Introduction

Dwight D. Eisenhower was the last US general to sit in the office of the U.S. President. In his presidential farewell address to the nation in 1961, he warned his country that, ‘We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex.’\(^1\) Over 60 years later and the military-industrial complex has only become more ingrained throughout the world. The industry of manufacturing arms, developing technology for warfare, and maintaining large levels of full-time personnel has become ubiquitous.

Particularly murky are private military companies (PMCs). PMCs are often thought of as the modern reimagining of mercenary groups as these companies tend to offer private security companies for hire. However, according to Geneva Convention Article 47, set requirements to define an individual or group as a prohibited mercenary. PMCs avoid checking all of these boxes by remaining legal within the domestic law of the countries where they are chartered (their home countries) and the law of the countries where they work (host countries).\(^2\)

The most famous of these companies today is the Russian mercenary company, The Wagner Group. Wagner first emerged in 2014 during Russia’s annexation of the Ukrainian peninsula of Crimea. It also operates in Syria and at least a half dozen African countries.

Drawing its staff mostly from former members of the Russian army, Wagner became the shock troops of the Syrian government, playing an instrumental role saving the Syrian government from the challenges of dozens of domestic factions that captured the country’s territory, including Islamic State, other Sunni factions, and several Kurdish militias. Later Wagner expanded operations through Central Africa, where it supported local armed forces that took power by overthrowing democratically elected governments in the Central African Republic, Burkina Faso and Mali.\(^3\)

Typically, these companies fill gaps in providing security—defending facilities, people or territory—where state armed forces and police cannot operate, are too weak or not trusted. Common responsibilities are ensuring the safety of government officials and their families, protecting vulnerable infrastructure like oil refining facilities, or leading military campaigns when local state armed forces are suspected of sympathizing with the separatists, rebels or terrorists.

The role of mercenaries always is controversial, since states are expected to be responsible for


their own security and the needs of their people. Mercenaries also becomes controversial because they may not be fully accountable when they commit crimes of war.

After the invasion of Iraq in 2003, for example, the US. Department of State needed to assure the security of its diplomats. With the U.S. marine Corps—its usual security provider—stretched then by the war, State Department hired a private company, Blackwater Security Consultants. In 2007 the American private security company (a more polite name for mercenaries) Blackwater mercenaries were responsible for a panicked attack on Iraq civilians that killed 17 Iraqi civilians. The individuals responsible were US citizens, several of whom were convicted and imprisoned until former President Donald Trump pardoned them in 2020.

In recent years, PMCs have come under scrutiny yet again as the Russian Wagner Group gained infamy in their exploits in global conflicts. In Libya, Mali, and Sudan the Wagner Group has been accused of harming peace and sovereignty. In Ukraine, Wagner militants have become key players in the Russian forces. This PMC has not only sown the seeds of disruption in Africa and eastern Europe, but it has also sown the seeds of disruption at home in Russia. Typically, the Wagner group operates by training local militias or cooperating with local forces in order to operate under host country and international law. This allows them to skirt classification as a mercenary group under Article 47 of the Geneva Convention.

In Russia, Wagner led a brief mutiny against the Russian government in June 2023, a protest against Russian Army leadership in the Ukraine war. Yevgeny Prigozhin, the founder of the Wagner Group, stood out as the leader of this would-be coup against Moscow. In August of 2023, he was killed in a plane crash caused by an on-board explosion, that also killed nine people.
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others. The mutiny or coup, and subsequent suppression of Wagner’s autonomy in Russia, has weakened, but not undermined its operations.

For the member states of the United Nations meeting in the Economic and Social Council, a major issue is how much and how to regulate PMCs. There are important divisions between the member states in Africa, where it remains a bulwark of Russian intervention.

PMCs are a sector of the military industrial complex used for a handful of purposes by many nations. Both the US and Russia use PMCs to varying degrees and both the US and Russia have received criticism by human rights organizations on the specific deployment and efficacy of these programs.

Many member states are opposed to their existence, or insist they be fully related as state armed forces are, subject to all the domestic and international laws of their home governments. Other Member States see them as useful tools for international security, filling gaps where their own police and armed forces cannot go, requiring regulation, but not to be prevented for working. And other Member States rely on PMCs to ensure security when they themselves cannot. They don’t want mercenaries to have complete freedom—they don’t want them in a position to overthrow governments—but they want to be able to contract their services as needed.

Other major mercenary and private military companies

While the headlines are dominated by the organizations that cause the most international disruption or become infamous for specific activities or crimes, there are innumerable private security firms in the world. Most do nothing more controversial than patrol business and neighborhood. They outnumber the police and armed forces in many countries. The private security industry employee tens of millions of people worldwide. For example, in South Africa alone, the private security industry includes 10,380 registered companies and over 2.5 million registered security guards. Besides Wagner, here are some of the best known:
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Olive Group: Created in 2001, the Olive Group protects oil firms from attackers in Iraq and elsewhere since 2003. Drawing on former Special Forces, the UK-chartered Olive Group was started by Harry Legge-Burke, an ex-Welsh guard. The Olive Group is a member of the International Peace Operations Association, the British Association of Private Security Companies and the Private Security Company Association of Iraq.

A more typical private security guard

Academi: Formerly known as the Blackwater, Academi was found in 1996 by ex-US Navy SEAL Erik Prince. The company has been renamed twice, each time after controversies, becoming Xe Services in 2009 and Academi in 2011. In 2014, Academi merged with Triple Canopy to form Constellis Holdings after it was acquired by a group of private investors. Blackwater is most known killing of 17 Iraqi citizens in the Nisour Square massacre in Baghdad.

G4S Security: The third-largest private employer of security staff behind only Walmart and Foxconn, G4S is the biggest private military group in the world, with around 620,000 employees world-wide. It operates in over 120 countries. It provides routine support to airport security, nighttime patrolling, and so on and does not involve heavy combat. According to a report in Business Insider, in 2008, G4S swallowed up Armorgroup, whose 9,000-strong army of guards protected about one-third of all non-military supply convoys in Iraq.

Erinys: Erinys is a private firm based in the United Kingdom, in operation since the beginning of the Iraq War in 2003-04. One of the primary tasks of the firm is to guard the oil pipelines and energy assets globally. Erinys was accused of killing of an American soldier and torturing prisoners in custody. The group also maintains a presence in Africa, where it has traditionally focused its operations.

Actions on Mercenaries

One must understand the difference between a PMC, militias, and mercenary groups. PMCs, private military companies, are private entities that may offer a variety of services. Typically, these companies will offer site security, guards, and security personnel. Additionally, these companies may offer training teams that may train foreign armed forces. Some of these companies will offer armed personnel, militias, to assist with some particular strategic mission. This may be protecting mines in Mali, offering security escorts, and even additional manpower for a military mission. PMCs often hire ex-military as their personnel to capitalize on their expertise in real missions.

Just because a group may be identified as a PMC does not mean it automatically offers militias or mercenaries. One must identify the specific services offered to distinguish between a given PMC and a mercenary group.

Due to this difficulty in identifying mercenary groups from the various levels of services offered by PMCs, taking action against these groups can be difficult to perform without cutting out PMCs that may be critical to a given state’s strategic needs.

United Nations Action
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Various international standards have been created that define and illegalize mercenaries internationally.\(^{11}\)

The first criminalization of mercenaries relevant to modern international law came in the 1907 Hague Convention, around fifty countries were present to this convention. This established that signatories were obligated to prevent the establishment of mercenary groups within their borders, such that those groups would not travel to foreign powers to act in that capacity.

In 1977, the Member States of the United Nations agreed on *Additional Protocol I* of the Geneva Convention. This laid out a rigorous definition for what constitutes a mercenary. This definition matches another passed by the African Union:

A mercenary is any person who:

1) Is specially recruited locally or abroad in order to fight in an armed conflict;
2) Does, in fact, take a direct part in hostilities;
3) Is motivated to take part in the hostilities essentially by the desire for private gain and, in fact, is promised, by or on behalf of a party to the conflict, material compensation substantially in excess of that promised or paid to combatants of similar ranks and functions in the armed forces of that party;
4) Is neither a national of a party to the conflict nor a resident of territory controlled by a party to the conflict;
5) Is not a member of the armed forces of a party to the conflict; and
6) Has not been sent by a state which is not party to the conflict on official duty as a member of its armed forces.

In 1989, the United Nations General Assembly agreed to establish the *International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries*, more commonly known as the *United Nations Mercenary Convention* of 2001, the year it came into force among participating states.\(^{12}\) This expanded upon Article 47 of the Geneva Convention. This reaffirmed the previous definition of mercenaries, criminalized the training of mercenaries, prohibited signatories from using mercenaries, and reaffirmed the goals of 1907 Hague convention requiring signatories to actively prevent the development of mercenary groups.

In the 35 years since the Mercenary Convention was opened for signature, 37 countries have ratified the document, making it part of the domestic law, fully enforceable by their own law enforcement agencies.\(^{13}\) The most recent to ratify was Armenia in 2020, and they ratified with reservations. This is not enthusiastic compared to most major international agreements, which boast ratification by the vast majority of the UN’s 193 member States. Clearly, states have reservations about the wisdom of the Mercenary Convention.
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States that have *ratified* the 2001 Mercenaries Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member States</th>
<th>Ratified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>23.11.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>10.07.1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>28.05.1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>31.05.2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>26.01.1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>20.09.2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>27.03.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>09.02.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>08.07.1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>07.12.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>21.01.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>08.06.1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>18.07.2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>01.04.2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>21.08.1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>16.09.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>22.09.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>11.09.1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>12.04.2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>09.02.1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>22.09.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>23.03.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>26.03.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>28.02.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>09.06.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>14.01.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>12.03.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>10.08.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>23.10.2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>25.02.1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>18.09.1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>13.09.1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also revealing is the list of Member States that signed, but *never ratified*. Signatures obligate participating states under international law, which usually is not enforceable. Ratification obligates states under their own domestic law, which is enforceable.

This list shows that’s that have had second thoughts about the agreement, usually because they want to protect their ability to sue PMCs under certain circumstances, and have reservations about the universal prohibitions of the Convention. The list is dominated by African and European countries, initially supportive, but later less certain.

States that *signed* but have not ratified the 2001 Mercenaries Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member States</th>
<th>signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>28.12.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>13.12.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Republic of</td>
<td>20.06.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>20.03.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20.12.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>23.10.2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>05.10.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>04.04.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>28.12.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>17.12.1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The key activating clause of the mercenary Convention is Article 5, which prohibits participating states, states party to the convention, from hiring mercenaries. Article 5 states:

1. States Parties shall not recruit, use, finance or train mercenaries and shall prohibit such activities in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention.
2. States Parties shall not recruit, use, finance or train mercenaries for the purpose of opposing the legitimate exercise of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, as recognized by international law, and shall take, in conformity with international law, the appropriate measures to prevent the recruitment, use, financing or training of mercenaries for that purpose.
3. They shall make the offences set forth in the present Convention punishable by appropriate penalties which take into account the grave nature of those offences.

The Economic and Security Council, ECOSOC, also has been heavily involved in debates on mercenaries and PMCs. Its most important resolution passed in 2005. This decision sought more information regarding the modern use of mercenaries. Indeed, this demonstrates the challenges involved with determining whether a particular militia is a mercenary group.

Many observers agree the ECOSCO is well positioned to take up the issue again. Its member States are increasingly interested in generating momentum for progress, especially now that the nature of the mercenary problems has changed greatly. Action slowed in the 2010s, as the American and British firms that dominated the scenes lost importance and visibility. Now the problem is symbolized by the extensive disruption of the Russian Wagner company, with effects felt in Africa, Europe and the Middle East.

In 2018 the Secretary-General of the United Nations addressed the Security Council on the use of mercenaries in Africa. Among his many remarks he noted: “The shadowy nature of the practice makes data hard to come by.” During
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times of large-scale violence, it can be quite
difficult to gather concrete data on the question
of human rights abuses. After all, winners write
the history books. Due to this nature of violence
and the fact that PMCs purposefully operate in
legal gray areas, mercenary groups may avoid
the consequences of international law.

Country and Bloc Positions

For the member states of the United Nations
meeting in the Economic and Social Council, a
major issue is how much and how to regulate
PMCs. There are important divisions between
the Member States.

Many member States are opposed to their
existence, or insist they be fully related as state
armed forces are, subject to all the domestic and
international laws of their home governments.
Other Member States see them as useful tools
for international security, filling gaps where
their own police and armed forces cannot go,
requiring regulation, but not to be prevented for
working. And other Member States rely on
PMCs to ensure security when they themselves
cannot. They don’t want mercenaries to have
complete freedom—they don’t want them in a
position to overthrow governments—but they
want to be able to contract their services as
needed.

These differences are strongest between blocs,
but also can be seen within them, especially the
African Union and Non-Aligned Movement.

The African Union: Historically, many nations
in Africa have allowed PMCs such as Wagner
Group to enter their country and act as

mercenaries, relying on them for security where
their own armed forces and police were too few
or not reliable. PMCs have not only acted as
mercenaries, but frequently are responsible for
training domestic forces. PMCs have come from
Israel, France, and the United Kingdom. Even
the Russian Wagner Group has often been
employed with intent for training. Practice
shows that these groups often take on militia and
mercenary responsibilities.\(^{18}\)

The modern sentiment for the majority of
members of the AU is staunchly anti-mercenary
and anti-Wagner. The reasons for this distaste
include a diminished sense of sovereignty,
increased chaos and turmoil, and anti-colonial
policy in some cases.

But some AU Member States host Wagner and
other PMCs. They insist that they have a
sovereign right to contract with these companies.
Because their security and industry, sometimes
the safety of government leaders and their
families, depends on PMCs, they are very
careful how they are regulated. Generally, like
China and Russia, they want regulation left to
each sovereign Member State, not imposed by
the international community. They are not
opposed to the Convention, but insist that
application and interpretation be left up to each
member States itself, with no foreign
interference.

China has the most military personnel of any
armed force in the world. As one of the largest
militaries and as a member of the Security
Council, China has a vested interest in
maintaining their strategic military capabilities.
China has often used PMCs for their security
services domestically. In recent years, over

\(^{18}\) Durmaz, Mucahid. ‘White Hands’: The Rise of
Private Armies in African Conflicts,’ Al Jazeera,
28 April 2022.
7,000 PMCs offering specifically security services have proliferated in China, mostly ensuring the security of private businesses. Internationally they also offer a way for China to bolster the strength of its domestic military subversively. However, China has largely held back from using PMCs as a militia or mercenary group.\(^9\)

China is ambivalent on the mercenary issue. It seeks to help, not hinder, the work of its own companies and ensure their security needs. And China insists that all Member States retain full sovereignty over their domestic affairs. But China will support any measure that decreases the capabilities of their adversaries from strengthening their strategic military capability. They would not support any measure that may elucidate the true strength of their domestic security forces, nor would they support any measure seeking to decrease that strength.

**European Union:** The 27 Member States of the EU are a world-leader restricting mercenary activity. They have been leaders against the American company Blackwater and Russia’s Wagner Group. Especially considering the rise of Wagner Group influence in Africa, the fear of empowering non-state actors with military might has increased.\(^20\) EU Member States also stress the universal and impartial rule of international law. They strongly support efforts to enforce the Mercenaries Convention.

As most European Countries have actively supported Ukraine in the Russia-Ukraine war, the association between Wagner Group and Russian armed forces will motivate EU member states to prevent the increased strength of such groups.\(^21\) However, many of these members, such as France and the United Kingdom, have PMCs operating around in the world. They will balance their interest in their PMC sector with their fear of empowering non-state actors.

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM):** NAM consists of 120 developing states. NAM was created so states not aligned with the US, or the Soviet Union during the Cold War could have their interests represented on the international level. The Nam seeks above all the support the economic development of its Member States, and help them strengthen their sovereignty. This can lead to conflicts among NAM Members on matters related to mercenaries.

NAM member states not previously discussed will generally wish to decrease the power of foreign militias and mercenaries, but generally will want to maintain the ability to use PMCs in whatever capacity they do. The specific history of a NAM member state must be considered for their nuanced policy perspective.

**Russia:** Wagner Group is a Russian-based private military company offering militias for hire. In Africa, half a dozen states have significant Wagner Group militants. These forces have helped stabilize Russian owned mines and other properties in various locations around the continent. However, they are largely
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perceived as unwelcome forces by their countries of residence.\(^{22}\)

However, the interests of Wagner Group and the Russian Armed Forces haven’t always aligned. The Wagner Group’s now-deceased founder Yevgeny Prigozhin is believed to have attempted a coup against Russian president Vladimir Putin. Prior to the attempted coup, Wagner Group had decided not to assist the Russian Armed Forces in its war in Ukraine.\(^{23}\) The Russian Armed Forces still make liberal use of militia groups and PMCs in their war machine.

Russia is\(^{24}\) unlikely to support any UN actions that will weaken its military strength. However, if UN actions could support Russia’s internal stability with respect to traitorous intent within PMC militias, Russia may support it.

The United States has a distinctive approach to PMCs, relaying on private firms for security in particular missions, above all for training recipients of American military assistance, and to a lesser degree for contact security of American government facilities and personnel. In additional, American corporations are major PMC consumers, especially the oil industry and raw materials firms who need to protect foreign facilities from attack by criminal gangs, terrorists and rebels.

PMCs offering services other than militias are a crucial part of the US military, which is a prominent arm of its foreign policy and diplomacy. America’s militaristic diplomacy has been likened to the world’s legitimised mercenary force.\(^{25}\) For years, Japan’s military force was supplanted with US military forces. Not only did this expand US military operating capacity, but it also served to further bolster the US economy.

Under President Biden, the United States is a strong supporter of the mercenary Convention and support measures to facilitate and strengthen its enforcement. But the US tends to insist on exceptions for some of its own activity. However, the United States is especially supportive of any UN action that draws attention to military activity of states it opposes.

Some possible proposals for action

The ECOSOC specializes in recommendations to UN Member States for action. It cannot demand the states do anything, since they alone are sovereign. Instead, the ECOSOC tends to recommend action, especially normative principles to guide states action. The ECOSOC has complete freedom in its deliberations and choices. Some possibilities to be considered include:

Recommend all UN Member states sign and ratify the 2001 mercenaries Convention. This addresses the challenge of PMCs like
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Blackwater and Wagner, undermining their support, their business and influence. But many Member States will be opposed or abstain, since they rely on PMCs for state security, or benefit from their work.

**Recommend all Member States prohibit PMCs** involved in anything other than training or guard activity, effectively banning them from combat operations. This will be especially popular with states in Africa and Europe, which accept a legitimate role for PMCs, but want principles that limit their activity to the least troublesome areas.

**Recommend all Member States refuse to employ or work with specific PMCs** that are especially dangerous or disruptive. The ECOSOC could ask the UN Secretary-General to keep a UN blacklist of banned PMCs, as agreed by the ECOSOC.
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