

This background paper has been produced for a workshop on "Civil society views on next generation peacebuilding and conflict prevention policy and programming issues and responses", convened by Peacebuild in Ottawa on March 14, 2011 with the support of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

The Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention consultation series seeks to bring together expert civil society practitioners, academics and Government of Canada officials to generate up-to-date information and analysis, as well as policy and programming options to respond to developments and emerging trends in peacebuilding.

Other subjects in the series include:
Women's political participation in post-conflict transitions *
Environmental and natural resource cooperation and transformation in post-conflict situations *
Trends in peacebuilding in Latin America *
Future directions for translating the norms of the Women, Peace and Security Resolutions into operational standards within the UN system *
The changing nature of non-governmental peacebuilding *

*Contact:
info@peacebuild.ca*



Background paper

Militarized Masculinity in Peacekeeping Operations: An Obstacle to Gender Mainstreaming

Hayley Lopes

Glossary of Acronyms

DPKO – Department of Peacekeeping Operations

MONUC –United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

MONUSCO – United Nations Organization Stabilization in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

PNC – Congolese National Police

STAREC – Government Stabilization and Reconstruction Programme

TES – Training and Evaluations Services

UNTAC - United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia

Hayley Lopes

Hayley Lopes is a graduate student in Conflict Studies at Saint Paul University. The focus of the majority of her work has been on gendered-dimensions of conflict. More specifically, the focus of her Major Research Paper is on the connection between military masculinity and sexual violence conducted by military peacekeepers.

This paper is a critical analysis of the underlying meanings of masculinities and femininities that affect the conduct of peacekeepers and the extent to which they are willing to prioritize the rights of women. More specifically, this paper will highlight the critical importance of recognizing militarized masculinities as an element of sexual violence during conflict. We cannot understand how to make gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping operations more effective without exploring the gendered discursive practices and attitudes implicit within peacekeeping.¹ Thus, if we are to translate the norms of Women, Peace, and Security Resolutions into operational standards, we must first examine norms that could be preventing implementation on the ground.

This paper will be divided into four sections. The first section will define militarized masculinity and juxtapose it to conceptualizations of peacekeeping in order to point out a theoretical contradiction between the two. The second section will provide concrete examples of peacekeeping soldiers engaging in sexual exploitation of women during peacekeeping missions in order to show how this contradiction takes form in practice. The third section will examine some of the obstacles to implementing the Women, Peace, and Security Resolutions as they relate to militarized masculinity. The final section will move beyond the critical analysis to provide practical suggestions on how to overcome obstacles to prioritizing the rights of women that militarized masculinity can create.

Before moving on, it is important to mention that even though this paper is primarily a critical analysis, it will not ignore empirical information or practical suggestions throughout it. The purpose is to raise consciousness about less widely known reasons as to why women's rights are still not being prioritized in peacekeeping operations in order to pave the way for more effective operational standards and practice. It is also important to mention that the observations made in this paper about militarized masculinity are not intended to generalize the identity and behaviour of all male soldiers. However, militarized masculinity is an attitude that exists among some soldiers nonetheless, and as such, it requires examination.

Conceptualizing Militarized Masculinity

It is well known that part of military training involves preparing soldiers to react quickly in highly aggressive and violent circumstances.² Some feminist scholars, such as Cynthia Enloe (2000) and Sandra Whitworth (2004) contend that the masculinity of many male soldiers changes throughout this training process, creating a particular identity that they call "militarized masculinity." Militarized masculinity is a combination of traits and attitudes that are hyper-masculine, hegemonic, and are associated primarily with military

¹Sandra Whitworth, *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*, (London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004), 28.

² Whitworth, 152.

soldiers. David Morgan provides a description of some of the traits associated with militarized masculinity:

Of all the sites where masculinities are constructed, reproduced, and deployed, those associated with war and the military are some of the most direct. Despite far-reaching political, social, and technological changes, the warrior still seems to be a key symbol of masculinity...The stance, facial expressions, and the weapons clearly connote aggression, courage, a capacity for violence, and sometimes, a willingness for sacrifice. The uniform absorbs individualities into a generalized and timeless masculinity while also connoting a control of emotion and a subordination to a larger rationality.³

Whitworth argues that militaries are known for promising to “make men out of soldiers” and she suggests that people primarily associate the military with being able to teach manhood, while soldiering itself comes secondarily.⁴ In addition, she argues that by joining the military, many men are confirming their manliness to others and also to themselves.⁵ Militaries depend on gaining new recruits by attracting young men to the idea of becoming “real men” through soldiering.⁶ As Judith Stiehm says, “all militaries have...regularly been rooted in the psychological coercion of young men through appeals to their (uncertain) manliness.”⁷ This uncertain manliness gets replaced with the creation of the stoic, strong, and emotionless warrior, who is willing to engage in violence when ordered to.⁸

Some theorists who have studied both militarism and masculinity have suggested that there is a strong connection between military organizations and hegemonic representations of masculinity.⁹ Some of these hegemonic depictions of masculinity within the military involve dehumanizing the “enemy,” in order to become emotionally prepared to eliminate the opposition in times of war.¹⁰ Whitworth argues that in order to dehumanize the enemy, one must first eliminate the “other” within themselves:

Basic military training helps to nurture the exaggerated ideals of manhood and masculinity demanded by national militaries. But this transformation is most effectively accomplished through the denigration of everything marked by difference, whether that be women, people of colour, or homosexuality. It is not by coincidence that the insults most new recruits face are gendered, raced,

³ David Morgan, “Theatre of War: Combat, the Military, and Masculinities” In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities*. (London: Sage Publishers, 1994),165.

⁴ Whitworth,160.

⁵ Whitworth, 160

⁶ Whitworth,172.

⁷ Judith Hicks Stiehm, *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 226.

⁸ Whitworth,172.

⁹ Whitworth,160.

¹⁰ Whitworth,172.

and homophobic insults: young soldiers are learning to deny, indeed, obliterate the “other” within themselves.¹¹

Dehumanizing the “other” and diminishing things considered “feminine” becomes dangerous, as it can pave the way for violence outside the realm of military warfare, such as sexual exploitation and abuse of women. It is important to mention the dehumanization of the “other,” when talking about gender relations, because masculinities and femininities are always constructed in relation to other cultural aspects that influence identity.¹² In times of conflict, women face an enhanced threat to their security, partly because they are “othered” through their gendered and ethnic identities. Consequently, in many ways, soldiers trained in military warfare are also trained in cultural and gendered insensitivity.¹³

Associated with militarized masculinity is the notion that soldiers are entitled to sexual encounters with women.¹⁴ The Tailhook scandal, where a group of male military pilots sexually harassed and assaulted women at a convention in 1991, is an example of this. In this particular case, these male military pilots sexually harassed multiple women in a hotel. Cynthia Enloe reflects on the negative reaction that some of the military officials had over public outrage with regards to the incident. Enloe writes:

If male aircraft pilots can't have a few drinks and send women down a hotel corridor gauntlet, how are they supposed to militarily bond with one another? If women are allowed not just to speak out against the hotel gauntlet tradition, but to join the fighter squadron itself, then who will be left at home for the manly pilot to take pride in protecting? And if a woman who isn't sexually attracted to even benign versions of male heterosexuality is permitted to openly express her sexual indifference to masculinized pilots, then what's the prize waiting at the end of the war?¹⁵

This quote helps to unravel the male privilege and enhanced sense of entitlement towards women that is associated with militarized masculinity, which has the potential to lead to violence.¹⁶ The use of military brothels, military involvement in forced prostitution, and soldiers raping the “enemy's” women are some ways in which violence against women has occurred during times of conflict. When analyzing these events through the lens of militarized masculinity, we can begin to understand some of the attitudes behind them. According to Whitworth, some of the consequences that result from militarized masculinity are: the sense of license to sexually assault and exploit women; the “hyperviolence” against men who are considered to be foreign and therefore less human;

¹¹ Whitworth, 172

¹² Paul Higate and Marsha Henry, “Engendering (In)security in Peace Support Operations,” *Security Dialogue*, 35 (2004): 487.

¹³ Anne Betts-Fethersten, “Voices from Warzones: Implications for Training,” in Edward Moxon-Browne, ed., *A Future for Peacekeeping?* (Basingstoke: Macmillan), 159.

¹⁴ Cynthia Enloe, “The Right to Fight: A Feminist Catch 22,” *Ms.* (July-August 1993): 84.

¹⁵ Enloe, *The Right to Fight*, 84.

¹⁶ Whitworth, 163.

the high rates of domestic violence in military homes; and the negative emotional and physical treatment towards soldiers who do not identify with militarized masculinity.¹⁷

Militarized Masculinity and Peacekeeping

Enloe says that, “To date, we in fact know amazingly little about what happens to a male soldier’s sense of masculine license when he dons the blue helmet or armband of the United Nation’s peacekeeper.”¹⁸ However, because the UN relies on soldiers for peacekeeping missions, militarized masculinity can also be implicit within the identity of UN peacekeeping soldiers.¹⁹ The contradiction here is that peacekeeping depends on soldiers, but it also demands that they deny many of the traits that they use to define what it means to be a soldier.²⁰ Thus, peacekeepers are supposed to perform military duties without being militaristic.²¹ Many people, including feminist scholars, have expressed the belief that soldiers make ideal peacekeepers, because peacekeeping often involves intervening in violent conflict and thus, requires combat training.²² However, it is important to understand that along with militarism comes the attitudes and traits that are associated with it, such as militarized masculinity. Subsequently, time must be spent uncovering these attitudes and skills associated with soldiering and examine the negative effects that they might have on peacekeeping operations.²³

Peacekeeping can provide a unique stage for examining militarized masculinity, because it is a means of solving conflict that is not fully or properly militaristic in the traditional sense.²⁴ For example, according to Whitworth, some military personnel have expressed that peacekeeping is considered less masculine than military soldiering, because it requires more compassion and less violence.²⁵ Peacekeeping also resolved what was considered to be a legitimization crisis for many post-Cold War militaries, because it was one of the few military activities that was still in demand and as a result increased.²⁶ At the end of the Cold War, peacekeeping operations became a central component within the UN’s framework and the number of missions increased significantly: 29 missions were created between 1988 and 1996²⁷. Furthermore, for quite

¹⁷ Whitworth, 172.

¹⁸ Cynthia Enloe, *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 33.

¹⁹ Whitworth, 3.

²⁰ Whitworth, 3.

²¹ Enloe, *The Morning After*, 33.

²² Whitworth, 152.

²³ Whitworth, 152.

²⁴ Whitworth, 16.

²⁵ Whitworth, 16.

²⁶ Whitworth, 16.

²⁷ Elisa Zenck, “Constructions of peacekeeper’s masculinity in the discourse on misogynist, racist, and homophobic violence performed during UN missions,” Gender Studies Department, Universiteit Utrecht, 2010, 18.

some time after the Cold War, peacekeeping soldiers were considered by feminist and IR scholars as having un-militaristic connotations.²⁸ However, Whitworth says that at the same time, peacekeeping created a masculine identity crisis for the military:

In this way, often ridiculed and demeaned within traditional military culture, the resolution of the military's legitimation crisis becomes to some extent a crisis of masculinity. All the messages a soldier receives about appropriate masculine soldierly behaviour are fundamentally at odds with what is expected in a peace operation.²⁹

The peacekeeping soldier is mostly depicted as benign, compassionate, and altruistic and they are believed to bring feelings of security to the areas they seek to protect.³⁰ This paper is not contesting that this is often the case, however, it is important to note that these are not traditionally accepted characteristics of male soldiers and as Whitworth argues, the militarized masculinity of soldiers cannot be assumed to automatically disappear during peacekeeping operations.³¹

Conceptualizations of militarized masculinity suggest that the willingness towards violence, and the masculine license to have women at their disposal, is ingrained within the identity of many soldiers. Thus, it does not seem irrational to say that these attitudes are maintained within the identity of the same soldiers who embark on peacekeeping operations. Furthermore, implicit within the term peacekeeping is the notion that the civilian population of that particular conflict-ridden area will be protected from violence. However, the actions of hyper-masculinity and violence on behalf of some peacekeeping soldiers often suggest otherwise. Militarized masculinity helps explain the reason why this transfers onto the peacekeeping stage.

Examples of Militarized Masculinity in Peacekeeping Operations

This section will provide examples of UN peacekeepers engaging in the sexual exploitation of women during operations in Cambodia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in order to explain the theoretical contradictions of militarized masculinity and peacekeeping on a practical level.

The United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), established in 1991 is an important case study, because it was considered to be a "test case" for the UN to determine what needed to be changed for future missions.³² UNTAC was widely regarded as a success; however, feminists such as Enloe were concerned, because the sexual violence and forced prostitution that took place among peacekeepers went largely unquestioned.³³ This could have been a test case to discover the role that militarized masculinity had in the violent behaviour of soldiers; however, there was a general lack of

²⁸ Zenck, 18.

²⁹ Whitworth, 16.

³⁰ Whitworth, 2.

³¹ Whitworth, 3.

³² Whitworth, 54.

³³ Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 99.

analysis over the link between soldiering and sexual violence.³⁴ The Cambodian Women's Development Association said that the incidence of forced prostitution in Cambodia grew exponentially from 6,000 women and girls in 1992 to over 25,000 in the mid-nineties when the mission was at its peak.³⁵ Forced prostitution was already taking place before the UN troops began their mission, but it is alarming how much it increased when they arrived and the open nature of prostitution which developed among the troops.³⁶ Whitworth argues that the openness of the troops about their use of prostitutes stems from certain aspects of militarized masculinity, such as the way in which some soldiers have a sense of entitlement towards the sexual services of women.³⁷ Whitworth says that this stems from the fact that these hypermasculine entitlements constantly need affirmation, and engaging in prostitution is a venue through which this takes place.³⁸ It is also linked to the aspect of militarized masculinity with regards to prostitution as being a form of recreation and male bonding for soldiers.³⁹ Going to the red-light district was a recreational activity that male soldiers did together and they would often purchase prostitutes for one another.⁴⁰ Enloe argues that the paradigm within the military is that if soldiers do not have prostitutes readily available to them, the outcome will be "recreational rape" of women by soldiers.⁴¹ A soldier's willingness to sexually exploit women cannot be found in biological explanations. Instead, sexual exploitation of women is a form of bonding among soldiers, because militarized masculinity is a "social masculinity," meaning that soldiers constantly need affirmation of their masculine identity. Thus, engaging in the sexual exploitation of women becomes a form of legitimization for the soldier's masculine identity, because it shows that the soldier embodies the traits associated with militarized masculinity such as heterosexuality, toughness, and hypermasculine behaviour.

In response to backlash against the misconduct of peacekeeping soldiers, peacekeeping chiefs instructed soldiers not to park their distinct white vans in front of massage parlors and to stop going into brothels in uniform.⁴² Instead, they were told to be more discrete about it, allowing them to act with impunity. This does not problematize the attitudes behind the actions; instead it has a striking similarity to the "boys will be boys" mentality that is often implicit within the military arena.

As a result of the increase in prostitution with the arrival of UNTAC soldiers, the transmission of HIV/AIDS escalated in Cambodia.⁴³ This frustrated some Cambodians and many people even began mocking the operation by changing the UNTAC acronym to, "The United Nations Transmission of AIDS to Cambodia."⁴⁴ One of the UNTAC

³⁴ Enloe, *Maneuvers*, 99.

³⁵ Whitworth, 67.

³⁶ Whitworth, 67.

³⁷ Whitworth, 67.

³⁸ Whitworth, 165.

³⁹ Enloe, *Maneuvers*, 111.

⁴⁰ Whitworth, 69.

⁴¹ Enloe, *Maneuvers*, 111.

⁴² Whitworth, 69.

⁴³ Whitworth, 66.

⁴⁴ Whitworth, 166.

medical officers pointed out that approximately seven times more soldiers and UN personnel would die of AIDS transmitted during the mission in Cambodia than of violence or hostile action resulting from the conflict that had brought them there.⁴⁵ With regards to lessons learned, the involvement of UN peacekeepers in the sexual exploitation of women in Cambodia led to the creation of policies, such as the “Blue Helmet Codes of Conduct,” to regulate the sexual conduct of peacekeepers. However, as this paper will point out in the next case study, these codes of conduct were not effective in ending sexual exploitation or in changing attitudes.

The UN mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), established in 1999 had a code of conduct, which stressed that while the age of consent in the DRC is 14 years, UN peacekeepers were prohibited from having a sexual relationship with anyone under the age of 18.⁴⁶ The code of conduct also warned peacekeepers against the sexual exploitation of local women.⁴⁷ According to Higate and Henry, the MONUC code of conduct for peacekeepers was an attempt to regulate peacekeepers’ masculinity in terms of sexual expression and its impact on the local people.⁴⁸ The code itself had six components. They are as follows:

- 1) Any act of sexual abuse and sexual exploitation, or other form of sexually humiliating, degrading or exploitative behaviour;
- 2) Any type of sexual activities with children (persons under the age of 18 years); Mistaken belief in the age of a person is not a defence;
- 3) Use of children or adults to procure sexual services for others;
- 4) Exchange of money, employment, goods, or services for sex with prostitutes or others;
- 5) Any sexual favour in exchange of assistance provided to the beneficiaries of such assistance, such as food or other items provided to refugees;
- 6) Visits to brothels or other places, which are declared off-limits.⁴⁹

In addition, the code of conduct has a footnote, which explicitly states that, “Consensual sexual relationships between UN staff and beneficiaries of assistance are strongly discouraged as they are based on an inherently unequal power balance.”⁵⁰ However, one of the problems with the code is the fact that it only limits how much soldiers can express their militarized masculinity, rather than examining militarized masculinity itself and reframing the attitudes of soldiers. Higate and Henry conducted fieldwork studies in the DRC during the peacekeeping mission.⁵¹ The goal of their research was to, “understand the ways in which peacekeepers conducted their masculinity in relation to local women.”⁵² One observation during this study was that commanders did not take enough

⁴⁵ Whitworth, 68.

⁴⁶ Higate and Henry, 487.

⁴⁷ Higate and Henry, 487.

⁴⁸ Higate and Henry, 487.

⁴⁹ United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), Code of Conduct on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. 2004, http://www.un.org/en/pseataaskforce/docs/code_of_conduct_on_sea_drc_en.pdf

⁵⁰ MONUC, Code of Conduct on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

⁵¹ Higate and Henry, 488.

⁵² Higate and Henry, 488.

measures to enforce the code of conduct.⁵³ Similarly to the situation in Cambodia, peacekeepers were told to park their UN vehicles away from bars and clubs that were “out of bounds” in order for them to be able to engage in sexual activity with local women, without being seen.⁵⁴ This only hid the fact that peacekeepers were sexually exploiting women, instead of eliminating it.

During their study, Higate and Henry also interviewed members of the peacekeeping mission. A female civilian UN worker said that she would rather work with a male peacekeeping soldier who had a “sexual outlet,” because he was more likely to be “controlled” in the office environment.⁵⁵ Higate and Henry said that the view this woman expressed was consistent among many UN personnel that they interviewed. In addition, they say that it has the potential to naturalize sexual relations between peacekeeping soldiers and local women. It also reinforces the message that soldiers are entitled to sexual services in order to fulfill their inherent “masculine” needs and perform their military duties better.⁵⁶ According to Higate and Henry, the majority of peacekeepers who were interviewed did not reflect on the social, economic, or historical context of local women’s lives and many of them believed that local women actively chose prostitution and other forms of sexual exchange.⁵⁷ One of the observations that they made overall is that the sexual conduct of peacekeepers was normalized and it was widely understood that sexual engagement with local women was central to the masculinity of many male peacekeeping soldiers.⁵⁸ Furthermore, they noted that, “...it was not unusual to hear male peacekeepers saying that giving money to local women in exchange for sex was actually a benevolent act.”⁵⁹ Higate and Henry’s study makes it seem quite evident that soldiers need to be exposed to more consciousness raising efforts about the consequences of their attitudes, behaviours, and actions towards local women during their missions.

Some of the consequences that stemmed from the actions of male peacekeeping soldiers in the DRC were “peace babies,” conceived by peacekeepers and local women. According to Higate and Henry, women’s insecurity was exacerbated, because they had to deal with both the social stigma of pregnancy outside of marriage and the struggle to financially support a child.⁶⁰ Another consequence was the significant number of women who lived with UN peacekeepers that were left behind when the troops left.⁶¹ According to Patel and Tripodi, 150 Congolese women and children were abandoned when the peacekeepers left and in most cases, they “...were left without any means of survival.”⁶² Patel and Tripodi argue that, “only through a more sophisticated understanding of

⁵³ Higate and Henry, 492.

⁵⁴ Higate and Henry, 488

⁵⁵ Higate and Henry, 488.

⁵⁶ Higate and Henry, 490.

⁵⁷ Higate and Henry, 490.

⁵⁸ Higate and Henry, 490.

⁵⁹ Higate and Henry, 491.

⁶⁰ Higate and Henry, 491.

⁶¹ Preeti Patel and Paolo Tripodi, “Peacekeepers, HIV, and the Role of Masculinity in Military Behaviour,” *International Peacekeeping*, 14 (2005): 592.

⁶² Patel and Tripodi, 592.

gendered experiences and sexual relations, can more effective policies and practices be initiated.”⁶³ Examining the attitudes associated with militarized masculinity and its consequences is part of this more sophisticated understanding of gendered experiences.

The MONUC mission has been renamed the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO). It took over from MONUC on July 1, 2010 and its mandate is to “concentrate its military forces in the eastern DRC while keeping a reserve force capable of redeploying rapidly elsewhere.”⁶⁴ MONUSCO has increased the number of military personnel to be deployed to the DRC, but has yet to release any concrete statements on new efforts to combat the hypermasculine militaristic attitudes of many military personnel. Part of the MONUSCO’s new mandate is to provide more support towards the implementation of the Government’s Stabilization and Reconstruction Programme (STAREC), which states that ending gender-based violence is one of its top priorities.⁶⁵ In May 2011, MONUSCO announced that it is going to set-up training sessions for STAREC to put the Congolese National Police (PNC) in training programmes that are geared towards sexual exploitation and abuse.⁶⁶ MONUSCO also needs to ensure that its peacekeeping forces are setting an example of non-violence towards the local population in order for the PNC training programmes to be influential. If the PNC are aware that male peacekeeping soldiers engage in sexual exploitation and abuse of local women, MONUSCO’s training programmes might seem contradictory to them. Sexual exploitation of local women by peacekeepers is not an issue of the past. It has been an ongoing concern since the mission began in 1999. Two cases of Tunisian and Indian MONUSCO UN peacekeepers engaging in sexual exploitation and abuse were brought to the UN’s attention in 2010 and are currently being investigated.⁶⁷

Linking Militarized Masculinity to Obstacles for Implementing the Women, Peace, and Security Resolutions

In Resolution 1325, the Security Council pointed out that peacekeeping personnel, whether civilian, civilian police, or military should receive training on the rights and needs of women. More specifically, it requests for the Secretary General to:

...provide Member States training guidelines and materials on the protection, rights and the particular needs of women as well as on the importance of involving women in all peacekeeping and peace-building measures, invites the Member States to incorporate these elements as well as HIV/AIDS awareness training into their national training programmes

⁶³ Patel and Tripodi, 594.

⁶⁴ MONUSCO, “Mandate,” 2010, <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/monusco/mandate.shtml>.

⁶⁵ MONUSCO “USAID, IOM, MONUSCO Reinforce Congolese Police in Fighting Sexual Violence,” May 25, 2011, <http://monusco.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=932&ctl=Details&mid=1096&ItemID=13767>.

⁶⁶ MONUSCO “USAID, IOM, MONUSCO...”

⁶⁷ “DRC: UN Peacekeepers Accused of Sexual Abuse,” *PeaceWomen*, http://www.peacewomen.org/news_article.php?id=1254&type=news.

for military and civilian police personnel of peacekeeping operations receive similar training.⁶⁸

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) says that training on gender awareness is “not a luxury, but a requirement for improving the effective discharge of the mission’s mandate and reducing both harmful forms of behaviour by peacekeeping personnel and unintended negative effects of mission policies and programmes.”⁶⁹ According to the DPKO, training courses for peacekeeping personnel on gender issues consist of an “awareness-raising” course, which is sometimes followed by more specialized training on certain gender issues facing peacekeeping missions.⁷⁰ An example of a more specialized training course is the course on combating trafficking in women and girls.⁷¹ These specialized training courses are optional and are only implemented if the particular mission will pose an increased threat to women’s security.⁷² In its Gender Resource Package for Peacekeeping Operations, the DPKO suggests that, “training on gender issues should be required for all levels and categories of staff, including national and international personnel.”⁷³ The problem is that it is not mandatory for all personnel to receive basic or specialized training and the DPKO even states that such training is overlooked for both middle and senior management.⁷⁴ As the DPKO acknowledges, it is crucial to make it mandatory for people in higher-level management positions in the training because they play key decision-making roles in peacekeeping operations and have a widespread influence on work practice as well.⁷⁵ If people in higher-level decision-making positions do not express enough concern in the gendered implications of their work, this lack of concern might trickle down to the lower ranks.

There are both pre-deployment and in-mission gender-awareness training courses. With regards to pre-deployment training, The Training and Evaluation Services (TES) of the Military Division created a generic training manual on gender and peacekeeping operations. The manual is not mandatory; however, it is available for Member States to give to their military and civilian personnel. According to the DPKO, “it is the responsibility of Member States to provide such gender-awareness training to both military and civilian police personnel participating in peacekeeping operations.”⁷⁶ The fact that pre-deployment training is optional for Member States, poses an obstacle to making peacekeeping personnel realize the gendered implications of their particular mission beforehand. Pre-deployment is a crucial time to engage peacekeeping personnel in gender-awareness training, because it encourages them to consider the gendered implications of their actions before entering the conflict-ridden environment.

⁶⁸ Resolution 1325 (2000), United Nations Security Council

⁶⁹ “Gender Resource Package for Peacekeeping Operations,” (2005), *Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit: United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations*, 45.

⁷⁰ Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷¹ Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷² Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷³ Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷⁴ Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷⁵ Gender Resource Package, 45.

⁷⁶ Gender Resource Package, 46.

With regards to in-mission gender awareness training, the DPKO states that military personnel receive induction training separately from civilian staff.⁷⁷ However, the DPKO says that the extent to which gender-awareness components are included within this training varies, depending on the mission and that training is stronger when the peacekeeping operation has a gender advisor on staff.⁷⁸ Furthermore, the DPKO states that the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) has a “women and children in and after armed conflict” course available upon request to missions.⁷⁹ The problem with this course is that it is designed for civilian personnel and that it is not mandatory for all peacekeeping operations.

Not only is basic training on gender-awareness during pre-deployment and induction lacking at the national level and in UN peacekeeping operations themselves, gender-awareness does not include a component on the implications that people’s own personal gendered identities can have on missions. For example, training does not include discussions on how masculinity is constructed in the military and the effects that this has on a soldiers’ perceptions of themselves and others. With regards to the challenges of training people about gender issues, the DPKO states that, “Some personnel may find that discussing how culturally defined roles and responsibilities for women and men differ among regions and communities can be unsettling and even confrontational.”⁸⁰ While it is true that discussing cultural perceptions of gender can be uncomfortable because it challenges a person’s traditional way of thinking, it is also necessary to realize that gender is not fixed. The DPKO also points out that “training participants who view these structures as immutable may resist any attempt to raise questions about them.”⁸¹ Many people, both militarized and non-militarized maintain a sense of gender as an immutable structure. However, it is important to at least educate peacekeeping personnel about the differences in gendered identities across cultures and even across institutions in order to set the stage for a paradigm shift. In the next section, I will provide suggestions on how to have an impact on addressing militarized masculinity in training programs.

Resolution 1888 (2009) calls for the UN Secretary-General to appoint a special representative to:

Provide coherent leadership on combating sexual violence; strengthen coordination of UN bodies; strengthen advocacy efforts within the United Nations and among Member States, military actors, judicial representatives and civil society; and strengthen UN awareness and capacity on issues related to sexual violence, both at headquarters and at the country level.⁸²

In order to abide by resolution 1888, in February 2010, the UN hired Margot Wallstrom, Vice President of the European Commission as the Special Representative for the

⁷⁷ Gender Resource Package, 46.

⁷⁸ Gender Resource Package, 46.

⁷⁹ Gender Resource Package, 46.

⁸⁰ Gender Resource Package, 46.

⁸¹ Gender Resource Package, 46.

⁸² Resolution 1888 (2009), United Nations Security Council.

Secretary General on Sexual Violence.⁸³ However, based on the actions that have been taken thus far, Wallstrom's role seems limited with regards to addressing sexual exploitation and abuse committed by peacekeeping personnel. For example, when Wallstrom visited Liberia in May 2010, an interviewer asked, "There is this other side of sexual violence: UN peacekeepers themselves being accused of perpetrating such abuses. What is your take on this? Does that fall under your mandate too?" Wallstrom's response was:

Not directly. But it will indirectly, because it takes only one case and the whole credibility of what the UN peacekeepers are doing will be put into question. We really have to demonstrate our commitment to eradicate this. We can actually do more training and vetting before the peacekeepers are deployed. We should also ensure that any such cases are immediately dealt with.⁸⁴

While Wallstrom's suggestions are important, it seems as though no one has direct authority to ensuring that gender-awareness training programs are implemented both at the national level and during UN peacekeeping operations.

The Women, Peace, and Security Resolutions also call for an increase in women's participation in peacekeeping missions. In May 2010, it was reported that the UN had 19 peacekeeping operations deployed worldwide and out of the 86,123 military personnel, less than 2,000 were female.⁸⁵ Militarized masculinity is one of the contributing factors to the low number of women participating in peacekeeping operations.⁸⁶ Peacekeeping operations still embody a hypermasculine militarized environment and thus, female peacekeeping personnel do not feel welcome, they often experience ridicule for being "feminine," and worst of all, they often become victims of sexual harassment and abuse.⁸⁷ Thus, in order to enhance women's willingness to become peacekeeping personnel, militarized masculinity must be addressed. Zenck argues that, peacekeeping should be scrutinized for maintaining militarized-masculinized practices that both deter women from becoming peacekeepers.⁸⁸ Allowing militarized masculinity to thrive in peacekeeping missions also maintains the idea that men are better at leadership and decision-making positions than women because they are less emotional and irrational in conflict situations.

Suggested Methods of Overcoming These Obstacles

Long-term and mandatory training and education at the national level about militarized masculinity and its consequences are key elements in making gender-mainstreaming efforts in peace operations more effective. The reason for this is, because the focus would be on changing attitudes and behaviours that condone violence against

⁸³ MONUSCO, "Background," 2010, <http://monusco.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=4072>.

⁸⁴ UN Focus, "In Conversation: Margot Wallstrom," (March-May 2010), 6(3), 17.

⁸⁵ Zenck, 18.

⁸⁶ Whitworth, 69.

⁸⁷ Zenck, 19.

⁸⁸ Zenck, 20.

women. It is well known among feminist and gender scholars that masculinities and femininities are not fixed. Instead, they are always being produced and reproduced.⁸⁹ This provides us with the hope that militarized masculinity can be reconstructed. For this to happen, militarized masculinity must first be deconstructed.

Similar to how masculinities and femininities can be learned, they can also be unlearned; however, the person that is expected to unlearn these attitudes has to understand the dynamics of their own identity. Enloe points out that militarized masculinities are difficult to unlearn, because only the military truly knows what goes into creating militarized masculinity and it is the military that is most unwilling to reconstruct it.⁹⁰ Similarly, Patel and Tripodi also argue that, "...a fundamental intervention related to behaviour change will have to emanate from military leadership."⁹¹ Thus, based on the observations that feminist and gender scholars have made, a change in attitudes must come from within the military itself; however, it is difficult to change the culture that has been entrenched within a long-standing institution. Small unit leaders have the greatest impact on a practical level, because even if high-ranking officers stress the importance of changing hypermasculine attitudes and behaviours, change must also be desired at the lower levels.⁹² With regards to gender mainstreaming efforts in the DRC, Patel and Tripodi contend that:

There is the tendency to believe that when a senior officer delivers an order it will be followed without hesitation. Although this is true in many practical cases, when the order concerns the implementation of a strong 'revolutionary' policy, in terms of the impact that it might have, then many more initiatives need to be adopted to ensure its effectiveness. Again, this is a challenging area where the military might be organizationally ready to adopt a new policy but institutionally resistant to enforcing change.⁹³

People in leadership positions within peacekeeping forces must demonstrate a commitment to understanding militarized masculinity in order for the soldiers that they are in charge of to be committed to problematizing their own attitudes and behaviours.⁹⁴ As Patel and Tripodi argue, the military community in its entirety must acknowledge the negative consequences of militarized masculinity in peacekeeping and develop measures that will create new, more positive forms of masculinity.⁹⁵ Similarly, Henri Myrntinen contends that peace operations personnel need to work with the already existing non-violent concepts of masculinity and femininity within the

⁸⁹ Whitworth, 28.

⁹⁰ Enloe, *The Morning After*, 33.

⁹¹ Patel and Tripodi, 590.

⁹² Patel and Tripodi, 590.

⁹³ Patel and Tripodi, 591.

⁹⁴ Patel and Tripodi, 591.

⁹⁵ Patel and Tripodi, 590.

relevant cultures in which peacekeeping operations are taking place in order to lessen gender insensitivity and to open the possibilities for sustainable peace.⁹⁶

According to Higate and Henry, peacekeepers can adopt more positive militarized masculinities if masculinities are constructed based on notions of faith, restraint and discipline.⁹⁷ They use the conduct of peacekeeping soldiers in two battalions in the UN peacekeeping mission in Sierra Leone as an example. They point out that the soldiers' commitment to Islamic religious practice within the camp gave the majority of them the discipline needed to resist sexual behaviour associated with militarized masculinity.⁹⁸ They also argue that many of the soldiers avoided local bars and nightclubs, especially since drinking alcohol was forbidden in their religious tradition.⁹⁹ As a result of avoiding the nightclubs, many soldiers spent their evenings playing sports, praying, and eating with one another, which created an identity that did not define itself based on sexual relations with women.¹⁰⁰ Higate and Henry conclude that the male peacekeepers in these two camps, "...were able to make themselves distinct and respectable by constructing themselves as good, honest, and pious, against a dominant image of 'peacekeepers behaving badly.'"¹⁰¹ I provided this example, not because I believe that religious dedication is the answer to creating positive militarized masculinities, but because it shows that the absence of militarized masculinity has the potential to eliminate the sexual exploitation of women.

Partnerships between civil society and the military are crucial for developing effective consciousness raising efforts and training programs.¹⁰² Consciousness raising workshops for soldiers led by both civil society members and military leadership should be conducted on a regular basis. Civil society members can explain the gendered effects of militarized masculinity, while military leadership can encourage peacekeepers to take these issues seriously. These workshops should examine militarized masculinities and femininities as well as identify cultural gender norms within the countries that they will be entering.¹⁰³ Higate and Henry point out that, in preparation for a peacekeeping operation, peacekeepers undergo a few hours of "pre-deployment training" on the UN code of conduct, norms, and regulations.¹⁰⁴ A few hours of training on gender issues along with some reminders throughout the mission is not enough. It gives off the impression that going through the regulations and the code of conduct is a tedious legal obligation that people want to get through quickly. Frequent and ongoing workshops on the implications of militarized masculinity and training sessions conducted by relevant civil society groups in conjunction with military officials has the potential to provide a more well-rounded approach to

⁹⁶ Henri Myrtinnen, 'Disarming Masculinities,' United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Disarmament Forum, *Women, Men, Peace, and Security*. 4 (2003): 44.

⁹⁷ Higate and Henry, 494

⁹⁸ Higate and Henry, 494.

⁹⁹ Higate and Henry, 494.

¹⁰⁰ Higate and Henry, 494.

¹⁰¹ Higate and Henry, 494.

¹⁰² Patel and Tripodi, 592.

¹⁰³ Patel and Tripodi, 592.

¹⁰⁴ Patel and Tripodi, 592.

conflict-based gender issues. Feminist and gender scholars have problematized militarized masculinities, however, there have been few recommendations made on how to implement change. Since militarized masculinity is a fairly recent and unconventional topic of discussion, there have been few suggestions on how to change attitudes surrounding militarized masculinity. Since it is difficult to change structural and institutionalized paradigms, workshops are a viable option, because they would not directly attack the institution itself or tell people what to do. Instead, workshops would educate military personnel about the implications of their own perceptions in order for change to occur gradually.

Workshops could include a variety of components including discussions about common perceptions of masculinity and femininity within the military, institutional expectations on soldiers, the differences between military and non-military masculinities, the concept of hegemonic masculinities, the link between militarized masculinity and sexual violence, and willingness towards change. Although these suggestions may sound idealistic, discourse is crucial to implementing change and workshops are a start to creating new, more positive definitions of ideal masculinities within the military.

Increased involvement of women within peacekeeping operations is also crucial, not because women are inherently more peaceful, but because peacekeeping troops have a disproportionately larger number of male soldiers.¹⁰⁵ According to Patel and Tripodi, the gradual inclusion of female soldiers in conjunction with training and education about militarized masculinities, has the potential to create a less hyper-masculinized atmosphere in peacekeeping missions.¹⁰⁶ In 2007, the UN deployed an all-female unit from India's Central Reserve Police Force into Liberia.¹⁰⁷ What was supposed to be a six-month deployment was extended, because the female police officers were more willing to deal with the psychosocial effects of trauma.¹⁰⁸ The reason for this is not because women are inherently better at dealing with the emotional aspects of conflict, but because it is more socially acceptable for women to do so and less acceptable for men, especially male soldiers.

I am not arguing that peacekeeping missions should turn into all-female operations. However, I am arguing that this all-female police force deployment has the potential to show what peacekeeping missions could look like with the absence of militarized masculinity and of course, the inclusion of more women. It is important for military leadership to reconstruct acceptable "masculine" behaviours among peacekeeping soldiers. This reconstruction should stress the importance of focusing on the economic, psychological, social, and physical effects that hypermasculine behaviours can have on others.

Conclusion

Militarized masculinity is one of the many social constructions of gender. There is tension between being trained as a soldier and then having to contain the traits associated

¹⁰⁵ Patel and Tripodi, 595.

¹⁰⁶ Patel and Tripodi, 595.

¹⁰⁷ Patel and Tripodi, 594.

¹⁰⁸ Patel and Tripodi, 594.

with being a soldier for peacekeeping missions.¹⁰⁹ Currently, there is no process that turns soldiers who are trained for war into soldiers who are prepared to work in a non-violent manner with a sense of cultural and gender sensitivity.¹¹⁰ As a result of this lack of training and education, some male soldiers are bringing violence and sexual exploitation into the countries where peacekeeping operations are being held. Thus, a deeper understanding of the dynamics of militarized masculinity and gender relations within peacekeeping contexts is crucial for intervention to be effective.¹¹¹ Some of the practical ways in which we can ensure that militarized masculinity does not pose a threat to the security of women are to incorporate soldiers, civil society, and military leadership in consciousness raising workshops that focus on defining militarized masculinity and its consequences. These workshops will help deconstruct militarized masculinity, which will help turn it into a more positive identity. In conjunction with this, there should be an increased inclusion of female peacekeeping personnel. Soldiers will always be a key component of peacekeeping missions. Soldiers are needed, as there are no other large groups of people who could be deployed to conflict zones as quickly.¹¹² Thus, if peacekeeping operations are to uphold women's security, there has to be a fundamental change in the way many peacekeeping soldiers identify as militarized men.

¹⁰⁹ Whitworth, 184.

¹¹⁰ Betts-Fetherston, 159.

¹¹¹ Higate and Henry, 481.

¹¹² Whitworth, 185.

References

- Betts-Fethersten, Anne. (2004). "Voices from Warzones: Implications for Training" In Edward Moxon-Browne, (Ed.), *A Future for Peacekeeping?* Basingstoke: Macmillan. 159-175.
- Enloe, Cynthia (2000). *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia (1993). *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. 33.
- Enloe, Cynthia (1993). "The Right to Fight: A Feminist Catch 22," *Ms.* 84-87.
- Hicks Stiehm, Judith. (1989). *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Higate, Paul and Henry, Marsha (2004). "Engendering (In)security in Peace Support Operations," *Security Dialogue*, 35(2), 481-498.
- MONUC. (2004). *Code of Conduct on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse*. Retrieved from: http://www.un.org/en/pseataaskforce/docs/code_of_conduct_on_sea_drc_en.pdf
- MONUSCO. (2010). "Background." Retrieved from: <http://monusco.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=4072>.
- MONUSCO. (2010). "Mandate." Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/monusco/mandate.shtml>.
- MONUSCO. (May 25, 2010). "USAID, IOM, MONUSCO Reinforce Congolese Police in Fighting Sexual Violence." Retrieved from: <http://monusco.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=932&ctl=Details&mid=1096&ItemID=13767>.
- Morgan, David. (1994). "Theatre of War: Combat, the Military, and Masculinities" In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing Masculinities*. London: Sage Publishers. 165-182.
- Myrtinnen, Henri. (2003). *Women, Men, Peace, and Security: Disarming Masculinities*. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Disarmament Forum. 37-46.

Patel, Preeti and Tripodi, Paolo. (2005). "Peacekeepers, HIV, and the Role of Masculinity in Military Behaviour," *International Peacekeeping*, 14(5), 584-598.

Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit: United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). (2005). "Gender Resource Package for Peacekeeping Operations." Retrieved from:
<http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org/pbps/library/GRP%20Full%20Version.pdf>.

PeaceWomen. (July 15, 2010). "DRC: UN Peacekeepers Accused of Sexual Abuse," Retrieved from:
http://www.peacewomen.org/news_article.php?id=1254&type=news.

Resolution 1325 (2000), United Nations Security Council.

Resolution 1888 (2009), United Nations Security Council.

UN Focus. (March-May 2010). "In Conversation: Margot Wallstrom." 6(3), Retrieved from: <http://unmil.org/documents/focus/unmilfocus23.pdf>.

Whitworth, Sandra. (2004). *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Zenck, Eliza (2010). "Constructions of peacekeeper's masculinity in the discourse on misogynist, racist, and homophobic violence performed during UN missions," Gender Studies Department, Universiteit Utrecht.