David Duriesmith

Masculinity and New War

The gendered dynamics of contemporary armed conflict

Masculinity and New War

This book advances the claims of feminist international relations scholars that the social construction of masculinities is key to resolving the scourges of militarism, sexual violence and international insecurity. More than two decades of feminist research has charted the dynamic relationship between warfare and masculinity, but there has yet to be a detailed account of the role of masculinity in structuring the range of volatile civil conflicts which emerged in the Global South after the end of the Cold War.

By bridging feminist scholarship on international relations with the scholarship of masculinities, Duriesmith advances both bodies of scholarship through detailed case study analysis. By challenging the concept of 'new war', he suggests that a new model for understanding the gendered dynamics of civil conflict is needed, and proposes that the power dynamics between groups of men based on age difference, ethnicity, location and class form an important and often overlooked causal component to these civil conflicts.

Exploring the role of masculinities through two case studies, the civil war in Sierra Leone (1991–2002) and the Second Sudanese Civil War (1983–2005), this book will be of great interest to postgraduate students, practitioners and academics working in the fields of gender and security studies.

David Duriesmith is a scholar of International Relations at the University of Melbourne, Australia. His work explores the role of masculinity, age, class and ethnicity in civil conflict from a pro-feminist perspective.

Routledge Studies in Gender and Global Politics

Series Editor: Laura J. Shepherd, UNSW Australia

This series aims to publish books that work with, and through, feminist insights on global politics, and illuminate the ways in which gender functions not just as a marker of identity but also as a constitutive logic in global political practices. The series welcomes scholarship on any aspect of global political practices, broadly conceived, that pays attention to the ways in which gender is central to, (re)produced in and productive of such practices.

There is growing recognition both within the academy and in global political institutions that gender matters in and to the practices of global politics. From the governance of peace and security to the provision of funds for development initiatives, via transnational advocacy networks linked through strategic engagement with new forms of media, these processes have a gendered dimension that is made visible through empirically grounded and theoretically sophisticated feminist work.

Masculinity and New War
The gendered dynamics of contemporary armed conflict
David Duriesmith

Forthcoming:

Why Women Rebel
Understanding Women's Participation in Armed Rebel Groups
Alexis Leanna Henshaw

Feminism, Prostitution and the State
The Politics of Neo-Abolitionism
Edited by Eilís Ward & Gillian Wylie

Masculinity and New War

The gendered dynamics of contemporary armed conflict

David Duriesmith

For Hael

Contents

1 Introduction

The new war puzzle

On the 7th of February 2014 a group of armed men attacked cattle herders in Unity state, South Sudan, making off with more than 200 head of cattle and leaving ten civilians dead in their wake, including three women and two children (Hatcher, 2014). Cattle raids are common across South Sudan and often result in the killing or sexual abuse of civilians, particularly when the assailants target those from an opposed ethnic group. In many instances attacks are reciprocal, with family groups responding to violence in kind. In others they are part of organised military campaigns to destabilise civilian populations or loot resources. Over the past 20 years cattle raids have become increasingly militarised and violent, with young men drawing on military equipment and training as a mechanism to pay the bride price required to marry (Sommers & Schwartz, 2011). Similarly, South Sudanese military groups have become progressively privatised, with traditional adversarial forms of conflict giving way to low-intensity violence focused on plundering resources and destabilising the base of opposing groups. Occurring less than three months after war broke out in the world's newest state, it is impossible to discern if this attack in early 2014 was an act of war targeting an opposing ethnic group, or an act of banditry. The assailants in this case, ethnically Dinka men dressed in military fatigues and equipped with assault rifles, may well have been members of the government forces (or the many militias that have been affiliated with it) or simply young men performing the well-established pattern of inter-ethnic cattle raiding against Nuer ethnicity herders.

Cattle raids in South Sudan follow a very different logic of war from that which has occupied the attention of security studies during the twentieth century. They don't contribute substantially to achieving military victory and in many instances appear to alienate civilian populations from which military groups draw the bulk of their support. Rather they are indicative of the 'new' forms of low-intensity conflict that have come to prominence in recent decades. Over the past 25 years international commentators have drawn attention to a diverse array of conflicts across the Global South which been characterised by their perceived brutality, longevity and irrationality. As the combatants of Boko Haram wage an effective campaign of pillage in West Africa and Daesh's 'medieval' tactics have surged into public discourse (Terry, 2015), it might seem that the established logics of military behaviour no longer apply. Concurrent with the emergence of these

'uncivil wars' the international community reeled at the gendered violence of contemporary conflict; the rules of war which appeared to prohibit sexual violence in conflict, it would seem to many contemporary commentators, had fallen away with the Berlin Wall. For generations raised on the mythologies of grand-scale total war, the current international warscape seems foreign and unintelligible. The brutality and apparent opportunism which characterise contemporary warfare, seen in South Sudanese cattle raiding, can seem distant and disconnected from previous forms of organised violence.

Although a shift would appear to have taken place in the practice of war, this book argues that the transformation is, to a large extent, not a stark break from the previous forms of violence. Rather the developments of low-intensity and high-brutality tactics that plague contemporary battlefields are a product of masculine logics which exist within patriarchal constructions of masculinity. Far from the chaotic actions of unintelligible monsters, this book suggests that the current cruelty, longevity and excess of contemporary warfare are a reflection and exaggeration of pre-existing patriarchal logics. The future of war, it is argued, can be found in the unstable gender hierarchies that create the preconditions for war and structure its practice once violence emerges.

The transformation of war

At its core this book is concerned with the suggestion that war is undergoing a fundamental transformation since the end of the Cold War. During the early 1990s debates over the future of war had been dominated by the voices of mainstream theorists preoccupied by grand visions of nuclear devastation, democratic peace or a 'clean' high-tech war (Hoffman & Weiss, 2006, p. 77). These debates often marginalised an array of protracted small-scale civil conflicts in the Global South that emerged after the fall of the Soviet Union and tended to prioritise state interest despite an increasingly diverse security landscape. After the 9/11 attacks militaries in the Global North followed this trend by emphasising the importance of counterterrorism and building up high technology weaponry for potential future wars. Within this embattled conceptual landscape Mary Kaldor's (2012) innovative work *New and Old Wars* presented a contrasting approach to warfare.

The main premise of Kaldor's argument is that the future of war is not in high technology military posturing, the use of weapons of mass destruction or a perpetual state of peace. Rather Kaldor (2012, pp. 2–3) suggests that the wars of the twenty-first century will be characterised by militias and paramilitaries, will use cheap, conventional small arms, and will target civilian populations. Kaldor did not predict that this development would be a result of shifting geopolitical arrangements that define international relations, or a significant progression of weapons technology. Instead, she forecasts a change in the social relations of war. The change in war practices was so stark that she concludes a new form of war can be distinguished from that which was dominant in during most of the twentieth century (Kaldor, 2012, pp. 15–17). Kaldor's notion of 'new war' provides an interesting account of conflict for feminist security studies research, as it refuses

the state- and military-centric approach that has been dominant in the academic study of war (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, pp. 10–11). The new war approach challenges leading understandings of war by emphasising the importance of social structures, culture and identity politics.[1]

Since Kaldor originally articulated her thesis in 1999 the trend towards protracted civil conflict has continued. Although yearly conflict-related deaths have fluctuated significantly since the early 1990s, the trend towards new war has not abated (Kaldor, 2012, pp. 208–213). As predicted by Kaldor and other new war scholars, 'old' interstate warfare has remained in the background of international affairs, while small-scale new wars have continued across the Global South (Goldstein, 2011, pp. 1–6). The new war thesis has continued to offer a valuable conceptual framework for exploring the current state of warfare, as well as explanation for shifts in the form of war, resulting in a robust body of scholarship (Mello, 2010). This has particular value for feminist scholars by providing an articulation of contemporary conflict that avoids assumptions about war being defined by relationship with the state, as is the case with competing terminologies, such as civil war or asymmetric war.

Despite the potential merits of the new war approach for feminist scholarship it has yet to receive significant analysis from a gendered perspective. This lack of feminist engagement, combined with its shallow treatment of identity and culture, has limited the usefulness of new war theory as a framework for feminist analysis. To address this limitation, this book asks the question, 'What role does gender hierarchy play in the construction of new war?'

Existing accounts of new war have often relied on shallow or incomplete explanations for the shifting patterns of post–Cold War armed conflict. Although many studies have tried to explain new war with reference to identity politics or economic motivations, these accounts have failed to take note of the most significant commonality across new wars: *that new warrior groups are dominated by male combatants*. At face value the failure to recognise gender as a significant dimension of new war may not appear to be deeply problematic. After all, a great deal of international relations literature fails to address the role of gender, and the study of war has been particularly prone to gender blindness (Peterson, 1992; Tickner, 1992; Pettman, 1996; Goldstein, 2001; Sjoberg, 2013). However, the blind spot for gender in studies of new war is particularly problematic because the core hypothesis of new war theory is that social relations of warfare have changed. Kaldor's (2012, p. 12) thesis emphasised the nexus of ethnic and religious identity politics as the root cause of new war. Despite the importance of social relations in Kaldor's original book, there have been relatively few studies providing detailed analysis of the social and cultural (rather than the political and economic) dimensions of new war and even fewer that have provided a gendered account (Malešević, 2008; Parpart, 2010a; Meger, 2011; Duriesmith, 2014; Malešević, 2014).

The lack of social analysis in most studies on new war has resulted in imprecise and simplified discussions of violence. Many accounts have emphasised the development of brutal violence against civilian populations as an essential

facet of the new war paradigm (Jackson, 2007, p. 270). Although there has been some exploration of this kind of violence, including some critical debate about its prevalence and significance, the discussion has often not been informed by a considered analysis of how brutal violence develops and becomes normalised within new warrior groups (Melander et al., 2009). This has led to a simplistic explanation of how particular grievances led new warriors to use vicious violence against civilian populations. This book looks to go beyond reductionist explorations of violence in new war scholarship by charting the role of masculinity in constructing combatants' behaviour within new warzones.

Aims and scope

This book argues that gender relations are essential in the transforming of conventional civil conflicts into the kind of messy, protracted new wars that have emerged across the Global South. By drawing on critical studies on men and masculinities and feminist security studies scholarship, it is suggested that the practices and processes Kaldor has identified as defining new war are a product of patriarchal gender relations which exist prior to war developing. This research challenges existing understandings of how new wars emerge, the ways that new warrior organisations train their combatants, and why certain tactics manifest within the context of new war. To explore the emergence of new war a comparative analysis of two case studies has been employed: armed conflict in Sierra Leone and South Sudan. On the basis of these case studies, Kaldor's new war thesis is challenged and revised by focusing on new war as a gendered practice performing particular masculine logics of protest and opposition.

This book aims to dissect the tactics employed by new warriors to lay bare their gendered construction. Existing studies have suggested that the tactics employed in new war are selected due to the economic benefits that they can provide to combatants or because they serve as a mechanism for gaining control over the populations of opposing identity groups (Hoffman & Weiss, 2006, pp. 63–66). Although these factors are relevant, this book suggests that the use of brutal violence against civilian populations was defined by the pre-war arrangement of gender. Instead of focusing on the purely strategic benefits or economic gains that using ruthless tactics against civilians can provide, this book explores the social dimension of new war violence. It sets violence in its social context, evaluating the gendered logics behind the use of extreme forms of violence, such as rape and torture, arguing that they emerge out of distinct masculine logics of violence and domination that were salient within those social contexts prior to armed conflict emerging.

Further, this book aims to ascertain the role of existing local constructions of masculinity in socialising combatants within new warrior groups. One of the least satisfactory aspects of *New and Old Wars* is its account of why some armed groups develop into new warrior organisations while others do not. Kaldor (2012, pp. 7–8) suggests that armed groups transform into new warrior organisations due to the divisive impact of identity politics. This account is challenged here; instead, it is argued that the particular dynamics of masculinity in both case studies were

essential to the development of new war. The exploration of masculinities provides a more robust and intellectually satisfying account of the transformation of armed groups into new warrior organisations.

Finally, this book aims to explore the conditions that contributed to the development of new war during the 1990s and 2000s. Scholars (Creveld, 1991; Munkler, 2005) have focused on some of the key structural shifts that led to the development of new war during this period. This literature has emphasised the end of the Cold War, globalisation, the breakdown of borders, economic shifts in the Global South and the emergence of a development/security nexus as significant structural shifts that have contributed to the development of new war. The usefulness of each of these factors as complete explanations for new war is challenged throughout this book. While it is true that each of these factors has some utility for understanding the development of new war, without the inclusion of a gendered perspective they remain incomplete and lack a unifying structural account of conflict transformation.

By providing an analysis of shifts within gendered hierarchies this book enriches existing scholarship, taking account of aspects of new war that have not been adequately explained thus far. This level of analysis indicates that the breakdown of 'patriarchal bargains' is a key cause of grievance that initially fuelled new war and a structural factor that shaped economic motivations. The concept of 'patriarchal bargains' was developed by Deniz Kandiyoti (1988) as an explanation for why some women cooperate with patriarchy in exchange for individual gains. Kandiyoti's account originally referred to the difficult compromises made by women within severely constraining gender arrangements, such as helping to police the behaviour of other women in exchange for recognition and social status. Although this formulation specifically referred to the bargains made by women to navigate a patriarchal social system (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 275), it can also be used to understand the actions of subordinate groups of men. This book utilises the concept of patriarchal bargains to explore the tensions that exist between groups of dominant and subordinate men, and how these tensions serve to construct new wars at a structural level. The exploration of new war at local, organisational and structural levels directly responds to claims made in Kaldor's original account (2012, pp. 7–10) of new war. Kaldor's thesis emphasises the definitive facets of new war: the motivations for fighting war; the techniques used to fight; and the actors who fight. The framing of these three elements has been slightly altered by focusing on the structural causes of new war rather than the individual motivations of combatants, allowing for a complex and multilayered analysis.

Although this book aims to be a wide-reaching analysis of gender and new war, it does not intend to be all-encompassing or exhaustive. Rather than attempting an unfeasibly broad study of the plethora of contemporary armed conflicts, this contribution has chosen to focus on two examples. Because of this, it does not begin with a detailed hypothesis of how new wars are constructed by gender. Similarly this book does not provide an all-inclusive study of war in Sierra Leone or South Sudan. In both cases this research focuses on one armed group (the Revolutionary United Front in Sierra Leone and the Sudan People's Liberation Army in South

Sudan) and investigates each only within a restricted time frame. These cases are used as contexts for exploring the construction of gender and new war. This means that the study of each conflict explores only the most relevant functions of conflict. This restricted scope has been designed to provide specificity and focus. Maintaining a rigorous concentration allows this book to throw new light on the puzzle of gender and new war without being sidetracked by issues peripheral to the central concern, which is the role of gender in constructing new war.

In addition to exploring the transformation of war, this book looks to contribute to feminist security studies by developing an approach to war which can address the diversity of masculinities in armed conflict and the hegemony of patriarchal power from which this diversity springs. Feminist international relations theory has often recognised masculinities as important for understanding world affairs. However, as with the scholarship on masculinities more broadly, it has struggled to come to terms with the diversity of men's experiences without losing sight of the resilience of patriarchal power (Hearn, 2004; Henry & Kirby, 2012). Particularly in the study of war there has been a tendency to present a monolithic picture of violent masculinity or to fixate on the complexity of fluid gender constructions. There are many deft explorations of local gender constructions in conflict (Denov, 2010; MacKenzie, 2012; Stern & Baaz, 2013), and key texts exploring the relationship between gender and war in broad terms (Elshtain, 1987; Enloe, 2000a; Goldstein, 2001; Sjoberg, 2013). Despite this, there has been little scholarship that has taken a comparative focus on the construction of militarised masculinity and used this to analyse broad trends in international conflict.

For this reason, this book looks to contribute to the growing scholarship on masculinity as a causal factor in war by unravelling both the role of local masculinities in transforming conflict and the commonalities of gender relations in eliciting organised violence. In exploring both case studies it is argued that the core structure for these armed conflicts was laid out in the form of patriarchal masculinities, existing prior to conflict developing. Conflict itself was sparked by the destabilising of the existing gender hierarchy, which, after promising men power and privilege, failed to deliver on its promises. The practices of war that emerged in each case both reflected and exaggerated the existing forms of patriarchal violence and privilege that defined the pre-war gender hierarchy. The multiplicity of masculinities that emerged during conflict reflected structural differences in the pre-war gender hierarchies and the different positions groups occupied. This account of war has implications not only for the cases studied and but also for intra-state warfare broadly.

Book outline

The first step to unpacking the puzzle of gender and new war is unpacking the history and meaning of the concept of new war. A large body of literature on the transformation of war has developed since the early 1990s. The following chapter, Chapter 2, therefore explores the way changes in war have been studied and understood, challenging the existing literature as being largely gender-blind

and failing to adequately take into consideration the relationship between local and global forces. Chapter 2 outlines the case study approach undertaken in this book and argues the value of exploring local constructions of gender in detail to develop a greater understanding of the international trend towards new war.

Chapter 3 explores the configurations of gender which make old war possible. Starting with the links between wartime violence and interpersonal violence, the chapter argues that core factors present within patriarchal masculinity make war possible. Building on existing scholarship on masculinities in the Global North, the chapter argues that seven core factors can be identified as central to the performance of war: violence, militarism, group membership, emotional detachment, aggression and bravado, risk-taking and aggressive heterosexuality. These factors are developed as the basis for investigating masculinities in new war and provide a comparison point for the practice of old war in the Global North.

Chapter 4 explores the socialisation of combatants and the use of violence within this war by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). The first case study focuses on the war in Sierra Leone from 1991 to 2002. Sierra Leone was valuable case study for exploring the significance of pre-existing notions of masculinity in training civilians to fight because of the wealth of materials interviewing young combatants. This chapter introduces the concept of 'protest masculinity' as a causal factor for the emergence of new war and suggests that the socialisation of combatants was facilitated by the existing cultural expectations of masculinity. This chapter focused largely at the individual level and begins the process of outlining the organisational and structural pressures present in the Sierra Leonean conflict.

The second case study, which is outlined in Chapter 5, explores the war in South Sudan between 1991 and 2002. This chapter focuses primarily on the actions of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) during this period. Looking at the shifting war practices of the group during the 1990s, this chapter investigates the development of new war tactics within a long-term ongoing war. The socialisation of combatants within the SPLA to use new war violence is investigated from a feminist perspective to suggest that the shift in gender ideology of armed groups can fundamentally change their tactic selection. It is argued that a militarised culture of entitlement and violence became entrenched within the SPLA and that this led to a shift from conventional war tactics to new war.

After having explored the local level of both case studies individually, Chapter 6 provides a comparative analysis of the two studies with a focus on the organisational and structural levels. The concept of 'patriarchal bargains' is introduced as a framework for understanding the development of new war, and as a basis for exploring the masculine logics of conflict transformation. This chapter draws out the commonalities between the case studies and suggests that failing patriarchal bargains were essential causes for the development of new war tactics in each state. In both cases the transformation of civil war into the model described by Kaldor as new war was constructed by the failing relationships between dominant and subordinate groups of men. As patriarchal bargains between men broke down, groups of subordinate men began to use new war as a mechanism to challenge the

existing distribution of power in society. Exploring peacebuilding in each state, the chapter suggests that efforts have been made to reforge patriarchal bargains between dominant and subordinate men, by offering volatile young men patriarchal rewards in exchange for their cooperation in stabilising the newly forged gender hierarchy.

Finally, the book is concluded in Chapter 7 by drawing out the broader significance of the findings for the study of war. This chapter explores the continuing utility of the new war thesis in light of the challenges presented by this research. Bringing the findings into light of post-conflict reconstruction efforts the book concludes that the integration of gendered concerns has the ability to strengthen the study of contemporary war profoundly, and to increase our understanding of the divergent conflicts currently seen across the Global South. As the final chapter, Chapter 7 indicates areas which require further investigation, and questions that remain unaddressed. The book concludes that attempts to study contemporary conflict without considering the structure of gender relations and the social construction of militarised masculinities will continue to misunderstand the gendered dynamics of war and the unstable social hierarchies that cause them.

Note

1 The concept of new war has undergone considerable criticism from a number of quarters. The problems with the concept are unpacked and its use is justified in Chapter 2.

2 'New' wars and gender

The concept of new war, first set out by Mary Kaldor in her 1999 book *New and Old Wars: Organized violence in a global era*, maintains that a fundamental shift has occurred in the nature of warfare since the early 1990s.[1] Kaldor and other 'new war' theorists assert that this shift is so substantial that a distinction must be drawn between old wars and new, with the former understood as occurring prior to the 1990s and declining in prominence since the end of the Cold War (Zangl & Heupel, 2010, p. 35). They maintain that the changes in the nature of warfare have required policymakers to respond with new approaches to peacekeeping and war-making (Kaldor, 2012, p. 71). The concept of new war unsettles many of the assumptions of conventional security studies, such as statism, focusing on formal militaries, abstracted views of violence and the public/private dichotomy (Mundy, 2011, p. 289). Due to this, the notion of new war provides feminists with an established framework that focuses on the interconnectedness of war, economy, culture, civilians and globalisation. Although this contribution is valuable it is currently undermined by an ahistorical focus on the distinction between new and old, as well as a shallow engagement with the concept of gender.

This chapter makes the case that the concept of new war has the potential to contribute to feminist security studies by reframing organised conflict in a way that is not state-centric, and that in turn the integration of feminist curiosity can improve the theorisation of new war. To do this, the use of the new war paradigm is first defended as a valuable framework for understanding contemporary conflict that does not buy into the statist assumptions of competing approaches. Kaldor's account of new war is then challenged on the basis that it presents a gender-blind and ahistorical understanding of contemporary conflict. It is argued that Kaldor's use of 'identity' as a causal factor in armed conflict presents a reductive logic of violence which fails to consider the structural and discursive content of identities. After having outlined the problems with the new war framework, this chapter outlines the research design that underpins this book and suggests made that the concept of new war can be redeemed from its failures by addressing the role of gender relations, social constructions and hierarchies.

The new wars paradigm

As Kaldor argues, the practice of war has undergone substantial changes during the twentieth century. Until the early 1990s, the dominant conceptualisation of

warfare was large-scale, escalating duels between similarly organised state militaries (Kaldor, 2012, pp. 2–3). During the second half of the Cold War, it became apparent that this definition was increasingly unworkable as insurgencies, guerrilla wars and simmering low-intensity conflicts became more prominent (Creveld, 1991). Combined with the development of weapons of mass destruction and the transnational integration of armed forces Kaldor concluded that this has meant that only the largest powers can afford to wage conventional war against much smaller opponents (Kaldor, 2012, p. 30). However, the apparent waning of conventional war does not allow one to conclude that war is at an end.

Kaldor's *New and Old Wars* argues the shifts in organised violence have been so profound that a fundamentally new form of warfare has developed since the end of the Cold War, and provides a broad explanatory framework for twenty-first-century war defined by four key shifts (2012, pp. 1–9). First, Kaldor (2012, p. 19) distinguishes new wars from conventional Western conceptions of warfare by the actors involved. New warriors do not conform to the traditional definition of military combatants as presented by the influential military theorist Carl von Clausewitz. In *On War*, a definitive text on the nature of warfare, Clausewitz (1940) suggests that war is a political act, which belongs 'to the Government alone'. In contrast to this, Kaldor (2012, pp. 6–8) suggests that governments have lost the monopoly on organised political violence, with new wars seeing the growing significance of militias, warlords, organised criminal networks, international movements and tribes. Consequently new warriors fit poorly within the conventional Western understanding of war, often appearing very different to the uniformed, state-sanctioned soldiers imagined by strategic leaders over the past decade.

The second departure from 'old war' that Kaldor outlines is the unconventional dynamics of identity politics, which motivate new warriors to fight. Kaldor claims that new warriors are motivated by divisive identity politics. In old wars she suggests that soldiers were motivated by nationalism or political ideology, while in new wars they are motivated by disparate identities. Based on case material from war in the former Yugoslavia, Kaldor concludes that new wars are sparked by the politics of identity. This is a notion that will be challenged in more detail later in this book.

The third departure from old war that Kaldor identifies is the economic structure that funds conflict in new wars. While old wars were most commonly funded by state taxation or the issuing of bonds, new wars are financed through illicit shadow economies of plunder and illegal resources extraction. In her discussion of old wars, Kaldor (2012, pp. 108–109) distinguishes a range of economic models for old wars, such as taxation and borrowing, mobilisation of the economy and the military-industrial complex. These methods are mechanisms to manage the way that war extracts resources from the economy. In contrast to this, new wars tend to be profit-generating enterprises for new warriors. The war economy at play in new wars is firstly a globalised economy (Kaldor, 2012, p. 95) that involves the 'fragmentation and decentralization of the state'. Rather than mobilising the state economy or the coupling of grand industry with an efficient

military, new wars directly gain funding through their military activities. New wars are not costly for new warriors to execute because they need little high-cost technological equipment: instead they commonly rely on cheap small arms, civilian vehicles and cell phones. To compound this, new wars are lucrative as conflict provides a fertile context for exploitative criminal tactics. Financing techniques include forced remittances from families abroad (often coupled with threats against family members in the state), black market trading, including the sale of drugs and human beings, protection rackets, forced taxation, warlordism, plunder and hostage taking (Kaldor, 2012, p. 109). This has created new war economies in which it is in the economic interest of new warriors to extend the duration of new wars indefinitely, by providing financial reward for those who are often without great financial prospects otherwise.

The final substantial departure presented by new wars is the brutal methods of violence employed in them. In theory, conventional war entailed a wide range of restrictions on the behaviour of combatants. However, in new wars, tactics that are conventionally prohibited, such as targeting civilians, rape, genocide, illicit trade or plunder, have become the primary means of pursuing conflict (Creveld, 2005). Conventional models of conflict between states have emphasised progressively escalating conflict between formal armed forces, for a temporally limited period of time, over a clearly defined border, with the intention of achieving defined political aims (Schultz, 2006). Kaldor suggests that this mode of warfare is in decline in favour of a new form of low-intensity conflict. Instead of the traditional escalating conflict for territorial objectives, new wars are typified by drawn-out strings of unconventional attacks with the aim to 'control the population by getting rid of every one of a different identity' (Kaldor, 2012, p. 8). While direct confrontations occasionally occur between competing militias, tribes and conventional forces, they play a proportionally minor role in comparison to attacks against civilian populations. The methods of new wars contradict the state-based rules of war, which drew a distinction between the combatants and non-combatants. This distinction has theoretically kept civilian populations free from intentional assault in conventional conflicts, although in practice this has often not been the case. Methods prohibited by traditional Western codes of war are becoming 'an essential component of the strategies of the new mode of warfare' (Kaldor, 2012, p. 8). The other great change to the conduct of warfare suggested by Mary Kaldor is the end of temporally bounded warfare, which is inherent to the Western understanding. In new wars there is perpetual low-intensity conflict fuelled by new war economies of plunder. Conventional militaries aim for the end of conflict, or at least victory in the campaign, but new warriors often do not seek an end to war. Rather they flourish on its perpetuation because warfare both provides the economic means to survive and affirms cultural identity.

Debating new war

Kaldor's definition remains the most cited in the new war literature, although individual authors put differing emphases on different aspects of new wars, or

on possible solutions to it. Despite this, her concept of new wars has created significant debate in contemporary discourse on conflict (McKenzie, 2011, p. 580). Since 1999, Kaldor's concept of new wars has been the primary topic of a number of prominent books and articles (Jung, 2003; Brzoska, 2004). The most enthusiastic theorists to adopt Kaldor's notion of new war have been writing on humanitarianism and largely from a liberal cosmopolitan orientation (McKenzie, 2011, p. 581). This adoption of the new war framework is not surprising, as Kaldor's own articulation of the concept is grounded in cosmopolitan commitments, the later portions of her book being devoted to arguments for a cosmopolitan response to new wars (Hutchings, 2008). The theorisation of new war has originated almost exclusively from the theoretical heartlands of security studies, rationalism in the form of either statism or human security. The scholarship has conformed to a restrictive range of common assumptions that discount the importance of culture and other social factors in favour of economic and strategic features (Malešević, 2008, pp. 106–109).

Some writing on new wars has used some aspect of the new wars thesis without adopting Kaldor's cosmopolitan theoretical framework. This includes scholars who view new wars as a threat to conventional state security while rejecting Kaldor's focus on human security and cosmopolitan governance (Brzoska, 2004; Munkler, 2005). Others have proposed revisions of the concept while arguing for the utility of maintaining the new war framework (Schäfer, 2004; Malešević, 2008; Reyna, 2009; Farneti, 2013). Mark Duffield's (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars* shows the potential for the new war framework as a tool for critical analysis. By adopting the new wars approach, Duffield provides an incisive critique of the relationship between humanitarian aid and militarisation, while reforming Kaldor's focus on the disintegration of the state to argue for the importance of a networked approach. Similarly, innovative research has been conducted by Gilberto Carvalho Oliveira (2013), who has used the notion of new war to critique international responses to Somali piracy. These uses of new war theory show its potential as a framework for investigating the challenge of contemporary conflict, without adopting all facets of Kaldor's concept.

'New' wars?

The most trenchant critique offered to Kaldor's theory has been her distinction between new and old wars. The distinction is one of the most fundamental aspects of Kaldor's argument. Although Kaldor does not suggest each of the distinctive features of new war is in fact 'new,' a key point of her argument is that the particular combination of factors requires such a drastic departure from the old paradigm that the result can be understood to be 'new'. Kaldor makes a strong case for the idea that there has been a drastic shift between what she identifies as old and new wars. However, terming the two forms of conflict 'new' and 'old' is a misleading characterisation of the distinction between the two forms of conflict.

The idea that conflicts are 'new' has been resoundingly critiqued from a historical perspective. Stathis Kalyvas (2001), Mats Berdal (2003), Edward Newman

(2004) and Paul Jackson (2007) have all challenged the historical accuracy of Kaldor's new/old distinction. All four authors reject Kaldor's attempt to classify eras in warfare due to its erroneous use of Western models of warfare as the reference point by which all conflict is measured. Jackson (2007, p. 270) suggests that the desire to establish typologies of warfare has resulted in 'an incomplete view of history that ignores parallel developments involving colonial conquest, insurgency, counter-insurgency and asymmetrical warfare – all of which have been taking place for centuries'. In contrast to Kaldor's depiction of a drastic shift to new war tactics during the 1990s these authors provide numerous historical examples of the messy protracted forms of warfare that Kaldor depicts as new. Rather than a clear transition from modernised, adversarial old war and messy, globalised new war, Jackson shows that there has never been an era of 'old wars' in the region. These critiques severely undermine Kaldor's claim for new war's novelty, showing the claim to be Eurocentric and historically unviable.

In the most recent edition of *New and Old Wars*, and in *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development*, Kaldor (2012; 2013) has responded to the critics who challenged the historical accuracy of her theory. She has rejected the critics' focus on new war's novelty as the key aspect of her thesis and concedes that many aspects of contemporary conflict have long existed in small-scale wars outside of the Global North. Rather than defending a stark transition between distinct eras of conflict, Kaldor (2012, p. 206) suggests that the utility of the new war thesis is that it has the potential to challenge old war thinking and to problematise the dominant discussion of conflict. While Kaldor does not dispute that there are many precedents to new war, she does argue that there are important aspects of warfare that have changed. First, Kaldor (2013) argues that highly destructive military technology has made conventional Western conflicts impractical for most states, renewing the significance of messy intra-state conflicts. Additionally she suggests that the development of communications technology has made small-scale conflicts far more globalised as local warriors are able to connect to global black markets for funding, recruitment and knowledge (Kaldor, 2012, p. 205). Kaldor argues that these shifts are significant enough to delineate a new form of conflict.

Although Kaldor (2013) makes a strong case that there are new aspects of warfare which the older paradigm does not account for, she does not demonstrate that a distinction between 'new' and 'old' is a crucial element of her thesis. The processes of disintegration of state institutions, blurring of national boundaries and perpetuation of ongoing conflict are distinctive features of contemporary conflicts. While the practices described by Kaldor are clearly different from Western state-based warfare, the shift is not necessarily a shift from old to new. However, this limitation does not completely negate the value of her thesis.

Despite the historical weakness of the new wars approach, it remains the most valuable framework for a gendered approach to contemporary armed conflict. The distinction between new and old wars has been shown by numerous critics to break down under detailed investigations. However, this inaccuracy is not a strong reason to reject the new wars paradigm, as shown by Jacob Mundy (2011),

who has directly responded to the existing criticisms of new war by providing a comparative analysis of civil wars. Mundy (2011, pp. 279–283) points out that most critiques of new war have attacked the notion on the grounds of its incoherence without allowing for a similar analysis to challenge the notion of competing frameworks, such as civil war.

The historical critique of new war has emphasised that the typology of new war does not have clear boundaries and that the concept is fuzzy. A similar challenge can be levelled to alternative frameworks, including the concept of civil war. Although many competing approaches default to the concept of civil war as the alternative framework, Mundy (2011, p. 282) shows that the distinction between what should be included as civil war and what should be excluded is far from unproblematic.

Firstly he demonstrates that the concept of civil war is used in divergent and deeply contradictory ways. Ontologically Mundy suggests that the concept of civil war exists on rocky ground. Despite the fact that there are various articulations of the concept of civil war, there is no consensus within the literature of the distinction between civil war, less-violent armed conflict and criminality. Furthermore, Mundy shows that the literature has difficulty identifying the beginning and ending of civil wars, which demonstrates blurred and ambiguous boundaries. In both the case of new war and alternative frameworks, such as civil war, the concepts used are often imprecise and fail to adequately account for the multiplicity of conflicts that exist. Despite this failing, the concepts retain their utility. As Mundy (2011, p. 289) explains, the selection of conceptual frameworks for analysing armed conflict should be based on their utility in addressing the problems they describe:

> A more intellectually honest and morally responsible debate about mass armed violence would recognise the need to adjudicate conceptual frameworks on political rather than historical grounds. This is not to say that politics is any less contested than history; it is to say that politics, rather than history, is actually designed to address human needs directly. Whether we choose to reject, embrace or reformulate concepts such as civil war and new wars, our justifications should not be based on claims of alleged coherence with particular representations of history. Rather, such concepts should be judged in terms of their ability to address the very phenomena they seek to ameliorate.

This approach advocated by Mundy allows observers to discuss trends in armed conflict without underplaying the considerable conceptual problems of categorising diverse instances of war. As small-scale armed conflict remains a critical problem for the study of international security, particularly in the post–'Arab Spring' world, the development of typologies that serve the needs of the international community is essential. With this core objective in mind, the new war paradigm provides an account of contemporary conflict that is useful for challenging the brutalisation of civilians.

The value of the new wars framework

Statist critics of new war argue that the framework should be rejected in favour of a conventional framework, such as civil war or insurgency, treating contemporary conflicts as internal state problems. The most common frameworks that are used, other than new war, include asymmetrical war, counter-insurgency, civil war and uncivil wars; each of these frameworks views conflict from the perspective of the nation state (Hoffman & Weiss, 2006, pp. 54–56). In each definition, the dichotomy between 'normal' state-based warfare and illegitimate small-scale conflict is implicit in the terminology used. By using the state as the key referent object of security, as is inherent in most typologies applied to these conflicts, it smuggles in a normatively charged bundle of assumptions that prioritise state interests and occlude non-traditional security concerns. Each of the statist frameworks endorses a dichotomy between legitimate state conflict and illegitimate internal conflicts between a state and a non-state actor.

The dyad of state and insurgent hides the experiences of civilians, who are treated as derivatives of the state, and relies on a normative assumption of state-secured negative peace as the ideal condition. This approach also mischaracterises armed conflicts as a tussle between the forces of order and those of chaos, sidelining the broader impact of conflict on civil populations and hiding the underlying social factors that may contribute to war. As this book aims to investigate the social relations of contemporary armed conflict, a different approach that can fully account for the implications of the social factors and of 'domestic' practices is needed.

It is for this reason that the new wars framework has been adopted. The new wars framework breaks from many of the problematic core assumptions of state-centric security analysis. The concept of new war unsettles the conventional wisdom that formal militaries and high technology are of paramount significance to the study of security and warfare. The new wars framework challenges the commonly held image of war in popular culture of men in uniform facing off in service of their country and its ideals, striking a blow against the hegemony of the warrior/citizen that has dominated international relations thinking during the twentieth century (Hooper, 2001, pp. 64–65). Instead, it places the intimate social relations of civilians and combatants at the centre of its analysis, arguing that the transformation of war has been characterised by a shift in the social relations of conflict.

The concept of new war provides a profound challenge to arguments for state military build-up, by reframing the security debate and demonstrating that peace is not assured internationally. Contrary to the notion of militarily assured peace, the terms of warfare have themselves changed and rendered the West's baroque arsenals obsolete (Kaldor & Beebe, 2010). The proliferation of new wars since the early 1990s has seemingly been unaffected by continued spending on deterrents, such as standing armies. Despite the spread of this irregular violence, many analysts have seen significant military build-up as a success. Kaldor (2012, p. 31) critiques this attitude, arguing that during the twentieth century 'many wars took

place all over the world, including Europe, in which more people died than in World War II. But because these wars did not fit our conception of war, they were discounted'. The new war framework is valuable for those hoping to analyse the social dynamics of armed conflict due its well-argued and comprehensive rebuttal of arguments for old war–style militarisation. Not only does the framework of new wars challenge the focus on militaries, states, guns and men in uniforms, but also *New and Old Wars* forces analysts to explore the effects of wars on civilians and non-uniformed combatants. This shift in conceptual framework, from state to non-state, from traditional security to non-traditional and from the Global North to the Global South, serves the normative goals of critical approaches to security (including feminist formulations) far greater than do competing typologies.

Use of the new war framework by feminist scholars

The utility of the new war framework for feminist scholarship has begun to appear in work from V. Spike Peterson (2008) on gendered new war economies, Sara Meger (2011) on sexual violence in new war and Jane L. Parpart (2010a; 2010b) on the interaction between poverty and masculinity in new wars. Peterson's concern is not explaining new wars as a whole: instead she applies her three-level gendered approach to the economic structure of new wars, arguing that new wars are a manifestation of the feminisation of war economies. The article primarily serves as a case study for her approach to gendered international political economy as set out in *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy* (Peterson, 2003). As such, Peterson's research demonstrates the potential for the new wars framework for those wishing to understand warfare with a gendered lens, but it does not attempt a detailed analysis of new war from a feminist perspective.

Meger (2011) has used the concept of new war similarly to Peterson, by exploring the political economy of wartime sexual violence through the framework of new war. By exploring the globalisation of shadow economies, Meger argues that new wars have made sexual violence a particularly lucrative weapon of war. Her work indicates that the globalisation of resource markets has established the structural conditions for sexual violence by rewarding combatants for disrupting civilian communities and imposing oppressive rule over resource-rich areas. Meger's application of new war theory shows its capacity to enrich feminist research into an existing problem for feminist scholarship, by shifting the focus of war beyond the state. Despite this, Meger's article proceeds in a similar vein to Peterson's contribution, in that it utilises the concept of new war to develop existing feminist analysis, rather than trying to develop a feminist approach to new war itself.

Jane L. Parpart's (2010b) article 'Masculinity, Poverty and the "New Wars"' goes further than Meger or Peterson by exploring the potential causal link between masculinity and poverty in contemporary conflict. Parpart asserts the need of a fundamental rethink of many core assumptions within the new wars thesis to address the role of gender, but commends the new wars thesis for attempting to connect contemporary armed conflict with global processes and structures (2010b, p. 674). Despite these commendations Parpart (2010b, p. 674) highlights

the most substantial failing of Kaldor's conception of new war – namely its gender blindness:

> The literature on the 'new wars' is strewn with pictures of impoverished, unemployed young men in 'guerrilla chic' clothing, with Ray-Ban sunglasses, waving AK47s menacingly in the backs of pick-up trucks, suggesting a link between poverty, young males, masculinity and contemporary conflicts. Yet little is written or said about this intersection.

In light of this omission, Parpart attempts to set out an agenda for future feminist research on gender and new wars. She asserts the centrality of masculinity for new warriors by analysing the language and examples presented in other studies of new wars. In particular Parpart (2010b, p. 674) emphasises the importance of economic inequality in exacerbating the existing gendered dimensions of conflict: 'combatants on both sides of the Congo struggles rationalise their participation in violence, including sexual violence, on the basis of the suffering and frustration they have endured due to poverty and neglect'.

The model for research set out by Parpart is the most promising so far for a feminist approach. Her article acknowledges the deep connections between the forms of masculinity in different new war zones and uses this to explain the proliferation of brutality and sexual violence. With great simplicity Parpart (2010b, p. 674) singles out patriarchal masculinity as the exacerbating factor in new wars, stating 'the masculinity spawned by war and terror is resolutely patriarchal, emphasising male authority over women as well as hierarchies among men'. While the connection between new war violence and masculinity has been clearly charted by Parpart, she has not developed a precise gendered model for understanding new war, and has only highlighted the need for further feminist exploration.

The contributions of Parpart, Peterson and Meger demonstrate the promise that the new wars framework offers for a gendered approach to war. Despite its potential, the many weaknesses of Kaldor's original account still must be addressed in far greater detail than previous gendered approaches have attempted. In particular, a detailed investigation of causation must be developed from a gendered approach (Duriesmith, 2014). Once this is addressed, the new wars framework can provide a workable model for those wishing to provide a gendered treatment of current forms and examples of conflict.

New and Old Wars' conceptual blind spot for gender

Despite the value of *New and Old Wars* for feminist approaches to organised violence, it does not engage with the concept of gender in its own right. Kaldor singles out the emergence of divisive identity politics as the key cause of new war, though despite this claim, she does not analyse the social construction of particular identities. Rather she contends (Kaldor, 2012, p. 73) that new wars are created by 'cleavage between the politics of particularistic identity and the politics of cosmopolitan or humanist values'. By describing new wars as a rift between identity

politics and liberal cosmopolitan values Kaldor minimises the significance of each construction of identity, reducing it to a broad description of identity politics as a model of engagement (Malešević, 2008, pp. 106–108). New warriors do not simply engage in 'identity politics' in a generalised sense; they perform particular gendered identities that have specific qualities which are defined within structures of power and the content of these greatly affects their behaviour in conflict. Put simply, the identities of warriors involved in new wars determine the course that new wars take. There are many similarities between the two new wars analysed by Kaldor (in Iraq and the Balkans), but her analysis fails to provide a thick explanation of the differences between the two. The substantially different identities at play in each case must be understood, to account for the differences between each conflict. To do this a gendered critique of masculinities is needed.

Kaldor's concept of new wars fails to integrate a gendered critique of war. Identities are not merely collectives of amorphous interchangeable characteristics or distinguishing elements; they contain a great deal of important information that helps determine how their holders behave in conflict. Kaldor (2012, p. 15) does concede that war, including new war, 'involves the mobilization and organization of individual men, almost never women'. Despite this concession, Kaldor makes no effort to discuss women as a potential group around which identity politics may be formed, or to explore the particular identities which may propel certain women towards armed conflict. To the contrary, in many of these conflicts Kaldor notes that women's groups played an integral role in engineering eventual peace. Despite this Kaldor (2012, p. 131) does not seem to associate women's groups with identity politics. Kaldor thus fails to recognise the crucial role that gender plays in the formation of identity. This omission renders the concept of new war incapable of explaining the difference between the identity politics of new warriors and other forms of identity politics, such as those advanced by some women's groups. Kaldor is correct in concluding that the heart of new war is a social transformation of organised violence. However, a failing of her original thesis is to conclude that it is the invocation of identity politics without addressing the role of gender.

The emphasis on identity politics and the construction of particular identities that are given life within armed conflict hide the mutually constitutive nature of war and gender. Kaldor's use of identity suggests that the concept refers to labels given to or taken by groups that create boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. Kaldor (2012, p. 7) uses the term 'identity politics' to refer to 'the claim to power on the basis of a particular identity – be it national, clan, religious or linguistic'. In this conception 'identities' are labels that create groups of inclusion and exclusion. In particular Kaldor (2012, p. 8) is targeting what she terms 'new identity politics' where claims to power are made on the basis of labels rather than appealing to political ideology. Kaldor's conception of 'identity' can be applied to contemporary European conceptions of civic nationalism, which she describes as an 'emancipatory nation-building project', as well as to more limited structural identifications. Kaldor's (2012, p. 8) particular opposition to identity politics is not over the existence or choice of particular labels that people hold onto; rather

she opposes the way that labels are used to create exclusivity and suppress the 'values of civility and multiculturalism'. Kaldor's conception of identity is as a set of labels that people may choose or have placed upon them; her argument is not simply directed towards particularly destructive construction of identities but to the use of them as a basis for political engagement. She advocates for a liberal cosmopolitan approach that supports civic values, multiculturalism and inclusivity as the best mechanism for opposing identity politics and the new wars.

Chinkin and Kaldor have attempted to address the gendered component of new war identities in their (2013) article 'Gender and New Wars'. Chinkin and Kaldor (2013, p. 181) argue that new war constructs different gender stereotypes to old wars, and that there is a need to reinforce the rule of law and the role of civil society in conflict-ridden areas to combat gender-based violence. While this article is a welcome addition to Kaldor's original formulation, its integration of feminist concerns is limited to its application of feminist thought and constructs a deeply problematic dichotomy between the masculinity of 'the heroic warrior of old wars' and the 'new warrior who deliberately engages in excessive violence against civilians, including women' (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2013, p. 177).

In framing the role of gender in new wars, Chinkin and Kaldor tend to treat the gendered practices of new war as derivative of the divisive identities originally emphasised in *New and Old Wars*. Chinkin and Kaldor provide welcome consideration of the increasing centrality of gender-based violence within contemporary conflicts, the use of gendered nationalist rhetoric and the exclusion of women from peace processes (2013, p. 173). However, their gender analysis is limited; they construct a narrative of new war gender relations that frames new war violence as pathological and exceptional, downplaying the relationship with peacetime gender practices, or commonalities with old war. When discussing the brutalisation of civilians, the authors describe militarised masculinity in new war as insecure and ambiguous, as the actions of new warriors fail to conform to Western stereotypes of militants as professional soldier protectors. In doing so they construct a narrative of new war violence as monstrous and divergent, downplaying links between the gendered practices of new war and the everyday civilian performance of masculine violence (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2013, p. 174). The emphasis on gender in new war treats sexual violence and abuse of civilians as extreme and precarious, hiding the way in which new wars are justified and made possible by the mundane, everyday configurations of gender. This follows the dichotomy between barbarism and civilisation that is present in Kaldor's main book (Hutchings, 2008). While new warriors are portrayed as unintelligible and brutal, the actions of 'civilised' soldiers are implicitly valorised as an idealised masculine form. Although Kaldor's approach does not aim to valorise the Clausewitzian soldier, her work evokes a false sense of disconnection between constructions of masculinity (Hutchings, 2008, p. 399).

Chinkin and Kaldor argue that the presence of divisive forms of identity politics means that fundamentally different forms of masculinity are constructed in new war. Chinkin and Kaldor (2013, p. 168) concede that war is predominantly a male activity, both in that it is predominantly males who are involved in conflict

and as war 'enhances and extols' the traits associated with masculinity. In the case of new war, the authors argue that the causal presence of divisive identity politics constructs and disseminates stereotypes of male power and female passivity. For the authors, this means that the emergence of problematic gender practices in new war is largely a follow-on effect from the nationalist identities that place 'others' beyond moral consideration, and subordinate women to men in the struggle for group supremacy. In constructing this account, Chinkin and Kaldor (2013, p. 177) posit a stark distinction between the ambiguity, insecurity and violence of new war masculinity and the 'heroic warrior of old wars – who is supposed to only fight other heroic warriors and to act in honourable and chivalric ways, thereby keeping gender-based violence out of sight'. Constructing this stark dichotomy between militarised masculinity in new and old wars fosters a false sense of disconnection, on the basis of the idea of that divisive identity politics is the root cause of new war masculinity emerging. The discussion they present does not consider masculinities themselves to be identities, but rather treats gender relations as an outcome of identity politics (with little consideration of what the content of these identities contains). This is indicative of the core problem with Kaldor's use of identity politics when considering gender; she suggests that it is the appeal to identity itself that causes new war, rather than the content and configuration of these identities. The discussion of gender within 'Gender and New Wars' is indicative of this, arguing that destructive masculinities emerge out of the politics of identity and extoling the role of civil society (particularly women's groups) without considering the notion that different forms of identity politics are at play in both.

As I have argued elsewhere, merely labelling factors such as ethnicity, religion, gender role or sexuality as identities in the sense Kaldor considers them sits uncomfortably with the feminist understanding of gender as both a discursive and material construction (Duriesmith, 2014; Hearn, 2014). The labels that reference identities may serve to include and exclude some people; however, each of these labels also contains a great deal of important content that includes social realities, cultural values, religious ideology and structural positions. The construction of identities includes distinct factors, such as the materiality of sex, age and ability; structural positions that relate to intersecting gender, race and class hierarchies; and cultural values that give detail to gender roles, social values or religious norms. To understand the development of new war, it is not enough to understand the dynamics of particularism and exclusion that Kaldor attributes to identity politics as a whole: it is even more important to understand the discursive content of the identities that she suggests have become politicised. To comprehend the social construction of new war fully it is necessary to address the role of masculinity at the cultural level in socialising combatants (rather than relegating it to an effect of identity politics); the power of gender relations in informing the forms of violence that new warriors develop; and the role of patriarchal social structures in constructing new wars. By engaging in a dynamic, multi-levelled analysis of masculinities and new war the broad identities that Kaldor discusses are revealed to both construct the practice of new war and in turn be transformed during new wars. The interactive nature of identities in these contexts and the multiple axes

of power along which they are situated (e.g. age, location, sexuality, class, ethnicity) require a fundamental re-evaluation of Kaldor's understanding of causation in new war, which largely ignores these structures of power as causes of conflict.

The cause of new wars lies in the specific construction of gender in each combat zone. Kaldor suggests that it is the appeal to the politics of identity itself, rather than an inclusive political ideology, which causes new wars. Despite this, her analysis does not provide clear distinctions between the identities that she indicates cause new war, such as ethno-religious divisions in the Balkans, and those constructions of identity politics which tend not to incite new war, such as queer identity politics. This approach does not allow Kaldor (2012, p. 7) to critique other cultures and identities, because such an endeavour would counter her aim to promote civic multiculturalism and inclusivity. This approach assesses cultures and identities in terms of choice rather than in a qualitative difference between them. However, it is not identities in abstract that cause new wars but the gendered content of specific identities which not only promotes new war but also gives meaning to its practice. This is an approach which is mirrored in Chinkin and Kaldor's (2013, pp. 181–183) study of gender in new war, whereby their main suggestion for ameliorating gendered violence in war is the promotion of international law, inclusive multiculturalism and civic (liberal) politics. By dichotomising between those fighting on the side of identity and those on the side of inclusivity, Kaldor obscures the comprehensive role that the context, cultures and social structures play in determining new war behaviour.

A vast array of political movements draw on notions of identity as a basis for political engagement without leading to new wars, including some women's movements, queer rights groups, disability rights groups and the black liberation movement. Each of these movements invokes the concept of a shared identity of its members as a basis for political engagement without resulting in the vitriolic aggression seen in new wars. The distinguishing factor in these movements is not presence or absence of identity politics but the specific and distinct cultural content that groups mobilise around. In each of these cases an appeal to a shared label as a basis for political organisation does not necessarily result in political violence or oppressive tendencies. Such movements often represent members who occupy a subordinate position within sociopolitical hierarchies and have focused on opposing oppression of their group rather than trying to dominate society through organised violence. Kaldor's focus on the *form* of identity politics rather than the detailed *content* of social construction weakens her thesis and undermines its ability to explain the development of particular forms of violence within new war.

To develop a satisfactory understanding of new wars, Kaldor's insights must be supplemented with a more systematic and robust gendered critique. Kaldor's account of new wars breaks down many of the problematic paradigms of mainstream security studies. But despite the value the framework provides, it is limited by its gender-blind outlook, which conceals the impact that gender and social structures have on the behaviour of combatants. By treating identities as interchangeable choices Kaldor fails to appreciate the malevolent role that specific cultures and power structures can play and undermines attempts to understand the differences

that exist between cultures. This results in a shallow assessment of new wars because Kaldor does not substantially explore the military culture of armed organisations and she is unable to explain the differences that exist between different new warrior groups and why not all instances of particularistic identity politics create new wars.

Unravelling the gender in new war

To redress Kaldor's blind spot for gender, this book explores the emergence of new war in South Sudan and Sierra Leone. To explore the gendered construction of contemporary conflict in sufficient depth this research has been restricted to these two cases. Exploring a wide-reaching international trend within a relatively contained book poses a considerable challenge and new war includes a significant diversity of individual conflicts. Rather than attempting a comprehensive account of all instances of new war, the cases were selected as vehicles for the exploration of the ways in which constructions of masculinity shape the practices of new war. By bringing the complexity of gender dynamics in two armed conflicts into sharp focus it is hoped that the masculine logic of new wars can be illuminated.

This book uses comparative case study analysis, which involves developing more than one holistic study of an event, policy, group, period or institution in order to explore a broader phenomenon. Within case study research, the individual cases – here new wars in South Sudan and Sierra Leone – are used as vehicles to investigate the subject of analysis, which in this research is the gendered construction of new wars. As studying masculinity and new war requires a deep investigation into the cultural contexts which surround wartime practices, only two cases have been used; there would not have been time to undertake in-depth investigation of a larger number of contexts in this book. While there is a substantial risk in diluting focus by exploring too many cases, there is also a risk in considering only a single case, because the case specifics – factors that are specific to one case and not representative of the subject being studied more broadly – may obscure the most important factors for understanding the subject being studied. The significant differences between the two conflicts have allowed this research to exclude specifics that do not apply generally to new war. This helps us identify core causes for the transformation into new war. The two case studies, which have many similarities, allow a comparison, and enable the possibility to be explored of a causal relationship between the construction of masculinity and the conduct of new war while remaining sensitive to differences between each example.

The two cases that have been selected are the Sierra Leone Civil War, from 1991 to 2002, and the Second Sudanese Civil War, which took place between 1983 and 2005. They have been selected for several reasons: their significance as examples of new wars; the breadth of source material that is available in the English language; the clear transformation of each conflict from a conventional civil war into a prominent example of new war; and the existence of gendered scholarship. Although both cases are valuable examples of new war, they each involve a diverse range of armed groups and actors that fit the new warrior archetype to greater and lesser degrees. At the same time there are significant differences between the two conflicts which allow us to exclude specifics that do not apply

generally to new war. This helps us identify core causes for the transformation into new war. To maintain focus the analysis of new war violence and the socialisation of recruits focuses on one armed group in each context: the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) of Sierra Leone, and the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA). The differences in scope, cultural context and background all provide a strong basis for comparative analysis.

To explore the role of gender in constructing these two new wars the next chapter outlines core factors in the creation of militarised masculinities in the Global North. These factors, such as aggressive heterosexuality, group membership and emotional detachment, are identified on the basis that they appear to have been of central importance to the creation of Western-style militaries and have structured the performance of interstate war. Each of these key factors has then been investigated in each case study to unpack how militarised masculinity is made, and the ways in which it differs to patterns identified in Western militaries.

From identity to gender

For the limitations in the new war thesis to be resolved, a more systematic study of the structure and social construction of gender relations is needed. By conducting a comparative case study of two separate instance of new war it is possible to go beyond Kaldor's generalised account of identity politics and to develop a fuller, more nuanced and undeniably messier account of contemporary conflict. This exploration has the potential to illustrate the way in which the social relations of war have changed while remaining attentive to the way in which identities are constituted in relation to social hierarchies, material conditions and discursive constructs. Taking on the category of gender is not meant to provide the conceptual silver bullet which will explain all aspects of new war; rather the inclusion of a gender framework is intended to complement existing economic, political and social accounts of contemporary conflict. The framing of gender, as opposed to identity politics, provides a more flexible toolkit, not only for understanding the beliefs that new warriors express but also for addressing the structural conditions that produce these identities, for differentiating between identities that are more or less volatile in a context of conflict and for developing mechanisms to understand changes in group behaviour. In-depth study of two cases has the potential to show the pervasive impact of gender on new war at local, organisational and structural levels. Studying these gender arrangements not only allows for commonalties to appear but also illuminates the differences and complexities between armed groups in new wars. Integrating a gendered analysis into the study of new war allows for a much more intellectually satisfying, comprehensive and useful framework for studying contemporary conflict.

Note

1 Earlier work on the transformation of war can be identified with scholarship from authors such as Martin van Creveld (1991). However, the focus of this book is primarily on Kaldor's articulation of the new war thesis.

3   Making men, making war

Men's use of violence in both war and elsewhere has structural significance, serving to maintain relationships of power and stratifying hierarchies between groups on the basis of gender (Enloe, 1997; Bouta, 2004; Baaz & Stern, 2009; Cockburn, 2010). The practices of violence both are the product of gendered logics, mirroring its scripts of masculinity and femininity, and serve to produce these logics by reinforcing their structural conditions. As this research looks at the structure of new war, the framework drawn on most directly is that of the social construction of gender, focusing on the role of gender relations in structuring the practice of war, and of war in reconstructing gender relations. This approach provides the conceptual tools necessary for looking at the differences between manifestations of violence, while remaining focused on the cross-cutting connections between patriarchal forms of violence. Valorised notions of masculinity are at the heart of organised state violence, defining the practice of war and encouraging recruitment (Woodward & Winter, 2007; Parpart & Zalewski, 2008; Barry, 2010). To understand these notions it is necessary to draw on the study of masculinities from sociology and elsewhere.

Security studies as a sub-field of international relations has often failed to reconcile itself with the masculine qualities of war (Shepherd, 2013). War has often been contrasted to illegitimate criminal violence conducted by non-state actors for supposedly apolitical reasons (Schultz, 2006, p. 6). As new wars have challenged this distinction by blurring 'legitimate' violence in war and 'illegitimate' criminal violence, the gendered quality of old war must be established before the distinct qualities of new war can be explored (Kaldor, 2012, p. 3).[1] To remedy the blind spot for masculinity within the study of war, this chapter makes the case that the practice of old war, as it has been understood by Mary Kaldor (2012), is a product of patriarchal arrangements of gender.

To develop an understanding of the gender and old war this chapter explores the configurations of gender arrangements that underpin state-based militaries. Seven recurring elements of masculinity are identified as crucial components for the creation of militaries and conventional old war: violence, militarism, group membership, emotional detachment, aggression and bravado, risk-taking and aggressive heterosexuality. Scrutinising these elements and the gender hierarchies that produce them provides a valuable tool for understanding the structural and material

dynamics of armed conflict. The investigation presented here provides the basis for parallel investigations of masculinity and new war in the following chapters.

War, violence and patriarchy

The construction of war is intimately intertwined with broader notions of gender and power in society. While conventional analysis of war has often portrayed violence as natural, caused by either biology or human nature, this has meant that common tactics, such as terrorist attacks, black market trafficking, the targeting of civilians, mass killings and rape, are dealt with in isolation from what is viewed as legitimate – or even noble – war-making. Despite this compartmentalisation, practices of conventional war-making are intimately intertwined with the intimate private gender practices, discourses and structures. Logics of masculine violence are interconnected. While security studies have tended to treat war as a discrete practice, the roots of wartime violence can be observed in peacetime masculine practices. Feminist discourse on intimate partner violence has provided the groundwork for gendered studies of armed conflict, ranging from gang violence to conventional interstate war (Cockburn, 2004; Pain, 2015).

Wartime patterns of behaviour tend to follow a distinctly patriarchal script, predicated on the notion of men's natural capacity for violence and directly tied to private patriarchal violence (Barry, 2010). When studying war this means that common gendered logics can be charted between public and private violence, by looking at the way in which behaviour coheres to, and is defined by, social scripts about how those assigned masculine and feminine roles in society are supposed to behave. This link has been charted by Rachel Pain (2015), who has argued that the links between public warring and private domestic violence are such that common accounts between the two need to be presented. This echoes the work of Cynthia Cockburn (2004, p. 44), who argues that wartime violence exists on the same continuum as interpersonal violence and that 'gender relations are like a linking thread, a kind of fuse, along which violence runs'. Violence, both in war and outside it, is defined by unequal gender relations.

The logics of wartime violence and interpersonal violence are unified by patterns of gender relations in which society is male-dominated and characterised by men's systematic exploitation of women, termed patriarchy (Pease, 2010). Though there are a variety of conflicting accounts of patriarchy, in this book the term is taken to refer to the situation in which 'men are structurally and interpersonally dominant in most spheres of life' (Hearn, 2004, p. 51). Patriarchy, when used in this way, is not intended to downplay the structural differences that are exhibited between historically differentiated patriarchies (Walby, 1990). Using the term 'patriarchy' in this way emphasises the interconnectedness of different manifestations of male power and the often-invisible intersections between different structures of oppression, such as gender, race and class.

Patriarchy is a gender system which contains both the material and discursive hegemony of men, and interacts dynamically with other systems of power and oppression (Hearn, 2014). Patriarchy is a material gender system because it

structures the modes of production in ways that re-enforce and reproduce men's dominance. It is discursive in that it produces, promotes and privileges gender constructions that maintain men's dominance and centrality in society. Despite the broad and abstract framing of these characteristics it is not used to imply a single, static or generalisable arrangement of social structures. Different patriarchies contain radically different orderings of gender, economic structures and discursive constructs (Walby, 1990). This means that although patriarchy can be understood as a system of gender oppression, it is not purely analogous with other systems of oppression, such as earlier Marxist understandings of capitalism. The use of patriarchy here does not suggest a singular internal dynamic of male power, but understands it to be a system of oppression inextricably intertwined with other systems oppression, without attempting to make claim to equivalence or casual primacy over other systems (Bryson, 1999, p. 321). While recognising these differences, the core concept of patriarchy is used as an acknowledgement of the plurality of gender systems that are predicated on men's systematic oppression of women.

Patriarchy as a concept has fallen out of fashion within feminist international relations scholarship (Sjoberg, 2013, pp. 350–351), having been replaced with masculinism as a framework to understand the structure of masculine power and dominant social structures. The notion of masculinism has been used to imply gender dominance of the masculine without being tied to the history of father rule, or the biological associations of competing terms, such as androcentrism. This shift has taken place due to the view that the concept of patriarchy is ahistorical, ethnocentric and universalising (Hooper, 2001, p. 41). Hooper has argued that using masculinism foregrounds the privileging of masculinity without focusing on men as a class group. This approach has the advantage of providing a more rigorous basis for exploring the differences between men and avoiding the occasionally essentialist claims that emerge in the literature on patriarchy.

However, this book adopts the framework of patriarchy rather than later concepts, such as masculinism. The reason for this is to maintain the transnational structural element of earlier feminist theorisation on the organisation of gender power, while supplementing this with later theorisation on masculinities. This use does not imply causal primacy over other axes of oppression. Rather patriarchy is understood to be a system of gender oppression due to the 'the recurrent and interconnected nature of male power' (Bryson, 1999, p. 321). By remaining focused on the interconnectedness of male power it is possible to uncover and challenge the myriad of locally differentiated structures of gender domination that propagate violence (Cockburn, 2010).

The unifying concept of patriarchy and of patriarchal violence provides the basis for analysing the role of gender in structuring new war without losing sight of the connections to other forms of violence that come from, and reproduce, male domination. As such the exploration of patriarchal violence in war does not suggest that all violence is the same, that all men are violent, that all those who are violent are men or that only men benefit from wartime violence. After all, such an approach has been resoundingly rebutted by feminists working within the international sphere (Gentry & Sjoberg, 2015). Instead, by remaining focused on the

structures and practices that privilege men it is possible to study the differences in wartime practice, such as between new and old war, without losing focus on the commonalities that tie them together.

Masculinities, hegemony and violence

Though the concept of patriarchy provides a valuable framing for understanding the interrelated logics of interpersonal violence and war, it needs to be augmented with a theory which is more attentive to difference. While there are a variety of ways to understand the differences between men, the approach taken within this book is grounded in materialist scholarship within critical studies of men and masculinities (CSMM). The materialist approach is a social constructivist one, which argues that many demarcations of meaning and value are created within a particular social group, but that these constructions are relatively stable reflections of material power arrangements between groups.[2] This approach combines feminist critiques of sexual politics with critical theory work (particularly of a Gramscian bent) on hegemony, with the intention of understanding how masculinities construct and reinforce gender hierarchies (Hearn & Morgan, 1990, p. 204).

The core concept in this framework, 'masculinity', is understood to entail the idealised beliefs, discourses and ideas about what men *should* be like, the distinguishing factors that describe what men *are* like and the phenomena that maintain male power (Flood, 2002). Or, as defined by Raewyn Connell (2005, p. 71), masculinity is 'simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practice through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality, and culture'. Masculinity is not solely the idealised notions of what a man should be, the attributes that separate men from women or the strategies that ensure male power: instead it entails all three aspects.

Masculinity is also necessarily defined relationally, not only in opposition to femininity but also in relation to other constructions of masculinity. The varied permutations of masculinity that exist within any given society reflect the underlying hierarchies and material conditions, as well as the discursive strategies employed by different groups. These variations construct drastically different norms around what a 'real man' should embody, and exhibit divergent performances of commonly held masculine norms. While those performing working-class masculinities may claim patriarchal authority with reference to the capacity to provide for their family by working with their hands, and the masculinity held by ruling elites may reference the capacity to command authority over workers, both articulations connect masculinity to the practice of formal work (Connell, 2005, p. 10). Not only do these two articulations of masculinity relate to formal work, but also they help to reproduce the economic foundation of wage labour and sediment hierarchical relations between managers and workers. If we look at the practice of war this means it isn't enough to explain what patriarchal values make a man a soldier; it is necessary to understand how this construction of masculinity relates to other forms of manhood, how these constructions interact with femininities and how all of these are hierarchically arranged.

In most societies masculinities are structured in relation to a dominant form of masculinity that is most privileged, termed 'hegemonic masculinity' by Connell (2000, pp. 10–11). Hegemonic masculinity is the form of masculinity that is most honoured within a society and whose beneficiaries are most structurally advantaged within the existing gender hierarchy. Drawing on Gramscian scholarship, these masculinities are considered to be hegemonic due to their capacity to continue men's cultural control over women, and of some men over others (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832). The patterns of practices that constitute hegemonic masculinity don't represent a static construction of the 'most masculine' ways of acting. Rather the hegemonic quality of these masculinities is defined by the practices, institutions, discursive arrangements and cultural norms that create and sustain male-centric societies (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832).

When studying violence there is a significant risk of equating 'hegemonic masculinity' with the most destructive or violent forms of masculinity that emerge in any given context. This trap, common within international relations, hides the way in which hegemonic masculinities maintain and reproduce patriarchy by producing cultural consent to oppressive relations. Equating hegemonic masculinity with violence misses the original intention (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832): that 'Hegemony did not mean violence, although it could be supported by force; it meant ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion'. Hegemonic masculinity is primarily about the patterns of practice that create subtle cultural power and sediment gender relations. In most instances it does not entail visible public violence, and where such violence is performed it is commonly through state-sanctioned proxies, such as members of the police or military who themselves do not receive the greatest benefits and privilege from patriarchy.

The use of complicit groups to perform violence on behalf of the dominant men means that it can often be challenging to locate the role of hegemonic masculinities in propagating conflict. Although masculinity is associated with 'power and legitimacy and privilege', Jack Halberstam demonstrates that masculinity becomes most legible when it is inscribed on non-hegemonic bodies (Halberstam, 1998, p. 2). This means that masculinity becomes most visible when it is performed by 'black bodies (male and female), latino/a bodies, or working-class bodies' (Halberstam, 1998, p. 2). At the same time, those masculinities that occupy the most dominant position in society can be passed off as natural, inevitable and good precisely because of their dominant position. This obfuscates the hierarchical nature of gender relations, framing the deviant masculinities as the core cause of violence, while ignoring the role of hegemonic masculinities in propagating subordinate forms. In practice the use of violence has structural significance, which is given meaning within the pre-existing gender order.

In each society differing historical patterns, material structures, institutions and gender constructions create hierarchically arrangements between masculinities and femininities. These arrangements are referred to as the gender hierarchy or gender order (Connell, 1987, p. 138). The particular arrangements of the gender order reflect patriarchy's 'current state of play' (Connell, 1987, p. 139). Within the gender order multiple masculinities and femininities are arranged to reflect

the particular organisation of gender in a given society at a particular historical point of time. This will mean that while hegemonic masculinity may be the most venerated or privileged gender position it will commonly be supported by a range of complicity masculinities, opposed by others and defined in relation to a range of similarly arranged femininities. The gender order is a site where other axes of oppression are mediated through to gender, as racially subordinated masculinities are positioned in relation to dominant masculinities, and economically privileged femininities are defined in relation to working-class ones.

The composition of the gender order will determine which forms of violence are acceptable, which are punished and which are hidden from public discourse. As violence is used by the dominant group both to sustain dominance and to contest the position of dominance in the gender order, this will mean that the violence of police may be sanctioned, due to its role in maintaining hegemonic arrangements; the violence of street gangs may be pathologised due to its disruptive effect on the gender order (Connell, 2005, pp. 81–89). Other forms of violence which maintains relationships of dominance will be hidden and denied, such as violence against women in many Western societies. Paying attention to the ordering of gender allows for the differing manifestations of patriarchal violence to be interpreted, and understanding the beliefs and values that underpin each form of violence illuminates internal dynamics of gender that result in differing forms of violence and can shine light on the underlying structures that make violence possible.

The gendered composition of old war

Conventional interstate war tends to serve the interests of a small constituency of dominant men and is made possible by the structures of gender that place them in a position of power. State-based wars are not in the material interests of the individual men who are called on to conduct them or those civilians whom armed forces are supposed to represent (Cockburn, 2010). Despite this lack of substantive legitimacy, old wars are justified through the masculine narrative of militant nationalism. As the state is a masculine institution, organised to protect the privileges of men and institutionalise men's power in the private sphere (Pateman, 1988; Hooper, 2001; Connell, 2005), the actions of the state in war reflect the interests of hegemonic state leaders. Accordingly, war is a clash between two separate competing patriarchal gender orders: the clash of formal militaries protects the interests of dominant men, and commonly causes the greatest harm to subordinate groups (Connell, 2005, p. 83).

In old wars, the armed branches of nation states fight over international position and power. An old war is a conflict between two demarcated patriarchal gender orders as much as it is an interaction of two states mobilising to compete over a contested international space. Within Western states a number of idealised masculine practices emerge as essential to the practice of old war, without which the practice of state militaries would not be possible. These factors can be drawn out from the rich body of work on militarised masculinity within the Global North

and crystallise around seven broad categories. These are the valorisation of violence, militarism, emotional detachment, aggressive bravado, risk-taking, aggressive heterosexuality and loyalty to a male group.

These factors provide the basic building blocks of what it means to be a man in the Global North. They structure the behaviour of combatants and provide the broad ideological basis for the practice of old war. Investigating these idealised factors and the hierarchies of gender that support these configurations helps to reveal the structural and material foundation of state-based war. They are the tools that make males men, and make men willing to fight. Similarly, they serve to normalise war and patriarchal violence, while demonising the performance of violence from subordinate groups. Understanding these factors as products both of patriarchal gender arrangements in general and of historically situated gender orders in particular provides the foundation for a corollary investigation of new war in the following chapters.

Masculine violence

The most common factor in the creation of old war is the association between men and violence. Although individual men may not be called upon to act out violence directly, men are often required to display a propensity for violence, particularly if their material position within the gender hierarchy is precarious. Masculinity places the expectation that its subjects possess power, and often that they protect it physically if threatened (Mooney, 2000, p. 96). Violence is coloured by gendered notions which associate its performance with discourses of masculinity. Similarly the parameters and scripts of violence that are performed reflect gendered discourses. Both in 'private' interpersonal violence and in war this means that practices of violence are products of gender hierarchies and serve to protect and reproduce the inequalities contained within them.

Often, violence is justified against particular gendered classes who are seen as being bad or resisting the hegemony of men. This is observed in Connell's (2005, p. 77) study of Australian masculinity among poor men, in which many of the participants studied either actively or passively supported violence against certain women, despite claiming an opposition to violence against women. In one observed situation, women who were seen to be undermining male authority by 'mouthing off' were hit and threatened by groups of men. In this instance, although the men described were not the primary beneficiaries of the Australian gender order, as materially disadvantaged men, they still used violence to protect the privileges they received due to the hegemony of men and the oppression of women. Men who occupy a materially precarious position in the gender order are also likely to be called on to use violence against other men to assert or maintain their masculine status. This violence may be structured and restrained in the case of sparring, violent sports and 'play' fighting. Alternatively, it may be relatively unrestrained in the case of bar fights, rioting at sports matches and bullying. Violence serves as a mechanism for subordinate men to stake a claim to masculine authority and privilege, while reinforcing the collective hegemony of men as a group.

Even those men who are not expected to actively seek out violence may be obligated to respond to other men's violence with similar forms of aggression (Connell, 2005, p. 99). This is observed in the call for boys to stand up for themselves early as primary school children. When challenged by a bully or aggressor, boys are often socialised to fight back rather than taking a non-violent approach, such as requesting help from authority or searching for other peaceable solutions (Plummer, 1999, p. 142). Such experiences of violence serve as a training exercise in patriarchal power, which conditions men to maintain control over other subordinates through the performance of physical power and domination.

By socialising men to respond to threats with violence, masculine individuals are primed for involvement in the military, which can then draw on those associations as the basis for involvement. Despite this, not all men's violence is portrayed as sanctioned or inevitable, with militaries often constructing careful discourses that valorise their violence as natural and necessary while demonising the violence of other armed groups as barbarous and chaotic (Welland, 2015). This kind of justification does not decouple violence from masculinity, but uses the association to differentiate between the 'good' and 'bad' men. In doing so the hegemony of men is maintained, while emphasising the need for some men to be controlled by others, cementing the existing structure of the gender order.

Militarism and masculinity

Although masculinity is coupled with violence, in many instances this is mediated through militarism to sanction certain kinds of violence while demonising others (Henry & Kirby, 2012). Professional military men are valorised as heroes and young men are often encouraged to participate in the military in some way. Privately, men stake claims to manhood by emulating the military through fashion, lifestyle, membership in paramilitary organisations or gun ownership or by consuming militarised cultural products. A second way in which men participate in militarism is through emulating warrior values or ideals, often through a militarised context, such as competitive sport. In contrast to militarism, warrior values are not professionalised or state-based; rather they encompass more individualised models of combat.

In the Global North men are encouraged to internalise their potential role as warriors from an early age through play, schooling, cultural products and social myths (Barry, 2010). Violence is normalised through cultural products that encourage boys to look up to combatants as role models: when boys are given toy weaponry from a young age and encouraged to pretend to slay and mutilate their playmates they are being primed for military service (Barry, 2010, p. 10). Taking the socialisation of boys into militarised masculinity further, the U.S. military has used video game technology to encourage boys to consider military service, and during late 2008 the U.S. Army opened up the Army Experience Centre in a Philadelphia mall to give boys a chance to play at war and possibly sign up for future military service (Barry, 2010, p. 11). The centre was a $12 million location where boys aged 13 and up could come and play on almost 80 video games that

simulated combat and allowed children to have their chance to kill for their country. This is a clear example of how boys are encouraged to internalise their role as potential combatants from a very early age as an avenue for accessing masculine privilege and status.

The relationship between masculinity, militarism and violence is often complicated by the roles that combatants are meant to perform in contemporary militaries. While military training has historically focused on priming men to perform destructive violence on an opposing armed force, maintaining the chain of command and fostering the *esprit de corps*, military personnel are increasingly required to perform the role of peacekeepers and law enforcement in conflict-affected warscapes. Sandra Whitworth (Whitworth, 2004) has explored the relationship between militarised masculinities and peacekeeping in *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping*, showing that this relationship is often fraught with contradictions and challenges for the men who are meant to exemplify militarised masculinity while also professionally maintaining peace and order. This places men into a bind of, on the one hand, having to show their dominance as military men and, on the other, subordinating their needs to the populations they serve. In practice this tension is resolved through numerous violent slippages, in the form of sexual abuse of civilians, brawling and excessive violence.

Group membership

Masculinities are inherently relational: they are defined by difference from femininities and other masculine positions. Accordingly, masculinities are created in a group context, and the structure of groups in which they are situated is key to the forms masculinity takes. The group is also one of the key sites where manhood is defined, proved and performed through ritualistic admission, group acts of violence, collective identification and communal responsibility. Violent rituals often accompany gaining admission to all male groups: this may be relatively mild, such as compulsory drinking games, or extreme, such as the brutality, humiliation or sexual violence present in many military organisations. This is particularly the case within military contexts, where the group is paramount over the individual. Men are required to centre their identity within the group context and within military contexts to create a communal sense of responsibility for acts of war. Each of these themes is of core importance to understanding the conduct of combatants within the context of new war.

As the primary site where men interact, the masculine group dynamic must be understood before men's actions and violence can be adequately explained (Agostino, 1999). For military men, full admission to the group as a peer is commonly gained by surviving hazing or passing basic training, or through their first combat experience (Barrett, 1996). Once this member status has been achieved, men are pushed to actively identify with the group through other signifiers. Within a military context this takes place very early within training when recruits are required to surrender their individuality to the collective group through discourse of brotherhood. This is most significant in small groups, such as a military squad,

but it is also seen in larger community groups, military organisations as a whole and even at the national level.

For enlisted men the military squad becomes the most basic level of social organisation, and the significance of military squads cannot be underestimated for combat situations. Many men describe a process of being subsumed by their squad: men eat, sleep, bathe, fight and die within the squad (Bourke, 1996, p. 128). This means that male combatants begin to identify primarily with their fellow squad mates. This attachment becomes so important for many military men that their identification with the squad becomes more important than the state, ideology, family or even their own lives (Bourke, 1996, p. 133). Militaries actively encourage this process through complex rituals, training and structures of discipline. Many men report that during conflict their primary obligation becomes to their immediate group, to the extent that they may risk their own safety or the success of military objectives to protect squad mates. Joanna Bourke (Bourke, 1996, p. 133) records a number of instances of combatants prioritising their military unit above anything else, including the experience of Liddell Hart, who observed during WWI that he and his fellow squad men became prepared to die not for their country but for the men who fought next to them. To create such strong bonds, complex rituals of induction and bonding have been developed within military organisations.

To create a powerful sense of group membership, recruits are required to experience harsh tests, ritualised humiliation and powerlessness. Such ordeals create a common ground for recruits, a shared experience to bond over. More than this, the nature of the ordeals tests and actively challenges the recruits' ability to live up to masculine tropes. This places an imperative on men to demonstrate their manhood as they are berated and challenged by their trainers. This is clearly seen in the verbal abuse hurled at military recruits: as part of their training men are accused of being women, children or homosexual (Barrett, 1996, p. 133). This is to incite men to actively prove their manhood or be subject to a bitter dressing-down and public shaming. Even within private military security companies, Paul Higate (2012b) shows that similar use of often homoerotic, violent or humiliating hazing rituals is key to the creation of a collective militarised identity. In these contexts Higate shows the fraught relationship men have with their militarised identities, both forged by problematically homoerotic gender performance and problematised by the need to maintain a heteronormative façade.

The purpose of ritualistic admission to masculine groups is to establish a dichotomy between those who are admitted to the group and those who are not. Primarily, this draws a distinction between those in the group and women. This can be seen clearly in the denigration that is directed towards those who fail to gain entry to the group: men who are not within the military group are described as wimps, 'pussies' or weak. The intended effect is to subjugate groups of outside men, often with the threat of being feminised. Similar to other elements of masculinity that have been discussed, male groups serve to reinforce hegemonic masculinity and hierarchy by providing a strong sense of superiority to the men who gain admission. Ramon Hinojosa notes that the military groups he interviewed

felt a sense of superiority regarding their squad, branch and country's military, which was played out in intense competition with other groups (Hinojosa, 2010, pp. 180–187). Furthermore, he found that participants expressed a sense of superiority to civilians, who they felt lacked the discipline, strength and bravery that military men had obtained. Hinojosa (2010, p. 191) describes this as a kind of ideological warfare against civilians and other military groups in which military men seek a superior, dominant status. This admission ritual provides some men with privileged access to a class of masculinity not open to other men, and provides reassurance of their superior position and legitimacy for their collective actions.

Emotional detachment

In order to demonstrate their masculine status, men are often required to detach themselves from a wide range of emotions and to disregard their capability for empathy. Moreover, masculine men are often expected to be detached from feelings of pain, sadness, empathy and tenderness. The process of detachment works to stamp out behaviours that are regarded as signs of weakness, such as crying or expressions of discomfort. Over time, the resulting stoic façade becomes one of the primary expressions of manhood. Men are expected to lack empathy and to remain emotionally detached from others. Those who are empathetic, caring, tender or soft are often ridiculed and excluded from recognition as real men (Miedzian, 1991).

Desensitisation of boys is a powerful structure of masculinity that begins from a young age, when boys are trained to suppress most emotion and hide signs of weakness. Young boys are often trained not to cry, or are required to endure painful contact sports, which conditions them not to express feelings of pain. The promotion of emotional detachment takes place across diverse cultures, and is applied to males at all stages of life, from young boys, who are told to be brave when experiencing pain, to public figures expressing cold detachment from the impact of their political decisions (Cohn, 1987, p. 268). Emotional detachment is intimately connected to other masculine practices which desensitise males to violence, such as violent hazing (Weinstein & White, 1997, p. 66). Such conditioning is integral to military training, during which young males are forced to endure brutal tests of strength and endurance: if recruits show emotional reactions to these exertions which do not fit the narrow parameters of hegemonic masculinity, they are subjected to public shaming, verbal abuse and additional brutal tests. This has led Kimmel (1996, p. 305) to describe traditional masculinity as 'a disease of disconnection' that creates dissociation between men and their emotions. Masculinity comprehensively conditions men to allow them to dissociate from the violent acts they commit and the pain they endure.

Dissociation creates conditions where men are able to accept their expendability and primes them for the use of violence: it disconnects an individual's consciousness from his experiences, feelings and actions. Dissociation is common in individuals who have gone through extremely traumatic experiences, such as survivors of childhood sexual abuse, and soldiers who have served in active

combat. This is well documented in the discourse on soldiers who suffer from post-traumatic stress, but is also exhibited in many soldiers from basic training onward. Kathleen Barry (2010, p. 15) argues that dissociation is a coping mechanism that allows men to survive without engaging with the possibility of their destruction, or the pain violence may cause. Barry identifies dissociation as an intended product of the 'blanket parties' thrown for new marines, where a recruit will be physically restrained by a blanket and beaten by those around him. During such hazing rituals recruits are not allowed to express the pain they endure, lest the group rejects them. Such rituals serve as basic training for battle experiences, during which men are expected to quell their fears and not be distracted by the prospect of death or dismemberment. The hazing functions to make men into efficient soldiers and obedient subordinates.

The emphasis on emotional detachment within many constructions of masculinity fuels the notion of war as a natural endeavour and that men are destined to be the main actors. Discourse on men's emotional detachment almost always ascribes emotion as a feminine trait. While 'real men' are portrayed as being naturally calloused to the brutalities of combat, feminine subjects are represented as slave to their emotions and incapable of withstanding the stress of war. This hides both the intense socialisation that goes into turning individuals into combatants and the role that women have played in all armed conflicts. The creation of this dichotomy contains both the demand that men close themselves off to emotion and the claim that women are products of it.

Aggression and bravado

To attain the full status of manhood, men are commonly expected to demonstrate aggression. As masculinity is hierarchical, men are often required to try to dominate, intimidate and socially overpower others by manifesting aggression and bravado, if they wish to obtain the benefits of a dominant position. Through such public displays they demonstrate their masculinity to those around them (Beynon, 2002, p. 11). Aggressive displays establish a hierarchy within masculine peer groups. Men can manifest these displays by verbal aggression towards other men, by aggressively acting out in social situations and by trying to dominate social spaces. If a man fails to demonstrate sufficient aggression he may be singled out for hostile reprisals. Masculinity also encourages men to assert potency in the form of bravado (Hinojosa, 2010, p. 180). In social contexts men are commonly expected to partake in competing expressions of bravery, skill and strength. This is exhibited in militarised contexts where the 'trash talk' of soldiers establishes group bonding and asserts collective masculinity. Although aggression and bravado are not direct forms of violence in themselves, they foster a culture that both condones and encourages wartime violence.

The solidification of gender hierarchies is a key facet of patriarchal masculinity. This is particularly the case in military contexts, in which highly formalised hierarchies provide the foundation of collective culture. Within military organisations hierarchies are sedimented through aggressive displays, in which aggression

and bravado are used to shame and subjugate less masculine men, and to assert the dominance of individual men (Francke, 1997, p. 152). The use of bravado, exaggeration and aggression is typical of basic military training. Rachel Woodward and Trish Winter (2007) found a pervasive culture of competing aggression and bravado within UK military culture. They found soldiers often participated in escalating claims of bravado and prowess, often in the form of sexual bragging or exaggerated claims of combat performance. To comprehend how masculinity impacts the conduct of warfare it is crucial to understand aggression, bravado and risk-taking as connected manifestations of masculine displays.

Displays of aggression and bravado manifest patriarchal power and domination. The expectation that men will be aggressive and dominating in social situations helps to dichotomise between men and women: women are expected to be submissive and acquiescent. Aggression in homosocial situations is often competitive, which means that men are expected to escalate their aggression to establish hierarchy within a group. This can be seen at many levels: the passing of denigrating jokes around the bar or the escalating brutality against prisoners in recent conflicts. Kathleen Barry (2010, p. 15) maintains that the myths of masculinity serve the purpose of making men's lives expendable, by leading men to accept the likelihood that they will be killed, maimed or psychologically wounded. Through aggression and bravado, men are able to normalise the prospect that they are likely to die as a necessary function of masculinity. Together, aggression and bravado serve to prepare men for combat and foster their potential for group violence.

Risk-taking

Risk-taking behaviour is central to the forging of men into efficient combatants. These risks are taken up through a wide range of activities, such as violent sport, dangerous sexual practices and dangerous approaches to illness, injury and health care. Risk-taking is facilitated by masculinity's emphasis on emotional detachment and aggressive performance. A high acceptance of risk is integrated into the structure of many masculine institutions. This is particularly the case in the instance of warfare. To go to war individuals must accept a significant degree of personal risk, as well as risking others within their community, such as family members who may not be able to support themselves, and of course risking the safety of their opponents.

Constructions of gender define experiences of risk and risk-taking. Risk is a fundamental aspect of all people's lives. Despite this, men and women are socialised to respond to risks very differently. Men are actively encouraged to take risks as a direct expression of masculinity. Bonding activities are often characterised by the adoption of shared risks – for example in team sports and excessive drinking (Miller, 2008, p. 482). Shared experiences of risks play a role in forming military masculinity, not only through simulating risk in combat but also by actual risks taken in intensive military training. Frank Barrett (1996, p. 134) has found that within the U.S. navy, men's communal risk-taking behaviours were used to construct a sense of common identity and as a badge of superiority.

Risk is constructed to correlate with bravery, toughness and potency. For example, young boys are encouraged to experience team contact sports, such as American football, where they have a significant risk of suffering long-term injury (Sabo, 1989). As boys grow older risk-taking is made possible through emotional detachment and aggression. Emotional detachment allows disconnection from the pain and damage that their behaviour causes, both to themselves and to those around them. When men choose to partake in heavy contact sports without engaging emotionally with the risks they involve, they are disconnected from the long-term hurt which an injury could cause them.

Bravado and aggression provide conditions for risk-taking to escalate. The connection between emotional detachment, aggression, risk-taking and masculine perceptions of potency has been reported in research on military masculinities. Frank J. Barrett (1996, p. 140) found that a superior value was given to roles in the U.S. Navy that entailed a greater degree of risk. For example, the hegemonic construction of masculinity privileged aviators, who actively pursued risky roles. Barrett observed that jobs that involved risk-taking were clearly privileged and even high-ranking positions, such as officers who worked in logistics, were considered to be subordinated to men whose jobs entailed a higher degree of risk. Aviators would attempt to dominate supply officers and emasculate them verbally: one aviator expressed his resentment at having to rely on supply officers, referring to them as 'little dicks' that needed to compensate for failed masculinity by making life difficult for the personnel doing the 'real' work (Barrett, 1996, p. 139). Because their work did not involve risk, supply officers were considered to be cowardly, impotent and physically weak. This provides a telling illustration of the privileges gained from risk-taking and the disadvantages they may suffer from abstaining from them.

The preference for risk-taking extended to Navy men's recreational activities outside their work context. Pilots, who were seen as being the most potently male and took the greatest risks in their work, had a reputation for risky sexual activity, drunkenness and recklessness when on land. They themselves saw their risks as a form of transcendence and empowerment, and took pride in the significant risks their job entailed: one pilot brushed off the mortality rate in their line of work (1996, p. 139) by stating, 'We're aviators. We laugh in the face of death'. The case of U.S. naval pilots illustrates a connection between risk-taking behaviour and the construction of hierarchy between men. The development of a risk-taking culture like this would not be possible without aggression, emotional detachment and establishing group membership through displays of dominance. Each of these factors provides mechanisms for men's risk-taking behaviour to be encouraged, internalised and enforced.

Aggressive heterosexuality

Compulsory heterosexuality has been a fundamental attribute of patriarchal masculinity in Global North states. Within military institutions there has run a deep fear of homosexuality and homoeroticism. These fears have been assuaged in

public displays of bragging about heterosexual potency, while demonstration of homosexuality within military contexts faces brutal reprisals. Compulsory heterosexuality is significant in defining men's relationships with one another and enforcing power relations over women. From a young age, boys are often taught that to be a 'real' man is to be heterosexual and sexually active. Particularly within the military context, the popular heroes of Western hegemonic masculinity are stiflingly heterosexual, sexually active and potent. For young boys a direct correlation is developed between hegemonic masculinity, heterosexual sexuality and aggression (Goldstein, 2001, p. 349). From *James Bond* to *Top Gun*, the cultural products of the Global North treat the hegemonic male as simultaneously conquering the male enemy through the barrel of a gun and conquering women sexually, or as a reward for conquering the 'bad' opponent. Both violence and sexuality are constructed as deeply interrelated.

Hegemonic masculinity in the Global North defines men's sexuality in terms of violence, oppression and aggression. From a young age boys are taught to suppress the aspects of sexuality that are tender, caring, tentative and egalitarian. In their place, boys are encouraged to be dominating, aggressive, possessing and above all powerful (Barry, 2010, p. 12): they are taught that sexuality requires them to be assertive, in control and confident to be 'real' men. This has the corresponding effect of constructing women to be passive, dominated, exploited and objectified. Furthermore, for men to be sufficiently masculine they must be active and penetrative in their heterosexual encounters. Men who do not live up to this ideal – by preferring their sexual encounters to be with other men, by failing to be aggressive or dominating in their sexual encounters with women, or by not actively pursuing sexual relationships at all – are singled out for retribution or placed in a subordinate position within the gender order.

Heterosexuality is often enforced violently within military groups. The connection been manhood and heteronormativity is so significant as to have led Michael Kimmel (1994) to describe 'masculinity as homophobia', due to the strength of connection between notions of Western masculinity and the fear of being feminised that can be assuaged only by demonstrating heterosexuality. Traditional Western military organisations often also express deep fears of homosexuality and actively enforce compulsory heterosexuality within small military units. Christina Jarvis (2004, pp. 73–74) has documented the great lengths the U.S. military went to during World War II to exclude homosexuals and enforce heterosexuality by policing homosexual encounters within the military. Drawing on an extraordinary body of pseudoscience, they worked exhaustively to uncover the root of 'true' homosexuality, to distinguish 'genuine' homosexuals from those men who were biologically heterosexual and may have been corrupted by deviant men. One such test was the gag reflex, whereby (Jarvis, 2004, p. 77) 'biologically homosexual' men were believed to lack this reflex due to their sexual practices. This pseudoscientific search for true homosexuality demonstrates a deep fear of the feminisation of military men.

Although the policies of publicly opposing homosexuality as a psychological pathology are gradually receding from Western militaries, the social enforcement

of compulsory heterosexuality remains. Heterosexual activity is promoted within military units through peer-enforced sexual activities. Military men are often encouraged to engage in group sexual activities, such as visiting strip clubs or brothels; sexual harassment; the recounting of heterosexual fantasies and stories in groups; and active sexual violence committed against women by groups. Militaries are also acutely aware of just how important men's sexual access to women is as a source of bonding and a reward. The use by the military of strip clubs and brothels to help 'let off steam' is widely recognised by military officials and academics (Woodward & Winter, 2007, p. 70).

Feminists Katharine Moon (1997) and Cynthia Enloe (2000) have both noted the critical importance of the sex industry for militaries that perpetrate old war. Group sexual activity helps to shore up collective masculinity and enforces heterosexuality. This helps to paradoxically reassure against fears of homosexuality and provide a group sense of common masculine potency (Enloe, 2000, p. 53). Military men are portrayed as uncontrollably heterosexual – incapable of controlling their sexual desires, which inevitably spill out onto any female body they can gain access to.Enloe (2000, p. 111) has found that military officials accept and encourage men's sexual use of women because they consider it to be inevitable. She has found that military officials consider 'recreational rape' to be an inevitable result of denying soldiers sufficient access to women's bodies through prostitution. This constructs an account of masculinity which demands that men actively pursue constant sexual encounters with women's bodies. If men do not demand and pursue sexual access to women – or if they do not express interest in heterosexuality or objectify women in this way – then they are suspected by the group to be corrupt, failed examples of manhood and open for scorn and attack.

'Old war' and gender relations in sub-Saharan Africa

Taken together these factors can be used to chart an account of how military masculinities are created by the Global North, which in turn explains the gendered logic of old war (as presented by Kaldor [2012]). Although there are inevitably complexities, slippages and inconsistencies across the ways in which gender is constructed and performed, these factors can be widely observed in the gendered structure of old war. While it is unproblematic to chart the importance of these factors in crafting old war, their contribution to new wars in the Global South is far less clear. The scholarship on masculinities in sub-Saharan Africa has also suggested that many of the factors just described, such as an emphasis on violence and militarism, are of central importance to the construction of dominant masculinity in numerous societies, including Nigeria, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda (Moran, 1995; Ricardo & Barker, 2005; Dolan, 2011; Meger, 2011). Whereas these commonalities remain, a careful historical reading of militarised masculinities in some cases suggests that the gender dynamics of conflict are starkly different to those observed in the Global North (Parpart, 2015). In many instances the underlying practice of war appears to be very different, despite some degree of resonance with gendered logics in Western interstate war.

This kind of resonance can be seen in the widespread practices of military admission rituals across sub-Saharan Africa. Similarly to their northern counterparts, military groups across sub-Saharan Africa often rely on initiation processes that require recruits to go through some kind of ordeal, proving their masculine status. However, if we look to the scholarship on African armed groups, the underlying gendered logic of these admission processes often follows very different patterns, reinforcing patrimonial relationships between young boys and 'big men', rather than the social authority of a formal military (Ricardo & Barker, 2005, p. 26). Further, the style of admission often takes cues from existing initiation structures, co-opting the form of pre-existing rituals to serve the military purpose. This may mean the establishment of 'age set' grouping within the military, or the creation of elaborate rites that mirror the practices of West African secret societies.

Even when the overarching gendered performances appear to resonate with the militarised masculinities in the Global North, the form of military practice is often very different, with combatants drawing on distinct traditions of armed conflict (Jackson, 2007). As was discussed in the previous chapter, the naturalised account of 'old war' presented by Kaldor and other new war scholars fits very poorly with the traditions of warfare outside of the Global North. Due to this, attempts to apply generalised knowledge on the structure of militarised masculinity which was developed in the Global North to the Global South risk further naturalising the gender dynamics of war, assuming commonality across times and locations where significant differences may be present (Stern & Baaz, 2013). Applying generalised models of militarised masculinity may hide the possibility of change, occluding the diverse manifestations of gender that may be present and hiding instances of slippage.

To avoid the duel traps of overgeneralisation and ignoring resonances requires an approach that pays attention to both change and divergence, as well as commonality and continuity. As this book studies shifts in war there is a high risk of either overstating the commonalities between gender arrangements in new and old war or treating the formulation of gender in each instance of armed violence as wholly disconnected from other gendered logics. As a result of looking at the practice of old war in the Global North, seven common factors have emerged which appear to be key to making men capable of doing war. However, the particular formulation of these factors, the emphasis placed on them and the way in which they intersect with other gender dynamics vary greatly. Accordingly, to study the gendered dynamic of new war it is necessary to look for commonalities that may exist between the way these factors emerge in the old and new wars, while remaining attentive to the different gendered logics, structures and practices that emerge. It is this comparative approach that provides the foundation for the following two chapters.

Notes

1 As is explained in the previous chapter, Kaldor's historical distinction between 'new' and 'old' wars is not taken to be historically accurate. Accordingly, when the term 'old

war' is used in this chapter it is taken to represent the kind of escalating, territorial, state-based conflict as she describes, rather than a particular historical period.

2 The meaning of 'material' within materialist accounts of masculinities is far from unified and shows a high degree of variation between CSMM scholars. The tag has problematically been applied to a variety of CSMM scholars who come from frameworks other than post-structuralism (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2003). While the tag of materialist applies adequately to the framework adopted by authors such as Jeff Hearn, whose work emphasises material factors in the Marxian sense of organisational structures and economic arrangements, it fits far less clearly with authors such as Michael Kimmel, who focuses far less on economic factors. However, as this research is most directly grounded in work that does focus on structure, class, economy and physicality, the tag of 'materialist' is consciously adopted.

4   Gender and new war
in Sierra Leone

War in Sierra Leone broke out in March 1991 and raged until coming to a close after United Nations and UK military interventions in mid-January 2002. During this time tens of thousands were killed and almost half of the population was displaced. Rape was widespread; direct attacks on civilians were commonplace. The primary belligerent force was the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF). Comprising a disparate group of rebels led by Foday Sankoh, the RUF fought against the Sierra Leonean Army (SLA), the *kamajor* hunter militias, the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) and a number of mercenary groups. Later in the conflict, some members of the RUF combined forces with remnants of the SLA between 1997 and 2002 to form the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), which ruled Sierra Leone briefly in 1998. Fuelling the conflict was a failing patrimonial system, economic disputes over the country's vast mineral resources and a deep rift between the traditional power structures of 'big men' patricians and excluded 'lumpenproletariat' youths.

This chapter argues that the development of new war in Sierra Leone was caused by the existing patrimonial social structure, the pre-war culture of masculine entitlement and the breakdown of relations between young and old men. It focuses on the local and organisational aspects of new war by exploring the transformation of the RUF from a conventional insurgency organisation in 1991 to a new warrior group by the mid-1990s. At the local level, the RUF's use of brutal violence against civilians and its practice of sexual slavery can be seen to be products of existing gender dynamics that encouraged men to respond to threats with violence, and treated any loss of privilege as a threat. After this, the chapter argues that the organisational construction of the RUF was a product of co-opting and exaggerating existing patriarchal gender relations in Sierra Leonean society. By focusing on the gendered structure of the RUF, and the masculine logic of its violence, it will become clear that the practices of new war were not the inevitable result of particularistic identity politics. Rather the fundamental attributes to developing new war in Sierra Leone were products of pre-existing gender dynamics that associated masculinity with power, wealth and private violence, while being structurally unable to support the inequitable gender arrangements that this demanded.

At the beginning of the conflict there were substantial differences between the RUF and the SLA. As the war progressed the tactics taken on by the SLA gradually began to resemble the RUF until it was often difficult for civilians to distinguish between the two (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 37). This transformation occurred due to the particular configuration of gender relations present within the RUF and Sierra Leone at large, which fuelled forms of violence that have subsequently been identified as new war. To explore the emergence of new war in Sierra Leone this chapter will examine the organisation and behaviour of the RUF based on the idealised notions of masculinity observed within Western militaries, set out in the previous chapter. It will develop an understanding of masculine violence, aggressive heterosexuality, group membership, militarism, emotional detachment, aggressive bravado and risk-taking in structuring the practices of combatants. These points of reference are used as the basis for comparison between the practice of new and old war, and to suggest that the masculine logic of new war was created by profoundly different gender dynamics than are observed within the Global North.

Sierra Leone's existing gendered social structure

From 1991 until 2002, the RUF fought to gain control over the country. After the first few years of fighting, clear boundaries between armed groups began to break down, making it increasingly difficult to distinguish between rebel forces and the state military. As this occurred, direct conflict between the armed groups decreased, while combatants began to target civilians almost exclusively. To understand the root causes of this transformation, from conventional insurgency to a new war model, it is necessary to understand the social context of war in Sierra Leone.

The patrimonial system is the central structure for understanding the construction of gender relations in Sierra Leone. Patrimony is a political and social system in which power and resources are organised around a central leader, who distributes them to clients. In the Sierra Leonean context, patrimony is manifested at all levels through the dominant masculinity of the 'big man'. At the state level this relationship is centred on the client/patron relationships that were essential to the structure of Sierra Leonean politics prior to 1991 (Leach, 1994, p. 165; Denov & Maclure, 2006b, p. 129). This was true in national politics all the way down to local communities, where the 'big man' patron was able to exert extensive power and control over subordinate women, men, boys and girls (Murphy, 2003, p. 62). On the local level, this power relationship was reinforced by secret societies and chiefdoms which established hierarchical structures subordinating the young and the poor to elders in the community (MacKenzie, 2012). The patrimonial system provided substantial material and social privileges to patrons, allowing them to benefit from the material resources of Sierra Leone while economically excluding those men and women who were unable to obtain patronage (Murphy, 2003, p. 72). Patrons also served as a kind of intermediary to gender power and position, either providing or

denying access to key demarcations of status, such as marriage, employment and secret society membership.

In Sierra Leone secret societies play a significant role in the social policing of men and women while informing children of dominant gender norms. Upon reaching adolescence, boys and girls are initiated by these societies through undergoing circumcision, becoming a man or a woman in the eyes of society (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 24). During this time young girls spend up to two years in the bush, learning skills and values, such as dance, singing, craft, herb lore, respect for elders and how to be a proper partner. As part of this process, 90 per cent of girls undergo female genital mutilation and are taught patriarchal values, such as subordination to their husband. For boys, initiation also involves remaining under the control of an older man for a number of years (Leach, 1994, p. 167). During this process both adult men and boys are referred to as 'learning boys' and are subordinate to a male patron, who may require their labour in farming, washing or menial tasks. In exchange, the older man is expected to train the 'learning boys' and provide assistance in acquiring wives and social status. These initiation processes are fundamental for both boys and girls being considered mature and rising up the gender hierarchy. They can also entail substantial cost, both financially and physically (Richards, 2005). Internally, secret societies are hierarchically structured, with chiefs and 'big men' wielding substantial control over other society members. Secret societies serve as one of the central social institutions through which gender relations are reproduced, and serve as the main mechanism for policing gendered behaviour, with societies punishing men and women who transgress the acceptable boundaries of behaviour.

Within this patrimonial system the monopoly over legitimate violence has never been held by the state military. Although the military served to protect the interest of central elites in the capital of Freetown, violence has always been privatised and in the hands of local 'big men'. Within Sierra Leone there is a long history of older patricians utilising younger 'war boys' as tools of older men's political authority (Shepler, 2010). Far from representing formalised and professional militaries, as has come to be central in the military traditions of the Global North, no clear distinction between private violence and public violence has been made. The utilisation of young men and boys for labour and political support and as combatants has provided the material base for 'big men' to exert authority, alongside the accumulation of women and girls for physical and reproductive labour.

The patrimonial system also created a strict gendered hierarchy in Sierra Leone, with subordination of poor to rich, young to old, women to men. In this context, most sexual violence was not seen to be problematic. Human Rights Watch (2003, p. 5) records that only the rape of a virgin was considered to be a serious crime, and even this is primarily a crime against the family rather than against the woman or girl. This often means that punishment for rape often consists either of paying a significant fine to the girl's family or marrying the rape victim. When Physicians for Human Rights (2002, pp. 57–58) polled women in Sierra Leone after the war they recorded that the majority of women believed that they should obey their husbands even when they disagreed, that husbands were entitled to beat their

wives and that women are required to have sex with their husbands even if they do not want to. Although sexual subordination was present, there were also significant social controls on men's violence against women, with secret societies playing a key role in protecting women from certain kinds of aggression and providing a venue for women to protect one another (Day, 2012). The dominating power relationships between men and women, young and old, help explain the forms of violence that manifest in Sierra Leone.

The practices of child marriage, polygamy and bride price all contribute to the use of violence in Sierra Leone. Child marriage is common in Sierra Leone, with the acceptable marriage age being as young as 12 in some circumstances. The structural disadvantage experienced by women is compounded by their commodification through the bride price system. To take possession of a woman or girl through marriage a man was expected to pay her family a substantial sum, considered to be reparations for her lost economic output (Coulter, 2009, pp. 74–75). This meant that men are often significantly older than their marriage partner, as older men tend to have access to greater economic resources. Thus the disparate age and wealth of partners – of husbands in relation to their wives – compound the unequal power of men and women (Coulter, 2009, p. 43). Exacerbating this disadvantage was the practice of polygamy, in which men could take possession of many women through marriage in order to gain access to their economic output, and as a signifier of masculine status.

The implication of this system was that powerful 'big men' accumulated women as markers of status. For women this meant that they often suffered highly unequal marriage relationships, and were treated as economic commodities traded between men as signifiers of social status and wealth (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004c, p. 98). For young men in particular this meant that marriage was often not possible: they were excluded from the patrimonial system, not only because they did not have the economic means to pay an adequate bride price but also because polygamy significantly reduced their marriage prospects. Such dynamics played a significant role in constructing the model of sexual slavery that has characterised sexual relations within combatant groups during the war.

War the RUF way

During Sierra Leone's conflict the RUF developed methods of new war which reflected an ideology of masculine dominance and the overthrow of existing gender hierarchies. The model of warfare developed by the RUF focused on the use of sexual violence, mutilation, looting, arson, abduction and terror. These were instrumentally used to control the population and enhance an 'enclavist' military culture which treated all non-members as enemies deserving brutal violence (Gberie, 2005, p. 136). Through directly targeting non-combatants and perceived innocents, the RUF was able to destabilise Sierra Leonean society and gain control over lucrative diamond mining regions. The ensuing destabilisation and anarchy created a culture of impunity, in which members of all military forces were able

to exploit civilian populations and extract mineral resources (USAID, 2001, p. 8). These resources were smuggled across the border into neighbouring countries, such as Liberia, in exchange for arms, drugs and luxury goods (Campbell, 2002).

To supplement this income the RUF was able to loot most of their other material needs from civilian populations, and this extraction gradually became the primary focus of their military organisation as war progressed. Peter Pham (2006, p. 94) has recorded that after 1993 the RUF avoided any direct confrontation with the SLA, preferring to attack 'soft' targets, such as humanitarian mission compounds, townships and mines. These efforts focused on extracting resources, controlling lucrative ventures and brutalising civilians, methods which allowed the war in Sierra Leone to continue for ten years despite the RUF not receiving widespread support from the general population.

The demographics, social structure and military culture of the RUF all indicate that militarised masculinity was significant in the development of conflict in Sierra Leone. The RUF received very little support from Sierra Leonean society at large. This meant that their primary method of recruitment was abduction of boys and girls, with little distinction on the basis of gender (Gberie, 2005, p. 8). Despite having a high level of female participation, the RUF can best be characterised as a male-dominated organisation, with all of the core ideologues, such as Foday Sankoh, Samuel 'Mosquito' Bockarie, Augustine Gbao, Morris Kallon and Issay Sesay, being male (Denov, 2010, p. 107). Furthermore, the construction of military culture in the RUF enforced a stereotypical vision of masculinity in combatants, such as emotional detachment, mandatory heterosexuality, extreme violence, homosocial group attachment and militarised manhood. The position towards femininity within the RUF was somewhat more fluid, with some women forcibly being placed into rigid patriarchal roles as sexual slaves and bush wives, while others were allowed to transgress into masculine roles within the organisation.

Women and girls within the RUF were marginalised or abused at all levels: not only did female members of the RUF suffer specific sexual and physical abuse at the hands of their fellow combatants, but also they suffered gender-specific disadvantage in the post-conflict period (Coulter, 2008). Despite this, the RUF is also characterised by a high level of female participation, with some women taking up commanding or training roles (Denov & Maclure, 2006a). Within the conflict many women and girls actively adopted the RUF ideology, taking on the role of combatant actively (Mckay & Mazurana, 2004). For some of these women the motivation for joining in fighting was to try to escape rigid patriarchal controls that shackled them in civilian society (Denov, 2010). However, for many more recruitment either was forced or represented a position of constrained choice due to limited options during the conflict (Coulter, 2009). For these reasons an understanding of the war in Sierra Leone is best developed through an analysis of the masculine culture of violence that drove the violence within the RUF.

Greed and war in Sierra Leone

The brutality and apparent irrationality of violence against civilians provided a significant conceptual quandary for international relations scholars in the early

1990s. Tactics such as the amputation of children's limbs and sexual abuse of the elderly and very young challenged functional accounts of violence, as these acts did not appear to have any clear significant strategic value. Particularly challenging was the fact that RUF violence was not directed towards a different ethnic or religious group (Hoffman, 2006, p. 10). All sides in the war appear to have targeted members of their own community, with the RUF commonly requiring youths to kill or rape family members as part of initiation rituals (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, pp. 43–52).

To come to terms with this perceived irrationality, a range of economic explanations were put forward. Authors such as Greg Campbell (2002) argued that the violence of the RUF can largely be explained in rational economic terms as a tool of disruption used to create a profitable shadow economy. The scholarship of political economists has disavowed the notion that violence in Sierra Leone was inevitable, by charting the international connections between the RUF and a wide range of international forces which armed, funded and trained combatants (Zack-Williams, 1999). Economic accounts have explored the international forces that influenced conflict in Sierra Leone and charted financing of armed groups.

Economic accounts of war in Sierra Leone argue that the RUF was primarily fuelled by opportunistic greed, suggesting that international forces facilitated conflict and motivated combatants to continue fighting (USAID, 2001). The violence perpetrated by the RUF is explained in functional terms, as an attempt to destabilise society so that armed enclaves could gain access to the mineral wealth of the diamond mines, an entrepreneurial endeavour to gain control of mineral resources that were being exploited by global economic forces (Hoffman, 2006, p. 5). This argument is exemplified by Greg Campbell (2002), who highlights the use of diamonds to fund the war in Sierra Leone. He argues (Campbell, 2002, p. 2) that 'the war was never more than an economic endeavour, a ten-year-long jewellery heist that continued despite the UN's efforts and the RUF's promises to stop mining'. This account provides a strong explanation of how global economic factors made the war in Sierra Leone possible by charting the flow of arms from the Western world during the war. It can also explain the actions of mercenary groups, such as South Africa's Executive Outcomes, as profit-seeking endeavours. The economic accounts also go some way to explaining how violence was used to destabilise populations and gain control over diamond mines (Campbell, 2002, p. xiv).

Despite the economic motives of some parties, economic accounts cannot explain the particular forms that violence took, or the involvement of most fighters who did not prosper during the war. While there may be functional reasons for using violence to destabilise society in general, economic accounts cannot explain the targeting of particular populations for rape or the widespread use of amputation. Moreover, it appears that the majority of profit from the RUF's violence was channelled back into fuelling the war effort through the purchase of ammunition, drugs and military equipment. Most of the combatants did not significantly benefit from the war, and were lucky to receive any salary beyond subsistence looting. Some leaders did benefit economically (Jackson, 2004, p. 142). However, this is more applicable to certain members of the SLA or leaders of the RUF than the majority of RUF members, who were living in the bush under spartan conditions.

Beyond a regular meal, the combatants emphasised the increased power and status of becoming a soldier rather than the particular economic wealth coming from the war (Murphy, 2003, p. 70).

Sociological accounts provided by Paul Richards (1996; 2005; 2006) and Myriam Denov (2010) were a further improvement on the economic explanations of war in Sierra Leone. This dispelled any belief in the irrationality or anarchic nature of atrocities in Sierra Leone. These scholars argued that the violence of the RUF, and other parties, carries significant social meaning and followed a clear logic. Denov contextualised violence in Sierra Leone by analysing the broader social meaning of particular acts, such as amputation, mutilation or rape. Denov placed the violence of rape by the RUF within the context of patriarchy and patrimonialism, providing, for example, a meaningful analysis of the RUF's practice of raping elderly women. Placed within the context of gerontocratic patrimonalism Denov (2010, p. 120) noted that sexual assault on the elderly is an attack on traditional values and authority structures.

The focus of Denov's work is primarily on dismissing stereotypical visions of child soldiers as villains, victims or heroes. In her commendable attempt to dispel stereotypes of child soldiers that are 'exoticized, decontextualized and essentialized' Denov (2010, p. 13) has not focused her primary attention on broader social structures or the causes of conflict, as this was not the intention of her research. For this reason Denov's work needs to be supplemented with a structural approach that contextualises the choice, individuality and subjectivity of combatants. What is needed is an exploration of how choice is given meaning, how individual experience is shaped by external forces, and how subjective experiences are constructed by the structural context in which individuals exist.

Paul Richards' (1996) anthropological work on violence in Sierra Leone provides a detailed and valuable attempt to place violence within the broader social context. In *Fighting for the Rainforest: War, youth & resources in Sierra Leone*, Richards argues that the intentional development of RUF tactics was based on the experiences of the RUF's leadership. He reveals the functions of RUF violence, such as intentional destabilisation of society through massed violence so that minerals may be extracted, and the use of amputation to prevent civilians from voting. Richards also charts the socialisation of child soldiers with violent cultural products, such as action movies and gangster rap music (Richards, 1996, pp. 56–58), and successfully dispels the myth that youth violence is apolitical and random. He suggests that the violence committed by combatants contains significant elements of performance and political messages that are particular to Sierra Leone's context (Richards, 1996, p. xxiv). Richards suggests that analysis of the cultural power dynamics behind violence can help to explain the particular forms that violence took. He also rebuts the suggestion that the form of war in Sierra Leone was inevitable simply due to the material conditions of poverty, population levels or diamond wealth. To do this, Richards (1996, p. 5) analyses the significant personal involvement of Foday Sankoh in initiating the war and he proposes that Sankoh's experience in Libya and intimate relationship with Liberia's Charles Taylor were essential to the start of violence in Sierra Leone. Richards notes the

extensive similarities between conflicts in Sierra Leone and Liberia, drawing a link between Sankoh and other RUF leaders' experience fighting for Taylor and the tactics they implemented once they were within Sierra Leone. In particular, the flashy brutal attacks against civilians that the RUF used have much in common with the model of violence used during Liberia's civil war.

Richards' work is useful in providing a model for understanding violence in Sierra Leone as a form of political communication. Most accounts of violence in Sierra Leone have emphasised the lack of strategic value in attacking civilians, and suggested that violence is an inevitable, almost mechanical result of economic injustices. Richards' work argues that the conspicuous, public displays of brutal violence should be interpreted as a form of extreme political communication. This approach has been developed further by Danny Hoffman (2006), who suggests that the mainstream discourse on whether violence is irrational or has instrumental value has misunderstood the role of violence as a form of political communication. Hoffman (2006, p. 13) suggests that violence must be 'read' to understand its symbolic importance and intended message. Although the message sent through violence is often contested or unclear, the 'violence as communication' approach adopted by Hoffman is promising for a gendered approach if it can help to explain the role of violence in gendered power struggles.

Richards' original argument in *Fighting for the Rainforest* did not show significant sensitivity to gender, but emphasised a political clash between those at the peripheries of the patrimonial system and those at the centre. Since the original authorship of this book Richards has published several articles (2004; 2005; 2006) that show a greater sensitivity to gender. These articles each address aspects of masculinity and gender relations. Despite this more recent work, Richards' writings do not treat patriarchy or militarised masculinity as a causal force. Rather he focuses on deploying gender as an analytical category to complement the category of age in understanding existing power structures and explaining the political ideology of groups such as the RUF.

While these accounts go a long way to deconstructing the kind of economic accounts of violence that are present in Sierra Leone, they do not fully address the structuring of gender. To take this scholarship further the following sections look at the construction of militarised masculinity within Sierra Leone as a causal factor in the conflict with reference to the idealised masculine practices observed in militaries of the Global North. Through this comparison some central differences in the structuring of gender relations can be observed, which in turn can help to unpack the masculine logic of new war in Sierra Leone.

Masculine violence

The violence performed by the RUF followed an existing masculine logic that existed prior to the outbreak of armed conflict in 1991. The brutality and apparent indiscriminate targeting of civilians by the RUF have perplexed many observers, as these targets normally posed no threat to the RUF's strategic interests (Bangura, 2000). What is obscured by most analysis is that the attacks had symbolic

rather than strategic value: the brutalisation of civilian populations was an attack against the existing hegemonic male order through its civilian subordinates. From this perspective, violence against civilians was an ideological attack against those men who dominate society through intermediaries. It represents a form of ideological warfare which attempts to wrestle control over society and assert the RUF's dominance.

Public attacks against civilian populations in Sierra Leone served as assertions of masculine dominance. When the RUF rounded up populations for amputation, public rape or torture, the violence was not anarchic or politically neutral. Attacks were also not, as some authors have suggested, inevitable violence created by 'lumpenproletariat' youths with more power than sense (Abdullah, 2005). The soldiers of the RUF did not brutalise civilians in a truly random or anarchic fashion: their violence was often carefully crafted to include public displays of highly ritualised and structured brutality which ensured that civilians were left utterly humiliated (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 4). Violence against civilians combined aspects of sexual violence, public humiliation, torture and mutilation (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 102). Civilians were often required to strip publicly before combatants and their peers, and many were raped or sexually tortured, often in front of family members. In a number of instances these attacks were specifically directed towards town chiefs, the elderly or other figures of authority in the existing gender order. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2004b, p. 510) records one of these instances:

> There was one lady in the group who was forced to show them the town chief, otherwise they would kill her. So with fear, she pointed at the town chief. Immediately, he was stripped naked in front of his subjects, including his wives and children. He was asked to run from where we were gathered to his store which was about 50 metres away. As an old man, he became exhausted and asked to lie down on the ground. He laid down, they asked him to open his mouth, he did, the commander took a single barrel gun loaded with bullets, put the gun in his mouth and pulled the trigger. His brains scattered all over the street.

This is not an instance of random indiscriminate violence. The targeting of chiefs and other authority figures is characteristic of a broader struggle against the hegemonic gender order in Sierra Leone. The ritualistic humiliation of a town chief in this example, where he is stripped naked in front of his family and community and then forced to run in public view, signifies an attack against his authority and an assertion of the combatants' power. A strategic military objective, such as eliminating a potential threat to the RUF's authority, cannot explain the systematic use of such ritual humiliations: as commentators from Sierra Leone have correctly noted, at the heart of this public humiliation is an attempt to shatter the bonds that held the existing social order together (Barnes et al., 2007, p. 11).

The use of amputation served the instrumental purposes of prohibiting civilians from voting and making them unable to conduct physical labour, forcing them to

flee to major cities so that they could receive some medical treatment and support (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 37). At the same time, amputation was used to humiliate the existing gerontocratic male hegemons, feminising them by making them unable to fight, to be economically productive or to enforce rule on younger men. The use of amputation negated older men's ability to fulfil core aspects of the mythology of masculinity and power: they were robbed of their ability to be provider, protector and ruler.

The widespread use of arson also served the functional role of destroying communities, allowing rebels to control large tracts of productive land with impunity. At the same time there are many instances where arson did not appear to serve such clear material interests. For example, the widespread practice of burning mosques and churches appears to have had more symbolic value than immediate tactical utility. Within Sierra Leone both religions had supported the authority of fathers and traditional tribal power structures, and by destroying the physical manifestations of religion in churches and mosques the RUF was able to make a violent protest against the existing social order and the men who dominated it (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 36). By challenging the authority of organised religions and the social order that it supported, the RUF created new social structures that benefited combatants.

Despite serving a multiplicity of purposes, new war violence in Sierra Leone was part of a coherent project to assert the masculine authority of combatants. On the surface, the violence implemented by combatant organisations often did not appear to serve any strategic interest; however, these violent acts against civilians worked to undermine the existing dominant 'big men's' claim to masculinity in direct ways, concretely demonstrating their inability to serve as protectors. At the same time the violence served to assert combatants' competing claims to authority, and due to this their strategic utility must be understood as part of a wider effort to challenge the authority of dominant men.

Aggressive heterosexuality

Violent sexuality was one of the defining attributes of new warrior masculinity in Sierra Leone, and during warfare sexuality was defined by violence. On the battlefield, sexual violence was used widely and in rebel camps sexual slavery became the defining trait of gender relations. The use of sexual violence throws light on how the particular model of new war violence developed by the RUF was used to conduct ideological warfare against the existing patrimonial order. Hegemonic sexual relations in Sierra Leone prior to the conflict in 1991 were defined by extremely patriarchal power structures, and the propagation of subordinated femininity, particularly for young women and girls (Coulter, 2009). In Sierra Leone's 'big man' culture, masculine status was defined by the ownership of women and girls (Barnes et al., 2007, p. 11). The ownership of women in marriage was a requirement in pre-war society for establishing full masculine status, and often entailed a significant cost in bride wealth (Coulter, 2009, p. 74). Additionally, the ownership of women and girls through marriage was a sign of economic

wealth – as it took considerable resources to pay multiple bride prices – and masculine prowess, as the accumulation of women was understood to be a sign of becoming a 'big man'.

Prior to war, marriage in Sierra Leone also offered some level of status and authority for women, particularly after childbirth. Within this context, marriage did serve as a mechanism for women to gain feminine status and power as they grew older and had more children. The monopolistic accumulation of women and girls by a small group of wealthy men was used in Sierra Leone as a way to dominate impoverished subordinate men, who were excluded from the patrimonial system and severely limited in their opportunity to marry, but also provided one of the very limited ways in which women could ascend in the gender order to respectability (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 43). This disenfranchised young men, who were unable to obtain the full status of manhood due to limited access to bride wealth.

Combatants took up the opportunity to rectify this situation. During raids on towns the RUF would send out combatants to round up females to be sexually abused (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 45). After being collected, the females were commonly raped, often by multiple perpetrators. These rapes were particularly brutal, often accompanied by sadistic sexual torture (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 100). Commonly practiced forms of sexual violence included pouring burning palm oil into women's genitals, penetration with objects, such as a pestle, knife or gun, and the mutilation of genitals or breasts with blades (Human Rights Watch, 2003, pp. 3, 33). These collective forms of misogynistic violence were an important step in forcing women and girls to accept the existence of sexual slavery and reinforced a violent culture of male power and aggression.

The way that sexual violence and torture were used by the RUF is particularly telling for understanding the way in which civilians were targeted. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has recognised the symbolic significance of sexual violence used by the RUF and suggested that the primary object of sexual violence was an attack not simply against the individual women but against society as a whole. The commission found (2004b, p. 486) that sexual violence

> Was a devastating tool of terror wielded intentionally to strike a sense of vulnerability into the wider society. It became the crux of a whole-scale assault on belief systems and traditional norms; a medium through which entire families or communities were 'punished' in revenge acts; and a crime against humanity. The very nature of the forced sexual acts forced upon the civilian population was an aberration to the individual and collective sense of self.

Here the commission is emphasising two different logics behind the use of sexual violence: first, that it was a calculated attempt to terrorise society, a motivation common to many civil conflicts; and, second, that it was a symbolic attack against society as a whole.

It is important to recognise that there are multiple logics behind different forms of sexual violence (Baaz & Stern, 2009). There are many recorded instances of sexual violence as a form of public humiliation, include forcing male family members to rape their sisters, mothers or daughters, as well as public examples of rape which family or peers were forced to watch (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 35). There are also many instances recorded of rape being used as a form of punishment, particularly within combatant organisations, which often punish women and girls with sexual violence (Singer, 2004, p. 104). Commanders also allowed combatants to sexually abuse women and girls to reward young troops for their good performance (Denov, 2010, p. 115). This suggests that there is a complexity behind the use of sexual violence: while it always serves male power, it is also used to achieve other more discrete goals.

Although there are multiple motivations for the use of sexual violence, each motivation serves to assert a new patriarchal social order. Paul Kirby's (2012) proposal that there are broadly three different accounts of rape as a weapon of war in feminist literature enables the interconnected motivations of the RUF to be distinguished. The first account used by feminists is *instrumentality*, which Kirby suggests emphasises that war rape is motivated by material interests, such as controlling populations through terror to obtain material goods. The second account, *unreason*, focuses on 'desire, bonding, esteem and sexuality' to encompass instances where sexual violence does not serve an instrumental value, or serve to construct or challenge mythologies (Kirby, 2012, p. 806). The third account, *mythology*, 'conjures symbols, imaginaries and collective identities' to explain the use of sexual violence (Kirby, 2012, p. 806). Each mode appears to have a different degree of explanatory value for different kinds of sexual violence employed by combatant groups.

Sexual violence in Sierra Leone's conflict conforms to each of the explanatory modes to some extent; however, it is the mythology account that provides the greatest explanatory value. The highly ritualistic public abuse of women and girls by the RUF appears to have both instrumental and mythological value. On the one hand it serves the instrumental role of breaking down the social fabric, allowing combatant organisations to gain control over productive diamond mines (Barnes et al., 2007, p. 11). On the other hand, the sexual violence has an important mythological value: by undermining the authority of existing dominant males it denies them the myth of male protector and asserts a militarised masculine mythology of potency, dominance and danger in combatants.

The sexual abuse of females within combatant organisations also is partly explained by instrumentality and mythology. Sexual violence created a culture of terror in female members of the RUF, ensuring their subservience and reasserting the feminine subordination of women who had fought. The exchange of women to be used for sexual abuse fits well within the mythological and the instrumental approaches to sexual violence. Instrumentally, the practice of bequeathing women and girls to male combatants served to encourage group morale and enslaving women and girls served to extract the value of their physical labour. The

enslavement of women and girls to men through marriage also serves mythological purposes, as it helped assert claims of masculine power, as required by masculinity, and structured women's subordination within the shackles of marriage in accordance with a mythology of feminine subordination.

The mythology account is the most enlightening when trying to understand the systematic use of sexual violence by all forces due to its utility as an ideological tool to construct, reinforce and challenge prevailing sociocultural beliefs (Kirby, 2012). It implies that rape does not purely serve material self-interest through accumulation or the mechanical acting out of personal desires: rather rape is a practice and a weapon that 'others' and objectifies the victim, while empowering the rapist. This approach draws on the work of Andrea Dworkin (1974, p. 171) in suggesting that those who commit sexual violence are '*programmed* by the culture as surely as rats are programmed to make the arduous way through the scientist's maze, and that the programming operates at every level of choice and action'. In this account, the mythologies of masculinity and femininity are what make sexual violence as a weapon of war possible. Women are targeted because they are constructed to be symbols of men's hegemonic status through femininity: their bodies become battlefields where men may stake their claim to manhood *because* of the pre-existing patriarchal tropes in wider society.

After being subjected to rape and torture, women and girls were often collected and subjected to sexual slavery. At the unit level females became the communal property of males in the camp to share (Denov & Maclure, 2006a, p. 77). Individual girls could be claimed by higher-ranking combatants as property through the practice of bush marriage. Bush marriage, or AK-47 marriage, was a form of sexual slavery used by combatant groups, in which abducted women and girls were owned by a particular man, commonly a powerful commander (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 31). Once owned by the man, they were required to render him extensive services, including domestic labour, assistance on the battlefield and sexual subservience. Powerful men within combatant organisations were able to use their status to accumulate many wives, and thereby aggressively assert masculinity within the group. Within the civil conflict the status that women gained from marriage was significantly eroded alongside the other rituals and constraints on marriage. In doing this the links between marriage and status were reformulated. For the majority of women this meant the rolling back of feminine respectability associated with marriage, with the exception of those married to high-ranking RUF commanders.

Military camps became a site where boys and men could stake their claims to manhood on the bodies of women and girls without the constraints of patrimony, bride wealth and social status intervening. In this way, the accumulation of women and girls for sexual use in military camps became a tactic of war. The RUF practices of rape and enslavement of bush wives were part of a coherent project to assert the masculinity of soldiers and were an integral component in their ideological war against the existing social order.

The bush wife phenomenon is a demonstration of the importance that maintaining masculine dominance and feminine subordination had for dynamics of new

war in Sierra Leone. As conflict in Sierra Leone progressed, combat missions increasingly focused on plunder or abduction, and from 1993 until the war ended in the early 2000s, the sexual enslavement of women and girls became a primary objective of combatant groups (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 9). The accumulation of women and girls as a systematic war practice parallels the pre-war exploitation of girls and women within the pre-war structure of marriage. The shift from treating women and girls as chattels within the context of marriage to their treatment as sexual slaves within bush marriage was a shift in the extremity of patriarchal abuse, but not a fundamental change in its nature. The exchange of women and girls within warrior groups can be accounted for as a means of demonstrating power and masculine authority. One of Myriam Denov's interviewees records that 'as a commander, you got to choose the girl that you liked and wanted to be with. Girls were used as gifts. I had three wives' (2010, p. 118). The acquisition of girls is used by men and boys as a signi-fier of their status within the group, an exaggerated continuation of pre-war mar-riage practices.

Sexual violence was also used as a mechanism for establishing masculinity of combatants whose status was under threat, and for undermining the masculinity of opponents. Interviews conducted by Denov and Maclure (2006b) with combat-ants suggest that rape was used in male groups to establish their status and as a form of group bonding. One of the boy soldiers that Denov and Maclure (2006b, pp. 128–129) interviewed explained that rape and abuse provided combatants with a sense of power: 'women who were just captured were always afraid and so I knew that she [sic] would obey. I felt more powerful because she was afraid of me'. This interaction is further explained by P. W. Singer in his book *Children at War* (2004, p. 104), who reports that the RUF used rape as a reward for young soldiers who had performed well. The RUF even began military operations spe-cifically intended to acquire young girls for rape, such as 'Operation Fine Girl', in which the objective was obtaining young virgins. The sexual use of women was intentional: one interviewee reported that (Singer, 2004, p. 104) 'even I had a woman. I was 12 at the time. She was 15. Our commanders said that all of us had to have a woman. If we didn't they'd kill us'. Aggressive heterosexuality was obligatory and enforced by combatant organisations, and followed a clear gen-dered logic of masculine power.

Sexual violence became an integral part of combatants' efforts to assert mas-culine dominance. Sexual slavery itself was a tactic of war, not simply a form of reward for soldiers but a tool used by combatants to stake their claim to male dominance against the hegemonic gender order. As men's control over women and girls was a cornerstone of 'big man' masculinity prior to the war, the use of sexual violence against civilian women and girls became a tool for dismantling this authority. The fulfilment of social myths of masculine power can help explain why soldiers were required to engage in rape, as an expected aspect of their role as combatants.

The prominence of sexual violence during the war is evidence of the gender dynamics of conflict. As the war was a conflict between groups of men for status

and authority, the brutal attacks against women and girls at first may seem to be out of place; however, as women are used as a signifier of masculinity, attacks against women can be understood as an indirect assault against men. To attack women and girls who are considered to be owned by male guardians or husbands represents an assault against the male-dominated social order.

Human Rights Watch records that the violence against women was used to undermine cultural values by systematically breaking taboos (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 148). When the RUF used young boys to systematically rape elderly women in their own community, it created a context where community relationships were undermined, and when fathers, brothers or sons were forced to rape their daughters, sisters or mothers, it undermined the strength of social ties. The use of violence in this way fits well with Kirby's description of the mythology account of war rape, which is used to attack the preconceived mythology of manhood by dominating men and defiling their 'property'.

There is also some evidence to suggest that boys were raped by combatants. Human Rights Watch (2003, p. 42) has recorded a number of instances where boys and men were raped by male rebels. Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) reported to Human Rights Watch that they treated 14 boys who had been raped. They suggested moreover that many more boys and men were suspected to have been raped. Due to the strict sigma against homosexuality in Sierra Leone, Human Rights Watch (2003, p. 42) was not able to investigate this possibility further, and was prohibited from talking to any victims of male-on-male rape due to the fear that it would further stigmatise and traumatise them. This assertion seems unusual considering that female victims are likely to have been similarly traumatised and stigmatised and there was no such prohibition against interviewing females. In any case, due to the lack of data no detailed analysis of male-on-male rape can be provided.

The use of sexual violence by the RUF followed a pervasive logic of aggressive heterosexuality that mirrored and exaggerated existing pre-war dynamics. The manifestation of aggressive heterosexuality within the RUF mirrors practices seen in the Global North by attaching value to men through their sexual conquest of women. However, the particular configuration of these practices is substantially different due to the position that combatants in Sierra Leone held, and the pre-war notions of sexuality that informed violence. In particular the development of sexual violence in the RUF reflects a fundamentally different relationship between the military group and society at large than can be seen within military units in the Global North.

Group membership: enclaves and fraternity

The socialisation of new recruits in the RUF provides telling evidence of how the construction of masculinity practically affected the form that war took in Sierra Leone. The original membership of the RUF was primarily constituted by marginalised young men, but as the war progressed combatant organisations increasingly relied on abduction for recruitment. As later recruits were initially reluctant

fighters, the RUF went to great lengths to create group camaraderie and commu-
nal purpose. To prime recruits for combat they needed to emotionally desensitise
them through savage violence and enforced drug use and then, after recruits had
been inducted into the group, they were indoctrinated into the RUF's culture of
warrior manhood. They were taught to value cruelty, violence, danger and martial
prowess, and these values were encouraged with reward and punishment inside
combatant organisations. Pre-existing patriarchal values facilitated the creation
of new warriors in this way. During each process of indoctrination, combatants
were able to draw on the rich patriarchal culture that already existed in Sierra
Leone, perverting and exaggerating practices as suited their purposes. New war-
riors within the RUF were socialised to be militarised reflections of the existing
patriarchal social order, performing tropes of masculine dominance and feminine
subservience with exaggerated violence and brutality.

The first step in constructing new warriors for the RUF was to create frater-
nal bonds of camaraderie between new recruits. The RUF actively created and
enforced an enclavist mentality that viewed all outsiders with suspicion. As most
recruits were recruited forcibly, a great deal of effort was required to turn them into
efficient combatants. Induction to the enclave commonly began by making any
chance of return impossible, and to do this, recruits were often required to attack
their family members' community (Denov, 2010, pp. 104–105). This made escape
and return to normality impossible, as recruits were permanently branded as rebels.
Branding, scarification or tattooing was also used to physically mark recruits, par-
ticularly for young recruits, which left few options other than to embrace the RUF
identity. This appears to have been an intentional and well-planned tactic.

The military culture that developed in Sierra Leone was highly patriarchal.
Despite the existence of a high proportion of female combatants, these were
treated as suspect members. Through extensive interviews with both male and
female combatants, Myriam Denov (2010, p. 119) has demonstrated that group
solidarity was encouraged only in male combatants. She reports that solidarity
was actively encouraged in male recruits so that after a successful battle, boys
and men would come together to tattoo one another, drink, play loud music and
rejoice. The recruits interviewed by Denov (2010, p. 106) reported that this behav-
iour was actively encouraged by senior commanders.

Such indoctrination appears to have constructed a form of masculinity which
opposed civilian society at large. Within the RUF, members were encouraged to
treat civilians in general as the enemy (Truth and Reconciliation Commission
of Sierra Leone, 2004b, p. 506). Although their official doctrine espoused an
egalitarian society, in practice their training encouraged new recruits to view all
non-members as a corrupt and oppressive class, inferior to the militarised mas-
culinity of the group, and needing to be dominated so that a new society could
be constructed (Hoffman, 2005). This fostered an enclavist mentality, by which
military groups were able to establish sovereign enclaves separated from main-
stream society (Gberie, 2005, p. 136). Groups such as the RUF were able to create
a separate social structure that paralleled mainstream society, while defining itself
in opposition to it.

Indoctrination into military culture appears to have been successful: a number of interviewees reported that they developed a great deal of devotion to the RUF (Murphy, 2003, p. 70). Recruits reported a strong sense of devotion to their commander or the particular unit in which they were operating. These relationships tended to reflect the patrimonial relationships that existed in pre-war Sierra Leonean society, as recruits were dependent on camp big men for economic support, protection and status. The loyalty felt by combatants was directed towards the particular commander who fed and protected them. This resembles the employment of young men as thugs under pre-existing patrimonial arrangements (Murphy, 2003, p. 70). Young forced recruits often expressed a great deal of nostalgia for their time in the military, and their intimate relationship with their commanders and peers (Denov, 2010, p. 105). The success of this indoctrination appears to have relied on the pre-existing construction of masculinity, mirroring and exaggerating the established patrimonial system and secret societies.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Sierra Leone has recognised that the structure of patrimonial relationships was an important resource for insurgent groups to draw upon as part of the indoctrination process. For junior fighters in particular, the TRC (2004b, p. 530) suggested that they 'depended totally on their commanders for provisions, for their livelihoods, for privileges such as drugs and women and girls, whom they raped and for their "licence to kill"'. This indicates that male power and masculine status were still arranged in a similar fashion to the pre-existing patrimonial system.

Recruits were encouraged to see their military enclaves as their new family. A number of sources have reported that young boys were told to forget their existing family and to consider their comrades as their family now (Denov & Maclure, 2006b, p. 124). This structure served as the basis for distributing material benefits, such as food, arms, drugs and clothing, as well as the symbolic benefits of status, power and authority (Murphy, 2003, p. 62). Similar to pre-existing arrangements, enclaves became sites from which commanders would distribute the trappings of idealised masculinity in exchange for the service and loyalty of recruits. Denov and Maclure (2006b, p. 124) describe induction into this group as one in which their individual identity was subsumed into the group. Boys and men became much attached to the successes or failures of the group as their primary devotion shifted from their biological family to their fellow warriors.

To signify group membership, the RUF commonly used ritual tattooing and gave recruits new names, crafting them a new role as a rebel warrior (Singer, 2004, p. 73). This occurred at two points. When recruits were first acquired they were often scarified, branded or tattooed with the letters RUF. This permanently marked them as rebels, making return to village life impossible, and ensured that capture by government or civil defence forces would lead to execution. Later, ritual tattooing was conducted to signify acceptance into the group after a successful battle. In this instance tattooing would often name the group that the combatant came from. One of Denov's (2010, p. 105) recruits recounts such an instance:

> After a successful battle, the young people would get together to prepare food and cook. They would play very loud music and come together to rejoice.

> After, they would give each other tattoos. Sometimes they would name their group the Tiger group, the Lion Fighters, or the Death Squad. [Did someone tell the young people to give themselves tattoos?] Yes, it came from the older commanders.
>
> (Boy)

Tattooing is seen here as a way of communally constructing manhood and reinforcing group solidarity. Additionally, the fact that this practice was ordered by older commanders suggests that it was an intentional technique to forge these ties. The ritualistic tattooing of warriors resembles the pre-existing ceremonial initiations that boys went through when making the transition from boyhood to manhood, and in this practice the RUF was able to draw on an existing awareness in recruits that they needed to assert their claim to masculinity before they could truly be considered full men (Denov, 2010, p. 116).

The ritualised process of initiation appears to have been central for transforming civilian men and boys into willing combatants for the RUF. As with conventional state militaries, new recruits go through a brutalising process which is intended to deconstruct their previous identification and attachment to the community. In conventional militaries, this process commonly involves a range of direct assaults against the individual through gruelling physical tests, verbal abuse and humiliation in basic training. This process of 'breaking down' recruits so that they can then be 'built up' into the form of masculinity preferred by the military group is a common trope in military training (Woodward & Winter, 2007, p. 104). In Sierra Leone this process took a more extreme form, as recruits were forced to make a direct break with their civilian life. For many this involved the destruction of recruits' civilian support system, often by the murder of their families. One of Myriam Denov's (2010, p. 104) recruits recounted the process of alienation from the civilian population, stating that the RUF commanders 'tried to spoil relationships among families . . . that is why [the rebels] would assign you to attack your hometown – so that you would have difficulty returning'. The intentional and systematic destruction of recruits' civilian attachment and identity is taken much further than in conventional military training.

Militarism and masculinity: making new warriors

Within the RUF, recruits were inculcated with a militarised version of masculinity that exalted men's martial prowess and combat experience: recruits were often not accorded full membership or status until they had fought or killed for the RUF. Access to arms appears to have been a particularly important signifier of masculinity and power.

The attainment of masculine status through martial prowess was not new in Sierra Leone. Prior to the conflict men often gained status and social power through their military exploits or their membership in hunting groups; however, these groups constructed a substantially different form of masculinity, which was constrained by strict rules of combat (Ferme, 2001, p. 5). In contrast, the construction of warrior manhood fostered in the RUF appears to have placed far greater emphasis on

cruelty and brutality. The construction of masculinity in the RUF emphasised a clear distinction and opposition to the militarism reflected in Sierra Leone's professional state-based military or the local hunter militias that propped up the hegemonic gender order. Through these different constructions, which altered the form that violence took, groups used warrior status to assert their dominance.

Central to the construction of masculinity within the RUF was the notion of men as warriors. Recruits' ability to kill, maim or fight was significant to the value that they were given, and soldiers were given high-ranking positions and status within the RUF based on their martial prowess. In many interviews ex-combatants described the sense of power that they achieved through gun ownership and participation in conflict. One of the boys interviewed by Myriam Denov (2010, p. 128) expressed his sense of power when handling a gun:

> I always felt powerful with my gun . . . when you have a gun, you can force anyone to do anything for you. You can even capture five big men if you have a gun. Otherwise who was going to listen to me as a small boy? If you were without a gun you were shit.

Here it can be seen that notions of power and value are deeply connected to the martial power that ownership of a gun conveys. This sense of power is particularly significant for the young boys who were co-opted into the RUF and had limited external avenues for gaining power or authority.

Interestingly the social construction of women and girls was far more ambiguous within the RUF. While many women and girls were invited to participate in the masculine aspects of warrior identity, in doing so they were also subjected to threats or retaliations for such transgressions. Women and girls who fought have expressed a sense of power and liberation from this experience, which mirrors findings in other conflicts (Lyons, 2004). Despite this, the organisation as a whole structurally marginalised women and put forward an ideology of masculine power. It would seem that within the RUF the position of women who fought was somewhat indeterminate – facing brutal attacks from male peers while simultaneously occupying positions of power and authority through their ability to fight.

Military exploits were consistently a path through which boys reported that they were able to gain status and authority within the group. Attainment of rank and status within military units was achieved primarily based on a warrior's success in the battlefield and his willingness to brutalise civilians. Recruits who actively took up their role as a warrior were materially rewarded, and those who resisted or failed to live up to expectations were brutally punished. Some interviewees reported that recruits who refused to kill or failed to succeed in firearms training would be killed (Denov, 2010, p. 99). The role of men and boys as warriors appears to have been deeply internalised by recruits, who expressed a great deal of pride in their role as soldiers during the war. Researchers have reported that interviewees expressed pride in their efficiency as soldiers, which is hardly surprising considering the importance of martial ability for the construction of dominant masculinity prior to the war (Denov & Maclure, 2006b, p. 128).

The dominant construction of masculinity in Sierra Leone prior to the war already had strong links to militarism and gun ownership. Melissa Leach (1994, p. 165) has conducted extensive anthropological analysis on the construction of gender among the Mende in Sierra Leone prior to the war. She found that there was a direct link between hunting, warfare and men's political authority. For men to achieve a dominant political position within Mende society they were expected to first participate in the hunting militias, which were directly linked to military rank and authority: for men to occupy a dominant political position and achieve 'big man' status, experience as a war leader was expected (Leach, 1994, p. 164). Thus we see that the fighters of the RUF reflected and exaggerated pre-existing practices of dominant masculinity through their own much more brazen displays.

Hegemonic men were expected to be successful in hunting big game, such as elephants, and participating in war-making. As with most dominant military cultures, the hunter militias of Mende society were bound by strict moral and ritual codes, which included regulation of men's physical contact with women to maintain ritual purity and a strict regime of mystical practices that were believed to make men immune to bullets (Leach, 1994, p. 161). As structurally subordinate men the warriors of the RUF gained status and authority through brutality towards the civilian population. The RUF encouraged recruits to act out wildly and actively rewarded acts of cruelty against civilians. Success within the RUF was often framed in terms of combatants' level of 'cruelty' or 'wickedness', emphasising the importance of transgressive violence (Denov & Maclure, 2006a, p. 97). One of Chris Coulter's (Coulter, 2009, p. 107) interviewees explained this practice in the RUF: 'they choose the commander according to this wickedness. You that are wicked will be the commander'. This is a substantial departure from the previous practices of combatant organisations in Sierra Leone.

The construction of militarised masculinity in the RUF shows a breakdown of the pre-existing principles of hierarchy that applied in the military and militias. Dominant constructions of masculinity in Sierra Leone centred power and authority on those who possessed age and economic wealth. In contrast, the RUF destabilised demographic arrangements in mainstream military culture by promoting young boys into positions of considerable authority. In particular, young boys who demonstrated a willingness and aptitude for extreme brutality reported being rewarded with rank and authority over men, women and other children (Denov & Maclure, 2006b, p. 128). The emphasis on forms of violence that transgressed the moral codes of masculinity within the RUF reflects their opposition to the patriarchal hierarchies that dominated Sierra Leone prior to the conflict. Although combatants were encouraged to partake in this form of militarised masculinity and rewarded when they did, the RUF had to employ sophisticated strategies to establish emotional detachment before recruits could become efficient soldiers.

Emotional detachment

In part, the brutal form that warfare took in Sierra Leone appears to have been related to the RUF's successful efforts to create emotional detachment and

dissociation in recruits. Practices such as intentional traumatisation, enforced drug usage, abdication of individual moral responsibility to the group and the creation of alternate personas all appear to have been instrumental to the construction of new warriors. The need to desensitise recruits to violence is common to military training worldwide; however, due to the extreme displays of violence expected by the RUF, the process of emotional detachment was taken further than is common for conventional old war soldiers. This process appears to have been successful, with numerous reports of recruits 'hardening' to acts of violence over time (Mckay & Mazurana, 2004, p. 35).

Combatants in the RUF were prohibited from publicly expressing emotions that were perceived to be effeminate, and rebels would often brutally punish recruits who expressed pain or sadness at the acts they were being forced to commit. Human Rights Watch (2003, p. 33) has reported numerous instances where recruits were threatened with death if they expressed sadness in relation to the violence that they committed. One of their interviewees reported that the rebels shot her brother in front of her after accusing him of escaping and then forced her to throw his body into a river. Later her husband was killed in front of her after a child accused him of failing to do his job properly, and after that her infant child was killed in her sight by another rebel captain who wished to rape her. During each of these instances the interviewee reports that she was prohibited from crying. She records that in the last instances (Human Rights Watch, 2003, p. 33) 'Captain "Danger" pulled my baby from my back and before I could do anything, he sliced my child in two. I was told not to cry otherwise I would be killed'.

The punishment for expressing emotion is tied directly to the RUF's inconsistent approach to femininity. Although women were encouraged to express feminine power through fighting (drawing on local tropes around the chaotic and dangerous nature of unbridled women), expressions of care, tenderness and remorse were brutally punished. The prohibition against expressing emotions was not unique to female recruits; male soldiers were similarly physically punished for expressing emotions which were considered to be a sign of weakness. The prohibition against expression of some emotions is not unique to the RUF. Rather it is an almost ubiquitous aspect of military training. However, the severity of punishment directed towards soldiers who fail to comply and the brutality of acts that recruits were forced to witness or commit would be considered unacceptable in conventional militaries.

Forcing recruits to commit atrocious acts of violence under duress also appears to have been significant in normalising such acts. As part of their basic training many RUF recruits were ordered to murder civilians or be killed. This appears to have been a systematic and intentional tactic to acclimatise recruits to violence. One young boy records this process (Denov, 2010, p. 98): 'After the training with guns, they would bring [a civilian] for us to kill. Each one of us was forced to kill'. This technique appears to have been successful: recruits reported a gradual acceptance of the violence that surrounded their lives, a process that is also found in conventional state military training, where recruits commonly go through simulated violence, such as combat drills or war games. RUF recruits were also

expected to react positively to the violence they were required to commit. As one young fighter records (Denov, 2010, p. 102), it was necessary to 'show happiness and laughter . . . Sometimes we sang, shouted and danced for doing or seeing what he had done to people . . . This was to train the children . . . All of this mayhem and celebration was part of the culture of the RUF'. This encouraged men to detach emotionally from the implications of their actions.

Forced drug and alcohol use was commonly used to further compound the emotional detachment caused by forcing recruits to commit atrocities. Myriam Denov (2010, p. 100) interviewed a former RUF commander to ascertain the purpose of drugging children. He explained that they

> were very much aware of the effects of drugs on children . . . Drugs and alcohol were prevalent and served as [a] prerequisite for combat activities. Fighting with a gun is not an easy task because it puts so much pressure on the mind. So we needed to free the mind by taking drugs, and it worked.

This is supported by the findings of the TRC (2004b, p. 418) that drug use was widespread in all factions and actively promoted by faction leadership. Drugs were seen to emotionally desensitise combatants, leading them to see their victims as less than human. One combatant interviewed by the TRC (2004b, p. 563) records the experience of drug use: ' "Colonel Gold Teeth" gave me cocaine and under its influence I saw humans as "chicken". I can fire at will mercilessly. I used to beat women or shoot them'.[1]

To further facilitate emotional detachment, members of the RUF would create alternate personas. After entering into the RUF, recruits would take on a pseudonym that represented their self-image as a warrior which suggested desirable elements of masculinity, such as violence. Examples include commanders named 'Kill Man No Blood' or 'Nasty Rambo' (Richards, 1996, p. 58). At other times the pseudonyms reflected a particular form of violence that the combatant wanted to be known for, such as 'Cut Hand' (known for amputations), 'Nylon' (who would drip burning plastic into victims' eyes) or 'Necka' (who would rape women irrespective of their age) (Coulter, 2009, p. 118).

The creation of alternate personas appears to have directly facilitated dissociation from the acts of violence that recruits were committing. Some interviewees reported that the adoption of a persona made them immune to the moral implications of their actions. One of the child soldiers that P. W. Singer (2004, p. 73) interviewed suggested that his persona of 'Bad Pay Bad' made him morally unaccountable for his actions, saying, 'It's like magic. I kill people and it doesn't stick to me. I still go to heaven'. Singer (2004, p. 73) analyses this process as 'doubling': recruits are rendered no longer culpable for their actions through creating a symbolic split from their previous identity. The idea that recruits are recreated into new beings is not unique to Sierra Leone, and is mirrored in the basic training of Western militaries (Woodward & Winter, 2007, p. 66). However, the full extent of taking on an entire new persona goes further in fostering individual dissociation, and in part explains the extreme cruelty that characterised the RUF.

The RUF's efforts allowed recruits to emotionally detach themselves from the negative impact of their actions. Studies which have explored the process of indoctrination into the RUF record that when recruits were first taken into the RUF, either forcibly or voluntarily, they were reluctant killers but, over time, soldiers came to accept the violence in the RUF as normal, and many came to revel in the excessive displays of masculine dominance (Denov & Maclure, 2006a, p. 78). Myriam Denov (2010, p. 143) records the casual and occasionally joyous manner in which ex-combatants would describe their use of violence. One interviewee records the joy gained from committing violence:

> [One man] pleaded that I kill him. But I considered killing not to have a very big effect because once a person died, everything was finished. I had to give him short sleeves (amputation above the elbow) on both hands. He jumped after me, wailing. I felt so good at that time because I was superior.

Initially disempowered recruits, such as the child soldier whom Denov interviewed, were able to gain significant empowerment and status through acts of extreme cruelty, which they originally would have found abhorrent, and this appears to have been an essential aspect in the process of indoctrinating recruits. Encouraging recruits to devalue civilian lives and emotionally detach from the impact of violence they were committing was a key part in making soldiers efficient killers. This process also tied into the RUF's opposition to dominant masculinity within mainstream Sierra Leonean society, as it allowed recruits to break deeply engrained taboos and employ the brutal violence that marks new war.

Humour or euphemisms also appear to have been important tools for quelling recruits' anguish over the violence they were committing. Fighters sometimes reported having joked about the violence that they were committing, mocking the bodies of dead enemies (Denov, 2010, p. 127). The RUF also developed a rich body of euphemistic language to underplay violence. Rather than referring to amputation, soldiers would discuss 'the operation' or giving a victim 'short' or 'long' sleeves – meaning that their arms would be amputated above the wrist or above the elbow. Similarly, soldiers referred to murder as 'washing', which is a linguistic ploy to avoid facing up to their actions explicitly (Peters & Richards, 1998, p. 191). Such euphemistic language appears to have helped recruits to maintain a façade of impassive bravado while committing horrendous acts of cruelty, often against civilians who were once their family or neighbours. Soldiers joking about brutal torture and using offhand euphemisms for the slaughter of civilians are both tactics that normalise violence and downplay the negative psychological dissonance of their actions. Denov (2010, p. 98) has noted that these practices bear striking similarity to the training that torturers go through. This suggests that recruits are not inevitably predisposed to commit such extreme forms of violence, but rather an intense process of socialisation is required to prime recruits for the violence they are expected to commit.

Aggression and bravado

The level of emotional detachment fostered in recruits and close group member-ship led recruits to act out exaggerated displays of aggression and bravado during combat. In constructing the culture of militarised masculinity, the RUF encour-aged soldiers to perform communal war songs which emphasised the mythology of masculine strength and martial prowess. In the field combatants reported using humour to downplay the cruelty of their actions, emphasise their bravery and appear either to be undisturbed by their actions or even to revel in using violence (Denov, 2010, p. 127). Using humour in this way creates a façade of masculine bravery and strength in the face of hardship and cruelty. The RUF's use of vio-lence is deeply interconnected with their culture of aggression and brutality, and by constructing a culture that valorised brutality and sadistic violence, members of the RUF performed escalating acts of cruelty as a way to demonstrate their dominance.

Within the RUF squads, recruits were under intense peer pressure to assert their masculinity through acts of violence. For new recruits, particularly boys and younger men, peer mentoring was a primary model of command and control (Denov & Maclure, 2006b, pp. 125–128). Peer pressure to publicly demonstrate masculinity was a powerful coercive force for young recruits as demonstrations of aggression and bravado were actively rewarded within the squad. The expres-sion of aggression and bravado within the RUF is a correlate of the emotional detachment fostered in recruits. As recruits were coerced into repressing feelings of empathy, sadness or tenderness, they were simultaneously encouraged to assert their bravery and dominance.

To encourage recruits' bravery and aggression the RUF expressed their mas-culinity through communal war songs and humour. Homosocial expressions of bravery are a common tool in military training, allowing men to accept their expendability and normalising acts of violence. In Sierra Leone the use of war songs was not invented by the RUF, for traditional songs have also emphasised the invincibility or bravery of male combatants. For example, similar tactics were employed by the *kamajor* hunter militias (Hoffman, 2004, p. 80). Similarly the idea that combatants can become invincible is not unique to the RUF, as the *kama-jor* also engaged in complex rituals to make themselves 'immune' to bullets or to imbue other mystical powers (Hoffman, 2004, p. 81). As with the RUF, these practices can be understood as a tactic to abate recruits' fear of being killed and inspire combatants.

Risk-taking

The practices of the RUF appear to have been quite risk-averse, which directly contrasts with the militarised masculinity constructed in Western states. The RUF model of fighting often directly avoided engaging in direct conflict with the oppos-ing military forces (Pham, 2006, p. 99). The RUF focused instead on dominating

and brutalising the civilian population and on wealth extraction. Despite the verbal references to combatants' bravery in the data, there seem to be relatively few examples of combatants in the RUF intentionally taking great risks. Indeed combatants were certainly very aware of the fact that their lives were at risk due to their involvement in the RUF. It is perhaps relevant that a significant portion of the RUF's membership was made up of forced recruits.

Due to this, the construction of masculinity in the RUF does not appear to emphasise risk-taking to the same degree as Western militaries. RUF ex-combatants have emphasised the undesirability of combat roles due to the danger involved. A number of interviews conducted with ex-combatants suggest that active combat roles were the least desirable missions to undertake, and those soldiers who were sufficiently brutal and cruel to civilians would be promoted so that they did not have to actively confront enemy forces (Denov, 2010, p. 114). In particular, the most powerful figures within the RUF do not appear to have had a particularly active role in combating the enemy forces of the *kamajor*, ECOMOG and the SLA. Accordingly, only marginalised members of the RUF were sent into active fighting against armed opposing forces.

A number of accounts have emphasised the idea that child soldiers were particularly efficient or active in combat roles due to their willingness to take risks (Denov, 2010, p. 6). However, unlike in the Western military construction of masculinity, within the RUF this apparent bravery was not valorised as the pinnacle of masculinity. Instead, what is emphasised is the child soldiers were dangerous, unpredictable or bestial due to their propensity to run into battle fearlessly and take on huge risks (Hoffman, 2004, p. 87). In other words, such risk-taking was stigmatised. Indeed, children's propensity to take such risks without actively considering their safety appears to have been actively exploited by both the RUF and the SLA, placing some of their least autonomous members into the way of the greatest danger.

The lack of emphasis on risk-taking does appear to have had a significant influence on the form that warfare took in Sierra Leone. For the RUF, and eventually for the SLA or AFRC, the primary focus was not on directly attacking opposing military forces. Early in the war direct conflict was commonplace, but as warfare continued, direct confrontation appears to have diminished. In contrast the primary attention of both groups was focused on trying to control and exploit civilian populations through excessive forms of violence (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004c, pp. 9–12).

There were exceptions to the normally risk-averse model of conflict, such as the occupation of Freetown in 1999 during 'Operation No Living Thing' (Black, 2010). Despite this, the primary model of conflict that the RUF initiated does not appear to have glorified risk-taking behaviour in the same way as has been observed in Western militaries. The development of this risk-averse value in RUF ideology is significant for the development of new war, as one of the more notable aspects of new war is that combatants focus on dominating civilian populations rather than fighting adversaries to establish a new state.

The lack of emphasis on risk-taking compared to that found in Western militaries can best be understood by the composition and motivations of the RUF. As a

significant proportion of the membership of the RUF was forcibly recruited, it is not surprising that that they did not internalise and accept their expendability to the same extent as Western soldiers. Some degree of danger was accepted, such as a willingness to go on looting missions or attack civilian towns. In addition to this, there does appear to be a willingness to take risks in relation to sexually transmitted diseases. Although sex with many partners was common, combatants appear to have been risk-averse in their sexual practices in that they preferred to rape virgins and young girls. It is not clear if this was an intentional practice to avoid the contraction of sexually transmitted diseases or due to the cultural preference for virgins and the strategic value in 'spoiling' virgins for marriage.

The shifting membership of the RUF, the SLA and the AFRC may have also contributed to a risk-averse culture. As the war in Sierra Leone progressed, the boundaries between the RUF and the SLA/AFRC became increasingly blurred (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004b, p. 553). During these latter years, particularly under AFRC control, military units would rapidly shift their allegiance, one day claiming to be part of one group, and the next day shifting allegiance to another. This practice was particularly found among 'sobels' – state soldiers who masqueraded as rebels when it suited them (Park, 2006, p. 317). During the conflict many Sierra Leonean state soldiers began to adopt the tactics of the rebels, and eventually this became such an entrenched practice that soldiers would take off their uniform and pretend to be rebels by night so that they could abuse civilians with impunity (Pham, 2006, pp. 103–104). Similarly, the rebel forces would pretend to be state militaries when entering villages so that the civilians would congregate, believing that they were going to receive food or protection. Due to these practices there was often no clear distinction between members of different organisations and the very fluid membership of each organisation made it more difficult to justify risky direct conflict. It is worth noting that a risk-averse model of conflict was not followed by the *kamajor* hunter militias, the ECOMOG peacekeepers or the UN forces who later entered Sierra Leone. However, this is not surprising considering the fundamentally different role of these groups in the gendered dynamics of conflict (as will be discussed later).

The difference between masculinity in the RUF and the construction of masculinity in Western militaries may also explain the risk-averseness of the RUF, which was primarily focused on flashy displays of masculine dominance rather than constructively trying to establish a stable political regime. The use of violence by those who benefit from dominant constructions of masculinity tends to be rare and used only in an effort to maintain their dominant position over society. In contrast, the RUF was not working towards any coherent new political reality. Rather their performance of masculinity through violence served as an exaggerated claim to manhood without this being backed by the material power or wealth which is required to live up to the dominant construction. Therefore there was no need for RUF fighters to directly attack and defeat the members of the SLA, for they were not working towards a new political reality. RUF war efforts were focused on demonstrating their manhood through violence, and for this goal actively risking one's life was not materially necessary. Power, wealth

and dominance were more easily accessible by attacking civilian targets which did not pose any threat to fighters. Accordingly risk-taking behaviour was unnecessary for Sierra Leonean rebels.

Conclusion

The differences between the form of warfare which developed in the RUF and the form developed by the *kamajor* were a result of the different positions of combatants in pre-war social hierarchy. This chapter has first shown that the new war violence used by the RUF served to challenge the authority of existing dominant men. By humiliating dominant men and 'spoiling' their property through sexual violence, the RUF was able to undermine the hegemony of tribal leaders and wealthy men. Simultaneously, these acts served to assert the masculinity of men in the RUF in grotesque, exaggerated performances of a kind which had already been associated with dominance and power.

The RUF relied on existing norms of masculinity, such as emotional detachment and bravado, to indoctrinate its largely unwilling recruits. Despite their unwillingness the RUF was able to draw on strong traditions of private violence, militarism and group relationships to justify and fuel the conflict that emerged during the 1990s. While this sort of conflict may appear to be aberrant or irrational to Western observers, the actions of the RUF are reflections and exaggerations of the dominant notions of masculinity in Sierra Leonean society prior to the war. The use of private violence by the RUF was not due to divisive identity politics that separated them from the opposing group, or in an effort to achieve short-term economic gains. Rather it cohered to deeply sedimented gendered logics of violence that encouraged men to use private violence to assert their authority, and justified attacks against 'soft' civilian targets.

The particular form of violence inherited substantial components from existing models of authority and violence, and transformed these to reflect the position of combatants within the gender hierarchy. These patterns of privatised violence that Mary Kaldor came to describe as new war did not emerge out of ethnic or religious differences (most armed groups were ethnically and religiously diverse); rather the particular practices that played out replicated what was already understood to be masculine behaviour. The abuses that characterised the conflict did not arise in a vacuum; rather they were a continuation of a gender system that validated men's domination and entitlement.

Note

1 In Sierra Leone chickens are viewed as animals of very low value. Referring to a person as a chicken indicates his or her low status and expendability.

5   New war in South Sudan

The SPLA was involved in a protracted war against the government of Sudan from 1983 until 2005, when the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed. Conflict between North and South Sudan had existed continuously since 1983 and resembled a conventional insurgency until 1991 (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 7). During the early stage of the conflict southern armed groups focused on combating northern military forces with a guerrilla campaign of raiding and disruption (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 90). However, during the early 1990s the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) underwent a fundamental transformation. The tactics employed by the SPLA shifted, so that, rather than attacking northern military forces, members of the SPLA began to predate on civilian populations and focus on accumulating resources. This shift was caused by a transformation of masculinity. It was during this period that traditionally prohibited practices, such as the organised murder of women and children, became commonplace (Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict, 2007). Soldiers who had previously claimed to defend the South began more than a decade of predatory raids against civilian populations (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 90).

Existing accounts have attempted to explain the shift of SPLA practices as a direct result of identity politics, economic competition or personality politics (Idris, 1991; Deng, 1995; Christian Aid, 2001; Switzer, 2002; Petterson, 2003). Although these issues did contribute significantly to new war in South Sudan, they are inadequate to explain the development of new war without the inclusion of a gendered analysis. These factors identified by other researchers are secondary motivations, which cannot account for the extreme brutality with which violence was pursued. The utilisation of harsh methods, such as amputation, abduction, rape or arson, is not explained by greed, and our understanding of targeting unarmed civilian populations is not illuminated by the logic of grievance. These tactics were the direct result of a military indoctrination which taught male recruits to value violence, group membership, emotional detachment, aggressive heterosexuality and the attributes of warrior manhood.

This chapter argues that the transformation of the Second Sudanese Civil War into a form of new war was directly caused by the militarised masculinity which developed in the SPLA between 1991 and 2005. It analyses new war in South Sudan at the local and organisational levels, both exploring the individual

socialisation of soldiers and characterising the organisational construction of masculinity. Before unpacking the conflict, the case is made that accounts based on ethnicity and identity are insufficient for understanding the transformation of the SPLA from a conventional insurgency to a destructive new warrior group. The role of gender relations in defining the new war tactics that the SPLA employed during the 1990s is investigated, with a particular focus on the recreation of warrior masculinity and domestic femininity. After this, the organisational construction of the SPLA is explored, arguing that the privatisation of violence and dismantling of existing warrior traditions were due to a process of co-option, where military leaders looked to restructure the gender order to their own benefit.

Race and ethnicity in South Sudan

Despite the many similarities between the tactics employed in Sierra Leone by the RUF and the SPLA in South Sudan the social contexts of each conflict are substantially different. South Sudan is almost ten times the size of Sierra Leone in terms of land mass and almost six times less densely populated. Furthermore the Second Sudanese Civil War continued for more than twice as long as the conflict in Sierra Leone and resulted in more than 1 million casualties. Moreover, the conflict in South Sudan has much more direct precedents, with a clear history of conflict between populations in northern and southern Sudan for hundreds of years before the second civil war began. Although each of these differences is significant, the most substantial difference is the role of race, religion and ethnicity in the two conflicts.

One of the most notable aspects of the conflict in Sierra Leone was that there did not appear to be any strong religious or racial motivations for the violence and each armed group directed violence against all ethnic groups. In contrast, the conflict in South Sudan was greatly influenced by religious, racial and ethnic tension. The notion of race in Sudan is complicated and contextually contingent as Sudan has more than 500 disparate tribal groups and there can be considerable fluidity between these groups. In South Sudan the most prominent group of peoples are the Nilotics, who comprise more than 90 per cent of the South Sudanese population and upwards of 25 distinct groups. Most prominent among these are the Dinka, Nuer and Shilluk, who made up the majority of the South Sudanese resistance fighters. Other ethnic groups in South Sudan include the nomadic Baggara Arab tribes, including the Messiria, and the Rizeigat, who were active participants in the South Sudanese conflict.[1] In addition there are a number of people from the North who now live in the South Sudanese capital, Juba, such as a small population of Arabs and other foreigners.

Prior to independence, the distinction between North and South Sudan was commonly broken down along racial lines (Jok, 2001, p. 74). The peoples that reside in the North are portrayed by the government as being Arab, while South Sudanese populations are described as 'black' or African. The ethnic distinction between groups in the South has not been historically consistent. Sharon Hutchinson (2000) has recorded that, prior to the civil war, Nilotic notions of ethnicity

were 'performative' rather than 'primordialist'. Hutchinson suggests that earlier 'performative' notions constructed ethnicity in terms of the community or culture a person was actively involved in; in contrast, the 'primordialist' understanding emphasises the role of lineage and parentage to categorise ethnicity. Similarly, Nilotic groups considered ethnicity to be a mutable affiliation that could change depending on marriage or other factors. During the war some Nilotics, particularly Dinka communities, began to adopt a more 'primordialist' notion of ethnicity.

South Sudanese academic Jok Madut Jok (2007, pp. 2–3) has challenged the applicability of 'primordialist' notions of ethnicity to the Sudanese context. He suggests that ethnicity has not been a historically coherent signifier. Rather individuals have often held multiple ethnic identifications and have been able to shift their affiliation throughout their life. Jok (2007, p. 2) contends that local understandings of whether an individual is 'black' or 'Arab' are complex and impermanent. An individual in South Sudan may originally be recognised as 'black' before converting to Islam and becoming an 'Arab', while at the same time presenting him- or herself to the international community as 'African'.

While the armed groups in South Sudan developed along racial and religious lines, it is overly simplistic to describe the conflict as simply caused by racial or religious tensions. To fully understand the reasons for conflict in South Sudan it is first necessary to explore the history of North and South Sudan leading up to the conflict. A brief historical summary is presented ahead which outlines the development of conflict in South Sudan and shows why a gendered analysis is needed to explain the shift from conventional insurgency to new war.

Colonialism, slavery and oppression: the historical context until 1990

Although the Second Sudanese Civil War began in 1983, its origins can be found in the historical tensions between the tribes indigenous to Sudan and those who migrated there from the seventh century onwards. The origins of conflict can be charted to the migration of northern 'Arab' tribes into the South prior to the 1820s (Petterson, 2003, p. 9). In the early nineteenth century Sudan was conquered by Turko-Egyptian rulers and unified into a coherent political entity that encompasses present-day Sudan. Turko-Egyptian rule lasted from 1821 to 1881 and led to increasingly hostile relations between the northern and southern populations (Stern & Bubenzer, 2011, p. xxx). Turko-Egyptian rule ended in 1881 by a local religious uprising led by Muhammad Ahmad bin Abd Allah: the period from 1881 to 1898 has been named the Mahdist period, after the theocratic local rule (Petterson, 2003, p. 12). During this period the oppression of southerners continued. Southern populations continued to be treated by the North as an economic resource to be exploited. Mahdist rule was ended in 1899 when an Anglo-Egyptian coalition conquered Sudan and declared that it was to be a condominium under the joint administration of Britain and Egypt (Mampilly, 2011, p. 133). During the period of Anglo-Egyptian colonialism the southern Sudanese enjoyed more peaceful relations with the North because slavery was suppressed by the colonial

administration (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 17). Between 1899 and 1955 the British effectively administered Sudan alone, with the Egyptian involvement remaining more symbolic than active.

The First Sudanese Civil War (known within South Sudan as Anyanya I, after the Anyanya separatist army) began in 1955 and lasted until 1972. The catalyst of Anyanya I was the British withdrawal from Sudan. It is generally believed that the Nilotic peoples of South Sudan wished to be allowed either to remain under British control or to become a separate entity (Jok, 2007, pp. 50–54). When military forces in the South became aware of the British withdrawal they staged a mutiny in the town of Torit, with the hope that the British would support the South remaining in the Empire. From 1955 (the mutiny began a few months before decolonisation) until 1972 a range of Nilotic militias and guerrilla movements fought in South Sudan against northern representatives. Anyanya I was a disorganised affair (Stern & Bubenzer, 2011, p. xii). Southern military operations were poorly coordinated and did not significantly threaten the North. The conflict ended in 1972 when the North and South signed the Addis Ababa Agreement, which gave a degree of autonomy to the South. Between 1972, when Addis Ababa was signed, and 1983, when the Second Sudanese Civil War began, the agreement was gradually eroded in favour of entrenching northern control over the South (Jok, 2007, pp. 50–54). The Addis Ababa Agreement broke down in 1983 when the then leader of Sudan, Gaafar Nimeiry, declared all of Sudan an Islamic state, ending southern autonomy and implementing *sharia* (Islamic law). This led to the creation of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), whose objective was to reinstate autonomy in South Sudan (Jok, 2001, p. 13). The early phase of this conflict, 1983 until 1991, was a conventional insurgency which resulted in relative success for the SPLA, who gained control over large areas in the South. To combat the SPLA, the North developed military forces along the North/South border and encouraged Baggara tribes to raid southern villages.

New war in the South: 1991–2005

Between 1991 and the end of conflict in 2005, southern militias transformed from conventional insurgent organisations into new warrior groups. In 1991 the SPLA split into the primarily Dinka Torit group and the primarily Nuer Nasir group (Mampilly, 2011, p. 141). This led to brutal fighting between these two groups and increasing hostilities between tribal groups in South Sudan (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, pp. 85–93). After 1991, the SPLA became an increasingly transnational organisation, operating in the countries bordering southern Sudan. The tactics adopted by the SPLA factions began to resemble the techniques of new war described by Mary Kaldor. Soldiers attacked civilians, combatant/civilian relations deteriorated and militias developed predatory tactics of resource extraction (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 7). The shift in military practices was a direct result of the gendered dynamics of the culture in which combatants had been socialised.

During the 1990s the SPLA was successful in repelling the government forces. By the mid-1900s they had gained control over most of southern Sudan

(Holt & Daly, 2000, p. 190). While the southern forces had relative success against the northern military forces, violence against civilians escalated on all sides. In the North, the government in Khartoum helped to train, arm and encourage militias to travel into the South and commit violence against civilians, actions which sometimes took the form of slave-raiding and 'punishment' of civilians for supporting the resistance (Holt & Daly, 2000, p. 190; Jok, 2006, p. 62). Likewise, all southern forces have been implicated in violence against civilians. Intertribal violence increasingly took a sinister turn as previous disagreements over cattle and land were militarised and made more deadly by the proliferation of small arms (Hutchinson, 2001, pp. 307–331). The southern combatant organisations adopted similar tactics to those used by the Baggara against them in their own intertribal conflicts. This created a context in which armed organisations, originally created to 'protect' the people of southern Sudan, began to use increasing brutality against the southern civilian populations (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 85). Northern forces responded to these developments by avoiding direct conflict with the southern forces in favour of predatory attacks against civilians. These predatory attacks created a culture of impunity for all military forces, allowing them to direct their violence against civilians.

Economically the southern region was made more volatile due to the influx of oil revenue. Most of the oil in Sudan is located along the North/South border, and from the late 1990s to the early 2000s oil production became the primary source of income for Khartoum. This resulted in northern strategy shifting away from an effort to destroy the southern resistance to a more limited focus on controlling the oil fields (Jok, 2007, p. 15). Oil revenues also supplied the northern forces with a large influx of military equipment, including helicopters, which have been used to strafe civilian populations. The influx of oil, often funded or operated by Chinese interests, allowed Sudan to pursue its war with relative international impunity. China's support in the United Nations and the extensive use of militias on the ground meant that the Sudanese government was able either to deny active involvement or to stall any meaningful action to stop the violence (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 27).

Since independence in 1955 northern Sudanese nationalism has increasingly demanded a strict ethnic and religious homogeneity (Jok, 2001, p. 13). Central to the notion of statehood which developed during the Second Sudanese Civil War was the active promotion of Islamic/Arabic cultural chauvinism and strict adherence to *sharia* law. The cultural chauvinism exhibited by the northern government served to legitimise the material exploitation and abuse of Nilotic tribes. Foremost among the material abuses suffered by southerners was the continuing practice of slavery, raiding and indentured servitude (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002). The South was also kept impoverished because a small northern diaspora controlled the administration of government and finance in the South. This has meant that South Sudan is one of the poorest, least educated areas in the world, despite the huge mineral wealth within its borders (Petterson, 2003, pp. 9–10). In addition to these economic deprivations, the government of Sudan deliberately armed opposing nomadic tribes so that they could engage in slave-raiding and

pillaging of the South. In each of these cases the justification provided by the North for such abuses has been framed in terms of cultural and religious differences.

War has had a deleterious effect on relationships between the Nilotic tribes in the South and the Baggara. Long-standing grievances around land were exploited by the northern government to forge the Baggara into a destructive proxy militia. Since gaining independence from the British, the northern government increasingly emphasised an understanding of statehood that appeals to the notion of Arabic and Islamic culture. The government has provided extensive resources and training to further militarise Islamic Baggara culture (Jok, 2001, p. 6). Pre-existing patterns of conflict between the Baggara and Nilotics were escalated until competition over grazing land turned into genocidal attacks against civilian populations. This animosity has allowed the North to direct attacks against civilian populations in the South while denying responsibility to the international community, as if much of the violence is not done by the national army. Arab tribes local to the South, such as the Messiria, are generally viewed by southerners as proxies of the northern Islamic state (Jok, 2001, p. vii). Jok Madut Jok (2001, p. 7) has described the views used to justify abuse of the South as follows: 'perhaps the most common view held by the Baggara, about Southerners in general and Nilotics in particular, is that the latter are naturally slaves'.

The social dynamics of warfare shifted dramatically in South Sudan during the 1990s. Prior to the 1990s, Nilotic culture included a strict set of rules that limited the destruction caused by conflict (Hutchinson, 2001, pp. 307–331). Primary among these restrictions were prohibitions against attacking women and children, prohibitions against killing men who were fleeing or who had requested the protection of women (it was believed that any man cowardly enough to be protected by a woman was unworthy of pursuit) and prohibitions against killing those who had already been injured (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 99). This began to change when Nilotic militias shifted from pre-existing, locally based defence organisations into well-organised military groups.

The shift meant that recruits were often formally trained and militarised, and their equipment changed from traditional weapons to small arms and their status to that of professional soldiers. As the military culture became more formalised it also began to adopt the practices of opposing northern forces. This meant that pre-existing prohibitions gradually eroded and soldiers who had previously fought only when necessary for defence of their communities began to expect a livelihood to be supplied to them in return for their involvement in conflict. Many aspects of this transformation can be explained in terms of economic tensions or historical experiences of racial oppression from North to South. However, many facets of this transformation, such as the development of brutal violence against civilians, cannot be accounted for purely in economic terms.

Identity and greed

Accounts of war in South Sudan that do not provide a gendered critique struggle to explain the tactics that came to characterise the conflict. The destructive practices of the SPLA that developed during the 1990s harmed their own economic

and political interest. Self-destructive techniques, such as arson, which SPLA soldiers came to rely on, desolated the South, weakening their basis of support. This led to widespread famine and displacement, allowing the North to direct attacks against civilian centres with impunity (Jok, 2001, p. 2). Early accounts of the conflict suggest that this kind of violence was primarily caused by a clash between different identities in the region. Francis M. Deng and Amir H. Idris have both argued that identity politics is the core cause of conflict. This logic of identity is clearly explained in Deng's suggestion that (1995, p. 1)

> The source of conflict lies not so much in the mere fact of difference as in the degree to which interacting identities and their overriding goals are mutually accommodating or incompatible. In the context of the nation-state, conflict of identities occurs when groups, or more accurately their elites, rebel against what they see as intolerable oppression by the dominant group, often expressed in denial of recognition, exclusion from the mainstream, marginalisation, and perhaps the threat of cultural annihilation or even physical elimination . . . where the state is weak, as is the case in post-colonial Africa . . . ethnic and religious tensions that have been long repressed begin to manifest themselves in violence, threatening the state with fragmentation, disintegration, and perhaps total collapse.

Deng makes a number of claims which serve to naturalise violence as an inevitable result of ethnic tension. According to Deng the key point of difference which will lead to conflict is when 'identities' and the goals that they possess are mutually incompatible. He emphasises three levels of incompatibility that will lead to conflict: denial of recognition; exclusion from the mainstream through marginalisation; and the threat of cultural and physical annihilation. Each of these challenges certainly did exist for the South Sudanese population as a whole, who had suffered a long history of oppression and violence at the hands of northerners (Holt & Daly, 2000, pp. 54–192).

   The oppression of southerners by northerners follows the mode of argumentation set out by Mary Kaldor, and cannot account for the particular forms that violence took in South Sudan. Women across Sudan have suffered, and continue to suffer, the same kinds of oppression that Deng suggests will lead to violence. In South Sudan, women's involvement in the public sphere and the state has been marginalised and is rarely recognised by male state leaders (Stone, 2011b). During the conflict, a significant number of women came to be involved in the SPLA. Despite the integral role that they played in supporting male combatants, their contribution and involvement are not recognised by the southern state, which maintains a narrative of strong male warriors protecting the nation (Duriesmith, 2015). Lydia Stone's (2011, pp. 34–35) extensive interviews with female combatants after the conflict confirm that women have remained an unrecognised and unsupported segment of the population.

   In the North, Sudanese women suffer similar degrees of oppression because the increasingly Islamist government in Khartoum has undermined their rights

and interests since the 1980s (Hale, 1996, p. 72). The experience of marginalisation and exclusion from the mainstream is a state of affairs which women in most states are expected to accept as the norm, and this is also the case in South Sudan. Women also endured the constant risk of annihilation in a cultural context that condoned widespread rape and violence against women (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, pp. 99–101). Similar oppression and marginalisation have also been experienced by other ethnic minorities across Sudan, such as by the Fur people in Darfur, who have suffered deprivations similar to the Dinka and Nuer communities (Jok, 2007, p. 18). The fact that other oppressed groups have not fought back violently suggests the experience of oppression is in itself an insufficient explanation for a recourse of violence.

A second body of literature has attempted to explain the violence in South Sudan as having primarily economic causes. These authors have emphasised the role of oil as a primary cause of conflict (Switzer, 2002). This approach has gained substantial traction in media reporting, which emphasises China's role in funding the northern government and equipping it with weapons to fight the South. This literature suggests that South Sudan's high concentration of oil wealth has created a resource 'curse' that provides the North a justification for extending the conflict (Johnson & Arbertman-Rabinowitz, 2008).

Oil remains a substantial contributing factor for conflict, but this in itself cannot explain the specific forms that the conflict took. It is certainly the case that northern forces have exploited the South for resources for hundreds of years prior to the start of the Second Sudanese Civil War, and there are strong reasons to believe that Khartoum was motivated to maintain the conflict so that it could maintain control over the oil fields for as long as possible (Jok, 2007, p. 15). Although economic accounts could explain some instances of violence which came to characterise the conflict, such as rampant slave-raiding during the 1990s, and the cattle raids of the Dinka and Nuer (Gross et al., 2011, p. 13), economic motivations are not sufficient to explain the development of other forms of violence.

Both northern and southern forces engaged in widespread brutal sexual violence against women and children. Sexual violence has been perpetrated by almost all armed groups and was directed against most segments of society, from both the same communities and opposing ethnic groups. Anyieth D'Awol (D'Awol, 2011, p. 53), a South Sudanese expert on women, security and conflict who has charted the extent of this abuse, suggests that

> Thousands of women were raped and sexually assaulted during South Sudan's brutal civil wars. In the long years of war, when violence was a common feature of everyday life, sexual violence became pervasive, perpetrated against women from all sectors of the population by soldiers and civilians alike.

Some instances of sexual violence documented by authors such as D'Awol may be explained by economic motivations – for example when government troops are deliberately aiming to destabilise a hostile population and take their land. But this society-wide epidemic of sexual violence cannot be accounted for simply with

an economic approach. The widespread sexual abuse of a population by its own armed forces does not provide any economic advantage. It is much more likely to cause resentment within the community, create injury or illness among the civilian population and increase the spread of sexually transmitted infections. During the conflict, the SPLA relied almost exclusively on support provided for them by civilian groups: food, shelter and transport were essential for the SPLA's survival and all provided by civilian communities in the South (Jok, 2001, p. 69). However the increasing use of tactics such as sexual violence during the 1990s badly damaged this support base and weakened the position of the SPLA in southern society. Economic greed can mobilise populations towards violence or conflict, but it cannot explain the particular forms that this violence has taken in South Sudan. Since economic accounts can provide only a partial picture of conflict in South Sudan, they need to be supplemented with a gendered account that can explain the particular forms that violence takes.

The puzzle of new war in South Sudan

Existing accounts have succeeded in unravelling two core aspects of the new war paradigm in South Sudan – namely belligerents' reasons for fighting, and why they employed the tactics they did. The expressed goals of most South Sudanese armed groups were either to protect their community or to oppose northern oppression (Jok, 2001, p. 70). In practice, however, their actions often focused more on extracting resources from the civilian population, asserting their dominance over the regions that they claimed as their own, and terrorising civilian groups outside their own communities (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 133). The disparity between the actions and goals of these groups brings into question whether their expressed aims were the true motivations that caused them to fight. It may be tempting to try to explain this rapacious behaviour as the informal acting out of opportunistic soldiers; however, in the case of South Sudan this form of explanation is deeply problematic because the scale of abuse committed by all sides of the conflict suggests that abuses were intentional, systematic and widespread (Jok, 2007; D'Awol, 2011). The organised way in which violations were perpetrated and the broad involvement of all armed forces suggest that a more concerted effort was behind such abuses.

   The lack of alignment between the ideology and practice of southern armed groups is a fundamental challenge to existing accounts of these forces' motivations, as well as Mary Kaldor's broad account of new war, because Kaldor's description of new war suggests that the use of violence comes about due to identity politics. The failure of previous approaches to properly explain the motivations for armed groups and their tactics results from the application of understandings of conflict which are gender-blind.

   An investigation into the practices of armed groups in South Sudan has the potential to provide a more compelling understanding of their motivations for participating in new war. The existing gendered literature on Western conflicts has gone a long way towards unravelling these factors in the Global North. The

practices of warriors in South Sudan were not the inevitable manifestation of 'particularistic identity politics' – as Mary Kaldor (2012, pp. 6–7) has suggested – or the rational use of violence to achieve economic gains. Rather they need to be understood in the context of a broad social process of militarisation in South Sudan which started in the late 1980s and motivated men to assert their dominance with brutality once they gained sufficient military power.

Armed forces on each side of the conflict socialised their recruits to use extreme forms of violence. By drawing on pre-existing notions of masculinity and male dominance, armed groups were able to mobilise young men to fight and commit egregious atrocities in an effort to attain masculine status. The development of a military culture that emphasised masculine violence, group membership, emotional detachment, bravado, aggressive heterosexuality, and warrior manhood suggests that the development of new war was the direct result of a particular masculine culture. Furthermore, the prestige and prevalence of these norms within southern militias indicate that the true motivation for combatants engaging in new war was an effort to assert masculine dominance over their respective communities.

Masculine violence

Recruits within the southern armed groups were taught to venerate the destructive power of male warriors and the use of violence as a technique for attaining masculine status. Prior to the 1990s, instances of conflict between southern ethnic groups had not resulted in many deaths (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, pp. 90–102). Strict cultural restrictions limited the forms of violence that men were permitted to commit in war (D'Awol, 2011, p. 56). Men were taught that the only eligible targets for wartime violence were other grown men who were actively engaged in conflict. Understandings of masculinity suggested that it was a cowardly act for a man to attack women, children, the elderly or men who had submitted. Thus far, socialisation of warriors had resembled many of the rules of war that Western men are taught to venerate through the culture of soldiery; 'real men' did not waste their time fighting their inferiors as there was no need to struggle for dominance with these targets, and it was considered 'cowardly' to attack vulnerable civilians (Goldstein, 2001, pp. 264–267).

Although violence had previously been held up as a path for achieving masculine status, its object had to be limited to other men who were participating in the same endeavour. Even when men did previously clash, the Nilotic groups who make up the majority population of the South did not experience high casualty rates from their conflict (Hutchinson, 2001, pp. 315–316). Inter-southern conflicts were understood by the community as a feud between 'brothers' rather than a war for survival. The status quo was essential to sanction historical conflicts as a location where men could attain masculine status and while minimising the risks they faced (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 8). The development of formal military training by southern resistance organisations, such as the SPLA, broke down the pre-existing military culture, and replaced it with customs that encouraged brutal violence against civilian populations as a path towards attaining masculine status.

The military training of SPLA recruits during the early 1990s illuminates the culture of masculine violence which caused so much destruction across South Sudan. Most recruits to the SPLA were brought to training camps along the South Sudanese border, where they received a rudimentary training before going into the field, and in these camps they were introduced to the use of violence by their superiors. Sharon Hutchinson, an anthropologist who has observed training, explains the ruthless treatment that recruits received and comments that 'camps were run more like concentration camps, in which recruits were routinely starved, beaten, imprisoned and sometimes killed at the least sign of dissent' (2001, p. 313). Training in the use of violence was also strictly gender-segregated. Although there were many women who joined the SPLA, the administration quickly prohibited them from front-line action to ensure that there was a sufficient female population to reproduce and provide the next generation of warriors (Stone, 2011, pp. 28–29). The justification for women's exclusion from the armed forces was explained by one SPLA combatant interviewed by Jok Madut Jok: 'the war is a responsibility for all; some must die in order for the whole to live . . . it is a war to be fought from all fronts and for generations, and women's front is reproduction' (1999, p. 429).

This establishment of strict gender segregation in the use of violence did in many ways mirror the pre-existing norms of violence which excluded women from combat roles. However, in the early stages of the civil war, when the SPLA was more influenced by liberationist ideology, many women did sign up and participate in some fighting duties. As the conflict progressed and the military leadership extended their personal control over fighting units, women were placed back into stereotyped feminine roles, carrying supplies, cooking or caring for those in need (Stone, 2011, p. 25). In establishing the masculine ideology of the SPLA it would seem that the leaders were quick to quash any fluidity in gender relations and women's attempts to stand up for their own liberation from the North, instead relegating them to a restrictive set of stereotyped supportive roles. The construction of masculine violence is twofold, developing the notion that men are naturally violent while reaffirming women's position as caring subsidiaries. The connection between violence and masculinity was further cemented by indoctrination that emphasised the exclusively masculine power of guns.

Despite giving very little political training, the SPLA did place a significant emphasis on the use of guns to assert their power. Prior to the civil war the warrior culture had placed a substantial emphasis on men's use of spears as the tool through which they achieved their status as warriors, and this was replaced by the SPLA with teachings that emphasised the use of guns (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, pp. 131–132). Sharon Hutchinson has recorded that the combatants were taught that the only way for the South to become liberated from the North was to attain more guns (2000, p. 11). They were also told to sing songs that emphasised the importance of guns, such as the graduation song which was taught to SPLA recruits when they received their first gun:

> Even your father, give him a bullet!
> Even your mother, give her a bullet!
> Your gun is your food, your gun is your wife.

The use of training tools such as chants and songs to normalise the use of guns, seen here with the SPLA, is not a unique innovation of the SPLA: it has been used by Western militaries, such as the U.S. navy, as well as other armed groups in Africa, such as the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (Barrett, 1996, p. 133; Denov, 2010, p. 106). This is a key tool of indoctrination that is essential for the process of militarisation and has been particularly damaging in South Sudan.

Teaching recruits that their power and status came from the barrel of the gun had disastrous consequences when soldiers took to the field. Guns were used by soldiers to resolve the most minor problems, with the result that disputes within the SPLA began to be resolved with gun violence, including disagreements over the ownership of property or questions of authority (Mampilly, 2011, p. 156). The most damaging effect of gun worship for the South was the use of firearms to resolve inter-ethnic disputes between the Nuer and the Dinka.

One of the most distinctive aspects of war in South Sudan consisted of raids that Dinka and Nuer factions directed against each other's populations with increasing lethality and frequency as the conflict progressed. When soldiers returned from training to the front line, they became involved in the pre-existing small-scale disputes. Long-standing conflicts, primarily over cattle, land and women, were co-opted by the armed men of the SPLA, who exploited local grievances as justifications for attacking rivals with techniques and weapons they had acquired to fight the North (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 132). The use of weaponry in this way allowed armed men to wrestle control of the Nilotic communities from the traditional hegemons, such as the chiefs or church leaders (Human Rights Watch, 1999, p. 4).

In this case the cultural shift among young southern men towards militarism was the important precursor to taking up new war tactics. The brutal violence committed against civilian populations, which authors such as Mary Kaldor have ascribed to identity politics, was directly caused by indoctrination into a military culture which venerated gun violence as a path to achieving the status of a 'real man'. This permissive shift in South Sudanese culture was a direct result of military training which encouraged men to use destructive gun violence to assert their status and deflect challenges from other groups. Thus the shift towards gun worship was an essential contributing factor leading to new war in South Sudan. However, on its own this cannot fully explain the extreme brutality of some violence, nor the targets chosen by combatants. For this an in-depth consideration of group membership, emotional detachment, bravado, heterosexuality and warrior manhood is necessary.

Group membership

In addition to teaching recruits to use violence, the SPLA also trained men to value homosocial relationships between fellow combatants above all other ties. A deep connection was fostered among recruits by emphasising fraternal bonds between soldiers of a similar ethnicity so that during conflict the male military

group became a key site where young men asserted their dominance, while devaluing non-members (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 101). Instances where groups of armed men met and interacted with civilian populations were also key sites where new war violence was committed (Jok, 2007, p. 223).

These group dynamics did not develop spontaneously or without reason. Close attachment to the group had been intentionally developed during the SPLA training. It was an emphasis on group dynamics which made brutal violence possible: the thick attachment between group members provided the justification for abuse of non-group members and the peer impetus to act violence out (Jok, 1999, p. 428). The development of group membership involved a process in establishing hierarchies, both within the SPLA and society at large, which were used to provide authority and legitimise their violent tactics. The first important step in this process was the exclusion of females from the accepted group by relegating women associated with the SPLA to traditional roles that held lesser value.

As in pre-existing patterns of conflict that existed in South Sudan, men were segregated from women to establish group dynamics. Technically, women were not prohibited from joining the SPLA, although they were prohibited from frontline combat (Stone, 2011). In practice women's connection with male military units was strictly policed (Gross et al., 2011, pp. 18–19). Formally this was done through the formation of separate women's units, which ensured that females would not challenge the homosocial bond (Stone, 2011, p. 28). When women were involved in the SPLA they were encouraged to take on supportive roles that closely resembled women's traditional roles, such as cooking, health care and care of children. Women were harassed and abused in instances where their presence challenged the social space of male bonding (Jok, 1999, pp. 428–429). Sexual abuse was a common tactic to exclude women from hegemonic male contexts, and when instances of this abuse were reported they were shrugged off by the SPLA leadership (Jok, 1999, p. 428), who concluded that 'no one can control the soldiers once they are off duty'. This hostile environment meant that women were largely excluded from military units, unless they were the wives of male combatants (Stone, 2011, pp. 31–34). Strong male-to-male ties were also fostered through initiation processes and bonding exercises that emphasised the superiority of soldiers over other groups (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 11): 'the SPLA's emphasis on male-to-male bonding was such that relationships with women and the family were increasingly de-emphasised and displaced'.

When recruits were subsumed into their military units, they were encouraged to leave behind other attachments in favour of a connection with their fellow soldiers. The process of group induction would begin by brutalising recruits and isolating them from their previous support structures (Hutchinson, 2001, p. 313). The separation of new recruits in SPLA training camps was particularly effective due to the large number of child soldiers that they employed. The induction process drew on the existing cultural practices of initiation to create especially strong group dynamics. In Nilotic societies young men go through a process of induction into manhood which involves facial scarification and other rituals, and each set of initiates is formed into an age set with which males remain connected for the rest

of their lives (Human Rights Watch, 1994b, p. 14). These age sets organise the social stratification for men and determine which group is in the hegemonic position at any given time. During the conflict, initiation began to be practiced earlier: previously boys were initiated between 15 and 18, but by the mid-1990s 13 and 14 had become the norm. Once boys of 13 had been initiated they were considered to be grown men in the eyes of society and expected to join the fight. The pressure of masculinity provided the necessary encouragement to get young men and boys to join the SPLA in large numbers. Chiefs in the South were encouraged by the SPLA to send a quota of boys for training (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 13). Families often did not need to be forced to give up their male children as the social pressure to turn their boys into men was sufficient for many families to acquiesce (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 11). By appealing to the social pressure of age sets, the SPLA was able to forge deep ties between armed units, whose in-group attachment superseded all other forms of social connection.

The homosocial bonding of military units created intense ties between combatants, which minimised their moral obligations to those outside the group and generated social pressure which escalated violence. The role of group membership in justifying violence is illustrated by an incident recorded by Hutchinson (2000, p. 11):

> A beautiful young girl, who had been carried off by ex-SPLA soldiers loyal to the Dinka warlord, Kerubino Kuanyin Bol, became the source of a heated argument. Three different soldiers all wanted to claim her as their consort. After summoning the three men and the girl and hearing their respective arguments, the Commander allegedly settled the dispute once and for all. Pulling out his revolver he reportedly shot the girl between the eyes and declared that no woman would be permitted to cause dissension in his ranks. The three soldiers allegedly shrugged off the incident. But the logic of the Commander was clear: the girl's life meant nothing in the context of troop solidarity and discipline.

It was the creation of tight military cohesion which opened the door for abuse of non-members in the way described by Hutchinson. In this case the group bonding of the soldiers was used to justify violence against the girl, who was regarded as an outsider to the group and a threat to the group's solidarity. The high value placed on peers and the deep moral obligations that combatants had to one another allowed for violence, such as the previous example, to be justified. The intensity of group membership fostered by the SPLA transformed conflict in South Sudan into new war. Training combatants to prioritise relationships with one another over civilians was an essential step in the development of new war. The devaluation of civilians due to this intense group bonding primed soldiers to use brutal violence against those who were not valued. Additionally, the creation of intense group bonding within armed organisations undermined the power of existing dominant men in South Sudanese society: the training of combatants to prioritise their relationships with one another over traditional authority structures undermined the power of the tribal and religious leaders who had previously dominated southern

society. Finally the creation of intense notions of group membership based on membership in the SPLA provided a new basis to assert the masculinity of its members in the face of northern oppression. After decades of oppression from the northern state the SPLA provided a vehicle to challenge northern dominance.

Emotional detachment

Within southern military groups a culture of emotional detachment developed that taught male recruits to devalue other groups. This military culture led to a significant escalation in the brutality of military violence. During the 1990s the SPLA began to increasingly emphasise ethnic difference as an important way to encourage group cohesion and justify harsh violence against northern forces (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 10). To facilitate the effective and ruthless use of violence against the enemy, soldiers were socialised to repress their emotional reactions to victims' suffering and engage in public demonstrations of aggression and bravado. These two patterns of behaviour created a social context where group violence escalated and became normalised. To facilitate these harsh new war tactics, recruits were taught to repress expressions of empathy or caring in exchange for public displays of violence and dominance. The emphasis placed on group membership provided an important first step towards creating emotional detachment from their victims (D'Awol, 2011, p. 57). Thus a shift in the military culture of the SPLA facilitated the new war tactics, such as raiding, sexual violence and abduction (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, pp. 21–26).

Removing combatants' moral obligations to civilians was a key step for northern forces' use of new war tactics. The government in Khartoum used proxy militias under their control to conduct regular raids against southern population centres. The tactics employed by these militias were characterised by callous violence, such as burning villages, looting, rape, murder and enslavement (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 10). Harsh violence was also used in public to punish women who were believed to have supported the SPLA, and public displays of brutality, such as amputation and public rape, cowed civilians into compliance. Directing violence against southern civilians' populations succeeded in entrenching northern control over productive oil-producing regions and displaced more than 4 million civilians (Petterson, 2003, p. 37). To promote violence against civilians, the northern forces were trained to devalue southern populations as religiously and ethnically inferior subjects (Jok, 2006, p. 70). The inferior moral status that northern forces attributed to southerners created a context of impunity, where any violence directed against civilians was sanctioned.

Developing a cultural context of impunity was a necessary step for the deployment of new war tactics. This was achieved by undermining moral obligations to southerners. The abuse of women at the hand of militias was particularly pernicious due to the subordinate structural position of the women:

> Northern soldiers deployed in the south enjoyed a sense of physical and
> moral freedom in their dealings with southern women because these women

were not protected by the same moral and religious codes that might have constrained a Muslim man towards a Muslim woman.

(Jok, 2006, p. 70)

The dehumanisation of southern women allowed northern forces to dissociate from the implications of their actions. The military ideology of northern militias directly taught that they had no moral obligation to the populations they fought against (Jok, 2007, p. 17): 'soldiers who are sent to the south, the Muslim soldier is imbued with the belief that he does not have to adhere to any boundaries because the enemy is not a co-religionist'. As war progressed in South Sudan the tactics employed by the SPLA began to mirror those of the northern militias, as did their treatment of civilian populations. Over time the members of the SPLA began to treat civilians with the contempt that had previously been displayed only by the northern raiders.

Within the SPLA emotional detachment was fostered by military training which punished expression of emotion and encouraged outward expressions of dominance and aggression. Both initiation rituals and military training socialised boys to endure substantial pain and suffering (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 11). Recruits were forced to repress visible emotional reactions to the suffering they endured. Desensitisation was particularly important due to the high percentage of child soldiers in the SPLA. One former Green Beret who worked with the SPLA estimated that nearly 50 per cent of the soldiers were 14 years old or younger (Singer, 2004, p. 87). The use of children to create compliant and brutal soldiers is not an isolated practice within the SPLA: it has been reported in many instances of new war, including Sierra Leone and Uganda. The rapid rise in brutal violence against civilians from 1991 till the late 1990s suggests that desensitising training was successful in the South. The organised nature of these practices within the SPLA indicates that there was a conscious effort from the commanders to develop the brutal tactics which were put into practice during the 1990s.

As military training in the South began to mirror that of northern forces, recruits began to devalue non-members by drawing on the pre-existing cultures of shame and revenge (Hutchinson, 2000). In Nilotic communities men are expected to avenge violence that has been committed against their kin and if they fail to do so they lose face and status as men. The SPLA drew on this pressure to motivate men to fight (Small Arms Survey, 2008, pp. 2–3). An example of this motivation is seen in the case of a young Sudanese boy who joined the SPLA after suffering northern violence (Singer, 2004, p. 65):

My father, mother and brothers were killed by the enemy, I became angry. I didn't have any other way to do, unless I have to revenge. And to revenge is only to have a gun. If I have a gun I can revenge. I can fight and avenge my mother, father and brothers. That is the decisions I took to become a soldier. The day my mother and father and brothers were killed, the enemy came by surprise. They attacked the village, they gathered the people and after that they took all the cows, and they burned all the houses, even all our

clothes were burned inside the houses. We remained naked, without food, and we were suffering, from hunger even. Nakedness was also a problem. Then I decided what to do. I thought I'd better join the army.

The direct motivation for recruitment for this young man was the killing of his family. Although this rationale was well understood in Nilotic communities, these young men were recruited into an armed group that actively worked to uncouple militarised masculinity from the traditional model of armed conflict.

During the early years of the conflict the rationale of reciprocal violence was minimised by SPLA training which encouraged unity among oppressed people throughout Sudan. During the 1980s the focus of the SPLA was the liberation of Sudan (both the North and South) from the oppressive northern government, but after the SPLA split in 1991 the military indoctrination of recruits also began to emphasise ethnic difference rather than underplaying it (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 118). This increased focus on ethnicity deepened the strength of group membership while further undermining combatants' attachment to civilians. The rapid rise of sexual violence between SPLA soldiers and groups of Nilotic civilians is a measure of the success of attempts to create such bonds.

Aggressive heterosexuality

Brutal use of sexual violence came to characterise the regular raids of SPLA troops during the 1990s. Although the exact number of those subjected to sexual violence is unknown, expert observer Anyieth D'Awol (2011, p. 55) has characterised it as 'intentional, widespread and systematic'. Violence was meted out against all strata of southern Sudanese society. The wives of combatants were subjected to sexual violence by their partners as a way to encourage reproduction and create more fighting males (Jok, 1999, p. 432). Other female members of the combatants' own social groupings were also targeted for sexual violence as communal punishment for behaviour that was seen to damage the war effort (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 85). The most egregious sexual violence was used as a tool of direct war against opposing communities in an effort to assert the militants' power (D'Awol, 2011). Most previous accounts of the conflict considered this last form of sexual violence – soldiers attacking opposing communities – as a tactic of the war effort. However, although the other forms of abuses were not directed against an opposing population, they were a key aspect of the war strategy, and what is important is that this strategy was determined by cultural constructions of gender that normalised men's role as warriors and women's role as child-bearers (Jok, 1999, pp. 435–438). By looking at the actions of SPLA soldiers, both in conflict and in their relationships, this use of patriarchal violence can be seen as following the continuum model (Cockburn, 2004). This builds on the centrality of aggressive heterosexuality within the SPLA, not simply as a useful tactic of war but as a core constitutive part of the military masculinity that defined its members.

SPLA military culture strongly emphasised men's obligation to reproduce. Prior to the conflict, Nilotic cultures required men to have many children to

obtain full status, so marriage and reproduction were treated as communal obligations. Men's families are expected to pay a substantial bride price in cows to the women's families prior to marriage (Stern, 2011, pp. 19–22). Marriage is seen as a public contract between extended two family groups: one family exchanges cows for the right to marry a woman, who in turn is expected to render children to her husband. Women's social value is also greatly enhanced through respectable marriage and childbirth (Jok, 1999, p. 432). Despite this, the gendered expectations around childrearing privileged men in the public sphere far more directly than women. Men were expected to reproduce to continue their bloodline and to provide future soldiers for the cause. While women were able to gain feminine status through reproduction, this status was directly placed as subordinate to men as a group. This meant that in the narratives of the war effort women were often treated as communal property, a wartime resource to be used for the good of the cause. Jok and Hutchinson (2002) have recorded this attitude among SPLA combatants, reflected in the saying ' "A girl belongs to everyone" – meaning she was a potential marriage partner for all unrelated men'. Little importance was given to women's consent or agency in this process as reproduction was women's 'national duty'.

New war in South Sudan transformed men's sexual relationships with women into nationalist contributions to the war effort. As conflict between the Dinka and Nuer factions mounted during the 1990s men increasingly demanded unlimited sexual access to women as part of their military duty: 'the cultural construction of gender must be discussed in the context of national struggle that has evolved to cause men to expect sex as a compensation for their national sacrifice and as a way to strengthen the struggle' (Jok, 1999, p. 433). Prior to the conflict, taboos restricted men's sexual access to women, some of which included not having sexual relations during menstruation or, in the case of women who had given birth, until after a child was weaned (Jok, 1999, p. 435; Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 101). As the conflict progressed, such restrictions were broken down by men who were taught that sex with their wives was an important part of military service. Jok (1999, pp. 431–432) has explored this shift in the context of the Dinka in some detail and concluded that 'the rules of sexual taboo are easily breached when the husband is determined to expose his wives to pregnancy before he is taken away for the military'. The rise of marital rape during the years of conflict was directly caused by the SPLA's focus on reproduction as women's contribution to the nation, and the necessity for men to continue their line before death. The ideology of continuing the male bloodline and ensuring sufficient population growth to fuel the war effort created a breakdown in the social structures that had provided some protections for women. In turn, the breakdown of these protections led to the development of new war tactics within the SPLA and the use of rape as a weapon of war.

The culture of aggressive heterosexuality that the SPLA fostered in its recruits appears to have been a key step in their use of systematic sexual violence. Sexual violence was used within soldiers' communities to police women's behaviour: all sides of the conflict used rape to punish women who were believed to be helping

the enemy. Many southern communities were subjected to raids by opposing SPLA factions or government-backed militias, and during raids soldiers would often take resources from civilians or commit public rape. When soldiers returned to their communities after a raid, women who had been raped or had handed over food were often accused of aiding enemy soldiers. Interviews with women who suffered during the conflict suggest that those who did not violently resist enemy soldiers' sexual abuse were particularly targeted for gang rape by the SPLA as a form of punishment (Jok, 1999, p. 431). This abusive treatment of women was not inevitable and was not systematic in the first civil war; rather the use of sexual violence as a weapon was normalised during SPLA training which valorised the use of sexual violence to teach women lessons (Jok, 1999, p. 433):

> A famous song all over Western Dinka called upon SPLA troops to have sex with and teach a particular woman a sexual lesson because she is a bad woman. Another song actually talks about an accomplished act of collective rape of a woman who is said to have roamed the region in search of a man to sexually satisfy her, but now she has settled down because she has learned a lesson. These types of songs have emphasized the undying women's appetite for sex, which drunken soldiers use to justify their acts.

Songs of this kind underlie the importance of gender constructions in establishing the tactics of new war soldiers. The use of gang rape as a public weapon to police women's behaviour not only demonstrates the importance of military training, which taught soldiers the importance of aggressive heterosexuality, but also highlights the symbolic and public nature of sexual violence and its use to dominate 'wayward' civilians.

The practice of sexual violence in South Sudan appears to mirror all three modes of instrumentality, mythology and unreason explored in the previous chapter. Following Kirby's (2012) instrumental mode, sexual violence appears to have been used to police communities, both in punishing perceived transgressions from within combatants' communities and as a punitive measure against opposing groups (Gross et al., 2011, pp. 22–23). However, these apparently instrumental attacks can also be understood as either mythological or unreason. The use of sexual violence directly served to construct mythological understandings of women's role in society and to reassure authority after perceived slights. Similarly, the prevailing characterisation of these attacks is the role of opportunism and the culture of impunity (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 3; International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 28; D'Awol, 2011, p. 54; Stern, 2011, p. 8). Despite having components of all three logics the mode of mythology appears to be most valuable in explaining the persistence and prevalence on all sides of the conflict.

Sexual violence clearly does have some degree of instrumentality, in punishing civilian groups for aiding 'the enemy'. However, this approach had a deleterious effect on all communities, contributing directly to displacement and destabilisation of all communities. Similarly the motivations expressed around this behaviour emphasise issues of honour, cohesion of community and protection of

property more than a rationalised attempt to displace opposing groups. Particularly the widespread practice of combatants targeting their own community members who had given 'support' to the enemy, by being subject to rape or looting, sits poorly with an instrumental account.

Similarly to the use of sexual violence by the RUF in Sierra Leone, the SPLA raids often involved public instances of rape which were often arranged in ways that magnified the humiliation of female victims (Jok, 2006, p. 62). Some demobilised child soldiers have reported being commanded to collect women many years older than themselves to rape (Small Arms Survey, 2008, p. 3). Elderly women and very young girls were also targeted for sexual violence, despite it being culturally prohibited for them to be sexually active. The impact of this abuse was compounded by the cultural value placed on women's chastity, as young unmarried women and girls who were known to have had sex – irrespective of coercion – were considered to be less eligible for marriage (Stern, 2011, p. 5). The rape of an unmarried girl was also considered an affront to her family, because unmarried girls are valuable commodities for their family who can gain a substantial bride price upon their marriage. However, the value of a girl who had been raped dropped substantially, which reduced her value as an asset in the hands of her relatives (Stern, 2011, p. 15).

The public rape of married women was similarly construed as an affront to her husband and family. Women who suffered sexual violence often came under suspicion from their husbands, who suspected that they had been complicit in the violence they suffered. Men's sexual control over their wives consistently emerged as an important marker of their status and masculinity. The wife of a junior soldier expressed the centrality of their relationship for her husband in an interview with Jok (Jok, 1999, p. 435):

> Once your husband is a soldier, especially a junior one, forget it, your life is miserable. He becomes intolerant of the slightest mistake, he becomes insecure in his marriage and suspects that his wife is no longer interested in him. He feels that his manhood is being questioned by the woman because he is not adequately providing for her, he can beat you for simply exchanging looks with or talking to a high-ranking officer. I can go on and on about what my husband says when he is drunk. One night he said, if you think you will be better off with that commander, why don't you go and sleep with him right now.

The fear that this soldier expresses about his masculinity and status is deeply connected to anxiety that he will not be able to maintain exclusive sexual control over his wife. The public rape of women who were already the purchased possessions of opposing soldiers is a fundamental challenge to the dominance of women's husbands over their family. The use of sexual violence against rape victims had the function of reasserting the dominant status of men whose property had been 'spoiled'. Such patterns were made possible by the normalisation of sexual abuse, the creation of emotional detachment from victims and the development of group membership, but they were given meaning only by notions of warrior manhood which considered civilian populations to be the dominion of armed men.

Although the use of violence against civilian populations is one of the definitive aspects of new war, this core feature is not explained well by Kaldor's account, which emphasises identity politics as the root cause of violence against civilians. In the case of South Sudan sexual violence certainly was used to target women of different ethnic groups, both by northern forces and by members of the SPLA; however, as the war progressed, the use of sexual violence by southern military groups against other southern ethnic groups shows that identity politics was not the sole cause of the SPLA's use of sexual violence. The intentional development of a culture of aggressive heterosexuality within the SPLA appears to have been a key step in the use of systematic sexual violence as the conflict progressed. An exclusive focus on identity politics to the exclusion of the military masculinity of soldiers provides an incomplete account of the use of new war tactics in southern Sudan.

Aggression and bravado

Many of the tactics used by the SPLA served the more symbolic purpose of asserting men's power over a community rather than advancing their material strategic goals. The use of these tactics to subordinate civilian populations and undermine the dominance of other armed groups suggests the underlying importance of public displays of aggression in asserting masculine power. However, the literature analysed on South Sudan did not show much evidence for the significance of bravado. What did come up in Hutchinson and Jok's (2002, p. 93) exploration of ethnic stereotypes and militarisation was the perception held by some Dinka that Nuer men performed a kind of uncontrolled bravado and aggression. They found that Nuer men were perceived to be impulsive and aggressive, willing to engage in conflict at the slightest provocation or chance to defend a perceived slight. This stereotypical construction of Nuer masculinities as *excessively* aggressive and unbridled resonates with colonial tropes of men from the Global South being aggressively hypermasculine, while remaining uncontrolled and slave to emotion. In comparison Dinka men were portrayed as being in control of their emotions and unlikely to express anger, but far more authoritarian and oppressive than Nuer men (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002).

It is hard to tell how much these constructions reproduce the performed identities of combatants, or reflected real trends. However, it is interesting that they follow tropes found in British military personnel, who constructed their own self-image of control as constituted in relation to the perception of U.S. soldiers as aggressive and undisciplined (Higate, 2012a). In the case of British soldiers the downplaying of bravado, while emphasising the American performance, appears to have served as part of a direct effort to craft a professional identity. In the same sense the portrayal of Nuer soldiers as excessively aggressive and blustering may be more reflective of the way in which Dinka militarised masculinity was formed by employing the Nuer as a foil to be positioned against. Although this avenue is interesting and could explain in more detail how military masculinities are created through relationships of opposition in South Sudan, there isn't currently enough

material to make robust conclusions on the role of aggression and bravado in constructing new war.

Militarism and masculinity

In order to mobilise recruits, the SPLA co-opted and transformed powerful pre-existing cultural understandings of men's role as warriors. The expectation that men and boys would take up arms in defence of their community was a powerful motivation which could be exploited by the SPLA to swell its ranks (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 14). The transformation of the SPLA into a new warrior group corresponded with a shift in the perceived role of men in armed groups. During the first eight years of the civil war there were two accepted roles for warriors. One was the war against the northern government, and this war was understood to be a war against oppression and colonisation (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 132). The other role was the warrior raiding culture that had existed in Nilotic communities prior to the war. By the mid-1990s these two very different conceptions of a male warrior's role had become enmeshed, as skirmishes between men over local disputes about land or cattle were subsumed into the nationalist rhetoric of the SPLA. This shift then allowed warriors to justify the brutal violence discussed here by claiming the moral authority of nations rather than the limited scope of a local dispute.

The shift towards ethnically based approaches to group membership among the SPLA appears to have been the first step in developing a form of warrior manhood that resulted in new war. Training which emphasised ethnic ties, rather than the common experience of oppression, was a necessary precursor to the SPLA's involvement in raids between the Dinka and the Nuer. Prior to the SPLA's involvement in these conflicts confrontations did not last more than a few days, but the military socialisation of the SPLA recruits prepared them for a fundamentally different kind of conflict. The SPLA trained soldiers to use the techniques which had previously been considered to be unmanly. Those members of southern communities who had not been socialised by the SPLA were initially shocked at the actions of soldiers who appeared to be using cowardly and unmanly violence, as reflected in one Dinka chief's characterisation of the violence (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 132): 'today's wars are fought by cowards who kill defenceless women and children'.

The shift in warrior manhood was particularly damaging due to the SPLA ideology that taught soldiers to establish their power with brutal violence. The nationalist rhetoric that was used to force women into sexual availability also allowed soldiers to justify predatory new war violence. SPLA leaders established areas of control which they claimed as their domain, and when fighting broke out between civilians in these regions the actions in opposing areas were treated as treasonous attempts to undermine SPLA authority (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 133). Using the methods and justifications of war which had been formed in the fight against the North, SPLA soldiers often used callous reprisal attacks against their southern opponents in which civilians were slaughtered and women and children were brutalised. These attacks were in turn seen by other SPLA commanders from another

ethnic group as an assault on their authority and resulted in further reprisals. The result was that by the mid-1990s the SPLA had largely broken down into a series of private armies led by local strongmen (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 136).

This shift in the social relations of war depended upon a prior shift in the construction of warrior manhood having taken place. Without the SPLA training that taught recruits to accept more brutal forms of violence and exclude opponents from any moral obligations, the destructive patterns of the 1990s could not have developed. The foreign influence of SPLA training in constructing new war can be seen in one Dinka elder's account of the conflict (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, pp. 131–132):

> This war between us and the Nuer was no longer our usual war . . . It was not in our hands anymore, it had become a soldiers' war both in equipment and in purpose . . . Examining the scale of destruction from this raid, we really had to wonder what its goals were. Traditionally, when the Nuer raided us, they took cattle, they never concerned themselves about the women, children, and the elderly, and they never chased after those who ran away. On our side we should mourn over the dead, recuperate from the loss, and then retaliate when the time and place were appropriate. It was just the way things were, we both had spears, and it seemed balanced. Now that balance was lost – and that was why we started to ask the SPLA to get involved. If the Dinka and Nuer soldiers had differed on some issues, and had decided to fight it out by hitting at ordinary communities as the Nuer did in this case, it was time the SPLA did the same . . . Counting on the SPLA to deliver us from Nuer attacks is certainly not the best way . . . How long have we been in disputes with the Nuer, but have we ever resolved them by intensifying the war?

The rejection of the SPLA by this elder shows the distinct shift that occurred between the SPLA and the traditional tribal elites by developing a culture of militarism in South Sudan. The divergence between the practice of SPLA new warriors who were willing to use systematic sexual violence and predatory raiding and pre-existing Nilotic understandings of a warrior's role led to the development of new war and a general breakdown in inter-group relations in the South. The emergence of new war within South Sudan occurred as a result of the transformation of culture within the SPLA. This cultural change not only altered the way members of the SPLA fought against the northern government but also fundamentally transformed the disputes between ethnic groups within the South, as well as the social structure of southern society and the tactics that the SPLA was willing to employ. If one aspect of masculinity was to be named as the most crucial in transforming the civil war in South Sudan into an example of new war, it was the development of a new form of warrior masculinity.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the tactics and training of SPLA soldiers in order to argue that new war in South Sudan was directly constructed by gender. Actions that had previously been rare in local forms of warfare, such as systematic wartime

rape and the murder of non-combatants, were made possible by a shift in perceptions of propriety for men. The systematic use of tactics such as sexual violence could not have occurred without a fundamental shift in soldiers' understandings of their role as men, and SPLA training has been located as a key site where these norms were altered. Militarised masculinity was important to the conflict in South Sudan long before it transformed into a new war during the 1990s. Prior to the development of new war in South Sudan, the training of soldiers emphasised an ideology of national liberation and opposing northern oppression. The shifting practices of the SPLA then became intimately linked to a transformation of military culture within the SPLA. The first shift that occurred was the adoption of forms of violence that had previously been employed by northern forces. Up until the mid-1990s the SPLA had been a successful insurgency which pushed northern government forces all the way back to the capital, but as relations between SPLA leaders broke down so did the emphasis on opposing oppression and injustice.

Although the SPLA had succeeded in challenging the northern government militarily in their struggles from 1983 until 1993, their military success did not translate into personal dominance over southern society for SPLA leaders. During this period the training of recruits also fundamentally changed. Rather than socialising recruits to give their primary allegiance to the people of Sudan or to the ideological basis of the SPLA, soldiers were taught to obey their commanders above all else. The shifting commitments of combatants also led to a new conception of the warrior's role that co-opted existing tensions between Nilotic communities and the resistance struggle against the northern government to create a new way of doing war. The result was new war. The SPLA began to use their military power to dominate southern populations as well as northern groups. This shift was primarily a social one, as is emphasised in Kaldor's account of new war. However, this transformation was not due to identity politics, as ethnicity had always been an element of conflict. It directly resulted from a shifting culture of militarised masculinity within the SPLA. The construction of masculinity within the SPLA that led to new war was intentionally taught to combatants to cause them to adopt the brutal tactics employed by the northern government. The development of new war in South Sudan was made possible only by the socialisation of combatants into a culture of militarised masculinity which prioritised aggressive heterosexuality, violence as a method of achieving dominance, commitment to the military group and emotional detachment.

Note

1 Baggara is an Arabic derivative term that roughly translates to 'cowman' and covers a wide range of peoples who live in Chad, Sudan and Niger.

6   Protest and opposition
Challenging the patriarchal bargains in war

So far this book has forwarded the case that the practice of new war in Sierra Leone and South Sudan can be understood only with reference to local configurations of gender. The previous two chapters argued that masculinity was essential in developing the practices of new warrior groups at the local and organisational levels. This chapter looks at the structural forces which propelled men to initiate new war in each situation, and the implications this has for the study of contemporary conflict. The societal dynamics of conflict are explored through R. W. Connell's (2005, p. 111) understandings of protest masculinity and oppositional masculinity, in conjunction with Deniz Kandiyoti's (1988) concept of patriarchal bargains.

The existence of unstable gender hierarchies was key to the development of conflict in both states. Although oppressive gender hierarchies exist in all societies, the tension caused by inequalities in Sierra Leone and South Sudan reached crisis levels, which led to a breakdown of the power-sharing arrangements between groups of men. In Sierra Leone, the crisis was evident in the patrimonial system's failure to provide avenues for young men to achieve status as a 'real man'. In contrast, in South Sudan the crisis was triggered by the imposition of *sharia* law, which provided a fundamental challenge to the authority of southern men. In both contexts, new war served as a vehicle through which subordinated men were able to challenge dominant men and establish an alternate hierarchical social structure. For men in Sierra Leone, their challenge to the existing patriarchal bargain was constructed through the culture of protest masculinity. In South Sudan the conflict was created through the construction of oppositional masculinity.

In both case studies, the archetypal attributes of new war developed when unstable patriarchal bargains between men broke down. The differing patriarchal arrangements in Sierra Leone and South Sudan account for differences in how new war manifested. This chapter contends that in both cases the fracturing of patriarchal bargains resulted in the dominant understanding of masculinity being transformed into a more destructive formation which glorified the power of warriors. At the conclusion of organised conflict in each state peacebuilding endeavours were employed to try to rebuild these patriarchal bargains by offering young men access to signifiers of masculine status, such as employment and social status. The implementation of peacebuilding efforts, such as disarmament, demobilisation

and reintegration (DDR) programs, failed in both states to challenge the underlying constructions of masculinity which fuelled this conflict. Instead, in Sierra Leone they focused on placating young men with pathways towards civilian masculine status, while in South Sudan DDR programs were structured to retire older soldiers and children from service, remove women from the armed forces and dismantle militias that challenged the government's authority. In both instances peacebuilding programs did not attempt to destabilise, challenge and fundamentally alter the constructions of masculinity that led to war. Instead, they looked to appease the perceived 'problem' populations of young men, while reinforcing the hegemony of men in society on the whole.

Based on these two cases, it is argued the existing approaches to gender and intra-state conflict need to be revised. Both the emergence of new war in each case and the success or failure of peacebuilding efforts were products of the underlying structure of specific configurations of the gender hierarchy. To mitigate the emergence of new war and to encumber the emergence of conflict after peace agreements have been signed there is a need to address the material structure of gender relations and the processes of change which allow patriarchy to reformulate through organised violence.

Protest masculinity in the Revolutionary United Front as revolt and reflection

The military culture of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in Sierra Leone was constructed in opposition to the power of dominant men, while reflecting and exaggerating the characteristics of mainstream masculinity. The distinctive aspects of new war in Sierra Leone are in part explained by conflict between groups of men over the distribution of patriarchal privileges. The RUF military culture was characterised by enclavist notions of militarised masculinity which were constructed in stark opposition to mainstream society (Gberie, 2005, p. 136). Opposition to dominant men was integral to the development of the new war tactics. Although the RUF's culture and ideology opposed mainstream Sierra Leonean society, the military culture and tactics that they innovated reflected an exaggerated version of pre-existing hegemonic masculinity. This dynamic relationship between dominant masculinities and the masculinities performed by socially excluded men resembles the dynamic identified by Connell as protest masculinity.

Connell (2000, pp. 10–13) explains that, within a society, men's behaviour is normally structured to fulfil an idealised model of manhood. Masculinity defines the practices of men: it ensures that men are rewarded for their performance of certain behaviour with power and economic rewards. Although masculinity is constructed as the natural state of affairs for men, individuals must still work to obtain their masculine status and what is required to attain the status of manhood depends on the social context. In many Western societies, manhood may be achieved through military service, economic enrichment, marriage or sporting prowess (Connell, 2000, p. 11). In Sierra Leone, masculine status is primarily attained through admission to secret societies, marriage and a position within the

community (Murphy, 2003, p. 68). This status is not automatic, and is key to the development of hierarchical power structures that place some men in a subordinate position to others.

Because of the hierarchical nature of gender arrangements, there are normally multiple masculinities that simultaneously exist within a society and offer different avenues for achieving a variety of privileges (Hinojosa, 2010, p. 191). This can be observed within Western societies in the differences that exist between the masculinity of a successful businessman, who may achieve social power and recognition through wealth and being in control of large workforces, and the masculinity of a working-class labourer, who is able to achieve status by working with his hands. Although these two positions grant very different degrees of power, both entail certain social privileges based on the roles that they fulfil, and demonstrate different constructions of masculinity within a social context. Different manifestations of masculinity do not represent discrete typologies; they are loose but identifiable categorisations (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 836). In addition to socially accepted roles, there are often other manifestations of masculinity which are less privileged within society – for example some constructions of queer masculinity or protest masculinity.

Connell's (2005, p. 111) understanding of protest masculinity was built on the concept of a 'masculine protest', developed by psychologist Alfred Adler to describe patterns of behaviour in men who had experiences of powerlessness during childhood. The concept was established by interviewing a range of socially excluded men in Australia and trying to understand the destructive behaviour that they often practiced. Connell defines protest masculinity as the exaggerated claims to masculine power arising from disenfranchisement from the current gender hierarchy (2005, pp. 94–111). When men are unable to attain the full status of manhood through the socially sanctioned routes, such as economic enrichment, occupying positions of power, using violence and obtaining women as wives, they may act out exaggerated masculine practices, such as sporadic violence and risk-taking. These acts were already socially understood to signify masculine status and played into existing tropes of how 'real men' were expected to behave. In the case of men who participated in protest masculinity, these tropes were performed in an exaggerated and often destructive fashion. Rather than taking risks on the sporting field, or in the stock market, men who participated in protest masculinity would take risks by abusing hard drugs, struggling against the police or speeding on motorbikes. Acts such as these reflect the behaviours that are associated with masculinity but are manifested in ways which far exceed socially sanctioned practices. At its crux, Connell defines protest masculinity as a façade, 'making a claim to power where there are no real resources for power' (2005, p. 111).

Connell (2005, pp. 98–101) found that many of the benefits enjoyed by dominant men, such as respectability and support from the law, were not accessible to the unemployed men he interviewed. Although men who call on protest masculinity may be subordinate to those who benefit most from hegemonic masculinity, they still access the benefits afforded them by male supremacy and actively seek to access the benefits provided by the domination and exploitation of women

(Connell, 2005, pp. 116–117). Connell argues that protest masculinity does not work towards any particularly productive aim. Instead it is an alternate basis for excluded men to claim manhood without forging a new political reality. For this reason the gatekeepers of hegemonic masculinity often judge the performance of protest masculinity as particularly destructive compared to their own practices, which are deemed necessary for maintaining order. This negative judgement is contrasted to the many forms of violence accepted within Western hegemonic masculinity. Whereas the violence contained within institutions, such as team sports, state military or patriarchal marriage, is condoned and often encouraged, the performance of protest masculinity is stigmatised. In Western countries, this is demonstrated by the depiction of youth and gang violence as particularly anarchical or dangerous, whereas violence from the police or sporting heroes is applauded and rewarded (Connell, 1989).

Many of the dynamics seen in Connell's account of protest masculinity are mirrored in the social organisation of the RUF. A significant percentage of the RUF, including many of the highest leaders, were recruited from socially excluded youths. Voluntary members of the RUF in particular were drawn from the marginalised and often criminal segments of the youth population (Abdullah, 2002; 2005). The leadership of the RUF did not have any clear political objectives beyond personal empowerment, and did not implement any programs for change in the significant areas that they controlled (Abdullah, 1998, pp. 222–224).

The performance of violence in the RUF bears some resemblance to the acting out described by Connell. The men whom Connell interviewed used public displays of violence to demonstrate their strength and to challenge the power of other men (Connell, 2005, p. 117). Although this use of violence did not contribute to any coherent goal or materially advantage the men who employed it, their use of public brawling or confrontations with the police served as a short-term way to assert their masculinity. The violence used by the RUF was similarly focused on display without substance. Although the RUF used brutal violence, this rarely contributed to achieving coherent strategic objectives. Because of the apparent lack of utility of the RUF's violence, protest masculinity provides a useful model for explaining how the violence was constructed. Protest masculinity also proves useful for gaining an understanding of the apparently irrational and indiscriminate violence in Sierra Leone. This is not to suggest that the practices of the RUF are directly equivalent to the young men interviewed by Connell, or that a strict typology of masculinities exists. Rather the usefulness of the concept is that it helps account for features in the relationship between a marginalised group of men (the RUF) and dominant constructions of gender. In turn, understanding this relationship helps to explain why the RUF practiced such extreme forms of public violence despite the apparent lack of utility in terms of military gains and ultimately helps to unpack the development of new war in Sierra Leone.

The defining trait of RUF ideology was their opposition to the gender hierarchy in Sierra Leonean society. The RUF does not to appear to have maintained a coherent ideology beyond a broad opposition to vague societal injustices (Denov, 2010, pp. 115–130). Their rhetoric emphasised that Sierra Leone was

a corrupt country in need of cleansing. In particular, they opposed economic injustices experienced by men who felt excluded from the patrimonial system (Murphy, 2003, p. 63). Instead of simply targeting the figureheads who benefited most from the patrimonial system, the RUF appears to have constructed society at large as the enemy. The RUF singled out 'big men' of Sierra Leonean society as the primary targets of retribution. Despite this, many civilians who suffered atrocities have reported that they were told to go to the president and to let him know what Sierra Leone was suffering (Physicians for Human Rights, 2002). This fits well with the pre-existing construction of masculinity in Sierra Leone within which local people were identified and defined by the patrimonial relationship between patron and client (Coulter, 2009, p. 79; Richards, 2005, pp. 571–574). Social relations in Sierra Leone were arranged in a hub and spoke system, with the patrician 'big men' at the centre and the clients socially attached to them in a range of 'spokes' that fed off the patronage of the centre. In this arrangement the wealthy 'big men' were at the centre of the system, and connected to them were a range of wealthy subordinates who served their interests. Secondary to these were a wide range of men and women who were attached to the more powerful men as workers, fighters and wives. Finally there were those men who were outside the systems of patronage who had few prospects and were often unable to achieve social status or wealth (Denov, 2010, pp. 115–130). The hub and spoke system functioned on multiple levels, with entire communities subordinate to a regional leader, such as a paramount chief, family units to local 'big men', and women or children subordinate to their husband or father. The RUF targeted both hubs and spokes: although the primary object of the RUF's vitriol was initially the head of state, their violence was acted out against all who were perceived to be under the state's leadership, from the military to local civilian populations.

The 'enclavist' mentality that developed in the RUF created small sovereign enclaves that functioned as independent communities. Danny Hoffman (2006, p. 6) records that establishing control over their own separate enclaves appears to have become the primary preoccupation of the RUF as the war progressed. This may be a reflection of the RUF's alienation from Sierra Leonean society at large when the people of Sierra Leone rejected the RUF's call to rise up against the existing social order. After their near-defeat in 1993 at the hands of the government forces, Lansana Gberie (2005, p. 136) records that the RUF came to resemble a religious sect more than a traditional revolutionary group. During this time the RUF developed an enclavist mentality that drew a stark distinction between those who were inside the group and other Sierra Leoneans. He suggests that during this time, the RUF began to see outsiders as deserving a brutal death, while Foday Sankoh was elevated to a godlike status. This account is corroborated by interviews with ex-combatants. Myriam Denov (2010, p. 105) records that boys were inculcated with an intense sense of group solidarity and devotion to their commander, with client-patron relationships being fostered between younger boys and older commanders, an arrangement which parallels pre-existing power relationships between dominant men and subordinate youths.

Although the RUF came to define their own existence in opposition to mainstream Sierra Leonean society, they still paralleled many of its social structures. Within their sovereign enclaves the RUF reproduced and exaggerated the existing patrimonial system that defined homosocial relationships through the client-patron relationships. Commanders took a range of boys and girls under their wing, using them as bodyguards and subordinates and to supply their material needs (Denov & Maclure, 2006b, p. 128). Access to the signifiers of masculinity – such as sexual access to women and girls, economic enrichment, armament and rank – was accorded on the basis of personal attachment to RUF commanders (Murphy, 2003, p. 76). Far from challenging pre-existing social arrangements, the construction of masculinity in the RUF reproduced patriarchal values, exaggerating men's dominance within a militarised context. This not only involved promoting an extremely violent articulation of protest masculinity but also entailed aggressive attempts to reinforce the hegemony of men and stereotyped femininity. Therefore the actions of the RUF are best explained by the two dynamics of protest masculinity: a stark opposition to existing distributions of power and the exaggerated reproduction of mainstream social constructs.

The gendered politics of new war in Sierra Leone

The practices of the RUF indicate that new war was used to challenge the dominance of wealthy older men. The divergent practices which developed between the RUF and other armed groups in Sierra Leone are explained by their position in the local social hierarchy. The political character of the RUF is explained by a material inability to fulfil the demands of hegemonic masculinity as their actions focused on staking a claim to masculine power and entitlement. Although their actions challenged the position of men at the top of the social hierarchy, the RUF did not fundamentally challenge the pre-existing hierarchical arrangements but merely elaborated them in a more toxic form.

The RUF's use of violence was oriented towards asserting their dominance over the civilian population. For an armed group headed by marginalised men, warfare provided a means to stake a claim to manhood in a language of power that was already understood in Sierra Leone – namely sexual abuse and violence. The forms of violence used by the RUF were significantly different from the practices of dominant men in their severity and sadism. However, despite visible differences, the RUF's violence relied on forms which were already understood to signify power and domination (Duriesmith, 2014). Accordingly, the practices of sexual slavery and rape were constructed by pre-existing notions of gender (Coulter, 2009, p. 144). Existing understandings of masculinity valorised the use of violence as a mechanism to assert power and authority; this legitimated the RUF's use of warfare as a method of staking a claim to a privileged position in the gender hierarchy. In this way war in Sierra Leone was not a stark break from peacetime gender politics. In peace and war, men's power, authority and entitlement are made possible by a foundation of violence and hierarchy which subordinate other gendered groups. The use of violence by the RUF was motivated by a system

that gave the message to youths that being a man meant possessing power and successful men were entitled to the subservience of others. Although the *manifestations* of violence in Sierra Leone were very different in peace and war, the centrality of masculinity remained unchanged.

The hegemonic construction of masculinity, centred on the patrimonial power of 'big men', created the necessary preconditions for war in Sierra Leone. A significant body of literature has focused on the politics of grievance in Sierra Leone: this perspective claims that the men of the RUF did not fight for a political ideology, but to seek redress for grievances caused by their subordinate economic or social status (Bangura, 2000; Abdullah, 2005; Gberie, 2005). The gender-blind nature of this approach is deeply problematic, as the RUF's grievances with the existing social hierarchies are based on a construction of masculinity that normalises masculine entitlement. The notion that members of the RUF were being disadvantaged was a consequence of a construction of masculinity which taught men they were entitled to economic and social privileges. Each of the key entitlements that the members of the RUF were being denied, and which are emphasised by the accounts that emphasise grievance, was also being denied to large groups of women in Sierra Leone.

Although young men were being denied access to wealth, individual freedom and social status by older patricians, so were a great many women by their family and husbands. Despite the common experiences of exploitation and deprivation between young men and women in Sierra Leone, the grievances of the RUF focused on the deprivation of young men in particular, silencing women's and girls' experiences of oppression in pre-war society. This was because the grievance was forged in response to an unrealisable ideal that men should be wealthy and powerful. Many of the RUF's war efforts were focused on obtaining the kind of social and economic privileges that hegemonic masculinity in Sierra Leone indicated a real man should have. Attempts at acquiring economic wealth, dominating civilian populations and accruing females for sexual use are all based on achieving the trappings of masculine power (Coulter, 2009, p. 79). These efforts would not have been meaningful without a system that socialised men to believe that they were entitled to these privileges. To explain the RUF's violence simplistically in terms of grievance fails to sufficiently critique a construction of masculinity that normalised men's power and authority.

New war in Sierra Leone must be understood in relation to the existing power structure which legitimised violence as an expression of dominance. There are substantial differences between the forms of violence committed by the RUF and the *kamajor* hunter militias which they fought against (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a, p. 33). After early setbacks in the 1990s the RUF became uninterested in waging conventional war. By the mid-1990s the RUF often avoided direct confrontation with other armed groups, preferring to target civilian populations with predatory raids (Pham, 2006, p. 99). In contrast, the form of warfare adopted by the *kamajor* reflected the actions of men who were invested in and benefiting from the existing gender hierarchy. Although they were implicated in the abuse of civilians, the *kamajor* did not primarily focus

on brutalising civilian populations. Instead, their war efforts adapted big game hunting techniques to attack the RUF in order to kill high-ranking commanders (Hoffman, 2005).

When the *kamajor* did brutalise civilian populations it was primarily when they were operating in a region controlled by an opposing ethnic group (Hoffman, 2004). They were implicated in smaller-scale abuses, such as ritualistic cannibalism and the brutalisation of civilians within their own communities who were thought to have cooperated with the RUF (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004d, p. 11). However, as attacks against civilian populations were not their primary focus, and were largely used to police their own communities, for ritualistic purposes and limited attacks against different ethnic groups, the core character of the *kamajor* was that of an authentic grass-roots movement of 'big men' and not a manifestation of protest masculinity. The *kamajor* and other civil defence forces that developed during the war were commanded by local 'big men' and grew out of the pre-existing hunter militias. These were important institutions for establishing men's status in the community before being adapted to create groups in opposition to the RUF (Hoffman, 2005): the *kamajor* provided a starting point for 'big men' to organise their communities and fight back against the RUF. As the group who stood to lose the most from a restructuring of social arrangements, 'big men' were actively involved in organising and funding the *kamajor*. As the members of the *kamajor* were comprised of dominant men and their clients, they had no need to focus on brutalising civilians who were already under their control: the *kamajor* were simply focused on protecting existing privileges.

While there were substantial differences between the ways in which the *kamajor* and the RUF practiced war, both groups worked to maintain gender arrangements that subordinated women. For the *kamajor* this meant reinforcing strict gender relations between women and men that prohibited contact while fighting was ongoing. In contrast the RUF in many ways appeared more fluid, allowing women to occupy combatant positions and even positions of authority in certain instances. However, Coulter (2009) reports that for most women their lives were heavily policed, with prohibitions against making friends, expressing emotion or resisting men's sexual advances all resulting in physical punishment or death. Often these practices were policed by other women, who were afforded limited rewards by cooperating with the existing patriarchal gender arrangements. This meant that for both groups women were not treated as 'true' members even though they participated in the RUF actively.

The fluidity around gender in the RUF can be understood as being a product of the group's weak material foundation and the ambiguous gender stereotypes they employed. While the RUF rhetoric often focused on manly virility and strength, for many of the members their actual experience was of marginalisation and poverty. Similarly, while the RUF was more than willing to harness the destructive force of women and girls as combatants, in doing this they built on stereotypes of femininity as a chaotic and dangerous quality that needed to be tempered with the strength of masculine rule. Both groups relied on the gendered stereotype that

women are 'by nature wild and dangerous . . . metaphorically "from the bush"' (Coulter, 2008). For the *kamajor* this meant keeping women at a distance or subjugating them, so that they did not risk discord and destruction with their actions. However, the RUF, which was far less invested in maintaining the exact pre-war gender arrangements, was willing to draw on stereotypes of monstrous femininity to bolster their numbers, so long as this did not threaten the dominance of men within the group. While the manifestation of masculinity was different, the commitment to male supremacy and the marginalisation of women through exclusive gender stereotypes and material structures of violence was consistent.

The differences between the forms of warfare that developed within the RUF and the *kamajor* were determined by their relationship to pre-war hierarchies. In both cases the use of violence was constructed in relationship with the hierarchical arrangement of patriarchy prior to the war, with one group fighting to gain dominance and the other fighting to protect their privilege. The abuses committed during the conflict did not arise in a vacuum; they were a logical continuation of gender arrangements that validated men's domination and entitlement. The distinctive attributes of new war that existed in Sierra Leone (the demographics of combatants, the tactics they used and the people they targeted) were a direct result of material tensions that existed between the 'big men', who were in a privileged position, and the young men, who were structurally subordinate to local patriarchs.

Oppositional masculinity in the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA)

There are many commonalities between the manifestation of new war in Sierra Leone and South Sudan. The SPLA and the RUF had many similar tactics: they both widely employed child soldiers; they both used pillage and sexual slavery; they both focused on destruction of property; and they were both deeply involved in international shadow economies. At a structural level, the two conflicts also have some substantial similarities. The RUF responded to the experience of oppression by violently acting out, using armed conflict as a vehicle to demonstrate their masculine status without working towards a concrete goal. The SPLA was also responding to oppression – by the state in North Sudan; however, their relationship with Khartoum was one of opposition rather than protest.

The SPLA established parallel hierarches and structures of domination in the South that challenged the hegemony of the northern state leaders. The colonial domination of South Sudan by the North created a context in which the southern leaders were subordinated to northern authorities (Jok, 2001, p. xi). In response to the experience of disempowerment, southern leaders mobilised into armed groups, and this provided a medium through which they were able to expel the existing authorities from the North and claim the dominant position (Jok, 2007, pp. 156–157). The conflict also led to a radical reconfiguration of South Sudanese society, as the leaders of the SPLA were often recruited from a group of highly educated men, who were outside of the traditional power structures of the

South (Sommers & Schwartz, 2011; Mampilly, 2011, p. 156). Many of the leaders of the SPLA did not conform to the social markers that signified masculine status within Nilotic communities (Hutchinson, 2001, p. 315). Important leaders, such as Dr John Garang, one of the founders and leaders of the SPLA, had not gone through the initiation and scarification rituals that mark boys' entrance into manhood in Nilotic cultures (Human Rights Watch, 1994, pp. 4–14). Despite this exclusion from the customary mechanisms for obtaining status, the leaders of the SPLA had often received a high level of education and had extensive military experience (Lesch, 1998, p. 33). They were able to draw on these resources in establishing new patriarchal social arrangements where they received the material benefits that come with masculine power and social status.

Constructions of masculinity that are structured in opposition to dominant arrangements are not unique to the context of South Sudan. Connell's work has analysed instances where men and boys establish notions of manhood which oppose and contrast the hegemonic arrangement. Connell (2005, p. 37) suggests that this can be seen in high schools when boys construct a subcultural group that resists the prevailing norms of dominant masculinity in that social milieu. Connell uses two examples to illustrate the concept of oppositional masculinity. The first is 'rough lads' who oppose scholastic expectations of the school system and move towards the factory floor as a form of opposition to their peers who were rewarded for adhering to the school's 'civilising' expectations. The second example is boys in the school system who resisted the imperative to engage in competitive sports by collectively producing a school newspaper. For these boys Connell found that intellectualism provided an alternative basis to claim masculine respect. For both of these groups their actions provided an oppositional way to be masculine. Their actions do not oppose the notion of masculinity broadly, but hold revisionist dispositions towards the current gender hierarchy.

The creation of an alternative and oppositional way of enacting masculinity does not mean that those who participate in it are fundamentally challenging the patriarchal arrangements; rather a subcultural group may try to establish alternate criteria for obtaining masculine status. These cases are best explained by the concept of oppositional masculinity rather than protest masculinity because the participants are working to establish new criteria for legitimising male privilege, rather than trying to replicate attributes which are already understood to signify masculine power.

The SPLA was the vehicle through which leaders were able to claim masculine respect. The use of military might as a method of establishing authority and masculine status was already understood in the South (D'Awol, 2011, p. 59). In contrast to the protest masculinity of the RUF, the SPLA worked towards the concrete goal of controlling the region and was able to establish well-organised formal structures that now dominate southern society (Mampilly, 2011, pp. 138–141). Although the SPLA also engaged in brutal violence, it was more targeted than the violence committed by the RUF. The SPLA focused their abuse on opposing ethnic groups, government proxies or civilians who were believed to be resistant to their authority. Their actions were brutal but did not have the same aspect

of theatrical public violence which the RUF came to be known for. Instead, the SPLA's violence is explained by a construction of masculinity that was cast in opposition to the men in Khartoum and the tribal civilian leadership in the South.

The SPLA as replacement patriarchs

Through oppositional masculinity, the leaders of the SPLA were able to establish themselves as the dominant group of men in a new patriarchal social hierarchy. At the start of the conflict the key members of the SPLA were marginal figures in Sudan. The creation of new war developed a context where the SPLA was able to rearrange the distribution of power between groups of men in South Sudan (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, pp. 127–137). The SPLA was able to expel the existing ruling men from the South, including the armed leaders from North Sudan, and to dominate the tribal leaders (Mampilly, 2011, p. 156). They replaced these two power structures – state and tribe – with a militarised social structure which venerated combatants (Jok, 1999, p. 436). The SPLA was successful in creating South Sudan as a separate state, cemented by an agreement between the male armed leaders of the SPLA and the male armed leaders in the North, but the creation of a new state entity did not mark liberation for all in South Sudan, or for the oppressed groups who remained in the North. It formalised the rule of a small caste of armed leaders as the hegemons in the South, and the success of this group has resulted in new structures of subordination which continue to dominate civilians, including the young and women. The oppressive practices of the SPLA during the conflict, the class composition of its leaders, the catalyst that initiated conflict and the arrangement of post-war South Sudan each suggest that new war was used to oppose dominant positions held by state and tribal leaders.

The catalyst for new war in South Sudan was the 1983 introduction of Islamic law: the application of *sharia* in the South destabilised the hegemonic status of Nilotic men in their own communities. During the interwar period, South Sudan was granted nominal independence and although northern interests still exploited and controlled parts of the South, particularly the capital, Juba, southerners were granted some degree of legal autonomy and independence (Lesch, 1998, p. 212). The spread of *sharia* into southern territories signified an ideological attack on the dominance of southern men. *Sharia* law was interpreted by southerners as underpinning a racist attitude that treated non-Muslims as second-class citizens at best, and at worst as slaves (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 18). The institution of *sharia* framed the oppression of southerners in gender-specific ways. For women, this meant persecution through laws that legitimised spousal abuse, stoning for adultery, exclusion from public life and state-sponsored sexual violence (Jok, 2006, pp. 71–74). For men, the imposition undermined the South's symbolic independence, ending southerners' technical autonomy that had existed since the First Sudanese Civil War, which in turn undermined the authority of southern patriarchs, placing them in a legal position which was subordinate to the North.

The SPLA was able to hijack the grievances of southern civilians and position themselves as dominant local leaders. Opposition to northern colonialism

had been a common trend in the southern Sudanese political discourse since the end of British colonialism. As the second civil war in South Sudan progressed, the rhetoric of decolonisation was adopted by some members of the SPLA to justify their individual power and authority. This anti-colonial rhetoric forged an oppositional culture which allowed men in the SPLA to legitimise their dominant position after the conflict.

Anti-colonial grievances justified the SPLA's claim to regional hegemony: many southern Sudanese people reported that the liberation struggle against colonial oppression and slavery was appropriated by a small educated cadre of elite men. Interviews with southern elders suggest that the violent conflict between Dinka and Nuer factions was used by members of the SPLA to create a context of impunity, where they could opportunistically use violence to gain rewards. This can be seen in a report from one Dinka elder interviewed by Jok Madut Jok and Elaine Hutchinson (1999, p. 132): 'this nasty war, which is not our way, but a war only educated people make use (to) fight'. Under the pretence of inter-ethnic conflict, combatants were able to abuse civilians on both sides of the divide with abandon. Similarly the military leaders from both factions were able to frame the opposing ethnic groups as the abstracted enemy of 'their' nation, justifying any injustice that they wished to commit as national self-defence (Small Arms Survey, 2008, p. 3). This created a context of impunity where armed men in the South were able to use forms of violence that had characterised the actions of the northern state militias.

Despite espousing the rhetoric of liberation and southern freedom, the SPLA used the social space of war to reinforce their collective power by creating militarised social structures. In many cases the SPLA used weapons that they had acquired for the purpose of ending oppression in Sudan to abuse civilian populations and institute new forms of oppression (D'Awol, 2011, p. 58). The abuses committed by the SPLA against their own communities, and the infighting between Nilotic groups, is best accounted for by a gendered understanding of masculinity and competition between androcentric groups over regional hegemony. Previously prohibited practices, such as war rape, abduction of children and mass killing of civilians, were reframed as brave or noble contributions to the liberation struggle by SPLA leaders. Southern Sudanese human rights advocate Anyieth M. D'Awol (2011) has described this shift in the SPLA as a twisting of men's responsibilities for protection. She suggests that traditionally Nilotic men were expected to protect women and children, alongside non-combatants who were under their authority, and if these groups suffered abuse at the hands of enemy forces it reflected poorly on the men who were supposed to protect them. In an inversion of the traditional protection afforded to civilian women, children and non-combatants, members of the SPLA targeted vulnerable groups within enemy populations as a way to undermine the dominance of men who were supposed to protect them.

During the 1990s the SPLA cast whole civilian populations as a potential enemy (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, pp. 85–90). The Sudanese government and its auxiliaries were originally perceived to be the sole enemy of the SPLA. After

splitting into two factions, SPLA proper, led by John Garang, and the SPLA Nasir, led by Riek Machar, both factions worked actively to deconstruct the existing power structures of religion and tribal authority. Machar and the other men who led the SPLA regarded existing authority figures in Nilotic communities, such as religious and tribal leaders, as a threat to their dominance. They appear to have been particularly threatened by the spiritual and family group leaders who were powerful figures in Nilotic society (Hutchinson, 2001, p. 315). To counter the authority of religious and tribal structures, the SPLA training emphasised that a distinction had to be drawn between the 'homeland wars' that they had historically waged between communities and the 'government war' of liberation. Training emphasised that in the 'government war' the laws that had historically governed Nilotic war practices no longer applied. The conflict was portrayed as a secular battle of national survival and, as a result, practices that had previously been forbidden were allowed without incurring divine retribution (Hutchinson, 2001, pp. 315–316). However, after the SPLA split in 1991, all conflicts between southerners were subsumed into the 'government war'. Cattle raids by Nuer and Dinka were reframed as a threat to the war effort, and punished with the same cruelty used by the northern state to suppress southern resistances.

Once the SPLA had successfully undermined the patriarchal authority of traditional leaders, they then assumed their dominant position and began to militarise civilian society. This was a calculated tactic that undermined the existing authority of traditional leaders and established an alternative basis for claiming hegemony. The masculine dynamic that existed between SPLA members and social authorities strongly resembled the power relationships between men which Connell describes as oppositional masculinity, in that it challenged the existing model of masculinity and forwarded a new model that privileged its advocates.

As discussed in the previous chapter combatants had been inculcated with the necessary building blocks of emotional detachment, warrior manhood and aggression in the early stages of the conflict. By the late 1980s the SPLA troops had already been trained to use brutal sexual violence against perceived foes; it was but a small step to reframe a new civilian population as the perceived enemy (D'Awol, 2011, p. 58). Initially, southern forces had trained their troops to use the tactics of pillage, arson, rape and callous murder exclusively within the 'government war'. With the necessary building blocks laid, it took a small shift in the gender dynamics of conflict for combatants to turn these tactics against their own communities in the South.

The practices of the SPLA after gaining control of the South indicate that their interest was in fighting for a more privileged position in the gender hierarchy and not the liberation of South Sudan from oppression. In substantive terms, the actions of both southern Sudanese factions compromised the interests of the civilians they claimed to represent. As the 1990s progressed, both groups escalated intra-southern conflict to new self-destructive levels in an effort to maintain dominance over the region (Hutchinson, 2000, p. 6). The particular cruelty of both groups' use of sexual violence is indicative of the masculine dynamics of war in South Sudan that emerged during the 1990s. In many instances, sexual violence

was used by SPLA factions in a punitive fashion, aiming to punish women who were perceived to have supported men of the opposing ethnicity (Jok, 2007, p. 433). In some cases it has been reported that the 'support' that women gave was being sexually victimised by opposing soldiers, only to be again abused by their own group once the abuse became known. Although there is no statistically sound data on the perpetration of sexual violence during the conflict, anecdotal evidence (D'Awol, 2011, p. 55) suggests that it became '*intentional, widespread and systematic*'. Sexual violence seems to have been employed when the SPLA's patriarchal authority was challenged, either by 'their' women being used by other groups of men or in an effort to dominate civilian communities.

The development of oppositional masculinity can also be seen in the experiences of men who started the SPLA. Most of the core SPLA leaders were separate from the traditional structures of power prior to the conflict. For instance John Garang, the SPLA's leader from 1983 to 2005, started his political life as a marginal figure. His parents had died early in his life and he gained his education in the U.S. After returning to Sudan to fight in the first civil war, Garang joined the Sudanese national army and developed further ties with other militarised men. Although Garang was far removed from the marginalised youth who fought for the RUF, he had also been excluded from the traditional power structures. This is indicative of the complex relationships that exist between masculinities in sites of conflict. Although Garang was privileged in many ways, receiving an international education and highly ranked in the armed forces, he was not well placed within the power structures of tribe and age set.

The SPLA provided an alternative route for men like Garang to obtain economic empowerment, sexual access to women and social status. Prior to the 1990s, the military leaders had minimal substantive power outside of refugee camps, which they ran in a rigid, authoritarian fashion (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 7). Northern men had previously occupied the dominant position in most areas of the South, controlling the formal economy, the functioning of the state and the military (Mampilly, 2011, pp. 132–133). By the early 1990s the SPLA had succeeded in pushing northern forces back, creating a contested political space. The removal of northern leaders was exploited by southern military units as an opportunity to gain recompense for their efforts in terms of power and wealth (Jok, 2007, pp. 82–84). By the early 1990s the SPLA had grown considerably in size and power (Holt & Daly, 2000, p. 190). This opened the potential for military commanders to begin asserting their masculinity in more explicit ways. The SPLA established new social structures that centred on the homosocial military unit. First, youths were removed from their family and tribal structures, two sites where boys in South Sudan traditionally had their status as real men established (Human Rights Watch, 1994, p. 14). Recruits were then inducted into a culture of militarised masculinity which emphasised combatants' expendability in exchange for sexual access to women, and the right to take economic resources from civilian populations (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002, p. 101).

The emergence of this ideology of militarised masculinity was devastating for many southern Sudanese women, who were treated as a national resource for the

SPLA to consume. Jok Madut Jok (1999) has recorded the gradual militarisation of women's lives by the SPLA as the conflict progressed. Despite being taught that soldiers should be powerful embodiments of militarised masculinity, most recruits' lives were intimately controlled by their commanders (Hutchinson, 2001, p. 315). The gulf between an ideology of masculine power within the SPLA and soldiers' individual experience of subordination to senior commanders contributed to wide-scale abuse of women in an effort to assert their dominance. Breaking down the pre-existing restrictions on sexual contact, unmarried SPLA soldiers came to expect free sexual access to civilian women as a reward for fighting. Jok (1999, p. 436) suggests that this was connected to the nationalist rhetoric of heroic sacrifice. He suggests that recruits were made into the 'hero who has sacrificed for all and whose desires, sexual and otherwise, should and must be met by all who support the national cause'. The ideological superiority of combatants made their every demand a necessary sacrifice for the liberation struggle. This was an important step in turning the conflict into a new war as it allowed abuse to be justified for the good of the nation (Stone, 2011, p. 29). The success of the SPLA did not destroy the oppressive hierarchies that were established by the northern state: rather they replaced them with a new patriarchal social order where combatants took the dominant position.

The new order established by the SPLA placed women in a clear subordinate position to men. The sense of superiority and entitlement taught to soldiers opened up new avenues to masculine status which had not previously existed. Prior to the conflict men were required to obtain a large number of cattle to pay for bride wealth if they wished to get married. As marriage is a key signifier of dominant position in South Sudan, the inability of many men to afford bride wealth was a significant impediment to climbing the social hierarchy. The devolution of conflict into a new war allowed men to gain access to women without owning cattle, and eroded women's ability to refuse sexual access by breaking down sexual taboos.

The ideology of the SPLA suggested that women's contribution to the war effort was reproduction. According to the SPLA's leader John Garang, for the war to continue it was necessary for women to maintain the population of South Sudan by being sexually available so that they could keep up the 'reproductive front' (Stone, 2011, p. 29). This meant that any refusal of access to a soldier was construed as a woman shirking her duties to the nation and singling her out as a potential enemy. The sense of sexual superiority that was taught to combatants was a necessary precondition to the later abuses committed by the SPLA and the development of new war.

Through the conflict, women involved in the SPLA worked to construct counter-narratives of women's roles (Stone, 2011). As with many other wars of national liberation, women of the SPLA fought to create space for their involvement from the early stages (Lyons, 2004). Receiving training and looking to join in armed combat, women initially sought to construct an alternative femininity that allowed for active participation in armed conflict. After the leader of the SPLA, John Garang, banned women's involvement in combat, asking them to focus on 'the reproductive front', women shifted their involvement to traditionally feminised roles of

support (Stone, 2011, p. 29). Despite this shift some women still sought to claim the status of warrior through their supporting role; this approach is expressed by one of Lydia Stone's (2011, p. 35) interviewees who defended her participation: 'I am not fighting with a gun, but I am fighting with my mouth'. Women's work to stake a claim to the status of warrior is particularly significant within the context of the SPLA due to the common belief that women were not fully persons due to their perceived inability to fight (Hutchinson & Jok, 2002).

Despite women's attempts to assert their status as contributors to the national liberation struggle, the SPLA was far more resistant to their involvement than was the case for the RUF. In many ways this is atypical for a war of national liberation, where women are very commonly heavily involved as combatants (Parpart, 2015). However, rather than trying to harness or co-opt women's contributions, the SPLA focused on policing and excluding them from combatant roles and reinforcing stereotyped femininity. In practice this meant that the SPLA worked hard to construct narratives of women as mothers and carers, while trying to exclude any involvement they have had in the masculine domain of fighting from public discourse. As the SPLA was working to construct and defend an oppositional notion of masculinity that was built on a rigid notion of the male warrior, this left far less room for fluidity around women's involvement than was seen in Sierra Leone. As with the *kamajor*, the leaders of the SPLA were appealing to an essentialised notion of gender relations that valorised male warriors, and created a stark dichotomy with those who were not 'real' warriors.

The oppositional masculinity of the SPLA also succeeded in subordinating men who had not fought in the conflict. The two clearest examples of this dynamic are the marginalisation of tribal leaders after the conflict and the belittling of youth culture that has developed in the capital Juba since the conflict ended. The development of state structure after the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, which was signed in 2005, protected the political power of the SPLA in South Sudan. This cemented the SPLA's official power as recipients of the state's oil revenues, and gave them the monopoly on legitimate organised political violence. This undermined the authority of the southern men who had previously had the most privileged positions under northern oppression, the tribal leaders (International Eminent Persons Group, 2002, p. 27). Prior to the conflict, the tribal leaders had exercised a great deal of authority over southern society and were the unofficial governors for everyday issues, such as marriage, cattle disputes and customs. After the conflict ended, the SPLA wrested control over many issues from these pre-existing power structures and replaced them with the authority of military and state. This fundamentally restructured the power relationships between groups of men, placing those who had previously been in a position of seniority (tribal leaders) in a subordinate position to military leaders, who gained almost limitless authority.

During the inter-conflict period of 2005–2013, young men who did not fight were placed in a precarious position. Many found the paths to achieving masculine status had been closed off, with marriage becoming increasingly difficult as the bride price skyrocketed after the end of the armed conflict. Young men who

were not members of the armed forces became increasingly marginalised by military leaders, who had claimed a disproportionate share of the post-war economic benefits to establish themselves as local 'big men' (Sommers & Schwartz, 2011, pp. 1–5). This led to the development of a new subculture of protest masculinity within the capital, Juba, that attempts to emulate the lifestyle of American hip hop culture. In a development that bears a striking resemblance to Sierra Leone prior to conflict, this caste of marginalised youths has begun to organise into gang-like structures to gain access to women, use intoxicants and obtain wealth in the shadow economy (Sommers & Schwartz, 2011). Since the re-emergence of conflict in 2013, many of these young men have joined the SPLA factions once more, contributing to the ongoing violence across South Sudan.

These developments suggest that a form of oppositional masculinity was at play in South Sudan rather than protest masculinity. The SPLA was working towards concrete goals through armed conflict, and by the end of the war the SPLA had become the ruling force in South Sudan, with its leader the first president of the world's newest state. In contrast to the RUF's destructive but ultimately futile actions, the SPLA succeeded in overthrowing a state structure and establishing their insurgent group as the rulers. This suggests that their actions were not the flashy performances of exaggerated masculinity that were exhibited in Sierra Leone. The direct attacks against civilian populations were designed to overthrow the men who occupied the dominant position in the patriarchal hierarchy and establish a new hierarchy in which armed men were hegemonic.

Starting and ending new war: the breaking and reforging of patriarchal bargains

In both Sierra Leone and South Sudan, new war was a vehicle for disenfranchised men to challenge the hegemony of dominant men. In both cases conflict was ended by the creation of a new patriarchal bargain between men under which subordinate men gained limited benefits in exchange for their cooperation with the dominant men. The concept of 'patriarchal bargaining' originates in the scholarship of Deniz Kandiyoti, who used it to describe the ways in which some women cooperate with patriarchal arrangements in exchange for individual benefits (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 275). Kandiyoti's account originally referred to the difficult compromises made by women within severely constraining gender arrangements, such as helping to police the behaviour of other women in exchange for recognition and social status. Although this original formulation specifically referred to the bargains made by women to navigate a patriarchal social system, it can also be used to understand the actions of subordinate groups of men.

Other feminist scholars have extended the concept of patriarchal bargaining to apply to groups of men. Sarah C. White and Andrea Cornwall (1997) used the concept to explore the ways in which young men collude in their own subordination to older men in exchange for gaining power over women later in their lives. White and Cornwall explicitly refer to the mobilisation of young men by leaders in the Global South as an example of patriarchal bargaining, where in exchange

for being exploited in the short term, young men are offered the eventual opportunity to gain control over women and economic resources. White and Cornwall suggest that despite this collusion providing them with some benefits, they remain in a subordinate position to older men.

Similar dynamics have been identified by Hanna Herzog and Taghreed Yahia-Younis (2007) in Palestinian Arab communities, where young marginalised men had mounted a significant internal challenge to the authority of local kin group leaders. To mitigate the potential damage caused by this challenge the older men were able to provide young men with limited local power in exchange for their cooperation with the kin-based political system. Herzog and Yahia-Younis develop the concept of protest masculinity by drawing on Connell's analysis of competition between groups of men. Looking at the ways in which masculinity excludes some men, creates conditions for crisis and then integrates them back into the patriarchal fold, Herzog and Yahia-Younis (2007, p. 586) suggest that patriarchal bargaining between groups of men is a normal aspect of patriarchal power struggles. This concept can help to explain why groups of men agree to abandon a struggle against the existing social hierarchy in exchange for certain benefits. Similarly, these bargains can break down if the benefits afforded to subordinate men are inadequate. The dynamic of a failing patriarchal bargain can be seen in both Sierra Leone and South Sudan prior to the conflict, and an understanding of patriarchal bargaining can help to explain how new wars in these context were halted without unmaking the patriarchal social arrangements that created them.

Masculinities were a key factor in causing the crises that led to new war developing in Sierra Leone and South Sudan. Both case studies exhibited a breakdown in the relationships between dominant and subordinate groups of men prior to the outbreak of war. In both Sierra Leone and South Sudan tenuous patriarchal bargains had existed between a ruling group – the wealthy patricians in Sierra Leone and the northern government in Sudan – and a subordinated group of men – impoverished youths in Sierra Leone and marginalised southerners in Sudan. In both cases these arrangements broke down as subordinate groups of men were increasingly unable to attain full masculine status as it was locally understood. These tensions arose due to the failing patriarchal bargains that promised men access to women, power, wealth and status in exchange for their cooperation with the ruling class of men. When these bargains began to break down, the subordinated men responded, and by the time new war developed in Sierra Leone and South Sudan the response became violent and chaotic, exacerbated by the proliferation of small arms.

New war in South Sudan occurred in response to the breakdown of an existing patriarchal bargain between southern leaders and the northern state. Until 1983, leaders in the South had retained technical control over their region in exchange for compliance with the state; however, the imposition of *sharia* law in 1983 undermined this existing patriarchal bargain and in response southern militias rose up and violently asserted their dominance. After successfully obtaining independence from the Republic of the Sudan, the militants of the SPLA established a new

patriarchal social order in the South. This led to the creation of a separate state and the institution of military leaders into a dominant position over the South. Although South Sudan was able to gain freedom from the oppressive northern state, this was done without unmaking militarised masculinity among the local population. Instead, the new South Sudanese state entrenched the privilege of militarised men through a formal state structure.

In contrast to this, the existing patriarchal bargain between young men and patricians in Sierra Leone had thoroughly deteriorated by 1991. Patricians were no longer able to supply many young men with the wealth and access to women which they demanded in exchange for their compliance with the existing social structures (Richards, 2005). When the RUF crossed the border of Liberia and Sierra Leone in 1991 it was able to exploit this failure, and mobilise young men into a revolt against the existing patricians (Hoffman, 2006, p. 11).

Recent attempts at peacebuilding in South Sudan and Sierra Leone have focused on re-establishing tenuous and strained patriarchal bargains by placating young men, rather than challenging the root causes of new war (MacKenzie, 2009; Gross et al., 2011). The most significant peacebuilding programs in both states have been those aimed at disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) of armed forces. In both Sierra Leone and South Sudan such programs have focused on removing young men from armed groups and providing them with the material trappings of manhood, such as employment, land or wealth (MacKenzie, 2009; Gross et al., 2011). In Sierra Leone these programs appear to have succeeded in striking a new patriarchal bargain between disenfranchised young men and older social leaders. In exchange for cooperation with the state, primarily by surrendering their weaponry and abandoning organised violence, they have been rewarded with economic enrichment and access to women.

Despite a significant proportion of female combatants, the DDR programs focused on exchanging money, occupational training and employment for combatants' guns (Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, 2002). For young men, DDR programs often provided new avenues for achieving masculine status in the community, as new pathways to employment, enrichment and eventually marriage were opened up. However, for the many female combatants this program provided few possibilities. The program focused on helping ex-combatants, but it delivered inadequate support for women who were associated with armed groups but whose status as combatants was overlooked or discounted by those organising the program (Denny, 2014, p. 73). In response to this marginalisation, many female former combatants relied on prostitution or transactional sexual relationships to survive.

In South Sudan the DDR programs that operated between 2005 and 2013 have also been designed to placate young men by giving them avenues for achieving status, primarily through employment or grants of agricultural land (Stone, 2011, p. 43). Although women have been treated slightly better in South Sudanese DDR programs, the focus has been on protecting the authority of the SPLA, rather than challenging or unmaking the hierarchical social structures which fostered war in the first place (Nichols, 2011; Duriesmith, 2015).

The approach to peacebuilding taken in Sierra Leone and South Sudan does not address the problematic hierarchical social arrangements which allowed new war to develop in South Sudan and Sierra Leone; they only mitigate its most extreme outcomes by privileging some men. Existing programs have correctly identified young men's inability to gain employment and social status and get married as important destabilising factors. What has been missing, however, is a deeper critique of the social context that first created damaging expectations of what a man needs to obtain, and the expectation that when faced with an inability of achieving these trappings of masculinity they will resort to violence. However, in both Sierra Leone and South Sudan some attempts were made by women to critique the broader social context that created new war. The Sierra Leone Women's Movement for Peace, a grass-roots women's organisation, attempted to critique patrimonial social arrangements as well as the oppressive social conditions it creates, which they identified as a cause for the poor treatment of women during and after the conflict (Richards, 1996, p. xxix; Castillejo, 2009, p. 3). Similarly the South Sudan Women's Empowerment Network began dialogues on the entrenchment of oppressive practices in post-conflict society (Ali, 2011).

Despite these valuable local efforts to challenge masculinity and militarism, the international response to new war has reforged a renewed patriarchal bargain by integrating combatants into the formal economy, and by providing education and employment. The fact that these privileges have generally not been extended to women and girls impacted by the conflict is indicative of an approach that aims to address the violent symptoms of masculinity. This can be seen in the current programs, which are designed to allow men successful avenues for gaining status through employment or agriculture without attempting to challenge the connection between masculinity, power and violence. This may ultimately be successful in dissuading men from engaging in new war, but it is unlikely to challenge the destructive use of violence in Sierra Leone or South Sudan unless masculinity can be unravelled. Even more worrying is the institutionalisation of patriarchal bargains within the structure of the state in Sierra Leone and South Sudan. By formalising resources distribution arrangements between groups of men (to the exclusion of most civilians and women) the DDR programs recreate the oppressive social hierarchies that originally triggered the crisis in the system. As masculinity rests on unequal hierarchical arrangements, violence cannot ultimately be mitigated by placating disenfranchised men.

The practices of new war in South Sudan were grounded in the acceptability of the masculine use of force. The forms of brutal violence that help to define new war, such as the systematic use of rape and the murder of non-combatants, were recent innovations within the context of South Sudanese societies, but the culture of men's expendability already existed prior to conflict. Long before the second civil war young men were expected to participate in armed conflict in the form of small-scale raiding (Gross et al., 2011, p. 13). Although these raids were rarely deadly and commonly short-lived, they nevertheless enshrined the expectation that men would be willing and available to fight in defence of their community's honour (Jok & Hutchinson, 1999, p. 131).

In South Sudan militarised masculinity remained in place since before the development of new war until the present day. In the post-war context men's expendability has become a militarised method of structuring the present-day state. Since conflict has ended, the government has formalised and reinforced the centrality of militarism in South Sudanese society by privileging the SPLA (Sommers & Schwartz, 2011, pp. 1–5). As discussed in previous chapters, cultures that glorify military action in Sierra Leone and South Sudan served to marginalise women and non-militarised men. Despite programs of DDR, the SPLA still remains a powerful force within society. Its members enjoy significant privileges over non-combatants, which include better job prospects, positions in the new government and a degree of legal impunity (Small Arms Survey, 2008, p. 8; Ali, 2011). This reflects the crystallisation of patriarchal privilege into a militarised state structure, formalised through the patriarchal bargain between military leaders and their subordinates. At the same time, the new order formally marginalises the many young men in South Sudan who did not fight, and now find themselves unable to gain economic enrichment, perpetuating the conditions which paved the way for new war (Duriesmith, 2015). It also protects the interests of warrior heroes over the interests of women, who have been consistently marginalised in the post-conflict era.

Attempts to address challenges posed by new war have been constrained by limited vision and aims. Most programs that exist to address militarisation in post-conflict societies have focused on removing weapons from society, removing combatants from the control of military leaders and giving masculine combatants formal employment. Not only does this approach tend to exclude women at each stage, but also it aims to serve and reinforce the oppressive hierarchies that existed prior to conflict. At the most basic level these programs have worked to re-establish patriarchal bargains that placate young men in each society.

Post-conflict research in Sierra Leone provides strong evidence that the reconstruction has focused on bringing previously excluded men and boys into the patriarchal fold rather than addressing the core tensions that initially caused the conflict. The failure of these programs appears to be particularly acute in Sierra Leone, where a relatively high female involvement in armed groups can be contrasted with very low participation in disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programs (MacKenzie, 2009). Instead of trying to combat the inequality that was a core cause of the original conflict, the DDR programs have worked to privilege male ex-combatants within the patrimonial structures of entitlement and reward that existed before conflict began. For women, however, this has meant that many of the more negative aspects of combat remain unchallenged. Megan MacKenzie (2009, p. 261) has critiqued this approach to peacebuilding as insufficient and short-sighted. Instead she argued for 'a truly progressive developmental post-conflict reconstruction program' that would 'include more radical change in the area of women's status in society'. Adopting a more ambitious response to new war seems essential in contexts such as Sierra Leone, where strong patriarchal values have been identified as a core cause of conflict (Human Rights Watch, 2003, pp. 4–6).

The post-conflict path to reconstruction that developed in South Sudan between 2005 and 2013 also failed to adequately address gender politics. The DDR programs in South Sudan have been more successful in integrating female combatants than in Sierra Leone and have successfully included thousands of women associated with armed groups, providing them with training as well as some economic support (Stone, 2011). The active focus on including female combatants in South Sudan peacemaking efforts appears to have been an attempt to avoid the failings of other DDR programs earlier in the decade. Nevertheless, although peacebuilding efforts actively sought to include women, they failed to address some of the most basic problems caused by militarised masculinity (Duriesmith, 2015). The success of South Sudan DDR programs in including women should not be interpreted as a successful adoption of feminist concerns, but rather their focus on female combatants without attempting to disarm and demobilise male soldiers is a symptom of a broader peacebuilding program which reinforces the power of militarised men.

Although the DDR program in South Sudan was comparatively successful in integrating women, it failed to successfully demobilise male combatants, who largely remain with the SPLA and merged into state militaries or local militias. South Sudan faces quite a different situation than Sierra Leone, because the SPLA was successful in creating a separate state from the North. Since conflict has ended, the SPLA remains the most powerful organisation in the South, with significant influence over the practices of the state (Duriesmith, 2015). Rather than seriously attempting disarmament, the SPLA have used the DDR programs as a mechanism to retire combatants who are too old, injured or no longer useful without needing to provide them with financial support. This has meant that the program, originally designed to reduce the size and impact of the SPLA, has transformed into an internationally funded form of social security for ex-combatants, without substantially impacting the influence or capabilities of SPLA-associated armed groups. This new social arrangement provided the basis for a patriarchal bargain to be struck between military commanders and younger combatants, providing material rewards for short-term compliance.

The failure to successfully unsettle the SPLA's social power in the post-conflict period has been disastrous for non-combatants in the South. Although the war between the Sudanese government and South Sudan officially ended in 2005, the influence of the SPLA on southern society remains pervasive. During the post-conflict period predatory forms of violence against women have persisted among many armed groups. Brutal sexual violence against female civilians remains largely unpunished if the perpetrator is a member of an armed group, as patterns of impunity have carried on from the conflict period (D'Awol, 2011, p. 53). In contrast to many other forms of sexual violence already present, the use of sexual violence by the armed forces is often directed towards relative strangers, and even though detailed large-scale surveys of sexual violence do not yet exist, qualitative evidence suggests that the end of conflict has not put an end to the abduction and gang rape of women by soldiers (Gross et al., 2011, p. 12). The continuation of this practice, which was used as a weapon of war during the years of conflict, has

also impacted on the large international migrant workforce of women in South Sudan. The widespread incidence of 'stranger rape' has been compounded by a burgeoning prostitution industry in the southern capital of Juba that is largely structured to serve soldiers (D'Awol, 2011, p. 66). Within this context the gender hierarchy has not been dismantled; instead a new patriarchal bargain has been struck between commanders and combatants.

Patterns of spousal rape and sexual coercion have continued since the end of formal hostilities with the North. The previous chapter on South Sudan outlined the increasing pressure on wives to be sexually available to husbands as the conflict progressed, and since the end of hostilities with the North sexual demands on wives have not ceased. In the post-conflict period the amount of bride wealth expected to be paid by grooms has also increased exponentially, driven up by not only the wealth of expatriate families who are part of the Sudanese diaspora but also soldiers whose incomes increased after the end of conflict. One of the impacts of the increased bride wealth is that a greater emphasis has been placed on the marriage contract as purchasing the rights to sexual service, with the result that men have come to expect unrestricted sexual access to their wives (Stern, 2011, p. 17). Although marital rape is not recognised as criminal, or even a problem in most instances, the pressure to be sexually available has dramatically increased. This is yet another way in which the impact of militarisation and new war is not contained by the boundaries of officially recognised war and peace. For the wives whose lives remain militarised through their husbands' continuing involvement in the new state military or the other factional militias, their existence is still controlled by a culture dominated by militarisation and entitlement.

The failures of peacebuilding programs in both Sierra Leone and South Sudan are examples of what happens when programs try to address the most visible symptoms of new war (organised brutal violence) without addressing the root cause. The core cause of conflict in both cases was a struggle between groups of men over the dominant position in a patriarchal hierarchy. The peacebuilding programs have focused their attention on making sure that militarised men, particularly young men, are lifted from the lowest position in society by providing them with employment, income and social status. This approach has been successful in lessening violent conflict between groups of men, without challenging the abuse of women and children which was normalised during the years of war. This is another instance of a patriarchal bargain being struck between state leaders and young militant men, rather than society making a coherent effort to unmake new war by resolving its causes.

Challenging the structural causes of conflict in new wars is possible only by taking a critical stance on the cultural contexts where they develop. New wars are not created in a temporal vacuum but are forged by the conditions which existed before war began and which in many cases continue long after conflict has officially ended. The first step towards creating a comprehensive response to new war is challenging masculinity and the oppressive hierarchies it creates, rather than trying to rearrange groups' positions within the hierarchy to avert explosive conflict.

Mary Kaldor's (2012, p. 12) suggested response to new war is the transformation of peacebuilding forces into a mixed military and policing force. This response avoids the common pitfall of trying to challenge new wars by developing more effective military institutions, but her analysis is problematic because it explains new war in terms of identity politics without challenging oppressive patriarchal hierarchies. It is not enough to tell combatants in South Sudan to be more civic-minded and inclusive of other ethnic groups unless the cultural context is transformed in a way that no longer valorises or rewards militancy. Teaching young men in Sierra Leone to engage in civil society groups as a mechanism for voicing dissent, rather than taking up arms, is similarly insufficient. Both approaches to peacebuilding focus almost exclusively on placating young men and creating new bonds between young men and their dominant leaders. This has had a pernicious effect on women in both societies and is likely to create further tension in the future between marginalised men who were excluded from post-war bargaining and the militants. For these reasons critiques of new war must challenge the insecure patriarchal bargains that create conflict, rather than trying to reformulate them.

Peacebuilding efforts have most commonly focused on fostering an understanding of civil nationalism, rebuilding the economy of post-conflict states and reintegrating combatants into mainstream society. Although these programs are motivated by good intentions, they have resulted in the reestablishment of the patriarchal social arrangements which initially caused conflict, and the forging of new patriarchal bargains between ruling men and the rest of society. The existing research on peacebuilding suggests that empowering women has many positive impacts on social stability and development, and in line with these findings the perpetuation of women's inequality in South Sudan and in Sierra Leone has also had a significant negative impact on economic development (USAID, 2012). After the conflicts in South Sudan and Sierra Leone ended, women were quickly returned to 'traditional' women's roles and often were excluded from independent involvement in society. Accordingly the difficulties faced by female populations who had been subjected to widespread rape and abuse have received scant attention (Jok, 2006, p. 61; Maclure & Denov, 2009). The focus on social reconstruction has prioritised the 'high politics' of armed men rather than addressing the pervasive impact of conflict on women and girls (MacKenzie, 2009, p. 243). This does not allow an effective way forward in addressing the root cause of new war.

In both Sierra Leone and South Sudan combatants were primed for the use of brutal violence by constructions of masculinity that existed prior to the start of war. Looking at new war as another facet of militarism and patriarchal violence, rather than a unique and isolated practice, enables scholarship to address the cause of violence instead of focusing on the most visible symptoms. A comprehensive response to gender violence in new war is needed, while existing peacebuilding programs have often focused on placating volatile young men. This has had a harmful impact on both societies studied in this book. By rewarding masculine combatants with wealth and status in the post-war period these programs have merely perpetuated the unstable social arrangements that gave rise to new war in

the first place. This focus is likely only to privatise violence, as the unchanging reality of abuse of women continues behind closed doors, hidden from the gaze of international observers. Alternatively the patriarchal social order may develop a new crisis and create conditions for new war once more, as has occurred in South Sudan (Duriesmith, 2015).

Taking a limited approach to the problem of new war is short-sighted and can best be redressed by adopting a feminist critique of new war, as suggested throughout this book. This needs to be done by challenging the power of dominant men which created the original conditions of conflict and striving to empower women in society.

The shifting social dynamics of new war

New wars are a product of the social milieu in which they developed. The social dynamics that led to conflict developing in South Sudan and Sierra Leone were drastically different from those that created conventional old wars. Mary Kaldor (2012, p. 4) has identified the most important shift in new war as a range of social changes. What Kaldor's book misses is that new war is primarily a shift from a context where a stable and powerful set of dominant men conduct war with other similarly structured societies to contexts where the hegemonic position of dominant men is fundamentally destabilised and undergoing a challenge from below. The key social dynamics that have shifted are the relationships between groups of men in societies where new and old wars occur. To understand the development of new war it is the social dynamics of such relationships that must be understood.

In these two case studies new war was a vehicle through which men were able to again masculine status and empowerment. The paths which new warriors took in these cases are greatly different from that used by the soldiers in old war because the dilemmas faced by them are fundamentally different. In most old wars a comprehensive social system exists to pressure men into fighting for the state and rewards them in status even if they are not rewarded substantially in material terms. New war is a product of its particular social context, just as old war was the result of the particular dynamics that exist between states. The local differences in each of these contexts have meant that the gendered dynamics of conflict reflected substantial differences. In the case of Sierra Leone the traditional paths towards men achieving masculine status were increasingly difficult to achieve due to the failing patrimonial system. In the case of South Sudan the ability of the Nilotic communities to maintain a dominant status was undermined by Khartoum's implementation of *sharia*.

The substantive commonalities that exist across these two case studies can be attributed to the commonalities of masculinity that existed in both contexts. The shift from state-based militaries to irregular non-state combatant groups is one of the definitive aspects of new war (Hoffman & Weiss, 2006, p. 58), a phenomenon which was present in both Sierra Leone and South Sudan. Both conflicts also made extensive use of young, marginalised and impoverished men. The demographics of these groups were not incidental. In Sierra Leone the leaders of the RUF were

able to draw on the existing grievances of young men and boys by offering them a chance to gain access to military power, women and masculine status within an armed group. The failing patrimonial system had taught young boys that men were supposed to be wealthy and powerful, while simultaneously denying them the means of achieving this status. In South Sudan the oppressive practices of the government in Khartoum challenged the dominant status of southern men by placing them in a legally subordinate position. This primed the southern communities for organised violence when a group of relatively marginal men were able to co-opt the grievances of civilian men and create an armed force which established the dominance of militarised masculinity. In both case studies the shift from state-based conflict to irregular combatants was not the result of random chance or divisive identity politics, as Kaldor (2012, p. ix) claimed. Instead it was a direct result of tensions between groups of men over who should occupy the dominant position in the patriarchal social order.

The targeting of civilians and the use of brutal sexual violence are also explained by the social dynamics of masculinity. Kaldor's book suggested that violence against civilians was deployed to destroy populations who embody different ethnic or religious identities from the combatants. In Sierra Leone and in South Sudan, however, this was clearly not the case. Both the SPLA and the RUF used widespread violence against the communities which they claimed to represent, and both groups had a pernicious propensity for using sexual violence against their 'own' community members. This sort of violence cannot be explained by the logic of identity politics: if identity was the primary motivation for conflict, it simply would not make sense for armed groups to brutalise communities who were of the same religious and ethnic markers as soldiers. In both cases the use of brutal sexual violence served to assert the dominance of armed men over civilian populations. The accumulations of women and girls as property and the use of violence against civilian men reflect the consistent actions of groups struggling to obtain status by acquiring the recognised markers that signify masculine hegemony: the possession of women, the accumulation of wealth and the subordination of other men.

These sorts of shifting social dynamics are not unique to the cases studied in this book, and similar gendered transformations can be observed beyond sub-Saharan Africa. Looking to conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Iraq the international community has been quick to note the distinct gendered quality of rhetoric employed by armed groups (Plummer, 2014; Spens, 2014; Baxendale, 2015). Not only have armed groups like Daesh (ISIS) placed gender politics at the heart of their international recruitment drives, offering young men an opportunity to seek status and glory in foreign battlefields, but also the core grievances that they express are framed in gendered terms (Van Leuven et al., 2016). While Daesh has put forward its central goal as the establishment and expansion of a theocratic state, in practice its actions in areas it controls have focused heavily on policing gendered behaviour (Culzac, 2014). If the actions of an organisation such as Daesh are looked at from the gender-blind framework of new war, their preoccupation with policing women's clothing, enforcing purdah and punishing perceived sexual deviance would be accredited to divisive identity politics.

By drawing on the framework employed in this book the gendered dynamics of new war in Syria and Iraq have less to do with identity politics than the social construction of gender within the organisation. To understand the construction of gender in these locations it is necessary to unpack the broader material conditions that underpin them. For Daesh this means not only understanding their theology, position within the local geopolitics or connections to global trends. It also requires a more focused analysis of the gender dynamics that produce new war tactics and the underlying struggles in the gender order that sustain them. This not only means looking to the arrangement of gender orders in Syria or Iraq, but also necessitates understanding the composition of gender hierarchies in states where foreign fighters are traveling from, the gendered composition of intervening forces and the particular gendered dynamics that emerge out of new warrior organisations such as Daesh.

As with the RUF and SPLA, the rhetoric used by Daesh focuses directly on forging a new gender reality for the men involved. As with both cases studied in the book, Daesh offers its members brotherhood, honour and masculine reward for participation in battle, not only to compatriots but also to pious men worldwide. Drawing on disenfranchised youth from around the world Daesh has promised its recruits access to marriage, wealth and the masculine power of military participation (Saul, 2015). Although it is beyond the scope of this book to explore these dynamics in greater depth, a cursory comparison suggests that the form of new war practiced by Daesh has distinct commonalities to the RUF and SPLA, and that a deeper exploration of the gendered composition of the organisation is likely to shed light on its use of new war tactics.

In both instances of new war studied in this book, the actions of armed groups reflected existing arrangements of gender, while being produced out of instabilities in the gender order. In contrast to Western militaries, which have long-standing prohibitions on new war practices, such as child conscription, war rape and looting, no similar traditional prohibition has existed in Sierra Leone or Sudan (Jackson, 2007, p. 270). Both Sudan and Sierra Leone have long histories of using child soldiers for small-scale conflicts, and in Sudan an extensive tradition of using boys to carry arms and as slave soldiers exists in conflicts between northern slavers and southern communities. In Sierra Leone a similar use of child soldiers has existed, in which 'big men' would acquire young boys and men as personal militias to assist in slaving. While the particular performances of masculinity reformed and altered existing gender arrangements, the root of the practices adopted is in what has come before and the instabilities that these performances created. Both cases were precipitated by a breakdown in the existing patriarchal bargains that had lent stability to the existing gender order.

The peacebuilding process in both states was similarly coloured by the gender arrangements that had existed in each state. As the SPLA looked to reforge a patriarchal bargain in South Sudan they did so by reasserting the centrality of armed men in society. Peacebuilding processes were used as an opportunity to expel suspect elements of the armed forces, while rewarding soldiers who had served the SPLA well with official military posts or profitable civilian employment. In

contrast, the Sierra Leonean peacebuilding process worked to disarm young men, who were identified as a risk to society. In exchange attempts were made to placate young men by providing them access to traditionally masculine vocations. This process was structured to reforge a gender hierarchy that placed women back into 'traditional' roles, directing them back into professions such as weaving and reasserting the importance of marriage. In both these cases the peacebuilding efforts were an extension of patriarchal gender politics, which looked to stabilise the gender hierarchy by rewarding 'problem' men and re-feminising women.

Rather than reflecting static continuity, or the novel creations of a globalised world, the emergence of new war is a reflection of the enduring power of gender constructions, and their ability to reformulate in response to instabilities contained within them. They reflect the way in which war and organised violence provide an avenue for change to occur in the gender order. New wars reflect the moments when the stability of the existing hegemonic order is unsettled, and other gendered formations emerge which challenge the previous compositions. Despite the potential for flux, in both case studies the emergence of new war represented the reformulation of patriarchy, rather than the creation of more equal gender relations. Taken more broadly this suggests that the cluster of behaviours which have been characterised as new war appears to represent a particular response to the dismantling or breakdown of existing patriarchal bargains. Although this breakdown may seem likely to have occurred in both Sierra Leone and South Sudan due to the particular gender arrangements that existed, the particular response was far from predetermined.

In both cases, it would appear that women sought to use the social space of war to stake a claim to social status that had previously been denied to them. Though these efforts eventually failed to elicit substantive, long-term change, they demonstrate that the gender relations that form new war are not inevitable. Similarly the failure of protest masculinity in the RUF to create a new gendered reality for its members and the instability built into the SPLA's vision of the militarist state both suggest that changing the underlying conditions of new war is possible. When looking to other conflicts this raises the possibility of unmaking new war by challenging the instabilities, inconsistencies and oppressions that underpin the performance of new war violence.

7 Conclusion
Unmaking new war

This book set out to explore the role of culture and social structure in developing new wars. The basic question asked was, 'What role does gender hierarchy play in the construction of new war?' This question was posted in response to a large body of mainstream scholarship produced by non-feminist authors who have attempted to explain the development of new war in the early 1990s. Despite the existence of this research, there has been little attention paid to new war from a feminist perspective (notable examples of feminist analysis include Peterson [2008], Parpart [2010b] and Chinkin & Kaldor [2013]). The dearth of work from these perspectives has created a gap in the existing literature, which this book has attempted to fill by developing a detailed feminist analysis of new war.

The gendered analysis presented contributes to theoretical and practical understandings of new war by charting the direct relationship between gender constructs, hierarchies, and stereotypes and the practice of organised conflict. The resolution of new war requires sound research, to provide the valid basis for developing peace and security in the Global South. Although the incidence of new war has significantly declined since the original accounts were published during the late 1990s, the rise in prolonged conflicts around the Middle East and neighbouring countries suggests that Kaldor's thesis remains relevant for understanding the landscape of international security today (Kaldor, 2012, pp. 202–221). The continued damaging impact of new war can also be observed in states where active hostilities have ended, including Sierra Leone, where the international community is engaged in a long process of peacebuilding. The relevance of new war theory also applies in states such as South Sudan, where new war continues aggressively despite momentary lapses in organised conflict. New war's continuing significance in the international community makes it a vital necessity to develop well-theorised, practical responses to its root causes. It is with this objective in mind that the book has explored the gendered construction of new war.

Existing literature on new war has emphasised the role of identity politics, economics, resources scarcity, geopolitical shifts or primordial ethnic difference (Brzoska, 2004; Munkler, 2005; Kaldor, 2012, pp. 2–3). In this book each of these factors has been explored and finally rejected as the primary cause of new war, because they each were unable to account for the development of new war tactics in case studies. Although this book has rejected some conclusions from this earlier

research, it has provided many valuable insights into the definition and practice of new war. This earlier scholarship illuminated the important role of international markets, globalisation and foreign governments in fostering new war. This book has endeavoured to complement existing work while challenging previously held core beliefs which characterised earlier research.

The most glaring issue with previous scholarship on new war was that it did not satisfactorily explain combatants' adoption of new war tactics over other forms of armed resistance. This deficiency is significant because the brutal tactics adopted in new war are themselves the major factor in the trauma caused by new war. This book has sought to address this conceptual blind spot by exploring the significance of patriarchal bargaining and the social construction of masculinity as causal factors in the construction of new war. A detailed investigation of two cases of new war, Sierra Leone and South Sudan, has established that fracturing patriarchal bargains between groups of men were an essential factor in constructing the practice of new war. In both cases, new war was used by a subordinate group to challenge the authority of dominant men after the breakdown of an existing patriarchal bargain. By exploring masculinity, this book has argued that new war in Sierra Leone and South Sudan is a gendered construct which arises in response to the crisis tendencies that exist in some patriarchal societies.

The book has ultimately arrived at three distinct conclusions about the nature of new war. First it has suggested that the violent actions of combatants which define a conflict as a new war are socially constructed by masculinity. Second it has argued that the existing constructions of gender in society were essential for the recruitment and socialisation of combatants. Finally it has concluded that the basic motivating factor behind new war is the breakdown of patriarchal bargains between groups of men.

This book has challenged the existing explanations of violence in new war and suggested a new gendered account. The use of brutal violence against civilian populations in Sierra Leone and South Sudan is often emphasised in the international relations literature on new war (Melander et al., 2009). Despite substantial attention being paid to extreme violence by international relations scholars, many authors have no causal account for why this violence develops and when causal accounts do exist they are often thin or imprecise. The initial new war thesis, as articulated by Kaldor (2012), conceptualised new war as a direct result of divisive identity politics formed around religious and ethnic attachments. Kaldor's approach suggested that warriors chose to use brutal violence as a mechanism for removing those with a different identity from themselves from a contested political space. This book has explored this claim and it has found that identity politics did not explain the manifestation of new war violence in either case study. Instead, by looking at the development of new war violence in Sierra Leone, it became apparent that the development of brutal violence was made possible through the pre-existing culture of patriarchal violence and the social dynamics between older and younger men.

In contrast to the account put forward by Kaldor and other scholars, such as Peter Hoffman, who suggest that extreme violence develops in new war in response to

economic underdevelopment or greed, this book has shown that the inclusion of a gendered component is needed. The importance of economic motivations can be seen in both South Sudan and Sierra Leone, and the notion of economic motivations for new war was carefully considered. In Sierra Leone deeply entrenched economic grievances were a key source of tension between the combatants of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) and those benefiting from the existing patrimonial system (Murphy, 2003). Similarly in South Sudan the tensions over oil wealth and arable land were significant economic grievances between all parties (Johnson & Arbertman-Rabinowitz, 2008). Mineral resources were a significant element of conflict in both cases (Hoffman, 2006). These case studies did suggest that economic grievances were significant in motivating combatants without this being able to fully account for the development of new war violence.

Despite the existing tensions over wealth, these did not explain the development of distinctive attributes of new war, such as new warriors' prevalent use of sexual violence or combatants' willingness to abandon economic gain to avoid appearing weak in front of their peers. The inability of economic accounts to provide a comprehensive explanation of why new war developed, as opposed to other forms of armed resistance, meant that economic accounts were rejected as the sole factor necessary for understanding the actions of new warriors. This research has suggested instead that economic accounts provide an incomplete framework for understanding new war: they can clarify some broad trends, but do not provide in-depth explanations for why disagreements developed into new wars rather than other forms of armed conflict, or why particular tactics were implemented. Instead, a more complete account is provided by exploring gender as well as economic factors.

This book has identified pre-existing notions of masculinity which condoned gendered violence and oppression as the core cause of the widespread use of sexual violence, abduction, pillage and torture in Sierra Leone and South Sudan (Bangura, 2000; Hutchinson, 2000; Murphy, 2003). By drawing on sociological, anthropological and historical material it was possible to chart direct connections between the wartime practices of the SPLA and RUF and pre-existing civilian practices of violence in the private sphere. While most of the existing literature has focused on the novelty or extremity of the violence of new war, this research has indicated that the use of brutal violence was more a development from pre-existing patriarchal violence than a distinct schism with previous practices. This analysis challenges the dominant understanding of new war, which has emphasised the ways in which it is a unique practice. Although new war is distinct from other manifestations of war, it remains a product of its social context and is constructed by pre-war patriarchal violence.

The second core finding of this book is that socialisation of new warriors in Sierra Leone and South Sudan relied on pre-existing notions of masculinity. In both cases this research found that armed groups were successful in transforming young men into motivated combatants by appealing to prior social understandings of masculinity that encouraged violence, emotional detachment, group solidarity, aggressive heterosexuality and risk-taking. The strong relationship between

civilian masculinity and the construction of masculinity fostered within armed groups is not surprising considering the work already done on militarised masculinity in Western states (Goldstein, 2001; Whitworth, 2004; Barry, 2010; Henry & Kirby, 2012). The fact that men were already socialised to use violence, suppress displays of weakness and remain loyal to homosocial groups before being recruited by armed groups primed them for training as combatants (Enloe, 2000; Agostino, 2003, p. 109; Johnson, 2009, pp. 575–596).

In Sierra Leone and South Sudan, the association of masculinity with wealth, power, possession of numerous sexual partners and martial prowess was essential in the development of new war. Had different constructions of masculinity existed prior to conflict it seems unlikely that the SPLA and the RUF would have been nearly as successful in developing civilians into new warriors. Although combatants may have transformed into soldiers after conscription, as they do worldwide, it would have been much more difficult to normalise the use of pillage, rape and maiming within their ranks without masculinity preparing combatants for those practices.

Not only was masculinity essential in socialising soldiers to use new war, but also it was important in creating the crises that led to new war developing. Both case studies exhibited a breakdown in the relationships between dominant and subordinate groups of men prior to the outbreak of war. In Sierra Leone and South Sudan, tenuous patriarchal bargains had existed between a ruling group, the wealthy patricians in Sierra Leone and the northern government in Sudan, and a subordinated group of men, impoverished youths in Sierra Leone and marginalised southerners in Sudan. In both cases these arrangements broke down as subordinate groups of men were increasingly unable to attain full masculine status as it was locally understood. This is the third key finding of this book: that new war was developed in response to homosocial power struggles as a mechanism for the subordinate men to challenge the authority of the existing hegemons.

New war has been characterised in this book as an extreme mechanism used to challenge the dominance of ruling men. Challenging the existing literature on new war, this book suggests that the most extreme facets of new war have resulted directly from the ordinary gender arrangements that define men's lives. Instead of emphasising the novelty of new war, this research indicates that it develops out of established social structures that exist in some unstable patriarchal societies. Exploring masculinity has ultimately led this research to challenge many of the core claims of the new war thesis. It destabilises the causal accounts proposed by new war theory and suggests a new approach anchored in feminist analysis of patriarchy. New wars are not created in a cultural vacuum. Challenging the structural roots of new wars is possible only by taking a critical stance on the cultural contexts in which they develop. They are forged by the cultural conditions that existed before war has begun and in many instances continue long after conflict has officially ended. The first step towards creating a comprehensive response to new war is to challenge the oppressive hierarchies that create the original conditions for conflict, rather than trying to rearrange a group's position within the hierarchy to avert explosive conflict.

Rethinking the core cause of new war in this book also leads one to question the current practical responses developed to new war that have been adopted by the international community. In both cases studied, the deterioration of patriarchal bargains between the dominant groups and subordinated men was identified as the root cause of new war. This book has challenged existing approaches to peacemaking by suggesting that an alternative response is to encourage more egalitarian social arrangements through challenging masculinity, empowering women and undercutting the power of militarism. The first step towards unmaking new war is to challenge the existing patriarchal bargains between men, not reinforce them by relocating ex-combatants into the existing patriarchal structures. Looking beyond the two cases studied, this research provides a serious challenge to the current responses to armed conflict that focus on building stability. The current response to conflict in the Middle East, which has focused on either targeting military capacity or challenging narratives of religious radicalisation, may be inadequate at responding to the underlying gendered structures that fuel new war. Although this research has indicated potential mechanisms for challenging new war in the peacebuilding process, it has not been within its scope to develop these concepts fully. Further research is needed to explore mechanisms for unmaking the patriarchal bargains between dominant and subordinate men and creating more stable social arrangements.

Dealing with the root cause of new wars will be successful only if the oppressive and unstable patriarchal social structures that fuel violent conflict are challenged and reformed. This research has found that new war in Sierra Leone and South Sudan was an explosive response to the tension existing between two competing groups of men. These tensions arose due to the failing patriarchal bargains that promised men access to women, power, wealth and status in exchange for their cooperation with the ruling class of men. When these bargains began to break down, the subordinated men responded. By the time new war developed in Sierra Leone and South Sudan, the response became violent and chaotic. The development of new war, rather than other forms of conflict, in both case studies was the struggle between dominant and subordinate men over the hegemonic position. The central role of gender in these power struggles does not negate the significance of other causal factors – such as economic tensions and underdevelopment – but rather understanding the gendered construction of war helps to inform and define the use of new war, including the contribution of other factors.

By looking at new war as another facet of militarism and patriarchal violence, rather than a unique and isolated practice, feminist scholarship can address the root cause of violence, instead of merely focusing on the most visible symptoms. Although a comprehensive response to gender violence in new war is needed, existing peacebuilding programs have often focused on placating volatile young men, and this has had a disastrous impact on both societies studied in this book. By rewarding male combatants with wealth and status in the post-war period these programs have tended to reproduce the unstable social arrangements that gave rise to new war. Addressing the symptoms of new war without challenging patriarchal social arrangements that gave rise to conflict is likely to result in forms of violence present in new war continuing behind the closed doors of the private sphere, away

from the attention of international observers, while remaining present in women's lives. Alternatively the patriarchal social order may develop a new crisis and create the conditions for new war once more.

More attention needs to be paid to the ways in which hegemony can fail, and masculinities can be unmade. This book has shown that during war there is a high potential for change in the gender order, with old hierarchies being altered, reformed and possibly even dismantled. Both cases represent examples when hegemonic masculinity failed. Although the outcome of these failures was disastrous for those involved, Claire Duncanson's (2015) work on dismantling hegemonic gender relations has suggested that exactly these kinds of failures in hegemonic masculinity open the possibility for positive change to be implemented. Both of these cases were examples where hegemonic masculinities were tested, and failed to retain their dominance, resulting in organised violence from those excluded or subordinated within the existing gender orders. It is equally possible that in these instances other alternatives could have arisen or that with the right impetus relationships of oppression could have been weakened due to these crises. This approach may prove helpful in trying to respond to the outbreak in new war that has been seen across the Middle East in recent years.

Although this book has attempted to challenge the dominant understandings of new war, and suggested a new approach grounded in feminist politics, it has not endeavoured to be an all-inclusive study of gender and new war. In-depth fieldwork could enrich the findings presented in this project and provide greater depth of understanding. In turn, further fieldwork would also provide opportunities to better understand peacebuilding in states that have been subjected to new war. This book has also focused primarily on the role of masculinities in constructing new war. This is not to suggest that understanding femininity or the experiences of women is any less significant. Rather this book has focused on the construction of new war as a form of masculine violence and due to this it has directed its attention to the actions and socialisation of male combatants. Although the findings in this book stand on their own, there is further room to explore the other avenues of inquiry and to provide greater depth of analysis.

New war is a practice constructed by patriarchal social structures. While there are many distinctive facets of the two conflicts studied in this book, the root cause of new war was the breakdown of social arrangements that are common to many societies. The implosion of patriarchal bargains in Sierra Leone and South Sudan sparked armed conflicts which transformed into new wars during the early 1990s. Tensions, disagreements and struggles exist in all patriarchal social orders, but what was distinct in Sierra Leone and South Sudan was the absolute failure of dominant men in placating large groups of young men. The transformation of simmering grievances into new war occurred due to the existing culture of violence that had existed in each state. Had different structural pressures or cultural understandings existed in each state, it seems unlikely that the conflicts in South Sudan and Sierra Leone would have developed into new wars during the 1990s. Accordingly new war should be understood as a product of fracturing patriarchal bargains and the culture of violent masculinity.

Bibliography

Abdullah, I., 1998. Bush Path to Destruction: The Origin and Character of the Revolutionary United Front/Sierra Leone. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 36(2), pp. 203–235.

Abdullah, I., 2002. Youth Culture and Rebellion: Understanding Sierra Leone's Wasted Decade. *Critical Arts*, 16(2), pp. 19–37.

Abdullah, I., 2005. 'I Am a Rebel': Youth, Culture & Violence in Sierra Leone. In: A. Honwana & F. D. Boeck, eds. *Makers & Breakers: Children & Youth in Postcolonial Africa.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, pp. 172–187.

Agostino, K., 1999. The Making of Warriors: Men, Identity, and Military Culture. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*, 3(2), pp. 58–59.

Agostino, K., 2003. Men, Identity, and Military Culture. In: M. Donaldson & S. Tomsen, eds. *Male Trouble: Looking at Australian Masculinities.* North Melbourne: Pluto Press, pp. 108–131.

Adler, A., 1956. *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler*. New York: Basic Books.

Ali, N. M., 2011. *Gender and Statebuilding in South Sudan.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Baaz, M. & Stern, M., 2009. Why Do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC). *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(2), pp. 495–518.

Bangura, Y., 2000. The Political and Cultural Dynamics of the Sierra Leone War: A Critique of Paul Richards. In: I. Abdullah, ed. *Between Democracy and Terror: The Sierra Leone's Civil War.* Dakar, Senegal: Codesria, pp. 13–39.

Barnes, K., Albrecht, P. & Olson, M., 2007. *Addressing Gender-Based Violence in Sierra Leone: Mapping Challenges, Responses and Future Entry Points.* London: International Alert.

Barrett, F. J., 1996. The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3), pp. 129–142.

Barry, K., 2010. *Unmaking War, Remaking Men: How Empathy Can Reshape Our Politics, Our Soldiers and Ourselves.* Melbourne: Spinifex Press.

Baxendale, R., 2015. ISIS 'Offers Fix' for Wounded Masculine Pride. *The Australian*, 15 December.

Berdal, M., 2003. How 'New' Are 'New Wars'? Global Economic Change and the Study of Civil War. *Global Governance*, 9(4), pp. 477–502.

Beynon, J., 2002. *Masculinities and Culture.* Buckingham: Open University.

Black, R., 2010. *Sexual Violence, Process Theories of Negotiations & the Evolution of Human Security.* [Online]. Available at: www.peacewomen.org/portal_resources_resource.php?id=975. [Accessed 30 05 11].

Bourke, J., 1996. *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain, and the Great War.* London: Reaktion Books.

Bouta, T., 2004. *Gender, Conflict, and Development.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Bryson, V., 1999. Patriarchy: A Concept Too Useful to Lose? *Contemporary Politics*, 5(4), pp. 311–324.

Brzoska, M., 2004. 'New Wars' Discourse in Germany. *Journal of Peace Research*, 41(1), pp. 107–117.

Buzan, B. & Hansen, L., 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, G., 2002. *Blood Diamonds: Tracing the Deadly Path of the World's Most Precious Stones.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Castillejo, C., 2009. *Women's Political Participation and Influence in Sierra Leone.* Brussels: Fundación Para Las Relaciones Internacionales Y El Dialogo Exterior.

Chinkin, C. & Kaldor, M., 2013. Gender and New Wars. *Journal of International Affairs*, 67(1), pp. 167–187.

Christian Aid, 2001. *The Scotched Earth: Oil and War in Sudan.* London: Christian Aid.

Clausewitz, C. v., 1940. *On War.* London: Trench Publications.

Cockburn, C., 2004. The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on War and Peace. In: W. Giles & J. Hyndman, eds. *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 24–44.

Cockburn, C., 2010. Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War: A Feminist Standpoint. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 12(2), pp. 139–157.

Cohn, C., 1987. Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defence Intellectuals. *Signs*, 12(4), pp. 687–718.

Connell, R., 1987. *Gender & Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R., 1989. Masculinity, Violence and War. In: M. Kimmel & M. Messner, eds. *Men's Lives.* New York: Macmillan, pp. 194–200.

Connell, R., 2000. *The Men and the Boys.* St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R., 2005. *Masculinities.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. & Messerschmidt, J. W., 2005. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender and Society*, 19(6), pp. 829–859.

Coulter, C., 2008. Female Fights in Sierra Leone War: Challenging the Assumptions? *Feminist Review*, 88(1), pp. 54–73.

Coulter, C., 2009. *Bush Wives and Girl Soldiers: Women's Lives Through War and Peace in Sierra Leone.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Creveld, M. v., 1991. *The Transformation of War: The Most Radical Reinterpretation of Armed Conflict since Clausewitz.* New York: Free Press.

Creveld, M. v., 2005. Power in War. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 7(1), pp. 1–8.

Culzac, N., 2014. *The Al-Khansaa Brigade Reportedly Upholds the Strict Religious Rules Implemented by the Islamic State (Isis) in the City of Raqqa.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/isis-british-women-running-sharia-police-unit-for-islamic-state-in-syria-9717510.html. [Accessed 20 12 2014].

D'Awol, A. M., 2011. 'Sibu ana, sibu ana' (Leave Me, Leave Me): Survivors of Sexual Violence in South Sudan. In: F. Bubenzer & O. Stern, eds. *Hope, Pain & Patience: The Lives of Women in South Sudan.* Cape Town: Sunnyside, pp. 53–78.

Day, L., 2012. *Gender and Power in Sierra Leone: Women Chiefs of the Last Two Centuries.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Deng, F. M., 1995. *War of Visions: Conflict of Identities in the Sudan.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Denny, L., 2014. *Justice and Security Reform: Development Agencies and Informal Institutions in Sierra Leone.* New York: Routledge.

Denov, M., 2010. *Child Soldiers: Sierra Leone's Revolutionary United Front.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denov, M. & Maclure, R., 2006a. Engaging the Voices of Girls in the Aftermath of Sierra Leone's Conflict: Experiences and Perspectives in a Culture of Violence. *Canadian Anthropology*, 48(1), pp. 73–83.

Denov, M. & Maclure, R., 2006b. 'I Didn't Want to Die So I Joined Them': Structuration and the Process of Becoming Boy Soldiers in Sierra Leone. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 18(1), pp. 119–135.

Dolan, C., 2011. Militarised, Religious and Neo-Colonial: The Triple Bind Confronting Men in Contemporary Uganda. In: A. Cornwall, J. Edstrom & A. Greig, eds. *Men and Development: Politicising Masculinities.* London: Zed Books, pp. 126–138.

Duffield, M., 2001. *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security.* London: Zed Books.

Duncanson, C., 2015. Hegemonic Masculinity and the Possibility of Change in Gender Relations. *Men & Masculinities*, 18(2), pp. 231–248.

Duriesmith, D., 2014. Is Manhood a Causal Factor in the Shifting Nature of War? The Case of Sierra Leone's Revolutionary United Front. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 16(2), pp. 236–254.

Duriesmith, D., 2015. Building Peace with Warlords in South Sudan: A Gendered Structure. In: J. I. Lahai & T. Lyons, eds. *African Frontiers.* London: Ashgate, pp. 157–166.

Dworkin, A., 1974. *Women Hating: A Radical Look at Sexuality.* New York: Dutton.

Elshtain, J. B., 1987. *Women and War.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Enloe, C., 1997. Forward. In: L. Weinstein & C. C. White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Enloe, C., 2000a. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Relations.* 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Enloe, C., 2000b. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Farneti, R., 2013. Bipolarity Redux: The Mimetic Context of the 'New Wars'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26(1), pp. 181–202.

Ferme, M. C., 2001. *The Underneath of Things: Violence, History and the Everyday in Sierra Leone.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Flood, M., 2002. Between Men and Masculinity: An Assessment of the Term 'Masculinity' in Recent Scholarship on Men. In: S. Pearce & V. Muller, eds. *Manning the Next Millennium: Studies in Masculinities.* Bentley, WA: Black Swan Press, pp. 203–213.

Francke, L. B., 1997. *Ground Zero: The Gender Wars in the Military.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gberie, L., 2005. *A Dirty War in West Africa: The RUF and the Destruction of Sierra Leone.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gentry, C. & Sjoberg, L., 2015. *Beyond Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Thinking about Women's Violence in Global Politics.* 2nd ed. London: Zed Books.

Goldstein, J. S., 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstein, J. S., 2011. *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide.* New York: Dutton Adult.

Gross, C., Kudelko, K. & Purvis, C., 2011. *Gender-Based Violence in Southern Sudan: Justice for Women Long Overdue.* New Haven, CT: Allard K. Lowenstein International Human Rights Clinic at Yale Law School.

Halberstam, J., 1998. *Female Masculinity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hale, S., 1996. *Gender Politics in Sudan: Islamism, Socialism, and the State.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hatcher, J., 2014. *South Sudan Unrest Exacerbated By Conflict Among Cattle Herders.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2014/mar/11/south-sudan-conflict-over-cows. [Accessed 07 01 2016].

Haywood, C. & Mac an Ghaill, M., 2003. *Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research and Social Practice.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hearn, J., 2004. From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men. *Feminist Theory*, 5(1), pp. 49–72.

Hearn, J., 2014. Men, Masculinities and the Material(-)Discursive. *NORMA: The Nordic Journal*, 9(1), pp. 5–17.

Hearn, J. & Morgan, D., 1990. Men, Masculinities and Social Theory. In: J. Hearn & D. Morgan, eds. *The Critique of Men*. London: Unwin Hyman, pp. 203–205.

Henry, M. & Kirby, P., 2012. Rethinking Masculinity and Practices of Violence in Conflict Settings. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 14(4), pp. 445–449.

Herzog, H. & Yahia-Younis, T., 2007. Men's Bargaining with Patriarchy: The Case of Primaries with Hamulas in Palestine Arab Communities in Israel. *Gender and Society*, 21(4), pp. 579–602.

Higate, P., 2012a. 'Cowboys and Professionals': The Politics of Identity Work in the Private and Military Security Company. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40(2), pp. 321–341.

Higate, P., 2012b. Drinking Vodka from the 'Butt Crack': Men, Masculinity and Fratiarchy in the Private Militarized Security Company. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 14(1), pp. 450–469.

Hinojosa, R., 2010. Doing Hegemony: Military, Men and Constructing a Hegemonic Masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 18(2), pp. 179–194.

Hoffman, D., 2004. Hunter Militias and the International Human Rights Discourse in Sierra Leone and Beyond. *Africa Today*, 50(4), pp. 73–95.

Hoffman, D., 2005. Violent Events as Narrative Blocs: The Disarmament at Bo, Sierra Leone. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 78(2), pp. 328–353.

Hoffman, D., 2006. Disagreement: Dissent Politics and the War in Sierra Leone. *Africa Today*, 52(3), pp. 3–22.

Hoffman, P. J. & Weiss, T., 2006. *Sword & Salve: Confronting New Wars and Humanitarian Crisis.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Holt, P. & Daly, M., 2000. *A History of the Sudan: From the Coming of Islam to the Present Day.* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Hooper, C., 2001. *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Human Rights Watch, 1994a. *Civilian Devastation: Abuses By All Parties in the War in South Sudan.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Human Rights Watch, 1994b. *The Lost Boys: Child Soldiers and Unaccompanied Boys in Southern Sudan.* New York: Africa Human Rights Watch Children's Rights Project.

Human Rights Watch, 1999. *Famine in Sudan, 1998: The Human Rights Causes.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Human Rights Watch, 2003. *'We'll Kill You if You Cry' Sexual Violence in the Sierra Leone Conflict.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Hutchings, K., 2008. Making Sense of Masculinity and War. *Men and Masculinities*, 10(4), pp. 389–404.

Hutchinson, S. E., 2000. Nuer Ethnicity Militarized. *Anthropology Today*, 16(3), pp. 6–13.

Hutchinson, S. E., 2001. A Curse from God? Religious and Political Dimensions of the Post-1991 Rise of Ethnic Violence in South Sudan. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 39(2), pp. 307–331.

Hutchinson, S. E. & Jok, J. M., 2002. Gender Violence and the Militarisation of Ethnicity: A Case Study from South Sudan. In: R. Werbner, ed. *Postcolonial Subjectivities in Africa.* London: Zed Books, pp. 84–108.

Idris, A. H., 1991. Conflict and Politics of Identity in Sudan, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005, Africa Watch, Sudan: Destroying Ethnic Identity the Secret War Against the Nuba. *News from Africa Watch*, 3(15), pp. 1–12.

International Eminent Persons Group, 2002. *Slavery, Abduction and Forced Servitude in Sudan.* Khartoum: International Eminent Persons Group.

Jackson, M., 2004. *In Sierra Leone.* London: Duke University Press.

Jackson, P., 2007. Are Africa's Wars Part of a Fourth Generation of Warfare? *Contemporary Security Policy*, 28(2), pp. 267–285.

Jarvis, C. S., 2004. *The Male Body at War: American Masculinity during World War II.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Johnson, B., 2009. A Few Good Boys: Masculinity at a Military-Style Charter School. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(5), pp. 575–596.

Johnson, K. & Arbertman-Rabinowitz, M., 2008. Power Distribution and Oil in the Sudan: Will the Comprehensive Peace Agreement Turn the Oil Curse into a Blessing? *International Interactions*, 3(4), pp. 382–401.

Jok, J. M., 1999. Militarisation and Gender Violence in South Sudan. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 34(4), pp. 194–212.

Jok, J. M., 2001. *War and Slavery in Sudan.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jok, J. M., 2006. Violence and Resilience: Women, War and the Realities of Everyday Life in Sudan. *The Ahfad Journal*, 23(2), pp. 58–80.

Jok, J. M., 2007. *Sudan: Race, Religion, and Violence.* Oxford: Oneworld.

Jok, J. M. & Hutchinson, S. E., 1999. Sudan's Prolonged Second Civil War and the Militarization of Nuer and Dinka Ethnic Identities. *African Studies Review*, 42(2), pp. 125–145.

Jung, D., 2003. *Shadow Globalization: Ethnic Conflicts and New Wars: A Political Economy of Intra-State War.* London: Routledge.

Kaldor, M., 2012. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era.* 3rd ed. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kaldor, M., 2013. In Defence of New Wars. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, 2(1), 1–16.

Kaldor, M. & Beebe, S., 2010. *The Ultimate Weapon is No Weapon: Human Security and the New Rules of War and Peace.* New York: PublicAffairs.

Kalyvas, S. N., 2001. 'New' and 'Old' Civil Wars: A Valid Distinction? *World Politics*, 54(1), pp. 99–118.

Kandiyoti, D., 1988. Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society*, 2(3), pp. 274–290.

Kimmel, M., 1994. Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity. In: M. Kaufman & H. Brod, eds. *Research on Men and Masculinities Series: Theorizing Masculinities.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 119–142.

Kimmel, M., 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History.* New York: Free Press.

Kirby, P., 2012. How is Rape a Weapon of War? Feminist International Relations, Modes of Critical Explanation and the Study of Wartime Sexual Violence. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(4), pp. 797–821.

Leach, M., 1994. *Rainforest Relations: Gender and Resources Use Among the Mende of Gola, Sierra Leone.* London: Edinburgh University Press.

Lesch, A. M., 1998. *The Sudan: Contested National Identities.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Lyons, T., 2004. *Guns and Guerrilla Girls: Women in the Zimbabwean Liberation Struggle.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

MacKenzie, M., 2009. Securitization and Desecuritization: Female Soldiers and Reconstruction of Women in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone. *Security Studies*, 18(1), pp. 241–261.

MacKenzie, M., 2012. *Female Soldiers in Sierra Leone: Sex, Security and Post-Conflict Development.* New York: New York University Press.

Maclure, R. & Denov, M., 2009. Reconstruction Versus Transformation: Post-War Education and the Struggle for Gender Equity in Sierra Leone. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(1), pp. 612–620.

Malešević, S., 2008. The Sociology of New Wars? Assessing the Causes of Objectives of Contemporary Violent Conflicts. *International Political Sociology*, 2(2), pp. 97–112.

Malešević, S., 2014. Is War Becoming Obsolete? A Sociological Analysis. *The Sociological Review*, 62(2), pp. 65–86.

Mampilly, Z. C., 2011. *Rebel Rulers: Insurgent Governance and Civilian Life during War.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Mckay, S. & Mazurana, D., 2004. *Where Are the Girls? Girls in Fighting Force in Northern Uganda, Sierra Leone and Mozambique: Their Lives during and After War.* Montreal: International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development.

McKenzie, A., 2011. 'New Wars' Fought 'Amongst the People': 'Transformed' By Old Realities? *Defence Studies*, 11(4), pp. 569–593.

Meger, S., 2011. Rape in Contemporary Warfare: The Role of Globalization in Wartime Sexual Violence. *African Conflict and Peacebuilding Review*, 1(1), pp. 100–132.

Melander, E., Oberg, M. & Hall, J., 2009. Are 'New Wars' More Atrocious? Battle Severity, Civilians Killed and Forced Migration Before and After the End of the Cold War. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15(3), pp. 505–536.

Mello, P. A., 2010. In Search of New Wars: The Debate About a Transformation of War. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(2), pp. 279–309.

Miedzian, M., 1991. *Boys Will Be Boys: Breaking the Link Between Masculinity and Violence.* New York: Doubleday.

Miller, K. E., 2008. Wired: Energy Drinks, Jock Identity, Masculine Norms, and Risk-Taking. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(5), pp. 481–489.

Moon, K. H., 1997. *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Mooney, J., 2000. *Gender, Violence, and the Social Order.* New York: St Martin's Press.

Moran, M., 1995. Warriors or Soldiers? Masculinity and Ritual Transvestism in the Liberian Civil War. In: C. R. Sutton, ed. *Feminism, Nationalism, and Militarism.* New York: Association for Feminist Anthropology/American Anthropology Association, pp. 73–87.

Mundy, J., 2011. Deconstructing Civil Wars: Beyond the New Wars Debate. *Security Dialogue*, 42(3), pp. 279–295.

Munkler, H., 2005. *The New Wars.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Murphy, W. P., 2003. Military Patrimonialism and Child Soldier Clientism in the Liberian and Sierra Leonean Civil Wars. *African Studies Review*, 46(2), pp. 61–87.

Newman, E., 2004. The 'New Wars' Debate': A Historical Perspective Is Needed. *Security Dialogue*, 35(2), pp. 173–189.

Nichols, R., 2011. *DDR in South Sudan: Too Little, Too Late?* Geneva: Small Arms Survey, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.

Oliveira, G. C., 2013. 'New Wars' at Sea: A Critical Transformative Approach to the Political Economy of Somali Piracy. *Security Dialogue*, 44(3), pp. 3–18.

Pain, R., 2015. Intimate War. *Political Geography*, 44(1), pp. 64–73.

Park, A.S.J., 2006. Other Inhumane Acts': Forced Marriage, Girl Soldiers and the Special Court of Sierra Leone. *Social & Legal Studies*, 15(3), pp. 315–337.

Parpart, J. L., 2010a. Masculinity, Gender and New Wars. *Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 5(2), pp. 85–99.

Parpart, J. L., 2010b. Masculinity, Poverty and the 'New Wars'. In: S. Chant, ed. *The International Handbook of Gender and Poverty.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 674–680.

Parpart, J., 2015. Militarized Masculinities, Heroes and Gender Inequality during and After the Nationalist Struggle in Zimbabwe. *NORMA: International Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 10(3–4), pp. 312–325.

Parpart, J. & Zalewski, M., 2008. Introduction: Rethinking the Man Question. In: J. Parpart & M. Zalewski, eds. *Rethinking the Man Question.* New York: Zed Books, pp. 1–23.

Pateman, C., 1988. *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pease, B., 2010. *Undoing Privilege: Unearned Advantage in a Divided World.* London: Zed.

Peters, K. & Richards, P., 1998. 'Why We Fight': Voices of Youth Combatants in Sierra Leone. *Africa*, 68(2), pp. 183–210.

Peterson, S. V., 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy.* New York: Routledge.

Peterson, V. S., 1992. *Gendered State: Feminist (Re)visions of International Relations Theory.* London: Lynne Rienner.

Peterson, V. S., 2008. 'New Wars' and Gendered Economies. *Feminist Review*, 88(1), pp. 7–20.

Petterson, D., 2003. *Inside Sudan: Political Islam, Conflict, and Catastrophe.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Pettman, J. J., 1996. *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics.* New York: Routledge.

Pham, J. P., 2006. *The Sierra Leonean Tragedy: History and Global Dimensions.* Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.

Physicians for Human Rights, 2002. *War-Related Sexual Violence in Sierra Leone: A Population-Based Assessment.* Boston, MA: Physicians for Human Rights.

Plummer, D., 1999. *One of the Boys: Masculinity, Homophobia, and Modern Manhood.* New York: Harrington Park Press.

Plummer, D., 2014. Masculinity and Terror: The Missing Conversation. *The Conversation*, 9 10.

Reyna, S., 2009. Taking Place: 'New Wars' Versus Global Wars. *Social Anthropology*, 17(3), pp. 291–317.

Ricardo, C. & Barker, G., 2005. *Young Men and the Construction of Masculinity in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for HIV/AIDS, Conflict and Violence.* Washington: The World Bank, Societal Development Papers: Conflict Prevention & Reconstruction, Paper No. 26.

Richards, P., 1996. *Fighting for the Rainforest: War, Youth & Resources in Sierra Leone.* London: Heinemann.

Richards, P., 2004. New War: An Ethnographic Approach. In: P. Richards, ed. *No Peace, No War: The Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflicts.* Oxford: Ohio University Press, pp. 1–21.

Richards, P., 2005. To Fight or to Farm: Agrarian Dimensions of the Mano River Conflicts (Liberia and Sierra Leone). *African Affairs*, 104(417), pp. 571–590.

Richards, P., 2006. Young Men and Gender in War and Postwar Reconstruction: Some Comparative Findings from Liberia and Sierra Leone. In: I. Bannon & M. C. Correia, eds. *The Other Half of Gender: Men's Issues in Development.* Washington, DC: The World Bank, pp. 159–194.

Sabo, D., 1989. Pigskin, Patriarchy and Pain. In: M. Kimmel & M. Messner, eds. *Men's Lives.* New York: Macmillan Press, pp. 156–175.

Saul, H., 2015. The Most Dangerous ISIS Propaganda Yet? Jihadi Brides with M5s, Fighters Relaxing and Children Playing Used to Present Caliphate as a Utopia. *The Independent*, 20 03.

Schäfer, H., 2004. The Janus Face of Religion: On the Religious Factor in 'New Wars'. *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions*, 51(1), pp. 407–431.

Schultz, R., 2006. *Insurgents, Terrorists, and Militias: The Warriors of Contemporary Combat.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Shepherd, L. J., 2013. The State of Feminist Security Studies: Continuing the Conversation. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14(4), pp. 436–439.

Shepler, S., 2010. Are 'Child Soldiers' in Sierra Leone a New Phenomenon? In: J. Knorr & W. T. Filho, eds. *The Powerful Presence of the Past: Integration and Conflict Along the Upper Guinea Coast.* Danvers, MA: Brill, pp. 297–322.

Singer, P., 2004. *Children at War.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Sjoberg, L., 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict: Towards a Feminist Theory of War.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Small Arms Survey, 2008. *No Standing, Few Prospects: How Peace Is Failing South Sudanese Female Combatants and WAAFG.* Geneva: Human Security Baseline Assessment.

Sommers, M. & Schwartz, S., 2011. *Dowry and Division: Youth and State Building in South Sudan.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Spens, C., 2014. Shock and Awe: Performativity, Machismo and ISIS. *E-International Relations*, 02 11.

Stern, M. & Baaz, M. E., 2013. *Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War? Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and Beyond.* New York: Zed Books.

Stern, O., 2011. This Is How Marriage Happens Sometimes: Women and Marriage in South Sudan. In: O. Stern & F. Bubenzer, eds. *Hope, Pain & Patience: The Lives of Women in South Sudan.* Cape Town: Sunnyside, pp. 1–24.

Stern, O. & Bubenzer, F., 2011. Introduction. In: O. Stern & F. Bubenzer, eds. *Hope, Pain & Patience: The Lives of Women in South Sudan.* Sunnyside: Fanele, pp. xii–xxvii.

Stone, L., 2011a. *Failures and Opportunities: Rethinking DDR in South Sudan.* Geneva: Small Arms Survey.

Stone, L., 2011b. 'We Were All Soldiers': Female Combatants in South Sudan's Civil War. In: O. Stern & F. Bubenzer, eds. *Hope, Pain & Patience: The Lives of Women in South Sudan.* Cape Town: Sunnyside, pp. 25–52.

Switzer, J., 2002. *Oil and Violence in Sudan.* Winnipeg: African Centre for Technology Studies.

Terry, J., 2015. *Why ISIS Isn't Medieval.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/history/2015/02/isis_isn_t_medieval_its_revisionist_history_only_claims_to_be_rooted_in.html. [Accessed 20 04 2016].

Tickner, J. A., 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security.* New York: Columbia University Press.

True, J., 2012. *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004a. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone Report Volume 2.* Freetown: Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004b. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report Volume 3a.* Freetown: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone, 2004c. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report Volume 3b*, Freetown: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Sierra Leone.

USAID, 2001. *Sierra Leone: 'Conflict' Diamonds, Progress Report on Diamond Policy and Development Program.* Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI).

USAID, 2012. *Gender Equality and Female Empowerment.* Washington, DC: USAID.

Van Leuven, D., Mazurana, D. & Gordon, R., 2016. Analysing the Recruitment and Use of Foreign Men and Women in ISIL through a Gender Perspective. In: A. de Guttry, F. Capone & C. Paulussen, eds. *Foreign Fighters Under International Law and Beyond.* New York: Springer, pp. 97–120.

Walby, S., 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict, 2007. *Sudan's Children at a Crossroads: An Urgent Need for Protection.* New York: Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict.

Weinstein, L. & White, C. C., 1997. The 'Military Academy': Metaphors of Family. In: L. Weinstein & C. C. White, eds. *Wives and Warriors: Women and the Military in the United States and Canada.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Welland, J., 2015. Liberal Warriors and the Violent Colonial Logics of 'Partnering' and 'Advising'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(2), pp. 289–307.

White, S. C. & Cornwall, A., 1997. Men Masculinities and the Politics of Development. In: C. Sweetman, ed. *Men and Masculinity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 14–22.

Whitworth, S., 2004. *Men, Militarism, and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, 2002. *Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, and Gender-Based Violence in Sierra Leone.* New York: Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children.

Woodward, R. & Winter, T., 2007. *Sexing the Soldier: The Politics of Gender and the Contemporary British Army.* New York: Routledge.

Zack-Williams, A. B., 1999. Sierra Leone: The Political Economy of Civil War, 1991–98. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(1), pp. 143–162.

Zangl, B. & Heupel, M., 2010. On the Transformation of Warfare: A Plausibility Probe of the New War Thesis. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 13(1), pp. 26–58.

Index