



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

'Weaponized Volunteering' and re-considering the volunteering-weaponizing divide

Shachar, I.Y.; Gazit, N.; Grassiani, E.

DOI

[10.1177/00113921221095964](https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221095964)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Current sociology

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act (<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Shachar, I. Y., Gazit, N., & Grassiani, E. (2023). 'Weaponized Volunteering' and re-considering the volunteering-weaponizing divide. *Current sociology*, 71(2), 199-213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221095964>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)



'Weaponized volunteering' and re-considering the volunteering-weaponization divide

Current Sociology Monograph
2023, Vol. 71(2) 199–213
© The Author(s) 2022
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/00113921221095964
journals.sagepub.com/home/csi



Itamar Y Shachar 
Ghent University, Belgium

Nir Gazit 
Ruppin Academic Center, Israel

Erella Grassiani 
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

This introductory chapter to the monograph issue *Weaponized Volunteering* explicates and situates the theoretical and conceptual problems the collection addresses. It defines the concept of 'weaponized volunteering' and analyzes its importance for understanding the relations between contemporary trends of moralization and militarization or securitization. It does so by providing a brief genealogy of the concept of 'volunteering' and the rising public interest in it since the 1990s, with the upsurge of neoliberal transformations and a post-political public sphere. The introduction then continues to review changing ideas in the literature concerning civil–military relationships and also concerning the entanglement of what is considered civil and what falls under non-military 'security' domains. It then connects both themes to explain the value of the concept of 'weaponized volunteering'. Finally, the introduction explores how the various articles in this monograph issue contribute to understanding how moralization and militarization, civic volunteerism, and securitization are increasingly entangled, and reinforce each other.

Corresponding author:

Itamar Y Shachar, Ghent University, Sint Pietersnieuwstraat 41, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.
Email: itamar.shachar@ugent.be

Keywords

Civil society, civil–military entanglements, civil–military relations, military anthropology, military sociology, securitization, violence, volunteering, weaponized volunteering

The ‘post-political’ character of most contemporary neoliberal societies creates a climate in which agonistic politics are discouraged (Mouffe, 2005) and political discussions are often avoided (Eliasoph, 1998). Particularly under neoliberalism, political problems are often ‘rendered technical’ (Li, 2011) and relegated from the domain of contentious politics to the realm of consensual governance (Brown, 2016). A somewhat different interpretation was proposed by Fassin (2012), who explored how social problems are increasingly voided of their political character by being framed as ‘moral’ or ‘humanitarian’ issues, leading to an increasing tendency of contemporary societies toward ‘moralization’. Concomitantly, ‘volunteering’ has been emerging as a type of public engagement that is particularly suited to this consensual and moralized zeitgeist: it has been portrayed by a wide range of political, economic, and civic actors as an altruistic act that is purified from economic and political interests (Shachar, 2014; Shachar et al., 2019). Furthermore, volunteering has been portrayed as emerging from and related to ‘the community’, a pre-political and ethical domain that has a constitutive role in the consolidation of neoliberal governmentalities (Parker and Debruyne, 2011; Rose, 2000).

This rising significance of morality and volunteerism extends to unexpected terrains. Particularly intriguing is the increasing mobilization of notions such as ‘volunteering’, ‘morality’, and ‘community’ by state and non-state armed organizations. Such organizations increasingly nurture new alignments and associations, or reframe existing configurations, between civic and militarized actors (Sørensen and Ben-Ari, 2019). Indeed, recent studies have examined the increasing linkages between militarism and humanitarianism (Ben-Ze’ev and Gazit, 2018; McCormack and Gilbert, 2018). At the same time, policing organizations as well as private security companies increasingly aspire to exhibit ethical conduct and ‘social responsibility’. These increasing humanitarian commitments of militaries or ethical commitments of public and private security organizations are engrained in their routine operations and duties.

This monograph contributes to an under examined terrain of scholarly inquiry: how the increasing promotion and popularity of the notion of ‘volunteering’ can cohere with and support militarism, securitization, and violent endeavors. A main example of such tendencies is the use of volunteers from the ‘community’ to support the operations of militaries, policing forces, and security organizations, through community policing programs (Cattellino, 2004), volunteer networks for home front assignments in times of emergency (Kulik et al., 2016), or organized volunteering programs of army family members (mostly wives) to support military operations (Gassmann, 2010). Under a similar logic, vigilant groups try to re-legitimize their operations by representing their work as a bottom-up, voluntary-based initiative (Chavez, 2008; Kirsch, 2010; Shapira, 2013). Other types of civic–military entanglements involving volunteerism are created when military and police units engage their personnel in volunteering activities beyond their regular security-related tasks, drawing inspiration from the popular trend of

corporate volunteering. Companies in the sectors of arms manufacturing, aerospace industry, offensive cyber, and private security services join the trend as well (Shachar and Barkay, 2021). Framed as ‘volunteering’ or ‘community engagement’, such activities often take place in cooperation with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or welfare and educational institutions. They may range from facilitating activities for children, the elderly, or people with disabilities to delivering food and other services to the needy.

We use the term ‘weaponized volunteering’ to characterize various activities that are organized by armed groups and organizations, or by organizations that are potentially violent or aimed to support violence. For these activities, they recruit individuals to engage in voluntarism that goes beyond their routine, compulsory or remunerated activity, with a purpose that is consensually perceived as ‘good’ and as contributing to civilian communities or the broader society. This new type of civic–military entanglement (Sørensen and Ben-Ari, 2019) reflects an increasing mobility between civil society and state and non-state security actors, which enables carriers of weapons and (potential) violence to appear as ‘doing good’, while conjoining militaristic ethos with a glorification of ‘volunteering’ and ‘community engagement’.

Analyzing this phenomenon requires an alternative framework to the functionalist and liberal differentiation between the sphere of the state, which includes the military, and the ‘civic’ sphere of ‘society’ (Habermas, 1996; Huntington, 1957; Janowitz, 1960). Such framework challenges liberal perceptions of civil society as a non-violent sphere in its essence (Kaldor, 2003) and perplexes the prevalent identification of volunteering with morality (Muehlebach, 2012). In this introduction, we sketch the contours of this framework. We begin by conceptualizing ‘volunteering’ and ‘weaponization’ in a way that do not conform to these traditional distinctions, and continue by introducing their contemporary entanglements as presented in the contributions to this monograph issue.

Volunteering

In contemporary neoliberal societies a consensual notion of ‘volunteering’ prevails, crystallized during the last three decades through diverse scholarly definitions of the concept, working definitions by policy-makers and practitioners, media representations as well as popular understandings of volunteering (often documented through survey-based studies; e.g. Cnaan et al., 1996). These definitional attempts are the result of a burgeoning public interest in volunteerism expressed by state agencies and international bodies, corporations, and influential non-profits, as well as research institutions and networks. In this nexus of public policy aspirations and the production of relevant knowledge, definitions of volunteering are often modified and maneuvered to feed into the efforts of public and private institutions to promote volunteering (Chambré, 1989; Ganesh and McAllum, 2009).

Dominant definitions of volunteering perceived it as an unpaid activity that is conducted by individuals out of free determination and willingness, while mostly perceiving these activities as having an organized character and often associating it with a particular institutionalized sphere, often termed as the non-profit, non-governmental, or third sector (Butcher and Einolf, 2017; Cnaan and Amroffell, 1994; International Labor Organization, 2011). These efforts to depict volunteering as an object that can

and should be defined, measured, and studied, which can be located within a clearly defined sector, feed into the efforts of powerful institutional actors to promote and govern volunteering. It implies that volunteering is a 'good' engagement that scholars should help promoting.

The perception of volunteering as occurring mainly within organizational structures that constitute the third, non-governmental, or non-profit sector associates volunteering with the realm of the 'civic'. This sector is an institutional realization of the ideal of 'civil society': a public realm which is perceived as distinctive from other social spheres, such as the economic market, the state-related political system, and the family, where citizens get organized autonomously to influence civic life and collective concerns (e.g. Dekker, 2009; Habermas, 1996). This perception of civil society – which is purified from 'external' contagions such as economic or political interests – conforms to a liberal tendency inspired by Habermas 'to enclave certain matters in specialized discursive arenas' (Fraser, 1990: 73). It further reinforces 'neo-Tocquevillian' approaches that 'imagine civic activity [as] residing in an institutional realm of voluntary, face-to-face associations' (Lichterman and Eliasoph, 2014: 803). Although there are alternative conceptualizations of civil society (e.g. Gramsci, 1971; Hegel, 2012 (1820)), the liberal perspective regarding the role and functioning of civil society became dominant among scholars of the third sector. The perception of volunteering as occurring mainly within the institutional realm of the third sector associates this form of participation with the liberal political ideal of the civil society.

The approach that guides this monograph moves away from this widely accepted approach. Instead, following Shachar et al. (2019), we propose a shift toward a critical focus on the rising political interest in volunteering. As part of this shifting focus, we problematize the prevalent association of volunteering as an activity organized through non-governmental or non-profit organizations by highlighting the increasing involvement of corporate and state actors in facilitating and promoting volunteering, actors that increasingly become constitutive forces in the proliferation of volunteering. Rozakou (2016), for example, explored governmental efforts to promote volunteering through an alignment of regional (European) and national (Greek) efforts, while Ogawa (2009) described the legal infrastructure, policy measures, and discursive techniques used by the Japanese state to encourage citizens to engage in particular forms of volunteering that the state was interested to promote. Corporations have been involved in public campaigns aimed to promote volunteering and donations to volunteer-infrastructure organizations (Shachar, 2014), but also encourage their own employees to volunteer through programs of corporate volunteering (Barkay, 2012; Rodell et al., 2016; Shachar and Hustinx, 2019). This governmental and corporate involvement in volunteering also demonstrates the problematics of framing volunteer work as derived from 'free will'. Based on this understanding, volunteering research should move away from the classical association of volunteering with 'altruism' (e.g. Haski-Leventhal, 2009) toward closer attention to the ways in which individuals navigate between different and sometimes contradictory motivations (e.g. Fleischer, 2011; Taylor, 2004).

We analyze this rising overall interest in volunteering as intersecting with the spreading hegemony of neoliberalism. We refer here to neoliberalism not only in the sense of a political-economic system (e.g. Harvey, 2005) but as a governmentality regime that

produces particular human subjects (e.g. Ong, 2006; Rose, 1999 cf. Hilgers, 2010). Volunteering and its promotion serve the structural-systemic interests of the neoliberal state (e.g. Krinsky and Simonet, 2017), but also constitute a technology of governmentality promoted by the neoliberal state and its aligning actors to shape and steer individual subjectivities (e.g. Hyatt, 2001; Rose, 2000). Nikolas Rose (1999, 2000), for example, demonstrated how third sector organizations, community-based projects, and volunteer efforts have become part and parcel of more recent forms of neoliberal governmental technologies that together with state agencies (through public–private partnerships) and other actors govern the political behavior of citizens. These new technologies of governmentality created new and hybrid settings of welfare provision in which services previously provided by government and its regular employees are gradually delegated to volunteers through the intermediation of third sector organizations (Hustinx et al., 2015).

However, while there is convincing evidence that contemporary forms of volunteering are inherently related to state policies and the economic market, ongoing processes of distinguishing volunteering from these realms remain crucial for its legitimization. The legitimacy of volunteering also relies on its popular perception as a pure engagement that is altruistic and autonomous. This perception has to be nurtured by promoters of volunteering and by the volunteers themselves, who construct it as altruistic by dissociating it from political or economic interests (Shachar et al., 2019). This is what identifies volunteering as ultimately ‘good’, an assumption that will be challenged in this monograph. We will do so by looking at the way armed or potentially violent organizations use volunteering as *modus operandi*, showing, through different cases, how volunteering ultimately can become a tool for the promotion of violence.

Weaponization

The study of military and society relations in the post-World War II era tended to view the two realms of the military and civilian society as dichotomous. The structural-functionalist perspective that characterized much of social sciences on civil–military relations (see: Burk, 1998; Huntington, 1957; Janowitz, 1971, 1976; Moskos, 1976) usually focused on the institutional level, and the question around the capacity of political systems to balance democratic arrangements with security considerations, the prominence of military elites in decision-making, and allocation of resources to military efforts. Hence, much of the research was on the nature of the boundaries between the military and civilian society and the degree of their permeability. Although scholars did acknowledge interactions between the two social spheres, for example, the importance of civilian legitimacy and support for the armed forces, the common view considered the two spheres as distinct. This changed with the ‘critical turn’ in political sociology, since the 1960’s, which was more open to the dialectical relations between the military and civilian sectors and to the impact of war and state violence on the wider society (Giddens, 1987; Mann, 1988; Tilly, 1995). Later on, feminist scholars contributed to the scholarly disentanglement of the ‘military’ versus ‘society’ dichotomy by describing how militarization is intertwined with knowledge production and spatial transformations (Lutz, 2002), and how military service produces gendered and racialized bodies, as well as

intersectional notions of citizenship (Sasson-Levy, 2003a, 2003b). This transformation also signaled a shift toward more critical conceptualizations and theorizations of civil–military relations, up until the recent focus on ‘civic-military entanglements’ which has fundamentally challenged the civil–military distinction dominating the social study of military and society (Sørensen and Ben-Ari, 2019).

Critical scholarly work has further expanded to the exploration of ‘things military’ and security issues beyond the military itself and its relations with wider society. This expansion into what we know as security studies saw a milestone with the work of political scientists Buzan and Waever (Buzan et al., 1998), who proposed their ‘securitization theory’ and highlighted the non-military aspects of security. Although often criticized as Eurocentric (Wilkinson, 2007) and gender-biased (Hansen, 2000), this approach sets the ground for a critical exploration of security. Waever’s original proposition was that security is a speech act: ‘It is by labeling something a security issue that is become one’ (Waever, 2004: 13; see also Floyd, 2007; Taureck, 2006). The idea was that when such labeling can convince an audience of a security emergency, then the powerful actor can legitimize further acts toward countering said security threat. Importantly, Waever saw such processes as a failure of regular politics (Floyd, 2007). Since the development of these ideas, scholars from other disciplines have pleaded for a critical study of security (for example, Goldstein, 2010, in anthropology, and Burk, 2001, in Sociology). Numerous scholars have begun to analyze security and security themes as social and intersubjective constructions, which are not limited to the realms of the military and the state but which are also part of other civilian settings. From a focus on top–down securitization scholars have moved to study, often ethnographically, everyday acts and processes of securitization. Thus, scholars have increasingly begun to critically question concepts of security and securitization generally (Maguire et al., 2014; Diphooorn and Grassiani, 2015, 2019; Gluck and Lowe, 2017; Neocleous and Rigakos, 2011), in specific geopolitical settings (El Dardiry and Hermez, 2020), and in relation to the body (Higate, 2012; Maguire et al., 2014), race (Machold and Charrett, 2021; Ybarra, 2019), neoliberal global economy (Diphooorn and Grassiani, 2016; Grassiani, 2017), and especially border control and irregular migration (Andreas, 2000; Ben Ze’ev and Gazit, 2018; Bigo, 2011; De Genova, 2013; Fassin, 2011; Samimian-Darash and Stalcup, 2017). Moreover, there is a growing acknowledgment regarding the normative and ethical dimensions of securitization (Floyd, 2019; Nyman and Burke, 2016; Taureck, 2006) and its influence on social relations.

In line with the efforts of these works, some of the contributions to this monograph issue ask how ‘security’ is understood and produced, what security means for different people, and how security themes are manipulated in civilian settings. More broadly, the monograph issue is concerned with the points of intersection between securitized and militarized discourses and practices, and what is classically perceived as ‘civil society’ or civilian volunteering, through exploring an array of phenomena we group under the term *weaponized volunteering*. With this focus we join previous works, already mentioned above (e.g. Diphooorn and Grassiani, 2019; Sørensen and Ben-Ari, 2019), which reject the civil–military/security binary because it masks rather than elucidates the ways in which militarism and securitization influence society. Alternatively, we wish to focus on the entanglements and trajectories of security and civilian volunteering and to show the different ways these two ideas and practices come together. Instead of considering

the realms of civil society and security/military as dichotomous, we suggest directing our analyses toward their disaggregated constitutive elements: the actors, sites, discourses, technologies, objects, and practices that are mobilized and reconfigured in innovative ways to make up particular, sometimes unexpected manifestations of civil–military/security relations. Consequently, we ask what social forces, interests, and actors-assemblages interlace in these realms? What is happening when companies, state actors, or organizations use volunteering in militarization/securitization processes? How does it affect these processes, and how does militarization or securitization affect volunteering? And more broadly, what can the convergence(s) of volunteering and security that we term ‘weaponized volunteering’ teach us about contemporary civil–military relations?

It should be stated from the outset that by ‘weaponized’ we do not refer solely to the actual use or possession of weapons although many of the cases discussed in this volume indeed include their actual and symbolic use. The mere presence of arms such as guns, rifles, and knives (openly or concealed), as well as wearing military-like equipment and camouflaged clothing or even actual uniforms in civilian settings, carries important symbolism since these practices engrain violence into civilian activities, especially if these activities are morally charged, such as ceremonies and national celebrations. As some scholars have indicated, there is an increased formal and informal authorization by governments to let civilians carry guns, particularly in the United States (Obert et al., 2018), but also increasingly in Europe (Koehler, 2019). There is also a growing presence of weapons in vigilante activities in Western and non-Western countries (Bjørge and Mareš, 2019). Although carrying guns and certainly the use of them are regulated by law in most countries, the practical control of the legal use of firearms and other kind of weapons (i.e. tear gas and alarm pistols) by civilians is often less strict and potentially less effective in comparison to the oversight of weapon use by state officials, such as soldiers and law enforcement officers.

Civilian volunteers carrying weapons further open up questions about the blurring boundaries between legitimacy and legality in relations to carrying weapons. For example, when weapon use is regarded as illegitimate but formally approved, or when carrying a weapon is illegal but informally legitimized by state actors. Voluntary activities undertaken by organizations whose members carry guns or potentially use such violent means will be impacted by such processes of (in)formal authorization and/or legitimation. Such questions will be taken up by the different contributors to this monograph issue.

Beyond the growing likelihood of (civilian) violence when guns and weapons are accessible (Braga et al., 2021), the *potential* of surging to use weapons can make a context ‘weaponized’ and serves as mechanism of social control and domination. In many countries, not all civilians have legal access to weapons and such authorized access is unequal. In Israel, for example, to be allowed to privately own and/or carry a weapon, one practically must have a military chapter in his or her background. As a result, the right to carry a personal pistol is mostly reserved to Jewish citizens of the country, as its Palestinian-Arab citizens are not recruited to the military. Moreover, together with labeling the Arab population a ‘security’ threat, this discrimination colors the Israeli field of security – composed of state actors, private entities, and even civil society groups, as contributions in this monograph highlight – as Jewish-centric. Hence, activities of

weaponized volunteering may also function as mechanisms of ethnonational control and informal policing (see Gazit, 2020; Gazit and Grassiani, this issue; Ivasiuc, 2015 on vigilante policing of Roma in Italy).

The threat of the use of weapons or violence by civilian volunteers can further contribute to a quiet and slippery militarization of civilian society and of society at large, as ‘weaponized volunteering’ may fuse the morality of civilian altruism with the tribute of security service, and thus initiate sentiments of nationalistic patriotism and militarism. Here we do not only refer to formal militarization of the regime but also to ‘militarism of civilians’ (Vagts, 1937: 451–483) or what Kimmerling (1993) termed as ‘cultural militarism’. Instead of being based on a strict separation of the military sphere from society or on exclusive military traits and official militaristic culture, popular militarism may be integrated into everyday civilian life and discourse and maintained through cultural and educational mechanisms.

Here we consider not only what Mabee and Vucetic (2018) call ‘civil society militarism’, that is, the growing involvement of civil organizations in security practices, but also the fusing of militaristic themes in a new and prevalent type of moralizing discourses that exclusively rests on humanitarian premises. This latter process happens, for example, through the framing of threats within civilian life in terms of military or (national) security threats and the engagement of civil society organizations in tackling them. An example of this, which will be discussed in more detail in one of the contributions to this monograph issue, is the emergence of a securitized discourse around ‘agricultural terror’ and the activity of militarized civilian groups to tackle it (Gazit and Grassiani, this issue). When military and security themes become a key aspect of civilian discourses of altruism and ‘doing good’ through volunteerism, we thus speak of *weaponized volunteering*. In this monograph, we will see how both phenomena strengthen each other and influence each other differently in several contexts.

Weaponized volunteering: overview of the contributions

This monograph and the contributions included in it resulted from an international symposium organized by the three co-editors at the University of Amsterdam in February 2019. The contributions present a variety of case studies, which exemplify diverse entanglements between armed organizations or environments and the sphere of civil society and volunteerism. Some of the contributions analyze volunteering and NGOs’ activities in militarized environments, while others extend the thematic scope to include volunteering in interaction with policing groups. Other cases focus on ‘militarization from below’ – how a militaristic state-of-mind induces citizens to create civic groups that are aimed to nurture militarized, weaponized, and neo-nationalistic endeavors. In some cases, corporate entities and neoliberal rationalities further complex these civil-militarized configurations.

The over-representation of case studies from Israel in this monograph is in line with the widespread recognition in military studies that the Israeli case is particularly relevant for studying the relations and entanglements between military, state, and society (Maman et al., 2001; Rosenhek et al., 2003). Furthermore, Israel plays an increasingly importantly

role in the diffusion of security ‘know how’ (Grassiani, 2017) and of militarized modes of thinking. To the Israeli cases presented in this monograph, cases from Latin America, Africa, and Europe join to depict an increasing mobility between the civil society and armed forces, which conjoins militaristic ethos with a glorification of ‘volunteering’ and ‘community engagement’, and enables carriers of weapons and (potential) violence to appear as ‘doing good’. These new configurations also reflect, and feed upon, changing social hierarchies, institutional arrangements, or power relations that cut across social, geographical, and political realms. Hence, the monograph contributes to a better understanding of the complexity of transnational sociological processes, in which moralization and militarization play a significant, often entangled, role.

The contribution by **Itamar Shachar** presents the increasing tendency in the Israeli military to engage soldiers in volunteering activities beyond their regular security-related tasks. These activities are mostly realized through forging partnerships or alignments between military units and NGOs or semi-public welfare and educational institutions. These cross-sectoral alignments sometimes extend to involve financial donations and volunteers from the corporate sector, creating what can be identified as an emerging military–industrial–non-profit complex.

A comparative analysis of volunteers’ role in environmental conflicts is presented by **Alexander Dunlap**. Dunlap examines three cases in Mexico, Peru, and Germany, in which corporations and the state collude in explicit and implicit violence to undermine popular resistance to natural resource extraction projects. He focuses on how corporate and state actors recruit volunteers from ‘local communities’ to be part of these efforts and exhibit ‘community support’ in these projects. He analyzes these utilizations of volunteers as part of domestic counterinsurgency strategies imported from the military sphere, and shows how they contribute to the social engineering of popular acquiescence to resource extraction operations.

Tammy Hoffman provides an integrative analysis of two educational endeavors in Israeli high schools which are usually perceived as separated: pre-military education programs and the incorporation of volunteering as a compulsory prerequisite for the matriculation diploma. Hoffman shows these two programs share a common discursive framework that glorifies an ideal Israeli citizen who serves his country through both civic volunteering and military service. This dual discourse blurs the boundaries between the civic and the military in these education programs and beyond them.

Sarah-Jane Cooper-Knock and **Tessa Diphoorn** examine various forms of citizen-led policing initiatives in South Africa’s policing projects, such as Community Police Forums, neighborhood watches, and police reservists. Their ethnographic and historical analysis shows the intermingling of state actors, local volunteers, and private security providers in these sites, while drawing on longer legacies of volunteerism tied to the country’s apartheid past.

Finally, **Nir Gazit** and **Erella Grassiani** examine how militarism may re-emanate in civil society with almost no influence from military actors. By examining the case of the Israeli NGO/militia *Hashomer Hachadash* (The New Guard), they show how ethos and practices of voluntarism play an important role in this process as they enable the organization to nurture a civilianized and populist form of militarism and neo-nationalism, outside the monopoly of formal governmental institutions.

The monograph ends with a conclusion by **Jon Van Til**, a veteran scholar in the field of third sector and non-profit studies, who situates the volume's contribution and the concept of 'weaponized volunteering' in the historical context of volunteering and third sector research. Van Til discusses possible directions to which the study of weaponized volunteering may evolve, and the challenges such research may face.

Looking ahead

It seems that societies across the globe have been changing rapidly since the research and writing process that resulted in this monograph issue. A global pandemic has been re-shaping social relations and ways of living, working, and participating in public life. When finalizing this introductory piece, in March 2022, the devastating destruction of war is threatening to crumble what has been imagined in Europe as an age of peace.

The covid-19 pandemic created a crisis that was analyzed in many countries as a 'security' issue, involving security specialists in decisions related to public health (Gad et al., 2021; Pasquier et al., 2021; Wilén, 2021), and deploying military units, police forces, and private security firms in governmental responses to the pandemic (Kalkman, 2021). Concomitantly, what was seen as a 'civic' response to the pandemic reached new peaks: solidarity initiatives and voluntary-based actions have blossomed, particularly in the first wave of the pandemic. However, this civic energy was quickly subsumed by neoliberal rationality, becoming an object of state attempts to manage and govern volunteering efforts (Shachar, 2020). Volunteering has re-emerged as a source of resilience that can enable 'communities' to survive crises, and increasingly attracted the interest not only of volunteering scholars and third sector practitioners, but also of security specialists (e.g. Landry et al., 2022). While not yet fully 'weaponized', volunteering has certainly become more 'securitized' during the covid-19 pandemic. Time will tell how these developments will affect future crises, such as the current war or those that will inevitably result from climate change. We hope that the current monograph issue could help us to imagine alternative ways of civic response that do not succumb to neoliberal and militarist logics.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the symposium discussants, Sarah Bracke, Willem van Schendel, and Jon Van Til, for their generous and valuable feedback, and to Barak Kalir for his continuous support in this project. We also wish to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Current Sociology* for their help in further improving the contributions to this monograph issue, and to the editorial team of CS monograph series for their guidance and patience.

Funding

The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The symposium *Weaponized Volunteering: New Configurations Between Civil Society and Armed Organizations* was supported by the Program Group *Moving Matters: People, Goods, Power and Ideas* at the Department of Anthropology, University of Amsterdam and the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the

Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 751924. The first author's work on this publication was also supported by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO), grant no. 3E017419.

ORCID iDs

Itamar Y Shachar  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1459-6469>

Nir Gazit  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8807-6530>

Erella Grassiani  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0722-400X>

References

- Andreas P (2000) *Border Games: Policing the U.S.–Mexican Divide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barkay T (2012) Employee volunteering: Soul, body and CSR. *Social Responsibility Journal* 8: 48–62.
- Ben-Ze'ev E and Gazit N (2018) Juggling logics on the Egyptian–Israeli borderland: Soldiers between securitization and arbitrary humanitarianism. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 47(2): 255–277.
- Bigo D (2011) Freedom and speed in enlarged borderzones. In: Squire V (ed.) *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity*. London: Routledge, pp. 31–45.
- Björge T and Mareš M (2019) *Vigilantism against Migrants and Minorities*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Braga AA, Griffins E, Sheppard K et al. (2021) Firearm instrumentality: Do guns make violent situations more lethal? *Annual Review of Criminology* 4: 147–164.
- Brown W (2016) Sacrificial citizenship: Neoliberalism, human capital, and austerity politics. *Constellations* 23(1): 3–14.
- Burk J (1998) The logic of crisis and civil-military relations theory: A comment on Desch, Feaver, and Dauber. *Armed Forces & Society* 24(3): 455–462.
- Burk J (2001) The military's presence in American Society, 1950–2000. In: Feaver PD, Kohn RH and Cohn L (eds) *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap in American National Security*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp.247–274.
- Butcher J and Einolf CJ (eds) (2017) *Perspectives on Volunteering: Voices from the South*. New York: Springer.
- Buzan B, Wæver O and De Wilde J (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Cattellino JR (2004) The difference that citizenship makes: Civilian crime prevention on the lower east side. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 27(1): 114–137.
- Chambré SM (1989) Kindling points of light: Volunteering as public policy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 18: 249–268.
- Chavez LR (2008) Spectacle in the desert: The Minuteman Project on the US-Mexico border. In: Pratten D and Sen A (eds) *Global Vigilantes*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.25–46.
- Cnaan RA and Amroffell L (1994) Mapping Volunteer Activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 23(4): 335–351.
- Cnaan RA, Handy F and Wadsworth M (1996) Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 25: 364–383.
- De Genova N (2013) Spectacles of migrant 'illegality': The scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(7): 1180–1198.
- Dekker P (2009) Civicness: From civil society to civic services? *Voluntas* 20: 220–238.

- Diphooorn T and Grassiani E (2015) Introduction: Security. *Etnofoor* 27(2): 7–13.
- Diphooorn T and Grassiani E (2016) Securitized capital: A processual-relational approach to pluralized security. *Theoretical Criminology* 20(4): 430–445.
- Diphooorn T and Grassiani E (2019) *Security Blurs*. London: Routledge.
- El Dardiry G and Hermez S (2020) Critical security and anthropology from the Middle East. *Cultural Anthropology* 35(2): 197–203.
- Eliasoph N (1998) *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fassin D (2011) Policing borders, producing boundaries. The governmentality of immigration in dark times. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 213–226.
- Fassin D (2012) *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fleischer F (2011) Technology of self, technology of power. Volunteering as encounter in Guangzhou, China. *Ethnos* 76(3): 300–325.
- Floyd R (2007) Human security and the Copenhagen School's securitization approach. *Human Security Journal* 5(37): 38–49.
- Floyd R (2019) *The Morality of Security: A Theory of Just Securitization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser N (1990) Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text* 25/26: 56–80.
- Gad M, Kazibwe J, Quirk E et al. (2021) Civil–military Cooperation in the Early Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic in Six European countries. *BMJ Military Health* 167(4): 234–243.
- Ganesh S and McAllum K (2009) Discourses of volunteerism. In: Beck CS (ed.) *Communication Yearbook* 33. New York: Routledge, pp.343–383.
- Gassmann JNN (2010) *Patrolling the Homefront: The Emotional Labor of Army Wives Volunteering in Family Readiness Groups*. PhD Dissertation. University of Kansas. Available at: <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/handle/1808/7420> (accessed 27 September 2018).
- Gazit N (2020) Military (non-) policing in the occupied territories. *Israel Studies Review* 35(2): 77–100.
- Gazit N and Grassian E (this issue) Securitized volunteerism and neo-nationalism in Israel's rural periphery. *Current Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221086824>
- Giddens A (1987) *The Nation-State and Violence*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gluck Z and Lowe S (2017) A sociospatial framework for the anthropology of security. *Anthropological Theory* 17(3): 281–296.
- Goldstein DM (2010) Toward a critical anthropology of security. *Current Anthropology* 51(4): 487–517.
- Gramsci A (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (ed. Smith GN and Hoare Q). New York: International Publishers.
- Grassiani E (2017) Commercialised occupation skills: Israeli security experience as an international brand. In: Leese M and Wittendrop S (eds) *Security/Mobility: Politics in Movement*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.57–73.
- Habermas J (1996) *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harvey D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen L (2000) The little mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen School. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 29(2): 285–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298000290020501>
- Haski-Leventhal D (2009) Altruism and volunteerism: The perceptions of altruism in four disciplines and their impact on the study of volunteerism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 39: 271–299.

- Hegel GWF (2012 [1820]) *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Higate P (2012) ‘Cowboys and professionals’: The politics of identity work in the private and military security company. *Millennium* 40(2): 321–341.
- Hilgers M (2010) The three anthropological approaches to neoliberalism. *International Social Science Journal* 61: 351–364.
- Huntington S (1957) *The Solider and the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hustinx L, De Waele E and Delcour C (2015) Hybridisation in a corporatist third sector regime: Paradoxes of ‘responsibilised autonomy’. *Voluntary Sector Review* 6(2): 115–134.
- Hyatt SB (2001) From citizen to volunteer: Neoliberal governance and the erasure of poverty. In: Goode JG and Maskovsky J (eds) *The New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in the United States*. New York: New York University Press, pp.201–235.
- International Labour Organization (2011) *Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Ivasiuc A (2015) Watching over the neighborhood: Vigilante discourses and practices in the suburbs of Rome. *Etnofoor* 27(2): 53–72.
- Janowitz M (1960) *The Professional Solider*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Janowitz M (1971) Volunteer armed forces and military purpose. *Foreign Affairs* 50: 427–443.
- Janowitz M (1976) Military institutions and citizenship in western societies. *Armed Forces & Society* 2(2): 185–204.
- Kaldor M (2003) *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kalkman JP (2021) Military crisis responses to COVID-19. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 29(1): 99–103.
- Kimmerling B (1993) Patterns of militarism in Israel. *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 34(2): 196–223.
- Kirsch TG (2010) Violence in the name of democracy: Community Policing, Vigilante Action and Nation-Building in South Africa. In: Kirsch TG (ed.) *Domesticating Vigilantism in Africa*. Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, pp. 139–162.
- Koehler D (2019) Anti-immigration militias and vigilante groups in Germany: An overview. In: Bjørgo T and Mareš M (eds) *Vigilantism against Migrants and Minorities*. New York: Routledge, pp.86–102.
- Krinsky J and Simonet M (2017) *Who Cleans the Park? Public Work and Urban Governance in New York City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kulik L, Arnon L and Dolev A (2016) Explaining satisfaction with volunteering in emergencies: Comparison between organized and spontaneous volunteers in operation protective edge. *Voluntas* 27(3): 1280–1303.
- Landry A, Price C and Colwell R (2022) The rising importance of volunteering to address community emergencies. *Canadian Journal of Emergency Management* 2(1): 12.
- Li TM (2011) Rendering society technical: Government through community and the ethnographic turn at the World Bank in Indonesia. In: Mosse D (ed.) *Adventures in Aidland: The Anthropology of Professionals in International Development*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 57–80.
- Lichterman P and Eliasoph N (2014) Civic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 120(3): 798–863.
- Lutz C (2002) Making war at home in the United States: Militarization and the current crisis. *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 723–735.
- Mabee B and Vucetic S (2018) Varieties of militarism: Towards a typology. *Security Dialogue* 49(1–2): 96–108.

- McCormack K and Gilbert E (2018) Spaces at the intersections of militarism and humanitarianism. *Critical Military Studies* 4(2): 97–101.
- Machold R and Charrett CC (2021) Beyond ambivalence: Locating the whiteness of security. *Society Dialogue* 52(1): 38–48.
- Maguire M, Frois C and Zurawski N (2014) *The Anthropology of Security: Perspectives from the Frontline of Policing, Counter-Terrorism and Border Control*. London: Pluto Press.
- Maman D, Ben-Ari E and Rosenhek Z (2001) *Military, State, and Society in Israel: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Mann M (1988) *States, War, and Capitalism: Studies in Political Sociology*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Moskos CC Jr (1976) The military. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2(1): 55–77.
- Mouffe C (2005) *On the Political*. London: Routledge.
- Muehlebach A (2012) *The Moral Neoliberal: Welfare and Citizenship in Italy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Neocleous M and Rigakos GS (eds) (2011) *Anti-Security*. Ottawa, ON: Canada: Red Quill Books.
- Nyman J and Burke A (eds) (2016) *Ethical Security Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Obert J, Poe A and Sarat A (eds) (2018) *The Lives of Guns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogawa A (2009) *The Failure of Civil Society? The Third Sector and the State in Contemporary Japan*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Ong A (2006) *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Parker C and Debruyne P (2011) Reassembling the political life of community: naturalizing neoliberalism in Amman. In: Künkel J and Meyer M (eds) *Neoliberal Urbanism and Its Contestations: Crossing Theoretical Boundaries*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.155–172.
- Pasquier P, Luft A, Gillard J et al. (2021) How do we fight COVID-19? Military medical actions in the war against the COVID-19 pandemic in France. *BMJ Military Health* 167(4): 269–274.
- Rodell JB, Breitsohl H, Schröder M et al. (2016) Employee volunteering: A review and framework for future research. *Journal of Management* 42: 55–84.
- Rose N (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose N (2000) Community, citizenship, and the third way. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(9): 1395–1411.
- Rosenhek Z, Maman D and Ben-Ari E (2003) The study of war and the military in Israel: An empirical investigation and a reflective critique. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35(3): 461–484.
- Rozakou K (2016) Crafting the volunteer: Voluntary associations and the reformation of sociality. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 34: 79–102.
- Sørensen BR and Ben-Ari E (eds) (2019) *Rethinking Civil-Military Relations: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Samimian-Darash L and Stalcup M (2017) Anthropology of security and security in anthropology: Cases of counterterrorism in the United States. *Anthropological Theory* 17(1): 60–87.
- Sasson-Levy O (2003a) Feminism and military gender practices: Israeli women soldiers in ‘masculine’ roles. *Sociological Inquiry* 73(3): 440–465.
- Sasson-Levy O (2003b) Military, masculinity, and citizenship: Tensions and contradictions in the experience of blue-collar soldiers. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 10: 319–345.
- Shachar IY (2014) The white management of ‘volunteering’: Ethnographic evidence from an Israeli NGO. *Voluntas* 25(6): 1417–1440.
- Shachar IY (2020) Revisiting solidarity: Developing exit strategies from a post-political pandemic. *Society and Space (Essays)*, 20 July. Available at: <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/revisiting-solidarity-developing-exit-strategies-from-a-post-political-pandemic>

- Shachar IY and Barkay T (2021) Re-shaping CSR locally and globally: Employee volunteering programs of Israeli Arms Companies. *Paper presented at The 15th European Sociological Association conference*, Online, September.
- Shachar IY and Hustinx L (2019) Settling the neoliberal contradiction through corporate volunteering: Governing employees in the era of cognitive capitalism. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 48(6): 773–805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241619828442>
- Shachar IY, von Essen J and Hustinx L (2019) Opening up the ‘black box’ of ‘volunteering’: On hybridization and purification in volunteering research and promotion. *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 41(3): 245–265.
- Shapira H (2013) *Waiting for Jose*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Taureck R (2006) Securitization theory and securitization studies. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 9(1): 53–61.
- Taylor RF (2004) Extending conceptual boundaries: Work, voluntary work and employment. *Work, Employment & Society* 18: 29–49.
- Tilly C (1995) War-making and state-making as organized crime. In: Evans P, Rueschemeyer D and Skocpol T (eds) *Bringing the State Back in*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.169–191.
- Vagts A (1937) *The History of Militarism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Waever O (2004) Peace and security: Two concepts and their relationship. In: Guzzini S and Jung D (eds) *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen Peace Research*. New York: Routledge, pp.53–65.
- Wilén N (2021) The military in the time of COVID-19. *Prism* 9(2): 20–33.
- Wilkinson C (2007) The Copenhagen School on tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is securitization theory useable outside of Europe? *Security Dialogue* 38(1): 5–25.
- Ybarra M (2019) ‘We are not ignorant’: Transnational migrants’ experiences of racialized securitization. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37(2): 197–215.

Author biographies

Itamar Y Shachar is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Sociology, Ghent University, Belgium, funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). He was previously a Marie Curie postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Anthropology, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. His main research interest is in the public rise of the notion of ‘volunteering’ under neoliberalism and in its political utilizations.

Nir Gazit (PhD in sociology and anthropology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) is a senior lecturer at the Department of Behavioral Sciences at the Ruppin Academic Center. His research interests include governance and sovereignty, military occupations, political violence, civil-military relations, and border zones.

Erella Grassiani is an Associate Professor of anthropology at the University of Amsterdam. Her research interests include the Israeli security industry and its global mobility, militarism, security organizations outside of the state and nationalism. She is the author of *Soldiering under Occupation* (processes of Numbing among Israeli soldiers in the Al-Aqsa Intifada (2013 Berghahn Books) and co-editor of *Security Blurs: The Politics of Plural Security Provision* (2019 Routledge).