

**Contracting to Train Foreign Security Forces: Benefits, Risks and
Implications for US Efforts in Iraq**

Deborah Avant
Professor, Political Science and International Affairs
Director, Institute for Global and International Studies
George Washington University
1957 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20052
202.994.6703
avant@gwu.edu

Statement prepared for the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on contracting issues associated with the development of the Iraqi Security Forces, Wednesday, 25 April 2007, 9-11am, 2212 Rayburn House Office Building.

Effective security forces are a crucial element of successful state building. The security forces most conducive to state building are those with basic capabilities that are also responsive to the civilian political leadership and operate in accordance with broad international norms for security professionals. Creating security forces in which all three of these elements work together is particularly important in transitioning countries. Incapable security institutions undermine immediate prospects for order. Capable security institutions without political control risk coups. Capable security institutions that operate outside international norms can breed resentment and the resumption of conflict.

A minimum condition for state building is military force with:

- moderate capacities
- coordinated (if not centralized) political control
- some modicum of respect for professional military and/or law enforcement values

Creating such a force, however, is quite difficult. Though the US has focused increased attention on training foreign security forces, successful training of foreign forces, even when carried out by US military forces, is complicated.¹ The following five factors inhibit a strong relationship between military training efforts and US goals or general stability in the country regardless of who is doing the training.

1. General training may not prepare forces for specific missions – forces need not just capacities but capacities to meet the specific threats they face
2. Coordinating civilian, military and police forces for counterinsurgency missions – even in purely operational terms – is difficult
3. Political direction directives from host country civilians that are poor or opportunistic can undermine stability no matter how good the forces
4. Professional values are often hard to put in practice – particularly against irregular opposing forces
5. The US often has many sub-goals in a conflict and the pursuit of one may undermine others (e.g., US forces working with warlords in Afghanistan to gain access to al Qaeda hideouts -one US goal- worked against President Karzai’s efforts to consolidate control over the country by training a national Afghan Army -another US goal).

Benefits and Risks of Contracted Training

The ability to contract with private security companies (PSCs) to conduct training undoubtedly augments US forces. The use of PSCs offers other benefits as well but the

¹ Though many agree that military training provides access to, and ties with, foreign military personnel – there is very little regularized examination of the relationship between military training and US goals – or the effect of military training on the nature of foreign forces. There are a variety of studies relying on anecdotal evidence from one or more cases. There is little systematic study, however, that compares efforts across a variety of cases or uses sophisticated indicators to judge effects. An overview of these missions and their intent can be found in John A. Cope, ‘International Military Education and Training: An Assessment,’ McNair Paper 44, (Washington, DC: Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, October 1995).

change introduced by contracting for training generally exacerbates the above difficulties. Below, I first outline the general benefits and risks of using contractors and then discuss at how they impact the general difficulties of training foreign forces.

Benefits:

- *PSCs can draw on a deeper pool of personnel and personnel with specific experience.* In the ACRI program, for instance, MPRI was able to provide French-speaking instructors for francophone African states that would not be available from the ranks of the Special Forces.² In Iraq, the US has relied on PSCs that have recruited internationally, providing a much larger labor pool.
- *Contractors can provide greater stability in training programs.* While military personnel rotate in a fixed manner in US forces, PSCs can provide teams in which the same personnel stay in a country for several years.³
- *Contractors can move personnel to the field more quickly* in some circumstances, providing what some have called “surge” capability.⁴ As the US went about the monumental task of training the Iraqi Army, police, and other security forces, PSCs offered a vehicle for a rapid increase in trainers that bolstered the capacity of thinly stretched coalition forces.

Risks:

- *Contractors are “rigid tools for fluid environments”.* The contract specifies tasks to be done and payment to be received for a specific period of time. Even if US priorities change, the contract enshrines the original agreement and makes change costly.
- *Contracted services often pose difficulties with coordination and integration.* Integration between different elements of US government, the host government, and other governments is complicated by dividing up training efforts among different contractors.
- *Contracted training services are subject to political opportunism.* When contractor and host government share interests, they can collude to further private interests rather than public goals.
- *Contracted training is difficult to monitor and control.*
- *Contracted training can be more costly.* Particularly in risky or uncertain environments.

² Interview with Ed Soyster, MPRI – 12 April 99; Interviews with Jean-Michel A Beraud and Clifford L. Fields, MPRI (ACRI program) 31 January 00; Interview with Scott Fisher, State Department, ACRI program, 31 August 99.

³ Comments of Theresa Whelan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, at the International Peace Operations Association Dinner, Washington, DC, 19 November 2003.

⁴ Interviews with Ed Soyster, MPRI, 1999, 2000, 2002; Stacey Rabin, PAE, comments at SAIS/IPOA Conference, “Enhancing Public-Private Peace Operations: Evaluations and Opportunities,” Washington, DC, SAIS 20 November 2003.

Contracting and common foreign force training stresses:

1. General training may not prepare forces for specific missions – forces need not only capacities but capacities in specific areas

The private sector can provide benefits in mobilizing personnel from a deeper pool with access to a wider variety of specialized skills. In the ACRI program, for instance, MPRI was able to provide French-speaking instructors for francophone African states that would not be available from the ranks of the US Special Forces.⁵ In Iraq, the US has relied on PSCs from a number of countries to train forces (mostly the Facilities Protection Force), and these PSCs have recruited internationally, providing a much larger and more diverse labor pool.

Contracting makes it harder to assess the fit between contracted training and force needs. Often the contractor is a main source of information about progress on goals related to the training contract. The contractor may withhold information that might disrupt the continuation of the contract, the contractor may not understand general US goals, or there may just be inadequate communication channels for unexpected information. All of this makes it hard to determine the degree of progress.

Reliance on information provided by the contractor creates particular problems when the host country and the contractor share an interest in the continuation of a contract even when it is not serving US goals as written. Pentagon officials reported this being a serious concern in the contract to train the Bosnian military, but they also said that such problems were common to contracts for foreign military training paid for by the US in Croatia and Macedonia as well.⁶ In Iraq this dynamic has been evident too; the 2007 SIGIR Review of DynCorp finds that DynCorp performed work authorized by the Iraqi Ministry of Interior that was not authorized by the US Department of State.⁷

Sometimes the contractor is aware of deficiencies in training or its integration with policy but is unable to communicate that effectively to policy makers. In Basra, for instance, ArmorGroup trainers were frustrated when their knowledge of militia infiltration of the police was not understood or acted upon by the British officials they were working for. They were further discouraged when the police chief was fired for talking about this infiltration to the local press.⁸

⁵ Interview with Ed Soyster, MPRI – 12 April 99; Interviews with Jean-Michel A Beraud and Clifford L. Fields, MPRI (ACRI program) 31 January 00; Interview with Scott Fisher, State Department, ACRI program, 31 August 99.

⁶ Interview with military officers at the Joint Staff, April 2002.

⁷ Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, “Review of DynCorp International, LLC, Contract Number S-LMAQM-04-C-0030, Task Order 0038, for the Iraqi Police Training Program Support,” SIGIR-06-029, DoS-OIG-AUD/IQO-07-20, January 30, 2007, p. 17.

⁸ Interview with ArmorGroup officials, October 2006.

Even when policy makers are aware of problems with a training contract, it can be hard to change the contract. This was an issue in Vinnell's contract to train the Iraqi Army.⁹ There were early indications that the training was not going well. Vinnell and others sent "classroom guys, not drill instructors"¹⁰ and put too much emphasis on classroom studies of strategy and tactics and not enough on basic combat skills. Reports suggested that the drill instructors were overweight, discipline was loose, the curriculum was confused (perhaps complicated by the number of subcontracts) and when the first battalion graduated on October 4, its commander concluded that he would have to redo much of the training.¹¹ In December the problem was even more apparent as almost one half of the recruits abandoned their jobs just before they were to leave training camp.¹² When it became clear that there was a problem with a contract, though, it was hard to adjust because "the contract is a rigid tool. When the situation has changed, you [the US military] are in a worse situation and need to fix things quick but the contractor has the bargaining power and he wants things to stay the same [as they were in the initial contract]."¹³ Vinnell kept the contract and completed its obligation to train nine battalions.¹⁴ Ironically, the extent of insecurity in Iraq led the army to be tested – and found wanting – earlier on than might otherwise have been the case.

2. Coordinating civilian, military and police forces for counterinsurgency missions – even in purely operational terms – is difficult.

Here the additional risks posed by contracting loom large. With different entities training the various armed services in Iraq, the potential for coordination difficulties goes up. The very fact of contracting often divides what should be an integrated set of policies into a number of discreet tasks. Writing contracts to insure communication and coordination with a variety of entities is often difficult. This is particularly the case when events on the ground change in ways the contract has not anticipated. Unlike US forces, which are placed under a commander in the field and thus subject to his command, contractors are ultimately subject to the contract rather than to a commander.

Though there have been efforts to devise more effective institutional coordination both in the field in Iraq and in the Pentagon given congressional guidance in the 2005 Defense Appropriation Act, reports are that coordination is still an issue – partly because of increased activity and interference by different parts of the Iraqi government.

⁹ In June 2003 Vinnell won a one year, \$48 million contract to train nine battalions (1000 men each) for the new Iraqi army. Pentagon Contract Announcement, US Department of Defense 25 June 2003. Much of the actual training was sub-contracted to MPRI, SAIC and several other firms Eagle Group International, Omega Training Group and Worldwide Language Resources, Inc. Geoff Fein, "Training Iraqi Army is a Wild Card," National Defense Magazine December 2003. Interview with Col. Paul Hughes, Senior Military Fellow, NDU and former official with ORHA and then the CPA, May 2004.

¹⁰ Interview with Col. TX Hammes, USMC, Senior Military Fellow at NDU, July 2004.

¹¹ Dean Calbreath, "Iraqi army, police fall short on training," San Diego Union Tribune 4 July 04; Ariana Eunjung Cha, "Recruits Abandon Iraqi Army," Washington Post 13 December 03, p. A1.

¹² Cha, "Recruits Abandon Iraqi Army."

¹³ Interview with Col. TX Hammes.

¹⁴ Calbreath, "Iraqi army, police force fall short on training;" Cha, "Recruits Abandon Iraqi Army."

Increased activity on the part of the Iraqi government is vital to the creation of an effective set of security forces in the long run. If these interventions are partisan or corrupt, however, they impede coordination and work against US and coalition goals. Because contractors are directly interfacing with the Iraqi government and have information about the degree to which members of the Iraqi government are reinforcing or undermining professional training, it is crucial that effective communication networks between US and coalition forces, US and coalition policy makers, and contractors be constructed.

In one important way, contracting for training can provide some advantages in coordination by generating greater stability of personnel doing the training. While military personnel rotate in a fixed manner in US forces, PSCs can provide teams in which the same personnel stay in a country for several years.¹⁵

3. Political direction from civilians that are poor or opportunistic can undermine stability no matter how good the training.

Military capacity need not translate into stability. Capable security instruments can overthrow governments or allow individual leaders or groups to pursue private or partisan ends. While the efforts of US troops are not impervious to this dynamic, PSCs are more likely to feed into opportunism. By their very nature, the flexibility of private forces can more easily be taken advantage of for private gain.

This was immediately apparent in the creation of the Facilities Protection Services in Iraq. Reports were that whole militia groups joined in force leading salaries and training to further strengthened the militias. Erinys did not violate the terms of its contract by training these people: the contract did not anticipate this opportunistic action. Initially each Iraqi ministry had armed units from this force to protect their infrastructure and other units protected private property but the Facilities Protection Services is now being moved under the control of the Ministry of the Interior.

As indicated above, though, similar infiltration has been reported to have occurred in the police forces. The Ministry of the Interior, under whom the Iraqi Police Service, the National Police and the Directorate of Border Enforcement serve, is also reported to have strong ties with Shiite militia groups. In response to concerns about the infiltration of the Iraqi police, DynCorp spokesman Greg Laguna said, "We don't control the political situation, the political loyalties of the people."

There are two kinds of opportunism at work in Iraq. One is a very dangerous potential for a diffusion of control that could result in the development of parallel forces that do not work together under central government command. Lessons from a wide variety of transitional states suggest that parallel forces loyal to different leadership can undermine prospects for peace. A crucial element for the development of civilian control is a civilian hierarchy that centralizes command over all forces.

¹⁵ Comments of Theresa Whelan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, at the International Peace Operations Association Dinner, Washington, DC, 19 November 2003.

The second is lower level corruption where officers pay kick backs to their superiors in order to get supplies and ghost soldiers and police help line political pockets. This second problem is exacerbated by the degree to which governance by local tribal and religious leaders take precedence over or are not well coordinated with the Iraqi constitution and Iraqi law.

Both work to undermine training efforts and often they work together. Setting up a system where contracted trainers think it is their job to contribute to managing this kind of opportunism is quite difficult – but it is also vital if we are to avoid US dollars being used to undermine stability in Iraq. Coordination among the different forces in Iraq and the tensions between the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Defense, and the national leadership is something that needs to be monitored carefully.

4. Professional values are often hard to put in practice – particularly against irregular opposing forces

The difficulty of maintaining professional behavior against irregular forces is something that troops struggle with constantly even in the US and the UK where training and socialization in professional values is very strong – witness Abu Ghraib and Haditha. Training forces without an historical appreciation of military professionalism to abide by these international law and professional values in the midst of an insurgency is a monumental task.

To the degree that PSCs draw from retired military personnel who are well socialized in international values and conduct their work accordingly, the values represented in military training can be as strong as if troops were training. The work that MPRI did for the ACRI program drew personnel with good area and language skills and generally operated well within the bounds of integration with social values. PSCs pulled directly from US professional military education in designing their curriculum. This curriculum is carefully designed to represent international values (not simply supporting civilian control of the military and respect for human rights, but claiming that these are integrally related to success on the battlefield) that model a particular type of military professionalism – and one that is consistent with what active-duty US troops would present.

Because contractors are not subject to the chain of command, however, the reliability of their behavior (even given recent attempts to make them liable to the US Code of Military Justice) is not as well reinforced as troops. According to Colonel Gerald Schumacher, a retired Special Forces officer, chaotic conditions in Iraq have led to an almost cavalier attitude among private security personnel toward international law, “I don’t know how anyone can function in an insurgent environment and have any regard for the laws of warfare and the Geneva Conventions.”¹⁶

¹⁶ Quoted in Tob Robberson, “DynCorp has big role, little oversight in war efforts,” Dallas Morning News, Sunday 24 December 2006.

Furthermore, the US contracting pattern in Iraq has relied on more companies and some that have recruited much more internationally. This recruitment pattern has yielded a more heterogeneous set of employees and companies that may represent different values (or less attention to professional values) in training. The US contract with Erinys to train a private facilities protection force brought in expatriates from South Africa, Nepal, and the UK, among others.¹⁷ The degree to which these employees represented professionalism in their work has been questioned – even by those in the industry.

Even if professional values are modeled in training, they also have to be reinforced with promotions and other rewards in the service. If personnel are rewarded for professional behavior, the organization will yield more professionalism. If, as in the case of the police chief in Basra who was fired for telling the truth about militia infiltration, they are punished for professional behavior, however, the reverse will be true.

5. The US often has many sub-goals in a conflict and the pursuit of one may undermine others (e.g., US forces working with warlords in Afghanistan to gain access to al Qaeda hideouts -one US goal- worked against President Karzai's efforts to consolidate control over the country by training a national Afghan Army -another US goal).

Contractors have frequently used the complexity of US goals to suit their interests in the continuation of a contract. When it looks as if their contract might be frozen because a host country is violating human rights concerns or misbehaving in some other way, a company may claim that its contract should not be frozen because “engaging” human rights abusers may lead to improvements in civil-military relations and democratization that may enhance attention to human rights in the long term. In a number of instances, these kinds of arguments have allowed a contract to continue even when a legal embargo is in effect.¹⁸ When confronted with evidence that the same company's contract may be in violation of local laws or be used politically by host country politicians in violation of human rights norms, though, the company can turn around and claim that it is serving US interests by enhancing the capacity of the host government's forces or rewarding cooperative behavior internationally. More than once, contractors told me that, “it is not our job to insure that our boss [the host country] abides by its own laws.”¹⁹ Similar issues have cropped up in the training of Iraqi security forces.

Institutional structures that can ameliorate foreign training stresses

I have argued elsewhere that democratically dense networks of international organizations (IOs) – can offer a coordinating umbrella for norms and standards and

¹⁷ DynCorp advertisements for police officers specify a requirement for US citizenship. See <http://www.policemission.com/iraq.asp>.

¹⁸ See Deborah Avant, *The Market for Force: the Consequences of Privatizing Security*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), chapter four.

¹⁹ Interviews with MPRI officials, 2002.

enforcement tools that get around the difficulties of training foreign forces.²⁰ In Europe, NATO and the Partnership for Peace (PfP) in Europe have generated a framework that:

- provides models of effective state institutions
- coordinates the roles of civilian and military personnel
- channels support through central state institutions so as to encourage coordination and lines of accountability within the state
- offers incentives (and disincentives) to encourage compliance

Private training in Croatia demonstrates the benefits of this kind of umbrella. NATO and the PfP provided an important framework that avoided many of the potential drawbacks of private training. The PfP worked not only to constrain the PSC doing the training (MPRI) but also to inform and constrain the Croatian government, military personnel and even international aid financiers. The PfP informed the fledgling government and military personnel about proper behavior, induced them to behave properly by rewarding proper behavior, and funneled resources through the state in a way that dissuaded opportunism all of which encouraged participation in emerging political processes even as MPRI performed the training. The information, inducements and dissuasion were tightly coupled to reinforce behavior among a wide variety of actors: civilian leaders, the military, MPRI, opposition parties, and international partners.

Croatia's contract with MPRI's undoubtedly enhanced the Croatian Army's capabilities. It also, however, consolidated rather than diffused control over violence—MPRI did not work with sub-state forces but instead worked for the central government to integrate forces within the Croatian Army. Funneling resources through the state gave international actors a central point of leverage within the Croatian government and made it easier to encourage the government to attend to collective (rather than individual) goals with its security forces. Even though the PfP was initially only a justification through which Croatia could purchase military training in the midst of an arms embargo, it nonetheless led the contract to specify courses and training that focused specifically on appropriate professional behavior and international law as it applies to military personnel. So although there were pressing and immediate security concerns in Croatia, the training program focused on long term institution building as well.

The PfP framework both provided a standard for military institutions as part of a democratic state and had within it carrots (international financing) and sticks (freezing of training) that the US and other international actors could use to encourage both the Croatian military and the Croatian government to focus on long term professional development in the military as well as short term security goals. Over ten years significant numbers of Croatian military personnel were trained. Partly because of the cache of American training, partly because of the lure of the PfP program, education by MPRI also enhanced the careers of those Croatian military personnel who participated. The reorganization of the Croatian Defense Department to meet PfP standards further reinforced these policies and the promises (and then delivery) of US financing for

²⁰ Deborah Avant, "Opportunistic Peacebuilders? International Organizations, Private Military Training and State-building after War," paper prepared for the Research Partnership on Postwar State-building, Boulder Colorado, July 2006.

continued military reform further rewarded military professionalism in Croatia. The long-term aims of the training and the fact that the contracts were sustained over many years gave more time for these effects to be felt.

By introducing professional values, connecting them with effective military performance and promising military aid for continued changes, MPRI training nudged improvements among the Croatian forces.²¹ The PfP framework also discouraged civilian leaders from using the military for partisan or individual purposes. Under this framework, private military training contributed to, rather than eroded, state building in Croatia.

Lessons for Iraq?

The difference between conditions in Croatia in the mid-1990s and conditions in Iraq today offer little optimism that the same kind of framework can be devised. While efforts in the Balkans could link up with the variety of institutions in Europe, efforts in Iraq do not have the same regional institutional resources. Also, Croatia's genesis as a separatist initiative to pull away from a multi-ethnic state left it with fewer ethnic and religious divides. Finally, the US responsibilities for and role in the development of the Croatian state were considerably different.

Nonetheless, a larger umbrella within which to coordinate training for Iraqi security forces and incentives for the Iraqi civilian government would undoubtedly be helpful. Such a framework should:

- specify model behavior for both civilian leaders and military personnel
- insure that the model and training centralizes rather than diffuses control over force
- tie continued support for the government and each contract to institutional milestones
- take advantage of regional agreements and international institutions to nest reinforcements for the model (this echoes the argument in the Iraq Study Group Report that urges cooperation with regional players)
- focus on the long term

General Institutional Issues to Consider in Contracting for Training Foreign Forces

There are a variety of additional concerns raised about contracting out foreign military training missions. It deprives active duty US personnel of "engagement" opportunities (or chances to make long-term personal contacts with military personnel in foreign countries) that are one of the rationales for increased attention to training in the first place.²² Also when the US sends PSCs and not military personnel the host country

²¹ Some egregious human rights violations by the Croatian forces took place in the early period of MPRI training but by the end of the training effort, some officials responsible for these violations were turned over to the Hague for prosecution.

²² Interview with Pentagon officials, April 2002. Comments of Theresa Whelan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, at the International Peace Operations Association Dinner, Washington, DC, 19 November 2003.

perceives a lower level of US commitment and generally values this training less highly – there is a certain cachet attached to being trained by US troops.²³ And there are questions about the relative costs of these missions.²⁴

The private option also enables US government officials to forgo investment in (or reorganization of) military forces for new problems – using PSCs one time make it more likely that they will be used in the future.²⁵ While the private option provides flexibility in the short run, then, it is harder to control and frequently more costly than its public alternative and reduces incentives to reorganize the force.²⁶ This is dramatically illustrated by the US use of DynCorp for fielding international civilian police. Initially DynCorp allowed the US to field a force of international civilian police in Haiti that it had no other way of fielding. Over the long term, however, the DynCorp option has allowed the US government to avoid the creation of an international civilian police capacity – despite the fact that such forces have been routinely sent abroad over the last 10 years and much evidence that these forces lack the requisite strategic vision for effective action.²⁷

Contracting for foreign training has thus far changed the balance of control between the executive and legislative branches of government. The executive branch hires contractors, not Congress. Though Congress approves the military budget, it does not approve individual decisions to contract out training. It is harder for Congress to oversee PSC behavior in contract with the US government. The annual consolidated report on military assistance and sales, for instance, does not include information on who is conducting particular training missions.²⁸ Examples of executive use of PSCs to evade congressional restrictions abound. For instance, when Congress institutes stipulations on the numbers of US troops – the executive has used contractors to go above this number. Sometimes Congress has innovated and stipulated an upper limit on the number of contractors, but this has simply led PSCs to hire more local personnel.²⁹ Thus, the executive branch, in its decisions to hire contractors and in its day-to-day implementation

²³ Comments of Theresa Whelan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, at the International Peace Operations Association Dinner, Washington, DC, 19 November 2003.

²⁴ Decisions to outsource these missions are generally to reduce stress on personnel not to save money – but many point to [assumed] cost saving to justify the privatization. A variety of Pentagon staff, however, have expressed confusion about the relative cost and suspicion that the cost is higher. There are no good empirical studies of the relative cost of public v private foreign training.

²⁵ Thomas McNaugher, “The Army and Operations Other than War,” in The Future of the Army Profession edited by Don M. Snider and Gayle L. Watkins (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002).

²⁶ See Goldman, et. al., Staffing Army ROTC, p. 12; Susan Gates and Al Robbert, “Personnel Savings in Competitively Sourced DoD Activities,” (Washington, DC: RAND (MR-1117-OSD); “Contingency Operations: Army Should Do More to Control Contract Cost in the Balkans,” GAO/NSIAD-00-225 (September 2000).

²⁷ Interview with Robert Perito, June 04. See Perito, The American Experience with Police; Robert Perito, Where is the Lone Ranger When You Need Him? America’s Search for a post-conflict Stability Force (Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press, 2004); David Bayley, Democratizing the Police Abroad: What to do and How to do it, (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 2001).

²⁸ Lumpe, “US Foreign Military Training”

²⁹ Lumpe, “US Foreign Military Training;” Baum, “Nation Builders for Hire,” p. 36

of policy is advantaged vis-a-vis Congress. Indeed, this change is often touted by members of the executive branch as one of the benefits of contracting out.³⁰

This is not to suggest that congressional oversight of foreign training is easy or that the executive does not have an advantage in this arena in the first place. The institutional safeguards that give Congress indirect means of control over military forces, however, are not present with PSCs. For instance, Congress has long-standing ties to military organizations, which affect incentives for individual service members and provide mechanisms for congressional control. These mechanisms are not so readily available for PSCs. There are, of course, other ways to avoid congressional scrutiny – through the use of covert operations, for instance. PSCs simply add another tool to this list.

This is also not to suggest that Congress will not develop better tools for oversight of PSCs in the future. Given the stresses on US forces and the likelihood that contractors will be used for a wide variety of military tasks in the future, I hope that Congress along with the agencies of the executive branch will develop more effective strategies for managing these contracts.

³⁰ For instance, Theresa Whelan claimed that one of the advantages of contractors is that they “ease” FMF rules for training foreign militaries. Comments of Theresa Whelan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, at the International Peace Operations Association Dinner, Washington, DC, 19 November 2003