

A photograph of three soldiers in a desert environment. The soldier on the left is wearing a white long-sleeved shirt, light-colored pants, a helmet, and sunglasses, and is looking down at a device. The soldier in the center is wearing a dark t-shirt, light-colored pants, and a helmet, and is looking to the right. The soldier on the right is wearing a camouflage uniform and a helmet, and is walking away. They are all carrying rifles and wearing tactical vests. The background shows desert vegetation and a body of water.

EDITED BY MAYA EICHLER

**GENDER AND  
PRIVATE  
SECURITY IN  
GLOBAL POLITICS**

# Gender and Private Security in Global Politics

## Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations

**Series editors: J. Ann Tickner, University of Southern California, and  
Laura Sjoberg, University of Florida**

*Enlisting Masculinity:*

*The Construction of Gender in U.S. Military Recruiting Advertising during  
the All-Volunteer Force*

Melissa T. Brown

*Cosmopolitan Sex Workers:*

*Women and Migration in a Global City*

Christine B. N. Chin

*Intelligent Compassion:*

*Feminist Critical Methodology in the Women's International League for  
Peace and Freedom*

Catia Cecilia Confortini

*Gender, Sex, and the Postnational Defense:*

*Militarism and Peacekeeping*

Annica Kronsell

*The Beauty Trade:*

*Youth, Gender, and Fashion Globalization*

Angela B.V. McCracken

*From Global To Grassroots:*

*The European Union, Transnational Advocacy, and Combating Violence  
against Women*

Celeste Montoya

*A Feminist Voyage through International Relations*

J. Ann Tickner

*The Political Economy of Violence against Women*

Jacqui True

*Bodies of Violence:*

*Theorizing Embodied Subjects in International Relations*

Lauren B. Wilcox

# GENDER AND PRIVATE SECURITY IN GLOBAL POLITICS

Edited by Maya Eichler

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by

Oxford University Press

198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

© Oxford University Press 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gender and private security in global politics/edited by Maya Eichler.

pages cm. — (Oxford studies in gender and international relations)

ISBN 978-0-19-936437-4 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-19-936438-1

(paperback : alk. paper) 1. Private security services. 2. Women soldiers. 3. Military

policy—Moral and ethical aspects. 4. International relations. I. Eichler, Maya, 1974– editor.

HV8290.G46 2015

355.3'5—dc23

2014028998

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America

on acid-free paper

To Ann and Cynthia, for paving the way



# CONTENTS

*Acknowledgments* ix

*List of Contributors* xi

*List of Acronyms* xv

Gender and the Privatization of Military Security: An Introduction 1  
*Maya Eichler*

## **PART I: Beyond the Public/Private Divide: Feminist Analyses of Military Privatization and the Gendered State**

1. Military Privatization as a Gendered Process: A Case for Integrating Feminist International Relations and Feminist State Theories 19  
*Saskia Stachowitsch*

2. Military Privatization and the Gendered Politics of Sacrifice 37  
*Bianca Baggiarini*

3. Gender, PMSCs, and the Global Rescaling of Protection: Implications for Feminist Security Studies 55  
*Maya Eichler*

## **PART II: Rethinking the Private Military Contractor I: Third-Country Nationals and the Making of Empire**

4. (Re)Producing American Soldiers in an Age of Empire 75  
*Isabelle V. Barker*

5. From Warriors of Empire to Martial Contractors: Reimagining Gurkhas in Private Security 95  
*Amanda Chisholm*

6. The License to Exploit: PMSCs, Masculinities, and Third-Country Nationals 114  
*Jutta Joachim and Andrea Schneider*



**PART III: Rethinking the Private Military Contractor II: Masculinities and Violence**

7. Aversions to Masculine Excess in the Private Military and Security Company and Their Effects: Don't Be a "Billy Big Bollocks" and Beware the "Ninja!" 131  
*Paul Higate*
8. Heteronormative and Penile Frustrations: The Uneasy Discourse of the ArmorGroup Hazing Scandal 146  
*Chris Hendershot*

**PART IV: Private In/Security: Gendered Problems of Accountability, Regulation, and Ethics**

9. Engendering Accountability in Private Security and Public Peacekeeping 169  
*Valerie Sperling*
10. Women, PMSCs, and International Law 187  
*Ana Filipa Vrdoljak*
11. Empathy, Responsibility, and the Morality of Mercenaries: A Feminist Ethical Appraisal of PMSCs 208  
*Jillian Terry*
- Conclusion 226  
*Maya Eichler*
- Afterword 236  
*Anna Leander*
- Bibliography 243
- Index 279

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Cambridge University Press for permission to reprint slightly edited versions of the following two pieces: chapter 4 (pp. 198–215) in *Altered States: The Globalization of Accountability* by Valerie Sperling, originally published by Cambridge University Press in 2009; and the article “(Re)Producing American Soldiers in an Age of Empire” by Isabelle V. Barker that originally appeared in *Politics & Gender*, volume 5, issue 2 in June 2009 (pp. 211–235).

I dedicate this book to two leading figures of feminist international relations—J. Ann Tickner and Cynthia Enloe—who paved the way for so many of us. Without their scholarship and example, I doubt that asking feminist questions about private security in global politics would have been possible in the first place. They have taught us to speak truth to power, question what is taken for granted, and listen carefully to those on the margins of international relations. Without asking feminist questions, they have insisted, we know less and are collectively worse off. This book is motivated by the kind of feminist questioning and scholarship that Ann and Cynthia have pioneered.

Over the past few years, a small but dedicated group of scholars has worked to develop feminist and feminist-informed analyses of security privatization and private military and security companies (PMSCs). In assembling this volume it was my goal to bring these scholars together and both showcase and advance this emerging research. The chapters make it evident that there are *multiple* ways of studying private security through gendered lenses. In this volume we have not exhausted feminist analyses of private security but instead aimed to inspire others to ask feminist questions and further develop the emerging field of “critical gender studies in private security.” It has been my utmost privilege to work with the contributors to this volume. I am grateful to each one of them for agreeing to be part of this project. Without their commitment the volume would not have materialized. I thank Anna Leander for her enthusiasm for this project and for supplying such an insightful afterword.

Several of the contributors to this volume participated in ISA panels on gender and private security. In 2012 I organized the panel “Gender and the Privatization of Military Security,” and in 2013 Amanda Chisholm

and I co-organized the panel “Silences and Margins: Interrogating the Intersections of Gender, Race, Class, and Citizenship in Private Security.” I thank the panel discussants—Anna Leander and Cynthia Enloe respectively—and the audience members for their engagement and comments. The Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section of the ISA has offered important institutional space that encourages and enables the kind of research presented in this book.

I am especially grateful for the support that my book proposal received from the editors of the Oxford Series in Gender and International Relations, J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, and my editor at Oxford University Press, Angela Chnapko, who expertly guided me through the publication process. My thanks also go to editorial assistants Peter Worger and Princess Ikatekit, project manager Peter Mavrikis, production editor Leslie Johnson, and copy-editor India Gray for their part in bringing this book project to completion. I am indebted to Soumita Basu, Amanda Chisholm, Deborah Cowen, Cynthia Enloe, Jane Parpart, Kim Rygiel, Valerie Sperling, Saskia Stachowitsch, and Sandra Whitworth who all at different times discussed the ideas for this volume with me and encouraged me to pursue it. I deeply appreciate the two anonymous reviewers who took the time to carefully read the manuscript and provided excellent and thoughtful feedback that has made this a stronger piece of collective scholarship.

The idea for this volume was born during a Gender and International Security Fellowship at the Harvard Kennedy School in 2010–2011 that offered support to me at a critical phase in my academic career. I also acknowledge the financial support I received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Postdoctoral Fellowship and the Lilian Robinson Visiting Scholars Program at the Simone De Beauvoir Institute at Concordia University while working on this edited volume. The Department of Geography at the University of Toronto, my institutional home for the past few years, was a most welcoming and intellectually stimulating place, in particular with Deborah Cowen as my postdoctoral supervisor. The final stages of work on this volume were completed at Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, my new home. As I embark on this new phase in my academic career, I am once again reminded of the importance of collaboration and mentoring as key values of feminist scholarship (and activism). I look forward to new opportunities to learn from my colleagues and students in order to advance together our understanding of the world and make it a truly more secure and just place for all to live.

Maya Eichler  
Halifax

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

**BIANCA BAGGIARINI** is a PhD candidate in sociology at York University, Toronto. Her research interests lie in feminist critical security studies, citizenship studies, and international political sociology. Her PhD dissertation examines how states respond to the “crisis of military sacrifice” in late modern, biopolitical societies. She has published on the gendered and sociopolitical effects of military privatization in *Gendered Perspectives on Conflict and Violence* (2013) and *St. Anthony's International Review* (2014) and has as a forthcoming (2015) article on military drones and sacrifice, which will appear as part of a special issue on Mimetic Theory and International Studies in the *Journal of International Political Theory*.

**ISABELLE V. BARKER** is an assistant dean at Bryn Mawr College. She has a PhD in political science and has research interests in immigration, feminist political economy, and political theory. She has published on topics ranging from geopolitics and women's human rights to the rise of global Pentecostalism as a response to dilemmas of social reproduction produced by neoliberal economic restructuring.

**AMANDA CHISHOLM** recently completed her PhD in international relations at the University of Bristol. Her dissertation focuses on Gurkhas in PMSCs and examines how reproductions of colonial histories and raced and gendered practices underpin representations of Gurkhas' labor. She has published articles on this topic in the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* and in *Security Dialogue*. Since completing her PhD, Amanda has taken a position as lecturer in international relations at Newcastle University. Her research continues to be motivated by how colonial histories, race, and gender condition and discipline military and security labor globally.

**MAYA EICHLER** is Canada Research Chair in Social Innovation and Community Engagement and assistant professor in the Department of Political and Canadian Studies and the Department of Women's Studies at Mount Saint Vincent University (Halifax). Her research focuses on feminist international relations theory, gender and the armed forces, the

privatization of military security, and post-Soviet politics. She has published the book *Militarizing Men: Gender, Conscription, and War in Post-Soviet Russia* with Stanford University Press (2012) and recent articles in *Critical Studies on Security*, *Citizenship Studies*, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, and *International Journal*. She currently serves as an Associate Editor for the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*.

**CHRIS HENDERSHOT** is a PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at York University. His dissertation is titled “Corpses, Guns, Penises, and Private Military and Security Corporations.” This project undertakes a posthuman, queer, and feminist analysis of the work that PMSCs do for and through privatizing, militarizing, securing, and commercializing processes.

**PAUL HIGATE** is reader in Gender & Security at the School for Sociology, Politics and International Studies at the University of Bristol. He has researched the gendered culture of the military, the transition from military to civilian life, and gendered relations in peace support operations. He is a former Fellow of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Global Uncertainties Programme with a project entitled: “Mercenary Masculinities Imagine Security: The Case of the Private Military Security Contractor.”

**JUTTA JOACHIM** is associate professor of political science at Leibniz University Hannover, Germany. She received her PhD from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and her MA from the University of South Carolina. She is the author of *Agenda Setting, the UN, and NGOs: Gender Violence and Reproductive Rights* (Georgetown University Press 2007) and co-author of *International Organizations and Implementation: Enforcers, Managers, Authorities and Transnational Activism in the UN and the EU: A Comparative Study* (both Routledge 2008). Her current project concerns the role of private actors in security governance. Her articles have appeared in, among others, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, and the *Journal of European Public Policy*.

**ANNA LEANDER** is a professor (MSO) in the Department of Management, Politics, and Philosophy at the Copenhagen Business School and professor of international relations at PUC Rio de Janeiro. Her research focuses on commercial security and on the development of sociological approaches to international relations. She has recently published the edited volumes *Business in Global Governance* and *Commercializing Security* and articles in *Global Constitutionalism*, *Leiden Journal of International Law*, and *Review of International Studies*.

**ANDREA SCHNEIKER** studied political science and sociology in Lille, France, and Münster, Germany, from 2000 to 2004. She received a PhD in political science from the University in Münster in 2008 for her research on the

self- and co-regulation of PMSCs. From 2008 to 2013 she was assistant professor at Leibniz University Hannover. She is currently a junior professor in political science at the University of Siegen, Germany. She has published in, among others, the peer-reviewed journals *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, *Comparative European Politics*, *Security Dialogue* (all co-authored with Jutta Joachim), *Disasters*, and *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*.

**VALERIE SPERLING** is a professor of political science at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. She received her PhD from the University of California, Berkeley. Her research interests include globalization and accountability, social movements, gender politics, patriotism and militarism, and state building in the postcommunist region. She is the author of *Organizing Women in Contemporary Russia: Engendering Transition* (Cambridge University Press 1999), which is about the emergence and development of the Russian women's movement, and *Altered States: The Globalization of Accountability* (Cambridge University Press 2009). Her latest book is *Sex, Politics, and Putin: Political Legitimacy in Russia* (Oxford University Press 2014).

**SASKIA STACHOWITSCH** is a postdoctoral research fellow and lecturer at the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna. Her research areas are gender and the military, private security, feminist international relations, security studies, and global political economy. Recent publications include *Gender Ideologies and Military Labor Markets in the US* (Routledge 2012); "Military Privatization and the Remasculinization of the State: Making the Link between the Outsourcing of Military Security and Gendered State Transformations" in *International Relations* (2013); and "Military Gender Integration and Foreign Policy in the United States: A Feminist IR Perspective" in *Security Dialogue* (2012).

**JILLIAN TERRY** is completing a PhD in international relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Her doctoral thesis, supervised by Kimberly Hutchings, examines the contributions of feminist ethics to the burgeoning field of feminist security studies and the impact of feminist insights on the ethics of contemporary war practices including drone warfare, private military contracting, and counterinsurgency. Her recent publications include "The End of the Line: Feminist Understandings of Resistance to Full-Body Scanning Technology" with Stephanie Redden in the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* (2013).

**ANA FILIPA VRDOLJAK** is professor and associate dean (research) in the Faculty of Law at the University of Technology, Sydney. She was a contributor regarding women's issues to the European Commission funded research collaboration titled "Regulating the Privatisation of 'War': The Role of the

EU in Assuring Compliance with International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights (PRIV-WAR).” She has been Marie Curie Fellow and Jean Monnet Fellow in the Law Department of the European University Institute, Florence, and visiting scholar at the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law, University of Cambridge, and Global Law School, New York University. She holds a PhD (in Law) from the University of Sydney.

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CDU	Conduct and Discipline Unit
CE	Council of Europe
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women
CIVPOL	Civilian Police
CP	Close Protection
ED	Erectile Dysfunction
EUPM	European Union Police Mission
GPE	Global Political Economy
HRC	Human Rights Council
ICJ	International Committee of Jurists
ICOC	International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers
ICOCA	International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers' Association
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
IPOA	International Peace Operations Association
IPTF	International Police Task Force
IR	International Relations
ISOA	International Stability Operations Association
KBR	Kellogg Brown & Root
LN <sub>s</sub>	Local Nationals
LOGCAP	Logistics Civil Augmentation Program
MEJA	Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PMSC <sub>s</sub>	Private Military and Security Companies
POGO	Project on Government Oversight
PSD	Personal Security Detail



RMA	Revolution in Military Affairs
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
SFOR	NATO-led Stabilization Force
SOFA	Status of Forces Agreement
SOMA	Status of Mission Agreement
SWAT	Special Weapons and Tactics
TCNs	Third-Country Nationals
TVPRA	Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act
UNDPKO	United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations
UNGC	United Nations Global Compact
UN-INSTRAW	United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women
UNMIBH	United Nations Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina
UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
UNOIGWG	United Nations Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia
UNWGM	United Nations Working Group on the Use of Mercenaries as a Means of Violating Human Rights and Impeding the Exercise of the Rights of Peoples to Self-Determination
USDOD	United States Department of Defense
USDOS	United States Department of State
USGAO	United States Government Accountability Office
VAW	Violence Against Women

# Gender and Private Security in Global Politics



# Gender and the Privatization of Military Security

## *An Introduction*

MAYA EICHLER

The past two to three decades have witnessed the increasing privatization of military security in Western states, with significant repercussions for global politics. Private military and security companies (PMSCs), especially those based in the United States and United Kingdom, have become central participants in contemporary warfare, selling services such as armed protection, training, intelligence, and logistical support to state and nonstate actors. It is estimated that the size of the global private security industry increased twofold between 1990 and 1999 (to USD 100 bln) and again doubled in size between 2000 and 2010 (Leander 2010, 209). The U.S.-led wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in particular led to burgeoning demand for private military and security services. In both wars, private contractors outnumbered or closely trailed U.S. troop numbers (see, for example, USDOD 2011).

It may be all too obvious to the casual observer (and therefore of little interest to the scholar) that the field of private military security is intensely gendered. The image of burly, masculine private contractors has become widespread over the past two decades, especially in media coverage of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Private contractors have been cast, like mercenaries were previously, as the “whores of war” opposite the “just warriors” of state militaries. Reports which allege poor financial accountability, impunity for war crimes, and disregard for local populations but also sexual harassment and human trafficking have plagued the private military and security

industry. In this context, the industry has begun to pay more attention to “women” and “gender” if only for the sake of reputation and revenue. Yet as gender is gaining in significance within the realm of private security, we continue to know relatively little about how and to what effect the privatization of military security is gendered.

This book brings together key scholars in the emerging research area of “critical gender studies in private security.” The contributors to this volume contend that the privatization of military security is a deeply gendered process, with gendered underpinnings and effects. The contributors employ a variety of feminist perspectives, including critical, postcolonial, poststructuralist, liberal, and queer feminist perspectives, as well as a wide range of methodological approaches such as ethnography, participant-observation, genealogy, deconstruction, and discourse analysis. Located at the intersection of international relations (IR), security studies, and gender studies, this volume aims to push research in two key directions. First, it establishes gender as key analytical category for the study of private security in global politics, thus introducing new research questions and methods to private security scholarship. Second, the volume advances the field of feminist security studies by contributing new empirical and theoretical insights into the gendering of security today.

Gender is often misunderstood as being interchangeable with women, but a feminist-informed gender analysis goes beyond adding women and stirring. While this book does ask where the women are in the private military and security industry and how they have been affected by PMSCs in the field, the book as a whole offers an analysis of the varied ways in which masculinities and femininities constitute, and are constituted by, private security in global politics, with particular consequences for the global social order. The contributors interrogate security privatization as a gendered process, and the private military and security industry as a crucial site for the (re)production and contestation of gender norms in contemporary warfare and global politics.

The book not only contends that security privatization cannot be fully grasped without a consideration of gender but also presents a framework for studying security privatization from a critical gender perspective that emphasizes intersectionality, multiple scales, and the political nature of PMSCs. Collectively, the chapters in this book demonstrate that gender, in intersection with citizenship, national identity, race, class, and sexuality, is shaped by, at the same time as it helps constitute, the practices of PMSCs and their employees along with public perceptions of private contractors. The contributors to the volume recognize gender as a key structure in the multiscale politics of security privatization, or, put differently, that security privatization is a gendered political process that takes place at and through multiple scales. Furthermore, we see PMSCs not simply as suppliers of security and

security-related services but also as political actors who contribute to the production of gendered social hierarchies and the global social order. After locating this volume in the literatures on security privatization and feminist IR/security studies, I outline in more detail the framework of the book and describe how the individual chapters contribute to its development.

## PRIVATE SECURITY IN GLOBAL POLITICS

Scholarship on the privatization of military security and PMSCs has proliferated in recent years across a number of disciplines, including political science, IR, international law, sociology, criminology, philosophy, geography, and business. Scholars in political science and IR have aimed to explain security privatization and assess its impact on the state's monopoly on legitimate force as well as to define, categorize, and regulate PMSCs (Singer 2003; Avant 2005; Kinsey 2006). In his seminal article and later book *Corporate Warriors*, Peter Singer (2001/02; 2003) identified a gap in the security market at the end of the Cold War, the changing nature of warfare, and neoliberalism as driving forces behind security privatization. Elke Krahmann (2010) more recently argued that the underlying ideology of civil-military relations (republican or neoliberal) plays a key part in explaining the willingness of state actors to privatize military security. Scholars have investigated how private force can enhance a state's military power but can also weaken transparency in states with high state capacity and increase vulnerability and conflict in states with weaker state capacity (Singer 2003; Avant 2005; Avant 2006). Much scholarly effort has gone into defining and delineating PMSCs in relation to mercenaries (Percy 2007), with most authors arguing that they represent a novel form of security actor despite their historical antecedents. Finally, much of the literature on security privatization has been driven by the practical challenge of how to regulate the industry and hold PMSCs politically, legally, and financially accountable. Here the existing institutional and legal frameworks have generally been deemed inadequate while industry initiatives toward self-regulation or voluntary regulation have been met with skepticism (Chesterman and Lehnardt 2007; De Nevers 2009; Carmola 2010; Dickinson 2011; Tonkin 2011). The research field of security privatization and PMSCs is highly dynamic, and contemporary scholarship goes well beyond these key themes. For example, lately more attention is being paid to the relationship between various security actors such as PMSCs, NGOs, and state forces in order to understand the complexities of today's military operations (Dunigan 2011; Berndtsson 2013; Birthe 2013), while questions of regulation, accountability, and ethics continue to be at the forefront of scholarly debates on private security (Tonkin 2011; Francioni and Ronzitti 2011; Huskey 2012).

Critical security studies scholars have made important contributions to research on private security. Importantly, they have questioned the public-private distinction that informs much scholarship on private security (Leander 2005; Krahmann 2008; Owens 2008; Abrahamsen and Williams 2011). As Patricia Owens (2008) argues, “there is no such thing as public or private violence. There is only violence that is *made* ‘public’ and violence that is *made* ‘private’” (979). In analyzing the effects of security privatization on the state, critical scholars contend that security privatization should not be equated with the erosion of state power or its monopoly on legitimate force. Instead, security privatization is best conceived of in terms of a broader transformation in governance that involves public/private and local/global actors as part of global security assemblages (Abrahamsen and Williams 2011) and the commercialization of security practices in both public and private spheres (Leander 2010). Critical scholars see security as essentially contested and political, and recognize that privatization involves not only a change in supplier but a reshaping of security itself (Krahmann 2008). Anna Leander (2005), for example, shows that security privatization reinforces militarized notions of security while depoliticizing security issues.

Feminist-informed gender scholarship has developed within, and draws on, this critical scholarship on security privatization but foregrounds gender, a hitherto neglected area of study within both mainstream and critical approaches. Feminist and critical gender scholars have investigated the significance of (hegemonic and subordinate) masculinities in the private security industry (Barker 2009; Chisholm 2010, 2014a, 2014b; Via 2010; Higate 2012a, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e) as well as examined security privatization as a process of remasculinization (Schneiker and Joachim 2012c; Stachowitsch 2013). Feminist scholars have also begun to address the lack of accountability of PMSCs toward female employees and local women in the field (Sperling 2009; Vrdoljak 2011). Taking a security studies perspective, Laura Sjoberg (2013) has conceptualized security privatization as a gendered state strategy in war that takes advantage of the gendered invisibility of the private sphere. This volume builds on and advances these existing feminist and critical gender studies contributions to scholarship on security privatization.

The book focuses on the recent outsourcing in Western states of military functions and military work to the private sector and the concomitant rise of PMSCs in global politics. The chapters in this volume primarily deal with the key players in the industry, that is, the U.S. and UK companies that operate globally. The book does not address the deeper historical phenomenon of mercenaries and mercenary armies or the broader phenomenon of private force in global politics, which includes pirates and non-state armed groups. The book deals with the market in security and security-related services in the context of warfare and to a lesser extent peacekeeping. While focusing on international war- and peacemaking, it is worth acknowledging that this

global market for force cannot easily be separated from the market in domestic commercial security services that has sprung up globally (Abrahamsen and Williams 2011). Both international and domestic private security are manifestations of the larger neoliberalization of security and the increasing securitization of public and private life at the turn of the twenty-first century.

Various terms have been used to describe the private companies whose employees perform the work previously carried out by military personnel. Scholars refer to private military firms (Singer 2003), private security companies (Avant 2005), and private military companies (Leander 2005). The most common term used in the scholarly literature, however, is private military and security companies—PMSCs—and it is this term that is used throughout the book to refer to the globally operating companies that sell a combination of services ranging from logistical support for military operations, armed and unarmed security services, military training, intelligence, and more. While smaller companies might focus on one or two of these services, larger companies often sell an array of military support and security services. The term “contractor” or “defense contractor” also appears in the book to refer to the employees of PMSCs, and the term “third-country national” (TCN) is used when speaking of employees who are citizens of neither the company’s host country nor the country of operation. Overall, the book deals with three distinct aspects of private security in global politics: the processes of military security privatization, the companies themselves (the PMSCs), and the employees of PMSCs (contractors). It is, then, a book about both the structural changes *and* the agents shaping and shaped by the privatization of military security.

## **GENDER AND SECURITY**

What distinguishes the contributors to this book is that they analyze private security through a primary (though not exclusive) focus on gender. Feminist scholars in IR (and other disciplines) distinguish between gender and biological sex to underscore that the meanings associated with masculinity and femininity are socially constructed rather than biologically given, and therefore vary across place and time.<sup>1</sup> Gender refers to the expectations, behaviors, and norms associated with being a man or woman in particular historical, cultural, social, and economic contexts. Feminist scholarship is interested in understanding how gender has been used to justify hierarchies and unequal power relations between people designated as “women” and “men.” Thus gender is more than a variable—it is intrinsically linked to gendered relations of power that are reflected in processes of masculinization and feminization. Crucially, gender is “a primary way of signifying relationships of



power” (Scott 1986, 1067). Gender structures social life as it assigns power to those institutions, practices, and activities associated with masculinities. For example, what has traditionally counted as political and thus relevant has gained its predominance by association with men and masculinity and in opposition to femininity and subordinate masculinities. The political leader, citizen, or warrior has long been imagined as a man and as displaying masculine characteristics (Tickner 2001). Significantly, gender also informs interstate relations whereby states try to project images of strength stereotypically associated with masculinity and aim to avoid their feminization within international structures (Sjoberg 2013). Gender is therefore a key social structure of domestic and international orders (Connell 1987, 2005).

The contributors to this book, while coming from a range of disciplines and employing diverse theoretical perspectives, all substantially draw on feminist IR theory to develop their analyses of the privatization of military security. Feminist IR scholarship has made important contributions to research on war and militarization. Over the past decade, the subfield of feminist security studies has emerged within feminist IR (Blanchard 2003; Sjoberg 2010; Wibben 2011). This new area of study is primarily focused on the public security sector even as it has paved the way for the kinds of analyses developed here. While there is significant diversity among feminist scholars of security, they share an interest in investigating how security practices are tied to norms of masculinity and femininity and tend to reproduce unequal gender relations. More specifically, feminist security studies makes four key contributions to the study of war and (public) security that inform the questions and analyses in this volume.

First, feminist scholarship has documented the important intersections between security, war, and national and global gender orders. Gender orders manifest themselves in gendered power relations, a gendered division of labor, and dominant sexual practices (Connell 1987). States’ security and defense policies (including the waging of war) shape and are shaped by notions of masculinity and femininity that pervade domestic and global politics (Goldstein 2001; Tickner 2001; Eichler 2012a). For example, policies such as male conscription or female exclusion from combat draw on, at the same time as they reinforce, dominant notions of masculinity and femininity. The association of military strength with masculinity in global politics has dire consequences for international peace considering that states are “motivated in part by a desire to appear ‘manly’” (Enloe 2000a). Therefore, we need to conceptualize security and war as gendered, and the organization of violence as intersecting with national and global gender orders.

Second, feminist scholars have shown that military organizations themselves are fundamentally gendered in that they represent a particular (micro) gender order within the broader societal (macro) gender order. Military labor and its management are deeply gendered. Militaries are male-dominated

organizations that privilege masculinity and exclude or marginalize women and values associated with femininity or incorporate them in highly specific ways (Mathers 2013). The world's armed forces are overwhelmingly made up of men, and states choose to primarily rely on men to fight wars. Despite this, militaries in a variety of ways rely on women and notions of femininity such as loyal military wives or patriotic soldiers' mothers. Increasingly, armed forces across the globe are recruiting women into their ranks to compensate for the lack of military "manpower" (Enloe 2000b), and even opening direct combat roles to women, most recently in Australia and the U.S. Changing gendered recruitment and personnel policies both challenge and reproduce norms of militarized femininity and masculinity.

Third, feminist security studies scholars argue that key concepts of security, such as protection, are gendered, in that they are informed by particular understandings of masculinity and femininity (Stiehm 1982; Tickner 2001; Blanchard 2003; Young 2003; Sjöberg 2013). The gendered ideology of protection that defines men as the protectors and women as those in need of protection is informed by both masculinism and militarism. In this view, women's gender subordination is intrinsically tied to the organization of the means of violence in society. Feminists critique both the notion of the state as protector and of men as protectors, and document how policies of protection often increase women's insecurities.

Finally, this leads feminist scholars to critically interrogate the concept of security, both in terms of asking whose security counts and what makes up true security. Feminist scholars argue that we need to look at security from the perspective of ordinary women (and men) rather than the state. They also employ a multidimensional concept of security that goes beyond, or is even defined in opposition to, military security to include other dimensions of security such as personal, economic, environmental, or physical (Tickner 2001; Blanchard 2003). Therefore feminist scholars call on us to investigate the appeal that militarized security continues to have in domestic and global politics and to envision alternatives to current security narratives and policies (Wibben 2011).

These four insights into the gendered organization of violence and conceptualization of security lead to a set of feminist-informed questions about the privatization of military security and the private military and security industry. How is the privatization of military security connected to national and global gender orders and their current transformations? What type of gendered organizations are PMSCs and what notions of masculinity and femininity do they rely on and reinforce? What gendered conceptions of protection and security does the private security industry (re)produce? And, how does the private security industry affect women's and men's security, both as employees and locals in the field? What gender-specific problems of accountability does private security pose, and what is the potential for

regulating and reforming private security from a feminist perspective? As the chapters in this volume answer these and other questions, they not only develop an in-depth analysis of gender and private security in global politics but also propose a unique approach to the study of gender and private security in global politics.

## **THIS VOLUME'S APPROACH: GENDER AND PRIVATE SECURITY IN GLOBAL POLITICS**

This volume brings together the work of a multidisciplinary group of scholars—from political science, IR and GPE, sociology, and international law—working at the intersection of gender studies and private security. While there is considerable diversity in empirical focus and theoretical perspective among the chapters of this volume, they collectively put forward an innovative framework for how to study the privatization of military security through “gendered lenses” (Runyan and Peterson 2013). This framework consists of the following four pillars:

1. A feminist-informed critical gender approach: This volume employs an explicitly critical rather than problem-solving approach to the study of gender and private security.<sup>2</sup> A problem-solving approach tends to instrumentalize gender in the interests of business, public image, accountability, or operational effectiveness while taking for granted the activities of PMSCs. In contrast to problem-solving approaches that treat gender/women as a variable to be added without changing how we study security privatization, this volume asks feminist-informed critical questions about gender and the privatization of security: How is security privatization a gendered process? How does it rely on, reinforce, and reproduce gender difference and inequalities? The feminist-informed critical gender approach employed here has both analytical and normative goals: an interest in improved analysis and better understanding of gendered power relations in the private security sphere as well as an interest in transforming security practices that reinforce gender (and other) hierarchies in global politics. Importantly, such an approach is interested as much in men and masculinities as it is in women and femininities.
2. Intersectional analysis: The contributions of this volume go beyond an analysis of masculinities and femininities in private security. Various strands of feminist scholarship, such as socialist (Hansen and Philipson 1990), critical race (Wing 1997), queer (Butler 1990), and postcolonial feminist (Mohanty 2003), emphasize that gender intersects with other categories of social difference and that an exclusive focus on gender misses the complex intersecting hierarchies of oppression and subordination

that shape women's lives. Many of the individual chapters in this volume emphasize the intersecting inequalities of gender with class, race, nation, citizenship, and sexuality and their significance for a better understanding of the practices of PMSCs. Thus the volume asks not only how is security privatization a gendered process, but how does its gendering intersect with other social hierarchies?

3. Multiple scales of analysis: Feminist scholars and activists have argued that the personal is political and international (Enloe 1989). Feminists are keenly attuned to how various scales<sup>3</sup>—such as that of the body, the household/family, the nation/state, the region, and the global—are intimately connected rather than distinct. The contributors to this volume, while each focusing on a particular scale or scalar process (such as globalization), shed light on how security privatization is made possible and experienced differently at various scales. Many of the chapters speak to the recent interest in feminist IR to place the body at the center of the study of war, focusing on how war is experienced by ordinary people and differently gendered, raced, classed, or sexed bodies (Sylvester 2013a). In this volume private security is seen not only as a local, regional, national or global practice (as it might in conventional studies on private security) but also as an embodied practice. Security privatization becomes materialized through particular gendered, raced, classed, and sexed bodies and has different effects on these bodies. The volume examines security privatization both “from above” and “from below”: How is security privatization connected to gendered state transformations and shifts in global markets? *And* how is private security a gendered experience for those individuals providing, buying, receiving, or exposed to privatized security, that is, how is private security embodied in particular contexts?
4. PMSCs as political: Animated by feminist concerns about gendered power relations and inequalities, the contributors bring a unique political view to the study of PMSCs. They do not treat PMSCs as neutral market actors filling a void in security provision but as political actors shaping not only security environments but also the global social order and its gender, racial, and economic foundations. Following from this, the volume asks the important question: How does gender help us see the ways in which PMSCs are implicated in reproducing and securing an unequal global order?

### **Structure of the Book**

The book is organized into four parts, with the chapters in part I focusing on feminist theorizing on military privatization; parts II and III on empirical explorations of masculinities; and part IV on political issues regarding

accountability, regulation, and ethics. That being said, a clear distinction among the theoretical, empirical, and political is not given as several of the empirically oriented chapters make strong and innovative theoretical contributions, and all chapters underline the gendered political nature of security privatization.

The first set of chapters by Saskia Stachowitsch, Bianca Baggiarini, and Maya Eichler (part I) advances feminist theorizing on military security privatization by focusing on neoliberal transformations of state structures and discourses. For political reasons the state has long been a key concern for feminist theorists (see e.g., MacKinnon 1989; Brown 1992). Feminists have scrutinized the state's role in upholding unequal gender relations through economic, social, and military policies, making it a crucial site for feminist activism. But feminists have so far not paid much attention to security privatization as an aspect of neoliberal state transformation. Stachowitsch in "Military Privatization as a Gendered Process: A Case for Integrating Feminist International Relations and Feminist State Theories" argues that military privatization is a gendered process that is best understood as a result of interactions between gendered states and the gendered international order. Military security privatization is not an effect of state erosion to the advantage of the global market for force but rather defined by the dynamics between neoliberal restructuring at the national and global level. These dynamics include the transformation of military labor markets, de-democratization, and discursive remasculinization. Stachowitsch develops a theoretical framework that integrates feminist IR/GPE and feminist state theories and allows us to capture the "hybrid character" of privatization as an aspect of both changing gender orders within the state and the gendered dynamics of the global economy. The military sector, public and private, she argues, is a state *and* international space, and thus an approach that is sensitive to changing gendered power relations at multiple scales—within and beyond the state—is needed for a deeper understanding of military privatization and its gendered implications.

Increasingly, governments have had to contend with their citizens' unwillingness to sacrifice soldiers in military operations in distant locations. The move from conscription to all-volunteer forces as well as the privatization of military security can be understood as mechanisms to deal with aversion to casualties. In "Military Privatization and the Gendered Politics of Sacrifice" Baggiarini considers how states and militaries are responding to the contemporary problem of sacrifice and how their responses are gendered in the context of military privatization. As the author argues, states have conceived of PMSCs as one solution to the problem of sacrificing soldiers, and military privatization is thus integral to the broader shift toward "bodyless warfare." By tracing the genealogical trajectories of privatized violence, she establishes PMSCs as a biopolitical component of the so-called revolution in military

affairs (RMA). Baggiarini concludes that the incorporation of private contractors into the theater of war is an important but insufficient move toward overcoming the limits of the body. States' increasing reliance on PMSCs highlights the paradox between bodyless war and sacrificial violence in contemporary warfare.

Another central issue at the nexus of state, military service, and citizenship has been that of gendered protection. My chapter "Gender, PMSCs, and the Global Rescaling of the Politics of Protection: Implications for Feminist Security Studies" begins from the feminist insight that states have historically entrenched unequal gender relations through an ideology of protection. While recent feminist work has moved beyond a focus on the geographic space of the nation-state, it has only begun to consider the implications of the privatization of military security for the gendered politics of protection. As I show in chapter 3, PMSCs have an active interest in extending the politics of protection to the global scale in order to extend the market for security. I argue that today feminists must question protection anew, by examining how protection is being marketized and rescaled, and racialized, gendered, and classed in new ways. The logic of global masculinist protection is increasing our dependency on the market while reducing our political autonomy.

Part II moves to a more empirically driven but nonetheless theoretically rich collection of chapters. The three chapters in part II investigate the widespread use of racialized "foreign" labor in the global private security industry by analyzing the varied masculinities that security privatization entails and relies on, and their intersections with race, class, nationality, and citizenship. The vast majority of employees who have been hired to work in Iraq and Afghanistan under U.S. defense contracts are in fact not U.S. citizens but citizens of states on the periphery and semiperiphery of the global economy. They have included so-called TCNs from countries such as India and the Philippines as well as "local nationals" (LNs) from Iraq and Afghanistan. TCNs and LNs have performed much of the logistical work in support of U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, but they have also worked in the provision of armed and unarmed security services.

Isabelle Barker's chapter "(Re)producing American Soldiers in an Age of Empire" examines the use of TCN labor for reproductive work—such as cleaning, food preparation, and laundering—on U.S. military bases in Iraq. As a result of military privatization, vital support services have been increasingly outsourced to migrant men from India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Nepal, and Pakistan. Barker argues that this globalized division of reproductive labor is a site of symbolic politics that reinforces the gendered dimensions of U.S. soldiers' national identity and is rooted in a long history of gendered military service. The use of migrant labor to perform feminized reproductive labor previously performed by military personnel helps construct a more unified image of the U.S. soldier as warrior. Barker

argues that this division of labor also reproduces neocolonial global relations and is thus integral to an aggressive U.S. foreign policy and the making of the U.S. empire.

Amanda Chisholm in her chapter “From Warriors of Empire to Martial Contractors: Reimagining Gurkhas in Private Security” brings to our attention the experiences of one particular subset of security contractors, namely Gurkhas. Gurkhas hail from Nepal and have fought in the British, Indian, and Nepalese armies. Long imagined as a “martial race” they have become sought-after workers in the global private security industry. Employing a feminist postcolonial approach that is sensitive to the intersections of gender with race and class and based on fieldwork conducted in Nepal and Afghanistan, Chisholm shows how Gurkhas and Gurkha agents view the industry and their own (martial and masculine) role within it. She examines historic constructions of Gurkhas and how Gurkhas and others reproduce or refashion these in the context of the contemporary market for force. Linking individual experiences to larger processes of colonialism and global migration (as does Barker), Chisholm’s analysis highlights the centrality of individual agency even for those on the margins of the globally operating private security industry.

The final chapter of part II, “The License to Exploit: PMSCs, Masculinities and Third-Country Nationals,” written by Jutta Joachim and Andrea Schneider examines the labor of TCNs in the global private security industry from another angle. Drawing on an analysis of company websites, the chapter explores how the construction of Western contractors as the world’s “best security experts” intersects with culture, race, and class to reinforce social inequalities and keeps from view the subordinate masculinities it relies on. The authors argue that the power of PMSCs rests not only on efficiency and cost-effectiveness but also on a hierarchy of masculinities. PMSCs allow state militaries to associate with accepted notions of militarized masculinity, such as the peacekeeper, and outsource less accepted ones. But, as the authors argue, the private provision of security services relies on hegemonic and subordinate masculinities that are constructed through “othering” and reproduce (post)colonial dichotomies. Significantly, their analysis highlights the political nature of PMSCs and the ways in which they contribute to the construction of masculinity norms in global politics.

Part III explores the masculinities of white Western contractors in relation to excesses and restraints of violence, and how these are perceived and interpreted. The chapters in this section also highlight the intersections of gender, masculinities more specifically, with nationality and sexuality in private security settings. Paul Higate’s chapter “Aversions to Masculine Excess in the Private Military and Security Company and Their Effects: Don’t Be a ‘Billy Big Bollocks’ and Beware the ‘Ninja!’” develops a microanalysis of protection and masculinity in the private military and security industry. He