Why Femicide? Analysis Of The Roots Of Cultural Hatred Against Women From Johan Galtung's Perspective
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Abstract
Femicide occurs when perpetrators have an either-or mindset that drives them to kill women. This is usually promoted or justified by patriarchal culture. The murder of women is an accumulation of hatred that has been maintained for a long time, is continuously produced, and occurs both in the private and collective spheres. The motives vary but are not limited to: the aim to dominate, conquer, or marginalize the existence of women. This research method uses a literature review, this research identifies that femicide can occur existentially and/or essentially. The research results show that both occurred because the perpetrator killed women in the abstract to maintain the logic of the status quo which positions masculinity as absolute superior. To prevent femicide in the context of cultural violence, this mindset needs to be redefined. The conclusion of this research is that Femicide is a facade of violence against women that is rooted in hatred that is fostered and reproduced continuously. Not only is it a manifestation of the most extreme patriarchal ideas, the murder of women is evidence of the inability of each community to create an environment without violence.
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INTRODUCTION

UN Women categorizes femicide or feminicide as an extreme manifestation of the most brutal form of violence against women caused by various interconnected and overlapping factors. Factors that cause femicide include, but are not limited to, stereotyping of gender roles, discrimination against women, unequal power relations, including social norms that legitimize femicide as an act that can be annulled. The most common perpetrators of femicide are those who have a close relationship with the victim or what is usually called intimate partner violence (IPV), such as their family or partner (Armenta, 2018). In 2021, around 45,000 women and girls worldwide were murdered by their closest relatives. Asia is the region with the most cases of femicide in 2021 with an estimated 17,800 women victims, then 17,200 women in Africa, 7,500 women in America, 2,500 women in Europe and 300 women in Oceania (UN Women 2022). However, there are cases of femicide that occur in the public sphere which are initially justified by traditions such as Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), the tradition of honor-killing promoted by the community, hatred due to sexual orientation issues, and even forms of organized crime such as terrorism and human trafficking (Crippa Méndez & Rodríguez Barraza, 2022).

Femicide can be a vehicle (tools, means) as well as an end (ends): a vehicle for patriarchal culture, an extension of racism, economic oppression and colonialism (Smith 2020) and the aim of maintaining the status quo where women are subjugated bodies which Michel Foucault called docile body (Habiba, 2023). This mindset is also promoted by traditions that normalize women’s natural qualities as simply being subordinate to men. In Indonesia, the term 3ur is known to define the main jobs if and only if someone is born a woman: work, well, kitchen. There is no other choice but 3ur and women are not given the opportunity to negate this tradition. If he doesn't agree, the public will immediately position him as a rebel. Women are born into the world with either-or categories: white-black, pure-sinful, submissive-rebellious. If you want to be called holy, you must submit, otherwise it means you are sinning. It seems as if her authentic
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selfhood can only be defined based on the anchor of patriarchal values. Those who rebel are threatened with entering the extreme manifestation of patriarchal space: femicide.

Hatred towards women is fostered little by little when patriarchal traditions begin to fade: women begin to negate and criticize traditions that have marginalized their role so far, women begin to redefine the internal misogynistic nature felt between women, etc. which threatens the absolute superior position of those who support women's subordination. The politics of othering, the "politics of otherness", "othering" that Zillah Eisenstein wrote about in her book Hatreds: Racialized and Sexualized Conflicts in the 21st Century, is the origin from which this hatred can be perpetuated (Cohen, 2018). Hate is the politics of treating someone or a group because they are considered different and threaten their sovereignty. Hate creates boundaries between 'I' 'We' or 'He' 'They' (Blee 2004). In the discourse on violence against women, femicide is a consequence of an either-or mindset as well as being a medium for othering in order to maintain the 'I' position. For Johan Galtung, this service which he calls marginalization is structural violence – as well as cultural when it is legitimized by symbols of language, religion, ritual, (Galtung 1990) etc. For example: the use of sexist language in everyday life, the normalization of cultural systems that eliminate the role of women, the internalization of misogynistic traits between women, can fuel hatred towards women (Brunke & Boira, 2022).

Based on this, the researchers concluded that femicide resulted from the implications of an either-or mindset and the belief in the existence and essence of women. Then three research questions emerged, namely: 1) What is femicide? 2) How does femicide work? 2) Why femicide? 3) How to transform deep-rooted hatred of women so as to prevent possible femicide? Researchers explore the results of the discussion into three parts, namely first, explaining what and how femicide occurs; secondly, exploring the possible causes of individuals and/or groups committing femicide in terms of existence (empirical) and essence (idea); and finally, explaining the urgency of transforming hatred against women in order to prevent femicide using Galtung’s theory of cultural violence (Colbert, 2019).

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a literature study type of research review) with the review model chosen being narrative review. The study carried out using a narrative review model, namely comparing data from several international journals that have been analyzed and summarized based on experience authors, existing theories and models. The research method used is: qualitative research method with the data source used in the form of data secondary obtained from several international journals, articles and research previous analysis that has been analyzed by the author regarding the problem that will be studied in this research. Researchers use descriptive analytical methods with collect, identify, organize and analyze various data found. Research is limited to a research focus on the technicalities of femicide, existential and essential femicide, and efforts to transform the either-or mindset to prevent femicide (Angelini, 2018). The main theory used in the analysis of femicide research is Johan Galtung’s theory of cultural violence (Rubio, 2023).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

About Femicide

Etymologically, femicide comes from two words, namely femina and caedere from Latin which means woman and murder or to kill. Femicide means femicide or to kill women. Femicide
is also defined as the intentional killing of women because they are women (Godoy-Paiz 2012). The UN Office on Drugs and Crimes said femicide occurred because of gender inequality and discrimination, "the most pervasive human rights violation is rooted in gender inequality and discrimination." and emphasizes that femicide is the most brutal manifestation of violence, “the gender-related killing of women and girls [as] the most brutal and extreme manifestation of such violence.” (Davidson 2023). The term femicide was first discussed in the early 19th century by John Corry in his book A Satirical View of London at the Commencement of the Nineteenth Century to explain incidents or cases of female murder in England (Briones, 2022). At the end of the 20th century, the term femicide became increasingly known to the public because it was reused by Diana Russell at the International Tribunal of Crimes Against Women to attract public sympathy regarding the discourse on violence against women (Radford and Russell 1992). Then in his book Femicide in Global Perspective (Russell and Harmes 2001), Russell explains that femicide is a product of patriarchal society which legitimizes oppression of women. For Russell, this deliberate murder of women was carried out by patriarchal men. Femicide as a method is used to maintain control and in the context of conditioning women in a completely alienated situation.

“It is during her periods that she feels her body most painfully as an obscure, alien thing; it is, indeed, the prey of a stubborn and foreign life that each month constructs and then tears down a cradle within it; each month all things are made ready for a child and then aborted in the crimson flow. Woman, like man, is her body; but her body is something other than herself.” (de Beauvoir 1974).

Women are born with a uterus and the attributes of the patriarchal sex characteristics that surround it. According to de Beauvoir, the natural condition of the female body, namely the ownership of the womb, is an essential element for her facticity in the world. For him, woman is a womb, tota mulier in utero. But for masculine hegemony, the body is not enough to define her as a woman. Because of this ownership of the uterus, women are said to "have infirmity in the abdomen" or have a weak (de Beauvoir 1974) abdomen. And therefore, it is mandatory to be alienated. In his book The Second Sex, this is it de Beauvoir shows how the biological justification – women are defined as merely a transit point for conceiving, giving birth, breastfeeding – for a woman's body lasts from the time she is born until she dies. Manifestations of sexist behavior carried out either in idea or practice have contributed to the positioning of women as those who will never be enough or independent. Like the comparative system or evolutionary hierarchy that de Beauvoir criticized: the justification that women's brains are smaller than men's brains, so that women's intelligence is considered lower and will not exceed men's intelligence (de Beauvoir 1974) (Zebadúa-Yáñez, Owen, Kessel, Cruz, & Chaparro-Martínez, 2023).

The term femicide emerged because of factors surrounding it including society's ideas about what it means to be a woman. Society's concept of womanhood includes discourses about subordination, weakness and femininity. In Latin America, the term feminicide emerged to describe the murder of women rooted in gendered power structures and produced by patriarchal social organizations. Feminicide violence is violence that occurs because of misogynistic behavior that rejects the existence of women (Carrigan and Dawson 2016). The manifestation of subordinate thinking about women is the forerunner to the emergence of hatred towards women, especially when women rebel from their subordinate space. Often, 'witch hunts' occur for rebellious women as a method of restructuring the status quo of masculine hegemony. This kind of hatred does not just emerge, but is mobilized through politics and institutions, fostered by legal regulations, then deposited in a culture that normalizes prejudice, aggressiveness, authoritarianism and domination of the objects of hatred (Harrington 2004). The first is in line
with what Galtung calls structural violence (which can be written or not), and the second is in line with what he calls cultural violence (Fileborn & Loney-Howes, 2020).

Femicide that occurs in private spaces is carried out by the victim's family and/or partner, while femicide that occurs in public spaces occurs by strangers, gang members, including state officials such as the police (Carrigan and Dawson 2016). The motives can be varied: revenge, hatred, jealousy, or sexual violence. But it is definitely caused by gendered motivations aimed at women, which are rooted in the patriarchal assumption that women are the property or objects of men (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights 2015). The National Commission on Violence Against Women in the report Vanish in the Silence: Victims of Femicide and Their Families Have the Right to Justice in 2022 states that femicide is driven by hatred, revenge, the desire to conquer, dominate, feel pleasure, and because it sees women as property that can be regulated according to what the perpetrator wants (Komnas Perempuan 2022). Therefore, gendered domains make the world only certain for men, legitimizing and normalizing a world full of domination and violence against women as the only way to maintain the status quo (Angulo-Pasel, 2018).

The construction that women 'by nature' occupy a subordinate space is a dialectic of the gender lens that has been discussed throughout written history. This gender lens not only helps reveal the injustices experienced by women, but also looks at the possibility of negating that injustice. This mapping is in line with how the three components of the violence triangle – direct, structural and cultural – that Galtung maps (violence is negated by non-violence/peace) (Confortini 2006). If the logic of the definition of femicide and Galtung's violence triangle is drawn, the researcher draws conclusions about how femicide occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Conclusion About How Femicide Occurred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMICIDE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct violence With objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tearing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piercing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poisoning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural violence Written: there is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a legal product,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an appeal letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural violence Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The femicides discussed in this table tend to discuss the murder of women empirically or existentially, the implication being that women's bodies are killed. Researchers need to provide rationalization that there is essential femicide which is carried out by 'killing' at the level of ideas: women are killed by destroying their persona (including in the cyber world), by doxing, dead-naming, etc. which falls into the category of gender-based cyber violence (KSBG) for the same reason as empirical femicide: women are killed because they were born female (Berube, 2023).
The following is a table of abstraction results related to existential and essential femicide carried out by researchers:

**Table 2. Abstraction Results Related To Existential And Essential Femicide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Femicide</th>
<th>Physical Medium</th>
<th>Cyber Medium</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>There is physical contact between the perpetrator and the victim; it is also possible to use assistive technologies such as essential femicides.</td>
<td>Social media in cyberspace for propaganda.</td>
<td>The body of a murdered woman; dead, not breathing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Supporting technology such as computers and smart devices</td>
<td></td>
<td>The woman's body is breathing, but trapped in a limited state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What differentiates existential and essential femicide most clearly are two things: 1) whether or not the murdered woman's body is dead, then 2) whether or not there is physical contact between the perpetrator and the victim. Both are equally likely to be carried out by identifiable or anonymous perpetrators, especially those carried out in cyber media.

**Promotion of femicide in a patriarchal sphere: the iceberg phenomenon**

Exposing femicide cannot stop at discovering the facts of murder of women which result in women's bodies empirically no longer breathing. Who is the victim? Who did it? If it has been answered, the problem is considered resolved. If so, this will only answer the problem at a fundamental level or what Sandra Walklate et al. call them thin counts (Walklate et al. 2019; Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon 2023). His 2019 writing on femicide does not answer the question of why it is related to femicide. Then, Walklate refined this idea in his latest article in 2023 with the proposal thick counts, where femicide can only be understood when describing the underlying patriarchal social relations (Sinclair, 2019). On thin counts, femicide is understandable when answering this chart:

![Figure 1. Hexagon Model](https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/)
Thin counts measure helps collect descriptive data on femicide incidents without delving into the invisible forces within them. Therefore, thin counts are not enough to reveal femicide at a deep level. The think counts model can be considered good at the individual intervention level but is weak in explaining femicide holistically (Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon 2023). Through thick counts, Walklate not only criticizes previous approaches, but also finds a model to reveal the iceberg phenomenon behind femicide (Tripp et al., 2021).

An example of the use of a hexagon measurement framework that researchers used in studying cases of in-laws killing their daughters-in-law in Pasuruan:

Figure 3. Example Of Using The Walklate Hexagon Model
This hexagon model is sufficient to understand the description of femicide cases. Next, following the measurement expansion used by Walklate (Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon 2023), here is an example of using a hexagonal pyramid of thick counts with the same case study (Samson, 2018):

![Hexagonal Pyramid Diagram]

**Figure 4. Visualization Of A Hexagonal Pyramid**

Patriarchal social relations are the foundation of how femicide works, which is often neglected to be discussed because it is usually considered taboo, unimportant, and has nothing to do with femicide cases. Because of this thinking, the thicker the measurement in tracing femicide, the more it proves that femicide is a complicated problem. The patriarchy that Walklate refers to is patriarchy in theory and practice which perpetuates violence against women, hegemonic masculinity, layered victimization of women’s lives (Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon 2023). By positioning patriarchy as the impetus for femicide, we can 'see' possible answers to the statement why femicide occurs as well as map out possible solutions to it (Zabjek, 2023).

The patriarchal sphere cultivates individuals and groups within it to normalize women's service. This service process occurs in the private and public spheres. Women's individualization is forcibly inhibited by symbolic spaces that only accept the laws of masculine hegemony within the context. This world based on symbolic rules operates based on the dominance of male subjectivity, by forgetting female subjectivity. Jacques Lacan also explains a similar condition through his concept of Father's Law, nom du père (Lacan 1956). In the context of Father-Mother, or nuclear relations, for example: Father's Law positions a mother who is unable to internalize her father's language, and therefore does not have the agency to become an independent subject. Arivia Girl in her book Philosophy with a Feminist Perspective (Arivia 2003), emphasizes that Lacan (with this theory) explains the existence of masculine symbolic rules which make it seem like a child can only function optimally as a part of society if he uses these symbolic rules. Mothers, or women in a more general context, are positioned outside the symbolic order where that order is dominated by the father's subjectivity. Lacan describes the concept of the symbolic father through the theory of the Oedipal Complex, whose theory he adapted from Sigmund

Freud. Lacan adapted by drawing Freud's Oedipal Complex theory into the cultural and linguistic realm (Barreno, 2021). The emergence of the ideal ego is the result of the instillation (cultural construction) of father's rules towards children in order to fulfill their needs (Grosz 1990). Based on the order of dominance of the father's subjectivity, or the symbolic father, a son is formed to become a family leader. Because the culture formed by the symbolic father order tries to do this, it will be a problem when the mother figure is unable to accommodate that order for her child. The symbolic father's order forms the child to be able to possess the mother in the context of domesticating her, controlling her. "... the possession enables the father to domesticate and control the mother's otherwise unpredictable desires."

Lacan argued that the symbolic stage in which the Law of the Father is present, is the determinant of individual identity. Father's Law for Julia Kristeva in her book The Power of Horror (Kristeva 1982), is the reason why women are often positioned as limited subjects who need to be abandoned if children are to have an ideal identity. In the symbolic stage/world, women cannot achieve self-integrity; because he was isolated in it (Aka, 2023). This alienation, which Kristeva calls abjection, is not only constructed by the father's rules, but also from within the woman herself. The construction of Father's rules has repressed and annulled women's subjectivity at the symbolic stage. The identity attached to it - feminine, nurturing - is marginalized so as not to damage the symbolic order that is considered ideal. Based on this mindset, normalization often occurs: sons are encouraged by the Symbolic Father's order to be more active in the public domain rather than the domestic one because the domestic sphere is positioned to be occupied solely by mothers or daughters.

In the patriarchal sphere, symbolic rules like this are produced and reproduced continuously, creating individuals and groups who are banal to the values of the service. For Johan Galtung, symbolic rules that infiltrate everyday language (including religion, ideology, art, empirical/formal science) constitute cultural violence and can also be a motor for direct and structural violence (Galtung 1990). Cultural violence is not like direct violence which can be easily identified. Because cultural violence works at an abstract, complicated stage, which is often invisible; which usually occurs by internalization, changing the moral color, and making reality blurry. Like the concept of thick counts in the context of femicide that Walklate discusses (Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon 2023). By Walklate, the patriarchal sphere/relationship is explained as the foundation for femicide. If we use Galtung's concept of cultural violence, femicide as an empirical practice is direct violence promoted by cultural violence, which contains patriarchal ideas. Firstly, the patriarchal sphere as the foundation, secondly, the patriarchal sphere as the idea/incubator /motor that drives the occurrence of femicide. With the methods (charts and hexagonal pyramids) Walklate and (triangle of violence; discussed in the next section) Galtung, both show that the theory and practice of questioning patriarchy itself is an iceberg phenomenon, visible to the naked eye, requiring in-depth investigation to reveal it (Arsawati & Bunga, 2022).

The Urgency Of Transforming Violence Against Women: From Either-Or Logic To Both-And

The structure of violence not only has implications for empirical bodily issues but also for ideal issues in the brain. As Galtung wrote, “A violent structure leaves marks not only on the human body but also on the mind and the spirit.” (Galtung 1990). This method of work is carried out so that violence does not stop when the object of violence dies, disappears, or is damaged beyond repair, but continues to be perpetuated and passed on through conditioning the mindset of the next generation. So when we discuss the structure of femicide, to study it holistically, we cannot stop when empirical questions are answered, but try to explore what is not visible. Who is the perpetrator? Who is the victim? When and where did femicide occur? What motives drive femicide? More than that, what desires can be concluded to be the subtle motives of the perpetrator? What is not written or is taboo to discuss? Galtung never specifically discusses
femicide, but Galtung discusses in general how structural-cum-cultural violence also occurs in the gender domain. Whether it is through religion, ideology, art, language, empirical science, formal science/mathematics, cultural violence can be a motor for femicide. With this, the researcher draws on the logic of patriarchal culture and uses 6 media of cultural violence that Galtung uses to formulate the impetus (thought patterns and practices) for femicide in the following table (Aldrete & Fernández-Ardèvol, 2023):

**Table 3. Media Of Cultural Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Empirical Science</th>
<th>Formal Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's subordinati on is justified by religious symbols</td>
<td>Militarism uniforms women's behavior in the private and public spheres; Ibuism</td>
<td>Women as sexual objects based on the male gaze</td>
<td>Language with Father's rules</td>
<td>Universalizing women's experiences</td>
<td>either-or rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is considered inconsistent with religious elements, is considered other, and the most extreme: femicide is carried out on the grounds of God's command</td>
<td>Artwork with the visualization of a male gaze</td>
<td>Sexist definition of women; sanitizing sexist language that is deemed unproblematic</td>
<td>The experiences of women in the Third World and developing countries are not considered</td>
<td>When they find an ambiguous existence, punishment is carried out, and the most extreme: femicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The essential patriarchal mindset means that which is not visible, and as Galtung discusses racist ideas, the patriarchal mindset is also produced and reproduced through subtle propaganda, such as but not limited to: educational curriculum, political jargon, including legitimation from the rule of law that does not favor marginalized groups, including women. For example, in 2022, Scotland apologized for the execution of women in Scotland in 1563 for being labeled as witches under the Witchcraft Act. Then in 2008, Switzerland also apologized publicly for the witch-hunting murder of Anna Goldi in 1782. Apart from good-will politics, this apology became a symbol of efforts to reparate and reconcile victims as well as transform direct violence that has been carried out (either individually or collectively). However, this is different from efforts to transform cultural violence: transforming the mindset about witch hunting is a long road. In essence, if the transformation of direct violence (beheading, burning witches; visible practices)
is not followed by the transformation of patriarchal ideas that have settled into thought patterns, reconciliation efforts (practices) will fall into a mere performative prison space. And in the end, the victim remains in the other's position (Caroppo et al., 2023).

When included in the triangle of violence, cultural violence legitimates direct and structural violence which is positioned at the foot of the triangle. In the triangle, violence directly results from structural and cultural violence as the legs of the triangle (Sithomola, 2020). Each form of the violence triangle chart cannot be read monolithically, it must be case by case because the aspects can also be different. The following is the triangle of violence that Galtung refers to:

![Figure 5: Cultural Violence Is A Legitimator For Direct And Structural Violence.](https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/)

![Figure 6: Cultural And Structural Violence Is A Source Of Direct Violence.](https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/)
Galtung discusses cultural violence by giving the example of African slavery in America. For the slaves to arrive in America, direct violence was carried out by taking them by force (Galtung 1990). Direct violence comes and goes, appears and disappears. However, what Galtung emphasizes is how massive direct violence will last by changing its form into massive structural violence, through a scheme of sanction rules, limiting the freedom of slaves, which are written and signed by topdogs who consider others the underdogs. Apart from that, in the case of slavery, cultural violence also persists by producing and reproducing racist ideas in various propaganda (Galtung 1990). These racist ideas are justified by empirical science such as Darwin's biological determinism (Dentice 2019) and then by religion, as was done by Wesley Swift in America in the 1950s/60s with his ideas about Christian identity which had a white supremacist vision and anti-Semitic views (Bochicchio 2021). What the Nazis did with the justification of their superhuman ideas also had similar service techniques, in fact they extended not only between men (superior) and women (inferior), but also between heterosexuals (superior) and homosexuals (inferior) (Faulkner 2006). Often ideas like this are disallowed because the environment considers the values being spread (ideas of racism, slavery) to be a form of love, even though this so-called love is just an expression of hatred (Zara, Gino, Veggi, & Freilone, 2022). For Galtung, the occurrence of the cultural violence triangle is a consequence of the use of formal rules: the theorem T and its negation \(-T\) cannot both be valid. Mathematics with general rules like this disciplines us into a particular mode of thinking that is consistent with black-and-white thinking and polarization in the personal, social and world spheres. The either-or feature of mathematical thinking is important; but as a model for human, social and world dialectical processes, it is not sufficient. And this adequacy is a fundamental condition for symbolic/cultural space, to guide us in imagining the potential for a less brutal/violent reality.

either-or mindset which considers the existence of women to be merely a negation of the existence of men. Whatever he did, when it did not conform to what was dictated by the formal rules married to the Father's Law, would be considered an insult. At the most extreme, femicide is permitted so that the status quo position of masculinity remains at the top. The researchers formulated the application of Galtung's triangle of violence to femicide as follows:

Figure 7. Either-Or Ideas Become Legitimators For Patriarchal Rule And The Murder Of Women

https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/
Either-Or Ideas And Patriarchal Rules Are The Source Of The Murder Of Women

This triangle of violence can occur due to symmetrical conflict (where the parties involved have equal relations) or asymmetrical (where there are unequal power relations such as topdogs and underdogs) (Edelstein, 2018). When femicide takes place, what we can trace is whether the femicide occurred because of symmetric or asymmetric conflict. However, both of them illustrate the triangle of violence, only with different contextualization. To attempt to transform the conflict, we first need to map the violence triangle into an ABC triangle whose illustration is as follows:

![Galtung’s ABC triangle](https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/)

**Figure 9. Galtung’s ABC triangle**

![Femicide based on ABC Galtung](https://ijhess.com/index.php/ijhess/)

**Figure 10. Femicide based on ABC Galtung**

---

3367

To map possible solutions to femicide, by following Galtung’s method, namely by negating femicide itself. This process is what Galtung calls the transformation method or transcend method, an effort to change violence into peace. The ABC triangle that maps conflict is also used to map transformation, namely as follows (Bryske & Faust, 2021):

![Galtung transformation ABC triangle](image)

**Figure 11. Galtung transformation ABC triangle (Galtung 2000; 2012)**

In corner A, transformation occurs starting from the redefinition of patriarchal ideas of either-or into both-and. The formal rules of hegemonic masculinity need to be abolished and redefined as part of the characteristics of a mere social domain, like femininity itself. By purifying hegemonic masculinity into masculinity, the either-or pattern which has the implication of subverting femininity can be overcome. Concretely, patriarchal ideas such as considering women are subordinate to men can be broken down and replaced with a both-and pattern: femininity and masculinity have equal space. Thus, the concept of 3ur for women is no longer a coercion but a choice, the concept of family leader for men is no longer an ‘obligation’ ‘natural’ but a choice, etc (Alam, Nurrahman, & Hamidah, 2023). Transformation A needs to be accompanied by transformation of corner C: the status quo of hegemonic masculinity is deconstructed with a middle way that can accommodate parties who have been marginalized by the status quo. Angles A and C, which are more latent and complex to transform, can be started by transforming angle B: femicide is negated by non-femicide, by means of (how to) two-way dialogue (Osborne 2020) and discussions in academic spaces (Luján Pinelo, 2022). Cyber media such as social media can also be an option for exploring angle B transformation. More than that,
social media technology can be a non-violent technology (Branson 2012) which can be used to prevent violence/in this case the mindset about further femicide. By not committing femicide, we have achieved peace, which in Galtung’s terms is negative peace (Wahyudi, Fithria, & Wardiwiyono, 2020). However, the transformation from doing it to simply not doing it will not be enough to transform femicide at its roots. Engaging in dialogue about femicide is the main door to positive peace.

CONCLUSION

Femicide is a facade of violence against women that is rooted in hatred that is fostered and reproduced continuously. Not only is it a manifestation of the most extreme patriarchal ideas, femicide is proof of the inability of individual communities to create a non-violent environment. Femicide not only occurs in public and private spaces, where it is visible, and then easily identified because there is evidence of a woman's death, but it also occurs in cyber spaces, carried out by anonymous people, 'killing' in invisible and subtle ways. Whatever the method, and whoever the perpetrator, femicide occurs because patriarchal ideas continue to be promoted and considered normal by individuals and communities who are comfortable with the status quo of masculine hegemony.

To transform femicide, using Galtung's ABC transcend method, it is necessary to identify non-femicide possibilities, in this case, but not limited to, opening up spaces for two-way dialogue carried out in public and private spaces, from the family sphere, to academic. Thus, the either-or mindset which has long fueled the perpetuation of patriarchal culture can be broken down and restructured with a both-and pattern which requires a fair status quo for the ideas and practices of masculinity and femininity. Researchers recommend that the either-or idea be restructured by redefining women as equal subjects to men. This can be done starting from 1) individuals who are open to both-and ideas, 2) groups, including educational environments that positivistically reveal epistemic violence and show alternative thinking, providing access to ideas that have been marginalized by masculine hegemony. Femicide cannot be prevented or treated at the visible level, but must also continue to be discussed at the invisible level, namely ideas.
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