A Bridge Too Far

Implementation of UNSCR 1325 in Afghanistan by the Dutch Armed Forces

Laura Ornée

June 27, 2018

Leiden University

MA International Studies

Advisor: Dr. Andrew Gawthorpe

Contents

Introduction

In 2000 a major breakthrough for women's rights and gender equality occurred: resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (WPS) passed and became the first resolution to address gender concerns at the Security Council.[1] Until then, gender issues were exclusively discussed at other UN bodies, like the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Resolutions passed by these organs are not binding, unlike those passed by the Security Council. Although the clauses of the Women, Peace and Security resolution are mere recommendations as well, they form the basis for addressing the issue in other, more forceful resolutions, for instance when establishing UN peacekeeping missions.

One year after the adoption of resolution 1325 another event took place that would occupy the Security Council for years to come. In October 2001, the United States invaded Afghanistan in an effort to remove the Taliban from power and root out Al Qaeda. Two months later the Security Council greenlighted the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and this NATO-led coalition joined the US. NATO's then twenty-eight members and twenty-three additional countries would contribute to the mission, with the United States providing by far the largest share of the troops.

The mission ran from 2001 to 2014, but it proved to be exceptionally difficult to counter the Taliban insurgency. ISAF did not succeed in decisively defeating the insurgents and although the invasion did mean the removal of the Taliban from power and the installation of a democratically elected government, the drawn-out counterinsurgency that followed is generally seen as a failure. [2] One of the larger troop contributors from NATO to this mission was the Netherlands. With 2200 troops in Afghanistan in 2006, it was the fifth largest contributor, averaging around 1700 troops the next three years until the end of the Dutch mission in 2010.[3] The country has also been a strong international proponent of women's rights and gender equality and when resolution 1325 was adopted, the country was a member of the Security Council and co-sponsored it. It is a member of the 'Group of Friends' of Women, Peace and Security, an informal group of countries with similar stances on the issue that coordinates its negotiation tactics, both at the UN and at NATO. The Netherlands has been in the top ten donors for UN Women for years, the Dutch ministry of foreign affairs has its own fund, FLOW, to support women's organizations and more recently, when President Trump pulled a large amount of

[1] United Nations Document, S/res/1325 (2000).
[2] Thomas E. Riks, 'Why Did We Lose in Afghanistan? That's Easy: We Failed to Execute the Basics,' *Foreign Policy,* February 17, 2015, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/02/17/why-did-we-lose-in-afghanistan-thats-easy-we-failed-to-execute-the-basics/, accessed June 22, 2018.
[3] ISAF troop contributing nations, NATO website, available at: https://www.nato.int/isaf/placemats_archive/2007-01-29-ISAF-Placemat.pdf and https://www.nato.int/isaf/placemats_archive/2009-10-01-ISAF-Placemat.pdf

funding for women's health organizations, a Dutch Minister established the 'SheDecides' campaign, to finance organizations hurt by the US's decision.[4] The Netherlands has firmly planted itself among the countries that see international women's rights as a priority and its representatives often speak out for Women, Peace and Security.

The country is, at least on the outside, committed to Women, Peace and Security and was a big contributor to ISAF. It is not yet clear, however, whether United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 played a big part in the efforts in Afghanistan, or whether policies designed in The Hague reached troops on the ground. Without research into this matter, gender policy cannot be adequately improved and adapted to fit the needs of the military and advance gender equality. In this thesis I will answer the question whether the Women, Peace and Security agenda was successfully implemented by the Dutch troops in Afghanistan. I will analyze the experiences of Dutch military personnel that has been deployed to Afghanistan through semi-structured interviews with ten respondents. I will first give some background for UNSCR 1325, before addressing my theoretical framework and discussing both NATO's and the Netherlands' policies on WPS. Lastly, I will analyze the results of the interviews with Dutch military personnel.

[4] Claudia Dreifus, 'In Response to Trump, a Dutch Minister launches 'SheDecides,' *New York Times,* February 20, 2017.

UNSCR 1325: Women, Peace and Security

Resolution 1325, passed in 2000, was the first of many to discuss the Women, Peace and Security agenda. It's based around the four 'pillars' of participation, prevention, protection and relief and recovery. The first addresses representation of women in peace processes at all levels. Prevention refers to preventing sexual and gender-based violence in conflict situations, while protection focuses on protecting the rights and bodies of women. Finally, the relief and recovery sections address the plight of conflict survivors, especially survivors of sexual and gender-based violence.[5] A fifth important goal in the resolution is 'gender mainstreaming', which means that all UN agencies, not just the one dealing with women's rights, should adopt a gender perspective in their work.

Although the resolution was a major breakthrough for feminist activists, some criticisms can be leveled against it as well. It does not, for instance, provide for a monitoring and evaluation mechanism to track progress on the resolution. Furthermore, the gender mainstreaming sections remain abstract[6] and the participation sections could solicit an 'add women and stir' solution, meaning efforts to simply improve the male to female ratio in any organization without gender mainstreaming and without introducing any gender sensitive policies.[7] The language in the resolution is quite limited as well, because it only speaks of 'women and girls' as opposed to men. This phrasing suggests that gender is purely a women's issue and overlooks the fact that it's about complex systems of masculinities and femininities. It also ignores people that fall outside of the traditionally binary conception of gender, such as transgender or genderqueer people.[8] Furthermore, the resolution only speaks of women in gendered terms, ignoring the possible intersections with other identity factors, such as ethnicity, class, religion or sexuality.[9] Lastly, the 'protection' pillar in 1325 is slightly at odds with the other goals, because instead of just empowering women and giving them a means to take back their agency, too strong a focus on this pillar could make them into victims in need of (male) protection.[10] Starting in 2008, more resolutions found their way through the Security Council that have

[5] Nicole George, Laura J. Shepherd, 'Women, Peace and Security: Exploring the implementation and integration of UNSCR 1325,'*International Political Science Review*, 37:3 (2016) 297-306.
[6] Amy Barrow, 'It's like a Rubber Band.' Assessing UNSCR 1325 as a Gender Mainstreaming Process,' *International Journal of Law in Context*, 5:1 (2009) 51-68.
[7] Jasmine-Kim Westendorf, ''Add Women and Stir': The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands and Australia's implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325,' *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 67:4 (2013).
[8] Nicola Pratt and Sophie Richter-Devoe, 'Critically Examining UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security' *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13:04 (2011) 489-503.
[9] Nicola Pratt, 'Reconceptualizing Gender, Re-Inscribing Racial-Sexual Boundaries in International Security: The Case of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on 'Women, Peace and Security,'' *International Studies Quarterly*, 57 (2013) 772-783.
[10] Nadine Puechguirbal, 'Discourse on Gender, Patriarchy and Resolution 1325: A Textual Analysis of UN Documents,' *International Peacekeeping*, 17:2 (2010) 172-187.

deepened the Women, Peace and Security agenda, mostly relating to conflict-related sexual violence and women's participation. The Security Council also started requesting countries to develop their own 'National Action Plans' (NAPs) to implement UNSCR 1325 at home. The Netherlands complied with this request in 2007 as one of the first few countries to do so.

Although assessing progress on resolution 1325 specifically is difficult, considering the level of abstraction of some of its goals, some of the more easily measurable variables give a bleak impression: participation of women in peacekeeping missions is at 10% for police and only 3% for military personnel; in 2012 women comprised just 10% of peace negotiators and under 4% of signatories to peace agreements. Furthermore, the WPS provisions have not featured prominently in Security Council resolutions since 2000, showing that the effort to mainstream gender issues into all UN security decisions and operations has not been successful at the Security Council.[11]

It is a shame, because in spite of the agenda's shortcomings its implementation is vital not only for the advancement of women's rights, but for the effectiveness of UN and other military missions. Feminists have argued for decades that war is deeply gendered and the same holds true for one of the most common forms of war today, counterinsurgency, and the concepts on which it relies, such as populations, insurgents and counterinsurgents.[12] The term counterinsurgency itself, for example, is usually coded as the feminine opposite of hyper-masculine conventional warfare. Where the latter relies on fire power, technological advances and large, fighting armies, the former concerns itself with 'softer' civilian matters, such as state-building, and uses a population centric approach.[13]

Recognizing and breaking down such gendered frameworks can increase the effectiveness of forces like ISAF, which fought a typical counterinsurgency in Afghanistan. Narratives such as the one Spivak famously pointed out of 'white men saving brown women from brown men'[14] were frequently repeated over the course of the war in Afghanistan.[15] A gendered narrative like this (here intertwined with racial designations as well) can create highly problematic assumptions, for instance that Afghan women see ISAF as a just and righteous force, that they're victims without any influence in Afghan

---

[11] Paul Kirby and Laura J. Shepherd, 'The futures past of the Women, Peace and Security agenda,' *International Affairs,* 92:2 (2016) 373-392.
[12] Synne L. Dyvik, 'Gender and Counterinsurgency,' in: Rachel Woodward, Claire Duncanson ed., *The Palgrave International Handbook of Gender and the Military* (London, 2017) 319.
[13] Laleh Khalili, 'Gendered Practices of Counterinsurgency,' *Review of International Studies*, 37 (2011) 1473.
[14] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in: Cary Nelsson, Lawrence Grossberg ed., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana, 1988) 271-317.
[15] Nicholas Kristoff, 'What About Afghan Women?', *New York Times*, October 23, 2010, https://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/24/opinion/24kristof.html, Horia Mosadiq, 'Help Afghan Women Ndash; and Win the Debate over the War,' *Independent*, August 18, 2009, https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/horia-mosadiq-help-afghan-women-ndash-and-win-the-debate-over-the-war-1773497.html, Gayle Tzemmach Lemon, 'Maimed Afghan Woman a Reminder of What's at Stake,' *CNN*, August 17, 2010, http://edition.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/08/16/lemmon.mutilated.woman.pic/index.html.

society, that Afghan women are never insurgents or that all Afghan men abuse women. When a military force is operating under these false assumptions it can hardly plan and strategize appropriately to win its counterinsurgency.

One way to combat this problem is a comprehensive gender policy. Measures like standard gender analysis in the planning phase of projects, in-depth pre-deployment training about gender relations and increased diversity of the armed forces can provide knowledge and understanding about the society a force is operating in, something that is especially important in a counterinsurgency mission hoping to 'win the hearts and minds of the people.'[16]

[16] Sheila M.Q. Scanlon, 'We don't know what we don't know – but we can learn: Lessons learned from Afghanistan on women, peace and security,' *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3 (2015) 4106-4114.

Changing the military

Innovation in the military has long since been a subject of discussion amongst academics and military personnel alike. History teaches that militaries, even more than institutions in general, typically show strong resistance to change and tend to have a conservative institutional culture. Several schools of thought exist on how innovation does happen in military organizations. In the 1950s Samuel Huntington espoused the *professionalist* approach, arguing that outside civilian intervention is unhelpful, because it deprofessionalizes and politicizes the armed forces, which should be controlled by its experts, the officers, who can spur innovation.[17] More recently, Rosen argued in the same vein that change comes from within the military, through senior military officers who create new military tasks and cause the younger generation to embrace them.[18] In the 1980s the *institutionalist* approach gained prominence, with authors treating the army as an organization like any other, which can be analyzed through organization theory. Authors from this school believe that due to opposition inside the military, external pressures, for instance from the civilian government, are needed to affect doctrinal change and innovation.[19] Most authors, however, propose a combination of external and internal pressures.[20] Drawing from organizational theory John Nagl, in his influential work *Learning to eat soup with a knife*, compares the successful British counterinsurgency in Malaya with the American efforts in Vietnam and concludes that the most important difference was that the British military was a 'learning organization', able to adapt during the war and take lessons from the field to heart, while the Americans held on to familiar, but unsuccessful, doctrine.[21]

In recent years a related theoretical approach has gained popularity: feminist institutionalism. This strand of new institutionalism focuses on the gendered nature of institutions and seeks to analyze how gender norms operate within them. Authors from this school have argued that 'the rules of the game' in any institution 'can be seen as gendered, because they prescribe (as well as proscribe) 'acceptable' masculine and feminine forms of behavior.'[22] So, constructions of masculinity and

[17] Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, 1957).
[18] Stephen R. Rosen, *Winning the Next War: Innovation and the Modern Military* (Ithaca, 1991).
[19] Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany Between the World Wars* (Ithaca, 1984), Jack Snyder, *The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914* (Ithaca, 1984), Steven Van Evera, 'Why Cooperation Failed in 1914,' in Kenneth Oye, ed., *Cooperation Under Anarchy* (Princeton, 1986) Matthew Evangelista, *Innovation and the Arms Race: How the United States and the Soviet Union Develop New Military Technologies* (Ithaca, 1988).
[20] Kimberly Martin Zisk, *Engaging the Enemy: Organization Theory and Soviet Military Innovation, 1955-1991* (Princeton, 1993), Williamson Murray and Alan R. Millett, eds., *Military Innovation in the Interwar Period* (Cambridge, 1996).
[21] John A. Nagl, *Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife* (Westport, 2005).
[22] Fiona Mackay, Meryl Kenny, Louise Chapell, 'New Institutionalism Through a Gender Lens: Toward a Feminist Institutionalism?' *International Political Science Review,* 31:5 (2010) 582.

femininity can vary not only across time and space, but across institutions.[23] Particularly in a traditionally hyper-masculine institution like the military these 'rules' can be pervasive.

Implementing a gender policy then brings with it not only the usual difficulties in trying to innovate the military, but also represents a challenge to the way the institution is gendered. This will cause even more resistance to change from the dominant group.[24] Egnell, Hojem and Berts have analyzed how Sweden implemented this change quite successfully so far. They identified three reasons for the Swedish army's accomplishments in this area: The work of key change agents, the placement of the Senior Gender Advisor directly under the Chief of Joint Operations and, most importantly, the decision to use an approach that was not rights-based, but instead focused on military effectiveness.[25] In the Swedish case the military responded to a combination of internal and external factors, since it was the civilian government that decided to implement UNSCR 1325, but key agents within the military took the implementation further.

The Swedish decision to use an instrumentalist approach, focusing on military effectiveness, instead of a transformative, rights-based one proved effective, but it is controversial amongst feminist scholars and activists. Women's rights in the military in general are seen as paradoxical by many authors. According to some feminist writers, women's military participation, for instance, 'merely legitimizes an institution that is antithetical to the goals of feminism.'[26] For feminists from this anti-militarist school the ultimate goal is not making militaries gender sensitive and promoting gender equality within them, since that will never be fully accomplished, but to eradicate all militaries and war, which are both expressions of a patriarchal system. Scholars that do believe militaries can be changed into gender sensitive institutions often argue a transformative approach is the right way to do it. Instead of making changes to existing practices to improve military effectiveness, a transformative agenda seeks to change existing interpretations of concepts like security and alter existing gendered frameworks. By focusing on military effectiveness gendered structures in the institutions remain untouched and true gender equality will be out of reach, according to these scholars.

As Egnell shows, however, the two approaches are not mutually exclusive. Often instrumental approaches can also achieve some transformative change or be a first step towards it. For example, increasing resources for a Senior Gender Advisor would be an instrumental approach, but if those

[23] Sally J. Kenney, 'New Research on Gendered Political Institutions,' *Political Research Quarterly*, 49:2 (1996) 457-8.
[24] *Idem,* 462.
[25] Robert Egnell, Petter Hojem, Hannes Berts, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change: The Swedish Model* (New York, 2014) 6.
[26] Claire Duncanson and Rachel Woodward, 'Regendering the military: Theorizing women's military participation,' *Security Dialogue*, 47:1 (2016) 4.

resources were then used to place more gender field advisors throughout the organization, increasing gender mainstreaming, it would have a transformative outcome. Secondly, Egnell argues that presenting gender policy in an instrumental way can be a tactical approach meant to avoid resistance, even though the actual policies can still be transformative. When the focus of the message is on military effectiveness, it might be easier to gain support from within the organization than when the focus is on women's rights or gender equality.[27]

[27] Egnell, Hojem, Berts, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change* (2014) 14-16.

Method

To examine the extent to which the Dutch army has applied resolution 1325 on the ground in Afghanistan I have interviewed ten members of the Dutch Army that were deployed to Afghanistan between 2003 and 2014. Nine of them were male and one was female, approximately the ratio male-to-female in the Dutch armed forces right now and during the mission in Afghanistan. Anonymity was guaranteed to all respondents, so the names used here are pseudonyms and certain details, like the exact timing of their deployment, will not be disclosed. The highest-ranking respondents were lieutenant-colonel at the time of their deployment to Afghanistan, while the lowest was a corporal. Any of the higher ranks were excluded, as they have little to do with implementation of policy on the ground. A list of general profiles for all respondents can be found in appendix 1. While other research into gender policy has focused on the experiences of people that were directly involved in policy development or implementation, such as gender advisors, this research does not include their perspectives.[28] None of the respondents ever had the word 'gender' in their job title or job description, like the vast majority of the Dutch armed forces. This research therefore gives an insight into the visibility, acceptance and implementation of gender policy amongst the 'regular' armed forces employees.

Interviews were conducted in Dutch, but the results are presented here in English. The questioning was designed to assess Dutch practices in several areas of the Women, Peace and Security agenda. First of all, the questions addressed education and awareness about gender issues among personnel. To implement an agenda, personnel has to be made aware of its goals and educated about its content. This does not necessarily have to take the form of education about the resolution itself, but it does mean soldiers have to be trained in issues the resolution addresses. An employee might not have heard of UNSCR 1325, but still be aware of the meaning of gender, gender mainstreaming and the implications of gender policy for their work. Secondly, the questions addressed implementation of the agenda on the ground. Concrete actions, such as building a women's hospital, can show how the Dutch applied the Women, Peace and Security agenda in their daily work in Afghanistan.

Both topics, education and implementation, can be interpreted in two ways: internal and external. UNSCR 1325 does not only ask countries to design gender sensitive operations, but also to improve gender sensitivity and gender balance in their own armed forces. So, any policies addressing

[28] Egnell, Hojem, Berts, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change* (2014), Anne Kesteloo, 'Gendered Discourses and practices on gender in military operations: The interpretation and implementation of a gender perspective in the ISAF operation by the accounts of Dutch military gender advisors,' *Master's thesis Gender Studies, University of Utrecht* (2015).

operations fall into the 'external' category, while policies designed for the inner workings of the armed forces fall into the 'internal' category. For the education section, an external policy might mean pre-deployment training for soldiers about local gender relations in Afghanistan. Internal policy might be education about sexual harassment in the workplace. External implementation measures can be, for instance, inviting local women to join discussions about the region's future, while an internal implementation measure might be setting up separate showers for women in the Dutch basecamp in Afghanistan.

Lastly, all questions addressed one or more of the four pillars of UNSCR 1325: Participation, prevention, protection, and relief and recovery, or the goal of gender mainstreaming. Of course, these pillars can overlap tremendously. For instance, any measures regarding gender sensitivity can arguably be categorized in the 'participation' pillar as well, even if they're not specifically meant to improve participation. After all, when an organization or society becomes more gender sensitive it will become easier for women to participate in it. Therefore, the division of the questions in pillars is not very strict and a question can address multiple pillars, but all pillars are addressed at least once. As suggested by Galletta in her book *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview and Beyond* all interviews began with a short introduction about the research and a general opening question, to establish a rapport with the respondent. The interview always ended with some general questions as well, to give respondents a last opportunity to explain any opinions and impressions that were not addressed previously. Other questions were not asked in a particular order, but asked when appropriate depending on how the conversation unfolded.[29] Appendix 2 is a visual representation of the questioning.

[29] Anne Galletta, *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview and Beyond: From Research Design to Analysis and Publication* (New York, 2013).

Women, Peace and Security in ISAF

When ISAF deployed there was hardly any attention for gender. The Security Council resolution that established the force, resolution 1386, did not mention the Women, Peace and Security agenda and did not refer to UNSCR 1325 in its preamble. NATO itself had limited experience with gender policies, although some initiatives regarding women's rights and women's participation had been undertaken by this time, the most important of which was the creation of the Office on Women in NATO Forces (OWINF) in 1998. Throughout the mission in Afghanistan gender policy became more pronounced, a few years behind developments in some of NATO's member countries, such as the Netherlands. In 2007 NATO issued a joint policy on Women, Peace and Security with the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the OWINF was renamed 'Office of the Gender Advisor.' In 2009 its 'Committee on Women in NATO Forces' was renamed the NATO Committee on Gender Perspectives (CGP) and its mandate was extended to include the implementation of a gender perspective in all military operations and specifically to support implementation of UNSCRs 1325, 1820 and related resolutions.[30]

2009 also saw the adoption of Bi-Sc Directive 40-1, 'Integrating UNSCR 1325 and Gender Perspectives in the NATO Command Structure Including Measures for Protection During Armed Conflict.'[31] It meant the integration of UNSCR 1325 into NATO military doctrine, as opposed to the political policy changes made earlier. The directive entailed, amongst other things, the appointment of Gender Advisors to ISAF headquarters and Joint Command and the recruiting of Gender Focal Points and Gender Field Advisors. It stated that 'gender perspective is a tool to increase operational effectiveness. By identifying an often-overlooked populace, recognizing their specific needs, and providing the appropriate comprehensive response, the operational environment is positively influenced.'

This suggests that NATO command was aware of the benefits a gender policy could have for its missions and wished to convey this message to the organization. However, as Hurley argues, the most consistent message explaining the rationale for gender policies addresses three issues: under representation of women in the military, victimization of women in conflict and their exclusion from peacebuilding and conflict resolutions efforts.[32] So instead of a story of military effectiveness, a story of women's rights, reinforcing the image of women as victims, accompanied NATO's gender policies.

[30] NATO website, 'Gender Perspective in NATO Armed Forces,' Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_101372.htm

[31] NATO, Bi-Sc Directive 40-1, 'Integrating UNSCR 1325 and gender perspectives in the NATO command structure including measures for protection during armed conflict,' (2009).

[32] Matthew Hurley, 'Gender Mainstreaming and Integration in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization,' in: Rachel Woodward, Claire Duncanson ed., *The Palgrave International Handbook of Gender and the Military* (London, 2017) 403-417.

It shows in the relative isolation of gender within policies and people directly involved with the topic. NATO's counterinsurgency manual, for instance, did not mention women or gender issues at all,[33] nor did the counterinsurgency manual of its largest contributor, the United States. [34]

Scanlon, who worked as Senior Gender Advisor in the Ministry of Interior in Afghanistan reported an experience that reflects this problem, pointing out that first of all, pre-deployment training for US troops often lacked depth and nuance and was based more on 'urban myths' about Afghan culture than on reliable analyses of differences between the two cultures. Secondly, she encountered resistance from both her Afghan and American colleagues, recalling one ISAF commander saying in 2014 that 'gender was a bridge too far and that there was not enough time left in the RS [Resolute Support] mission to make any progress in this area.'[35]

[33] NATO, AJP-3.4.4, 'Allied Joint Doctrine for Counterinsurgency,' (2011).
[34] US Army, FM 3-24, MCWP 3-3.5, 'Counterinsurgency,' (2006).
[35] Scanlon, 'Lessons learned from Afghanistan on women, peace and security,' (2015) 4110.

Women, Peace and Security in the Netherlands

In 2000, the Netherlands was a member of the Security Council and it co-sponsored UNSCR 1325. Although women had been allowed to join the armed forces since 1979, by 2006, when the country deployed its mission to Uruzgan, the gender balance in the army was still very much askew.[36] Earlier that same year a special committee was tasked with investigating 'undesirable behavior' in the armed forces after a sexual harassment scandal and found that many women experienced some form of harassment in the armed forces, more than in other institutions. Although the report did mention a 'historically present macho culture', the only measure it proposed to combat this was increasing the number of women in the armed forces.[37] The report did not mention UNSCR 1325 and did not have any advice for gender mainstreaming measures, making its conclusion mostly an instrumental 'add women and stir' solution. The report resulted in the establishment of the 'Central Organization Integrity Defense' (COID), which helps implement the 'integrity policy', in 2010 and the creation of a code of conduct for the armed forces, which was superficial (it consists of only two pages) and did not address gender either.[38]

Between 2004 and 2007 several policy initiatives were undertaken regarding gender in the armed forces. The Action Plan Gender, in 2004, Genderforce, in 2006 and the National Action Plan on UNSCR 1325 in 2007. The latter was designed mostly by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, although the Ministry of Defense was a partner, did not suggest many concrete changes for the Dutch armed forces.[39] The other two plans did target the armed forces specifically. The Action Plan Gender was a first attempt and fairly simplistic. It mostly focused on increasing participation, with a goal of 30% female civilians working for Defense and 12% female military personnel in 2010.[40] Any gender mainstreaming measures the plan mentioned, which weren't many, were all meant to increase participation too. The plan did express the need to 'convey the added value of mixed teams to the organization,' the strategy Egnell argues worked well for the Swedish,[41] but did not suggest any measures to do so. Project Genderforce was developed in cooperation with Sweden, Scotland and Austria and all countries received funding from the EU for this project. Although participation was still an important part of Genderforce, it also paid attention to gender mainstreaming within the

[36] Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 'Brief regering; Personeelsrapportage van Defensie midden 2010. - Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het Ministerie van Defensie (X) voor het jaar 2011,' 32 500 X (2010).
[37] Commissie Staal, 'Ongewenst gedrag binnen de krijgsmacht,' (2006) 35.
[38] Ministerie van Defensie, 'Gedragscode Defensie,' (2007). Available at: https://www.defensie.nl/downloads/publicaties/2007/04/04/gedragscode-defensie
[39] *Dutch National Action Plan on UNSCR 1325: taking a stand on Women, Peace and Security* (Den Haag, 2007).
[40] Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 'Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het Ministerie van Defensie (X) voor het jaar 2011,' 29 800 X (2004).
[41] Egnell, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change* (2014).

organization, gender education and integrating a gender perspective into missions.[42] As Egnell points out, this project was an important milestone for Sweden.[43]

Both these plans still included counterproductive ideas, however. Although they both explained how gender is a social construct that can vary between times and places, they also named inherent differences between men and women as a reason for wanting to increase female participation in the armed forces. Without explicitly tying the different characteristics to men or women, both plans state: 'For the enforcement of peace and security in an unstable environment, sometimes powerful and unambiguous action is required, while other times ask for a readiness to listen to local parties,' arguing that 'teamwork requires players with different qualities.'[44] Statements like these perpetuate harmful stereotypes, like the idea that women are inherently better listeners and deliberators, while men are more aggressive, stronger and better decisionmakers. Actively dismantling these ideas would be a more transformative approach, while perpetuating them to convince personnel of the usefulness of the policy is highly instrumental.

The State Secretary at the time of aforementioned initiatives was Cees van der Knaap, who had indeed adopted gender equality in the armed forces as one of his priorities. Before he became a politician, he was in the armed forces himself and he stated in feminist magazine *Opzij:* 'I did not and do not like working with just men. I don't like the male culture.' He argued that a 'healthy mix of men and women' is good for an organization and tried to implement multiple measures to increase the number of women in the armed forces.[45] He tried, for instance, to change the law so that young fathers, not just young mothers, could refuse deployment. He was also a proponent of letting women work on submarines. Both measures, however, eventually stranded due to practical concerns: Dutch submarines would have to be rebuilt to include separate facilities for women, which was deemed too expensive, and allowing fathers to refuse deployment would seriously hamper the operational effectiveness of the armed forces.[46] He did appoint the first two female Generals, in 2005 and 2007, but did not manage to increase female participation by much, which shows that even with a driven

[42] Gender team hoofddirectie personeel, 'Genderforce, vrouwen en mannen presteren samen beter,' (Den Haag, 2006) 16.
[43] Egnell, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change* (2014).
[44] Nieuwsbrief Defensie Vrouwen Netwerk, 6, May, (2006), available at: http://docplayer.nl/15424354-Nieuwsbrief-defensie-1-blik-op-defensievrouw-man-versus-vrouw-internet-intranet-column-jacqueline-gelezen-en-gezien-leestips-ingezonden-brieven.html
[45] Cisca Dresselhuys, ''Ik ben geneigd matroos Anja the geloven', Staatssecretaris van Defensie Cees van der Knaap langs de feministische meetlat,' *Opzij,* June 1, 2006, 226.
[46] Patricia de Jonge, 'Interview met Staatssecretaris van Defensie Cees van der Knaap: 'Ik gruwel van die machocultuur'', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, nr. 9, February 28, 2007.

civilian leader it remains difficult if not impossible to change the armed forces without strong support from within the organization.[47]

In the period leading up to the mission in Uruzgan the Netherlands clearly tried to implement UNSCR 1325. The Ministry of Defense started multiple projects focusing particularly on female participation in the armed forces. Plans were not always truly gender sensitive or transformative, but used a highly instrumental approach, sometimes even perpetuating harmful stereotypes in the interest of convincing personnel of the use of increasing the number of women in the army. Project Genderforce leaned somewhat more towards a transformative approach, with a less narrow focus on participation, but it remained quite practical. State Secretary Van der Knaap summarized near the end of his tenure in 2007: 'the leadership understands by now. Up next is the ground floor, we're working through a layer of clay there. I can't reach the base, the armed forces are too hierarchical for that. Awareness has to spread like an ink spot.'[48]

[47] Cees Banning, ''Zo'n vent die vrouw', Leanne van den Hoek is de eerste vrouwelijke generaal in Nederland,' *NRC Handelsblad*, November 7, 2005.
[48] De Jonge, 'Interview met Cees van der Knaap,' *De Groene Amsterdammer,* nr. 9, February 28, 2007.

Respondents' views

In this chapter I will clarify the respondents' views on some general topics, such as the culture within the armed forces, its attitude towards gender issues and the respondents' own views about women. Their ideas about these topics inform their perspective and possible bias on gender policies that I will discuss later and are therefore important to analyze.

All respondents agreed that the culture in the Dutch armed forces is 'typically male', wording it as 'macho culture', a 'men's world' or 'men's organization'. This culture expresses itself in the behavior of men in the army in two ways. First of all, they can be highly competitive. Ernie, George and Ron mentioned how, especially in some infantry units, soldiers tend to be very ambitious, show off a lot and have big egos.[49] Neither of them approved of this behavior and for Ron it was part of the reason he left the infantry, arguing that 'everyone had to be really tough[50] all the time and that just didn't suit me anymore'. Ron and Ernie both followed up their comments on the macho culture by pointing out that women in those competitive infantry units showed the same behavior as the men; 'there are no Barbies there'[51] and 'those are not fun women in my eyes, they're way too competitive and overachievers.'[52] George, however, argued that while men find it difficult to show vulnerability, and therefore act tough, women find that easier and by having women join infantry units, they might change the behavior of the men for the better. Both arguments are representative of the quite stereotypical way most respondent think about men and women. 'Tough' women are the exception, and not much fun, while in general women are supposedly better at being sensitive or vulnerable.

The other way the typically masculine culture of the armed forces shows, is a certain coarseness of manners. Without getting into details respondents said the men, when they're alone with other men, would 'make certain statements you wouldn't make at home,'[53] often 'rude' or 'sexual' remarks that are 'negative about women'.[54] When women are present the men change their behavior and talk differently. Apparently, they recognize that certain things they say are offensive or sexist, but it's still no problem to say them as long as it's amongst just men. Most respondents that identified this behavior said it annoys them and they would correct their colleagues, especially subordinates, when it 'goes too far.'[55]

---

[49] Ernie, personal interview with the author, April 5, 2018, Ron, personal interview with the author, April 5, 2018, George, personal interview with the author, April 5, 2018. Dates of the interviews will be mentioned once in footnotes, information from the interviews thereafter will only be referenced in footnotes when the respondent is not explicitly mentioned in the text.

[50] He used the Dutch word 'stoer', which does not translate perfectly, but means something like 'tough' and 'cool' combined.

[51] Ron.

[52] Ernie.

[53] Ernie.

[54] Stan, personal interview with the author, April 10, 2018, and Ron.

[55] Stan.

Although, again, most respondents thought and spoke in stereotypes, none of them approved of the toxic masculinity they described. Ernie, Harry, George, Percy, Ron, Stan and Errol[56] also argued that increasing the number of women in the army will change the culture for the better, and the culture has already changed compared to when there were practically no women participating thirty or forty years ago. This change happens either because men adjust their behavior when women are present or simply because they get used to having women around in the workplace and stop seeing them as a minority or an exception. Seven of the respondents had positive attitudes towards increasing the number of women in the army in all positions. Harry was slightly skeptical about women in 'certain units that are away a lot with little comfort' saying that 'maybe they shouldn't want that' and, though he thought it was fine in general, we shouldn't push it just for the sake of participation. Cedric and Ron did express clear negatives views about women in combat positions (but not in other positions), arguing women either aren't physically fit enough, or that having women in an infantry unit would bring about an undesirable 'change in dynamics'[57]. However, both of them also admitted they'd never served with a woman in a combat position. George on the other hand recounted that he used to think it was a bad idea, until he served with a woman in an infantry unit which functioned very well.

The respondents' generally positive attitude towards female participation is encouraging, but some of the reasoning behind it less so. First of all, the observation that men behave differently when they are around men compared to when they are around women implies that women aren't seen as equal at all. As mentioned before, either the remarks made amongst men are truly offensive and shouldn't be made at all, or women supposedly can't take a joke. Another cause of the change in behavior reveals a harmful way of thinking about women: they should be treated with a certain special respect and be put on a pedestal. This type of 'benevolent sexism', as theorized by Glick and Fiske, serves to perpetuate patriarchal social structures the same way its better-known companion, 'hostile sexism' does. While hostile sexism achieves this through 'derogatory characterizations of women,' benevolent sexism attributes positive traits to women instead. It recognizes that men are dependent on women, as mothers, romantic partners and for procreation, and acknowledges that women have a certain dyadic power over men. The two forms of sexism share three subcomponents, each with its hostile and benevolent side. Protective paternalism is the benevolent version of dominant paternalism and views women as creatures that should be protected (not controlled) by men, the stronger sex. Complementary gender differentiation, as opposed to competitive gender differentiation, assigns positive instead of negative skills or traits to women that justify traditional gender roles, for instance that women are warm and emphatic and therefore better at parenting, while men are calm and

[56] Harry, personal interview with the author, Percy, personal interview with the author, April 10, 2018.
[57] Cedric, personal interview with the author, April 5, 2018, Ron.

ambitious and therefore better at business. The last subcomponent, heterosexuality, can be hostile and view women as mere sexual objects, who may use their sexuality to gain power over men, or intimate, with women being romanticized as sexual objects needed to 'complete' a man.[58]

A lot of the sexism prevalent in the respondents' own thinking and their description of colleagues' behavior is benevolent. All respondents, including the ones with negative views about women in combat units, said something along the lines of 'colleagues are colleagues and whether they're men or women doesn't matter.' So, at least consciously, all of them were in favor of treating men and women the same. Most of them, however, quickly contradicted themselves. Stan mentioned a young woman who worked in his unit at one point for whom he and his coworkers, significantly older than her, had 'paternal' and 'protective' feelings. The other young person in the group, a man, aroused no such emotions. Ernie, Errol and Harry mentioned similar feelings of protectiveness for women that are common in the armed forces, such as that it would be 'emotionally more difficult' if a woman was captured by the enemy than if a man was. These are all examples of protective paternalism.[59]

Some respondents also expressed ideas of gender differentiation, both complementary and competitive. Women 'think differently' according to George, Cedric, Harry and Errol. They're 'more pragmatic', have 'stronger values' and are better at 'showing vulnerability', so sometimes you just need the 'female touch' for an issue. This type of 'gender essentialism' reinforces traditional gender roles and is therefore a step back from gender equality. It is not, however, surprising that respondents harbored these views, since parts of the Women, Peace and Security agenda and the Dutch gender policies perpetuate such ideas as well. Women are often portrayed as 'peacekeepers' or 'peacebuilders', who have a 'pacifying effect' on their colleagues, confirming the trope of the calm, peaceful, non-violent woman.[60] Any competitive gender differentiation respondents made was always about physical characteristics. All respondents except Dudley mentioned the fact that women are on average not as strong as men, which sounds like an objective statement. Cohn, however, argues it's an expression of negative sentiments towards women that, in the current climate, cannot be uttered in a more direct way. In other words, since it's no longer acceptable to explicitly state that women are inferior to men, even in the armed forces, the seemingly objective 'physical training protest' becomes a way of expressing that idea.[61] Cedric, Ron, Errol and even Rita specifically used the 'PT protest' to argue women aren't suited for certain jobs.[62]

---

[58] Glick and Fiske, 'Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women,'122.
[59] Errol, personal interview with the author, May 14, 2018.
[60] Johanna Valenius, 'A Few Kind Women: Gender Essentialism and Nordic Peacekeeping Operations,' *International Peacekeeping*, 14:4 (2007) 510-523.
[61] Carol Cohn, "How Can She Claim Equal Rights When She Doesn't Have to Do as Many Push-Ups as I do?" The Framing of Men's Opposition to Women's Equality in the Military,' *Men and Masculinities*, 3:2 (2000) 131-151.
[62] Rita, personal interview with the author, March 15, 2018.

Heterosexual hostility was quite present during the interviews as well, especially in descriptions of behavior of others. The respondents argued that some men feel the need to 'prove' themselves by 'peacocking' in front of women.[63] Women are the 'chickens' to their 'roosters', or even 'game to hunt.'[64] Dudley was genuinely surprised that women who wear burqas aren't all ugly, but often 'beautiful', as reported by female colleagues who were allowed to see their faces.[65] Ernie recounted the story of a female subordinate who worked for him recently, not on deployment, but at headquarters back home. She was single and had male colleagues at her door like 'drooling dogs' keeping her from her work. In all these examples women are seen as nothing more than sexual objects. When a woman behaves as a sexual being in any way, the hostility becomes even stronger. Ernie's story went on with the woman in question starting relationships with some of the men and eventually being transferred, because she had 'too many boyfriends' and the situation was 'not workable' anymore. Ernie and Percy both stated that a common sentiment amongst men in the army is that when a woman becomes intimate with one of them, the rest feels they're entitled to the same treatment. Rita, recognizing these trends, said she was cautious not to talk to one man for too long, because it would incite 'gossiping'. Dudley also recounted that the 'locker room talk'[66] is sometimes more malicious than just sexual jokes, with men criticizing female colleagues or superiors or accusing them of 'sleeping their way to the top.'

So even though the respondents were all proponents of having more women join the army and of equal treatment, they observed several forms of sexism in the workplace and, without noticing, espoused it themselves at times. My position as a young woman might have caused respondents to mince their words or emphasize their support for equal treatment, but they made plenty of problematic remarks without realizing and had no trouble describing problematic behavior of others. It shows that there has hardly been any transformative change to the culture in the armed forces and it's probably not the most inviting place for women. Stronger policies in the area of gender are essential to changing this situation.

Not all respondents, however, were positive about such policies. Only George explicitly argued it was useful to have a gender policy to deal with the nature of missions these days, which often take place in countries with decidedly different gender relations than here. Harry was not opposed, but said the policies often felt 'forced', causing army employees to ridicule them. Most other respondents connected the term gender only to policies concerning relations within the armed forces and considered them 'unnecessary', after all, how to treat each other is just 'common sense'. Any change

[63] haantjesgedrag
[64] Ernie, Percy.
[65] Dudley, personal interview with the author, April 19, 2018.
[66] In Dutch: 'borrelpraat', or talk during 5-o'clock-drinks).

in the armed forces should just 'come with time' and with the increased participation of women.[67] That such preexisting ideas about gender policies influence people's assessment about their effectiveness became clear when discussing a military exercise two men participated in a few weeks before the interview. A gender advisor was present there and Harry mentioned how useful it was to have her there to explain certain policies, while Percy brought her up too and said what she did was not useful at all, but a 'missed opportunity'.

So, although the men I interviewed acknowledged there is a 'macho' culture in the armed forces and identified some problematic behavior, they were reluctant in ascribing any value to gender policies to combat this. Clearly the message that gender policies can enhance military effectiveness has not reached troops on the ground at all. Furthermore, respondents unwittingly contributed to maintaining misogynistic stereotypes and behaviors with their own ideas about men and women, even though on the surface they were all proponents of more women in the army and equal treatment.

[67] Percy, Stan.

Education external

Aside from the training and education military personnel goes through in the Netherlands when it joins the armed forces, they receive pre-deployment training before every mission. It wasn't always part of a deployment with the Dutch armed forces. Errol, who was in Afghanistan in the early stages of the Dutch involvement, did not follow a program as is customary now. His preparation for deployment was more focused on technical and tactical issues. Practice quickly changed, however, because all respondents that deployed a few years later followed more or less the same kind of training. It prepared people for the specific circumstances in the region they were deploying to, covering everything from what the weather is like to which types of bombs and IEDs to expect. It also discussed cultural differences and how to interact with locals, but this was just one class among many in a course that lasted only one week. As expected, the respondents said it was not extremely thorough, but focused on the way they should behave around locals, including local women. The advice was always not to look at women, not shake their hands and not talk to them unless their husband gave permission and to make sure to find a female soldier to frisk them when necessary.

The nature of pre-deployment training was thus highly practical and used an instrumental approach; Ernie compared it to the 'rules of engagement', you simply need to know them to do your job. While it is understandable there are some time restraints for training like this, treating gender and culture differences in general so superficially can be counterproductive. First of all, only Harry, Errol, and Ernie had ever heard of the WPS agenda, and Errol and Ernie both mentioned they had gotten to know it in recent years, not when it was adopted or around the time they were deployed to Afghanistan. It was never discussed in training and neither were the benefits of having a comprehensive gender policy. No one knew the term 'gender mainstreaming' and no one was fully aware of the 'external' aspects of the Dutch gender policy, they connected it mostly to the idea of female participation in the Dutch armed forces itself. This reinforces the idea that gender policy is 'useless' and is being 'forced' on the organization by politicians: it becomes just another box to check.

Secondly, superficial pre-deployment training that simply highlights the differences between cultures and gender roles can reinforce harmful stereotypes about 'the other'. As mentioned before, it is one of the pitfalls of UNSCR 1325 to begin with, because it represents women exclusively in gendered terms and fails to acknowledge the intersections with other social categories, such as ethnicity, class, sexuality or religion.[68] Without delving deeper into those complications, pre-deployment training paints the 'Afghan woman' as an abstract and one-dimensional being.

[68] Pratt, 'Reconceptualizing Gender' (2013) 772-783.

Some of the respondents' descriptions of them and of Afghan culture illustrate this problem. Everyone agreed that women in Afghanistan are 'treated poorly' and are controlled by men. When I asked respondents about Afghan women in the police force or military, respondents who were deployed to rural areas often snickered, saying that was never a possibility, even though in 2010 the first women joined the Afghan military. While the two respondents who spent time in Kabul did recount how the city was different from the country, with women participating in local governance and, for instance, the police force, all respondents spoke in very general terms about Afghan women. They were 'basically slaves'[69] and Rita mentioned how the fully veiled women were jokingly called 'blue moving objects' by military personnel on the base. Errol argued that although Dutch politicians like to say the hijab and burqa are symbols of oppression, Afghan women just want 'safety, food, a roof over their head, school for their children and glass in their windows'.[70]

Talking about women this way makes them into passive objects without unique identities and opinions and it denies them any agency. It also makes them into decidedly non-political beings. Related to this view of Afghan women as passive creatures are the deterministic ideas about Afghan culture the respondents harbored. Ron, Dudley, Percy and Errol explicitly mentioned they thought 'you can't change anything' there, it's 'flogging a dead horse' and the only way to change something for women is to 'take every male older than twelve and put them against a wall and shoot them.'[71] Only George attributed any agency to Afghan women, arguing that to win the 'hearts and minds' of the population one must know the 'core grievances of women' and despite the fact that women there 'are fairly meek and don't get a lot of say over things, […] they can still influence the men.'[72]

One of the goals of the Women, Peace and Security agenda and especially the later resolutions is to acknowledge and facilitate such female agency, not just within the family but in all parts of society. While it's understandable that pre-deployment training addresses practical concerns, doing so without properly explaining gender policies and at least some of the complications of gender relations leaves personnel with superficial ideas about Afghan society. As mentioned before, this can be harmful to the mission. As George's remark shows, understanding half the population (and their relation with the other half) is important when trying to build a state that has the confidence of its people. When fighting insurgents misunderstanding of women's roles can be dangerous as well; after all, when the military assumes women have no agency and couldn't possibly play a role in the insurgency, they're bound to miss or underestimate certain threats. In this case, the instrumental approach the armed forces chose was thus counterproductive.

[69] Dudley
[70] Errol
[71] Percy, Ron, Dudley
[72] George

Implementation external

Implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda by the Dutch in Afghanistan was slow to start and remained isolated with the people who were directly involved. Only one of the respondents, Harry, reported to having worked with a gender adviser. This was not, however, in a Dutch camp, but at NATO headquarters in Kabul, staffed with employees from different countries. The others were all aware the position existed but did not have anyone in their unit in Afghanistan who worked on gender issues. They also didn't work with a gender adviser from outside their unit or work on any gender- or women's issues specifically themselves.

Most respondent did witness the implementation of small parts of the Women, Peace and Security agenda from a distance, even though they weren't directly involved themselves. Usually these efforts were focused on the participation pillar of the resolution. A frequently mentioned example were meetings on the Dutch camp where women could voice their concerns, attended exclusively by women on both Dutch and Afghan sides to create a safe space. Meetings like this were held for other groups as well, such as different tribes or community leaders. Dudley spoke with female colleagues who attended such meetings, meant to 'get information on what [the women's] lives looked like.' The goal was, according to Dudley, to gain intelligence the army could use, not to help the women in any way, so again the approach here was instrumental and not rights-based. Ron witnessed another project: sports classes for women on an Afghan police camp, which he visited to provide security there. He mentioned it wasn't always well attended, sometimes they organized events 'for nobody' because some commanders would not allow women to go. Lastly, some respondents mentioned locals could occasionally receive medical attention at the Dutch camp, including women, who would always be attended to by female doctors and nurses.

Although the respondents were aware of projects like these, they did not have anything to do with them, because none of them worked for the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) or on Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC), the 'soft' sector, as some called it. Only Errol mentioned that in the planning phase of the mission to Uruzgan some issues came up he had to think about, like medical treatment for local female patients and education for girls. On the whole, however, it seems that the goal of gender mainstreaming from UNSCR 1325 was not achieved in Afghanistan. Importantly, the respondents had never heard of this goal and did not understand it. They thought it was quite logical they did not work on gender policy, because 'it wasn't relevant' in their job, or even because they 'didn't have women in their unit'.

For most of the respondents, however, the Women, Peace and Security agenda would have been highly relevant in their job. Dudley and Stan, for instance, worked for the Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team, a unit that trained Afghan military personnel, so the national army could eventually secure Afghanistan without outside help. Teaching them about gender issues was apparently not part of that effort, even though both NATO and the Netherlands used gender policies themselves. George worked on counter narcotics, including an 'alternative livelihoods' project meant to provide another source of income for farmers who had to get rid of their poppy fields, but he never had to consider any gendered aspects of this endeavor. The respondents' attitudes and experiences match the descriptions of Gender Advisors who were deployed to Afghanistan, which Anne Kesteloo analyzed in her thesis: They felt they had to implement gender by themselves, because no one else was working on it, or even interested in working on it.[73]

[73] Anne Kesteloo, 'Gendered Discourses and practices on gender in military operations' (2015).

Education internal

Although a lot has changed in the armed forces over the past decades, education on gender policies remains limited in the Dutch armed forces. In Dudley's words, they're 'not good at it, absolutely not'. It shows in the respondents' awareness of the Women, Peace and Security agenda and the armed forces' own programs regarding gender policy. As mentioned before, only one respondent knew of the agenda at the time of his deployment to Afghanistan. Two respondents had heard of the armed forces' own policies, like the Action Plan Gender or Genderforce, but did not know what it these entailed. George was taken aback when hearing the UN had something to say about gender policy in the military, because in 2006 he commanded the first Dutch infantry company that included a woman in a combat position. It was a test run for the Dutch military to see 'if it worked', which it did quite well according to George, but the reasoning behind it was never explained to him, nor was he ever asked for an evaluation.

Furthermore, none of the respondents knew what the word 'gender' meant. When asked about the definition of the word, most of them said 'equality' or 'treating people equally', often following it up with 'but that's just common sense'. Harry and Errol argued gender was about 'diversity', about all 'minorities, not just women'. Rita and Stan came a little closer, with Rita calling gender the 'nature' of people, including how 'masculine' or 'feminine' they are and Stan saying 'gender is just there, we're dealing with men and women and people in between, who feel they're not one or the other or both'. As Harry mentioned earlier is common with gender policy, military personnel just have to implement certain measures that are decided higher up the ladder without a clear explanation.

None of the respondents except Rita ever received education or additional training meant to prevent sexual harassment, sexism or related issues. For Rita it was part of her training as spiritual counsellor, since people might come to her to discuss incidents, and later she witnessed training days and conferences organized by her office addressing gender issues. The others did not remember ever participating in training like that, however. The only way the topic was ever addressed for them was during regular training when the code of conduct was discussed. For most respondents that was a long time ago, in the 1980s, when women had just gained the right to join the military. The message they received was to 'treat each other with respect' and 'normally' with 'common sense.' George did mention he thought training has gotten somewhat more expansive over the years. The youngest respondent, Ron, joined the military in 2009 and there was attention for sexual harassment during his training, but according to him there was extra attention for the topic due to a recent sexual harassment scandal in the armed forces that made the news. However, since there were no women in his unit, Ron figured, they 'didn't really have to address it'.

So, some progress is being made, but as Ron's reasoning shows, an attitude of not talking about things when there is no perceived problem remains prevalent in the armed forces as well. Rita and George identified the same reactionary pattern and George thought it made sense to only address sexual harassment when something goes wrong, because in his opinion it usually doesn't. Education on gender issues is clearly being designed with an instrumental approach, which leaves personnel clueless about both the meaning and implications of gender issues for the organization and about the armed forces' policies in the area and their goals.

Implementation internal

The Dutch armed forces were still learning how to deal with gender differences within its ranks during the war in Afghanistan. When UNSCR 1325 was adopted women had been allowed in the armed forces for only twenty-one years and the respondents that experienced the first few years of mixed units mentioned how the organization wasn't ready for them and it took some getting used to. This was reflected in the first makeshift Dutch camps in Afghanistan, which in the early phase of ISAF involvement were small and primitive, without separate facilities for men and women, as Errol and Rita explained. Dutch policy later in Afghanistan was to have separate sleeping containers ('FEBs') and bathrooms for women and men, which most respondents reported were present by the time Camp Holland had been erected in Uruzgan. It was a flexible policy, however, so when there were no resources or space for separate facilities, men and women lived in mixed FEBs with mixed facilities, which was the case for Stan and, for instance, outside the gate on patrols. It was a clearly instrumental policy, since a transformative policy would be trying to deconstruct the idea that men and women are so different they need separate bathrooms by having gender neutral bathrooms, while also being inclusive for people who don't fall into the binary gender categories. Respondents, however, all found it quite normal to have separate facilities when possible and saw it as an improvement over non-separate facilities. It's not surprising, since outside the military public spaces usually have separate bathrooms as well, so maintaining that custom might make the organization more attractive for women who have been used to it their whole lives.

One of the most problematic gender policies the Dutch military has implemented, according to the respondents, are the different fitness requirements for men and women. Five of the respondents brought it up and argued it was counterproductive, while others, as mentioned before, said women are less physically fit than men in general. Cedric, Ernie and Harry remembered how the first few years women could join the armed forces, they were often cut a lot of slack during training, which 'caused resentment which is still there.' As touched upon in the Respondents' views chapter, Cohn argues this is not an objective protest, but an expression of negative sentiments towards women.[74] The physical tests for military personnel are not connected to specific job requirements but are a measure of overall physical fitness and health. After all, there is age differentiation for the tests as well: they become less demanding as personnel gets older. Respondents mentioned this fact, but did not have any problem accepting that a 32-year old man has to go through less demanding tests than a 29-year old man. Although at first glance having different fitness requirements for men and

[74] Cohn, "How Can She Claim Equal Rights When She Doesn't Have to Do as Many Push-Ups as I do?" (2000) 131-151.

women seems like an instrumental approach, meant to get more women to join the military, it is actually a transformative approach, acknowledging the average physical differences between men and women, just like between older and younger men, but also recognizing that those differences are not all-important when assessing whether someone is suited for a job in the military. However, this transformative approach clearly did not go over well with military personnel on the ground.

Conclusion

Although the Dutch were strong proponents of the Women, Peace and Security agenda, the implementation of resolution 1325 on the ground in Afghanistan was minimal. Personnel that did not have 'gender' in its job description was hardly ever involved with implementing gender policies, which shows that gender was not mainstreamed throughout the armed forces, but remained a fringe issue separate from other activities. Furthermore, the respondents had very little idea of what the Dutch gender policies entailed, what the meaning of the word gender was, what the UN had to do with it, or how gender policies could positively affect the mission.

The question then rises how the Dutch could have done better. Political will at the top was not lacking and multiple new gender policies were designed after the WPS agenda was adopted in the Security Council. What these policies, and their implementation, had in common, however, was that they used an approach that was highly instrumental. Although Egnell argues that this approach worked well for Sweden, in the Dutch case it tended to backfire, mostly because of the message it sent to army employees.

Although policy documents tried to focus on military effectiveness, they did so by perpetuating harmful stereotypes. Pointing out how men and women can bring different perspectives to the table during a mission is a fine example of an instrumental approach focusing on military effectiveness. However, saying 'men and women are different' instead of 'men and women have different life experiences and therefore different perspectives' only reinforces the sexist ideas that are still rampant in the military, presenting women as tools to be used occasionally in certain missions, instead of consistently valuable contributors. Secondly, even the attempted message of military effectiveness has not come across at all. Most respondent still thought gender policy was unnecessary and ridiculous and could hardly think of any ways it could be useful for military operations.

The problem lies not necessarily with using an instrumental approach. After all, this can lead to transformative change as well. Having separate facilities, for instance, can lead to more female participation, which can, in some cases, lead to changed minds. George wasn't convinced of the benefit of mixed units until he had commanded one. However, the message accompanying an instrumental approach should be more transformative and not based on ancient assumptions and stereotypes.

So, education, both on internal and on external policy, needs to change. Instead of superficial instruction on the differences between men and women or on how to treat women in different cultures, a more thorough treatment of gender and gender policies is needed. This can take a more transformative shape and deal with the meaning of concepts like gender, sexism and masculinities, but should also serve to explain the benefits of certain policies for military effectiveness and the reason for the education itself. This way personnel can be convinced of the use of gender policies and stop

resisting them, without reinforcing their existing stereotypical ideas about men and women. A balanced combination of an instrumental approach, focusing on military effectiveness, and a transformative approach, addressing the problematic gendered assumptions present in the military, can thus lead to better implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda.

Appendix 1: Respondent Profiles

Dudley	rank: staff sergeant
	Job: technician, Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team (OMLT)
	Start: 1980 (conscription), ’89 after again
	Afgh: 2006-2010, post 2010
	Outside the gate: yes
Cedric	rank: lieutenant-colonel
	Job: training, information management
	Start: 1981
	Afgh: pre 2006, 2006-2010 2x
	Outside the gate: no
Ernie	rank: warrant officer
	Job: equipment care
	Start: 1979
	Afgh: 2006-2010
	Outside the gate: no
George	rank: Major
	Job: planner counternarcotics
	Start: 1990
	Afgh: 2006-2010
	Outside the gate: no
Harry	rank: lieutenant-colonel
	Job: joint visits bureau, corruption task force.
	Start: 1980
	Afgh: 200-2010, post 2010
	Outside the gate: no
Percy	rank: lieutenant
	Job: platoon leader
	Start: 1989, officer in 2006
	Afgh: 2006-2010, 2x

	Outside the gate: yes
Ron	rank: Corporal
	Job: recon platoon
	Start: 2009
	Afgh: post 2010
	Outside the gate: yes
Stan	rank: Major
	Job: OMLT
	Start: 1979
	Afgh: 2006-2010
	Outside the gate: no
Rita	rank: Major
	Job: spiritual counsellor, humanistic
	Start: after 20 years in education made a career switch in 2001
	Afgh: pre-2006
	Outside the gate: no
Errol	rank: Major
	Job: planner
	Start: 1981
	Afgh: pre-2006
	Outside the gate: no

Appendix 2: Interview Questions

Table 1.1	**Introductory questions**	
	Could you describe your career with the armed forces? From when until when were you in Afghanistan and what was your job title and rank there?	
	What were your daily activities in Afghanistan?	
	How would you describe the culture in the armed forces?	
	Internal	**External**
Education/awareness	Have you ever heard of the Women, Peace and Security agenda from the UN/gender actionplan/genderforce/Bi-sc directive 40-1? What do you know about it? What does the concept 'gender' or 'gender perspective/gender sensitivity' mean to you?* *P1/P2/P3/P4/P5*	*question applies here as well
	In your basic training or other trainings, was gender, or male-female relations, ever discussed? How? Did you, for instance, receive education about sexual harassment in the workplace and how to deal with that? *P2/P5*	Did you receive any pre-deployment training about contact with the locals before you went to Afghanistan? And about relations between men and women in Afghanistan? What did that training look like? *P2/P3/P5*
Implementation	For men: Were there any women in your unit? How did you experience working with them? For women: what was it like to work for the armed forces as a woman, a small minority? How did you experience working together with your male colleagues? *P1*	Did you ever have contact with the local population? With women as well? How did that go? *P1*
	I your opinion, were the camps you stayed in in Afghanistan designed properly to accommodate both men and women? How so? *P1/P2/P3*	When a new project or operation started, was there specific attention for possible gendered aspects? Was there, for instance, any reflection on the different impacts on boys and girls, women and men? *P2/P3*
	Have you ever experienced or witnessed unpleasant incidents	Were there ever any measures taken specifically to protect

	between men and women in your workplace? How did the commanding officers deal with such incidents? *P4*	Afghan women, in the time you were in Afghanistan? *P3*
	Have you ever worked with a GENAD, or did you know any GENADS? What kind of work did they do? How did that relate to your work? What was their added value to the mission, if any, according to you?* *P1/P2/P3/P4*	Have you ever worked on projects meant to improve the position of women in Afghanistan? (for instance: building a women's hospital in Tarin Kowt?) how did you feel about that? *P1/P2/P3/P4*
		One of the goals of the mission was strengthening the Afghan government. Were women involved in attempts to do that? Did they get a chance to have a say in governance? Were they involved in meetings between locals and the armed forces? *P1*
		What happened when Dutch actions created Afghan victims, for instance in the crossfire of fighting with OMFs? Was the family compensated in some way? How? Were the wounded taken care of? *P3/P4*
		*question applies here as well
	Closing questions	
	Do you think the way the Dutch armed forces handle gender issues has evolved over the last two decades? How?	
	What do you think about the Ministry of Defense's policies? Do you think it's important to have proper gender policies? Why?	
	How would you define the word 'gender'?	

P1 = participation
P2 = prevention
P3 = protection
P4 = relief and recovery
P5 = gender mainstreaming

Sources

Newspaper articles

-Banning, Cees, ''Zo'n vent die vrouw', Leanne van den Hoek is de eerste vrouwelijke generaal in Nederland,' *NRC Handelsblad*, November 7, 2005.

-Dreifus, Claudia, 'In Response to Trump, a Dutch Minister launches 'SheDecides,' *New York Times,* February 20, 2017.

-Dresselhuys, Cisca, ''Ik ben geneigd matroos Anja the geloven', Staatssecretaris van Defensie Cees van der Knaap langs de feministische meetlat,' *Opzij,* June 1, 2006, 226.

-Jonge, Patricia de, 'Interview met Staatssecretaris van Defensie Cees van der Knaap: 'Ik gruwel van die machocultuur'', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, nr. 9, February 28, 2007.

-Mosadiq, Horia, 'Help Afghan Women Ndash; and Win the Debate over the War,' *Independent*, August 18, 2009.

-Nicholas, Kristoff, 'What About Afghan Women?', *New York Times*, October 23, 2010.

-Riks, Thomas E., 'Why Did We Lose in Afghanistan? That's Easy: We Failed to Execute the Basics,' *Foreign Policy,* February 17, 2015.

-Tzemmach Lemon, Gayle, 'Maimed Afghan Woman a Reminder of What's at Stake,' *CNN*, August 17, 2010.

Dutch Government documents

-Gender team hoofddirectie personeel, 'Genderforce, vrouwen en mannen presteren samen beter,' (Den Haag, 2006) 16.

-Commissie Staal, 'Ongewenst gedrag binnen de krijgsmacht,' (2006)

-Ministerie van Defensie, 'Gedragscode Defensie,' (2007). Available at: https://www.defensie.nl/downloads/publicaties/2007/04/04/gedragscode-defensie

-Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 'Brief regering; Personeelsrapportage van Defensie midden 2010. - Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het Ministerie van Defensie (X) voor het jaar 2011,' 32 500 X (2010).

-Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 'Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het Ministerie van Defensie (X) voor het jaar 2007,' 30800-X, nr. 42, October 18, (2006) 28.

-Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, 'Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het Ministerie van Defensie (X) voor het jaar 2011,' 29 800 X, (2004).

Other

- NATO, AJP-3.4.4 , 'Allied Joint Doctrine for Counterinsurgency,' (2011).

-NATO, Bi-Sc Directive 40-1, 'Integrating UNSCR 1325 and gender perspectives in the NATO command structure including measures for protection during armed conflict,' (2009).

-NATO website, available at: www.NATO.int

- Nieuwsbrief Defensie Vrouwen Netwerk, 6, May, (2006), available at: http://docplayer.nl/15424354-Nieuwsbrief-defensie-1-blik-op-defensievrouw-man-versus-vrouw-internet-intranet-column-jacqueline-gelezen-en-gezien-leestips-ingezonden-brieven.html

-United Nations Document, S/res/1325, 'Women, Peace and Security,' (2000).

-US Army, FM 3-24, MCWP 3-3.5, 'Counterinsurgency,' (2006).

Bibliography

-Barrow, Amy, 'It's like a Rubber Band.' Assessing UNSCR 1325 as a Gender Mainstreaming Process,' *International Journal of Law in Context*, 5:1 (2009) 51-68,

- Carreiras, Helena, 'Gender integration in the armed forces: A cross national comparison of policies and practices in NATO countries,' *CWINF*, (2002), URL: https://www.nato.int/ims/2002/cwinf2002/

-Cohn, Carol "How Can She Claim Equal Rights When She Doesn't Have to Do as Many Push-Ups as I do?" The Framing of Men's Opposition to Women's Equality in the Military,' *Men and Masculinities*, 3:2 (2000) 131-151.

-Dyvik, Synne L., 'Gender and Counterinsurgency,' in: Rachel Woodward, Claire Duncanson ed., *The Palgrave International Handbook of Gender and the Military* (London, 2017) 319-334.

-Duncanson, Claire and Woodward, Rachel, 'Regendering the military: Theorizing women's military participation,' *Security Dialogue*, 47:1 (2016) 3-21.

-Egnell, Robert, Hojem, Petter, Berts, Hannes, *Gender, Military Effectiveness, and Organizational Change: The Swedish Model* (New York, 2014),

-Evangelista, Matthew, *Innovation and the Arm Race: How the United States and the Soviet Union Develop New Military Technologies* (Ithaca, 1988).

-Evera, Steven Van, 'Why Cooperation Failed in 1914,' in Kenneth Oye, ed., *Cooperation Under Anarchy* (Princeton, 1986)

-Galletta, Anne, *Mastering the Semi-Structured Interview and Beyond: From Research Design to Analysis and Publication* (New York, 2013).

-George, Nicole, Shepherd, Laura J., 'Women, Peace and Security: Exploring the implementation and integration of UNSCR 1325,'*International Political Science Review*, 37:3 (2016) 297-306.

-Huntington, Samuel, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, 1957).

-Hurley, Matthew, 'Gender Mainstreaming and Integration in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization,' in: Rachel Woodward, Claire Duncanson ed., *The Palgrave International Handbook of Gender and the Military* (London, 2017) 403-417.

-Khalili, Laleh, 'Gendered Practices of Counterinsurgency,' *Review of International Studies*, 37 (2011) 1471-1491.

-Kenney, Sally J., 'New Research on Gendered Political Institutions,' *Political Research Quarterly*, 49:2 (1996) 445-466.

-Kesteloo, Anne, 'Gendered Discourses and practices on gender in military operations: The interpretation and implementation of a gender perspective in the ISAF operation by the accounts of Dutch military gender advisors,' *Master's thesis Gender Studies, University of Utrecht* (2015).

-Kirby, Paul, Shepherd, Laura J., 'Reintroducing Women, Peace and Security,' *International Affairs*, 92:2 (2016) 249-254

-Kirby, Paul and Shepherd, Laura J., 'The futures past of the Women, Peace and Security agenda,' *International Affairs,* 92:2 (2016) 373-392.

- Mackay, Fiona, Kenny, Meryl, Chapell, Louise, 'New Institutionalism Through a Gender Lens: Toward a Feminist Institutionalism?' *International Political Science Review,* 31:5 (2010) 573-588.

-Murray, Williamson and Millett, Alan R,. eds., *Military Innovation in the Interwar Period* (Cambridge, 1996).

-Nagl, John A., *Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife* (Westport, 2005).

-Obradovic, Lana, *Gender Integration in NATO Military Forces: Cross-National Analysis,'* (Farnham, 2014).

-Posen, Barry, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany Between the World Wars* (Ithaca, 1984).

-Pratt, Nicola, 'Reconceptualizing Gender, Re-Inscribing Racial-Sexual Boundaries in International Security: The Case of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on 'Women, Peace and Security,'' *International Studies Quarterly*, 57 (2013) 772-783,

-Pratt, Nicola and Richter-Devoe, Sophie, 'Critically Examining UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security' *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13:04 (2011) 489-503,

-Puechguirbal, Nadine, 'Discourse on Gender, Patriarchy and Resolution 1325: A Textual Analysis of UN Documents,' *International Peacekeeping*, 17:2 (2010) 172-187.

-Rosen, Stephen R., *Winning the Next War: Innovation and the Modern Military* (Ithaca, 1991).

-Scanlon, Sheila M.Q., 'We don't know what we don't know – but we can learn: Lessons learned from Afghanistan on women, peace and security,' *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3 (2015) 4106-4114.

-Snyder, Jack, *The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914* (Ithaca, 1984).

-Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in: Nelsson, Cary and Grossberg, Lawrence ed., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana, 1988) 271-317.

-Valenius, Johanna, 'A Few Kind Women: Gender Essentialism and Nordic Peacekeeping Operations,' *International Peacekeeping*, 14:4 (2007) 510-523.

-Wright, Katherine, 'NATO's adoption of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security: Making the Agenda a Reality,' *International Political Science Review*, 37:3 (2016) 353-4.

-Zisk, Kimberly Martin, *Engaging the Enemy: Organization Theory and Soviet Military Innovation, 1955-1991* (Princeton, 1993).