This chapter articulates how violence cascades to domination, and domination to violence. Because this is the most central cascade in the book, we develop it at some length, while also explaining in sequence Propositions 6–10. Violence that cascades to militarisation is particularly likely to cascade domination and more violence. In such cascades, material forces cascade to war. Invading armies and missiles are examples of cascading materiality too obvious to excite explanatory insight. Flows of refugee bodies are also cascades that are not quite so obviously implicated in the cascading of violence.

This chapter diagnoses refugee flows as important in the onset or escalation of many wars. It follows that the work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) is crucial for cascade prevention. Previous chapters argued that a higher level of diplomacy exercised by leaders such as Bill Clinton and Nelson Mandela, and a more principled refugee diplomacy, might have helped prevent the first pan-African clutch of wars concentrated around the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in 1996. This book finds it hard to imagine the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan without recruitment from Pakistan’s refugee camps. It is hard to imagine the rise of Al-Qaeda without Osama bin Laden
continuing to offer schooling to uneducated boys in those same refugee camps after the war with the Soviets was won. Defiant bodies cascaded as suicide bombers\(^1\) from those camps.

It was not just that those bodies had defiance; defiance had bodies. Defiance was an imaginary of God’s work that inhabited bodies to stand up to Western humiliation of Muslims. That was how their bodies were storied as they flew themselves into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001. Cascading torture of bodies motivates war—a factor explored in particular in Chapter 8 on the Marxist uprisings and the rise of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka. Defiance is generated through bodies of dissenters challenging the authority of the sovereign state. Through the rhetoric of the war on terrorism, states attempt to reinforce their authority and regain control over those defiant bodies.

A neglect in our discussion of the Congo wars in the past two chapters was that hundreds of indigenous Congolese militias were motivated by many different senses of exclusion—by the ethnic other (for example, Hema by Lendu and vice versa), by immigrants from Rwanda, by patrimonial politicians in Kinshasa, by the army, by foreign armies and more. Yet there is also a deep structure to that multitude of exclusions. It is about cascades of cash. Cash cascades to war in the sense that cascades of money politics recurrently drive a politics of exclusion. The ‘other’ is excluded from patrimonial politics so there is more money for the in-group. Discrimination and domination cascade as a formerly excluded group deploys force to retake a space and then exclude the formerly dominant group. Militarisation cascades.

This is what explains why resource-rich DRC, once the most industrialised country in Africa after South Africa, is now last on the planet in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita and last on the Human Development Index. There is perhaps no region that suffered more ruthless, brutal

---

\(^1\) While we do not go into detail here, Martha Crenshaw (2007: 136), in her review of the literature of suicide terrorism, observes how individuals are mobilised for the purposes of making their bodies the ultimate weapon. Crenshaw reflects that there are differences in how the attackers are described. Diego Gambetta (2006) talks about suicide missions. However, other social scientists (e.g. Bloom 2005; Hafez 2007; Pape 2003; Pedahzur 2005) refer explicitly to suicide terrorism. Shaul Shay, a historian who heads the Israeli Defence Forces Department of History, uses the terms ‘suicide attack’ and ‘suicide terrorism’ interchangeably (Crenshaw 2007). Historian Raphael Israeli (2002) is adamant that the term terrorism be used to describe violence associated with Islam; he implies that relatively neutral terms such as suicide bombers are too weak and insufficiently condemnatory. Crenshaw observes that ‘the authors who define their subject as suicide terrorism are typically less sensitive to the need to compare suicide attacks to other forms of terrorism or political violence’ (2007: 137).
colonialism than the slave and plantation economy of the DRC (formerly Zaire). Extractive colonialism was followed by the most extravagant of all extractive postcolonial African leaders, president Mobutu Sese Seko. As with the Mughal and British empires in India (Chapter 5), Mobutu, in his 32-year reign, kept for himself steep tax collections that drove his people into poverty. Through his clever courtship of Western support, destabilisation of his neighbours, systematic corruption and grandiose economic schemes, he left Zaire on the brink of economic collapse. He then borrowed the country into deep debt, putting the borrowed billions into his personal investments in the West. He had his central bank print billions of bank notes to send more money offshore to his family patrimony.

One might have thought that, with nothing left to tax and the country hopelessly in debt, extractive options were closed off to the successor regimes of the presidents Laurent Kabila and Joseph Kabila. Not at all. The card they played was to sell off the resource future of their country to foreign mining corporations at bargain prices. They kept the proceeds for themselves and their vote buying. This ‘mortgaged the future of [the DRC’s] citizens as surely as if they had issued debt’ (Collier 2009: 76). That is what we mean by the deep structure of the calamity of the DRC being a sequence of cascades of cash into regime pockets. The cascades of militarisation that swept the current president to power, and keep him there, were causally prior to his cascades of cash, but also causally consequent on Mobutu’s cascades of cash. This chapter sees those flows of soldiers and flows of cash through the prism of cascades of domination.

This chapter introduces, in turn, Propositions 6–10 of the starting theory:

**Proposition 6:** Refugee and IDP flows further cascade violence. Violence cascades when those displaced by violence displace others from spaces to which refugees flee. Refugee camps become nodes of hopelessness and resentment for those they trap. This makes them ideal recruiting grounds for those with weapons and cash to enrol bereft young refugees into armed groups. In turn, these recruitment practices inside refugee camps make camps targets for atrocity by enemies of the recruiters.

**Proposition 7:** Cascades of violence that disintegrate the capabilities of one legitimate monopoly of force to dominate all other armed groups in a territory create conditions of anomie. No one knows any longer what the rules of the game are; no one knows who is legitimately in charge. Anomie cascades further violence.
Proposition 8: Cascades of violence recursively cascade militarisation and domination. Military and domination recursively risk further cascades of violence.

Proposition 9: Crime often sparks cascades to war and war to crime. As crime–war–crime cascades from hotspot to hotspot, violence becomes less shameful and easier to excuse. When rape and violence become less shameful, this further cascades rape and violence.

Proposition 10: When war produces a cascade of violence that moves to many new spaces that bite back at a combatant nation, the costs of shutting down the violence in all those spaces can quickly exceed the benefits of winning the war. It can then be rational to cut one’s losses by pulling out of the war, leaving a festering cascade of violence behind, unresolved. The contemporary war economics of cascades therefore sustains cascades of violence (as we saw with cut-and-run policies in Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya).

Cascades of bodies

Proposition 6: Refugee and IDP flows further cascade violence. Violence cascades when those displaced by violence displace others from spaces to which refugees flee. Refugee camps become nodes of hopelessness and resentment for those whom they trap. This makes them ideal recruiting grounds for those with weapons and cash to enrol bereft young refugees into armed groups. In turn, these recruitment practices inside refugee camps make camps targets for atrocity by enemies of the recruiters.

There is a literature that draws on Georgio Agamben’s (1998) work and provides a critique concerning people’s resistance, tortured bodies and refugees. Some of these analyses explain counterterrorism laws and policies that suspend ordinary laws to create a ‘state of exception’ (examples from South Asia are provided in Chapters 5, 6 and 8). Agamben (1998: 2) claims that the state of exception is connected to insurrection and civil war; modern totalitarianism is defined by means of the state of exception, eliminating ‘not only political adversaries but entire categories of citizens’ who, for some reason, ‘cannot be integrated into the political system’. He asserts that ‘the state of exception is not a special kind of law (like the law of war); rather it is a suspension of the juridical order itself’ (Agamben 1998: 4). His most significant contribution to this is his concept of ‘bare life’—the human without the rights and legal status of a citizen or ‘a pure
simple corpus’ based on *Homo sacer*, a figure in archaic Roman law. Here, he establishes symmetries between the state of exception and bare life: ‘Bare life remains included in politics in the form of the exception, that is, as something that is included solely through an exclusion’ (Agamben 1998: 11). He also talks about modern-day detention centres that are born of the state of exception (Agamben 1998: 174).

We will see that flows of bodies cascade violence in different ways from cascades of imaginaries of insurgency and counterinsurgency strategy (Proposition 2), and from imaginaries of security dilemmas (Proposition 5). The sheer concentration of bodies belonging to folk from one side of a cleavage creates both an opportunity for military recruiters and an embodied target for the adversaries of those recruiters. The latter is well illustrated by Rwandan President Kagame’s genocidal campaign to clear Hutu refugee camps in the DRC and by the recruitment activities of the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda in those same camps to enrol young fighters to their project of liberating Rwanda from Kagame. It is also illustrated by the recent brutal targeting of Palestinian refugees for both violence and recruitment in Syria, discussed in the previous chapter, and their historical targeting in Gaza, the West Bank, Lebanon, Jordan and elsewhere. The Hutu bodies were vulnerable to recruitment because they were poor and angered by domination; they were vulnerable to attack because they were being recruited and because they were stateless. Stateless people have no national army to defend them.

A modus operandi of the Rwandan army in the DRC, as it had been inside Rwanda itself in 1994, was to declare areas around refugee or IDP camps ‘military zones’ with prohibited access, deliberately excluding humanitarian agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the media. Then UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali interpreted this Congo tragedy thus: ‘two years ago, the international community was confronted with the genocide of Tutsi by weapons. Today we are faced with the genocide of Hutu by starvation’ (Reyntjens 2009: 96). Worse, the return of humanitarian aid to these starving people was used as bait to draw them into killing zones. Once humanitarian agencies discovered the whereabouts of refugees who had fled their former camps, they sought permission from military units to let them in to provide aid. ‘Facilitators’
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2 See, for example, Green and Ward’s (2009a: 56) analysis of *Homer sacer* and the ‘purifying’ homophobic assassination of gay men and transgender people in Iraq.
who advised refugees where to go to receive aid were repeatedly agents of their murderers who lured the vulnerable to their slaughter (Reyntjens 2009: 96–7).

When hundreds of thousands of refugees flee into another country, they displace locals who do not want to live in or near a refugee camp. In time, refugees begin to take jobs from locals. Their desperate needs distort welfare budgets that in poor countries have so little to provide for the needs of poor locals. Hungry locals, of course, come to resent refugees who are being fed with their taxes—more so when they take their jobs. When refugees are trapped for a long period in a new country, a politics of exclusion tends to grow against refugees. This became a genocidal exclusion of Hutus from many hotspots in the DRC, fuelled by a politics of hate from the regime across the border in Rwanda—dominated by Tutsi survivors of Rwanda’s genocide against them by Hutus. Similar dynamics prevailed in Tutsi–Hutu refugee cascades across the DRC–Burundi border. Armed Congolese groups emerged with platforms such as ‘the total refusal to cohabit with the Tutsi refugee’ (Reyntjens 2009: 149).

The inclination to use force and the prevalence of violence among refugees—particularly in factional, ethnic and clan conflicts—have been described as refugee militarisation (Mogire 2011: 40). Rebel and militia groups use refugee camp resources and also impose taxes on refugees to support their insurgency. Burundian Hutu rebels use refugee camps in western Tanzania for such purposes. In Kenya, the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) and Somali militia also obliged refugees to make financial and food contributions (Crisp 1999). States can also exploit refugees by manipulating them to join or support certain armed activities. During the Cold War, the interests of the West were served by the continued military use of refugees (Loescher 1992: 12–13). War by proxy resulted in an unregulated and constant flow of weapons and aid to ex–Rwandan Armed Forces troops who controlled refugee camps to launch attacks across the border against Rwanda’s new regime (Mogire 2011; UNHCR 1995). East Pakistani/Bengali refugees who were offered sanctuary in neighbouring India were also trained by India to return to Pakistan to fight for independence for Bangladesh during the 1971 war.

Osama bin Laden was a prominent mujahidin leader who created Al-Qaeda by setting up madrassas (religious schools) in Afghan refugee camps in north-west Pakistan, where 6 million people had fled. He offered
children an education they otherwise had no chance of getting. Note that an obvious anti-cascade strategy in the 1980s and 1990s would have been for Western donors to build better schools than bin Laden was able to provide in those refugee camps. Chapter 2 showed this to be one of the many roads not taken to prevent the cascade towards the attacks on the Twin Towers and the war on terror. We see in this book that, on a wider front, the refugee and IDP camp is critical for understanding the cascading of South Asian violence.

It is worth emphasising that, in this book, we articulate how refugee and IDP settlements become instrumental in supplying bodies to communicate certain kinds of messages and bodies to target. This instrumental nature of bodies in interned spaces is critical for our understanding of cascades of violence. Caution is needed about the risk of playing into nationalistic understandings of refugees as security threats, even when one’s analysis is about how such understandings are another way refugees become a target in wars. This line of thought has been criticised as securitisation—that is, particular groups are constructed as threats through speech acts and nondiscursive practices. Didier Bigo (2002: 65), for example, analyses the securitisation of immigration.

Soon after the Paris terrorist attacks in November 2015, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, António Guterres, said it was ‘absolute nonsense’ to try to blame refugees for terror attacks, stressing that they were its ‘first victims’ and could not be held responsible for what happened in Paris, Beirut and elsewhere. Throughout this book, we explain how people are victimised and marginalised by dominations through policies, strategies and leaders. Divisive ethnocentric practices and political mobilisation on historical claims and grievances repeatedly spiral towards conflict with other groups.

**Anomie**

**Proposition 7**: Cascades of violence that disintegrate the capabilities of one legitimate monopoly of force to dominate all other armed groups in a territory create conditions of anomie. No one knows any longer what the rules of the game are; no one knows who is legitimately in charge. Anomie cascades further violence.
Anomie of two forms is hypothesised as critical to the cascading of violence. One is classic Durkheimian anomie of unsettling the legitimate norms that apply in a particular territory (Durkheim 1952). The second is the unsettled nature of perceptions of who is legitimately in charge (Braithwaite et al. 2010a).

When no one knows what the rules of the game are, ambitious politicians are attracted to enrol armed groups to impose new rules of the game that favour them. A normative vacuum in a particular territory thus attracts the most tyrannical of forces. The unsettled nature of social order means that claims for power staked by those forces of domination are likely to be contested by other (sometimes even more tyrannical) forces. In sum, violence cascades to anomie of two types. And anomie cascades to violence. An underestimated path for peacemakers is to identify rule-of-law vacuums hotspot by hotspot instead of state by state. War might then be prevented by populating those hotspots with decent, locally deliberated normative orders. Peacemakers can identify monopoly of legitimate force vacuums to make either the legitimate powerful or the powerful legitimate. How this might be done has been one of the policy projects of Peacebuilding Compared (Braithwaite and Wardak 2013; Wardak and Braithwaite 2013). Re-establishing normative order in anomic spaces was what the police station reconciliation committees project in tribal Pakistan was about. It successfully dampened cascades of revenge killings (Chapter 2, this volume; Braithwaite and Gohar 2014).

David Kilcullen (2011) argues that the Taliban came to power in Kandahar province as an ‘armed rule of law movement’. It was able to do this because Kandahar was a much more disordered space than other regions of post-communist Afghanistan. Kilcullen takes us on a journey across time and space to show, starting with the writings of the ancient Greek Herodotus (1954), how military commanders with a small local base could expand that base during periods of Hobbesian (1651) anarchy by providing quality justice and security services to ever-widening circles of frightened citizens. Hotspots destabilised by successive waves of
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3 French sociologist Émile Durkheim (2014) introduced the idea of anomie in his book *The Division of Labour in Society* in 1893. Durkheim’s conceptualisation focused on the lack of normal ethical and social standards. When ordinary rules are broken down, people are unable to determine how to act with one another. In his 1897 book, *Suicide*, he also discussed how normlessness caused deviant behaviours such as depression and suicide (Durkheim 1952). In criminology, the idea of anomie is explained in relation to a person’s choice to commit crime. Criminal activity is chosen when a person believes that there is no reason not to choose it.
violence became anomic security vacuums that attracted violent tyrannies in Afghanistan, cascading from other regional players such as Pakistan. Residues of previous wars left many groups with a score to settle against others who had occupied their lands. The Taliban was able to begin on its path to power in Kandahar only after 1994 by offering to establish Islamic order in Hobbesian spaces exploited by many armed gangs. The Taliban was able to show farmers that it could make it possible to get their produce to markets without being shaken down by a multitude of armed groups along the road. The Taliban shut down their roadblocks. At one level, they made rural spaces safe for women who were being raped by armed men. Of course, the Taliban then used that domination of an anomic space to impose a new form of tyranny, not only on women.

**Proposition 8:** Cascades of violence recursively cascade militarisation and domination. Militarisation and domination recursively risk further cascades of violence.

This proposition means that militarisation, domination and violence reinforce one another in feedback loops. Militarisation refers to a particular process of change in the state and in the relationship between the state and other actors across civil society. Broadly speaking, a state or society is understood to be undergoing a process of militarisation if there is: a) an increase in the size, cost and coercive capacity of the armed forces or police and security agencies in a country; b) a greater political role for militaries; c) an increase in reliance on organised force, domestically and abroad, to secure policy goals, rather than ideological hegemony and bargaining; d) a change in the culture in the direction of values and beliefs that more effectively support organised state violence and non-state violence; and e) increasing external offensive military alignment or alliance with other states or armies, or use of force externally (Tanter 1991: 22–3).

Tanter’s original categorisations implicitly accept a monopoly on violence by the state, but we have tweaked them slightly above to accommodate militarisation by non-state armies. Tanter (1991: 24) acknowledges that the assumption of a standard role for the armed forces against which militarised states could be measured is a general difficulty in defining militarisation. In our book, we approach this problem by investigating militarisation through the prism of domination.
Cascades of violence create not only flows of bodies into refugee camps but also flows of military bodies and military hardware into military camps that sit near the refugee camps. Chapter 7 is a classic instantiation of this, with the havoc and human rights abuses caused by Bangladeshi military camps near IDP settlements in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT). Enduring reproductions of militarisation are predicated on, and justified through, a range of ideological rationales of order and chaos, revolts and counterinsurgency measures that advance and legitimate military action (Lutz 2002: 723).

Part II explores the historical contexts of militarisation that led to the prevalence of military values and practices in South Asian societies. Seungsook Moon (1998: 90), in her analysis of the militarisation of South Korea, observes that, throughout the twentieth century, until the 1970s and before the rise of economic conglomerates, the military had been the single most powerful institution. She argues that during Japanese colonisation, the repressive state apparatus was extended to South Korean society through coercion and imposition. With their symbols, organisation, structures and weapons, the Japanese Empire’s armies were intimidating. These mechanisms of domination were replicated by the postcolonial nation and facilitated by the military build-up of the Korean War. Massive US military aid resulted in the expansion and modernisation of the military elites who dominated the politics of the Korean Peninsula for decades. South Korea’s example demonstrates that, in times of war, militaries become more politically influential; it becomes more difficult for political leaders to survive without the support of generals. It is also an encouraging case because, even as it has been faced with a neighbour as militarised as North Korea, it has become a considerably less militarised and less dominated society in recent decades.⁴ Militaries tend to bring to the governance table a military imaginary of governance as being fundamentally about a monopoly of force (Proposition 2). Militaries incline to the belief that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun because when militaries are in a position to exercise power it does.

---

⁴ Perhaps for the wrong reasons (fear of communism), South Korea became one of the few countries to become substantially more equal (and less corrupt) as a result of twentieth-century land reform. As a result of the government’s land reform program after the Korean War, the income of the landlord class (the wealthiest 4 per cent of the rural population) fell by 80 per cent, while income increased by 20–30 per cent for the poorest peasants (the bottom 80 per cent) (You 2014: 194). As the recent impeachment of the head of state by Korean courts illustrates, South Korea today is a society with a comparatively robust separation of powers and a lively pulse of political freedom.
They have a hammer; they see nails they can hit to force society back together. At least this is a dominant military imaginary; there are countless military leaders with more nuanced thinking about power.

There is an intoxicating quality about military victory:

[T]he Rwanda Patriotic Army (RPA) went from war to war, and from victory to victory (from 1981 to 1986) on the sides of [President Yoweri] Museveni in Uganda, from 1990 to 1994 in Rwanda [leading to control of the Rwandan state], from 1996 to 1997 in Zaire [returning a minerals windfall worth more than the national defence budget]. (Reyntjens 2009: 4)

Finally, the RPA bogged down with its failed DRC regime change of 1998. Yet it continued to make profits by many subsequent incursions that settled for grabbing chunks of military control over resource-rich locales in the DRC.

Dominant military imaginaries are quite different from the way religious leaders behave during times of anomie. If religious leaders think that a certain military faction will win, and this military faction will support their religious group in victory, they often lend ideological support to militarisation. But, as opportunities for cascades of peace arise, religious leaders have other tools besides that hammer, and they use them. They can reinforce cascades of peace by seeking to tie people together through bonds of love, forgiveness, reconciliation and interfaith dialogue. Because of their skills with these other tools beyond hammering people back together, religious leaders contingently support cascades of violence (when they perceive that to sustain the faith existentially) and cascades of peacemaking. So the sacralising of a space by religious power is contingently violent or nonviolent. Only 13 of the 39 wars that have been coded for Peacebuilding Compared so far have been coded a ‘low’ fit to: ‘Sequence of religious leaders contributing to conflict by supporting violence followed by religious leaders becoming advocates of peace.’ So far, the militarisation of a space by a military with low legitimacy tends to be associated much more consistently with increased prospects of violence in that space.

Of course, there are many exceptions where military leaders have been educated and persuaded to become peacemakers in search of a path to submit their military power to the legitimate civilian authority of an elected government. These exceptions are crucial to the analysis of this book. A particularly notable exception is where military power is
harnessed to the legitimate authority of UN peacekeeping authorised by the Security Council. The exception within the exception—UN Chapter VII enforcement that kills civilians as collateral damage from peacekeeping—reveals the deep structure of the risks in militarisation. This risk is profoundly illustrated by the disastrous intervention of Indian peacekeepers in Sri Lanka (Chapter 8). All these possibilities lead to the proposition that cascades of violence risk militarisation, and militarisation risks further cascading of violence.

It is important to describe how we employ the term domination in this book. Political power that protects people and respects rights as it springs from a democratically legitimated rule of law is not domination. Because political power that springs from the rule of law is not arbitrary power, but power humbled by legal checks and balances, it is a form of political power that is not deeply feared by law-abiding citizens (Pettit 1997). Power that grows out of the barrel of a gun lacks these qualities. When a soldier ties our hands and points a weapon at us, checks against pulling the trigger are few.

The power of the judge’s order is real, but less dominating than the gun at our head because we might appeal to reverse the judge’s order before it is put into effect. Detention in a war zone is more dominating than arrest by police in a peaceful democracy because we fear so deeply that detention could be a prelude to torture, perhaps rape or being ‘disappeared’. Militarisation tends to cascade domination that cascades further domination and militarisation. So, vulnerable civilians crave minimally sufficient militarisation. When people on one side of a cleavage dominate those on another side through means such as military torture, this is likely to cascade to reciprocation.5

Domination can cascade to many forms of tyranny that feed back into domination. Exclusion is a common one. The evidence that ‘state-sanctioned discrimination’ is a correlate of civil war is particularly strong (Goldstone 2008: 5; Gurr 2000). Multiculturalism or ethnic fractionalisation is not the predictor; it is state-sanctioned discrimination against a group. Even so, in the Peacebuilding Compared project, we do not take for granted that this result, which has proved so robust with

5 The micro foundations of our analysis in defiance theory give one account of why. If I am coerced by unbridled torture, I am more likely to resist by supporting the torture of my enemies. Indeed, my revenge might well be more bloody than the violence inflicted on me. I might seek to realise it by supporting or harnessing the most unbridled forms of militarisation.
older wars, will continue to hold for wars up to 2030. This hypothesis, 
alongside the others in this book, will be retested quantitatively in 2030. 
We certainly find the hypothesis to be qualitatively potent across South 
Asia in this volume.

In Part II, we see that the influence of military values and practices is 
reflected in heavily militarised places such as Kashmir, Peshawar, the CHT 
and Kabul. These are also deeply gendered processes that are generated 
through hierarchical interactions between the security sector and local 
communities. Sexual and gender-based violence is a form of exclusionary 
domination that we find recurrently associated with militarisation. This 
theme is rejoined when we discuss the hypothesis that crime cascades 
to war and war to crime (Proposition 9). Through arrest and forced 
disappearances, abuse, forced marriages, torture and rape of women and 
girls, domination is created and maintained in our South Asian cases.

Extraction is another mode of domination that cascades further extraction. 
Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) argue that the extraction of resources 
and slaves was the business model for colonies such as Congo that 
became extremely violent societies (Hochschild 1998). Their governance 
institutions provided weak guarantees of inclusion. In contrast, inclusion 
characterised the governance institutions bequeathed to the white settlers 
of white settler societies such as the United States, Canada, Australia and 
places such as Congo were afflicted with weak institutions designed to 
allow maximum extraction from indigenous peoples, and why white 
settler colonies such as Australia received institutions designed to build 
welfare for whites. One might have hoped that when black leaders took 
over, professing an ideology of building welfare for Africans, the violence 
from a politics of extraction and domination would end. President 
Mobutu of Zaire was a good example of a leader who came to power with 
such promises, but who was attracted to seek power precisely to sustain 
institutions of extraction and domination. So were the two presidents 
Kabila, father and son, who succeeded Mobutu. Extraction cascading 
down through history made president Mobutu one of the wealthiest 
people in the world and is helping the current President Kabila on to that 
trajectory of extractive path dependency. Extractive colonial institutional 
legacies are resilient because they bequeath criminogenic opportunity 
structures to successor elites. These opportunities tempt those who control 
the guns in a society.
Across South Asia, we find cascades of money politics to be a recurrent form of domination that becomes intertwined with militarisation. We explain this phenomenon more deeply in Chapters 6 and 7. Money politics means that ordinary citizens are dominated by both business power and political power that yield to money power. Citizens get not the government they say they want, but the government that money can buy. In eastern DRC, diamond, coltan, gold and tin traders buy both politicians and armed groups. Those armed groups literally enslave people to work in mines under their control. In another wider set of contexts, armed groups allow civilians to control mining but tax their production heavily. Slavery and taxation by armed groups are business models diffused by model mercenaries (Proposition 2). These are ways that military domination, political domination, business domination and modelling are intertwined in eastern DRC.

Proposition 8, therefore, helps us to understand something like the rise of Islamic State in Iraq, Syria and Libya. As in so many oil-rich states, in the history of Iraq, money politics has loomed large. So, too, have local perceptions that international conflicts in which ordinary people suffer have been about extraction of their resources by Western colonial powers, multinational oil companies (Sampson 1975) and minority Sunni tribes
like that of Tikrit’s Saddam Hussein extracting the oil wealth of Shia and Kurdish lands. External interests further prized open Shia–Sunni and Kurd–Sunni cleavages. Indeed, cleavages internal to these identities were also pulled apart.6 Militarised factionalisation matters because the quantitative evidence shows that the larger the number of armed factions in a civil war, the harder it is to broker a peace, particularly a sustainable one (Doyle and Sambanis 2006: 94–101).

More recently, on a wider canvas, the formidable regional power of Iran on one side, with allies such as Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Assad regime in Syria, has increasingly been in conflict with Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Egypt backed by other Sunni regimes on the other. This widening cleavage has promoted violent imaginaries of Sunni–Shia struggle in the region, suppressing older imaginaries of coexistence. US rule in Iraq after 2003 was alert to the dangers of this cleavage. Al-Qaeda in Iraq was exploiting it to build its power base; this eventually forced the United States to see this grave geopolitical risk. So, perhaps too late, the United States insisted on powersharing as something that must come from the 2010 election in Iraq; there must be Shia, Sunni and Kurd ministers with senior portfolios. But, of course, the electoral logic that the statebuilders had put in place meant that Shia politicians won most seats in the Shia-majority country; prime minister Maliki was Shia. As soon as Western forces departed Iraq in 2014, the progressive marginalisation of elected Sunni and Kurd leaders that had been under way turned into a rout. It was an example of the majoritarian domination by democracy that we consider in Chapter 10.

Things got worse when large rallies organised by Sunni tribes to protest their political exclusion were hit by Iraqi army attacks, murdering large numbers of protestors. Sunni tribal leaders had given democracy a try for four years but the powersharing understanding had been ruthlessly abrogated by Shia electoral majoritarianism. They had tried to assert their rights peacefully by democratic means, such as protests by unarmed citizens, and were slaughtered for this. Re-enter Al-Qaeda in Iraq. It was about to morph into Islamic State with a leader independent of Al-Qaeda and an ideology more savage and radical than Al-Qaeda’s. It seized the
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6 For example, Saikal (2014: 7) highlights the intra-Shia schism between the Iranian-supported Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (representing some of Iraq’s middle-class Shia) and the Sadrists (representing some of the more marginalised and lower-class Shia) that opened as a result of ‘the spilling of blood over time’ (see also Hagan et al. 2015).
moment to remilitarise Iraq and declare a new Islamic caliphate on a large swathe of territory that spread from the areas of Syria it controlled by then and across the Sunni belt of Iraq. It was able to attract a surge of support from local fighters to drive the Iraqi army out of the neighbourhoods where they had been murdering Sunni protestors. As the Iraqi army pulled back from these areas to regroup, Islamic State seized formidable American military hardware that had been left behind. This dynamic reached a crescendo when fewer than 1,000 Islamic State fighters seized control of the second-largest city in Iraq, Mosul. There, Islamic State looted enormous stockpiles of US-supplied tanks and other advanced weapons systems and the local banks and surrounding oil wells whose exports further funded the insurgency. Success bred success as Saudi, UAE, Kuwaiti and Qatari businessmen pumped more money into the nascent caliphate, although, by 2015, Islamic State in Iraq relied mainly on their own looted bounty. Alienated young Muslims from perhaps half the countries of the world flooded in to volunteer for this bold new Islamic State fightback.

In sum, a major new war was the result of a history of geopolitical humiliation, money politics, oil politics and extraction, followed by a pretence of democracy that was in reality a practice of exclusion; a closing off of legitimate means for Sunnis to articulate grievances; a history of militarisation of space that included masses of military hardware waiting to be looted; and external sponsors ready to further support remilitarisation of anomic spaces. This 2014–18 war contains ingredients common to many of the post-1990 wars from all corners of the globe that have been coded so far for Peacebuilding Compared.

At a more micro level, in the biography of Islamic State leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, we see how a particular institution of militarised domination—the US military prison at Camp Bucca—operated as a university for terror rather than as an institution for containing violence. This was not because Baghdadi was treated unusually oppressively in the prison. On the contrary, he made himself useful as a prisoner who was not classified as a jihadist or arrested for any serious offence, to be a bridge between the Americans and their captives. Through playing this role, the prison gave him an enormous network. On release, he used that network to expand Islamic State. Inmates left with phone numbers of key contacts
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7 The Islamic State leader also spent some time in Abu Ghraib prison.
inscribed on the elastic of their underwear. Baghdadi had been arrested for the crime of visiting the home of a man on the US wanted list at the time he was picked up. The prison was a university in insurgency for Baghdadi because it was full of former military and intelligence leaders of Saddam’s regime, who taught him much about war. One of its former inmates who had been a senior officer in Saddam’s military sponsored Baghdadi’s ascent to the Islamic State leadership. William McCants said of the 24,000 inmates who graduated from Camp Bucca:

If they weren’t jihadists when they arrived, many of them were by the time they left. Radical jihadist manifestos circulated freely under the eyes of the watchful but clueless Americans. ‘New recruits were prepared so that when they were freed they were ticking time bombs’, remembers another fellow inmate … peers would ‘teach him, indoctrinate him, and give him direction so he leaves a burning flame.’ Baghdadi would turn out to be the most explosive of those flames … [but there were many former Ba’athists and others at Bucca who joined Islamic State]: ‘If there was no American prison in Iraq, there would be no [Islamic State] now’, recalled [another Bucca inmate]. (McCants 2015)
Civilising crime-to-war hotspots

Proposition 9: Crime often sparks cascades to war and war to crime. As crime–war–crime cascades from hotspot to hotspot, violence becomes less shameful and easier to excuse. When rape and violence become less shameful, this further cascades rape and violence.

Historians do not always take seriously the proposition that crime cascades to war. In a sense, they are right that this should not be the most central element of cascades of violence theory. Yet perhaps historians should treat it more seriously than they do. Sparks that ignite conflagrations matter. At the height of the tinder-dry Australian bushfire season, the structural conditions are of large fires waiting to happen, awaiting the spark that causes the inevitable. Yet there can be no doubt that there would be more fires without education campaigns to dissuade smokers from throwing cigarettes from car windows and campers from lighting fires. There would be more fires if there were no rapid responses to lightning strikes and to electricity lines needing repair. Likewise, as discussed in Chapter 2, we could think of effective counterterrorism to protect Archduke Ferdinand from assassination in 1914 as a noteworthy path not taken to war prevention (Clark 2012). As Otto von Bismarck had said before it happened, ‘some damned foolish thing in the Balkans would one day cause a great European war’ (Evans 2013). It is dangerous to neglect spark prevention. It is a conceit that one could understand structural conditions so well that one could know that a war, especially a world war—even the next thing that might happen in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya or the DRC—is so inevitable that it is hardly worth bothering with the sparks.

We use the Sri Lankan case in Chapter 8 to focus particularly systematically on the Proposition 9 cascade, although we find it to arise recurrently in all the country cases in this book. Gerlach (2010) argues that extremely violent societies are not violent in some cultural or essential way. Rather, societies transition in and out of extremely violent periods of their histories as a result of crises. Karstedt’s (2012) work on her Violent Societies Index shows empirically that extremely violent societies experience disparate kinds of violence that are highly correlated. For example, state coerciveness is a rather consistent response to violent challenges to the state (Davenport and Inman 2012: 622). Proposition 9 is about one dynamic that might be responsible for that empirical result: violence cascades across space and time from one kind of violence to another. For
example, in some Peacebuilding Compared cases, sexual and gender-based violence has significant explanatory power, such as in the Bougainville civil war (Braithwaite et al. 2010b: 20, 41–2), where an incident of rape was one of the sparks that ignited armed conflict, further rapes turned the war to a new intensity and the war in turn cascaded to a frequency of rape not seen before the war (Braithwaite 2006). The DRC’s wars and the Bangladeshi war for independence from Pakistan were cascades to particularly extraordinary levels of rape—millions of rapes in the DRC (Peterman et al. 2011), hundreds of thousands of rapes in Bangladesh—often executed with the objective of cascading domination through impregnation) (Chapter 7, this volume; D’Costa 2011).

Rape also has the ability to accentuate and securitise identity differences through which crimes cascade. Women’s subordinate role often results in them being targeted both by the enemy and by their own communities. Feminists have questioned the binaries of casting women only as victims and men as belligerent perpetrators (Reilly 2007). Women’s labour and women’s bodies have always been integral to warmaking (Charlesworth and Chinkin 2000; Enloe 2000; Reilly 2007); women also become active participants in political violence and criminal networks. The routine rape of Chechen women by Russian soldiers is one key motivational factor for women to take up arms and become suicide bombers. To recruit more female operatives from Tamil areas, the LTTE used to show graphic images of Tamil women and girls being raped and tortured by enemy soldiers. The rape–recruitment nexus and the capacity for rape to transform the character of a conflict are central themes in Chapter 9 on the Maoist insurgency in Nepal.

Another turning point in the gender politics of war was 2015. The male-dominated armies that had caused the devastation in Syria and Iraq refused to honour their much-mouthed responsibility to protect the citizens of Kobani and Mount Sinjar from Islamic State, and to protect Yazidi and Christian women from sexual slavery. Kurdish women then arrived from all over Syria, Turkey, Iran and Iraq to fight in approximately equal numbers to the men. In crucial battles, the Peshmerga leadership made the decision to push forward with a majority female front line. They made the decision at the urging of women fighters to make a feminist point. They won where male-dominated Western infantry were afraid to go. They taunted Islamic State fighters with their courage and with their belief that they would not go to Paradise if killed by a woman. The depth of the courage of the Kurdish women was revealed by their training videos,
which John Braithwaite watched in Iraq, showing women how to kill themselves if captured, advising them that ‘girls must not allow themselves to be captured by Islamic State’. Now that these Kurdish fighters have completed the toughest fighting to defeat Islamic State, Turkish forces are surging into Syria to attack them at the time of writing, and the United States has simultaneously cut off their supply of weapons to them.

Rape can be an effective part of a genocidal strategy (Askin 2003). Feminist politics challenges the myth that rape is rare in war or peace. These histories are why we position a singular importance for rape in Proposition 9.

Meaningful prevention models are multilayered, starting with peacebuilding that tackles deep structural drivers of conflict such as militarisation, poverty, gender inequality, discrimination and domination of one group by another. One can never declare victory over deep societal structures such as these. They bounce back resiliently. Hence, we must also attend to proximate causes of a conflict. In Chapter 2, we saw that an important proximate cause of World War I was the ultimatum that Austria–Hungary issued to Serbia in 1914, and subsequent ultimatums by other governments. Because there tend to be many proximate causes with an unpredictably contingent character, it is quite a challenge for preventive diplomacy to be ready to address all of them as they arise. Few peacemakers have the vision before the event that a particular proximate action could become a provocation to war. The Swiss cheese model that comes to us from accident prevention (Reason 1990) captures the prevention idea. Each layer of prevention put in place is full of holes—like a slice of Swiss cheese. Regrettably, even with many layers of prevention, the holes in layers can align and mortal risks slip through one preventive net after another. Yet the more layers of prevention are put in place, the more likely it is that the weaknesses of one layer of prevention will be covered by the strengths of another.

Even if it were true that security sector reform could extinguish all sparks that ignite violence, or patch all cracks in the security sector so it never failed, criminologists point to another reason root causes such as systematic discrimination against an ethnic minority require remedy. It is unthinkable that African-Americans could mount a civil war against
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8 For an earlier Peacebuilding Compared volume that applies the Swiss cheese model of relying on redundant fallible layers of social defence to armed conflicts in Indonesia, see Braithwaite et al. (2010a: 236–9).
America’s white majority, or Aboriginal against white Australians. When African-Americans do riot—as happened in Los Angeles and other cities in the 1960s and after police bashed Rodney King in 1991, and in Ferguson, Missouri, and other cities after incidents of excessive police force in 2014–15—the capabilities of the security forces are so overwhelming that escalation to civil war does not occur (Proposition 1). Urban riots are a tiny cost of structural inequality and discrimination compared with the routine bloodletting of a high crime rate. The evidence for this is discussed in Chapter 11.

Where resistance through warfare is not an option for an oppressed group that has no external sponsor supplying them arms, disengagement becomes a problem—disengagement from oppressed people’s own traditions and identity, from education, from employment and entrepreneurship and even from care and responsibility for children in circumstances where states unreasonably and repeatedly steal children from poor families (as we see in the work on domestic disengagement and defiance by Valerie Braithwaite 2009). The kind of structural factors, proximate factors and ignition points analysed in this book, and in the Peacebuilding Compared project more widely, might be seen as warning signs of disengagement from the social order that can disintegrate domestic peace. They are also warnings of defiance that might lead to riots and warfare to overturn the social order. Indeed, the United States and Australia bear large continuing costs in violence, especially domestic violence, murder and sexual assault (especially of children), as a result of their racial discrimination. These violence costs are greater than the one-off cost of many of the armed conflicts considered in this volume. Several times more US civilians—now approaching 1,000 a year—have been killed by their own police since 2000 than have been killed by terrorists.

Of course, most crime does not cascade to war. Most of us commit crimes in our lifetimes, sometimes major ones, without ever causing a war! Likewise, smokers dispose of cigarettes carelessly countless times without causing a fire that destroys a town. To date in the Peacebuilding Compared dataset, some kinds of crimes are repeatedly coded as sparking armed conflicts. Political assassinations, major terrorist acts, murder and rape in the context of ethnic/religious riots recurrently appear as important crimes to minimise for societies that seek peace. The argument that crime cascades to war is easier to make today because few would question that the terrorism of 11 September 2001 resulted in the ‘war on terror’ that included the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. Yet, we always knew
that the biggest crimes in modern history involved the theft of whole continents that caused protracted frontier wars when it occurred with the European invasions of South and North America and Australia, and at the Berlin Conference of 1884 to carve up Africa among European powers.

Crime in the Peacebuilding Compared dataset is sometimes more than a cause of war; it can also crush the cause of peace. Amin Saikal (2014: 48–9) describes the impact on peacemaking of two serious crimes under Afghan law:

The [former Afghan president Hamid] Karzai and US policy of reconciliation and the efforts of the High Peace Council initially seemed somewhat promising. In January 2012, senior Taliban officials arrived in Qatar to open a political office in the country. This was seen as a potential breakthrough in negotiations between the Karzai administration, the Taliban and the United States. However, these efforts soon proved untenable in the aftermath of two critical events in Afghanistan. In February 2012, the media reported that copies of the Qur’an were burnt in a US military base. While this did not directly affect negotiations with the Taliban, with a spokesperson for the group specifying that ‘this issue will not affect [the] process in Qatar’, the killing of 17 civilians by a US soldier in Kandahar in the following month cemented the end of a short-lived experiment.

The conclusion that war cascades to crime is supported by Archer and Gartner’s (1984) result that homicide rates rise after nations participate in wars at home or abroad. Ghobarah et al. (2003) confirmed this cross-nationally for suicide as well as homicide. Monique Marks (2001: 89, 133) found in South Africa that former male combatants experienced anomie, powerlessness and emasculation that became a ‘slippery slide into the underworld of crime’. We have learnt from Iraq (Boyle 2014: Ch. 8) that violent death rates often go up after a war ‘ends’, with only El Salvador having a higher total violent death rate than Iraq between 2004 and 2009 (Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development 2011: Ch. 2). This result has also been discovered in a number of African and other conflicts where killing (Duffield 2001: 188), and even more so sexual and gender-based violence, can increase after a peace agreement is signed. Likewise, this occurred after some Latin American civil wars—most notably, the continent’s biggest recent wars in El Salvador and Guatemala, where a doubling of already extreme homicide rates at the end of the war delivered a higher death rate than during many of the peak years of civil war (Muggah and Krause 2011: 180; Richani 2007; Westendorf 2015: 8).
There can be various local reasons for this. A common one is that a peace agreement between warring armed groups gives them security from each other’s guns, which allows them to concentrate with impunity on pillage of civilian populations, the domination of which they divvy up in the peace deal. Or, if one party to the war withdraws completely from the space, the other party can resume its war aims with impunity against civilian populations, as when Serbian forces withdrew in the Kosovo peace, allowing ethnic cleansing and murder of Serbian civilians by armed Albanians, which had been impossible during the war (Boyle 2014: Ch. 6). This is one way of reading the effect of some peace deals and ceasefires in the DRC. A survey of more than 10,000 households in North and South Kivu reported the largest source of insecurity as ‘bandits’ (24 per cent), the second-most important source of insecurity was the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (21 per cent), followed by demobilised soldiers or deserters (13 per cent), armed non-Congolese groups (12 per cent) and armed Congolese groups (11 per cent) (GRIP 2011: 114). In other words, ‘war’ in the DRC is, first, common crime, second, state crime and, third, violence by non-state armed groups. An Oxfam survey yielded similar results for Afghanistan in 2008 (Waldman 2008: 12), where ordinary Afghans certainly feared being killed by the Taliban. But fears of warlords, criminal gangs, international forces, Afghan police, armed men hired to do the bidding of Afghan government officials and drug traffickers (which, were they combined with ‘criminals’, would be perceived as the top security threat) are all extremely high. Fears of the Afghan army, family violence and intertribal violence are also quite high. In Afghanistan, as in the DRC, the evidence is clear therefore that insurgents are just one part of a much larger fabric of fear.

Boyle (2014) identified the key variable for explaining how the severity of strategic postwar murder (such as assassination of political opponents or media critics) is whether or not the armed group that signed the peace accord had effective internal control over its own fighters. Post conflict, completely new bargaining contests elicit violence among factions and splinter groups of former armies, even within associations for the welfare of war veterans in cases such as Timor-Leste and Kosovo (Boyle 2014: Chs 6 and 7). A war that is anomic can become even more anomic for veterans once their military commanders step down and decommission their armed authority. Boyle (2014) suggests that if the internal control of former commanders over their fighters disintegrates totally, other crucial
parties for strengthening the peace architecture can conclude that there is no longer any point in negotiating with the former armed groups. Such cessation of negotiation with the veterans can become a new danger to the peace. These risks are particularly profound in Boyle’s data when the culture of violence as the means of pursuing factional agendas persists in combination with some factions never having agreed to the terms of the peace in the first place. Beyond politically instrumental violence, if fighters are totally out of control they are also more prone to mixtures of expressive violence, revenge and instrumental violence. An example is veterans occupying the luxury home and raping the women of an innocent Serb family after the war because ‘Serbs burnt our house’ (Boyle 2014: Ch. 6).

Richani’s (2007) analysis of El Salvador, with comparisons to Guatemala and Lebanon, illustrates the type of case where criminal gangs move in to monopolise social control ‘post conflict’ (see other sources in Chapter 11, this volume). The El Salvador case illustrates how both crime and contemporary wars cascade from local hotspot to hotspot, more than from country to country—as international relations theories would have it. Hence, the effect of a war in some part of El Salvador cascades to an impact on crime on the turf of a particular gang in some small part of Los Angeles. When those gang members return home to set up control of their own gang, it is over some very local hotspot of violence within El Salvador. Hotspots destabilised by successive waves of violence become anomic vacuums that attract violent tyrannies. We have explained that Kandahar was such a hotspot that enabled the rise of the Taliban in 1996. Violent crime is highly concentrated at hotspots; half the crime in US cities occurs at fewer than 3 per cent of their addresses (Sherman et al. 1989; Weisburd 2012).

The civil war in El Salvador caused a flood of refugees to the United States after 1980, including a cascade of unaccompanied children. The adult refugees were mostly unskilled peasants with little or no English who experienced widespread unemployment in the United States. This resulted in their recruitment into gangs and the drug trade, particularly in Los Angeles. Gang wars arose from the takeover of formerly Mexican gangs by Salvadorians with fighting skills sharpened by civil war. In the years after the 1992 peace agreement in El Salvador, the United States forcibly repatriated 130,000 immigrants back to El Salvador—43,000 of them with criminal records. This number continued to grow over the past decade. Returning gang members took over certain hotspots, making a number of coastal sites in El Salvador transit points in narco-
trafficking—something that never had been part of the local crime scene before 1990 in El Salvador. El Salvador’s prisons became particularly inflamed hotspots where assassinations of gang members were rife. After the 1992 peace agreement, El Salvador’s homicide rate skyrocketed, with more people killed per year than during the civil war. The homicide rate peaked at 138 per 100,000 in 1994 and 139 in 1995. Gang conflict was responsible for much of this homicide. While 85 per cent of homicides were of males (Ayala 2012), male violence cascaded to El Salvador also having the highest rates of femicide in the world (UN Women 2013) and of child murder (Lee 2015). Wikileaks (2011) revelations suggest the homicide rate might have spiked again in 2005 above civil war levels of mortality, to an even higher level than that acknowledged by the government. The true homicide rate is likely far more extreme than the official statistics suggest because a corrupt police and judiciary are routinely paid not to find ‘homicide’. Moreover, for a small country of 6 million people, El Salvador has the quite extraordinary number of more than 2,000 ‘disappearances’ in some years (Ayala 2012). The two major Salvadorean gangs are now transnational organisations spreading from hotspot to hotspot beyond El Salvador to Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, the United States and Canada, each gang with many tens of thousands of members and strategically networked with Mexican drug cartels.

Plate 4.3 Street gang members in prison in El Salvador.
Source: Giles N. Clarke/Getty Images.
Cascade dynamics explored in this book include violence that spreads horizontally in space from hotspot to hotspot, sometimes linking one hotspot to another, as ink-spots that expand and connect up, as well as vertically up through structural cleavages. This book concludes that twenty-first-century warfare is concentrated at local hotspots. Most places in the DRC, Kashmir, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Pakistan are as safe for a pleasant walk as the 97 per cent of addresses in US cities that are not hotspots of crime.

In consequence, peace is accomplished hotspot by hotspot more than state by state. Political settlements and a politics of reconciliation that are less myopically national and more oriented to a local politics of place are needed to resolve contemporary violence. This is also the message of the work of Kalyvas (2003, 2006: Ch. 11) and Autesserre (2010, 2014) on cleavages best studied in terms of their unravelling in a local politics of place and then connected up to national and transnational variables. It is also a theme of Gerry van Klinken’s (2007) book on ethnic, religious and separatist armed conflicts in Indonesia with the wonderfully suggestive subtitle Small Town Wars. He limited his hotspots to five provinces in Indonesia where communal violence occurred. Then he paired these examples to five main processes of contentious politics: identity formation, escalation, polarisation, mobilisation and actor constitutions, as suggested by McAdam et al. (2001).

‘Small town wars’ is both a post-Westphalian and a pre-Westphalian concept. At the height of Westphalian hegemony, from 1900 to 1941, the most deadly warfare and 80 per cent of all wars were interstate. From 1945 to 1976, this reversed sharply to a situation in which ‘85 per cent of all wars were on the territory of one state and internally oriented’ (Doyle and Sambanis 2006: 11). We might qualify this to predominantly ‘internally oriented’. While World War I started with an incident at a hotspot, Sarajevo, it spread through alliance structures as whole nations issued ultimatums. At every stage of modern history, the local politics of place is important to understanding warfare, as is state action. It is just that historians systematically overestimate the degree to which interstate wars are total wars that engulf the entire territory of a nation because historians
do not spend enough time on the ground during wars. The imperative to correct this has become more profound as growing proportions of post-1945 wars spread hotspot to hotspot more than state to state.  

Like international relations, criminology has a history of inattentiveness to the local politics of place. As a result, criminologists have been more concerned with violent displacement than with cascades of violence. Displacement is the idea that if we extinguish violence at one place, those who are structurally disposed to violence will simply move to commit crime at another place. The empirical literature mostly tends not to reveal displacement effects for violence and crime generally (Weisburd et al. 2011). Rather, when we extinguish crime at one hotspot of violence, crime also tends to decline in surrounding areas. This should have been a clue for criminologists to follow cascades of violence as a research question more important than displacement of violence.

We find war and crime cascades in this book to be bidirectional and complex. In the fieldwork for Peacebuilding Compared in Mindanao, Philippines, as in most of the other conflicts we have studied, we found plentiful evidence of women believing that war was a cause of their husbands returning from battle to inflict domestic violence on their families. We encountered stories of Mindanao mothers sending their daughters to work as domestics in Gulf states to protect them from the domestic violence of their ex-combatant fathers. Tragically, some of these girls were lost to their families when traffickers ensnared them into sex slavery. War cascades to domestic crime, which cascades to transnational crime. The Philippines is the largest exporter of guest workers to Gulf states, who come disproportionately from the most impoverished and war-torn region of the country, Mindanao. We also found cases of young mothers escaping the violence of their combatant husbands by travelling as domestics to the Gulf, then becoming lost to sex trafficking and forced labour and lost to their motherless infants.  

They become trapped in a complex net of exploitation.
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9 One evocative vindication of this is Hagan et al.’s (2015: 126–7) analysis of how a Shia organised crime group that controlled a suburb of Baghdad called Sadr City morphed into the Mahdi Army that radically destabilised Iraq.

10 Parrenas (2001) observes this phenomenon as the care crisis reproductive economy.
Islands of integrity and peace

Proposition 9 on crime–war is a challenge to extant criminological theory as well as international relations theory. Taking criminological theory more deeply into domestic space and away from violence, we see the challenge of regulating the crimes of Wall Street as one of civilising a space where criminalised cash cascades dangerously. The Wall Street challenge is how to imbue new norms into an anomic space with a high degree of mobility of aggressive young traders. Tackling corporate crime through effective local enforcement strategies—bank by bank, bank branch by bank branch—is as important as reforming international banking rules at the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (Braithwaite 2013). A change in international rules that has no follow-through to local enforcement is just an international ‘ritual of comfort’ (Power 1997). Without any change in global rules, local bank regulators in the United States might have prevented the Global Financial Crisis of 2008 had they cracked down branch by branch on banks with unusually high numbers of loan defaults once an explosion of fraud-driven loan defaults became visible on Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) databases in 2005 (Braithwaite 2013). Of course, Swiss-cheese style, it might have been more permanently prevented by structural changes to financial capital and its regulation. Corporate crime in banks is not just about Wall Street; Peacebuilding Compared finds it to be a recurrent challenge in local peacebuilding contexts during and after civil wars from Baghdad to Belfast, from Belgrade to Kabul and from Kathmandu to Zagreb (Green and Ward 2009a: 52; Marsavelski and Braithwaite 2018). We described in the previous chapter how the greatest extractive excesses of DRC president Mobutu used his central bank as their vehicle.

Likewise in the DRC, it is important to build peace mine by mine, village by village, just as it is important to build peace through UN Security Council resolutions in New York. A local politics of place is needed to connect these threads of analysis into a fabric of reform, whether that place is a mine, a village or a bank branch. Consider the common scenario in the Peacebuilding Compared dataset where corruption benefits a dominating group and disadvantages some religious or ethnic other, and where this is a grievance at the root of armed conflict. There is virtue in the 1990s Transparency International strategy of reforming a society pervaded with deep structures of corruption by establishing ‘islands of integrity’ where central anticorruption commissions can be found. Reform can also be at
the level of local islands of integrity whereby a town of 35,000 people, such as Bhaktapur in Nepal, signs an integrity pact with Transparency International so that it becomes a local anticorruption model that might spread to other localities that observe its benefits (Transparency International 1999: Para. 62).

Likewise, there was virtue in the approach of the International Force for East Timor in establishing ink-spots of security that gradually expanded and connected (Braithwaite et al. 2012). MONUSCO in DRC tracked the same idea with its strategy of ‘islands of stability’. There was a model of peace in Somaliland as an ‘island of civility’ (Kaldor 1999) that showed other locales the benefits of local reconciliations that expand trade as regions of peace expand. Kaldor (1999) argues that it is possible to find these islands of civility in nearly every war zone.

Peace was also modelled from islands of civility that were the only local spaces where women’s peacemaking groups that crossed the cleavages of the war could meet in safety in Maluku, Indonesia (Braithwaite et al. 2010a: 26, 160–2), and Bougainville (Braithwaite et al. 2010b: 36–7). For Mindanao, we observed in our Peacebuilding Compared interviews that successive peace agreements since 1996 were far from a total failure, even though they were unravelled by spoilers who turned Mindanao back to war. This was because one of the initiatives that survived these peace processes was the many ‘peace zone’ agreements to which the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), the New People’s Army and the Armed Forces of the Philippines were all sometimes signatories (Avruch and Jose 2007; Iyer 2004; S-CAR 2015). These commentators argued that while the peace zones were far from the most important driver of the new peace agreement of 2014 between the MILF and the government, their expansion helped extend a foundation for the peace. We return to the promise of cascading nonviolence locally from peace zones in Chapter 11.

Settled, locally attuned rules of the game that are decent and that work well in the context of a particular hotspot that is unsettled in some way are all that is being suggested. This is not very novel. Because the modelling
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11 It is just a Chicago School portrait of the whole globe painted pointillist style; collective efficacy (Sampson et al. 1997) constructed community by community. It is Durkheim for hotspots, as opposed to Durkheim for so-called organic societies.
of violent imaginaries (Proposition 2) is one of the mechanisms that move violence from hotspot to hotspot, cascades from one locality to another can travel long distances.

Consider the Buddhist Sinhala nationalist imaginaries of organisations of authoritarian Buddhist monks such as Bodu Bala Sena (Buddhist Power Force), which, in Sri Lanka, have cascaded violent ethnic rioting against not only Tamils but also Muslims. Our interviews suggest that these Sri Lankan organisations were influenced by fraternal organisations of Buddhist Burmese nationalist monks. These organisations have led attacks to drive Rohingya Muslims from their homes with indiscriminate killings in Myanmar.

The displacement caused by the escalating pattern of targeting Muslims has cascaded refugees across the Indian Ocean and into Bangladesh, as discussed in Chapter 9. In 2012, Muslim rioters (some of them believed to be Rohingya refugees, according to our fieldnotes) left a trail of destruction in Ramu, Bangladesh, where 11 temples, including two 300-year-old temples, were torched. Then, 2013 saw retaliatory attacks by Muslims against Buddhist refugees (Proposition 6) from Myanmar who had fled to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. These incidents led to wider regional concerns about violent imaginaries fuelled by the Myanmar conflict cascading to conflict between Muslims and Buddhists across Asia, particularly in Indonesia (to where Buddhist–Muslim Myanmar refugee violence has also cascaded). Malaysia was another cascade where resentment by Muslim majorities of the affluence of Buddhist, particularly Chinese, minorities has led to massive rioting and large-scale loss of life in the past (Purdey 2006). May 2013 saw an attempt by Islamists to bomb the Myanmar Embassy in Jakarta in retaliation for attacks on Muslims inside Myanmar (Coates 2013). Thus, violent imaginaries can travel far, as can the abused bodies of refugees, as they leap from hotspot to hotspot.

It follows from Proposition 9 that cascades can be interrupted by acting locally on fissures within fissures. Embedded within the grand narratives of dozens of Asian conflicts that construe their conflict as being about some grand cleavage (such as Acehnese separatists versus Indonesian nationalists) lurked a subsidiary fissure that motivated the slaughter or cleansing of Buddhist Chinese. One of these dozens of examples nested in the Peacebuilding Compared data is the Bougainville separatist civil war between Bougainvilleans and mainlanders of Papua New Guinea. The three local Chinatowns on Bougainville were ethnically cleansed, never to return, even though the war had nothing to do with grievances
against Chinese traders (Braithwaite et al. 2010b: 28). Imaginaries of Chinese as economic exploiters of impoverished locals have cascaded great distances from one hotspot to another across Asia and beyond (Chua 2004). They can only be addressed by a very local ethnic politics of peacebuilding, reconciliation, inclusion and social justice. The same can be said of the way the 1999 civil war in Kosovo not only cleansed Albanians and Serbs, but also Roma in many localities during the war and its immediate aftermath.

Cascades of shamelessness

As cascades of crime to war to crime accelerate, violence becomes less shameful and easier to excuse. Most of us do not decide against murdering someone who creates difficulties for us because we weigh up the benefits of eliminating them against the expected punishment costs of detection (Ahmed et al. 2001). Rather, we do not even consider murder as an option; murder is unthinkable to us. Our socialisation into the shamefulness of murder has put this option right off our deliberative agenda. Sexual and gender-based violence rates increase when violence against women is no longer seen as shameful. The politics of nonviolence of the women's movement has had a profound impact in constituting violence as more shameful in recent decades than it was in the past. The incidence of these crimes has fallen in response to this feminist politics (Pinker 2011: 196–201). Sadly, this progress suffers setbacks in times of high crime and high war. Violence becomes less shameful and easier to excuse for the cause. When conflict supplies justificatory scripts for rape and violence, these crimes of domination of women become less shameful. Proposition 9 is about why this further drives up the incidence of rape and violence.

As cascades of crime to war accelerate, the criminalisation of the state also becomes less shameful. In peaceful democracies, a criminal record tends to be fatal for a political career. When security dilemmas grip the imaginations of citizens, they want political leaders who can protect them from the dangerous other. Quite often they come to think that a hardened criminal is precisely the kind of political leader who can offer their group
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12 When the Black Panther movement in 1968 was justifying violence in the struggle against white oppression in the United States and against the war in Vietnam, its leader, Eldridge Cleaver (1992), famously wrote in Soul on Ice that ‘[r]ape was an insurrectionary act’ (when directed at ‘defiling’ revenge against white women).
that protection from another ethnic or religious group. In our interviews with Iraqi community and religious leaders, they said people often joined Islamic State because they feared the violence or expropriation of their property by a political boss who dominated their village or town; they turned to Islamic State to warn off that political or party boss.

War also creates new criminal opportunity structures for political leaders who control states. Examples include corruption, embezzlement, contracts that favour a family business, crushing the competitors of a family business and coercing the central bank to print money to finance a family business. The scale of criminal opportunity in conditions of war can be beyond the imagination of what is possible in normal times (Marsavelski et al. 2017; Marsavelski and Braithwaite 2018). It takes criminals of extreme ruthlessness to lunge at the lure of criminalising a war state or its central bank. In these conditions, Cloward and Ohlin’s (1960) theory of crime driven by illegitimate opportunity structures comes into play. Hagan et al. (2015) deploy opportunity theory in their analysis of the criminalisation of the post-2003 Iraqi state. In conditions of war, political control of states becomes less attractive to honest politicians and more attractive to the most ruthless of criminals. Another reason criminal hardmen seize opportunities to control states when warlike conditions permit this is that by controlling the state they can confer on themselves immunity from prosecution for their past crimes.

The emergence of merchant capital in the sixteenth century illustrates the relationship between illicit economic activity and primitive capital accumulation. The merchants and captains of the great seaports of northern Europe were ruthlessly criminal in their methods for supplanting those of Venice and Genoa. Long before the term ‘money laundering’ was coined, the Brentano (the influential Frankfurt merchant dynasty of the seventeenth century) employed this tactic (Bayart et al. 1999). In our own time, the opportunities offered to organised criminals by the globalisation of markets have direct links to warmaking and state-making (Tilly 1985). The interaction between the practice of power, war, economic accumulation and illicit activities of various types forms a particular kind of political trajectory that leads to criminalisation of states. Examples

13 In conditions of civil war in anomic societies, false rumours about people and events are endemic. The media is captured by different factions in the conflict, to the point where it becomes hard to know what to believe. Consequently, if a leader seems to credibly promise protection to my group, I tend to disbelieve claims about his or her criminality.
from sub-Saharan Africa include rents obtained from the control of exports of gold, ivory and slaves and collaboration with extractive colonial powers (Bayart et al. 1999). Various terms have been used to describe such extractive criminality. Ayittey (1999: 157–8) uses ‘vampire states’, Bayart et al. (1999) use ‘criminalized states’ and Reno (1999) uses ‘shadow states’ in their analyses of violence and criminalisation in Africa.

The work of some of the most influential scholars of the politics of development connects in a non-criminological way to Cloward and Ohlin’s (1960) criminological insight. Commanders of criminalised states strip away institutions that might limit their opportunities by, for example, arresting or firing anticorruption commissioners or judges. Samuel Huntington’s (1991, 2006) work was fundamentally about how the corrosion or absence of institutions explains instability and violence (likewise, Fukuyama 2014). Criminalisation of the state conduces to what Michael Mann (1986, 1993) calls despotic power: the capacity to suppress dissent, rights, the media and opposition parties. Despotic power gives states the appearance of strength, but effective state strength comes from what Mann calls infrastructural power: the power to secure public safety by legitimately making and enforcing laws, and power to deliver peaceful growth through the infrastructure of education, health and other public goods. For Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson (2012), ‘criminalised states’ crush peaceful development because they are ‘extractive’, pushing aside inclusive institutions that enable peaceful development. For Douglass North et al. (2009), mafias and other organised criminal groups that strip states are examples of ‘limited access orders’ wherein a coalition of rent-seeking elites deploys political power to prevent both political and economic competition. For North et al. (2009), peace and development are unlikely in criminalised states because they are limited access orders.

This book can be read as both an attempt to infiltrate criminological theory into international relations and an attempt to infiltrate international relations theory into criminology. Crime and war share one fundamental characteristic in their empirical social science literatures. Ken Pease (1998: v) showed with crime that ‘victimisation is the best predictor of victimisation’. For example, the best predictor of one’s house being burgled in the next six months is whether it has been burgled in the past six months (see also Rey et al. 2012: 526). Likewise, one of the best predictors of whether a country will have a civil war in the near future is whether it has recently had one (Call 2012: 53; Collier 2009; Hibbs 1973). Crime and war share the features that they are cascading
phenomena within themselves. Crime cascades to crime (and war); war cascades to war (and crime). Self-reinforcing features of these phenomena cascade further because they are also mutually reinforcing. It is not just civil war that cascades to further civil war or interstate conflicts that cascade and cluster in regions and at hotspots in space and time (A. Braithwaite 2016); it is also that military coups cascade to further military coups. Collier (2009: 147) reports that the baseline risk of a coup attempt in Africa is 4 per cent per year. In the year after an attempted coup, the risk of a further coup is elevated to 10 per cent. In addition, the occurrence of a coup significantly increases the chances of a civil war (Collier 2009: 153). These associations are a special focus of Chapter 8.

The political economy of cut and run from cascades

**Proposition 10:** When war produces a cascade of violence that moves to many new spaces that bite back at a combatant nation, the costs of shutting down the violence in all those spaces can quickly exceed the benefits of winning the war. It can then be rational to cut one’s losses by pulling out of the war, leaving a festering cascade of violence behind, unresolved. The contemporary war economics of cascades therefore sustains cascades of violence (as we saw with cut-and-run policies in Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya).

The nine different cascade dynamics presented in the propositions that precede this one mean that cascades get out of hand—so much so that the wealthiest of states can decide that continuing to fight a long war becomes unmanageably expensive. North Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh put the political economy of defiance and persistence thus: ‘Kill ten of our men and we will kill one of yours. In the end, it is you who will tire’ (Record 1998: 37). After sinking a decade of blood and treasure into a war in Afghanistan that killed more than a million people, the Soviet Union cut its losses in 1988–89, leaving almost another million people to die in a cascade of subsequent wars that has continued from 1989 to 2018. The United States pulled out of a decade of war in Vietnam that killed a million people, leaving another million to die in a cascade of subsequent fighting, especially in Cambodia. France and Belgium opted out of the project of managing conflict that cascaded from their colonial policies in Congo, Burundi and Rwanda. The colonial policies that had a hand in these cascades were extractive institutions and state-sanctioned discrimination in favour of Tutsis over Hutu and other ethnic groups.
Many millions of Africans have lost their lives to a succession of Great Lakes regional wars and genocides from 1960. What can we do to prevent the legacy of withdrawal of external powers from Syria likewise becoming a seven-figure quantum of killings?

Afghanistan is unusual in that both of the greatest Cold War powers decided to cut their losses in the country. Afghanistan was the Soviet Union’s Vietnam. We saw in Chapter 2 that the US Government smugly saw victory in Afghanistan as sufficient in 1989 and so walked away from the mess the proxy war they contrived against the Soviets had afflicted on locals. With hindsight, we might perceive that presidents Gorbachev and Bush had interests that were more in alignment at that time than at any time before or since. Tyrant though he was, Afghanistan’s president Najibullah at least wanted to hand over to a transitional government of national reconciliation with participation from all major armed groups. The Soviet Union and the United States might have worked together to support such a democratic transition through the kind of aid that was provided to post-communist regimes in Europe. Instead, they allowed Pakistan to call the shots, backing a succession of mujahidin groups (who they thought could prevail militarily as Pakistani clients) until they decided to back the Taliban. Obviously, the Taliban power base that Pakistan nurtured cost the United States much more dearly than donor support for a peaceful 1989 transition in Afghanistan would have cost. If we consider the Russian cost–benefit calculus, Russia loses more young lives to heroin flooding in from Afghanistan each year than it lost in the entire Afghan war (Paoli et al. 2009: 238). While heroin deaths fell in the West in the early years of this century, in Russia they shot through the ceiling as a result of networks into a war-induced boom in Afghan opium production that peaked at 92 per cent of the world market (Paoli et al. 2009).

What the Soviets and the Americans left behind after their mutual cut and run were foreign mujahidin such as Osama bin Laden and the kind of anarchic rule-of-law vacuum in Kandahar that we have already described as enabling the rise of the Taliban in 1994. UN peacebuilding to deliver rule of law to Kandahar in 1989 would have been a wise investment, as would have been a joint demand from the great powers for an end to Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) interventions that were unravelling Afghanistan militarily. Saikal (2014: 2–3) conceives this as part of a wider, longer pattern across the four adjoining West Asian countries of Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq:
The region’s constituent states have been repeatedly invaded or intervened in by major powers such as Tsarist and Soviet Russia, Great Britain and the United States, with each seeking, often in competition with one another, to redirect the domestic and foreign policy objectives and priorities of the constituent states … Ultimately, none of these powers have been able to achieve their goals entirely to their satisfaction, and all have, at times, bowed out of the arena in one way or another, at high costs to themselves and to the subjected peoples. This proved to be the case first with the British, whose many decades of colonial domination and interference ultimately bore little fruit. The same proved true for Tsarist and Soviet Russia, whose empires collapsed and ambitions shrank during the Anglo–Russian rivalry from the mid-nineteenth century to the Second World War and, subsequently, during the course of the US–Soviet superpower competition.

In Chapter 2, we considered the cascading of violence from Libya south to Mali, Chad, Niger, northern Nigeria and beyond, east to Syria and Iraq, and the spilling of refugees north into the Mediterranean as a result of the militarised regime change in Libya in 2011. Perhaps what is needed is opposition to any military intervention in another country to effect regime change (as opposed to peace enforcement to secure civilian protection) unless the international community is prepared to fund more than a decade of continuous UN-sanctioned international military presence until a just peace and a legitimate post-conflict state are consolidated.

At present, none of the major powers is prepared to go all the way with such follow-through. This means that the economic logic of regime change is the cascading of so much violence from the international military intervention as to induce the profound likelihood of the politics of cut and run. Never mind the morality of leaving behind one’s allies in the regime change to the mercy of the victors in successive civil wars. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) leaves behind not just locals who supported their international intervention. It also abandons local feminists who championed women’s rights in the period before a patriarchal armed group cleans them up. It has been a morally and fiscally reckless and feckless politics of short-term populism in starting wars. It has bequeathed long-term abandonment of parts of the world to chaos.
Conclusion: Civilising or cascading process?

Many influential social scientists have sought to understand why our planet has experienced a long-run decline in the incidence of violence since the Middle Ages, if not longer (e.g. Broadhurst et al. 2015; Eisner 2003; Pinker 2011; Spierenberg 2008, 2013). Scholars in the tradition of Elias (2000) conceive this as a ‘civilising process’ (e.g. Pinker 2011; Spierenberg 2008, 2013), referring to data from the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, England, Scandinavia and across Europe and Asia (Broadhurst et al. 2015; ter Haar 2000).

There are various alternative interpretations on offer to the civilising theoretical framework, perhaps the most common being the globalisation of the capacity of states to pacify spaces that contained many unregulated spaces before states assumed sovereignty over entire territories. Another alternative or complementary interpretation to the civilising process is that, at least since the second half of the nineteenth century, cascades of nonviolent struggle against domination have had a trajectory that has been upwards in the sense of taking more steps forward than backward. This chapter has mentioned the women’s movement as one particularly important example of a cascade of nonviolent struggle against domination. Global movements for the rule of law and human rights, for democracy, the labour movement, the disability rights movement, the environmental movement, the indigenous rights movement, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ) rights movement and the restorative justice movement are others that share with the women’s movement—and, most critically, with the peace movement itself—anti-domination agendas that Part III concludes have been fertile for the struggle against violence. Such social movements gave rise to new pacifying institutions such as the law of war, transitional justice, the League of Nations, the United Nations, Track II diplomacy, peacekeeping and reconciliation committees inside the walls of Pakistani police stations. At least all of these macro and micro mechanisms and institutions are among the alternatives to ‘the civilising process’ considered in this book.

Work in the civilising tradition documents not only a tenfold to fiftyfold long-run decline in the homicide rate, but also movements that ‘abolished’ socially sanctioned forms of violence such as duelling, slavery, executions, killing suspected witches, corporal punishment, mercenary armies and judicial torture. There were at least formal declarations of the abolition
of these dominations, though all proved resilient in finding new ways to keep creeping back. Norbert Elias (2000) interprets the European civilising process that began in the eleventh or twelfth century as driven by a growing capacity for impulse control. A sense of shame over impulses of violence and revenge increased through courtly manners as royal courts discovered their interest in pacifying the spaces they controlled. The shamefulness of violence, and other norms of impulse control, then progressively democratised to the middle class and later down to peasants.

This book addresses the question of whether or not this civilising process is in fact a cascading process. Whether scholars of Europe such as Elias himself are accounting for the decivilising reversals of the Holocaust or scholars of Cambodia (Broadhurst et al. 2015) are accounting for the decivilising reversals of the Khmer Rouge genocide, there is a struggle within the terms of that theory to accommodate such dramatic reversals. We conclude in Chapter 11 that the risks of cascades of domination and violence and the opportunities for cascades of nonviolence and liberation are always in contest at any historical moment.

In this book, the peace movement is important among these anti-domination movements because it has spawned an instructive literature on how to cascade nonviolent tactics (e.g. Ackerman and DuVall 2001; Roberts and Garton Ash 2009; Sharp 1973, 2012). The restorative justice movement also has distinctive importance because, as in the work of South Africa’s Archbishop Desmond Tutu, it assists with a theoretical account of why the ‘justice cascade’ (Sikkink 2011) of truth and reconciliation commissions can advance restorative justice, and what specific tactics of reconciliation this implies. Formal apologies by leaders are one implication, for example. From 1900 until the 1980s, apologies by political and religious leaders were practically non-existent, averaging fewer than five per decade for the entire world. By the twenty-first century, apologies by political and religious leaders had climbed steeply to 100 per decade (Pinker 2011: 544). Restorative justice as an explanatory theory of nonviolence responds in exactly the same period, showing that apology can reduce violence when the apology is viewed as sincere. Understanding the conditions required for apologies to be seen as sincere is central to restorative justice research (e.g. Ahmed et al. 2001; Braithwaite 2002: 81; Strang et al. 2013). Politically, the women’s movement was the most important of the social movements for cascades of nonviolence because, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was the women’s movement that had sophisticated political organisation for the promotion of nonviolence (Etchart 2015). It connected productively
to the peace movement and to the professionalisation of a diplomacy of mediation more than a century ago to suppress international violence, and to the restorative justice movement today in pursuit of nonviolent ways to suppress domestic violence.

Institutions of the United Nations such as the UNHCR have already proved useful for the purpose of preventing violence from crossing tipping points. We have seen how local tipping points that UN institutions failed to prevent locally—such as the outrage caused by the February 2006 bombing of the al-Askari mosque in Iraq—could induce global change to war and terrorism (Boyle 2014: Ch. 8; Hagan et al. 2015: Chs 1 and 2). The journey of this book is also about exploring how to make UN institutions more robustly effective than they currently are. In a case such as Iraq, structural international remedies and preventive diplomacy were also required. When violence begins to cascade, momentum towards domination and militarisation can cascade rapidly across tipping points, driven by the 10 dynamic propositions we advance for spirals towards extremely violent societies.

This book argues that cascades of nonviolence such as the Arab Spring in 2011 or the historical spread of the norm against killing prisoners of war create an opportunity for an organisation like Islamic State to jump into that space with an imaginary of reversing those cascades back to barbarism. Any anomic space is a niche of opportunity for practitioners of cascades of nonviolence and practitioners of violence alike. When the number of claimants for a chaotic space becomes large, it is also easier to reverse established civilising norms such as the ban on use of poison gas in warfare (Pinker 2011: 273), and to blame one of the other ruthless parties within the anarchic space—as we see with mutual recriminations against different sides for using poison gas against civilians in Syria (Dyer 2014). Such cascade hypotheses do not posit a long-run shift in the deep structure of human psychology in the way Elias does.

Nor are our hypotheses about medieval history. Our 10 propositions are not about the rise of courts that seek pacified spaces under their control, in preference to an order enforced by roving hot-headed knights. The hypotheses and empirical analyses of this book are about the past century. Hence, it is possible that the civilising process of Elias (and Pinker) provides a better account of the history of the longue durée, while cascades theory will supply a more inductively attuned theory for the past century and the next. In particular, cascades theory provides a good
account of why some of the worst genocides in human history occur so late in the trajectory of the civilising process in Armenia/Turkey, Germany (and Central Europe), Cambodia and Rwanda–Burundi–Congo (see also Balint 2012) and why there have been multiple narrower genocides against multiple groups in places such as Libya, Iraq and Syria targeting religious or ethnic minorities such as Yazidis during the current decade. This seems more helpful than seeing them as ‘setbacks’ in a process that is not quite inexorably unidirectional.

There are tipping points in cascades of violence (Gladwell 2000; Kennedy 2009). This book shows that the tipping point defined by Proposition 1 and Figure 3.1 is just one kind of tipping point in play. Hurting stalemates, in which both sides become worn down by war weariness, are another kind of tipping point that we code in the Peacebuilding Compared data (Mooradian and Druckman 1999; Sisk 1995; Zartman 2000, 2001a). The most important tipping points considered in this book arise when Nelson Mandela or Nepalese Maoists flip their strategy from an imaginary of armed struggle to an imaginary of nonviolent resistance.

It also follows from understanding how violence cascades that it is mostly a mistake to fight violence with violence. Only rarely is this the best or only recourse available to us. We might do better to focus on fighting violence through prevention attuned to interrupting rather than accelerating cascades. Violent means of pursuing simple policies such as regime change in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya or Syria must be contested critically against the question: ‘To what might violence in pursuit of that regime change cascade?’

Ultimately, this book simply argues that, in conditions of late modernity, cascades of violence and militarisation are under continual contest by cascades of nonviolence nurtured by social movement politics. Cascades of domination are under constant contest by cascades of liberation animated by anti-domination social movements of the kinds mentioned above. This is a struggle without end that ebbs and flows. It is a struggle in which the politics of state violence and domination do not consistently enjoy the advantages that realist international relations theory claims. Because violence cascades, it is imperative that we learn how to prevent it before it cascades too far. The world might learn—perhaps it is already learning—how to return to a long-run historical trajectory away from violence.
This text is taken from Cascades of Violence: War, Crime and Peacebuilding Across South Asia, by John Braithwaite and Bina D’Costa, published 2018 by ANU Press, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.