were walking through the halls of the stately Colegio Militar de la Nación (CMN), the only officer academy of the Argentine Army, when the general suddenly halted, pointed to a door, and said: “Look, that’s the place where I realized that the army had changed.”¹ When attending a ceremony the year before, he had been about to walk through a doorway when he saw a female officer approaching it as well. This brought him up against a cultural and institutional paradox: “According to rank, I should go first, but as a man, I should let the lady go first.” Women and soldiers were, for this officer, two opposing identities. He opted to let the lady go first. His reaction exemplifies the ambiguous and paradoxical position of military women in the Argentine Army, as well as the tensions that women have sparked since their incorporation into the officer corps in 1997.

In this article, I analyze how military women deal with these ambiguities and this paradox in their attempts to be recognized as both women and soldiers in the Argentine Army. Although there had been female nurses in the Argentine Army since the 1980s, women interested in actual soldiering had to wait until 1996 when they were allowed to join as rank-and-file soldiers. But it wasn’t until 1997 that women were allowed to apply for officer training in the CMN (Lucero 2009). Since 1997, women between the ages of 17 and 25 have been eligible to apply for officer training at the CMN. If accepted, they become part of the “Command Corps,” which includes officers from all the combat arms of the army.² After four years of study, they graduate as second lieutenants with a university degree and no ceiling on future rank. When the first 13 women graduated from the CMN in December 2000, the Argentine Army became the first military institution in Latin America to have female officers. As is the case for most members of the Argentine Army, female soldiers come from the lower middle class. In 2010, women made up ten percent of the personnel of the army; this included three percent of the Command Corps; two percent of the Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) Corp; 15 percent of the Command Corps cadets at the CMN; 42 percent of the professional staff (nurses, doctors, and lawyers) in the officer corps; and 16 percent of enlisted soldiers (Ministerio de Defensa de la Argentina 2010).³

The ambiguous position that female soldiers occupy in most of the armed forces in the world is associated with a deeply rooted historical narrative that naturalizes the link between men and the armed forces, associating masculinity with physical strength and emotional self-control and feminizing the idea of nation, thus designating men as its rightful guardians (Stiehm 1982). Women who choose a military career in the Argentine Army are aware that they are entering into a typically male organization that will grant them marginal symbolic and moral status. But this does not discourage their willingness to be part of a gendered regime predicated on their subordination. In fact, most of them are not interested in subverting the hegemonic masculine

values, images, and practices shaping military life. On the contrary, they just want to be “one of the guys.”

In this article, I show that by complying with both conventional definitions of female identity and traditional military male behavior—two dimensions that army members perceive as mutually opposite—female soldiers enact a paradoxical individuality that destabilizes traditional conceptions of military individuality and can operate as a relevant source of individual agency. I argue that enacting this paradoxical individuality opens up a possible association of the image of the military with social identities that the Argentine Army has historically resisted: the officer as worker and, more broadly, as citizen. I develop this argument by examining ambiguities of military femininity and military corporality, as well as the relationships between military women and the informal transformations of hierarchy and discipline inside the army. Although apparently marginal to the commonplace view of military life as centered on training for and carrying out military operations, these dimensions shape the everyday experience of female soldiers in an army that is currently not involved in any armed conflict. It is precisely in these interstitial spheres of military life that these women, acting out of a paradoxical individuality, have unintentionally promoted certain telling transformations in present-day army life.

This article is based on data I gathered in the course of observation, interviews, and informal conversations carried out from October 2002 to the end of 2011 with both male and female soldiers of varying ranks in the Argentine Army, many of whom were CMN cadets or young officers.⁴ Also included is what I have learned from 2007 to 2010 as a consultant to the Council on Gender Policy of the Argentine Ministry of Defense. This advisory position has provided me with firsthand experience, from a different perspective, of the problems and everyday aspirations of the female members of the Argentine Army.

GENDER AND THE TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE ARGENTINE ARMY

The main purpose of the democratically elected administrations in office since 1983 was to reduce the autonomy of the armed forces by subordinating them to civilian control. Raúl Alfonsín, the first postdictatorial president, drastically reduced the military budget, tried officers accused of human rights violations during the preceding military dictatorship (1976–1983) in civilian courts, and passed a law banning the intervention of the armed forces in domestic conflicts. During the two terms of the next president, Carlos Menem (1989–1999), while both the military budget and public-sector areas controlled by the armed forces were further reduced, immunity was granted to officers accused of human rights violations; Argentine foreign policy was also brought into close alignment with that of the United States (López and Pion-Berlin 1996).

These measures weakened seriously the political power, autonomy, and social prestige of the Argentine Army. In the

mid-1990s, the military needed to transform its internal structure, recover its poor public image, reverse a deep crisis of recruitment, and become more permeable to social and cultural transformations. In this context, military and political authorities promoted different changes in the armed forces: the participation in international peacekeeping missions of the UN; the abolition of conscription and the establishment of a professional all-volunteer force in 1994; the adoption of a university-level officer-training program within the CMN in 1997, which became part of the national university system; and the incorporation of female soldiers in 1997, who were perceived as probable agents of democratization and of change to institutional values. In Japan, for instance, the Self Defense Forces associate their own peaceful behavior with their female members (Frühstück 2007:126).

It should be noted that incorporation of women into the Argentine Army was an independent initiative of the military authorities to which the national government rapidly added its support. At that time, no political actor or social movement was interested in advocating for action in this direction. With this precursory measure, the Argentine Army mirrored a broader historical process in which equal gender rights and opportunities were being advanced nationally and at both the legislative and the judicial levels. For instance, the new constitution from 1994 made explicit the need to ensure genuine equality of opportunity, treatment, and rights of women and men in the fields of society, politics, and the state. Moreover, in 1997, the executive branch of the national government approved the Equal Treatment Act for Civil Servants, which, a year later, was reinforced by a new national decree establishing the guidelines for a Plan for Equal Opportunities for Men and Women in the Workplace.

Nevertheless, a real interest in the status of women in the Argentine Army would not appear explicitly on the national political and social agenda until Nilda Garré became Minister of Defense in November of 2005. While Garré was Minister of Defense (2005–2010), gender issues gained tremendous importance in national defense policymaking. In 2006, Garré created the Observatory on the Integration of Women in the Armed Forces, which conducted polls and interviewed hundreds of male and female soldiers and became an important source of data regarding women in the Argentine military. In early 2007, Garré created the Council on Gender Policy, which remains active today. It is made up of female soldiers from different branches of the armed forces. There are also representatives from state agencies who are working on gender and human rights issues and academic researchers who specialize in military and gender topics.

Council members have been meeting once a month since 2007 to consider gender-related matters. Many of the discussions have led to ministerial-level resolutions modifying normative frameworks and creating new institutional spaces, among which the Gender Offices, functioning in different areas of the armed forces, are especially noteworthy. Staffed

by female soldiers, these offices provide military authorities with guidance on how to employ a gender perspective when dealing with military staff, as well as on how to handle complaints regarding gender issues. The majority of the issues identified and handled by the council had to do with making working conditions in the military compatible with the demands of family life; specific topics included the length of the work day, maternity leave, and the provision of daycare for children.

Notwithstanding these innovations, gender matters continue to elicit little or no interest among scholars focusing on the Argentine armed forces. In fact, since the beginning of the first postdictatorial government in 1983, the primary focus of such studies has been oriented toward analyzing the levels of military autonomy under the subsequent democratic regimes, the military's participation in politics, the military's relationship to the state (Canelo 2010; Diamint 1999; Fitch 1998; López and Pion-Berlin 1996; Sain 2010), and the juridical consequences of the human rights violations committed in the 1970s (Acuña and Smulovitz 1995; Hershberg and Agüero 2005). At present, research on Latin American armed forces is mainly focused on issues such as security, regional defense, and peacekeeping operations; a very low priority has been given to analyzing the armed forces as a social and professional institution or examining the actual experience of its members.⁵ In the case of Argentina, very little is known about the day-to-day experience of soldiers during the present period of democratic stability.

WOMEN IN THE ARMY

Women trying to be “one of the guys” in the Argentine Army raise a unique set of analytical problems for researchers studying female autonomy in male organizations and their capacity to produce institutional changes. Theories of “gender and organization” have approached these issues by assuming that women working in predominantly male organizations are either subordinated to or resisting male domination (Acker 1990; Britton 2000). This approach is also found in most studies that analyze the experiences of women in the armed forces. While these studies have focused on the factors that determine the admission of women into the army, the degree of integration they achieve, and the discrimination mechanisms that they confront (Dandeker 2003; Segal 1995), the few sources of research focused on how women deal with the constraints of organizational masculinity in different armed forces of the world conclude that most of these military women adopt conservative strategies that reproduce and legitimize the hegemonic gender regime, thus presenting no threat of institutional change (for Canada, see Winslow and Dunn 2002; for France, see Sorin 2006; for Israel, see Hauser 2011 and Sasson-Levy 2003; for the Netherlands, see Carreiras 2006 and Sion 2008; for Portugal, see Carreiras 2006). In these studies, the way military women deal with their ambiguous status in the army tends to be reduced to a subordination–resistance dichotomy. Nevertheless, my research shows that the complexities of women's

experiences in this masculine organization cannot be reduced to this dichotomy, which leaves little room for the analysis of the ambiguities and changing meanings of women’s practices.

To explore these complexities, I build on anthropological studies that approach the experiences of women without foregoing normative or universal definitions of what constitutes an autonomous action or an act of resistance in gender relations. Sherry Ortner (1996, 2006), for instance, shows that female agency cannot be understood without taking into account the individual projects, desires, and experiences that women express and achieve through the different “power games” in which they are involved. Ortner argues that the same “power game” that produces the subordination of women in a specific setting—for instance, the relationship between men and women in church, the factory, or the army—can enhance individual projects or produce liberating effects when viewed in relation to another sphere of power such as the family or the community.

Similarly, Mindie Lazarus-Black, in her analysis of women seeking legal redress from domestic abuse in Trinidad, shows that for women “agency, like power, is fluid and dynamic, belonging less to any one individual actor than to the highly contextualized interactions between parties at different sites along a shared process—be it either the legal process or the process of including women in higher education, professions, sports, or international development” (Lazarus-Black 2001:394). A different focus on what women’s actions actually produce and effectuate in specific contexts can be found in Saba Mahmood’s (2005) study of urban middle-class Egyptian women participating in the Islamic revival movement that placed women in a marginal position. Mahmood shows that through these pious practices, these women gain more respect and autonomy vis-à-vis family, friends, and other social ties. Female autonomy can even arise from the same mechanisms that produce their domination without any need or explicit intention to subvert them.

These studies show that female agency cannot be simply assumed from women’s acceptance or rejection of male domination; it must be deduced from contextualized and specific power relations that enable different forms of subordination and autonomy. As critics of the “romanticized” conception of women’s resistance have stated (Abu-Lughod 1990; Kondo 1990), the exercise of power in gender relations is full of contradictions and ambiguities. In this article, I expand these studies by analyzing the paradoxical position that women occupy in the Argentine Army and by considering the results that this position produces in individual and institutional terms.

Following Michel Foucault’s (2000:341) conception of power as a “set of actions” that “operates on the field of possibilities in which the behavior of active subjects is able to inscribe itself,” I suggest that the hegemonic notion of the individual that prevails in the Argentine Army is a key component of the organizational “field of possibilities” in which

women negotiate their position. While some studies show that women’s choices in different armed forces around the world—complying with traditional feminine expectations or behaving in masculine ways—alter only the definitions of women as individuals but present no threat to traditional gendered definitions of the military (Carreiras 2006; Hauser 2011), I argue that the behavior of military women also alters traditional definitions of military men as individuals, which in turn contributes to undermining the gendered definition of the military identity.

My analysis shows that military women unintentionally challenge the holistic representation of the military individual that male soldiers are supposed to embody in the Argentine Army. When trying to be identified as “one of the guys,” female soldiers do not envisage the military individuality as a whole associated with a stable identity but, rather, view it as a moral, social, and professional performance that allows them to carry out personal projects. They enact a paradoxical individuality that does not try to eliminate either of the two terms that the hegemonic image of the military individual depicts as opposite—“woman” and “soldier.” The ways in which female soldiers live and perform this paradoxical individuality constitutes their primary source of agency.⁶

The predominant concept of individuality in the Argentine Army is similar to the holistic one analyzed by Louis Dumont (1970) in his study of the caste system in India, in which individuals can only be conceived as an expression of the moral whole encompassing them, in relation to which they are obliged to define themselves. Similarly, membership in the Argentine Army takes precedence over claims to individuality. Military socialization, for example, subordinates physical and psychological characteristics, as well as personal interests and motivations, to the hierarchical position of the individual within the military institution. Personal desires devoid of collective values run the risk of being perceived as either a threat to institutional cohesion or an indication of insufficient “military spirit” (Badaró 2009). Such a holistic concept of individuality has profound implications for the ways in which gender relations are shaped in the Argentine Army today. Male soldiers who object to the presence of women in the army tend to question the legitimacy of either their womanhood or their military identity. The result is the perception of female soldiers as fragmented subjects whose sex bars them from integrally incorporating a military identity. Paradoxically, this exclusionary mechanism is precisely the point at which a certain potential for agency among female cadets and officers emerges, making possible a transformation in the institutional conception of the military subject.

REDEFINING FEMININITY

The criticism of traditional models of femininity is commonplace in the experience of women in armies around the world. The female soldiers in the Israeli Army studied by Orna Sasson-Levy (2003), for example, sought to differentiate themselves from the traditional stereotype of the

subjugated, servile, weak woman by adopting “antifeminine” behavior and emulating masculine military conduct. By the same token, the female Dutch soldiers studied by Liorna Sion (2008) try to become strong individuals and gain the acceptance of their male counterparts in two contrasting ways: by neutralizing their feminine traits or by becoming hypersexualized. Further instances of this same behavior are explored by Helena Carreiras (2006) in her research on the Dutch and Portuguese armed forces. This author identifies “conformist” strategies in women who minimize their femininity to avoid excessive visibility and conflict with their male counterparts. By contrast, “complicit” women adopt attitudes that reinforce the roles and images of traditional femininity. Carreiras also identifies a strategy emphasizing an emancipative femininity that, unlike the “complicit” strategy, aims at imposing the specificity of the women who practice it to defend their interests in the military world without feeling obliged to adapt to prevailing masculine norms. However, this strategy has few practitioners; most female soldiers adopt conformist integration strategies aimed at minimizing their differences and visibility.

From different analytical perspectives, these studies concur on one point: female soldiers alter hegemonic representations of feminine identity within the military. Sasson-Levy accurately observes that the disruptive effect female soldiers exercise in the Israeli Army is due to the fact that they bring into play a hybrid subject that is difficult to categorize: “the identity of these female soldiers is neither the stereotypical, subjugated, traditional female identity nor that of the man/soldier, but is rather located somewhere in between” (2003:453). However, this author points out that the conservative attitude of most female soldiers tends to diminish the subversive potential of the hybrid subject they represent: “Women soldiers reproduce and reaffirm masculinity as the exclusive source of military authority. In this way, despite personally subverting the military’s construction of masculinity and femininity, they ultimately identify with the military’s ideology, its laws, and its rules” (2003:453).

These researchers lament that the conservative integrative strategies adopted by most female soldiers are ineffective in modifying the prevailing gender regime in the military world. From this viewpoint, female soldiers are expected to develop a political agency that they themselves do not, in fact, recognize as such. The lack of evidence for the existence of this agency is taken as proof that military women are being manipulated by a system that grants them a feeling of individual self-esteem in exchange for their reinforcing and legitimizing the very ideological mechanism that authorizes their gender subordination. The problem with this assumption is that it minimizes both the multiple meanings that female soldiers attribute to their membership in the armed forces and the modalities of agency that they can find or elaborate in the power relations in which they are involved in the army.

In December of 2002, I spent six days with CMN cadets undergoing military training in Patagonia. One day, while

making the rounds of the tent area where we all slept, a young male captain and I heard a woman’s voice behind us severely reprimanding someone: “What are you doing, cadet? Hurry up! What’s wrong with you? We haven’t got all day to wait for you, you know!” Automatically we both turned our heads. When the captain saw that the voice belonged to a fourth-year female cadet who was dressing down a second-year male, he looked at me, surprised, and said, smiling: “Look at Rodriguez! Well done, well done!” The cadet was Moira Rodriguez. The day before, while walking around the camp, in the distance I had seen Moira and Romina, another fourth-year cadet, applying what I took to be makeup: dressed in combat uniform, with a mirror in one hand and what looked like lipstick or eye shadow in the other, the two female cadets seemed intent on applying their makeup.

When I approached them, however, it turned out that what appeared to be makeup was, in fact, green and black sticks of camouflage. “I thought you were putting on makeup,” I said in an attempt to break the ice, while at the same time hoping that seeing them as women, not soldiers, would not make my remark sexist. Quite to the contrary, my interlocutors took it as a compliment that opened the way for reflections on the issue of femininity among female soldiers. While finishing her “face painting,” Moira said to me: “I used to be very feminine; before joining, I was totally different from what I am now. I was the typical spoiled child . . . I came here and made a complete U-turn in my personality. You can still be feminine, but you acquire other things that you normally wouldn’t have. Here they train you, temper your character.” Romina listened attentively, nodding in agreement with her fellow cadet’s words.

After finishing their camouflage, Moira and Romina inspected the interior of a tent storing weapons and ammunition, gave a couple of orders to some male cadets under their command, and began cleaning their guns. I accompanied them, making almost no comment; their actions clearly reflected what they had said in our conversation prior. Moira had referred to her joining the army as both a moment of “liberation” from the family she left behind in the small provincial town where she grew up and as an opportunity to “become a responsible person.” As for Romina, she had said that signing up for the army allowed her to take on the capacity of becoming a “leader”—a figure that she associated with mainly masculine attributes and behavior that contradicted traditional images of femininity.

What Moira and Romina were elaborating on in 2002 was an image of the female soldier that I would see repeated in the practices and representations of the vast majority of female cadets and officers with whom I became acquainted in the course of almost a decade of fieldwork in the Argentine Army. Silvana was a 28-year-old officer when I met her in 2008 at a Council on Gender Policy meeting. The firmness and critical tone that she adopted at this meeting when answering questions posed by higher-ranking male officers concerning the treatment of women in the army drew my

attention. What distinguished Silvana was the self-assurance and conviction with which she described the serious difficulties confronting military women who wanted both a home and family life and to fulfill their military obligations and advance professionally as well. Up to that point, I had never seen an officer speak in such a way to a high-level officer.

Several weeks later, Silvana and I met for a chat in the restaurant at the Ministry of Defense. With her hair pulled back off her face and wearing little makeup, inconspicuous earrings, a tailored blouse, and dark skirt, Silvana was indistinguishable from the professional women one sees on the street in downtown Buenos Aires. From the start, it was clear that she had reflected a great deal on her experience as a woman in the army. She described how she had progressively “lost” her former concern for typically feminine beauty care routines related to makeup and hair and body care. “I don’t have time for it; I have more important things to do.” The “important things” were her professional career and family. She was married, had two children, and had been in the army for almost ten years. When referring to what place “femininity” holds in the military, she smiled, raised her eyebrows with a sardonic air, and said: “The soldier must be a leader who expresses himself energetically, whose conduct is exemplary, and who generates respect; that’s why femininity has no place in the barracks” (conversation with author, September 8, 2008).

In spite of this statement, in the course of our conversation Silvana went out of her way to show that she had no desire to undermine her femininity; she simply expressed it outside the military world: “When I go to a party, that’s the occasion to put on makeup and apply face and body creams; then I put on my best dress and all the jewelry my husband has given me. But in the barracks you have to be a soldier.” In truth, although many female soldiers attempt to recast their understanding of what femininity means, the fear of being seen as unfeminine is also present to some extent. For instance, Soledad, a cadet with whom I spoke in a CMN classroom in 2011, said: “Just because I’m a cadet doesn’t mean I’m going to stop being feminine. I go dancing on my days off; I have a boyfriend, I dress well, I wear makeup, and I wear my hair down. There it’s one thing, and here it’s another” (conversation with author, May 9, 2011).

During almost a decade of conversations with female cadets and officers, I observed this ambiguity regarding femininity expressed over and over again. In the army, women try to remain at an arm’s length from the stereotyped model of feminine behavior in order to identify themselves with the hegemonic model of male military masculinity while at the same time appealing to some aspects of this same stereotype when referring to their lives outside the military milieu. According to Katia Sorin (2006), female soldiers in the French army face similar dilemmas regarding femininity as do Argentinian female soldiers: “It is by no means rare to encounter, within the same conversation, two positions between a total rejection of any feminine benchmarks (so-called “feminine” values) and also a search for or validation of such

benchmarks and of some of these values” (Sorin 2006:92). Sion (2008) also found a dichotomy between the neutralization or reinforcement of sexuality and femininity in the different strategies that female soldiers adopted to find their place and gain acceptance in male groups of NATO Dutch peacekeeping units in Bosnia and Kosovo. In the Argentine Army, the ambiguity that female soldiers describe regarding the expression of traditional feminine aesthetic “values” inside the barracks should not be taken to mean that any trait traditionally associated with the figure of a woman becomes invisible or is limited to the symbolic field of conventional femininity. Nor was there any attempt on the part of my interlocutors to superimpose an alternative to the traditional concept of womanhood. On the contrary, the aim of officers like Silvana was to gain institutional recognition and legitimacy for the traditional roles of wife and mother as integral parts of the professional life of military women.

Unlike their female counterparts, male officers and cadets are obliged to incorporate a concept of masculinity that, despite different degrees and levels of expression, must be manifested constantly both inside and outside the armed forces. For them there is no place for the distinction Soledad makes between “here” and “there.” While most men in the Argentine Army share the perception of military women as ambiguous, fragmented individuals incapable of becoming fully incorporated into the armed forces, the female soldiers I encountered attempted to resignify this ambiguity by affirming the possibility of symbolically dissociating themselves from their military status to become “civilians” in specific situations and contexts.

The gender policies implemented by the Ministry of Defense since 2007 have granted institutional recognition and legitimacy to the ambiguities and paradoxes resulting from the tensions between femininity and male military norms inherent in the experience of women in the armed forces. In fact, most military women I met in the Argentine Army did not feel that adopting hegemonic masculine norms (Connell 1995) would necessarily threaten their femininity. Rather, they emphasized the opportunity this gave them to redefine the links between their subjectivity and gender identity, on the one hand, and their social background, on the other hand. When viewed unilaterally from the perspective of the domination–resistance dialectic, the behavior and values adopted by female soldiers for the purpose of gaining recognition and acceptance in the military would seem to reinforce submission at the expense of the freedom to act autonomously. However, this view changes when female agency is understood in terms of not only the power relations in which women are involved but also the personal desires and projects (Ortner 2006) they hold when entering the military world to pursue a professional career. Seen in this light, incorporating masculine norms and practices and behaving accordingly fosters feelings of self-esteem, social respect, and even moral superiority.

For most military women, the femininity existing “outside” is synonymous with comfort, superficial pleasure,

and emotional weakness. Their views echo a deeply rooted representation among military members, for whom the civilian world outside is a place where everybody, especially young people, lacks values and moral principles. By contrast, inside the military world these women aim to elaborate a kind of femininity that, without invalidating certain hegemonic gender codes “outside” such as the importance of personal appearance, incorporates into their gender identity moral values like honor, courage, and individual responsibility, which female civilians allegedly lack. In this sense, being “one of the guys” in a group can be an important mechanism for acquiring professional respect. This was suggested by Vanesa, a 29-year-old officer, with whom I spoke in the CMN library in 2011:

I love to feel like I’m just one of the guys here. I don’t feel different now. My last name [is] García [. . . I] could be Carlos García or Vanesa García; it makes no difference. They [male officers] don’t have to act differently because “García” is present. And to me that’s just great. I don’t want them to change their vocabulary when I’m there. My husband is an officer, and he says his comrades have to watch their words when I’m there because there is a lady present, but I tell him that he sees me as a lady, while the others see me as one of the guys, and that speaks well for the integration of women in the army. [conversation with author, May 10, 2011]

The paternalistic attitude adopted by male soldiers toward their female counterparts is one of the most common ways of marginalizing women in the armed forces. Firmly anchored in the aristocratic components of traditional military masculinity that depict the soldier as a “gentleman” who must be courteous to and protective of women, this attitude highlights the ambiguity of the figure of military woman. I have heard many comments and complaints from female cadets and officers about the “protection” they receive from military authorities. This paternalism prevents female soldiers from experiencing the same kind of treatment as their male counterparts; the result is a devaluation of the military training of these women who, according to male soldiers, have not been subjected to treatment and situations demanding enough to have acquired the real “military spirit.”

However, in her attempt to be “one of the guys,” Vanesa challenges the legitimacy of her own husband’s paternalistic attitude when he expects other officers to treat her like a “lady.” She demands respect for institutional mechanisms, such as the one decreeing the use of last names in interpersonal relations, which give priority to profession over gender identity. Like many female soldiers, Vanesa makes no attempt to gain male recognition by appealing to frameworks of meaning outside the military sphere. On the contrary, she and her counterparts aspire to institutionally legitimize their actions in relation to traditional military virtues and values such as obedience, bravery, loyalty, and honor. This identification with traditional values is where they find both the primary obstacles to being accepted in the army and the greatest potential for shaping a sense of individual agency.

Studies of military women in Japan (Frühstück 2007), Portugal (Carreiras 2006), and France (Sorin 2006) have

shown that, for most female soldiers, joining the army is a way of challenging social conventions and expectations related to women’s roles and capacities. This is also the case of Argentine female soldiers. In the Argentine Army, many discover a sense of individual agency when overcoming obstacles that require “masculine” standards of physical strength. In most cases, the determination developed by these soldiers not only serves to counter criticism from their male counterparts but also allows them to build an image of feminine exceptionality that fills them with pride. Many women told me that belonging to the army has allowed them to differentiate themselves from women whose work or profession involves no particular gender conflict. The resulting feeling of self-esteem and respectability leads to forms of agency that can empower female soldiers when interacting with their male and female counterparts in society at large. This is especially true in provincial localities where the armed forces enjoy social prestige.

These female soldiers have unintentionally resignified the link between institutional norms and the acquisition of personal autonomy. Mahmood observes that the Islamic women she studied “did not regard trying to emulate authorized models of behavior as an external social imposition constraining individual freedom. Instead, they treated socially authorized forms of performance as the potentialities—the ground if you will—through which the self is realized” (2005:31). The female soldiers I got to know in the Argentine Army also used institutionally authorized norms and masculine models to transform themselves. But unlike Islamic women, they did not perceive this newly acquired self as a monolithic entity touching on each and every aspect of their lives; rather, they viewed it as a performance that took the form of specific practices to be manifested in specific contexts and situations.

VISIBILITY, AUTHORITY, AND RIGHTS

“Do you really think I can parade in these heels and walk in this uniform? And I freeze to death in the winter when I have to parade in this skirt. It’s absurd.” During a chat in the CMN library in late 2008, Juana, a 24-year-old officer, pointed out the parts of her formal dress or “social” uniform that bothered her. This was not the first time I had heard women complain about the dress codes they had to obey. I often observed how the discomfort visible in female soldiers’ facial expressions and body language would disappear once they left the CMN dressed in “civvies.”

According to both formal and informal definitions, soldiers in the Argentine Army are primarily bodies: the body and what a soldier does with it represents the army as a whole. A soldier’s body is a collective entity through which the moral values to which the institution aspires and that the institution represents for society at large are condensed and expressed. As Mary Douglas (1991) points out in her classic study, groups use the body symbolically to define and defend their moral frontiers. Since the army opened the officer corps to women in 1997, authorities have been

primarily concerned with the moral aspects of their corporal aesthetics to the detriment of practical considerations. Although unrelated to any specific guidelines, the dress code applied to women seeks to insure that their corporal image conforms to hegemonic representations of femininity. For example, by requiring earrings, specific face makeup, and skirts and heels for parades, the aim of army authorities has been to highlight the femininity of military women: they are women first, the term *military* functioning as a qualifier. This has accentuated the view that these soldiers are incomplete individuals who are out of place in the military world.

According to institutional rules and regulations, a soldier's gestures, uniform, shoes, personal hygiene, and hairstyle must all reflect both the emotional state of the individual and the moral position of the military institution as a whole. It is not surprising that, in my conversations with female soldiers, they never failed to mention their bodies and corporal image when illustrating their symbolic and moral status in the Argentine Army. Hair was the element most frequently named, specifically the “bun” they are obliged to wear. In 2011 I spoke with Mariana, a 25-year-old officer, who spoke as if she didn't care if she was overheard by the young male cadets and officers sitting around us in the CMN library. My impression was, in fact, that she wanted them to hear what she had to say about soldiers who object to women in the army: “If I'm doing everything right, what's the problem? That I have a bun, and nothing else” (conversation with author, April 6, 2011). Mariana knew that the bun is no mere aesthetic detail in the experience of female soldiers. On the contrary, from the point of view of both male and female soldiers, this hairdo symbolizes the ambiguous, paradoxical place the latter occupy in the army: reducing femininity to a bun helps integrate women into the armed forces while at the same time distinguishing them as women within the institution.

One Saturday afternoon in 2004, I was chatting with three third-year female cadets in a boarding house where many cadets spend the weekend. As soon as we began talking, they let me know they were made up and dressed up because after we spoke they were going to a café. When I asked if they were meeting CMN male cadets there, Sonia answered with an ironic smile: “They [male cadets] see you here with a bun, little earrings, and a uniform, but when you let your hair down and they see you dressed differently, they don't recognize you” (conversation with author, June 2004). Julieta, another cadet, agreed with her: “Even in civvies, you know male cadets are in the army because of the haircut; but as for us, we let down our hair, take off our earrings, put away our briefcase, and we're super civilian.” More than their male counterparts, military women appear to have no problem reflecting the plurality of identities encompassing their choice of a military career.

In March of 2010, while traveling with approximately fifteen cadets of different ages, half of whom were women, on the train connecting the CMN with the city of Buenos

Aires, I was surprised to see that, at a distance of around four stations from the academy, the female cadets, almost in unison, began letting their hair down; they not only changed their hairdo but in most cases also took off their tie and jacket, undid a few shirt buttons, and began putting on makeup as well. In only a few minutes, they had removed from their bodies all the symbols indicating they belonged to the army. By contrast, the male cadets did not alter their dress, and there was no way they could modify a haircut that denotes membership in the armed forces the world over.

The bun serves both as a symbol of women belonging to the military institution and as an instrument for manipulating and redefining the meanings associated with this membership. These women perform a double gendered mimetic action: when trying to be identified as “one of the guys” in the military, they imitate a stereotyped masculine behavior; when trying to highlight their womanliness in face of military and nonmilitary interlocutors, they imitate a stereotyped feminine image based on the aesthetic aspects of their bodies and behavior. Even if, as Judith Butler (1993) rightly argues, mimetic performance of gender has no subversive or conformist meaning per se, women's double mimesis in the army reflects a situational concept of military identity that contradicts the predominating holistic perspective—that belonging to the institution should encompass all aspects of a soldier's life. In other words, through their bodies, gestures, uniforms, and emotions, female cadets and officers unintentionally show that the masculinity–military link is indexical—that is, contextual not categorical or “natural.” These behaviors open a way to consider military activity more as a situational performance based on the deployment of professional training than as the exercise of supposedly natural corporal and emotional gendered attributes improved by military training.

The tendency of female soldiers to symbolically manipulate the signs indicating they belong to the army when in public has implications for the visibility of the Argentine armed forces in society at large. In public space, there are pathways, places, and presences inaccessible to direct observation; they only exist within the framework of a “sensibility regime” that grants them specific visibility. According to Jacques Rancière (2000:13), a sensibility regime presupposes “delimitation in time and space of the visible and the invisible, of words and noise from what defines both the place and the dilemma of politics as a type of experience.” In present-day Argentina, the sensibility regime orienting public perception of the armed forces oscillates between insult and praise for members. Soldiers in uniform rarely go unnoticed on the streets of Buenos Aires: seeing them either awakens images associated with the last military dictatorship or, less frequently, generates respect and admiration. Cadets and officers have told me they prefer not to wear their uniforms on the street to avoid conflict with civilians who have a “negative image” of the army. I have heard numerous accounts from soldiers of being denounced as “assassins” or “torturers” on the street.

Within this sensitivity regime, what effect do female soldiers produce? An in-depth investigation into civilian–female soldier interactions in public space and in different social milieus would be required for a complete answer to this question. However, during my fieldwork I never heard a female soldier say she had received the kind of insult mentioned above. In my view, there are at least two reasons for this. Any perplexity or surprise these female soldiers cause is due more to their gender identity than the recent past of the Argentine Army, and the image of the violent, authoritarian soldier predominating in many sectors of Argentine society is primarily a masculine one. In this sense, the sight of female soldiers in uniform frequenting public space, often accompanied by their male counterparts, represents for many people an image of a new military identity that is dissociated from the last military dictatorship.

The following example should illustrate this point. In 2009, I invited the female soldiers who were fellow members of the Council on Gender Policy of the Ministry of Defense to the presentation of my book on the CMN at the IV Mercosur Congress of Anthropology held in Buenos Aires. I had given a copy of the book to one of them, Laura, who had shown great interest in the research that went into it. Wearing her dress uniform, she was in the audience during the public presentation and actively participated in the question-and-answer period. Around thirty people were there, in large part Argentine anthropologists. None of us had ever seen a soldier in uniform before at a social sciences academic activity or congress in Argentina. However, no one seemed uncomfortable. The few colleagues who mentioned Laura to me afterward did so to comment on the richness and acuity of her interventions. For colleagues who, like myself, are highly critical of the military dictatorships of the 1970s in particular and feel no particular empathy for the military in general, Laura did not represent the image of the authoritarian officer isolated from society that was commonplace during the 1970s. Rather, she was viewed as a modern, open-minded professional.

Nonetheless, this image of the military woman acquires a different meaning inside the army. Many male soldiers still see their female counterparts, despite equal military training, as fragile, vulnerable, dependent beings constantly requiring special treatment. This is the source of a comment frequently made by male soldiers: female soldiers are much more likely than male soldiers to report mistreatment, discrimination, and abuse of authority by superiors. What is interesting here is the implication that military women are associated with an increase in formal complaints and, above all, with the destabilization of discipline and authority—two mainstays of military life. According to this view, female soldiers constitute a threat to the stability of military life, and not only because they endanger the careers of those against whom complaints are lodged. By demanding the recognition and protection of their physical and moral integrity as individuals, they are also altering hierarchical relations within the army. Making a formal complaint can be viewed as an

act of individuation that favors personal interest over and above collective values such as obedience and respect for hierarchical authority.

Yet most female soldiers reject this point of view, privileging compliance and respect for superiors over presenting formal demands and complaints. In 2011, I met Ana, a 30-year-old officer who was particularly concerned about the notion that military women were more likely to report their superiors than men. She had been working as an instructor at the CMN for two years. During her time as a cadet, she had had many problems with male cadets and some officers who discriminated against her. She dealt with the problem by discussing it personally with the men involved. But the discrimination continued, forcing her to leave the academy. When she recalled this part of her story during our talk in the CMN cafeteria, she shook her head and pursed her lips, looking both angry and sad. But she was also proud of the way she had handled the situation. She had made no formal complaint because she did not want to be considered “soft”: reporting someone to the authorities went against her goal of being accepted as “one of the guys.” Studies of military women in Japan (Frühstück 2007) and Israel (Sasson-Levy 2003) have identified similar attitudes, showing that female soldiers tend to “ignore” or “trivialize” situations of discrimination and male harassment to avoid adopting a discourse of victimization that, in their view, would reinforce the image of vulnerability and weakness that many of their male counterparts already held of them.

It is worth noting in this case that Argentine military women’s attitudes on gender relations had changed alongside transformations that took place in the criteria of authority and discipline of this institution. Ana’s experience illustrates this aspect. Two years after her departure, she decided to return to CMN; she did so while also acquiring the rank of officer and a university degree four years later. According to her, the position of female soldiers in the army had changed greatly since she was a cadet. To make her point, she had me look around the CMN cafeteria where we were chatting: three male young officers were deep in conversation in one corner; at another table, three male and two female fourth-year cadets were having coffee; a third-year male cadet was sitting alone, drinking a soda and listening to music on his cell phone; and a mix of female and male third-year cadets came and went. Ana commented that this intermingling of men and women, officers and cadets, and cadets from different years would have been impossible when she entered CMN in the early 2000s. My own impression coincided with hers—I have also of late observed greater mingling and interactions among soldiers of different ranks and cadets from different years as compared to when I first began coming to the CMN in 2002.

One of the primary changes that Ana identified in the CMN since her time as a cadet had to do with obeying orders. Current hierarchical relations are seen as more flexible, less distant, and more attentive to the recognition of individual needs. In the opinion of many present-day male soldiers, the

most significant change in the army is that current military authorities pay attention to the individual interests, complaints, and rights of their subordinates. What is paradoxical about this institutional change is that it grants some degree of legitimacy to the argument that many male soldiers have used for years to stigmatize their female counterparts and criticize their presence in the army: the alleged propensity of women to make formal complaints and report physical or psychological mistreatment and abuse of authority. It would seem that the negative image that male soldiers have elaborated about female soldiers has contributed, to some extent, to the granting of greater visibility to individual interests, desires, and needs—formerly viewed as contrary to central values such as discipline, obedience, honor, and institutional loyalty—within the military institution.

According to Mariana, a 27-year-old army officer, male soldiers see these matters as endangering the “*esprit de corps*.” In 2009, as we talked informally after a Council on Gender Policy meeting at the Ministry of Defense, she said: “Now women place great emphasis on work schedules that don’t require late hours. Complaints of this kind are very frequent. The point is that men don’t see this as a problem; for them being on call 24/7 is part of the job of being a soldier. Their idea is this: if you chose the military as a career, you’ve got to put up with it because they think their wife can take care of the children” (conversation with author, April 20, 2009). Since their creation, the Council on Gender Policy and the army’s Gender Offices have become institutional spaces where long-standing tensions between individual rights and institutional values have acquired more visibility and relevance and where female soldiers have begun demanding, both officially and informally, greater compatibility between family life and individual rights, on the one hand, and institutional responsibilities, on the other hand.

While the tensions between individual rights and collective obligations reverberate in the army’s Gender Offices, the number of official complaints filed at these offices is actually very low. The only accessible official statistics on these topics shows that between 2009 and 2010, the Gender Offices of the Army received 15 formal complaints filed just by female soldiers. This statistic reports the results in these terms: 40 percent of complaints were framed as “abuse of authority”; 20 percent as “discrimination”; 20 percent as related with problems in the “employment regime”; 6.6 percent on “sexual harassment”; and 6 percent on “domestic violence” (Ministerio de Defensa de la Argentina 2010:52). While the first two categories refer primarily to disciplinary conflicts involving military personnel with different ranks, the third refers to conflicts regarding work requirements, especially time off during pregnancy and maternity leave. We can therefore say that 80 percent of all complaints involved two central values of military life: discipline (expressed as respect for hierarchical relations) and vocation (expressed as dedication to duty). By contrast, there were fewer

complaints related to the kind of violent behavior occurring in both the military and society at large such as sexual harassment and domestic violence, which can be explained by the fact that underreporting these issues in official statistics is a frequent behavior of most armed forces in the world and also of most of its victims, military and civilian.

Anthropological studies of norms and legal processes have shown that rights and laws serve as symbols and instruments for both oppression and social change (Lazarus-Black 2001; Merry 1995). As Lazarus-Black (2001:389) points out, when subordinated actors struggle to “gain access to and recognition from dominant institutions that often contribute to their everyday oppression . . . [they] claim new rights and negotiate structural transformations that enable them to enact those rights.” In the Argentine Army, female soldiers do not frame their claims in terms of individual rights nor do they seek recognition for new legal systems. “Individual rights” run the risk of being perceived as “personal interests,” a notion that clearly challenges the holistic cosmology prevalent in the army. Rather, when military women demand, officially or informally, greater compatibility between family and professional life, they appeal to symbols highly valued by the military institution such as family, motherhood, and being a responsible soldier, which carry normative prescriptions that, although not viewed as external to the military, open the way for the recognition of women’s autonomy.

At first glance, the very existence of the Council on Gender Policy and the army’s Gender Offices seem to indicate a certain “feminist militarism,” a concept that Hugh Gusterson (1999:19) coined to refer to “feminist” women in the U.S. Army who agree to military norms but “struggle against discrimination and for a more complete incorporation into the military.” However, in the Argentine example, female soldiers did not identify themselves as “feminist” but, rather, as “women” or “professionals,” which for them did not exclude their condition of mothers and wives. Initially created as places for institutionally discussing and dealing with gender issues in the military, the Council on Gender Policy and the army’s Gender Offices have been rapidly transformed into spaces for making visible formerly unrecognized work problems. Placing gender issues on the agenda of defense policymaking and giving a role to female soldiers in this terrain has not only improved concrete aspects of a soldier’s professional and family life but also has introduced a long-resisted figure within the military institution: the soldier as worker. In fact, many of the changes brought about by gender policies have simply brought military normative systems into conformity with the rules and regulations governing the workplace in other areas of the public and private sectors (Ministerio de Defensa de la Argentina 2010). The attempt by female soldiers to be recognized also as mothers has raised the issue of the worker’s rights in the military milieu and, by extension, the rights of the military individual as a citizen.

CONCLUSION

My purpose in presenting these examples has been to show how female soldiers have made possible a more flexible notion of military identity. The ability of these women to distinguish different dimensions in their own identity that are perceived as dissociated by their male counterparts is one factor that has led to both their marginalization and the respect shown for their autonomy inside and outside the military world. Like the French feminists analyzed by Joan Scott (1996), female soldiers seem to have “only paradoxes to offer.” Such paradoxes point to the ambiguity and identity ambivalence of the distinction between soldier and woman, as well as to the different kinds of individuality that female soldiers make visible inside and outside the army. The paradoxical individuality that they represent can be both the source of their marginalization as well as the condition of possibility of their agency.⁷

By aspiring to be recognized simultaneously as women and soldiers, by denying that being a soldier represents a renunciation of their femininity, and by questioning the notions of femininity ruling other social environments, these women have become the model for a military individuality that is not trapped in rigid, all-encompassing social categories. The ambiguous character that male soldiers assign to their female counterparts is transformed by the latter into a source of individual agency, thus decompressing the holistic nature of the categories of “soldier” and “woman.” In this sense, the presence of women in the officer corps generates situations that reveal to all members of the army the fragilities of the military individuality inculcated in this institution, thus opening up a discursive space for redefinition.

In this article, I have tried to show that the agency of female soldiers does not contain any explicit intentionality to resist or subvert the norms related to the obedience, honor, and loyalty that individuals owe the institution. Their agency is to be found, rather, in their search for institutional recognition for the ways they experience and express these values and norms as mothers, women, partners, professionals, and workers. By their actions, female soldiers have paved the way for discussing a key dimension in the redefinition of relations among the armed forces, the state, and society at large in present-day Argentina: the soldier as citizen.

Incorporating women into the officer corps has blurred a distinguishing characteristic of the military in Argentina. Not only has the gender homogeneity of its leadership elite come to an end, but the institution is now starting to be located on the same relative plane as the civilian world outside, at least in terms of social diversity. Indeed, for many male soldiers, the presence of women risks turning the army into an institution like any other in the public sector where men and women work together. Female soldiers were perceived as representing the intrusion of civil society into the army. When I started doing fieldwork in the Argentine Army in 2002, I noted that male cadets and officers associated their female comrades with places outside the military, such as the university or school. Women were considered to have better performances in the classroom of the CMN than at “training

camp.” The lack of corporal and moral strength that military men attributed to civilians were also attributed to female soldiers, despite their equal military training. This image of military women also has other dimensions: high-ranking male officers usually select female soldiers to represent the army in activities in which soldiers have to interact or work together with civil society or the media. Female soldiers are used to showing the “openness” of the Argentine Army and the fluidity of their relations with society.

Moreover, this image of military women as, to some extent, more “civilian” than military men and more connected to civil society resonates with a desire that most young military men expressed to me many times: the desire to be perceived as “normal people”—that is, as young professionals with projects and preferences equivalent to any other individual of their generation and, more broadly, of the rest of society. But this “normal” image is, in some way, precisely what most military women represent to their male colleagues. While inside the army, women represent a paradoxical individuality that cannot fully be integrated into the holistic military identity; outside the organization, they represent an open-ended individuality that embodies this will to “normalize” the public image of the military individual, a will that strives to put soldiers and citizens on the same symbolic and moral level as individuals. In this sense, the ambiguities of the image and institutional position of female soldiers have posed the dimension of citizenship within the military profession. These women, albeit unintentionally, have forced the institution’s authorities and members to think of them as both soldiers and citizens in a democratic society. In other words, above and beyond constitutional rights and obligations, they must now think in terms of the equality of the symbolic and moral status of soldiers and regular citizens.

As is the case with most female soldiers in other countries’ armed forces, women in the Argentine Army adopt conservative strategies to be identified as “one of the guys.” But the effects and meaning of these strategies may change depending on the history of armed forces and their home country, as well as on the way social analyses interpret women’s behavior. While in most studies these strategies reproduce and legitimize the hegemonic gender regime, thus presenting no threat of institutional change, I have tried to show that in the Argentine case these attitudes can enhance individual agency despite lacking explicitly intended open contestation of military values and that they resonate with the process of political “normalization” of the army, which even today remains haunted by the legacies of its authoritarian past. This last point marks the main difference between Argentine female soldiers and the situation of military women in countries where armed forces have a consolidated tradition of subordination to civilian and democratic political power and where these women are not necessarily supposed to become moral tokens of the change of the army’s political behavior.

Moreover, the experiences of women in the Argentine Army mirror the ambiguities and contradictions of women’s current status in Argentine society. Since the 2000s,

Argentine women have gained more access to the labor market, university educations, political life, and economic activities. However, these advances went hand in hand with increased job insecurity and occupational segmentation for women, their continued low participation in decision-making positions in business and in politics, the naturalized gender division of labor in the household that places the majority of responsibilities on women, and the persistence of stereotypical representations on women’s capabilities (Faur 2008; Novick et al. 2008). The political will and determination of civil and military authorities to echo or challenge within the army the current status of women in Argentine society, as well as the motivations and interests of new generations of soldiers, will contribute to shape the future of female soldiers.

Máximo Badaró *Instituto de Altos Estudios Sociales (IDAES), Universidad Nacional de San Martín (UNSAM), Paraná 145 (1017), Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Av. Rivadavia 1917 (1033), Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; mbadaro@unsam.edu.ar*

NOTES

Acknowledgments. Since 2007, the National Council of Scientific Research (CONICET) of Argentina has been supporting my research on the Argentine Army. I am deeply indebted to Tom Boellstorff, Michael Chibnik, and the anonymous reviewers for the time and significant efforts they put into the careful and insightful suggestions they made for revising the article, which has undoubtedly improved it. I thank the men and women from the Argentine Army for their willingness in sharing their personal experiences with me during my fieldwork. I am very grateful to my colleagues of the Universidad Nacional de San Martín in Argentina and to those who read and thoughtfully commented on earlier drafts of this article. Any errors and omissions are entirely my own.

1. All names of military personnel have been changed to safeguard their anonymity.
2. In 2013 women were finally accepted into the cavalry and infantry, the two branches that had remained closed to them.
3. In 2008 the Latin American armies with more female personnel were Uruguay (12.9%), followed by Argentina (10%), Guatemala (8.5%), and Honduras (8.3%); the lower levels of female presence in the army were represented by Bolivia (0.3%), Colombia (0.6%), Ecuador (0.7%), and Brazil (2.7%). See Donadio 2009.
4. For more results of this research, see Badaró 2009.
5. For some exceptions in the small field of the anthropology of Latin American armed forces, see the following: on Argentina, see Badaró 2009, Frederic 2008, 2013, Guber 2004; on Bolivia, see Gill 1997; on Brazil, see Castro 1990 and Castro and Leirner 2009; and on Colombia, see Theidon 2008.
6. My notion of “paradoxical individuality” follows the definition of paradox that the political philosopher Todd May elaborated for the work of Gilles Deleuze: “Paradox involves the bringing

together of disparate elements into a convergence that neither reduces one to the other nor keeps them apart (May 2005:104).

7. According to Butler (2004:3), the fact that female “agency is riven with paradox does not mean it is impossible. It means only that the paradox is the condition of its possibility.”

REFERENCES CITED

- Abu-Lughod, Lila
1990 The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women. *American Ethnologist* 17(1):41–55.
- Acker, Joan
1990 Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society* 4(2):139–158.
- Acuña, Carlos, and Catalina Smulovitz
1995 Militares en la transición Argentina [The military in Argentine transition]. In *Juicio, castigos y memorias: Derechos humanos y justicia en la política argentina* [Judgment, punishment and memories: Human rights and justice in Argentine politics]. Carlos Acuña, ed. Pp. 21–98. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Badaró, Máximo
2009 Militares o ciudadanos: La formación de los oficiales del Ejército Argentino [Military or citizens: The training of Argentine Army’s officers]. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.
- Britton, Dana M.
2000 The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization. *Gender and Society* 14(3):418–434.
- Butler, Judith
1993 *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex.”* New York: Routledge.
2004 *Undoing Gender.* London: Routledge.
- Canelo, Paula
2010 ¿Un nuevo rol para las Fuerzas Armadas? Políticos y militares frente a la protesta social y los derechos humanos: Argentina, 1995—2002 [A new role for the military? Politicians and soldiers facing social protest and human rights: Argentina, 1995–2002]. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Carreiras, Helena
2006 *Gender and the Military: Women in the Armed Forces of Western Democracies.* Routledge Military Studies series. London: Routledge.
- Castro, Celso
1990 O espírito militar [The military spirit]. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor.
- Castro, Celso, and Piero Leirner, eds.
2009 *Antropología dos militares* [Anthropology of soldiers]. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getulio Vargas Editora.
- Connell, Robert W.
1995 *Masculinities.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dandeker, Christopher
2003 “Femmes combattantes”: Problèmes et perspectives de l’intégration des femmes dans l’armée britannique [Women fighters: Problems and perspectives of women integration into

- the British Army]. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 44(4):735–758.
- Diamint, Ruth, ed.
1999 Control civil y fuerzas armadas en las nuevas democracias Latinoamericanas [Civil control and armed forces in new Latin American democracies]. Buenos Aires: Nuevohacer.
- Donadio, Marcela
2009 La mujer en las instituciones armadas y policiales: resolución 1325 y operaciones de paz en América Latina [Women in armed forces and the police: 1325 resolution and peacekeeping operations in Latin America]. Buenos Aires: Red de Seguridad y Defensa de América Latina.
- Douglas, Mary
1991 Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. Routledge Classics series. London: Routledge.
- Dumont, Louis
1970 Homo hierarchicus. Paris: Gallimard.
- Faur, Eleonor
2008 Desafíos para la igualdad de género en Argentina [Challenges for gender equality in Argentina]. Buenos Aires: Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo.
- Fitch, Samuel
1998 The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Foucault, Michael
2000 The Subject and Power. In *Power: The Essential Works of Foucault*, vol. 3: 1954–1984. James D. Faubion, ed. Pp. 325–348. New York: New Press.
- Frederic, Sabina
2008 Los usos de la fuerza pública: Debates sobre militares y policías en las ciencias sociales de la democracia [The uses of public force: Social sciences debates about the military and the police in democratic times]. Buenos Aires: Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento-Biblioteca Nacional.
2013 Las trampas del pasado. Las Fuerzas Armadas y su integración al Estado democrático en Argentina. Buenos Aires. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Frühstück, Sabine
2007 Uneasy Warriors: Gender, Memory, and Popular Culture in the Japanese Army. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gill, Lesley
1997 Creating Citizens, Making Men: The Military and Masculinity in Bolivia. *Cultural Anthropology* 12(4):527–550.
- Guber, Rosana
2004 De chicos a veteranos. Memorias argentinas de la guerra de Malvinas [From kids to veterans: Argentine memories of the Falklands War]. Buenos Aires: Antropofagia.
- Gusterson, Hugh
1999 Feminist Militarism. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 22(2):17–26.
- Hauser, Orlee
2011 “We Rule the Base because We’re Few”: “Lone Girls” in Israel’s Military. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 40(6):623–651.
- Hershberg, Eric, and Felipe Agüero, eds.
2005 Memorias militares sobre la represión en el Cono Sur [Military memories of the repression in the Southern Cone]. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Kondo, Dorinne K.
1990 Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lazarus-Black, Mindie
2001 Law and the Pragmatics of Inclusion: Governing Domestic Violence in Trinidad and Tobago. *American Ethnologist* 28(2):388–416.
- López, Ernesto, and David Pion-Berlin
1996 Democracia y cuestión militar [Democracy and the military question]. Quilmes: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.
- Lucero, Mariel
2009 Las mujeres en las fuerzas armadas argentinas [Women in the Argentine armed forces]. UNISCI Discussion Papers, 20. Madrid, Unidad de Investigación sobre Seguridad y Cooperación Internacional (UNISCI)-Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Mahmood, Saba
2005 Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- May, Todd
2005 Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merry, Sally
1995 Resistance and the Cultural Power of Law. *Law and Society Review* 29(1):11–26.
- Ministerio de Defensa de la Argentina
2010 Informe sobre la integración de la mujer en las fuerzas armadas [Report on the integration of women into the armed forces]. Buenos Aires: Ministerio de Defensa.
- Novick, Marta, Sofía Rojo, and Victoria Castillo, eds.
2008 El trabajo femenino en la post-convertibilidad: Argentina, 2003–2007 [Women’s work in the post-convertibility time: Argentina, 2003–2007]. Santiago de Chile: Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe.
- Ortner, Sherry B.
1996 Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture. Boston: Beacon.
2006 Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rancière, Jacques
2000 Le partage du sensible. Esthétique et politique [The distribution of the sensible: Aesthetics and Politics]. Paris: La fabrique.
- Sain, Marcelo
2010 Los votos y las botas: Estudios sobre relaciones civil-militares en la democracia argentina [Votes and boots: Studies on civil-military relations in Argentina democracy]. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.

Sasson-Levy, Orna

2003 Feminism and Military Gender Practices: Israeli Women Soldiers in "Masculine" Roles. *Social Inquiry* 73(3):440–465.

Scott, Joan Wallach

1996 *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Segal, Mady Wechsler

1995 Women's Military Roles Cross-Nationally: Past, Present, and Future. *Gender and Society* 9(6):757–775.

Sion, Liora

2008 Peacekeeping and the Gender Regime: Dutch Female Peacekeepers in Bosnia and Kosovo. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 37(5):561–585.

Sorin, Katia

2006 Women in the French Forces: Integration versus Conflict. *In Challenge and Change in the Military: Gender and Diversity Issues*. Franklin C. Pinch, Allister T. MacIntyre, Phyllis Browne, and Alan C. Okros, eds. Pp. 76–96. Winnipeg: Wing.

Stiehm, Judith Hicks

1982 The Protected, the Protector, the Defender. *Women's Studies International Forum* 3–4(5):367–376.

Theidon, Kimberly

2008 Reconstructing Masculinities: The Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration of Former Combatants in Colombia. *Human Rights Quarterly* 31(1):1–34.

Winslow, Donna, and Jason Dunn

2002 Women in the Canadian Forces: Between Legal and Social Integration. *Current Sociology* 50(5):641–667.