

Workshop: Exploring Violence and Peace in Divided Societies

April 13th, 2015

1 Devonshire Place
Room 108 North

9:00-9:15: Breakfast

9:15-9:30: Opening Remarks

Jeffrey Kopstein, The University of Toronto (jeffrey.kopstein@utoronto.ca)

9:30-11:00: Social Divisions and War-Making: The US and the Vietnam and Iraq Wars

Presented by **Yontan Freeman**, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

(yonatan.freeman@mail.huji.ac.il)

Discussant: **Lee Ann Fujii**, The University of Toronto (lafujii@chass.utoronto.ca)

11:00-12:30: How Violent Non-State Actors Establish Critical Mass in Divided Societies: Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and Boko Haram

Presented by **Daniel Sobelman**, Harvard University (daniel.sobelman@gmail.com)

Discussant: **Randall Hansen**, The University of Toronto (r.hansen@utoronto.ca)

12:30-2:00: Lunch

2:00-3:30: Modeling Security Sector Elasticity in Changing Divided Societies

Dan Miodownik and **Ariel Zellman**, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

(miodownik@gmail.com and ariel.zellman@mail.huji.ac.il)

Discussant: **Edward Schatz** The University of Toronto (ed.schatz@utoronto.ca)

3:30-4:00: Coffee Break

4:00-6:00: State, Society and Security in Expanded States: Israel/Palestine and Lebanon

Oren Barak, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Cornell University

(oren.barak1@mail.huji.ac.il)

Discussant: **Jacques Bertrand** The University of Toronto (jacques.bertrand@utoronto.ca)

6:00-6:15: Closing Remarks

Jeffrey Kopstein, The University of Toronto (jeffrey.kopstein@utoronto.ca)

6:30: Dinner at Bar Mercurio (270 Bloor Street)



Sponsored by the Anne Tannenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto and Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies and The Halbert Exchange Program at the Munk School of Global Affairs

Workshop: Exploring Violence and Peace in Divided Societies

“Social Divisions and War-Making: The US and the Vietnam and Iraq Wars”

Yonatan Freeman, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Between 2003 and 2011, the sand dunes and alleyways of Iraq were the site of a struggle between the United States military and a series of enemies. Many scholars and pundits would note similarities between this fight and the one undertaken some 40 years earlier in Vietnam. Numerous parallels could be found in both, including disapproval ratings by American voters and a similar “domino theory” presented to the public by policymakers. Although many similarities exist between the Vietnam and Iraq wars there remains a major domestic difference which is striking when the two are compared – the lack of an active, widespread US citizen anti-war protest movement in the latter. While intense protests, and even domestic terrorism, by Americans would exist during the Vietnam War, it would not be the case during Iraq. This research argues that the reason for this is that a different US military was present on each battlefield.

While the US had a conscription-based force during the Vietnam War, an all-volunteer military was present during the Iraq War. This change in the mode of recruitment caused civilians and soldiers to be either close or distant from one another, both physically and socially. It was this factor which affected the way in which the general public perceived the soldier and subsequently the intensity of the anti-war response. A conscription-based force caused the civilian to be more concerned about the soldier and intensified the means in which the civilian decided to protest an unpopular war, while an all-volunteer force did the opposite. This research, which evaluates the US, a major world player and an important power many other states seek to emulate, can be useful to other democracies, such as Israel, who are currently deliberating the implications of a transition to an all-volunteer force.

“Expanded States, Divided Societies: Israel/Palestine and Lebanon In Theoretical and Comparative Perspective”

Oren Barak, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Cornell University

The paper presents a broad comparison between Lebanon and Israel/Palestine since their creation after the state’s expansion in 1920 and 1967, respectively. Its basic assumption that the area that until May 1948 was known as Mandatory Palestine, that was occupied by Israel in June 1967, and which is referred to as the Land of Israel (Eretz Israel) by its Jewish inhabitants and as Palestine (Filastin) by its Palestinian inhabitants, constitutes a single political entity, though one that is not recognized by any state, including Israel. This basic assumption, which political developments since 1993, and perhaps even more so since 2000, have reinforced, makes Israel/Palestine comparable to other multi-communal political entities, including Lebanon, which was created as a multi-communal political entity after the expansion of Christian-dominated Mount Lebanon in 1920. Based on this basic premise, the paper explores the effects of the state’s expansion on the process of state formation, broadly defined, and on the relationship between the state, society and security, in Lebanon and in Israel/Palestine since the state’s expansion. It suggests that in Israel/Palestine the process of state formation has led to the emergence of a strong state in terms of its coercive power, but that the boundaries between the state, the dominant Jewish community, and security, which had been fragmented since the state’s independence 1948, became even more porous after 1967. As a result, members of the Palestinian community in Israel itself and in the Territories were effectively excluded from politics and, in many cases, from other public spheres, and were, by and large,

Sponsored by the Anne Tannenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto and Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies and The Halbert Exchange Program at the Munk School of Global Affairs

Workshop: Exploring Violence and Peace in Divided Societies

regarded as a security threat. In view of the declining Jewish majority in Israel/Palestine, this means that the Israeli state was acceptable to less and less people who were ruled by it, and that its rule needed to be asserted by using more and more violence. In Lebanon, by contrast, the process of state formation engendered a weak state in terms of its coercive power, which often found it difficult to effectively claim a monopoly over the legitimate means of violence. However, since the boundaries between the state gradually became fragmented with respect to all of its communities, and given that political power gradually became shared by members of all these groups, the state became acceptable to most of the people under its rule.

“When Do Violent Non-State Actors Establish Critical Mass in Deeply Divides Societies”

Daniel Sobelman, Harvard University

The paper examines the conditions and motivations that give rise to Violent Non-State Actors (VNSAs) in divided societies and enable them to evolve and establish "critical mass," which is the stage in which they will have gained sufficient political and military clout to challenge and even reshape the status quo, or will have simply become a *fait accompli*, in their society. The study of the evolution of VNSAs and their ability to impose a redistribution of power on far superior state actors remains in its infancy. This paper will shed light on an important stage in such actors' life cycles by comparing the cases of Hezbollah, Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad in the Gaza Strip, the Islamic State, and Nigeria's Boko Haram. These groups lend themselves to such a comparative study as they vary in their backgrounds, motivations, and goals, are currently in different developmental stages, but are all operating in deeply divided societies.

“Modeling Security Sector Elasticity in Changing Divided Societies”

Dan Miodownik and Ariel Zellman, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

A central analytical puzzle for those who study deeply divided societies is to determine how states which govern over them can maintain long-term political stability. Yet whereas resort to communal violence represents the ultimate violation of such stability, it is rarely considered how changes within the composition and political organization of divided societies may impact the security sector's ability to address these threats. Nor has it been adequately theorized how security sectors themselves may have a hand in either perpetuating or undermining such political institutionalization of social power. This paper therefore proposes a typological theory of security sector organization in divided societies, suggesting that particular organizational patterns of state security sectors are best matched to particular patterns of divided society governance insofar as they contribute to their political stability. Once thoroughly institutionalized, the state-security nexus is only so elastic in response to endogenous change within divided societies such that, beyond a given tipping point, they may actually accelerate rather than prevent regime collapse.

Sponsored by the Anne Tannenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto and Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies and The Halbert Exchange Program at the Munk School of Global Affairs