

A DYADIC EXAMINATION OF THE TERRITORIAL PEACE

by

JOSEPH ADRIAN RICKERT

KARL DeROUEN, COMMITTEE CHAIR

HOLGER ALBRECHT

JOHN BEELER

BARABARA CHOTINER

DANIEL J. LEVINE

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Political Science  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2019

Copyright Joseph Adrian Rickert 2019  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## **ABSTRACT**

The territorial peace theory poses the most prominent challenge to the democratic peace theory. Although territorial peace theory has generated robust results in quantitative studies, the domestic processes involved in regime formation and change pre- and post-resolution of territorial threats still warrant consideration. This leaves open avenues of research that might augment the theory's applicability to certain regime types rather than being understood as a universally applied systemic theory. This study examines two democratic and non-democratic dyads that do not entirely conform to territorial peace theory to help explain regime type formation. These case studies also investigate domestic processes of regime response to external territorial threat, and the impact of this threat on regime type.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank my dissertation committee chairman, Dr. Karl DeRouen, for his assistance in guiding me through this project. Without his patience in reading over numerous revisions and his pertinent suggestions, this project would not have been possible. I would also like to thank all my dissertation committee members: Dr. Holger Albrecht, Dr. John Beeler, Dr. Barbara Chotiner, and Dr. Daniel J. Levine, all of whom provided invaluable suggestions for improvement throughout this project and offered much appreciated encouragement and support. Any errors within the text are mine alone.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: THEORY.....	6
CHAPTER III: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
CHAPTER IV: ISRAEL CASE STUDY.....	36
CHAPTER V: EGYPT CASE STUDY.....	87
CHAPTER VI: SOUTH KOREA CASE STUDY.....	140
CHAPTER VII: NORTH KOREA CASE STUDY.....	164
CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION.....	182
REFERENCES.....	193

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The territorial peace theory poses significant challenge to democratic peace theory. Whereas the democratic peace argues that democracies do not go to war with other democracies (i.e., democracy links causally to peace), the territorial peace argues that democracy is more likely to develop in states that have resolved border/territorial disputes (i.e., peace results in democracy). The territorial peace reasons that pervasive territorial disputes are more likely to create conditions that are unsuited to democracy, primarily the establishment of large standing armies, a decrease in political polarization, and a public unified around a common external enemy. Therefore, according to the territorial peace theory, the key driver of peace is settled borders and the absence of territorial disputes.

Although both theories are supported by robust quantitative analysis, each has its problems. First, with respect to the territorial peace, there are examples of states that are democratic or that have democratized despite pervasive territorial threats, and states that have not democratized despite resolving territorial disputes. An examination of the domestic political processes of such cases and how they respond to threat will provide a better understanding of the effects of security threat on regime type.

Second, although democratic breakdown occurs, there are few, if any, examples of this happening because of territorial threats. If security threats are more likely to result in conditions orthogonal to democratic formation, arguably those same conditions are detrimental to existing

democracies. There are many historical examples of democracies restricting civil liberties and becoming more militarized in response to security threats (the U.S. response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks being one example, France's declaration of a state of emergency after terrorist attacks in 2015 being another), yet very few examples involving total democratic breakdown because of security threats alone. Institutional explanations likely provide a reason for this, as democracies are more immune to long-term democratic erosion due to increased militarization and political centralization of power. The presence of democratic institutions constrains arbitrary exercise of power, limiting response options to territorial threat that may threaten democracy itself.

Third, political polarization itself can be detrimental to democratic formation and longevity. Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) highlight recent American political polarization as potentially weakening the country's democratic norms. Alternatively, it is not illogical that a state facing a security threat may begin or continue holding contested elections while remaining united against an external threat. The United States, for example, continued holding elections during the Civil War. The September 11, 2001 attacks united the Democrats and Republicans, but this threat also greatly expanded executive powers. These observations support the territorial peace theory in that polarization decreased and executive power expanded and civil liberties curtailed. Yet, these observations also demonstrate some flaws with the territorial peace, as elections continued and the immediacy of the threat gradually receded.

Fourth, scholars who have examined the territorial peace note that the theory does not describe the monadic processes by which states democratize after removal of territorial threats (Owsiak 2013,720). Doing so would provide a better understanding of the relationship between external threat and democratization. An examination of cases deviating from the territorial peace

would improve the understanding and applicability of the territorial peace theory, allowing scholars to understand the conditions under which it is more applicable than others, along with a refinement of its relationship to the democratic peace. Theories are improved when enigmas are examined, allowing their applicability to be enhanced.

Case studies examining nonconfirming examples of the territorial peace will provide a better understanding of the applicability of the territorial peace. Owsiak (2013, 718) has argued that additional research should be conducted to further investigate the “nuanced relationship between settled borders and democracy”, noting that although settled borders make democratization more likely, it does not create the type of democratic regime change necessary for the democratic peace to apply. Similarly, in his research demonstrating how international rivalry impacts domestic politics, Colaresi (2004, 567) has indicated the importance of future case study research to further investigate the impact of foreign rivalry on domestic and international processes that perpetuate the rivalry.

As will be discussed below, a deviant-case analysis as described by Gerring (2006) will provide as-yet unspecified domestic processes involved with how regimes respond to external security threats, thereby providing a better understanding of the territorial peace theory. Because numerous variables are responsible for influencing regime change and regime type, deviant-case analyses will provide an examination of those variables to allow for observation of these variables and how they relate to regime type.

### **Research Design and Case Selection**

In order to better understand the way in which security threats affect regime type, I will select dyadic enduring rivals as cases, one involving a democracy and the other a non-democracy. Dyadic enduring rival cases provide an examination of how democratic processes

advanced or halted in each dyad in response to a security threat, along with the effects of the end of the security threat on both regimes. Goertz and Diehl (1992, 1993, 1995) classify enduring rivals as states engaging in repeated conflict, with such rivals being eight times as likely to experience conflict as states in isolated conflict, and the beginning and ending of such rivalries involve large political shocks (such as changes in internal distributions of power, national independences, world wars, or territorial changes). Enduring rivals are thus more likely to view one another as a threat and would thus provide a more accurate depiction of the territorial peace than states which were not enduring rivals.

The case selections chosen represent deviant, or nonconfirmatory, cases with respect to the territorial peace theory. As Gerring (2006) explains:

The purpose of a deviant case -analysis is usually to probe for new – but as yet unspecified – explanations... The researcher hopes that causal processes within the deviant case will illustrate some causal factor that is applicable to other (deviant) cases. This means that a deviant-case study usually culminates in a general proposition –one that may be applied to other cases in the population (106).

Because my intent is to broaden our understanding of territorial peace theory and to ascertain not only the domestic political processes involved regarding the impact of security threat on regime type, but also whether different regime types respond to threats in different ways, I have selected cases which are deviant from the territorial peace theory. What impact do variables such as historical background, economic growth and development, and social and cultural norms have on the way in which a regime responds to territorial threat? If these four case studies provide an understanding of the process by which regime is affected by security threats, the territorial peace theory can better be understood and situated within the international relations literature.

Israel and Egypt are the first and second dyadic case studies because Israel is a democracy and entered the system as a democratic state, whereas Egypt is not democratic. Both have fought multiple wars with each other since Israeli independence in 1948, and these states signed a peace treaty in 1979. Each has considered the other a significant security threat at various times since 1948. This case will allow for a detailed examination of the impact of external threat on domestic society and politics and whether these threats influenced democratic or democratization processes. Having signed a formal peace treaty, both states resolved their territorial disputes with each other, an important condition necessary for democratization according to territorial peace theory. Any movement towards democratization in Egypt since 1979 can therefore be identified, thus allowing for a better understanding of the impact the resolution of territorial disputes had on democratization processes.

North and South Korea are the third and fourth dyadic enduring rivals for case study selection. South Korea democratized despite an existential territorial threat and a formal state of war with its only territorial neighbor. North Korea enjoyed security guarantees from great powers with significant conventional and nuclear capability, yet it has not democratized. An understanding of domestic processes in these dyadic enduring rivals will provide an improved understanding of the territorial peace theory and possibly the democratic peace theory.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORY**

The territorial peace theory is problematic as a systemic theory because it omits important variables which determine regime type. However, my purpose is not to debunk the theory, but rather to explicate important aspects of it that contribute to regime type. When considering the omitted variables that are discussed in this study, the theory and its applicability to certain situations may be improved. In addition, territorial peace theory may be more applicable to certain regime types (i.e. military regimes) and security situations than others. As has also been mentioned, scholars have noted territorial peace theory's lack of explanation of domestic processes involving democratization after the resolution of territorial threats. In examining deviant cases, the applicability of territorial peace to specific regime types and/or security situations may be attained, and the domestic processes, which affect regime type, are examined. This allows for an examination of how the resolution of security threats influences regime type, if at all. It also allows for an examination of the influence of threat on regime, how regimes respond to threat, and any influence of threat perception on regime type. Lastly, as the data used to measure territorial peace theory is from 1945 and beyond, it is possible that the theory captures specific Cold War systemic influences, and prior datasets may yield different results. Below is a description of how the theory is problematic as it is currently understood,

followed by a theoretical explanation of what these cases have uncovered, which will help guide future research.

First, the theory does not specify what is meant by a democracy. This is problematic in that prominent scholars note that there are various kinds of democratic regimes (Linz 1990; Schmitter and Karl, 1991), just as there are many kinds of authoritarian ones. Regimes are not monolithic; therefore, it is problematic for systemic theories to speak of general “democracy” or “autocracy” without specifying what is meant by those terms.

Second, the territorial peace does not explain the process of democratization once the state has resolved territorial disputes; it merely argues that democratization is more likely to result after the resolution of territorial threats. However, this is problematic and linked to the first critique in that at which point may a state be said to have successfully democratized?

Third, the theory does not account for how certain regime types may perceive and respond to territorial threats, but instead assumes that all non-democratic regime types will behave in similar ways after territorial threats have been resolved. In short, the theory is too general, whereas it may be very applicable in certain circumstances to specific regime types or longstanding ethnic territorial conflicts. With respect to threat perception, the theory assumes that a non-democratic regime facing a threat from a neighboring state will maintain a large standing army, experience centralized political power with limited political plurality, and that the population will similarly be united in their opposition to this threat. However, populations are also not monolithic, and the citizens of a multiethnic state engaged in a territorial dispute may be divided on how the regime responds to that threat compared to population with a homogeneous ethnicity, for example.

Furthermore, many countries on earth experience some form of territorial disputes in any given year, ranging from small-scale disputes over fisheries to territorial disputes resulting in militarized disputes. Not only do different leaders and regimes respond to such disputes in varied ways, but not all are perceived as posing threats serious enough to result in a garrison state, a large standing army, and a population united against the threat. In addition, the theory does not consider alliance networks or security umbrellas, which can greatly obviate threat perception from neighboring states. The South and North Korean case studies demonstrate how each state relied on security guarantees from powerful allies to minimize the threat of invasion or military disputes, thereby altering levels of perceived and likely threat. However, these variables are not considered by the territorial peace theory at all. Thus, “territorial disputes” are also not quantified. Power asymmetry undoubtedly determines the way a state responds to a territorial threat or dispute; a powerful state experiencing a territorial dispute with weak neighbor may perceive no viable threat from that state at all, whereas if the larger state makes no hostile moves against the weaker state, it likewise may not perceive it as a threat. The territorial dispute would thus remain dormant, as has occurred between several South American states in recent years. Alternatively, a weak state that perceives a more powerful as hostile may form a garrison state to defend against a much more powerful and threatening neighbor, which has the potential to affect regime type.

Not all threats to the state are external or territorial. Some regimes, as the North Korean and Egyptian cases illustrate to some degree, view their own citizens or military officer corps as a threat and rely on security services, secret police networks, or the military to suppress the population or threatening group. This may result in a sizeable repressive apparatus, including secret police networks, mass surveillance of civilians or perceived hostile social groups, all of

which are also anathema to democratic governance. The Egyptian case will demonstrate that Sadat decreased the size of the army while simultaneously increasing the size of the security forces as he considered the military a threat. To pacify the top military leadership, the regime's relationship with the U.S. since 1979 provided the military with public goods in the form of direct US military aid to that institution, making a coup attempt less likely. As the North Korean case will also demonstrate, ideology also influences what the regime considers a threat. Non-neighboring states with a particular ideology may be considered a fundamental threat to the regime, which also may unite the leadership and possibly the entire society against this ideological threat, which has been observed in North Korea with respect to the United States.

Fourth, the territorial peace does not recognize the important role that external great powers have in determining regime type, independent of the presence or absence of territorial threats. Major countries such as the United States, Russia, China, and others have played important roles in maintaining current regimes or pressuring them to change. A few examples include Syria, Libya, Iraq, Ukraine, Belarus, Egypt, Jordan, Bahrain, South Korea and North Korea. This calculation usually involves the geopolitical interests of those powers, but the important point is that regime type is not simply a matter of domestic power calculus contingent on the resolution of territorial threats; some regimes democratize despite serious territorial threats, whereas others do not democratize even after those threats have been mitigated or resolved. With the complex interaction of multiple variables, determining regime type is a complex process typically not responsive to any single cause. The actions of these great powers may contradict expectations of the territorial peace. This particular variable will be demonstrated below with respect to two of the four case studies, Egypt and South Korea.

The path dependency of authoritarian institutions is also not considered by the territorial peace, nor are the individual wishes of the authoritarian leadership. The case studies involving Egypt and North Korea demonstrate the desire of the leadership to maintain indefinite control, and efforts to democratize would end the leader's power. The decades of authoritarian institutions reinforced the power of the political leadership, making grassroots efforts at democratic reform extremely difficult and easy to overcome. However, in some circumstances the leader may willingly step down and concede to democratic pressure, or implement democratic reforms that ultimately lead to democratization, as happened in South Korea. One topic raised by this research is the possibility that certain regime types respond differently to territorial threats that may be more in line with expectations of the territorial peace, with military regimes being one possibility.

These case studies will demonstrate that although the territorial peace theory is in some cases accurate in its prediction of strong centralization of power and to some extent a reduction in political plurality, in each case there is much more involved than matters of security which influences regime type. Below is a brief description of the variables that will be identified in the case studies that the territorial peace theory at present does not consider, but which may contribute to a greater understanding of this theory.

Ethnocratic regimes are defined as states where a dominant ethnic group controls the majority of the power, with ethnicity determining rights rather than citizenship. These regimes appear to be *sui generis* regime types which would constitute exceptions to the territorial peace because their very nature presupposes the creation of a state for a specific ethnic group to the exclusion of all others, particularly those which are perceived as a threat. Such a state's actions will involve the maximization of rights for the dominant group and the minimization of the rights

for all other groups within the state. The state is typically involved in a realist, zero-sum environment where it considers its survival in jeopardy from non-dominant ethnic groups which it views as a fifth column, and its actions may involve aggressively suppressing the rights of and/or removing these groups to areas beyond the state or marginalizing them within the state into manageable Bantustans. Since the dominant ethnic group's secured existence is the *raison d'être* of the state, the institutions of state exist to support such a group rather than to suppress it. Therefore, such a state would likely have an electoral "democratic" government among the dominant group, while restricting various rights for the non-dominant groups. It would be contradictory for the state to suppress the dominant group with the military or security services since the existence of the state itself is to promote the interests of the dominant ethnic group. The dominant group controls the state. The security services and military would instead exist to repress all other ethnic groups it considers threatening.

The territorial peace theory would predict that a state that felt threatened by regional ethnic groups would likely not be democratic. As has been articulated, such ethnocracies likely would demonstrate democratic rights for the dominant group only, which is contrary to the territorial peace. Two cases of interest are Israel, which is addressed below, and South Africa under apartheid, not addressed in this study but perhaps in future research. The Israeli case study will demonstrate this reasoning to be accurate, as well as provide an explanation for an enigmatic case that Gibler (2012) recognizes, along with India, are difficult for the theory to explain. Thus, threat does not always equate with authoritarian and/or garrison states. Ethnocracies may promote democratic governance for the dominant group to the exclusion of all other groups. While such states would not be considered liberal democracies, they may well meet the standard of electoral democracy for the dominant group.

In addition to ethnocracies, ethnic solidarity is important in determining interstate relations and the likelihood or absence of conflict between bordering states with a shared ethnicity. The case study on South Korea will demonstrate how shortly after democratization in 1987, the democratic leadership responded to popular wishes to improve relations not only with the DPRK, but also with China and the Soviet Union as part of the *Nordpolitik* strategy. Many South Koreans felt kinship ties to the North and advocated the government begin steps that would ultimately lead to reunification. In particular, the younger generation of South Koreans was less likely to view the DPRK as threatening and sought to diminish the U.S. role in the ROK. Many also saw the U.S. as having supported the authoritarian regime in the ROK. The territorial peace does not consider the role of shared ethnicity on threat perception, which may have a significant impact in mitigating threat perception. This raises the possibility of the territorial peace explaining regime responses very accurately in states where ethnic groups are openly hostile to one another, whereas it would not accurately do so in states with shared ethnic ties.

Lastly, research has shown that civil-military relations are important not only in determining the power calculus of regimes, but it also affects military battlefield performance (Brooks 2006). This, in turn, is influential in determining responses to perceived territorial threats as it is a factor in power asymmetry; militarily stronger states would be better able to handle such threats from neighboring states with a more capable military, and therefore perhaps less likely to require a large standing army that could reinforce the authoritarian regime.

Similarly, as the Egypt case study will demonstrate, the territorial peace assumes that the military automatically carries out the orders of the political leadership, whereas in some cases it may be struggling for political power itself. In Egypt, the military was at odds for decades with

the political leadership, as each had different goals. In the 1950s some components of the military sought a more democratic trajectory than the Free Officers who ultimately took control of the government. In the aftermath of the 1979 peace treaty with Israel, a majority of the population favored ending the treaty. This is contrary to the territorial peace, which fundamentally argues that peace results in democracy, and were the wishes of the majority carried out under a democratic regime, this could likely realize the annulment of the peace treaty. Thus, democracy would lead to the possibility of continued tension and conflict. This is also contrary to the democratic peace. A similar situation exists in Jordan, with democratic efforts curtailed to maintain peaceful relations with Israel, as will be described below.

The territorial peace theory can be improved by isolating instances where its three primary assumptions are all present: a highly centralized political structure, limited political polarization, and a population united against an external threat. It would appear that those cases to look for would involve states sharply divided among ethnic and/or religious differences, what Huntington refers to in his *Clash of Civilizations* (1996). Strong ideological cleavages between neighboring states would also appear to support the territorial peace logic, although the bulk of this was likely during the Cold War. Populations with deep longstanding animosities would be the most likely to organize their societies into combatting a perceived enemy in the way the territorial peace dictates rather than applying the theory in a broadly systemic manner.

Second, certain regime types, such as military regimes, may more accurately adhere to the expectations of the territorial peace, considering that the literature on such regimes indicates they are relatively short-lived and often exist to resolve a pressing issue, such as restoring order or, perhaps, responding to a perceived external threat?

If such specific cases can be identified which adhere to the expectations of the territorial peace theory, this would better situate the theory to a specific application instead of what it currently is understood to be, a broad systemic theory standing as the primary challenger to the democratic peace theory.

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Scholars have long examined the relationship between security threat and changes in regime and society. Lasswell (1941) argued that states facing serious security threats would experience radical societal changes, shifting from interactions dominated by bargaining (e.g. businessmen) to one where the chief social actors were specialists in violence (e.g. the military and the soldier), a condition he termed “the garrison state”. Because of this martial domination of society and the reduction of political plurality, democratic norms and customs would diminish and be replaced by plebiscite elections, legislatures would be abolished, and opinion tightly controlled and managed to reflect that of the interests of the elites, who would label themselves the guardians of society. Industrial production would be predominantly military-based, with frequent war scares forcing public trust in military elites for protection.

Friedberg (1992) explains why the United States did not become a garrison state during the Cold War. He argued that a state’s domestic structures not only determine its responses to security threats, but also how they may provide safeguards against over-centralization of power. Friedberg’s example of the United States during the Cold War illustrated how the specialists in violence harnessed the private sector’s abilities to provide military output to adequately meet the state’s security needs via military contracts. A significant reason for this was politicians’ fears of public backlash against overproduction of military goods and underproduction of civilian ones; for the total mobilization of society to occur, the entire social structure would have to be

transformed to that of a permanent war footing. Thus, the contract state replaced the need for the garrison state in the United States, thanks to its constitutional safeguards and democratic norms ingrained within the population. Alternatively, the Soviet Union, which lacked similar democratic norms and safeguards, could more accurately be described as a garrison state. Importantly, Friedberg notes that it was the Soviet Union's ability to mobilize societal resources for defensive purposes as a garrison state that led to its collapse. Thus, institutions and democratic norms appear a significant immunity to authoritarian tendencies.

However, are non-democracies more likely to become garrison states when facing security threats? Does regime type and their institutional/domestic structures affect the way those societies respond to security threats? Alternatively, what are the effects of security threats themselves on regime type?

In an early work on threat perception, Singer (1958) defines threat as capability plus intent, and that to escape the security dilemma, both capability and intent must be removed. Farnham (2003) found that when global norms are violated, states/leaders perceive those violators as threatening and unpredictable. Farnham's (2003) research lends support to normative interpretations of the democratic peace, as she notes that democracies do not automatically view autocracies as threatening, as the U.S. and U.K. allied with Stalin's USSR to defeat Hitler. Furthermore, scholars of the 1930s felt that German leaders other than Hitler would have been willing to negotiate with the allies. Thus, leaders who violate democratic norms of compromise are more likely to be viewed as unpredictable and threatening. Research has concluded that threat perception is a combination of state capability plus intent (Cohen 1978), and a state which violates international norms is perceived by other states as unpredictable, and thus, threatening (Farnham 2003).

Colaresi (2004) has demonstrated how rivalries between states impact domestic politics, creating a domestic political environment that rewards hawkish leaders unwilling to make concessions to the rival, and discourages/punishes dovish leaders who are more willing to make concessions to the rival. Colaresi (2004) found that the more a government perceives a rival to be threatening, threat perceptions among the public increased as well. These findings perpetuate rivalries between states, locking them in a protracted security dilemma where neither is likely to make peaceful overtures to the other.

For decades, the question of why democracies do not go to war with each other has been extensively researched, with numerous theories attempting to explain this finding. Democratic peace theory (Doyle 1983, Bremer 1992; Maoz and Russett 1993; Russett and Oneal 2001) argues that democracies do not go to war with one another, and instead settle disputes by peaceful means. Quantitative support for the democratic peace theory is quite robust.

Additionally, for several years the territorial peace theory (Gibler 2012) has been understood within international relations to pose a direct challenge to the democratic peace, which inverts the causal arrow of the democratic peace theory. Whereas the democratic peace argues that democracy allows peaceful relations with other democracies, the territorial peace argues that the establishment of peaceful borders results in conditions conducive to democracy. In other words, the elimination of threat makes democratization more likely. Thus, is territorial peace a step prior to democratic peace? When do states consider a neighboring state a security threat? Border or territorial disputes may exist for decades or centuries without either state willing to go to war over the issue. Furthermore, military capability and intent would undoubtedly be important in determining whether either state perceives this environment as threatening.

According to Gibler's argument, states sharing borders with nonthreatening neighbors are more likely to maintain smaller standing armies, and leaders have a less immediate need to centralize power and authority. Therefore, domestically politics is more polarized and tolerance of minority groups is greater among the public, all of which are conditions conducive to potential democratic development. According to the territorial peace theory, security threats from a neighboring state make autocracy more likely because opposition parties and the general public tend to rally around the leadership in response to external security threats, thus reducing political veto points, increasing executive power and making coercion more likely by stifling redistributive demands by the poor (Gibler and Tir 2010, Gibler 2010, 2012). In order to meet the territorial threat, Gibler maintains that states facing external threats tend to have large standing armies, which allow for greater coercive power and opportunities for military bargaining within the political apparatus, and consequently greater centralization of political power (larger bureaucracies to facilitate a tax base sufficient to maintain the large military force, weaker tolerance for opposition from rival political parties and groups, and increased public support for the leadership because of security fears). Thus, the presence of a territorial threat fundamentally shapes a country's domestic political structure and regime type.

Rose and Mishler (2002) also support the finding that external threats tend to cause the population to rally in support of the current regime, and that robust economic performance and high standards of living result in significant levels of regime support, whether it is democratic or not.

DeRouen and Peake (2002) also find significant rally effects in response to external crises. Presidential use of force shifts attention away from the economy and affects the president's approval ratings.

The territorial peace does not specify the domestic political conditions that result in democratic regime change other than the resolution of border disputes leads to decentralization of political power and increased political competition and a reduction in military manpower (Owsiak 2013,717-18). This alone, although perhaps a step towards democratization, seems unlikely by itself to lead to democratic regime change absent other important factors contributing to democratization. These variables include increased GDP per capita, a large and growing middle class, willingness of leaders to democratize, and the establishment of democratic norms and institutions, any of which could be argued to be even more important than whether a state's borders are contested, with supporting evidence being the existence of democratic states with ongoing security threats from rivals. As Owsiak (2013) further states:

The link between settled borders and democratic regime change depends on a state's existing regime type. This caveat suggests that scholars might need to think more about integrating the democratic and territorial peace arguments – treating them as complimentary, rather than exclusive, theories (727).

Although Owsiak (2013, 728) agrees with Gibler that the settling of border disputes contributes to democratization, and that “settled borders are both necessary and sufficient conditions for democratization...”, the South Korean case will show that settled borders are not necessary for democratization. Indeed, Owsiak (2013, 728) noted that Mali's democratic government reverted to an authoritarian one despite having settled borders, indicating that “settled borders are (not) a panacea”.

The significance of the impact of threat perception on democracy and democratization serves to further integrate both the democratic and territorial peace theories by illustrating the process by which democratization occurs in the context of border disputes and states facing territorial threat, which Owsiak (2013) has argued is a possible avenue of future research.

Similarly, in his research demonstrating how international rivalry impacts domestic politics, Colaresi (2004, 567) has indicated the importance of future case study research to further investigate the impact of foreign rivalry on domestic and international processes that perpetuate the rivalry.

Gibler (2010) also persuasively argues that democratic regimes facing security threats from bordering states may experience a rollback of democracy stemming from greater centralization of power, because immediate border threats result in rally effects whereby the people and leadership support the current leader so that the threat may be addressed. Power tends to become centralized at that point, and, as Gibler notes, “(in) states that experience territorial threats in most years, centralized decision-making authority is nearly guaranteed” (2010, 17). However, Gibler also notes the difficulty of democratic reversal, once having been established, without “serious external shocks” (2012, 38). Of course, centralization of power is not the same thing as democratic reversal, and Gibler notes the difficulty of a political group seeking to change democratic institutions using territorial threat as a pretext (2012, 38). Yet, Linz and Stepan (1978) find that democratic collapse results from the inability of the regime to resolve crises. Owsiak (2013, 728) also states “any unsettled border may create an external threat that overwhelms democratization processes. In contrast, clearing external threats from the foreign policy agenda shifts institutional and societal forces so that democratization can occur.” The assumption with this statement is that this process is inevitable, and it is not, as the case studies involving Egypt and North Korea will demonstrate.

Historical evidence demonstrates that security concerns affect democratic practices. Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018, 92-95) note how potential autocrats “*need*” crises (whether manufactured or genuine), such as economic problems or security threats, to justify authoritarian

practices. These scholars specifically note how “external threats offer them [authoritarian leaders] a chance to break free... ‘legally’” (94). Furthermore, significant “security crises – wars or large-scale terrorist attacks -are political game changers. Almost invariably, they increase support for the government. Citizens become more likely to tolerate, and even endorse, authoritarian measures when they fear for their security” (192).

Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018, 92-95) provide numerous examples of how authoritarianism arises as a response to security threats. Hitler used the threat of communism and the Reichstag fire to justify emergency decrees, and ultimately the Enabling Act, to reverse civil liberties and destroy the democratic opposition. Ferdinand Marcos cited terrorist bombings as justification to declare martial law and rewrite the constitution, which greatly facilitated the reversal of democracy in the Philippines in the 1970s. The bombing of a Moscow apartment complex in 1999 was blamed on Chechen rebels, allowing Russia’s launching a second Chechen war, and Putin consolidated power in the mid-2000s by reversing press freedoms and targeting opposition leaders. After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the U.S. government responded with an enormous expansion of executive power, creating an entirely new cabinet level department (Homeland Security), the largest restructuring of the federal government since 1947. In addition, the controversial PATRIOT Act was passed by wide margins by both political parties, which placed significant restrictions on American civil liberties while expanding the coercive powers of the federal government. Defense expenditures increased, and the media became complacent with respect to this growing federal power, neglecting its traditional role as watchdog to power and serving as more of a lapdog, particularly in the lead-up to the Iraq war. At the same time, public opinion polls troublingly revealed how majorities of Americans (55%) reported willingness to give up civil liberties in exchange for security, with minorities (35%) responding that giving up

civil liberties was not necessary (Pew Research). As time progressed without another 9/11-style terrorist attack, those numbers have largely reversed. Yet, during external security threats fear among the population clearly favors a more muscular security state at the expense of democratic practices.

Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) make an important distinction between a leader's overall beliefs in democracy and their temporary expansion of emergency powers to deal with emergencies and crises:

In the United States, too, security crises have permitted executive power grabs, from Lincoln's suspension of habeas corpus to Roosevelt's internment of Japanese Americans to Bush's USA PATRIOT Act. But there was an important difference. Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Bush were committed democrats, and at the end of the day, each of them exercised considerable forbearance in wielding the vast authority generated by crisis (193).

Although leaders across regime types often can, and do, employ robust measures that expand executive and governmental powers amid security or other crises, their willingness or ability to curtail those powers at the end of that crisis is a significant distinction between a democratic and authoritarian leader. Weeks (2012) finds that different types of authoritarian regimes face varying levels of institutional constraints, thus making leaders less willing to undertake risky endeavors, such as using military force. Weeks found that personalist regimes (e.g. Stalin's USSR, Pol Pot's Cambodia, and Hussein's Iraq) and military juntas were the most willing and least constrained in using military force, whereas non-personalist authoritarian regimes are the most constrained and thus the least likely to use military force compared to the other types of authoritarian regimes. Weeks states specifically that Bueno de Mesquita's selectorate theory only applies to personalized authoritarian regimes, which are the most violent and willing to take risks, as they have eliminated most or all checks to their authority. Juntas,

although war-prone because leaders have been steeped in military culture and conditioned to believe that military force can solve problems, can still be held accountable for poor performances or decisions, as the Argentine junta realized after their defeat in the 1982 Falkland's War.

#### Threat Perception and International Rivalry

Weeks (2012) demonstrates that autocracies vary in their ability to hold leaders accountable, with personal dictatorships and military juntas the most likely to engage in use of military force, and non-personalist regimes the most constrained from using military force. Thus, authoritarian regimes are not monolithic; certain types of authoritarian regimes are more constrained when responding to external threats than others. These varying levels of coercive power among regimes would likely influence its ability to centralize power or maintain a large and pliant military force in response to territorial threats.

Do states (democratic and non-democratic alike) view certain regime types as more threatening than others? Tomz and Weeks (2013) found more support for the normative interpretation of the democratic peace in that respondents in their experiment in the U.S. and U.K. viewed other democracies as less threatening than autocracies, and thus were less willing to advocate use of military force against another hypothetical democracy pursuing development of nuclear weapons than they were against a hypothetical non-democracy doing the same.

Davenport (2007) focuses on what he terms the "domestic democratic peace", noting that although in general coercive behavior in democracies is limited by institutional constraints, there exists a wide range of coercive behaviors between democracies depending on the level and type of threat they face. Comparing whether this restraint comes from public votes and opinion (what he terms "voice") or the institutional constraints and opposition leaders (what he terms "veto"),

Davenport finds that voice is the most influential in curbing government coercion, followed by veto. Additionally, democracy is better able to restrict overt governmental violence than to hinder governmental restrictions (as were put in place in the U.S. after 9/11). Finally, in examining multiple threats between democracies, from violent demonstrations to civil and interstate war, Davenport (2007) found wide variation depending on the type of conflict being experienced, but in general democracies were superior in promoting lower-level forms of repression than they were at decreasing higher levels of repression. Thus democracies, once established, are more likely to temper government violence and coercion. This finding is consistent with Gibler's (2012) observation that because Israel entered the system as a democracy, it was largely immune to democratic reversal from territorial threat.

Similarly, Carey (2010) found that out of demonstrations, riots, strikes, and guerilla warfare and revolution within democracies, only guerilla warfare increased government repression. The presence of a democratic regime reduces the risks of state repression and terror, and institutionalized democracies have a far lower chance of experiencing state terror compared to other regimes, and mixed (hybrid) regimes experience the highest levels of state repression of any regime type. This finding is consistent with Davenport's (2007) findings, and consistent with my hypothesis regarding the role of democratic institutions in checking coercive governmental authority and in preventing democratic reversals in light of foreign security threats. However, there is some evidence to the question Carey's (2010) findings, such as U.S. government repression of labor strikes in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, including the Haymarket Riot in 1886, the Pullman Strike in 1894, the Ludlow massacre in 1914, among others. The Peterloo Massacre in the UK in 1819 would be another, although one may question whether the UK was fully democratic at that point, or even whether the U.S. was fully

democratic, as suffrage was denied not only to women, but also minorities in much of the country.

The current rollback of democracy in Turkey is an interest case to compare with this research. In the case studies that follow, close attention will be paid to the importance of individual leaders' actions and their willingness to relinquish extraordinary powers they have acquired during existential crises, which in and of itself plays a significant role in a country's move towards democracy or dictatorship.

#### Democratization and Institutions

Huntington's (1991) findings and analyses regarding factors associated with democratization is relevant to the focus of this dissertation, particularly that territorial and security threats from other countries redirect the military's attention towards a foreign threat, thereby making it less likely that the military would stage coups against the regime itself (Huntington 1991, 245-247). Huntington mentions this occurred in Turkey, Greece, Spain, Portugal, and Argentina (246-7); in short, by directing the military's focus on external security threats this actually aided democratization by defining the military's mission as defender of the state instead of serving as an actor in domestic politics. Huntington (1991, 247) notes that "new democratic governments attempted to redeploy military forces so that they were better located to defend the nation than overthrow its government". In such cases, democratization occurred while security threats were *ongoing*, and the redirection of the military's focus towards external threats further aided democratization instead of threatening it, contrary to the territorial peace.

Huntington (1991) also noted that newly democratized states generally cut defense spending and military manpower, but at the same time these countries modernized their militaries (249-50), noting that militaries in authoritarian countries tended to be "oversized and

underequipped” (249), and that military equipment in Spain under Franco had been largely obsolete. Huntington found that in Greece the democratic Papandreou regime modernized the Greek armed forces, and Argentina and Spain undertook similar efforts. Comparable trends occurred after Eastern Europe’s democratization after 1989 and the gradual incorporation of former Warsaw Pact countries into NATO during the 1990s and 2000s and the subsequent retooling and rearming of those militaries under NATO standards.

In his advice for newly democratic regimes, Huntington (1991) suggests that leaders move to resolve conflicts with other states, but also cautions that “The absence of a foreign threat, however, may leave your military devoid of a legitimate military mission and enhance their inclination to think about politics. Balance gains from the removal of foreign threats against the potential costs in instability at home” (252). Huntington (1991) also suggested leaders in newly democratic states shift military manpower away from urban areas and into remote regions, and to modernize the military with state-of-the-art equipment that could, if the leaders played their cards right, be purchased for them by the American taxpayer (252-3).

These findings are a direct contradiction to the territorial peace argument, and support democratic peace theory because of the temporal sequence of events; in the numerous cases Huntington mentions, democratization occurred *before* the resolution of territorial threats, and those threats could be used to give the armed forces a focus, thereby making coups against the regime less likely. In further support of the democratic peace theory, Huntington notes that after states democratize, they are in a better position to solve long-standing disputes with other states. In particular, he notes how Argentine relations with the United Kingdom improved after the overthrow of the generals in the aftermath of the Falklands War, and how Spanish relations over Gibraltar improved with the UK after the end of the Franco regime (Huntington 1991, 247).

Relations with North Korea also improved after South Korean's democratization, as will be shown.

Mansfield and Snyder (1995) argue that democratic transitions increase the likelihood of interstate war, contrary to the arguments made favoring the democratic peace. They argue this occurs because power struggles between elites encourage appeals to nationalism to garner popular support, thus keeping the new elites in power. Of further significance are Mansfield and Snyder's (1995) finding that weak institutions in democratizing and autocratic states make war more likely. Thus, democratizing states were found to be more war-prone than fully democratic or fully autocratic states.

Russett and Oneal (2001) control for degree of democratization and find that what determines the likelihood of conflict is not how recently a state democratized, but the *level* of democratic government both members of the dyad achieved (120). In other words, the more democratic a state is, the less likely it is to experience conflict with another state as long as the other state is also highly democratic.

Centralization of political power can occur under both democratic and authoritarian regimes, often occurring when a state is attempting to overcome obstacles to implement economic policy, as Haggard and Kaufman (1995) note. These scholars also note the importance of regime type with respect to the pace of liberalization (e.g., establishing rights among citizens, separation of powers, the establishment of multiple political parties, and the establishment of the rule of law) and whether it occurs at all, with one-party systems better able to direct the pace of liberalization than military regimes. Huntington (1991) has also reached similar findings with respect to regime type and the prospects for democratization.

Tilly (2007) discusses general factors that often lead to democratization, which primarily involve the incorporation of interpersonal trust networks into politics, the elimination of inequality from public politics, and the elimination of autonomous centers of coercion; de-democratization generally occurs with the reversal of these processes. Tilly (2007) also emphasizes that democracy coexists within a moderate range of state capacity; too little state capacity and a regime is too weak to impose its will throughout the country, and too much state capacity often leads to authoritarian regimes and police states.

The literature on democratization describes the importance of per capita wealth to democracy. Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub and Limongi (1996) find that the democratic strength of a country is closely correlated with its level of per capita wealth and its governing institutions, with democracy lasting longer as GDP per capita increases. Furthermore, they argue that above a per capita GDP of:

\$6,000, democracies are impregnable and can be expected to live forever: no democratic system has ever fallen in a country where per-capita income exceeds \$6,055...Once established in a developed country, democracy endures regardless of how it performs and regardless of all the exogenous conditions to which it is exposed... For some countries, therefore, the story ends here: once democracy is in place, affluence is a sufficient condition for it to survive regardless of anything else. But democracies can survive in poorer countries, if they generate economic growth with a moderate rate of inflation (41-42).

This finding implies that economic development trumps security threats as it relates to democratic regime survival. However, Przeworski et al (1996) appear to contradict themselves by also claiming, "Economic factors are not the only ones that matter for the durability of democracy. Indeed, international conditions predict regime survival better than does the level of development" (43). So, which is more important, economic development or global and regional conditions?

## The Influence of Great Powers on Regimes

The role of external great powers is also important in determining regime type. Levitsky and Way (2010) refer to the presence of a strong regional power with the ability to offset or reverse Western democratization efforts as “black knights”. Russia served a black knight role with respect to Belarus and has attempted to do so with Ukraine, with the result being civil war in the eastern part of the country.

In a series of case studies Bunce and Wolchik (2011) analyzed factors that led some Eastern European states to democratize (Slovakia in 1998, Croatia and Serbia in 2000, Georgia in 2003, Ukraine in 2004, and Kyrgyzstan in 2005) and factors preventing others from doing so (Armenia in 2003 and 2008, Azerbaijan in 2003 and 2005, and Belarus in 2006). The common factors associated with the successful democratic transition cases all included a vibrant civil society (often backed by Western governments), a united political opposition, and a willingness among the population to protest election fraud, even at risk to their safety. Such popular protests garnered international attention, demanding the regime adhere to the rule of law. In both Serbia in 2000 and Ukraine in 2003-2004, the regime’s coercive measures backfired, causing security forces to remain neutral in Ukraine and to join the opposition in Serbia. The regime’s tactics hardened resolve among opposition groups, which were in turn buttressed by civil society groups and Western-backed NGOs, leading to the collapse of the authoritarian regimes in those countries.

The failed cases of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Belarus are quite interesting. Despite the presence of a united opposition and mass protests in the aftermath of fraudulent elections in all three states, Armenia and Azerbaijan were locked in a border /territorial dispute over the Nagorno-Karabakh region, in which Azerbaijan lost 17 percent of its territory, resulting in a coup

and 700,000 refugees from the region. Both regimes used this conflict to justify continued authoritarian rule, which is in accordance with Ghibler's territorial peace theory. Azerbaijan also had a corrupt regime in 2005, exploiting its loss of territory to Armenia to stir up sentiments among the population. The regime regularly used violence against political opposition via its security services, and this coercion stifled the formation of a unified opposition. Furthermore, whereas the West backed pro-democracy movements in all successful cases mentioned above, the European Union and the United States offered little support to Azeri democratic reformers, while Russia backed the regime. Western support for the democratic opposition in Armenia was similarly tepid. These powers ignored fraudulent elections in both countries by not backing democratic reformers to the same extent they had done so in other countries, primarily for geostrategic reasons.

Despite some organized protest against Lukashenka's fraudulent elections in Belarus in 2006, Bunce and Wolchik state that the majority of Belarusians cited wages and healthcare as higher priorities than democratic governance, with a significant percentage of the population supporting the regime. Consequently, Western funding of NGOs and civil society groups in Belarus was miniscule, perhaps because of the realization that any funding would be offset by Russia, which supported the Lukashenka regime. Although it must be noted that attaining reliable public opinion data in authoritarian states is difficult because of fears of retaliation and intimidation by the regime, Bunce and Wolchik indicate that most Belarusians are strongly pro-Russian and are wary of Western intentions in their country.

Importantly, many Armenians and Azeris live in crushing poverty, with both countries lacking a significant middle class. Despite sizeable economic growth rates of 13% in Armenia, 55% of the population lived in poverty and 23% in extreme poverty (Bunce and Wolchik 2011,

180, 191), with the bulk of the economic gains going to the oligarchs and elites. Armenia's real unemployment rate in 2003 was 25%. Azerbaijan also saw significant economic growth rates in the early 2000s, the bulk of which benefitted the oligarchic elites rather than the population as a whole, 30% of whom lived in poverty and 8% in extreme poverty (Bunce and Wolchik 2011, 180, 191).

Bunce and Wolchik indicate the presence or absence of a border conflict in all of their case studies. Interestingly, two of the three cases that did not make the democratic transition were experiencing border disputes (Armenia and Azerbaijan), while only two of the six cases that successfully transitioned to a democracy were experiencing border conflicts (Serbia and Georgia). In the Armenian and Azeri cases, the high poverty rates, lack of Western support for the democratic opposition, very low GDP per capita levels and high unemployment rates, the absence of the rule of law and the presence of high levels of political corruption are certainly potential confounding variables that may do more to explain the lack of democratization in those states than the mere presence of a border conflict alone.

Bueno de Mesquita and Smith (2008) examine the role of domestic and external revenue sources and their contribution to the duration of authoritarian regimes. They found that an authoritarian regime with abundant free revenue sources (i.e., natural resource rents and foreign aid) can afford to be more repressive towards its citizenry, as such regimes are less reliant on tax revenue for survival and thus are not as dependent on bargaining with domestic groups. Bueno de Mesquita and Smith (2008) argue that authoritarian reliance on tax revenue for survival tends to lead to liberalization, whereby authoritarian regimes are replaced by democratic regimes. Thus, these scholars argue against providing foreign aid to such regimes (195).

In a similar argument specifically citing China and Russia, Gat (2007) claims that if authoritarian states are large enough and control enough resources they can remain viable, relying upon various forms of capitalism to fuel their economies and to join the global economic order (59). Gat asserts that such authoritarian states may challenge liberal democracy by providing a viable alternative political order to the liberal democratic model, considering their abilities to achieve long-term economic growth based on a model of authoritarian governance and vibrant economies. Using the cases of Germany and Japan during World War II, Gat (2007) makes a counterfactual argument and maintains that had those states won the war, they would have been in control of enough global resources to endure as viable totalitarian states. The Soviet Union endured for over seventy years as such a system. China and Russia today may eventually liberalize, or they may continue along the authoritarian path, in which they “could establish a powerful authoritarian capitalist order that allies political elites, industrialists, and the military; that is nationalist in orientation; and that participates in the global economy on its own terms, as imperial Germany and imperial Japan did” (66). The elections of authoritarian leaders in Eastern Europe such as Duda in Poland, Orban in Hungary, and arguably the United States with the election of Trump, along with the rejection of globalization and the liberal global order by these regimes lends further credence to Gat’s warning of the possible emergence of an illiberal global order, both within and outside of the West.

Yet, Gat also concedes one weakness to this argument is that is that often as economies liberalize, so too does the political system (65), as Bueno de Mesquita and Smith have argued above. However, China appears to be an exception to this argument. The literature here suggests the importance of variables such as the role of external powers, resource availability

and revenue sources to influence the viability of authoritarian regimes, which are important considerations when examining deviant cases of the territorial peace.

### Military Power Asymmetry

A final important factor relating to the issue of threat perception is asymmetry of military power. According to the territorial peace argument, threats to a state's territorial integrity lead to defensive responses of a political, military, and psychological nature. To what extent would a militarily powerful state feel threatened by a hostile, but militarily weaker, neighbor? To what extent do the possession of nuclear weapons guarantee state survival, and render conventional military threats unlikely? Have nuclear powers guaranteed state survival by making an invasion so unlikely because of the catastrophic costs the defender could impose that no rational actor would willingly carry out such an attack? Indeed, nuclear peace theory is somewhat supported by Rauchhaus's (2009) research, which found that nuclear symmetry reduces the chances of conflict, while nuclear asymmetry increases it. Others have downplayed the role nuclear weapons had in preventing war between the Soviet Union and the United States (Mueller 2010).

Monteiro (2012) argues that nuclear weapons protect all major powers from occupation and physical attack (whether conventional or nuclear), leaving only an economic possibility for state destruction. Thus, a state that has developed nuclear weapons has effectively guaranteed its survival. If true, this logic can be incorporated into territorial peace theory by assuming that, given current technology, nuclear-armed states have essentially satisfied their territorial security and thus guaranteed their survival indefinitely. Accordingly, one would expect nuclear powers to decentralize political power and reduce the size of their military, a large standing army no longer being necessary to preserve state survival. Yet, almost half of the known nuclear powers

are undemocratic (Russia, China, Pakistan, and North Korea), despite Russia and China having had nuclear weapons for decades, Pakistan since the late 1990s, and North Korea since 2006.

Indeed, although India and Pakistan have fought three wars, after both states became nuclear powers conflict between them has been limited to border skirmishes (1999). This suggests that conflict among nuclear powers has an extremely low probability. However, Israel's policy of nuclear ambiguity makes the assertion that possession of nuclear weapons limits wars to skirmishes difficult to make with certainty. According to the logic of nuclear deterrence, nuclear capabilities must be known to be an effective deterrent. Furthermore, the 1973 Yom Kippur War was one of limited aims for Sadat, which made an Israeli use of nuclear force unlikely.

#### Significance

An improved understanding of the ways in which security threats affect regime type is important both in international relations and comparative politics for several reasons. First, if security threats hinder the development of democratic regimes, or make transitions to democracy more difficult, an examination of the process by which this occurs is essential, as well as cases in which this is more or less likely to occur.

Second, it is unlikely that all regimes respond similarly to perceived threats. In authoritarian regimes the role of the leadership is important, and individual leaders' decisions and threat perceptions undoubtedly vary widely, making a universal prediction of regime responses to perceived threats quite difficult. Furthermore, different types of security threats affect regime type in a variety of ways. Variables such as relative threat perception and military power asymmetry, including security umbrellas provided by allied states, could determine the ways in which states gauge degrees of security threat, which could, in turn, have varying impacts

on a state's regime type. There is little consensus in the comparative politics literature on how security threats affect regime type. Some, such as Huntington (1991, 252), argue that as states make peace with former enemies the military is more likely to assume roles in domestic politics; in short, foreign threats provide a *raison d'être* and focus for militaries. Gibler (2012), however, argues the opposite, that in the absence of territorial threats militaries are more likely to be reduced and thus assume a diminished role in politics.

Third, the role of external powers is significant in determining regime type, as will be shown. Authoritarian regimes may be aided and supported by external great powers, thereby reinforcing the regime and making democratization difficult, despite the resolution of territorial threats, as will be demonstrated in the Egypt case study. Alternatively, military alliances may embolden regimes and therefore diminish perceived external threats, therefore either allowing authoritarian regimes to remain as such or possibly to democratize, depending on the interaction of many variables.

A fourth reason why these questions are important is that a better understanding of the role security threat has on regime type can perhaps help to disentangle territorial peace theory from the democratic peace theory. The territorial peace has been presented as a counter explanation to the democratic peace, but as Owsiak (2013) notes, perhaps these two theories are not antagonistic but instead complimentary in some respects?

## CHAPTER IV

### ISRAEL

“Although Israel has been immersed in a prolonged violent conflict, it does not behave like a society under siege...Israel has not turned into a garrison state, a modern Sparta ruled by specialists in violence whose entire way of life is subordinated to meeting the challenge of an external threat” (Horowitz and Lissak 229).

The purpose of this case study is to understand, within the context of the territorial peace theory, why Israel entered the system as a democracy and remained democratic between 1948 and 1967, the period which Israel faced the most serious external threats to its territory. The key assumptions of the territorial peace theory are that democracy is more likely to occur after a state has resolved threats to its territory, as territorial threats are more likely to create conditions that hinder democratic development. As Gibler (2012) argues in explaining the territorial peace theory, states facing existential territorial threats are more likely to maintain large standing armies, experience diminished political polarization as elites unite to oppose the external threat, and realize decreased levels of tolerance of alternative viewpoints among the population for the purpose of uniting against the external threat. All of these points are detrimental to the formation of democratic governance, according to the theory, and Gibler (2012) thus argues that once territorial threats have been resolved, the need for large standing armies, political unity, and fear of diverse popular opinions likewise diminish, making it more likely that democracy can develop. Gibler (2012) notes how some countries such as Israel and India seem to contradict the territorial peace theory because they are democracies *despite* existential territorial threats. Gibler

(2012) offers a few post-hoc explanations for these seeming contradictions, such as asymmetry of military power, those states having entered the system as democracies, and the structure of their armies being incapable of widespread suppression of their populations. As will be demonstrated, these explanations are too general and do not adequately address the anomaly, which is if states with existential territorial threats can also be democratic, a closer inspection of the territorial peace theory is justified to explain such anomalies and better situate the theory within the context of it being the most significant challenge to the democratic peace theory.

However, one problem with the territorial peace theory is that it does not define how democracy or autocracy is measured. There are numerous definitions of both regime types, making this lack of specificity problematic as to what types of systems qualify as democratic and upon which criteria they are based. Israel qualifies as an electoral democracy: its citizens enjoy universal suffrage, numerous political parties compete in free and fair elections, voter turnout is high and similar to that of other Western democracies, there is turnover among competing political parties, citizen civil liberties are protected, rule of law is present, and the judiciary is independent. However, like all democracies, Israeli democracy has flaws, as will be mentioned in more detail below. There is a disparity between the privileges enjoyed by the Jewish majority and those of the Palestinian minority in terms of the inability of the latter to serve in the armed forces. The state has destroyed numerous Palestinian villages, including house and mosque demolitions, and has expanded Jewish settlements on occupied territory over the last fifty years, which is illegal under international law. Lastly, over seven hundred thousand Palestinians were forcibly removed from what would become the State of Israel, all of which raise dubious questions regarding the strength of Israeli democracy.

Israel has also been described as an ethnocracy (Smootha 1990, 2002), or a democracy only for the ruling group. Therefore, the minority group enjoys far fewer protections from the state, raising questions about the quality of Israeli democracy. For the purposes of this dissertation, Israel will be considered an electoral democracy, and the focus is an examination of how this system persisted despite decades of territorial threat. Its territory will be defined as that within the Green Line, its internationally recognized 1948 borders. This is because in order to examine the fundamental questions the territorial peace addresses, that external territorial threats hinder the development of political polarization and competition, encourage large standing armies, and result in a fearful public rallying around a unified leadership, the primary focus is on how an electoral democracy endured despite decades of persistent territorial and security threats from neighboring states.

Using the territorial peace theory as a model, it will also be argued that Israel's ethnocratic designation is a fundamental explanation for how its electoral democracy within the Green Line persisted, primarily for the dominant ethnic group. Were Israel to grant full civil rights to Palestinians within its territory, the concept of Zionism would be destroyed, and a perceived manageable external threat would become internalized, making the implementation of a garrison state more likely. In sum, by forcibly removing over 700,000 non-Jews from its territory, Israel was creating a specific kind of ethnic state, one reserved for its own ethnic group. Therefore, "democracy" could be practiced by the dominant ethnic group, but only to the exclusion of "the other". The passage of Israel's Nation-State Law in 2018 further lends credibility to this argument, that Israel be designated as an ethnocracy with the bulk of the rights of citizenship bestowed upon the dominant ethnic group, including electoral democracy. Israel's Likud government under Netanyahu passed this law, which specifies the right of national self-

determination to belong to the Jewish people, elevates Hebrew to the official language while designating Arabic to “special status”, and identifies Jewish settlement as encouraged by the state (*New York Times*, July 18, 2018). Interpreting this law as well as Israel’s ethnocentric designation through the lens of the territorial peace, that is, as a response to a continuous perceived territorial threat to a specific ethnic group, provides a meaningful explanation for Israeli state policy since its incorporation as a sovereign state in 1948. This law is antithetical to democracy itself but elevates or reserves democracy for the dominant Jewish ethnic group. As is mentioned, this law “entrenches the privileges enjoyed by Jewish citizens, while simultaneously anchoring discrimination against Palestinian citizens and legitimizing exclusion, racism, and systemic inequality” (*New York Times*, July 18, 2018).

Regarding the territorial peace theory, this is one explanation for the anomalous case of Israel being classified as a kind of democracy despite existential security and territorial threats; the minority ethnic group was removed and denied full civil rights. As will be explained below in more detail, an ethnic state had no need for coercion of its own people, as their fates were tied in to the existence of the state itself; external conquest of this territory would result in possible genocide and almost certain politicide, so survival of the state was linked to survival of the dominant ethnic group. Kimmerling (2008) and others have noted Israeli politicide against non-Jews in the region, which denotes the Israeli government’s zero-sum realist view of its position in the region. Ironically, it is its own use of politicide which allows its citizens to avoid a garrison state and to be characterized at least as an electoral democracy within the Green Line, a view of the territorial peace which thus far has not been considered.

Electoral democracies serve as minimal standards for democracies, and using a minimal definition allows a closer examination of the territorial peace theory and how threats affect

domestic regime functions. In this chapter's conclusion, it will be hypothesized that Israel's ethnocratic designation serves as a type of "coping mechanism" for pervasive security threats, allowing democracy to continue for certain groups but not for others. This raises the possibility of an expanded understanding of the territorial peace theory, as well as an expanded understanding of pervasive security threats on democratic regimes and societies.

There are two key factors which explain how Israel was able to maintain a democratic structure within a threatening security environment. First, the history of Jewish persecution and their communal existence within hostile regions where threats were constant forged a consensus of unity among Jewish communities who found common identity and purpose in the Zionist movement. Jewish resettlement of Palestine and the establishment of the Yishuv and eventual Jewish state were based on democratic elements carried over from Jewish communal traditions practiced in Eastern Europe. Within a Jewish state the emergence of territorial threats would not undermine these democratic structures and norms because of the shared nature of the threat, and near universal Jewish communal commitment to defense of state. The Yishuv emerged and developed alongside Palestinian Arabs, and two separate ethnic communities developed within the same region. As the Jewish community developed with an influx of immigrants to the region, the perception of Israel as the land of the Jews was akin to a Jewish nation-state rather than a heterogeneous multiethnic state. Although Israel's ethnocratic structure decouples liberalism from democracy, -the question of equality before the law is second to one's ethno-national identity- its structure serves as an essential cohesive element within this dangerous security environment by providing democratic rights and freedoms to the core ethnic element while separating what is perceived by the dominant group as a potentially threatening fifth column - which is why these groups are not encouraged to serve in the military. The second

explanation for how Jewish democracy persisted in a dangerous security environment is based on the nature of their democratic norms and institutions and the interconnectivity between civilian and military spheres, what has been described as the interrupted system, which has further solidified these democratic norms.

Gibler (2012) argues that Israel entered the system as a democracy, thus making Israel atypical with respect to the territorial peace. Two fundamental questions thus emerge. First, how does Israel come to be accepted as a democracy despite the forcible expulsion of over 750,000 Palestinians before becoming a state in 1948? To be sure, its declaration of independence proclaimed democratic elements, as will be discussed below, and all Jewish citizens were granted universal suffrage and protections by the state, non-Jewish groups were denied these rights. Second, although Israel entered the system as an electoral democracy, how did this arrangement endure *despite* decades of severe existential security threats? If the territorial peace is to be fully understood, its logic must apply to democratic and non-democratic states alike. If states with disputed borders are more likely to centralize political power and maintain large standing armies, this logic should also apply to democracies as well. Although Israel adopts a civilian-militia model to deal with extensive security threats, its electoral democracy has persisted, and it has not become a garrison state, as Horowitz and Lissak (1978) have noted above. An examination of why Israeli electoral democracy was able to withstand over twenty years of territorial threat constitutes part of this case study.

This analysis demonstrates the need for a more nuanced understanding of regime types as relates to both the democratic and territorial peace theories, as neither provide clear definitions for what they mean by a “democracy”, or “non-democracy”, treating such regimes as monolithic when in reality they exist along a continuum, where elements of one can bleed over into another.

If one response to perceived security threats is the formation of an ethnocratic state, this uncovers an additional element of territorial peace theory which has been thus far unrealized and unexamined. This case study analysis will explain the paradox of Israel's maintenance of democratic system within a dangerous security environment. Lastly, Israel's democratic structure provides additional military advantages compared to its authoritarian neighbors, which is borne out by Israel's numerous one-sided military victories over its neighbors in conventional contests. Brooks (2006) has theorized that military performance is a function of the structure of civil-military relations, which will be examined in more detail below.

### **Democratic foundations in the Yishuv**

Before Jewish groups began immigrating to Palestine in the 1880s, there had been a tradition of regular elections and local democratic self-government among Jewish communities in Eastern Europe, where democracy was not typically practiced in the larger state, with the Austro-Hungarian and German empires being exceptions after suffrage was extended, as male Jewish citizens enjoyed voting rights. Because of their fears of persecution in much of Europe, Jewish communities were closely-knit and suspicious of outside legal and political institutions. Thus, many European Jews formed their own institutions at the community level. Self-governing bodies known as *kahal* were created, where "both lay leaders and rabbis were chosen by a group of electors (*mevorerim*), who were in turn elected by all eligible voters. Elections were regarded as events of great importance and were vigorously contested" (Mendelsohn 1993, Dowty 1998, 28).

Within these semi-autonomous Jewish communities, Jewish law often superseded state law, and there was an expectation that fellow Jews would not betray one another to outside authorities. Because these communities were often composed of members with diverse views

and were surrounded by inimical groups - including in many instances a hostile state, such as Czarist Russia, where pogroms were common - the need for consensus was strong. These communities had to be largely self-governing and inclusive of all town inhabitants, with benefits distributed among all members. This experience fostered a sense of Jewish community that carried over into pre-state Israel, and is reflected in the Israeli Declaration of Independence, which called for the creation of a state where total equality of social and political rights would be extended to all its inhabitants. This egalitarian prospect had been a longstanding plan, with Ben-Gurion calling for complete equality for all Israeli inhabitants in 1943 (Dowty 1998, 186). In addition to the need for consensus in European Jewish communities, a strong legal tradition also developed based on rabbinical teachings which were later transplanted to the Yishuv; these traditions granted protections of life, security of property, freedom of movement and freedom of speech, with judicial protections equaling or surpassing those of modern Western democracies. These traditions lay a foundation for localism and decentralization, which would later make the task of placing these disparate groups under central control very difficult for the governing authority (Horowitz and Lissak 1978, Dowty 20-31, 1998).

The institutions that spearheaded the first immigration waves to Palestine in the 1880s also had democratic roots. Leon Pinsker, the leader of the Zionist movement in the 1880s, organized a conference of the Chovevei Zion (lovers of Zion), which had thirty-four delegates (Dowty 28). As Asher Arian (1998, 11) notes, when immigration to Palestine began in the 1880s, Zionist ideology was strongly rooted in European secularism. Theodore Herzl's *The Jewish State*, published in 1896, was the major impetus of the modern Zionist movement that led to gradual waves of emigration from Europe and other regions to what is now the state of Israel. In his 1902 *Altneuland*, Herzl proposed a society based on democratic pluralism where Jews and

Arabs enjoyed equal civil and political liberties. Thus, it is evident that Jewish social and political traditions in Europe were commonly based around egalitarian democratic principles -at least insofar as this involved intra-communal governance - and these democratic traditions were transmitted to the Yishuv.

In Russia, conditions for Jews had been especially harsh in light of frequent pogroms carried out in that country, and laws prevented Jewish ownership of property, restricted Jews from various occupations, and forbade Jewish settlement outside of towns and cities (Cohen 1987, 53). As Cohen (1987, 58-59) describes, wealthy Jewish elites, known as *shtadlanim*, served as intermediaries between the Jewish communities in Russia and the Czarist government. Typically, these intermediaries were conservative and were rewarded by the government for their support of the status quo. Any notion of reform would be gradual and top-down. Jewish politics changed rapidly, however, after Pinsker's 1882 pamphlet "Autoemancipation" was published, which urged a shift from Jewish passivity to direct action, and, in response, socialist and nationalist Jewish political parties began forming in Russia and Eastern Europe, replacing the functions formerly served by the plutocratic and conservative *shtadlanim*. Cohen notes that, "it was clear that a new, and autonomous, Jewish politics was taking form with a new, more national and democratic, political style and content" (59).

In addition to having had a foundation based in communitarian democracy, the Yishuv also enjoyed strong civic associational memberships. Membership in agricultural groups was common, which taught many young men immigrating from Eastern Europe and Russia farming skills which became useful upon their arrival in Palestine. Another major pre-state associational institution was the Histadrut, a socialist labor organization formed in 1920 that was not only a significant labor union, it was also one of the largest employers, first in the Yishuv and later in

the Israeli state. Like the World Zionist Organization, the Histadrut's leadership was chosen democratically, with elections held every four years. Cohen (1987) describes the Histadrut as a:

vehicle for the Zionist socialist revolution... The Histadrut aimed to be a Jewish workers' state within the state of Mandate Palestine, as well as the harbinger of a future, sovereign, socialist Jewish state. It was not merely a trade union federation, but a vast public sphere of the working class which included a co-operative economy, agricultural settlements and an elaborate social welfare structure under its umbrella. Its internal governance was determined by elections in which various labour and socialist parties competed (6).

In sum, the Histadrut represented labor's economic, social, and cultural interests (Arian 47, 108-110), allowing workers to bargain collectively, increasing their economic strength in a democratic fashion. As Medding notes, these civic associations were centrally organized and formed before the political parties, which enabled major sectors of society to become politicized (8-9). In addition, these civic organizations were nested in the World Zionist Organization, which operated on the principle of proportional representation.

The covert military/security force in the Yishuv in operation during the British Mandate was known as the Haganah, and it worked to achieve independence in *partnership with* the civilian political authorities. Originally under the control of the Histadrut, the Haganah was a decentralized military arm of the Yishuv with localized command. The Haganah was organized to be a defensive force only, and by the 1930s it became divided between leftist and rightist factions (Horowitz and Lissak, 1978, 46). As Arian (1998) explains, in the Yishuv, the Haganah was loyal to both the ruling labor party (Mapai) and the various civilian institutions of the emerging state, an arrangement that continued after independence.

Horowitz and Lissak (1978) describe the expansion and consolidation of power within the political center, which occurred in stops and starts from the 1920s to the mid-1940s. In April 1920 the first elected assembly in the Yishuv was chosen, with 22,000 of 28,000 eligible voters

participating (42). The Fourth Elected Assembly in 1944 was chosen according to the principle of “one man, one vote”, with 67% of the eligible voters participating (43). Although the central authority was weakened between 1939-1940, 1941-1944 saw an expansion of national authority from the political center, assisted in part by the import of capital from the United States, which allowed for a large increase in the budgets for the national institutions. The years 1945-1948 saw the continuation of expansion of the political center, although the left-right division within the military made it difficult for the center to enforce its authority, a problem that would later be resolved by Ben-Gurion, described below. In sum, the political center gradually expanded its authority by gaining control over material resources, realizing an increase in capital from abroad, and the use of symbols and solidarity to legitimize its authority to govern (65).

To recap, vibrant elements of a democratic civic culture arrived along with the numerous waves of Jewish immigrants to Palestine, contributing to the democratic foundations in the Yishuv and eventually in the Israeli state, which entered the system as a democracy. Along with the tradition of Jewish communitarianism and self-government, the “general currents of Western liberalism, the role of the British model, and populist aspects of East European socialist ideologies all pushed the Zionist movement and Israeli governance in a democratic direction” (Dowty 1998, 184). It should be noted, however, that this democracy was ethnically circumscribed and designed for the dominant Jewish ethnic group. The Histadrut, for example had no Arab members. The democratic elements of the state were indeed forming but were reserved primarily for the dominant ethnic group.

### **Israeli democracy: a rocky start**

Dowty (1998) argues the nearly two decades between 1948 -1967 was the least democratic period in Israel’s history, and that it became more democratic after 1967. Dowty

attributes this to the dominance until 1977 of the socialist Mapai, lack of governmental oversight by the Knesset, a semi-independent press that was under party control and subject to a loose (but effective) form of censorship, and unequal rights for and the marginalization of the Arab minority in politics (68-71). This claim is consistent with the territorial peace, which argues that territorial threats tend to produce party unity and political centralization, which is inimical to democracy. Although Israel has been classified as a democracy by Polity IV since 1948, its democracy was weak until 1967, the same year as its decisive battlefield victories over its Arab neighbors, and gradually became more democratic within the Green Line (Israel's 1948-9 internationally-recognized borders), while becoming less so within the Territories, when its ethnocratic character began taking shape. This finding appears to confirm Gibler's (2010, 2012) territorial peace arguments with respect to territorial threat limiting party polarization and its hindrance of democratic development.

After Mapai's dominance came to an end in 1977 with the Likud victory under Begin, Israel gradually adopted a proportional representation system with a low voter threshold, allowing the proliferation of many parties. Israel maintains an independent and respected judiciary with a strong history of judicial safeguards whose provisions equal or rival those of many modern liberal democracies. Israelis enjoy high levels of civic-mindedness, with 79% regularly reading newspapers and follow news on television or radio (compared to 58% in the U.S.) Elections are free and fair, with voter turnout averaging around 80% (Dowty 1998, 28, 80-82). State control of the press, however, continued into the 1990s.

Yet, flaws in Israel's democracy remain. Israel lacks a written constitution, in part because of an inability between religious and secular groups to reach a consensus on the religious nature of the state, which would be officially declared in a constitution. There are few

protections for minority rights. The Knesset is dominated by a strong executive with few checks, and its powers have increased since the reforms of the mid-1990s. There is no separation of powers, save for an independent judiciary (although this is not a requirement of democracy), and local governments are highly centralized. Although Arab Israelis living within the Green Line may vote, there are no independent Arab newspapers, and for the first forty years of Israel's independence, no Arab parties existed that advocated for their rights (Dowty 1998, 84, 186). Israel had a parliamentary system until 1996, after which it became a presidential-parliamentary system (after which it then switched back to a parliamentary system), which has raised serious questions of legitimacy, accountability, and political control (Arian 1998, 239).

One major reason for the end of the leftist Mapai dominance of government and the rise of Likud was Israel's improved security situation after 1967. As mentioned above, this is consistent with territorial peace theory. Mapai had urged national unity in order to bolster defense and security in a dangerous environment, but after the decisive victory in June 1967, hawkish right-wing nationalist and religious groups (many of whom expressed contempt for Western-style democracy) became more politically assertive, increasing their seats in parliament. The 1977 Likud victory resulted in a large increase in the establishment and expansion of settlements in the Occupied Territories (Dowty 1998, 104, Kimmerling 2008). It should also be noted that although Israel's existential security was less at risk after 1967, its territorial threats did not diminish, as evidenced by the 1973 Yom-Kippur War and other on-going disputes to the present.

Polls also reflect civic attitudes towards Israeli democracy and the Arab minority. More than one-third consistently stated the view that Israel "was 'too democratic' or 'far too democratic'", and there was significant deference to the defense apparatus in security matters,

with a large minority willing to limit democracy “when faced with the slightest threat to national security”. Similarly, there exists a willingness of a significant number of Israelis to place restrictions on the media when the interests or image of the state was threatened. Although large majorities of Jews are supportive of democracy, there is more leniency towards Jews who harm Arabs than vice versa. It is for this reason that Dowty cites Arab inequality under the law as the “Achilles heel of Israeli democracy” (Dowty 1998, 11).

### **Defense and security dilemma**

The foundations of Israeli democracy have been discussed above, explaining how it entered the system as a democratic state. This is only part of the story, however, as assumptions Lasswell (1941) made about how democracies could become garrison states (and by default witness the erasure of their democracies as the specialists in violence run the country), and the logical reasoning of the territorial peace theory assume that security threats are detrimental to democracy and could contribute to its destruction. If we assume that in general, territorial threats are likely to result in centralization of political power, large standing armies, and a public willing to grant more power to the state while ceding civil and political rights, how do democracies defend against these tendencies?

When Israel became independent in 1948, it was surrounded by hostile states that together possessed the capability to destroy it, making this an extreme example of democratic survival in an openly hostile environment. Although Israel was militarily weak at independence, its power grew significantly over the next two decades, surpassing the military capabilities of its regional enemies. In terms of 1948 population size, Arab states dwarfed Israel, ranging between twenty to one and fifty to one in comparison, with Israel’s population only 806,000 compared to Egypt’s 20,300,000 (Dowty 1998, 86). The majority of the Israeli population lived until 1967

within range of enemy artillery. Israel also maintained an enormous military budget in the 1970s ranging between twenty to thirty percent of GDP, compared to three to six percent in most Western states (Dowty 1998, 87). Israel has also fought eight wars with its neighbors since independence without regional allies to aid in its defense. Dowty (1998) further notes, “through the 1991 Persian Gulf War the Israeli public was never more than about five years from either the last conflict or the next one” (86). This harsh reality lent substance to threats from Israel’s enemies to drive them into the sea; such a thing was a distinct possibility and not just hyperbole.

On May 15, 1948, a day after the creation of the Israeli state, a coalition of Arab armies from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan attacked Israel. This was an existential war for Israel, and despite heavy losses, Israel emerged victorious, capturing additional Arab territory. Despite the victory, the 1950s were characterized by a constant state of preparedness, with Israelis expecting a second round of fighting (Van Creveld 1998, 103).

A significant step in the consolidation of Israeli democracy occurred after the ceasefire that followed the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. This became known as the *Altalena* incident. As Shimshoni (1982, 179) explains, defense in the Yishuv had been local and under civilian control, and after the formation of the state in 1948, because political institutions had developed before the military, not only was the latter established to serve a subservient role to the former, but institutions of state and political decision-making and control were already well-established. After independence, disagreements over various policies that would be enshrined within the laws of the state resulted in a factional split among several competing groups, which then took up arms and established their own military forces. One was known as *Lechi*, and another was Menachem Begin’s *Etzel*, a forerunner to the *Likud* party (183). In 1944, the Yishuv government had begun efforts to subordinate all armed factions to the central governing authority, and, with

British cooperation, began arresting *Etzel* members. After the end of World War II, the Jewish Agency assumed defense policy authority, but neither *Etzel* nor *Lechi* recognized the authority of the Jewish Agency.

In May 1948 a merchant ship named the *Altalena* departed Marseilles for Israel loaded with weapons and munitions, including “5,000 rifles, 450 machine guns, and millions of rounds of ammunition”. *Etzel* declared that it would take twenty percent of these arms, which Prime Minister Ben-Gurion forbade. When the ship docked north of Tel Aviv, fighting broke out between *Etzel* and the regular forces of the Israeli army. The ship was shelled by the army and heavily damaged, and key leaders of *Etzel* were arrested and its remaining members were banned from the army (Sachar 2007, 329-330).

This incident was significant because it evidenced the forcible consolidation power by the central authority in Israel. In Tilly’s (2007) terminology, the Israeli government destroyed a rival autonomous coercive force within the state, thus increasing state capacity and eliminating an armed rival faction that could challenge the state’s authority at will. Tilly describes how targeting rival autonomous coercive groups is a necessary step towards the establishment of democratic conditions within a state, as the presence of rival autonomous power clusters is detrimental to democratization; the first and second essential steps towards democratization being the elimination of categorical inequalities and the integration of trust networks into politics, both of which had been occurring since the creation of the Yishuv, as described above (137).

Other examples of government elimination of rival autonomous groups occurred with the liquidation of the Palmach, the covert wing of the Yishuv’s military arm Haganah, along with the destruction of an ultranationalist terrorist splinter group known as LEHI, or “Fighters for the

Liberation of Israel” (Yaniv 1993, 84). After the creation of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), LEHI continued as an autonomous armed group carrying out attacks and assassinations within Israel, until Ben-Gurion arrested hundreds of its members and disarmed the group (Yaniv 1993, 85)

One of Ben-Gurion’s major accomplishments as Israeli’s first Prime Minister was the establishment of a formidable fighting force that was able to defend Israel from its neighbors. Israel allied with Britain and France against Egypt in the 1956 Suez War, and sought security guarantees from the United States, but was not successful in achieving these until the late 1960s during the Johnson administration. Israel’s security position greatly improved after the 1967 Six-Day War, whereby it achieved significant military victories against Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. It captured the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights, tripling its territorial size and acquiring strategic depth, greatly improving its security options. Despite initial setbacks in the 1973 Yom Kippur War, with American political and military assistance Israel emerged victorious. In 1979 Israel signed a peace treaty with its most formidable adversary, Egypt, and another with Jordan in 1994.

This security dilemma in which Israel found itself poses a seeming paradox when viewed within the context of the territorial peace – how did Israeli democracy persist despite two decades of severe security threat from neighboring states?

Speaking directly to how decades of security threat fostered greater unity among Israeli Jews, Alan Dowty (1998) notes that this threat led to greater power centralization, cohesion, and “civic-mindedness ” (*mamlachtiut*) in response:

Some maintain that it is only the external threat that has held Israel together ... The need for unity translated into a strong tendency to defer to the existing leadership, despite the strong Jewish tradition of skepticism toward authority... The truth is that obsession with security actually meshes very well with proclivities rooted in the Jewish past. The threat of danger from the

outside was to a great extent what made consensus and volunteerism work in the *kahal* and in the *yishuv*. Increased threat usually forced Jews to bond more closely together, with tradition as the glue that held them together and ensured their survival...Four of the major holidays on the Jewish calendar (Passover, Purim, Hanukkah, and Tishah b'Av) commemorate a threat to Jewish existence in one form or another...Acts of terror against Israeli civilians were seen not as political actions designed (however brutally) to achieve Palestinian national aims but as plain and simple acts of antisemitism. A deep sense of "familism" has always pervaded the Israeli reaction to these events; the death of a single Israeli "on a national background" (that is, by an Arab, for political reasons) is seen by most Israelis as an attack on a family member and as a personal threat...The consensus was that Arab threats should be taken seriously...and that the security of Israel was always in jeopardy, since a single defeat would mean national destruction (88-89).

Dowty's observation helps shed light on a new possible interpretation of the territorial peace theory in certain ethnocratic circumstances: security /territorial threat may actually be the glue that fosters democratic cohesion for a homogeneous ethnic group. This type of democratic centralism fostered volunteerism and civic-mindedness, as pointed out by Reiter and Stam (2002), which is conducive to democracy rather than inimical to it. In applying the territorial peace to a heterogeneous society, it is logical that various groups with diverse loyalties would be coerced by the center/majority into unifying to defend the state against external threats, with social norms discouraging any sort of criticism of the government that is theoretically keeping everyone safe. Under these conditions, with the threat of internal fifth columns, a non-democratic government may be required to maintain order. However, when applied to a homogeneous group with a history of persecution, conflict and security threats are viewed as routine, more normal than abnormal, the threat itself providing social cohesion - a type of social capital itself. There is no need for an authoritarian coercive state to forge unity; that is handled automatically by ethnic solidarity. Maintaining a democracy under these circumstances would not risk destruction of the state, for nearly all inhabitants of the dominant ethnic group would be in common danger; bargaining with an external enemy with the power to inflict genocide or

politicide would be against the interests of virtually all members of the ethnocratic polity, and would likely not be tolerated by the mass public.

Dowty (1998) again provides support for this argument, noting that “In Israel, the left-right spectrum is defined mostly by security and foreign policy positions rather than by socioeconomic issues” (104). Thus, the security issue is the dominant social narrative in Israel, with discussion focused on degrees of security, such as the left’s advocating land-for-peace deals, versus maintaining the status quo in the OT and expanding settlements by the right. Both sides maintain their preferred policies support Israel’s security interests; they simply disagree on the methods that will achieve them. All share a commitment of military service to and defense of the state, despite their ideological persuasions.

If one were to view Israel in ethnic terms, one would expect the dominant group to view fellow members with little suspicion, particularly if majorities within that group, including both genders, were required to devote years of military service to the state. In Israel, 85% of males serve in the army, with military service beginning at age 18 and lasting for three years before transitioning to reserve service. Men are required to serve as reservists for 45 days a year until age 48. Women serve until the age of 26 but are exempted for reasons including marriage or childbirth. In Israel, 60% of women are subject to the draft, but do not serve combat or frontline roles. The only non-Jewish groups eligible for military service are Circassians and Druze; Arabs are ineligible. Eighty percent of Israeli citizens serve the state in either a military or civil capacity. Even Israelis with low intelligence and those with minor criminal records are eligible for military service. In Israel, service to the state is a strong social norm, essentially a rite of passage of citizenship, which also affects employment prospects (Gal 20-23, in Ashkenazy 1994).

While the Jewish majority is viewed as very loyal to the state, the Palestinian minority is generally seen as a potentially dangerous fifth column, which is why they are not allowed to serve in the security or military services (Smootha 107-109 in Yaniv, 1993). In viewing the state in Smootha's ethnocratic terms (described in detail below), it becomes clear how such a regime would reserve democratic rights and benefits only to the ethnic majority and not for the minority.

### **External and Internal Threats to Israeli Democracy**

Although there has not been a crisis involving usurpation of civilian control of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), the potential for such certainly exists. Ben Meir (1995) notes that despite being the perfect candidate for Lasswell's garrison state, Israel is nowhere near being such. However, several potentially serious problems exist within the current ambiguous nature of war powers and military authority in Israel. First, although it has been the practice that decisions involving military operations originate at the government level, specifically at the MDC (Ministerial Defense Committee), there is no specific provision in Israeli constitutional law involving the power to declare war or wage military operations (Ben Meir 1995, 58). Ben Meir illustrates the problems inherent in the ambiguous control over the IDF:

*The Basic Law: The Army* thus leaves many crucial questions unanswered and fails to define the national command authority clearly...In the end, clarifying the national command authority was left to legal advisors and the IDF and the Ministry of Defense; not surprisingly, they could not agree on a solution (56).

Formally, the IDF is completely under civilian control with the level of authority exercised by the cabinet over the chief of general staff (CGS) equivalent to that of the CGS's authority over subordinate military officers (Ben Meir 1995, 57). The potential problems involve the application of this to daily functions, particularly the unclear relationship between the government and the minister of defense, and that between the chief of staff and minister of

defense (57). Ben Meir characterizes the level of Israeli military participation in civilian spheres as higher and more significant than in most Western democracies, but on a manageable level – comparable to that in the United States in World War II. To avoid potential subversion of civilian control over the IDF, Ben Meir recommends amending current Israeli law to state that the Minister of Defense be the one to issue instructions of the high command, clearly to enumerate national command authority, to specify an unambiguous order of succession between the Prime Minister and the Minister of defense, and, lastly, to code into law appointments of senior officers (180-181).

Fears of subversion of civilian control over the military are not unfounded. Patrick Tyler (2012) chronicles numerous instances where major military operations were planned and carried out without the knowledge of the Prime Minister, and particularly how notable (and popular) military officers, such as Ariel Sharon, frequently undercut the wishes of the Prime Minister regarding planning and executing military raids. Tyler describes how, under Ben Gurion's shrewd leadership, Israel transformed its military capabilities in less than a decade from a weak state barely capable of defending itself to a war machine to rival that of its hostile neighbors. Working closely with France, after establishing a formidable conventional military apparatus, Israel began developing nuclear capabilities in the late 1950s, and then gaining a strong ally in the United States in the late 1960s, which then began selling it advanced weapons systems.

The Israeli military, argues Tyler, enjoys a prominent political role, implementing political policies and remaining ever vigilant from a security perspective. Despite having rapidly surpassed its neighbors in military capabilities (as evidenced by its numerous one-sided military victories in conventional wars), the Israeli military establishment continues to view the state as being under constant threat from neighbors capable of inflicting terrible destruction upon it,

although this view now focuses on potential nuclear threats (primarily from Iran) rather than conventional ones. Quoting Edward Said, Yiftachel (2006, 67,69) notes how Israel routinely cites the rhetoric of survival and security as justification for its military policies, while simultaneously denying this to Palestinians. This siege mentality in which the military envisions Israel's security environment despite the significant advantages it enjoys relative to its neighbors is also echoed by Dowty (1998). The perception of constant existential threat despite having achieved the status of the strongest military, and only nuclear, power in the region enjoying near unconditional American political and military backing provides cover for continued Israeli military action in the region, as evidenced by the 1981 air attack on the Osiraq nuclear reactor in Iraq, the 2006 war with Hezbollah in Lebanon, sporadic military incursions into Gaza, and frequent operations in the West Bank. The consequences of this hyper vigilant military posture, Tyler argues, is overly aggressive Israeli military operations and policies, which further alienate Arab neighbors and spark retaliation that feeds an unending cycle of revenge and retaliation.

Examples of Tyler's observations of Israeli military subversion of civilian control include Ben-Gurion's masterful temporary relinquishment of the prime ministership to Moshe Sharett in 1954, in essence to provide a scapegoat for his behind-the-scenes military operations, with Ben-Gurion remaining Defense Minister. Surrounding himself with tough, hawkish military men (known as *sabras*) who grew up in the Yishuv fighting Arabs for most of their lives, Ben-Gurion was not hesitant to apply military force when he thought it was in Israel's interests. Tyler (2012) describes how military hawks subverted the government in power, behavior that became routine throughout the 1950s:

More disturbing for Israel's young democracy, it was painfully obvious within the ruling party that the leaders of the defense establishment, especially [army Chief of Staff Moshe] Dayan, were making regular visits to Ben-Gurion's retreat in the Negev for consultation and instruction at a time when Ben-Gurion was supposed to be in

retirement...Ben-Gurion had schemed to circumvent the “old guard” of the Mapai – Sharett, Levi Eshkol, Golda Meir, and their allies – in his quest to put the country back on the attack. In doing so he relied extensively on the younger generation of sabras and their like-minded comrades throughout the army, where the thirst for combat with the Arabs – a “second round” of war – was far from quenched (23).

After Arabs murdered two Israeli civilians in a settlement east of Tel Aviv in October 1953, Ben-Gurion appointed Ariel Sharon to head a commando unit that staged a retaliatory raid on the Arab town of Qibya without Sharett’s knowledge or approval. The destructive raid resulted in seventy civilian deaths and much of the town in ruins, drawing condemnation from the Eisenhower administration, which threatened to cut off U.S. aid to Israel (Tyler 2012, 45-46).

Additional examples of military operations outside government control include Egypt’s capturing of a cargo ship’s crew, trying, and executing two of them, followed shortly thereafter by an Egyptian raiding party dispatched by Nasser from Gaza into the Sinai resulting in the deaths of two Israelis. In retaliation, Ben-Gurion, working in secret with army Chief of Staff Moshe Dayan, ordered Operation Black Arrow, a commando raid into Gaza headed by Sharon to destroy the responsible Egyptian forces. Black Arrow was the largest Israeli use of force against Egypt since the 1949 Armistice, and resulted in the further erosion of Sharett’s credibility, an indication of an out-of-control military and defense establishment. Operation Susannah in 1954 (aka the Lavon Affair) was a covert Israeli operation involving the planting of bombs in British and American facilities to reverse British plans to withdraw troops from the Canal, and was conducted without the knowledge of Prime Minister Sharett.

Tyler describes how the military culture has dominated the Israeli state from inception to present day, this martial culture seeing the state as under constant threat, which itself poses a potential threat to democracy because of the subversion of the democratically-elected government described above. He provides numerous examples, such as former generals like

Dayan, making decisions that led to the Six Day War, over the wishes of Prime Minister Eshkol, whom Tyler portrays as weak and unable to reign in his sabra military commanders.

Although such covert actions are inherently undemocratic, they are not unique to Israel. Although the CIA has conducted countless covert operations since its inception, from toppling democratic regimes throughout the Third World to smuggling drugs into the United States and other countries, as McCoy (2017) details at length, these actions were carried out with the knowledge of the president. The clandestine actions in Israel conducted without the prime minister's knowledge are certainly troublesome from a democratic perspective. Arian (1998, 292) echoes Tyler regarding the difficulty for Israelis (including the IDF) to envision the region in new, nonthreatening ways.

Noting how few democracies have been able to maintain liberal traditions in a hostile security environment, Arian credits Israel's relatively small land area, its reliance on sizeable reserve forces, which are able to be called up routinely to respond to crises, and, like Horowitz and Lissak (1989), the military's partnership with the civilian political apparatus as helping to maintain Israel's democratic regime type in spite of decades of constant security threats (Arian 1998, 292-293).

Because Ben-Gurion had eliminated competing centers of power within the military and defense forces by disarming and dismantling the Haganah, Palmach, Irgun, and Lehi when the IDF was established, he did not subordinate the IDF to control by a specific civilian head, such as a defense minister, because he feared the rise of coalitions within the military. Instead, Ben-Gurion relied on his own prestige as Israel's founding father to maintain military control. Yet, the lack of a clear chain of command and distinct institutional lines of authority between the military and their civilian heads has proven problematic. As have Horowitz and Lissak (1989),

Arian (1998, 293-295) notes the permeability between the military and civilian spheres, and that “there is no civilian counterpart to the military in the Israeli defense establishment. Top military leaders have been called on to be very active in matters of policy that, according to a purist model, should be the exclusive area of the politicians.”

Adding to the problem of a lack of clear lines of authority between the civilian and military sectors is the fact that these spheres are blurred in Israel (Horowitz and Lissak 1989), with civilian ministers receiving military appointments and officers questioning political decisions. In sum, although the military is answerable to the cabinet and Minister of Defense, no clear civilian patterns of control over the military have been institutionalized. Despite formal civilian control, the military continues to play an active part in politics, as it has done throughout Israel’s history. Arian provides a pertinent summary, “If indeed the Israeli system is a partnership between civilian and military spheres, there is at least some evidence that the military partner is more senior than the civilian one” (Arian 1998, 298-299).

Does this blurred authority between the civilian and military spheres pose a threat to Israeli democracy? The short answer would be yes, followed with a couple of caveats. First, as has been shown by Huntington’s (1991) reverse waves of democratization, all democracies remain vulnerable to a variety of threats, whether from a military coup to economic collapse and pervasive social strife. Furthermore, democracies continue to erode around the world up to the present. “Between 1975 and 2015, 37 democracies broke down, and in addition democracy has recently eroded in countries such as Hungary, Poland, and Turkey” (Graham, Miller, and Strøm 2017, 686). However, the reservist nature of the Israeli military appears to temper this, as does the permeability between the military and civilian spheres, which creates a kind of power-sharing arrangement. Second, because Israel has endured this situation since independence in 1948, and

has seen the reduction in threat posed by neighboring states during that time, along with the expansion of its own military power, it seems unlikely that a more peaceful contemporary climate would witness a sudden military move to undermine Israeli parliamentary democracy; this seems far more likely during times of serious security threat, or during a crisis of governance where a large segment of the population had lost confidence in its legitimacy. Dowty (1998) has noted that Israel's least democratic period was during its first twenty years of existence. Horowitz and Lissak's (1989) nation-in-arms model is clearly a response to the threatening geostrategic position in which the state of Israel was birthed, and yet Israeli democracy has endured, at least within the Green Line.

### **The Interrupted System: How did Israeli democracy survive decades of external security threat?**

Although Israel has been immersed in a prolonged violent conflict, it does not behave like a society under siege. Its democratic government and routine civilian life are a far cry from the type of 'siege mentality' bred by living under a constant state of emergency. Israel has not turned into a garrison state, a modern Sparta ruled by specialists in violence whose entire way of life is subordinated to meeting the challenge of an extended threat (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 229).

Despite the overwhelmingly hostile security environment in which the Israeli state emerged, Israeli democracy has received consistently high rankings among the institutions that provide national democracy rankings among which political scientists rely. According to Polity IV data, Israel was democratic upon becoming an independent state in 1948 and remains so until present day. The only negative deviation from its otherwise perfectly democratic ranking (a perfect 10/10) was from 1967-1999, when it dipped from 10 to 9. This ranking highly questionable, however, given the disparity between Jews and Palestinians, and scholars should examine the validity of such rankings more carefully. Freedom House gives Israel similar

admirable results regarding democratic performance, with a ranking of 80/100 from 2006-2015. While Freedom House has scored Israel at a 1 in political rights (the best possible score) since 1998 to present, its civil liberties score of 3 from 1998-2005 slightly improved to a 2 from 2006-2015. Similarly, its 1998-2005 freedom rating of 2 improved to a 1.5 from 2006-2015. To be sure, Polity IV and Freedom House ratings are not the only authority in determining whether a state is democratic. A closer examination is necessary, particularly in Israel's case, in that it is in illegal occupation of territory outside its borders and administers a people who are not granted equal rights as Israeli citizens – both are issues which call into question Israel's democratic classification. However, as has been pointed out above, the emphasis here is on its ability to maintain a democracy within the Green Line since becoming a sovereign state.

Why did Israel not become a garrison state? In addition to the ethnic solidarity argument above, a significant institutional explanation to the question of how Israel maintained a democracy in the midst of decades of territorial threat is provided by Kimmerling's (1985) analysis of the interrupted system, and his (2008) classification of different political- and civil-military relations, which is expanded on by Horowitz and Lissak (1989).

Horowitz and Lissak (1989) list several reasons, involving social and institutional structures, and the organization of the Israeli military itself and how it interacts with the civilian sector. They describe two ideal-types of civil-military relations, one of which being the nation in arms model, referred to by Kimmerling (2008) as "civilian militarism". It is characterized by a standing army and a large reserve force comprised of conscripts, permeable boundaries between the civilian and military sectors, and a national consensus of a "serious external threat to the state" where the "rules of the game...define the areas in which a convergence between the sectors occurs, and where it is legitimate for the army to be involved in civilian decision-making

processes and those areas in which the permeable boundaries between the sectors are open to reciprocal influence”. They contend that most states exist along a continuum between these two ideal-types, with Israel exemplifying the nation in arms/civilian militarism model. Each ideal-type offers its own potential threats to democracy, however. In the nation in arms model, the permeability between the military and civilian spheres allows for many points where one sector may manipulate the other, with the obvious threat to democracy coming from an overly ambitious military interfering to a greater extent in the civilian sector than the other way around (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 204-205).

Because the IDF relies heavily on reserve forces instead of a large standing army, this contributes both to the militarization of the civilian sector, and to the civilianization of the military sphere (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 197). Reservists are routinely called up in response to crises, which has become a norm within Israeli society - Arian (1998, 292) notes the saying common in Israel, “Israelis are soldiers on eleven months’ leave”. The importance of this is that Israeli society has implemented institutions to allow for transitions between normal situations and emergencies with minimal disruptions in daily life, which Kimmerling terms the “interrupted system” (220). As Horowitz and Lissak (1989) explain:

Israeli society has institutionalized arrangements for suspending social roles and activities when priorities suddenly change in times of emergency as the dormant conflict erupts into war. This phenomenon goes beyond mobilizing the manpower and the other resources technically necessary for conducting a war. Not only does the military sphere expand and the civilian sphere contract, but the civilian sphere changes its patterns of operation for the duration without losing the capacity to return to routine functioning once the emergency has passed (220).

This institutionalization and normalization of life with intermittent national emergencies is a fundamental answer to the question of why Israel did not become a Lasswellian garrison state and provides a significant challenge to territorial peace theory. If security and territorial

threats remain common, social and institutional mechanisms can be created to normalize this conflict without sacrificing democratic governance. Friedberg (1992) offered a similar answer as to why the United States did not become a garrison state during the Cold War – the myriad of competing interest groups and U.S. ideology prevented specialists in violence from dominating the state. Business interests were able to supply military goods to the state to satisfy its defense needs - what Friedberg termed a “contract state” - without having to resort to a garrison state. In short, American small-government ideology and a pluralist Madisonian system of interest groups, whereby ambition checked ambition, prevented a garrison state in the United States during the Cold War. Thus, the answer to the question of focus, what mechanisms prevent the erosion of democracies into garrison states, appears to lie more in their institutional structures and norms rather than a generalizable response to security threats.

Similarly, Brooks (2006) finds that different civil-military arrangements within autocracies strongly affects military and battlefield performance. In a case study analyzing different styles of civil-military relations under Nasser and Sadat, Brooks theorized that authoritarian states where the political leadership dominated a divided military structure fielded more effective units on the battlefield than a military apparatus that shared political power and maintained a unified officer corps. The former was the model Sadat built, which made impressive early gains in the 1973 Yom Kippur War, while the latter was the Nasser model, which was badly defeated in the 1967 Six Day War. Although this is discussed in more detail in Chapter V on Egyptian case study below, scholars have identified civil-military relations structures as being important in determining not only military efficacy but also in determining how regimes manage external security threats.

While at first glance Brooks's (2006) theory on Egyptian civil-military relations (hierarchical, top-down political control of a divided military) appears to divulge from Israeli civil-military relations (a permeable civil-military apparatus with each able to wield influence over the other), the failsafe in a democratic system is ultimate civilian control over the military. In a democracy, this mechanism precludes any possibility of military encroachment of the political realm. In autocracies, however, this is always a possibility, hence the need for the leadership to fully control the military and keep it divided and thus weakened. To be sure, as discussed above, Ben-Gurion's destruction of rival autonomous power factions within Israel cemented political control of the military, the periodic actions of ambitious generals notwithstanding.

Horowitz and Lissak (1989) further describe how the permeability between the civilian and military sectors in Israel help facilitate cooperation and understanding between both. Although Israel as a nation-in-arms experiences military involvement in the civilian and political spheres to a greater extent than Western democracies, there are various checks on excessive military power. For example, IDF officers typically are forced to retire in their mid-to late-forties and begin "second careers" in the civilian sector. Thus, it is common for these officers to begin adopting civilian viewpoints on matters as they near this age, and also carry military perspectives into civilian life as well (228). At the same time, these officers typically remain in the reserves, thereby maintaining contacts with their former military colleagues. In addition, almost all civilian leaders have experienced military service, both in the regular army and in the reserves, further contributing to the intermingling of civilian and military backgrounds, perspectives, and mindsets. This has the effect of encouraging the exchange of information,

viewpoints, and terminology, which facilitates informal understandings and the establishment of informal boundaries between the military and civilian sectors (228).

Yaniv (1993, 82) argues that the pervasive external threat Israel faced for so long actually assisted in maintaining democratic civil-military relations in Israel by making any significant changes to the internal political order potentially disastrous from a national security perspective. Additional factors Yaniv considers important are Israeli sensitivity to world opinion, government action during Israel's formative period that eliminated groups opposing separation of military and political domains, and the civilian self-defense ethos which formed in the Haganah and developed into the IDF persisted. However, Yaniv's point about Israeli sensitivity to world opinion is questionable, considering dozens of Israeli violations of UN resolutions with respect to actions in the Territories, and more recently Israel's passage of its Nation State Law in 2018.

Kimmerling (2008) argues that land availability can shape significant elements of regime type, including ideology and political and economic structures, inverting Frederick Jackson Turner's argument. Kimmerling notes that only 7% of Israeli land is private (with 3.5% owned by Israeli Arabs), the rest being under state control, which accounts for Israel's highly centralized, collectivist system. Kimmerling asserts that Israel has avoided the garrison state classification because of a democratic political culture and a relatively stable political system; the civilianization of the military, which prevents the establishment of an independent military structure detached from the general interests of society as a whole; the sole focus/responsibility of the military on security needs (which Huntington also considered important); and the ability of the military officer elite to partake in political decisions, which removes aspirations of the military to accumulate political power or to expand their roles outside that of defense of state that would undermine democracy. Widespread conscription within Israeli society both militarizes

and civilianizes the civil-military sectors of society, fostering understanding and consensus between the two. In fact, Kimmerling states that the civilian and military spheres have become so interconnected that it is impossible to distinguish between the two, thus creating a military-cultural complex which penetrates all social spheres (133, 176). Here, the territorial peace argument could be cited as responsible for such a militarization of society; such extensive security threats have transformed Israeli society not into an undemocratic garrison state, but rather a democratic form of civilian militarism. The Israeli case is evidence that democracy is not entirely incompatible with a pervasive militarism of society, particularly if that society consists of an ethnic group united from feelings of historical persecution by outside groups, that persecution helping to cement solidarity among the ethnicity itself.

Kimmerling (2008) notes that although a central organizing principle of Israeli society involves militarism, this has varied over time in character in response to specific threats. During its early years of existence as a state, it became evident that the state had to militarize in order to survive. Thus, national security matters trumped economic, political, social, and ideological concerns. This preoccupation with security declined after 1977, and then returned after 2000 with the Second Intifada.

There are ways in which the civilian sphere is militarized, and the military sphere is civilianized. With respect to the former, in matters of national security, the military is given significant leeway to engage in censorship, but not in political matters (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 218). The operation of the “interrupted system” has been described above, and during national emergencies or the mobilization of reserve forces to respond to crises, logistical arrangements are utilized to allow for continued commercial and industrial operations with minimal disruptions. In addition, “temporary preference (is given) to those contributing to the

collective effort”, including officers and IDF personnel in an effort by the civilian sphere to contribute to the security effort however they can by assisting those in uniform during crises. Thus, Israel can easily shift from a peacetime to a war footing and back again with minimal social disruptions that would be extremely disruptive in other states (220).

Two examples of the civilianization of the military sphere include the *Altalena* incident (described above), where the civilian political authorities destroyed autonomous power centers within the state and thus eliminated rogue paramilitary elements seeking to maintain autonomy, and Ben-Gurion’s disbanding of the Palmach after the formation of the Israeli army, the Palmach being the elite military force of the Haganah (which was also disbanded after creation of the IDF). Thus, armed autonomous military groups were eliminated by Israel’s civilian leadership and placed under civilian control.

In addition, active duty military officers took part in political party activities, with some even running as candidates competing for parliamentary seats in 1949, a practice later banned with the Basic Law: Knesset. In addition, political parties reserved chief political positions to retired military officers, with numerous extreme parties doing this to boost their own legitimacy, although most retired officers belong to the two major parties, with Labor having a slight lead (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 223-225).

The level of military involvement in Israeli foreign and defense policy is also significant. There were tremendous increases in defense expenditures after the 1973 Yom Kippur War, which “rose from an annual average about 20 per cent of the GNP to an average of about 30 per cent. The war of attrition with Syria in 1974 led to an increase in reserve duty and to greater public concern with security” (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 207). Despite the boost in expenditures, public criticism of the army increased, likely because of how Israel was initially

caught by surprise by their enemies and initially fared quite poorly. To summarize Horowitz and Lissak's (1989) points, all of the following are examples of how the military sphere spills over into the civilian sphere: the ability of the Chief of Staff and high level military officers to brief cabinet ministers, the civilian sector's reliance on military intelligence involving security threats, the fact that most diplomatic action between Israel and its Arab neighbors takes place between military officers during cease-fire negotiations rather than civilian diplomats, the military's responsibility for carrying out both civilian and military functions during periods of martial law (as occurred in 1948 and 1967) in governing Arab areas, the ways in which military doctrine shapes civilian political policies (such as the first-strike policy in place until the 1967 War, or the defensible borders strategy afterwards), and the lack of clear divisional authority between senior political and military authorities (Israel has no commander in chief of the armed forces; instead that role is shared between the cabinet, and the Minister of Defense carries out this role on behalf of the cabinet); in short the General Staff enjoys significant leverage over the cabinet (208-213).

### **Six Day War and the Jewish Ethnocratic State**

The Six Day War resulted in Israel's acquisition of significant territory, tripling its size. Not only had Israel soundly defeated three Arab armies in a few days, but its seizure of territory changed the strategic security calculus that had existed since 1948. Whereas prior to June, 1967, Israel had existed in a precarious security environment where a military defeat could mean the destruction of the state and possibly genocide or "politicide" (Horowitz and Lissak 1989, 196), these new lands afforded Israel much desired territory better able to absorb future military attacks (which would be realized in the 1973 Yom Kippur War). Israel's one-sided victory in 1967 demonstrated the formidability of its military, particularly its ability to single-handedly and simultaneously defeat multiple Arab states. Although the war was initiated by Israel in a pre-

emptive strike, giving it a decisive advantage, its forces also proved vastly superior to those of its opponents, in part owing to the freedom of Israeli officers to respond to changing battlefield realities, whereas Egyptian troops were required rigidly to adhere to plans despite changing battlefield realities (Kandil 2014). This point is argued by Reiter and Stamm (2002), who have found significant evidence to support their claims. This point is expanded upon in the Egypt case.

Another outcome of the war was that Israel secured a superpower ally in the United States that pledged to guarantee its security, a commitment later backed up by the willingness of the U.S. to go to Defcon 3 during the 1973 Yom Kippur War to deter Soviet intervention, and the enormous U.S. airlift to resupply Israel after it suffered severe losses in the first few days of that war. The U.S.-Israeli alliance further enhanced the IDF's military and technological capabilities, virtually guaranteeing its ability to defeat Arab armies in any conventional military conflict.

In addition to its overwhelming military superiority, it is well-known that Israel is a nuclear power, albeit an undeclared one. It is difficult to determine the exact year that Israel developed nuclear weapons, and there is no public discourse within Israel on the subject (Kimmerling 2008). Tyler (2012) claims Israel developed its first bomb in 1967, while Fisher (2013) claims it was in 1968. Several scholars and journalists also state that Nixon and Israeli PM Golda Meier reached a secret deal in 1969 that Israel would not test nuclear weapons or acknowledge having them, in return for which the U.S. would cease inspecting Israel's Dimona nuclear facility and stop pressuring Israel to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (Kimmerling 2008, 175; Fisher 2013). Estimates of the Israeli nuclear arsenal ranges from 70 to 400 nuclear weapons, according to a 2007 Federation of American Scientists study. A leaked 1999 assessment from the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency estimated an Israeli nuclear arsenal

at the time to number between 60-80 weapons, which would increase slightly to 65-85 by 2020. A more recent report by the Institute for Science and International Security for the Nuclear Threat Initiative reported “a full range of about 90-290 weapons” in the Israeli arsenal (Kessler 2015).

In short, Israel’s security environment after June 1967 was completely transformed, with its security and its survival as a sovereign state practically guaranteed. This proved a double-edged sword for Israel, however, as in achieving security against external threats, Israel’s victory internalized them. Israel now occupied lands with over 700,000 Palestinian Arab inhabitants, which were placed under military administration. Whereas Arabs living within the Green Line had been granted full citizenship and enjoyed many rights thereof (except the right to be subject to military conscription, which remains a barrier between Jewish and Arab Israeli citizens), Palestinians in the Occupied Territories (OT) did not. They were trapped in a stateless limbo, subject to Israeli martial law.

Although Israel officially stated that its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza was temporary, its policies contradicted this. Shortly after the end of the 1967 War, Military Advocate General Meir Shamgar argued that these territories were “disputed” lands, and not occupied, because they had never been part of a sovereign state but had been captured by Jordan and Egypt in 1948, respectively. Hence, they were *sui generis*. Less than six months after the occupation began, the Israeli government began referring to these occupied lands as Judea and Samaria, the biblical lands of Israel, and official maps were gradually changed so that the Green Line (Israel’s 1949 armistice borders) was erased, eliminating the separation between its 1949 borders and the newly occupied lands. Schoolchildren were led to believe that the newly occupied lands were also an integral part of Israel. According to Gordon (2008, 8-9), a majority

of Israelis now consider the separation barrier the actual border of the state rather than the Green Line. Homes and even entire Palestinian villages were demolished to make room for Jewish places of worship, and later, Jewish settlements, built on top of former Palestinian villages. By April 1968, 5,367 Palestinian homes and three villages had been demolished to make room for Jewish worshippers (Handel 603, quoted in Ophir, Givoni, and Hanafi 2009).

Road networks linked Israel proper to the OT, allowing Israeli citizens the opportunity to shop in the territories, where customs practices were lax. A greater economic zone was established between Israel and the OT, and after Likud's 1977 electoral victory, the number of Jewish settlements in the OT skyrocketed. Although these Jewish settlers lived outside of Israel proper, they were protected by Israeli law and IDF soldiers rather than local laws (Gordon 2008, 7, 26).

The Jewish settlers have been described as "turtles", carrying the protections of Israeli law on their backs as they relocate outside of the Green Line, while Palestinians living in the OT are denied voting rights, and local Palestinian law is routinely overridden by Israeli military law (Gordon 2008, 27-28). Because of Israel's Right of Return law, Jews from all over the world may immigrate to Israel and become immediate citizens, while Palestinians living in these territories are denied citizenship status, including the right to vote (Kimmerling 2008). These settlers constitute a strong lobby; although they live outside of the Green Line in "disputed" territory, they are overrepresented in government and parliament. Settlers are represented by 16 of 120 Knesset members, six government ministers, and they hold key positions within politics, the military, and academia. Netanyahu's 1996 electoral victory over the "peace candidate" Peres was determined by settler voters (Yiftachel 2006, 85).

Israel began implementing oppressive policies designed to subjugate and pacify an occupied population. Some scholars classify Israel as a colonial and a settler society (Yiftachel 2006, 12-13; Kimmerling 2008, 177; Robinson 2013; Shafir 2017). Over 2,500 military orders issued within the OT, and the Israeli High Court of Justice nearly always supported the actions of the military administration, which include curfews, arrests and deportations, expropriation of Palestinian property, and house demolitions. Palestinian rights were arbitrarily defined by the occupying power, and their right to statehood ignored. The military government in Gaza and the West Bank served as the legislative and executive authorities there. A surveillance regime was established, which included opening Palestinians' mail, censoring books and films, issuing identification cards to all Palestinian males age 18 and over (which they were required to carry at all times), and an extensive network of local informants was established. Permits were required for a variety of routine activities, including operation of businesses, building houses, and driving automobiles. They were issued by the Israeli military authorities, which had the power to revoke them at will, and did so for infractions such as violation of curfew, criminal offenses, and attending protests against the Israeli occupation. The General Security Services, also known as Shabak or Shin Bet, assumed the authority (although it had never officially been granted to them) to make decisions such as the establishment of curfews, whom to arrest and detain, house demolitions, the hiring and firing of local education officials, and the opening and closing of such institutions (Gordon 2008, 27-38).

Sammy Smooha (1990, 2002) characterizes this state of affairs in the OT as an “ethnocracy”, defined as “the expansion, ethnicization, and control of a dominant ethnic nation (often termed the charter of a titular group) over contested territory and polity” (Yiftachel 2006, 11). Yiftachel (2006) describes the two-tiered nature of rights and citizenship within the Israeli

ethnocracy; full democratic rights and privileges of citizenship (including civil rights, elections, and a free press) are reserved for one ethnic group (the Jewish people) and denied to the other (the Palestinian Arabs). This situation arises when control over a territory is disputed, and the dominant group has the power to determine the character of the state. The minority is able to use the institutions of state to attempt to *improve* their status, but they are never able to achieve full equality with the dominant ethnic group. While the state maintains democratic institutions and features, ethnicity (rather than territory) determines who will enjoy these rights and who also shall enjoy the bulk of the state's resources and benefits. Thus, inequality in economic and educational resources persists indefinitely. For example, in 1989, 39.8% of Arab households and 48.7% of Arab children lived below the poverty line, compared to 12.8% of Jewish households and 18.6% of Jewish children. In 2001, the number of Arab households living below the poverty line had increased to 44%, and the number of Arab children living below the poverty line had jumped to 56%, while Arab income over a fifteen-year period was 65-73% that earned by Jews (Yiftachel 2006, 169).

Borders are blurred and ambiguous in ethnocracies, and social cleavages are defined along ethnoclass lines. Ethnocracies are differentiated from *Herrenvolk* or apartheid regimes in that in the former, significant, albeit partial, civil rights are bestowed onto the minority ethnicity, while in the latter, they are absent. Whereas democracies are polities espousing a community of equal rights among citizens within a given territory, this is broken in ethnocratic regimes; only the dominant ethnic group enjoys full democratic rights, and borders are undefined. This system of institutionalized ethnic inequality guarantees conflict as long as it persists (Yiftachel 2006, 16).

## **A Two-Tiered Social Structure**

The Arab minority population within Israel was 15% in May 1948, when Israel became a state, and had increased to 19% in 1996 (Robinson, 2013; Dowty 1998, 186). Arabs are not eligible for military service in Israel, and military service qualifies one not only to lifelong state social-welfare benefits, it also provides social networking opportunities that are useful in procuring employment (Arian 1998, 38). Arabs were not initially allowed to enter the Jewish labor force, delaying their financial opportunities (Yiftachel 2006). Arabs in Israel have experienced crushing poverty. Although they constitute less than twenty percent of the population, they account for half of those living in poverty in Israel (Arian 1998, 38). Between 50-60% of Arab lands in Israel were expropriated by the state for the purpose of the construction of 500 Jewish settlements. Despite comprising 16% of the population, Arabs own 3.5% of Israeli territory and control 2.5% of the local governments (Yiftachel 2006, 166).

Robinson (2013) demonstrates that although the Palestinians within the Green Line were gradually granted citizenship rights within the state, the settler-state mentality of the Jewish majority as reflected in the central governmental practices sought to exclude to the extent possible the state's resources from Palestinians and prioritize them for the Jewish population. Restrictions on Palestinian access to resources (such as land, water, and income), their ability to travel freely within Israel, and employment opportunities hindered their ability to achieve true equality with their Jewish counterparts. Examined by Smoocha (1990, 2002), Yiftachel (2006), Gordon (2008), and Kimmerling (2008), this marginalization of the minority, despite eventual full citizenship rights, adds further credibility to the argument that the Israeli state is an ethnocracy. These policies were repeated to an even greater extent in the Occupied Territories after 1967.

Despite initial setbacks, however, Israeli Arabs have also seen a gradual improvement in their educational and financial conditions, and many have become middle class. Although no formal obstacles exist preventing Arabs from voting for Arab party lists and in achieving representation equivalent to their numbers within Israel, many Arabs vote for Jewish parties that have “bought” the Arab vote in various ways. The Arab population is politically fragmented, and some refuse to participate in Israeli politics at the national level (194-195). Dowty also notes in a 1980 survey that 90% of Jewish Israelis were generally supportive of the concept of minority rights, but only 40% expressed support for extending full civil equality to Arab Israelis (195). In addition, three-quarters of Israeli Jews opposed the creation of independent Arab universities, media, trade unions, or political parties (196). Thus, neither full integration of Arabs into Israeli society nor separate development between the two ethnicities has proven workable in Israel, leaving the status of minority rights a serious ongoing cleavage.

### **The Birth of Palestinian Nationalism**

Kimmerling (2008) argues that Palestinian nationalism emerged after the Six Day War, when in the early 1970s a right-wing nationalist, religious youth movement known as Gush Emunim, or “the Bloc of the Faithful”, gained momentum and in 1974 took control of the National Religious Party. Gush Emunim at first consisted of a core of Ashkenazi Jews from elite military units who charged the secular generation of Israeli Jews with having abandoned their commitment to religious Zionism and began establishing settler communities in the West Bank in earnest. Using traditional Zionist symbolism and rhetoric about reclaiming the land of the Jews from the Arabs and from nature itself to establish new settler communities, this group sought to create an identity which blurred the boundaries between religious and secular society. They did so via strategies such as colonizing the West Bank (which they referred to as Judea and

Samaria to imply resettlement of traditional Jewish lands) in order to make future Jewish withdrawal of the land all but impossible, and used the terms “Land of Israel” interchangeably with the “State of Israel” (171).

These settlements expanded rapidly following Likud’s 1977 electoral victory. By 1987, Israel had confiscated 40% of the land in the Occupied Territories and had constructed 125 settlements (Gordon 2008, 16). By the end of 2001, there were 206,000 settlers living around East Jerusalem (Yiftachel 2006, 66). As of 2008, there were 140 Jewish settlements in the West Bank with over 180,000 residents, who were protected by the IDF, which adopted policing roles rather than traditional combat duties. Clashes between settlers and Palestinian infiltrators became increasingly common and bloody, particularly with the First Intifada (uprising) in 1987. Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin eventually concluded that a military solution to the Palestinian “problem” was impossible, and that only a political solution (i.e. land for peace) would resolve the issue (Kimmerling 2008, 172).

When Rabin became the Labour Prime Minister in 1992, he was convinced that Israeli withdrawal from most of the West Bank and Gaza and the creation of a limited Palestinian state would not only greatly reduce, if not eliminate, the cause for Palestinian grievances in the OT, but such a move would also obviate the need for the IDF to serve police roles in the territories, allowing it to resume its traditional duty of defense of state from outside aggression. Indeed, the 1979 Camp David Accords and peace treaty with Egypt had demonstrated how peace could be achieved between Israel and Arab actors by diplomatic, rather than purely military, means. Just as the Six Day War had transformed Israel into a regional power, the 1979 peace treaty with Egypt had greatly altered the balance of power in the region. The 1994 Israeli-Jordanian peace treaty did so further by allowing both Egypt and Jordan to become recipients of vast amounts of

American military equipment and economic aid as a quid pro quo for maintenance of peace with Israel (Kimmerling 2008, 172-173; Brooks 1998, 70-72).

Smootha (1993), Yiftachel (2006) and Kimmerling (2008) argue that Palestinian nationalism, and the increasingly militant tactics adopted, arose as a response to Israeli militarism after the 1967 War and the accompanying settlement of the West Bank. Shafir (2017) also argues that the persistent violence in Israel and the OT is the result of Palestinian resistance to Israel's systematic colonization of the West Bank. The decades of ethnocratic policies have resulted in a pushback among Palestinians which Yiftachel (2006) characterizes as "ethnoregionalism", or attempts by the Palestinians to form their own collective identity and to marshal resources to increase collective rights, protect homeland spaces, and to resist the dominant ethnic structure of the Israeli state by restructuring the polity itself rather than adhering to their designated roles within it.

A major impetus for the birth of Palestinian ethnoregionalism stems from the proliferation and acceptance of globalized norms of civil and human rights; Yiftachel notes that such movements are not unique to Israel/Palestine, but also Spain and the UK, as evidenced by sporadic separatist movements in those regions.

Ethnocratic regimes are not doomed to remain so; they may reform or be reformed and become more democratic, which is one goal of Palestinian ethnoregionalism. As a case in point, the 2006 elections within the Palestinian authority were deemed free and fair by international observers, even if they were dismissed by the Bush administration for political reasons (Brownlee 2012). If Palestinian ethnoregionalism proves successful, Yiftachel (2006) argues that this will greatly expand civil and political rights for Palestinians, make the distribution of public goods more equal, and decentralize Israel's highly centralized government (187).

Yiftachel also notes how Smoocha (1992) claims that elements within the Jewish democratic culture have relaxed control over Palestinians within the Green Line, partially incorporating them into Israeli society. Citing surveys, even if a Palestinian state were ultimately created, 80-95% of Arab Palestinians would prefer to remain in Israel (164).

As several scholars have illustrated, Israel has been in a catch-22 since acquiring the territories in June 1967. Dowty (1998, 233) captures the conundrum in laying out Israel's two options. Should Israel annex the territories and their one million Palestinian inhabitants, they would be forced to grant them Israeli citizenship, which would threaten the Zionist nature of the Israeli state, placing Israeli Jews in the minority. Alternatively, continuing the occupation has already undermined the democratic nature of the Israeli state, and the disparity between Jewish and Palestinian Arab rights will become permanent. Should this second option be chosen, the ethnocracy described by Smoocha (1993, 2000), and Yiftachel (2006) will become more pronounced, which will likely accelerate the death tolls among Palestinians and Israelis fighting over the OT that Gordon (2008) has discussed. Kimmerling (2008, 169) is more pessimistic about change in the status quo, arguing that mass expulsion of Palestinians from the OT is unlikely on humanitarian grounds, as Israel would face a serious international backlash (although this has not deterred Israeli actions in the past). Equally unlikely, he argues, is Israel's granting Palestinians full citizenship rights, which would destroy Zionism. Perhaps the best option, one not mentioned in the above calculus, is the one favored by Rabin – withdrawing from most of the territories and allowing for the creation of a Palestinian state? Here, all citizens within the Green Line would enjoy citizenship rights, perhaps with the inclusion of military service for Israeli Arabs (and the benefits that such service entails), and ethnocracy is ended in the OT. The Likud party, although advocating annexation of the territories from 1969 into the early 1970s, has since

renounced full annexation. As many scholars and observers have repeatedly noted, greater Arab birth rates compared to the non-Arab Israeli rates are creating a demographic problem that will eventually force Israel's hand in dealing with the occupied territories in one of the ways described above.

### **Israel and the Territorial Peace**

This case study has found consistencies with some arguments from the territorial peace, namely that territorial threats likely result in a decrease in party polarization, which was the case in Israel between 1948-1977. The territorial peace also argues territorial threats prevent democratization. Although Dowty (1998) argues that Israel was the least democratic between 1948-1967, it was still democratic.

Gibler (2012) provides three possible explanations (although untested) for democracy's endurance in Israel and India, states which remained democratic despite security threats. The first is that both states are more militarily powerful and enjoy greater military capabilities than their neighbors. Second, the nature of the IDF in Israel and India's large population make it difficult for the military to serve as an effective force of repression, and both states entered the system as democracies. Third, citing Boix (2003), Gibler maintains that democracies, once established, rarely de-democratize absent major external crises (Gibler 2012, 36-38). However, the 1930s saw a reverse wave of democratizations in Germany, Japan, Italy, Spain, and Portugal as Huntington (1991) points out, which stemmed largely from internal crises.

The first explanation involves a power asymmetry argument, which holds only after the 1967 war. As has been shown in this case study, from 1948 until 1967, Israel was severely outmatched and outnumbered by its Arab neighbors. It also lacked allies, while its Arab neighbors enjoyed Soviet military and political support, to varying degrees. Thus, Israel had to

stand alone and fight most of its wars during this period alone. Thus, this first argument is inapplicable for the first two decades of Israel's existence.

Although Gibler is correct about the IDF's inability to serve as an effective force for repression inside Israel proper, considering its reservist nature, this has not been the case outside the Green Line. The IDF, as has been shown above, has served as a police and occupation force within the Occupied Territories since 1967, but it is carrying out this role against Arabs rather than fellow Jews. To add to Gibler's explanation regarding the nature of the IDF, its citizen soldier function is inherently democratic, which would presumably check any attempts to repress fellow Israeli citizens in the name of national security. It is unlikely the government would need to militarily repress its population, considering that a military defeat would be as detrimental to its Jewish population as it would be to the state itself; the survival of the population is linked to the survival of the state. Such an action may also lead to an army revolt, as fears of such occurrences increased after the 2005 forced removal of settlements in Gaza.

The second part of this explanation is that Israel entered the system as a democracy. This is correct, but it does not mean its democracy could not have collapsed from two decades of security/territorial threats. This ties in with the third explanation, that democracies rarely reverse except in response to major external crises. This is also correct, but existential threats over decades would certainly constitute a major external crisis, particularly because of the ability of Arab militaries to overrun the small Israeli state, which had few allies it could rely on to come to its military defense until 1967 or 1973, save for the 1956 Suez War where Britain and France cooperated with Israel in their war against Egypt. Huntington (1991) and Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) detail the reversal of democracies over many decades, which may collapse from internal or external crises. Because democracies are not immune from reversal, this case study has

sought to explain the mechanisms which made it possible for Israel's democracy to persist despite two decades of territorial and security threats. These explanations involve a foundation of democratic culture and norms, the establishment of democratic institutions, such as representative political structures and an independent judiciary, as well as the mechanism of the interrupted system and the citizen soldier model of compulsory military service.

The significance of Israel's classification as an ethnocracy, and not a democracy, by Smooha (1990, 2002), Yiftachel (2006), and others is that this seemingly raises the question of invalidating any analysis of Israel with respect to the territorial peace argument. Although since 1967, the manner in which Israel has administered the OT certainly qualifies it as being classified as an ethnocracy, this was not a result of security or territorial threats, but rather from policies implemented by the Israeli government itself. What is interesting is how Israel managed to maintain its electoral democratic institutions within the Green Line between 1948-1967 *despite* extreme threats to its territory. The ethnic solidarity among the Jewish members of society (the we're-all-in-this-together approach) provides the ethnic and normative explanation for how Israeli democracy survived in a threatening security environment, while Kimmerling's interrupted system provides the institutional explanation.

A second reason Israel's classification as an ethnocracy is important with respect to the territorial peace argument is that it highlights flaws with both the democratic peace and territorial peace theories, as neither define what they consider democracies. To be sure, democracies are not monolithic; there exists a continuum along which regimes may be classified which possess varying degrees of what can be classified as democratic elements, as Dahl pointed out (1971). In that case, what type of democratic regimes are produced, according to the territorial peace, once border disputes are resolved? Are they liberal democracies? Illiberal democracies? Hybrid

regimes? Does the type of democracy matter if they possess some elements of democratic regimes, such as free and fair elections, as were conducted by the Palestinian authority in 2006? Lastly, how can the territorial peace apply to a state with undefined borders, as in the Israeli case? One way around this is to assume the internationally-recognized borders established by the 1949 armistice, known as the Green Line.

Gordon (2008) argues that the Israeli occupation of the territories itself has changed, with the institutional mechanisms of control taking on a life of its own. The occupation has become bloodier and more repressive over time, particularly between the 1980s-90s, then again during the 2000s. Both periods coincide with the First and Second Palestinian Intifadas, or uprisings. These mechanisms of control change, and are changed by, the policies of the Israeli government which oversee the Occupied Territories. These observations echo those of Kimmerling (2008, 177), who notes the interconnectivity between the military and civilian spheres, particularly how settlement doctrines are translated into military doctrines, and vice versa. These settlement-military doctrines in turn create societal problems that construct social facts and are in turn constructed by them. As is mentioned above, the IDF's shift from warfighting/defense of state to policing of the Territories degrades its ability to carry out the former.

Gordon (2008) details the sharp increase in numbers of Palestinians killed over time to support his claim. The average annual number of Palestinians killed in the OT between June 1967 and December 1987 was 32. This is seemingly in accordance with defense Minister Moshe Dyan's policy to maintain an "invisible occupation", and to allow Palestinians to lead their lives with as little interference as possible. Between December 1987 and September 2000, the average annual number of Palestinians killed rose to 106. Between September 2000 and September 2006, that number jumped to 674 (Gordon 2008, xvii).

## **Conclusion**

Within the context of the territorial peace, Israeli electoral democracy survived in a hostile security environment because of 1) a democratic culture and practices which developed within Jewish communities within Europe and were brought to the Yishuv; 2) a sense of shared ethnic solidarity forged by a history of persecution during the Diaspora and carrying over to the Yishuv and then the Jewish state and embodied in the Jewish ethnocratic structure, where survival required shared service and sacrifice among nearly all members of the Jewish ethnic group; 3) the creation of an ethnocratic state, shifting non-Jews from beyond the territory of the state and thus eliminating the need for a garrison state as the perceived fifth column was primarily pushed into occupation zones outside the Green Line, and 4) the institutional explanation of the interrupted system, including the interconnection between the civil and military spheres, the routinization of conflict among Jewish society within the state of Israel, which necessitated the rapid shift from a peacetime to war setting and back again with as little disruption to society as possible. While the third explanation above appears paradoxical, as the establishment of an ethnocratic state is inherently incompatible with liberal democracy, as well as incompatible with Israel's own declaration of independence, in reality it allowed for the establishment of an ethnic democracy for the dominant ethnic group rather than a liberal democracy for all members within the state. That Israel may forcibly shift non-Jews from its territory and deny basic civil and political rights to citizens based on ethnicity and still earn high marks from Freedom House and Polity IV in terms of its characterization as highly democratic raises questions about the meaningfulness of such rating from those bodies, both of which are highly referenced as authoritative sources for political scientists. This, however, is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Concepts such as elections for representative institutions (from Jewish organizations to political parties), civilian control of defense and military forces, and a civic-minded culture where voluntary associational memberships were common were all present in pre-state Israel, which itself was founded as a democracy. Although Israel entered the system as an electoral democracy, its security was precarious until the 1967 Six Day War, when its military capabilities improved significantly. When the state formed, it was able to devote resources and create institutions capable of handling the perpetual security threat in a dangerous environment; armed conflict was a part of life in the Yishuv.

Although Israel's ethnocratic structure certainly raises doubts about its designation as a democracy, it is without question that Israel maintained electoral democratic elements within the Green Line for its Jewish inhabitants, and also granted citizenship to Arab-Israelis living within the Green Line, although it still denies them certain basic rights, such as the right of military service and resulting benefits derived from such service. Israeli electoral democracy persisted during the most serious threats to its security, from 1948-1967, based on ethnic solidarity and shared commitment to state security and survival. Although ethnocratic elements were certainly present in the Green Line prior to 1967, such as Arabs living under martial law until 1966, when Arabs were granted citizenship, the period from 1967-present is one of ethnocracy within the OT, which is a reflection not only of Jewish ethnic solidarity and Zionist goals, but may also have arisen as a consequence of Israel's security threat. The consensus of the need for unity among the Jewish people to secure the state was a question of national and ethnic survival and has undoubtedly led to the persistence of the siege mentality that continues in Israel despite vast improvements in its strategic security situation after June 1967. If Israeli ethnocracy is a response, at least in part, to a perceived security threat, as Smooha's work implies, this finding

demonstrates how democracies may persist, at least as it relates to a core ethnic group, in a threatening security environment. Those ethnicities that were perceived as a potential fifth column were brutally marginalized, while full democratic rights remain for the majority. This provides another dimension to the territorial peace theory, unrealized and unexplored until now.

## CHAPTER V

### EGYPTIAN AUTHORITARIANISM

*“By a 54%-to-36% margin, Egyptians say their country should annul its three-decade-old peace agreement with Israel.” (Pew Research, May 18, 2011)*

This chapter will examine the second enduring rival with Israel, a case which also is contrary to the territorial peace in that Egypt failed to democratize after resolving its territorial disputes with Israel in 1979, and significantly improved its security position with its closer relationship with the United States. This relationship strengthened and modernized Egypt’s military, so according to the territorial peace the conditions for democratization were met. In examining the conditions for why Egypt failed to democratize will be important in testing the assumptions of the territorial peace and uncovering additional variables that are also significant in determining regime type that the territorial peace does not account for. It will be shown that despite a latent pro-democratic element within the military during the 1952 coup, the authoritarian leadership under Nasser and Sadat lay the institutional foundation for “personal authoritarian” and “neo-sultanistic” authoritarian regimes, and internal power struggles between the political and military spheres were ultimately settled in the aftermath of the 1967 Six Day War in favor of the political apparatus, consolidating the power of the authoritarian leadership. Egypt’s story is more one of a struggle for power among political and military elites rather than being determined by territorial threats. The role of great external powers, in particular that of the United States, is significant in supporting the authoritarian regime and in opposing the

democratic Arab Spring uprisings in 2011. These findings demonstrate the importance of domestic power struggles, the establishment of authoritarian institutions, and the influence that external great powers have on regime type, variables thus far not mentioned in the territorial peace theory, but which are nonetheless significant.

Important to the territorial peace, the peace treaty signed between Egypt and Israel had little to no impact on Egypt's inability to transition to democracy, which has still not occurred as of this writing. In fact, it was Egypt's authoritarian leadership under Sadat that made this peace treaty possible, which was implemented over objections from sizeable percentages within Egypt's chief military officers. In direct contradiction to the territorial peace's logic, were any democratic transitions within Egypt to occur this would likely realize the *end* of the peace treaty, according to popular opinion polls.

This chapter will further demonstrate that the territorial peace theory says too little in terms of defining what is meant by "democracy" itself, and its inability to take into account strong versus weak regimes, state capacity, economic growth, the presence and strength of a civic culture, conflict and cleavages between various domestic ruling groups, and the role of outside powers in assisting or preventing democratization. After the overthrow of the Mubarak regime in February, 2011, it was democracy itself that posed the greatest threat to the 1979 peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, a fact that stands in direct opposition to the logic of Territorial Peace Theory.

### **Early Democratic Sentiments within the Military**

Egypt was a monarchy prior to 1952, headed by King Farouk I, and had been a British colony since 1882. Egyptian military officers in 1952 moved to initiate a coup to expel the British imperial power, depose the pro-British King Farouk I, whom they saw as increasingly

corrupt, and then ostensibly turn the regime over to civilian leaders to be ruled in democratic fashion. The ensuing coup became known as the “Free Officers Coup”, led by military officers Muhammad Naguib and Gamal Abdel Nasser. As leader of the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC), Mohammad Naguib became Egypt’s first president, and the country was declared a republic in June 1953 (Kandil 2014). Naguib represented the interests of the monarchy, which had been primarily comprised of the bourgeoisie and large landowners. According to Kandil (2014, 41, 148) the educated classes and a significant proportion within the military favored the establishment of a democratic regime after the ouster of the king and the British, but these groups were outmaneuvered by Nasser, who sought autocratic rule. As will be shown, from this point onward, various groups would struggle for political domination, with the winners controlling the country. These struggles involved the Egyptian president, prominent generals within the military, and later, the security services.

Historically, the military is usually associated with reversing democracies in most countries rather than seeking to bring it about or preserve it, although military regimes have been known to voluntarily return to the barracks and turn power over to civilian leadership, as with Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua in 1990. It is therefore interesting that in the early 1950s in Egypt, a “major bloc” of pro-democratic artillery officers had sought in the Free Officer’s Coup to ultimately put the government in civilian hands after having deposed the monarchy and expelled the British from the country. They plotted a coup against Nasser in December 1953, but this plot was foiled and its leaders imprisoned (Kandil 2014, 30).

Over the next few months, a power struggle ensued between Nasser and Naguib arising over policy differences between the two men. Nasser forced the popular President Naguib to resign in February 1954, sparking widespread civilian protests and a backlash among military

officers, who feared Nasser's authoritarian tendencies. In March, Egyptian cavalry units demanded Naguib be reinstated as President, but elite security forces, recognizing that democracy would mean the end of their careers, swiftly moved to end the cavalry mutiny. To bring the mutiny to a decisive conclusion, Nasser reached an agreement with air force and artillery officers, who ordered their respective units to outmaneuver and threaten to destroy the cavalry units, which brought the mutiny to an end. However, the Muslim Brotherhood, which had supported Naguib, organized mass popular demonstrations and thousands of Egyptians took to the streets, demanding Nasser's arrest and Naguib's reinstatement. Confronted with such mass popular outrage, Nasser relented and reinstated Naguib. Naguib responded by appointing Nasser as his prime minister and embarking on a policy of compromise, which proved his eventual undoing. To further solidify his grip on power, Nasser created a security coterie consisting of his chief lieutenants, which by 1954 had become a part of Nasser's base of support. The careers and livelihoods of these officers were directly tied to Nasser, and any talk of democracy or changing the status quo threatened their positions. These chief officers then began coercing their subordinates to oppose Naguib and his March decrees, which had placed restrictions on the military. On March 29, Nasser revoked these restrictions on the military, and banned any demonstrations in the name of maintaining law and order (Kandil 2014, 33-41). These political moves served to create an authoritarian framework which became institutionalized over time. Although some scholars have argued that Egypt under Naguib could have become a limited democracy along that of the Turkish model, Kandil (2014, 41) argues this claim is likely exaggerated.

## **Israeli perception of Nasser**

The Israeli leadership initially welcomed the 1952 Free Officer's revolution, thinking that its young lower- and middle-class officers would part from the conservative elitism that had been present under the monarchy, and that the new regime would modernize Egypt, holding out the possibility of more cordial relations between their two countries. However, this initial period of hope faded after Nasser's publication of *The Philosophy of the Revolution*, which was a manifesto of his stated goals as Egypt's leader. Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion perceived these goals as a desire for Arab unity at Israel's expense, and according to Podeh and Winckler (2004, 75-76), Ben-Gurion's greatest fear was the rise of another strong Arab leader like Ataturk.

Three events during this period served to reinforce Israel's perceptions of the new regime's threatening nature viz-à-viz Israel. The first came after a group of Egyptian Jews who had been spying for Israel were arrested by Egypt and put on trial in September 1954. Several were sentenced to death, and others to lengthy prison sentences. A second occurrence involved several Egyptian raids into the Sinai, which sparked an Israeli military response in February 1955, killing 37 Egyptians. Third, Egypt's declaration of non-alignment and neutrality in the Cold War in 1955, followed by a large Egyptian arms deal with Czechoslovakia, altering the regional balance of power in Egypt's favor. These three events helped to solidify Ben-Gurion's negative assessment of Nasser as untrustworthy and possibly pursuing a goal of aggressive military conquest (Podeh and Winckler, 2004 77-78).

By January 1956, the Israeli leadership began equating Nasser with a new Hitler, and *The Philosophy of the Revolution* as an Arab *Mein Kampf*, with Egypt seeking *lebensraum* which could potentially wipe out Israel (Podeh and Winckler 2004, 81-82). The language of survival

and Holocaust references was frequently used in speeches by Ben-Gurion in reference to Nasser's perceived plans for Arab nationalism (a theme noted by Patrick Tyler referenced in the Israel case). These speeches also highlighted the undemocratic and (in Israel's view) illegitimate way in which Nasser came to power, contrasting Israel's democratic regime as moral and just compared to that of Egypt. To be sure, Prime Minister Moshe Sharett was not as inclined to see such a threat from Nasser and was more hopeful that peace could be achieved. However, Sharett's resignation in June 1956 left those in the Israeli leadership viewing Nasser as a threat in the majority. Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal the following month, and the resulting Suez War further confirmed the Israeli leadership's view of the Nasserist threat.

Nasser's primary domestic goals consisted of the establishment of a nationalist, populist regime with military backing, and an emphasis on Pan-Arab unity. As Kandil (2014, 41) notes, unlike communist countries such as the Soviet Union and China, where a dominant political party ruled supreme over a civilian-headed military apparatus, Egypt lacked such a dominant party system. Instead, the president held all the power, and had to maintain constant control over the military or face the possibility of a coup. Thus, charismatic top generals and officers posed the continuous possibility of a threat to the president, requiring the appointment of loyal followers to these positions. This constant game of ensuring loyalty from chief officers was what played out in Egypt for six decades of authoritarian rule.

Despite Nasser's embrace of socialism, his ultimate focus was Pan-Arab nationalism. Lacking a specific ideological perspective other than nationalism, he adopted both market and socialist policies where needed, and tried to foster close ties to Eisenhower to gain superpower support, particularly during and after the 1956 Suez Crisis. Being a savvy politician, Nasser formed coalitions with groups that would help achieve his goals and reinforce his hold on power.

For example, he appointed Marxists to high-level economic positions, but arrested many communists he saw as posing a threat to his rule. He also initially supported the Muslim Brotherhood to gain the backing of its followers, but after coming to power he turned on the group to marginalize its influence and further expand his control over the Islamists (Abu-Magd 2017, 45-47).

After achieving power, Nasser's primary threat came from the military, which enjoyed peak political prominence between 1952 and October 1968, as all of Egypt's vice presidents and prime ministers since 1952 had backgrounds in the military (Kassem 2004). The armed forces during the majority of Nasser's rule was headed by Abdel Akim Amer, who served first as Chief of Staff of the military and then commander-in-chief of Egypt and Syria's joint military command. Amer was appointed as Nasser's vice president in March 1964, and rose rapidly within Egypt's power structure. Between the end of the 1956 Suez War and the 1967 Six Day War, a power struggle for control over the military ensued between Nasser and Amer. During this period, the military was the dominant institution in the country, often referred to as a "state within a state" (Kandil 2014). Despite Nasser's repeated attempts to outmaneuver Amer, this failed, and Amer remained a potential challenger until immediately after the conclusion of the Six Day War in 1967.

Because of this political threat, in 1962 Nasser began to decrease the military's political role and presence within the regime. First, Nasser reduced the number of officers in his cabinet from 51.5% in 1961 to 36.3% by 1964. Second, Nasser established the Arab Socialist Union in 1962, the country's only political party at the time, which shifted the balance of power away from the military towards the political and state security apparatus (Kandil 2014, 74). In an attempt to counter these moves that were weakening the military's political power and influence,

Amer refused to prosecute officers accused of crimes, essentially putting them above the law.

Amer and the armed forces thus realized that the military's power would remain contained by the executive unless it was able to achieve a decisive victory in the field (Kandil 2014, 71). Such a victory would elevate the military's status in the eyes of the public and make any further attempts at marginalization by Nasser extremely unpopular.

### **1967 War**

One problem with the military seeking out war with its Israeli rival, however, was that a significant proportion of Egypt's military and Western-trained officer corps was bogged down fighting in the war in Yemen (1962-70), where one-third of its military forces were deployed (Cook 2007, 28). In December 1966 the military high command strongly discouraged any military confrontation with Israel in the near future because of the deleterious effects the Yemeni war had had on Egyptian soldiers. For example, a combination of lax training and war weariness resulted in the needless expenditure of ammunition by frustrated soldiers. The Egyptian air force grew accustomed to performing operations in a country with no air defenses of its own, and was thus deteriorating in quality over time. Over 70,000 Egyptian troops were in Yemen by the end of 1966, and this began taking a toll on Egypt's economy. By March 1967, the armed forces implemented a three month freeze on conscription of new recruits in a military already suffering from severe shortages in equipment and munitions. To make matters worse, soldiers were woefully uneducated, with literacy rates in the marines, infantry, and air force being only eighteen, nineteen, and twenty-one percent, respectively (Kandil 2014, 71-75).

In addition to the domestic power calculus between Amer and Nasser described above, Kandil (2014) argues that another rationale for Egypt's planning war with Israel in 1967 despite the dearth in military preparedness for such an undertaking involves Egypt's creeping

abandonment by both superpowers. Soviet policy forbade direct military aid to non-Communist countries, and because of Egypt's refusal to join the Central Treaty Organization, American attention had shifted away from Egypt in favor of Israel during the Johnson administration. An Egyptian military victory would therefore demonstrate Egypt's value as a regional military power, thereby attracting superpower attention and favor. Regarding domestic power politics, such a victory would reassert the military's political prominence and value in projecting the power of the Egyptian state, putting Amer in a position to eclipse Nasser politically.

Nasser had been convinced by personal friend and former World Bank president Eugene Black at the end of 1966 "that officials in Washington were discussing plans to 'unleash Israel' against Egypt sometime next year" in a military scheme labeled Operation Turkey Shoot (Kandil 2014, 73). Nasser promptly warned Amer of this alleged Western plot to annihilate the Egyptian military and overthrow the regime. As confirmation of the potential accuracy of these claims, the Soviet Union provided Nasser with intelligence reports of Israeli military mobilization against Syria. This resulted in Egyptian mobilization of forces in the Sinai in May 1967, where eighty percent of the troops consisted of untrained reservists that had been hastily sent to units in which they had never served (Kandil 2014, 79-82). As indication of the severity of the crisis in which Nasser found himself, Chief of Staff Fawzy warned that Nasser had no control over the army (Kandil 2014, 72). Fawzy's claim appears all the more accurate in light of Amer's false assertions to Nasser of Soviet pledges to become involved in any conflict should the United States become directly involved, assurances that were never made by the Soviets. In effect, the military was making crucial foreign policy decisions and keeping the president in the dark about vitally important matters of intelligence and military strategy, making outright fabrications. In

addition, the military ignored Nasser's repeated warnings of an imminent Israeli attack, thinking Israel was bluffing (Kandil 2014, 79-81).

With the pre-emptive Israeli air strikes that began the Six Day War, Egypt's unprepared military was thoroughly demolished. Because of the incompetence of its military officers, what fighting force Egypt did have was wasted on pointless maneuvers. In a panic, Amer unilaterally ordered the military withdrawal from the Sinai, which Kandil (2014, 82) argues was the primary reason for Egypt's defeat. The Sinai withdrawal was one of the most disorganized routs in military history, with less than 6% of Egypt's Sinai forces returning home with their weapons. Although 294 Egyptian troops had been killed on the first day of the war, after Amer's withdrawal of the Sinai, 17,000 Egyptian troops were killed or captured (Kandil 79-82).

Kandil (2014, 82) argues that Amer did not want war with Israel, but had engaged in military posturing to win concessions, which led to an extreme miscalculation of Israel's willingness to go to war, and Egypt's consequent humiliating military defeat. In addition to its loss at the hands on its rival, Egypt suffered a major economic decline as a result of the war. Because of Amer's incompetence and the military disaster over which he had presided, Nasser seized upon this to fire and imprison his chief of staff as a matter of political necessity and survival, and to purge many officers from the military to further weaken this institution that had apparently gone rogue under Amer's leadership. Nasser's purges essentially decapitated the military high command, weakening it significantly until Sadat began reinstating some officers several years later (Kandil 2012, 148). The military victory that Amer had sought, which would have further increased his prestige over Nasser, had failed. Furthermore, because of its obfuscatory actions leading up to the war, the military had demonstrated that it posed a serious political threat to Nasser and had become a rogue institution.

## **The Six Day War and the Territorial Peace**

It is useful to revisit the argument of the territorial peace as relates to the buildup to and execution of the Six Day War. Although this theory assumes leaders devote the full resources of the state against border/territorial threats, this is not the policy that Egypt undertook. Israel was unquestionably the most significant threat that Egypt faced, and the loss of the Sinai in the war underscores this fact. Israel and Egypt had fought two wars (1948 and 1956) prior to 1967 and had engaged in numerous military raids and skirmishes. Yet, Egypt had committed a full one-third of its military to the war in Yemen, which has been called by some as “Nasser’s Vietnam”. On the eve of the Six Day War, Egypt had implemented a freeze on conscription because of budgetary necessities, and its most esteemed, Western-educated officers were in Yemen rather than on the border with Israel. The combination of this distant military commitment, the drawdown of military forces and funding, and the grossly undertrained and undereducated nature of the Egyptian military do not fit well within the tenets of the territorial peace -instead of using the bulk of its military to garrison national defenses, Egypt’s military was fighting in a non-contiguous state. Furthermore, as described above, there had been democratic elements among the elites and military prior to and after the 1952 Free Officers Coup, and Nasser did not cite the Israeli military threat as justifications for his authoritarian rule. As has been demonstrated, Ben-Gurion was initially hopeful that the new Egyptian regime would be progressive and non-hostile to Israel. However, a full understanding of this observation cannot be completed until an examination of the 1973 war, the 1979 peace treaty, and decades that followed.

## **The Sadat Era and political-military power struggle**

Sadat became Egypt’s president after Nasser’s death in September 1970. At this time, despite the purges that Nasser had implemented after 1967, the depoliticization of the military

and its eclipse in political power by the security services was still ongoing and would not be complete until around 1971 (Kandil 2012, 113). This strategy to depoliticize the armed forces served two purposes: first, it allowed Sadat to increase his control over the military by dividing it and reducing its political influence; and second, it allowed him to create a loyal paramilitary police/security force that could keep the military in check. Having served as vice president under Nasser, Sadat was familiar with the power struggles that had occurred between Nasser and Amer, and Sadat was therefore taking steps to coup proof his regime from any potential attempts by the armed forces to control or overthrow him.

Sadat's alteration of the civil-military structure is also cited by Brooks (2006), who argues that by dominating the political apparatus and dividing the military, Sadat effectively increased the military's battlefield efficacy, citing Egypt's marked military improvement in military performance in the 1973 Yom Kippur War compared to the 1967 Six Day war.

Despite these depoliticization strategies, the military still remained overly confident in its ability to control the new president, whom it greatly underestimated. After being warned by a journalist who predicted Sadat would imprison the heads of security within a year of his taking power, Nasser's director of personal security, Sami Sharif, responded, "There is nothing to worry about, Sadat must do as we say and if he does not, we will just dispose of him" (Kassem 2004, 20).

Winning back the Sinai was one of Sadat's primary goals, and he preferred to achieve this outcome politically, with a diplomatic, rather than a military, solution, if possible. Two of Sadat's early overtures indicative of this goal are noteworthy. The first occurred in January 1971, when Sadat invited Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir to secret talks to negotiate a peace settlement, which she declined (Kandil 2012, 121).

Noam Chomsky (1993) details how later that same year Sadat embraced a peace plan proposed by UN mediator Gunnar Jarring, whereby Israel would withdraw from Egyptian territory in exchange for peace between Israel and Egypt. Although Prime Minister Rabin referred to Sadat's acceptance of the Jarring proposal as a "bombshell" and a "milestone", the proposal was rejected by Israel because, according to Chief of Staff Haim Bar-Lev, Israel thought it could gain more concessions by holding out. Although the Jarring plan was consistent with official U.S. policy, National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger was at the time in a dispute with the State Department, attempting to replace Secretary of State Rogers. Presumably not wanting the State Department (or Rogers) to benefit from a potential Egyptian-Israeli peace deal, Kissinger pushed for the maintenance of the status quo and rejected calls for negotiations (Chomsky 1993). Israel's recalcitrance to negotiate over the Sinai led Sadat in 1971 to begin implementing plans for war with Israel to recapture its lost territory.

Sadat's next political strategy called for improving ties with the United States, which held considerable influence over Israel. As Kandil (2014, 121) notes, Sadat had been attempting to develop close relations with influential Americans for years before becoming the Egyptian president. Sadat recognized the influence the United States held in the Middle East, having written in his memoirs about how Eisenhower had delivered a political victory for Egypt during the 1956 Suez War, and how "there was one power that ruled Egypt and the world, that is: America". Sadat was also known to frequently state that "America holds 99 percent of the cards" in the Middle East" (Kandil 2014, 121). Sadat had fostered a close relationship with David Rockefeller, and Kandil (2014, 121) notes how former U.S. intelligence analyst Owen Sirrs claimed that Sadat's close ties to the U.S. intelligence community helped to solidify his

hold on power, a claim that appears all the more likely in light of Brownlee's (2012) analysis of the U.S.-Egyptian geostrategic relationship since 1979, described below.

An example of Sadat's foreign policy overtures and attempts to secure American support came in July 1972 with Sadat's unilateral expulsion of all Soviet troops from the country, a decision arrived at in part because of frustrations with the limited nature of Soviet assistance. "Our friends in the Soviet Union only go to a certain point with us," he [Sadat] said, referring to Soviet arms supplies. But Israel was getting 'all-out' support from the United States" (Tyler 2012, 231).

The expulsion of the Soviets, however, failed to secure a favorable response from the United States. This decision was also deeply unpopular within the military because of its dependence on Soviet arms and sophisticated radar and air defense equipment, particularly as Sadat was actively preparing for war with Israel at this point.

A tempestuous meeting between Sadat and his military advisors occurred on October 24, 1972, where Sadat expressed an overly confident assumption of military preparedness and sought to launch the war by mid-November of that year. Sadat had gone into the meeting assuming it would put the finishing touches on the war plan. When top generals at the behest of War Minister Sadeq expressed Egypt's lack of preparedness for war because of lack a of arms, equipment, and munitions (a deficit made worse by Sadat's unilateral expulsion of the Soviets three months prior), Sadat flew into a rage and dressed down his officers. All officers who had disagreed with Sadat at the meeting were fired two days later, including war minister Sadeq, who had been very popular within the military. In addition, over one hundred officers were purged over the next few weeks. Sadeq's popularity with the troops had also contributed to his

dismissal, according to Chief of Staff Shazly, thus causing Sadat to view him as a threat, (Kandil 2012, 116-117).

An indication of the continued strife between Sadat and the military he was struggling to control came one month after Sadeq's dismissal. A collection of officers known as the Save Egypt Movement planned a coup to overthrow Sadat because of his plans to push the country into a war for which it was unprepared. These officers feared war would result in the annihilation of the military, and that the president had become too reckless. Having caught wind of this plot, Sadat tasked a civilian security force, the State Security Investigations Sector (SSIS), with investigating the military plot. This was significant in that it further diminished the military's political power and expanded that of the security forces on which Sadat increasingly relied to safeguard his rule. The SSIS uncovered a plot within military intelligence to arrest the political and security leadership, along with all officers loyal to Sadat, at the wedding of Chief of Staff Shazly's daughter on November 9, 1972 (Kandil 2012, 118).

Sadat appointed loyal friend, Ahmed Ismail, as war minister in late October 1972 in light of the SSIS revelations and to replace his previous war minister Sadeq, whom he had fired. Not only was Ismail loyal to Sadat, but he also posed no political threat. Ismail had a questionable military service record, having twice been relieved of duty for incompetence, and was very unpopular within the military. In addition, Ismail was dying of cancer. Such an appointment as Minister of War on the eve of a planned military confrontation with Israel served to ensure that a benign loyalist presided over an increasingly hostile military. Sadat's strategy of divide and conquer is clearly evident.

The Soviet Union feared another Middle East war was imminent, which in the era of détente it wished to avoid. Tyler (2012, 232-235) describes a June 22, 1973 visit from Brezhnev

to Nixon's home in San Clemente, California, where the Soviet leader discussed proposals that would improve the chances for Middle East peace, namely opening the Suez Canal, a security guarantee for Israel, and Israel's return of Arab lands. Enmeshed in the Watergate scandal, Nixon remained non-committal, fearing reprisals from pro-Israeli Congressmen. In addition, Nixon was hesitant to open such negotiations in light of prior comments from Golda Meir about the desirability of annexing lands Israel had won in the war. In fact, Moshe Dayan had plans to construct a new deep-water port in Yamit in the Sinai, which telegraphed Israel's designs on keeping Egyptian territory. At Dayan and Israel Galili's urging, plans were presented to the Labor government for Israeli industrialists to relocate factories to the Sinai and the West Bank, as well as to further open the door to Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, which then included the Sinai. Proposed policies from the right-wing parties in the opposition were even more unapologetic in calling for open annexation of occupied Arab territories. These Israeli plans undoubtedly hastened Sadat's push to recapture the Sinai before the Israelis could create enough civilian and industrial investments there before Israeli withdrawal would be considered too costly. As the door for a diplomatic resolution to the Sinai situation appeared all but closed, a military solution seemed inevitable.

### **1973 War**

In order to illustrate the extreme divisions between the Egyptian president and his chief military officers, it is necessary to understand the strategic significance of two major passes in the Sinai which were of vital military importance – the Mitla and Gidi passes. Kandil (2012, 115) explains that each Egyptian Military Academy cadet “learned that controlling the passes was one of the few long-standing strategic doctrines of defending Egypt's eastern borders - a doctrine that extended from the days of Pharaoh Thutmose III to the British General Allenby”.

The geographic features of these passes afforded a dug-in army a near impregnable defensive position, and control of these passes equated with control over the entire Sinai. Egyptian military strategy called for crossing the Canal and quickly occupying these passes, which would afford Egypt a dominant military position in the battle over the Sinai. Sadat's chief officers had been led to believe by Sadat himself that he supported such a plan as blueprints for the upcoming war developed.

The military significance of these passes notwithstanding, Sadat was in an almost unwinnable position from a political standpoint. His objective was to win back the Sinai from the Israelis, but doing so militarily would risk, in a zero-sum fashion, the loss of his prestige and the consequent gain in prestige for the military, an institution he was in the process of depoliticizing and marginalizing. Just as Nasser and Naguib had become national heroes in the 1948 war with Israel, a decisive military victory in the Sinai would almost assuredly produce new war heroes. Such men would be adored by a grateful nation, and this could destabilize Sadat's presidency and present potential alternatives in the form of military celebrities. Thus, he sought a political/diplomatic victory in the Sinai, similar to that achieved by Nasser in the 1956 Suez War (Kandil 2012, 113, 120). Sadat's assumption was that if Egypt demonstrated a strong military opening, the United States would quickly intervene and negotiate a peace settlement to prevent an Israeli defeat, a settlement that included return of the Sinai to Egypt (Rabinovich 2004, 26).

On the eve of the war, Egypt had mobilized a formidable 1.2 million men (Kandil 2012, 126). Advanced Soviet surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) that had been acquired by Egypt prior to 1972 had been installed west of the Canal to provide air defense cover for the Canal zone and any Egyptian advance several kilometers across it. The Egyptian and Syrian militaries had

largely built up their forces along their frontiers with Israel in secret, disguising them as training exercises. Many warnings to the Israelis from numerous intelligence agencies, even a visit from King Hussein of Jordan to Golda Meir herself to warn of an imminent Egyptian-Syrian attack, went unheeded. The Israeli consensus was that the Egyptians were not ready for war.

The war began on October 6, 1973 with Operation Badr, with a massive Egyptian artillery barrage across the Canal targeting the Israeli Bar-Lev line, which was a series of thirty-five reinforced bunkers guarding the Canal. After the bombardment, there was a coordinated, simultaneous Egyptian attack across the Suez Canal and a Syrian attack into the Golan Heights, forcing Israel to fight a two-front war. The Egyptian army staged the largest crossing in military history, and quickly breached the Bar-Lev line and its thirty-five fortifications (Kandil 2012, 126).

Egypt's chief generals begged Sadat to allow the military to advance and take the passes, but this would mean leaving the cover of the SAMs west of the Canal. Politically, it would mean handing the military a dazzling victory, which would rob Sadat of his pre-conceived political/diplomatic settlement for which he was hoping. Sadat ordered his army to halt as the Israeli enemy was reeling in disarray, falling back eastward across the Sinai. Not only were the troops and officers in shock at being denied such crucial objectives that were within reach, so too were military officials in the U.S., Soviet Union, and among Egypt's Arab allies, all of whom expected Egypt to easily seize the passes in short order (Kandil 2012, 127-128). Sadat wanted his forces to remain in position, secure within the air defense umbrella located west of the Canal. He also felt that he had made his point and that the United States would begin pressuring Israel to make concessions within short order.

Twenty hours after the crossing of the Canal, Sadat sent the first of thirty-eight back-channel cables to Henry Kissinger between October 7-29, 1973. In these first communications he expressed his intentions not to escalate the war, thus showing his hand to Israel's ally. As these cables continued, Kissinger urged Egyptian restraint, hinting at the possibility of a negotiated settlement if the war was not escalated, while feeding the Israelis all the information Sadat relayed to him. In addition to satellite photos of Egyptian troop concentrations showing no movement, Kissinger was able to reassure Israel of Sadat's plan not to further attack in the Sinai. This led to a Pentagon recommendation to IDF Chief of Staff David Elazar to concentrate Israel's forces against the Syrians first, as they were much closer to Israeli population centers, and then deal with Egypt after the Syrian threat had been eliminated (Kandil 2012, 129-130).

After heavy fighting, the IDF wore down the Syrian armor units and halted the Syrian advance. Fearing the Israelis would destroy the Syrian army and threaten Damascus, Assad begged Sadat to launch his offensive in the Sinai to relieve the pressure on Syria. Sadat's hand was forced because not only had Kissinger's responses in the cables become aloof and dismissive, but Israeli aircraft were now bombing cities in Egypt, killing over five hundred civilians (Kandil 2012, 132-133). Kissinger had also persuaded Nixon to resupply Israel with a massive airlift of vital armaments and ammunition. The airlift not only replenished the losses that had been sustained by the IDF in the first few days of the war, but the equipment provided was far superior to what Egypt could defend against, including tanks and the most sophisticated missiles in the world. American personnel also arrived to train the Israelis in their use. Despite Soviet recommendations for Egypt to destroy the airfields in the Sinai to disrupt the further arrival of American supplies, Sadat did not want to anger the United States, and thus allowed the airlift to continue unabated.

By the time Sadat ordered the offensive to resume in the Sinai, the Israeli forces had managed to regroup and were in the process of being reinforced by the American airlift. The Egyptian field commanders and officers were on the point of mutiny owing to their perception of Sadat's repeated mismanagement of capable forces. Two of these field commanders attempted to resign, but their resignations were rejected by the war ministry. On October 18, fifteen officers of mid-rank entered the Presidential Palace, warning Sadat of the strong possibility of a military coup against him, which by that time a reinforced enemy was threatening Egypt proper. Sadat merely thanked these men and dismissed them (Kandil 2012, 133).

Kissinger continued to feed the Israelis all information communicated by Sadat, and on October 13 and 15, two U.S. reconnaissance aircraft mapped the Egyptian military positions for Israel's benefit, demonstrating the weak points and thus allowing an Israeli offensive to breach the lines and cross the Canal into Egypt, all at Kissinger's urging before a negotiated ceasefire was called. This maneuver exposed the Egyptian 3<sup>rd</sup> Army to being outflanked and destroyed "in the hope that he [Sadat] could still pull off a diplomatic coup" (Kandil 2012, 134-135).

Kissinger and Brezhnev arranged a ceasefire, formalized by UN Resolution 338, but Kissinger was able to convince Sadat to waive joint U.S. and Soviet observers to monitor the ceasefire. Because of the absence of Soviet observers, Kissinger provided an opportunity for Israel to continue to degrade the Egyptian military, giving the Israelis the green light to continue the encirclement of the Egyptian Third Army trapped in the Sinai, which consisted of 45,000 men. Brigades led by Ariel Sharon and Bren Adan crossed the canal and destroyed a large section of the SAM umbrella, allowing Israeli air and ground attacks to continue. Sadat further enflamed his military officers by his unilateral acceptance of the ceasefire while Israel was flagrantly violating it, besieging Egyptian cities along the canal. Despite Sadat's top generals

and his war minister urging him to not agree to a ceasefire until his Third Army was rescued and Israel withdrew from west of the canal, Sadat refused their advice. In a meeting with the SCAF, the officers had assumed Sadat had summoned these officers to plan a rescue operation to break the encirclement of the Third Army in Sinai. Instead, and to the bewilderment of the SCAF officers, Sadat declared the war at an end and urged the military to refrain from meddling in political matters from that point forward (Kandil 2012, 137-138).

By the time a ceasefire was negotiated, Sadat had commenced his continuation of purging the military of key officers. Chief of Staff Shazly had been labeled a coward by Sadat and fired, and many field commanders were reassigned to the civilian sector. Al-Gamasy, who had enjoyed strong support among troops and officers alike for his military service to Egypt and had a reputation as a staunch opponent of Israel, was appointed Minister of War so that he could perform the unpopular work of negotiating peace with the Israelis and take the blame for any problems that resulted. Gamasy had been critical of the military's involvement, starting after the 1967 war, in civilian construction and land reclamation projects (described in detail below), which he argued weakened it as a fighting force (Kandil 2012, 135, 140-141).

Gamasy met Kissinger in Aswan on January 11, 1974 to continue talks on disengagement of forces in the Sinai. Kissinger announced "Sadat had already agreed to permanently limit the Egyptian presence in Sinai to 7,000 troops and 30 tanks..." (Kandil 2012, 141), a plan that Gamasy had been unaware of, and was outraged and felt Sadat had betrayed not only him, but Egypt and the troops that had died in the war. The purpose of Sadat's one-sided concession was to attempt again to win American favor and support, and thus achieve a favorable bargaining position vis-à-vis Israel to achieve the return of the Sinai. Sadat's decision resulted in a rebellion

among the troops in the Third Army, and forty-three officers were arrested for plotting a coup (Kandil 2012, 141-142).

Sadat's October Paper to parliament on May 15, 1974 blamed vast expenditures in the military budget as cause for Egypt's economic decline and announced that "the defense budget would be substantially reduced". In addition, Sadat announced his policy to open the Egyptian economy to foreign investment, thus beginning his *infitah* policy, which was in line with the wishes of Egyptian capitalists, who had favored a brief war with Israel followed by a settlement – the particulars of which did not matter (Kandil 2012, 138). Sadat's October Paper is significant in that it called for a substantial reduction in defense expenditures while their main rival remained in control of Egyptian territory, which stands in direct contradiction to the concept of the territorial peace theory.

Although Egypt officially considers the 1973 Yom Kippur War a victory, it can be argued that the Egyptian military's dismal performance convinced policymakers and military brass alike that any future military victory against Israel was unlikely, if not impossible, and that the best and only option was to formalize peace. This is exactly what Sadat had set out to do, and he continued demilitarizing Egypt and marginalizing it from politics (Abul-Magd 2017). Although Sadat's military strategy evoked the ire of his officers and his military strategies were clumsily carried out, his regaining the Sinai and conducting formal peace with Israel were two noteworthy achievements. He was careful to avoid granting potential enemies in the military a battlefield victory, which would weaken his hold on power. This demonstrates Sadat's perceptiveness and shrewdness as a political leader.

## **Battlefield Performance**

A final mention of Arab battlefield performance is necessary, as scholars have discussed explanations for this, ranging from theories about how democratic and authoritarian regimes field armies of superior and inferior quality, respectively (Reiter and Stamm 2002), to the ways militaries are employed to protect the regime degrades combat readiness and training (Brooks 1998, 2006, Quinlivan 1999). It is interesting to note the different levels of autonomy the Israeli forces allowed junior officers compared to their Egyptian counterparts. Israeli officers had leeway to exploit changing situations as they saw fit, whereas Egyptian officers had to request authorization before deviating from any plan. This rigidity proved detrimental to the Egyptians as the days passed, as initial opportunities to seize strategically important ground, such as the Mitla and Gidi passes mentioned above, were not exploited, and the Israelis were able to recoup their losses and regroup. These observations are consistent with scholarship noting the differences in military structure and combat between soldiers produced by free-thinking, democratic societies and authoritarian regimes (Reiter and Stamm, 2002).

Brooks (1998) and Quinlivan (1999) argue that although there is variation in performance across Arab armies, their generally poor battlefield performance stems from the ways in which autocrats politicize military forces for internal security, or “coup-proofing”, which degrades their combat readiness. Centralized political power prevents autonomy in the lower ranks, rendering them unable to alter plans in response to rapidly changing battlefield conditions. U.S. military commanders noted how Egyptian military forces rigidly adhered to orders during the Gulf War in 1991, which U.S. officers later tried (without much success) to remedy by recommending decentralization of power in the Egyptian military to allow for greater levels of autonomy among the lower ranks. As mentioned above, Brooks (2006) has noted a significant improvement in

Egyptian military battlefield performance after this institution was depoliticized after the disastrous 1967 Six Day War, when Nasser and later Sadat reduced the political power of the military and divided its ranks. The importance of this observation is that the structure of civil-military relations can determine the level of military efficacy on the battlefield, which in turn may alter levels of perceived external threats.

Lastly, military service in authoritarian regimes is a form of public goods provision, or jobs creation akin to bureaucratic employment. Thus, a large military, as in the case of Egypt and Jordan, is not necessarily a response to external threats, but rather a public goods provision to ensure regime stability. Armies may be large in raw numbers, but this does not always imply a formidable fighting force, as Iraq's performance in the Gulf War of 1991 has demonstrated. Egypt's involvement in the milbus enterprise has further degraded its combat readiness and effectiveness (Brooks 1998, 50).

### **Sadat's economic neoliberalism**

The dangerous levels of tension between the military and the Sadat regime described in detail above are indicative of the necessity to continue to marginalize the military and replace it with a pervasive domestic security force loyal to the president. As mentioned above, this process occurred from 1967 until the mid-1970s. Not only was this security force used to check a weakened military, but also to break strikes, which were increasing in number with Sadat's neoliberal policies as Egypt transitioned away from Nasser's socialism. Sadat's answer to the economic decline, which began after 1967 and continued into the 1970s, was to implement the neoliberal policy of *infitah*, or economic openness, in 1974. Not only did *infitah* bring to an end most elements of socialism that had been implemented under Nasser, its speedy adoption also contributed to vast increases in economic inequality, bread riots, and increased labor strikes.

One prominent example includes the food riots occurring between January 18-19, 1977. This protest was the largest civil unrest since the 1952 coup, so extensive, in fact, that Sadat had to flee Cairo by helicopter for his own safety (Kandil 2012, 169). The combination of rapid implementation of neoliberalism, resulting bread riots, and overall opposition to Sadat's concentration of political power resulted in the 1981 "Autumn of Fury", where large numbers of Egyptians marched in street protests against these policies and the worsening economic situations (Brownlee 2012, 1). In the foreign policy realm, *infitah* was yet another signal to the United States that Sadat was eager to foster closer ties by rejecting socialism and adopting neoliberal economic policies.

The true nature of the *infitah* policy was to allow elites to enrich themselves while avoiding the industrialization of Egypt as a whole, which would have allowed a far greater share of the population to enjoy Egypt's economic growth. Kandil (2012, 161-162) describes the effect *infitah* had on the construction, business, and land speculation sectors of the Egyptian economy. The return on construction investment between 1970-1980 rose from 42.1% to 62.8%, while wholesale commerce rose from 43.6% to 75.4% over that same period. Whereas there were only a few dozen agents of foreign companies operating in Egypt in 1974, and that number had expanded to over 16,000 by 1981. In 1970 Egypt had no millionaires, but there were 17,000 by 1980, with 7,000 having achieved this distinction through land speculation alone. After the initiation of *infitah* in 1974, 53.5% of state-owned land on the Mediterranean Sea was transferred into private hands without any payments being made, analogous to practices of the Robber Barons in the Western U.S. in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. From the mid- 1970s onwards, building construction increased 107%, with over 90% consisting of the construction of luxury apartments, vacation homes, and villas. By 1987, the industrial sector comprised 19% of GDP, employing

14% of the labor force, while the non-industrial sector, comprised primarily of the construction and service sectors, made up 60% of Egypt's GDP and employed 53% of the labor force.

American public and private interests also greatly benefitted from infitah. Between 1974-1984, Egypt imported \$ 2.8 billion in American-made goods, which made up 33% of all imports.

Egypt exported a mere \$ 33 million to the United States, 85% of this being oil.

This economic arrangement led economist Mahmoud Abd al-Fadeel to compare Sadat's U.S.-sponsored deindustrialization of Egypt and its haphazard liberalization of certain sectors of the economy to the policies imposed by the European powers on Mohammad Ali's Egypt after his military defeat in 1840. As an illustration of how the Egyptian government willingly entrapped itself within a neoliberal capitalist system that relies heavily on the mechanism of debt to yield enormous profits for those in the developed world, the arrangement with the United States regarding military aid was seemingly a Faustian bargain for Egypt. Although Egypt fought five wars between 1955-1975, consuming \$ 2.2 billion in Soviet arms, \$ 500 million of which was in the form of aid, between 1975-1981, Egypt did not fight a single war, but accrued \$ 6.6 billion in debt to the United States, with \$ 650 million a year servicing this debt (Kandil 2012, 161-162).

Sadat continued to purge the military of disloyal officers throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, sometimes resulting in their mysterious deaths. On October 5, 1978, one day before the "victory" parade celebrating the Yom Kippur war, Defense Minister Gamasy and Chief of Staff Fahmy were purged, along with the replacement of the "entire leadership of the October War..." (Kandil 2012, 144). The next defense minister, Kamal Hassan Aly, whose job it was to keep the military out of politics, was replaced for advocating a strong military. The new defense minister, Ahmed Badawy, who had distinguished himself in the 1973 Yom Kippur War in his

defense of the canal, had run afoul of Sadat with an address to parliament where he implied any Middle Eastern powers who developed nuclear weapons (i.e., Israel) would force Egypt to balance against them, conflicting with Sadat's pledge not to pursue a nuclear weapons program. Badawy's helicopter crashed on March 2, 1981, killing him and "thirteen [other] senior commanders (nine major generals, three brigadier generals, and a colonel)", sparking widespread speculation that the crash was in fact an assassination of these officers by the regime (Kandil 2012, 144-146).

Between 1954-1974, thousands of officers were purged, with Nasser in the aftermath of the 1967 war having "decapitated" the military leadership. Although the military resisted Sadat's efforts to continue to sideline it as an institution, and adamantly opposed his throwing away a potential victory in 1973, the military was simply too weak to play an active political role. Its reputation had also been tarnished in the eyes of the public because of its defeat in 1973, despite Egypt's official claims of victory in the war (Kandil 2012, 148). Sadat's next move was to create a formidable security apparatus that would coup proof his regime by keeping the military and any potential challengers repressed.

### **Security forces**

Starting in the mid-1970s, Sadat began increasing the power of the interior ministers and the security forces to prevent the possibility of a military coup. As Quinlivan (1999) notes, regimes may be coup-proofed by appointing loyalists to prominent positions within the power structure, and creating parallel military forces and security agencies to counter the regular army. Sadat appointed al-Nabawi Ismail as head of the Interior Ministry, who had been an opponent of Naguib and was influential in the March 1954 movement against pro-democracy forces in Egypt. At Sadat's request and under Ismail's stewardship, the police forces increased their numbers in

1977 from 100,000 to 300,000, adding tear gas and armored vehicles to their inventories, which had previously consisted of truncheons and rifles (Kandil 2012, 168-170).

A description from a Colonel Mohammad Selim of the Egyptian military describes the shift in power from the military to the security forces:

We understood that the general strategy was to weaken the army and strengthen the police force. This began with Mamduh Salem in 1971, but it picked up only after al-Nabawi Ismail took over the Interior Ministry in 1977. We lived to see the day when the interior minister became the most powerful man in Egypt. We also followed how the CSF was being propped up to take over riot control. We were quickly becoming dispensable. And there was nothing we could do about it (Kandil 2012, 170).

Consistent with Egypt's importation of American products, the paramilitary Central Security Forces (CSF) in 1979 received implements of coercion from the United States in abundance, including 153,946 tear gas cannisters, 2,419 automatic weapons, and 328,000 rubber bullets (Kandil 2012, 170). The United States was now investing in the long-term survival of the Sadat regime.

### **Camp David and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty**

In 1977 Sadat decided to unilaterally travel to Jerusalem to deliver a speech proposing his desire to begin the peace process before the Knesset, and by 1979 77% of Egyptians approved of Sadat's attempts to forge peace with Israel (Brownlee 2012, 29). This move did, however, alienate Egypt's Arab allies, who adamantly opposed Israel's strongest adversary seeking unilateral peace talks. Consequently, some of these countries promptly froze relations with Egypt. Sadat responded by severing ties with Libya, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and South Yemen, demonstrating his resolve to achieve peace with Israel (Brownlee 2012, 28-29). Although his military advisers were skeptical, they cautiously went along with Sadat's proposal, which led to the Camp David Accords two years later.

The actual negotiations are described in detail by Jason Brownlee (2012), with Sadat's obsequiousness to U.S. preferences being quite apparent. Carter's use of the realities of the Cold War helped convince Sadat that a formal peace treaty with Israel would free up Egyptian troops based in the Canal zone and would eliminate the Soviet's playing one side off against the other as it had been doing for decades (Brownlee 2012, 32-33). Along with peace, Sadat was convinced he could gain an ally in the United States, seeking to recreate the experience of 1956 when Eisenhower had intervened on Egypt's behalf in opposition to Britain, France, and Israel. The proposed US arms sales to Egypt would be a boon to the Egyptian military, thus coup-proofing his regime into the future as long as the arrangement persisted. Sadat frustrated his advisors by essentially prostrating himself before Carter's proposals, unwilling to press for many concessions from the Israeli side. Alternatively, the Israelis had the luxury of citing the need to only make concessions that would be acceptable to the public. At one point, Sadat "stunned his delegation by saying he 'would sign anything proposed by President Carter without [even] reading it'" (Brownlee 2012, 33).

The significance of this chapter is that Egypt's authoritarianism made the peace treaty possible. Brownlee (2012, 37) notes that despite opposition among Sadat's advisors, an implausible 99.95% parliamentary vote ratified the peace treaty with Israel in April 1979, and foreign journalists witnessed the stuffing of ballot boxes. In the ensuing elections, candidates critical of the peace treaty were prevented from openly criticizing the treaty. Sadat's new National Democratic Party won 86.4% of the votes, with a mere 8.4% of contested seats going to opposition groups.

The Camp David Accords officialized the new U.S.-Egyptian military and security partnership. In addition to \$ 1.3 billion in annual military aid, which strengthened the Egyptian

military despite its reduction in manpower, joint military cooperation increased. The two countries engaged in joint military maneuvers, U.S. troops underwent desert warfare training in Egypt, and Mubarak's regime would be a key ally in the War on Terror. With the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, Egypt authorized twenty overflights of U.S. aircraft per day, cracked down on radical Islamic groups and detained suspected terrorists, and received suspected terrorists from the U.S. and other parts of the world as part of the "extraordinary renditions" program (Brownlee 2012, 8).

Sadat's achievements were indeed significant. Israel agreed to withdraw from the Sinai and Egypt won back territory lost in 1967. Sadat forged closer ties with the U.S., which after years of sequestration and loss of political power, was an enormous windfall for the military in terms of receipt of advanced military training and equipment. The political leadership simultaneously reduced the political influence of the military, with the leadership protected by the security apparatus long into Mubarak's tenure in office. However, according to the territorial peace theory, these developments resolved Egypt's territorial threats, and should have provided the opportunity for gradual democratization, yet this did not happen. The explanation as to why not involve the individual choices of the authoritarian leadership to maintain control, relying on decades of authoritarian institutions to protect their power within society. In addition, Egypt's regime was now useful to the United States, which wielded enormous influence over Egypt's political and military apparatus, reinforcing the authoritarian status quo. As will be explained below, when the Arab Spring threatened this with a grassroots democratic uprising, the U.S. backed the authoritarian regime to suit its own geopolitical interests. These are variables that the territorial peace does not consider in its calculus, but which are nonetheless quite significant.

## **Post-Peace Reallocation of Military to Civilian Sector**

After the 1979 peace treaty with Israel, the military was an institution with a diminished role. Both Nasser and Sadat, after recognizing the threat that the armed forces posed to their control over the country, had begun the process of the marginalization and depoliticization of the military, and in 1967 the military began to undertake distinctly civilian projects, from reclaiming desert lands to largescale construction projects. This process accelerated in 1980 under the defense minister Abu Gazal (1980-1989), where the military relied on its extensive contacts within the business community to begin mass producing civilian consumer goods. Instead of being a defeated institution and truly marginalized by the political and security apparatus, as was the goal of Nasser and Sadat, the military was simply seeking alternative (i.e., economic) means to remain an influential actor in Egyptian society. Because there was little role to play for a military lacking any credible security threat on its borders, as U.S. military aid “all but eliminated the threat of military defeat” from Libya (Brownlee 2012, 11), the military took on a dominant economic role instead (Abul-Magd 2017). This is consistent with Huntington’s (1991) observation that when the military is no longer tasked with serving as the role of defense of state against a clear external threat, it may take on additional roles, such as political involvement. Because the political leadership in Egypt from the end of Nasser’s rule through Mubarak had closed off the possibility of military involvement in politics, it found an economic niche with which the top military leadership benefitted financially from the milbus system, biding its time for a change in the status quo, which arrived with the Arab Spring movement. This allowed the military an opportunity to re-enter the political sphere, as will be discussed below. This relates to the territorial peace because it illustrates an important consideration that the theory does not consider: formal peace and the resolution of territorial threats within an authoritarian regime

presents an alternative path for the military to take, whether to remain focused on its traditional role of national security, to become more involved in national politics, or to find some alternative endeavor as happened in Egypt and as occurs in other countries. This presents a more complex situation instead of the one that territorial peace assumes: that peace makes democratization more likely.

Abul-Magd (2017) describes in detail how the military maintained a behind-the-scenes niche of authority by implementing a combination of mass surveillance of Egyptian society while dominating the construction and manufacturing sectors, made possible by the neoliberal policies of Sadat and Mubarak. Although clearly subordinate to the president, the military had essentially carved a niche for itself within the economic sphere and was biding its time for the right moment to resume political power (which would come after the Arab Spring in 2011). The armed forces had been greatly satisfied by the conditions of the Camp David agreements, with guarantees of \$ 1.3 billion annual U.S. military aid, thus allowing its modernization. One could therefore argue with this basic military need having been satisfied, and no security threats on its borders to contend with, the military's economic niche was immensely lucrative for high-ranking officers. There was no need for political dominance when the president was maintaining neoliberal policies that contributed to expanding the wealth of these officers. Such an arrangement of the dispensation of private goods by authoritarian leaders to key elites as a means of buying their support has been described by Bueno de Mesquita, Morrow, and Silverson (1999) and is clearly applicable to Egypt from 1979-2011.

The military's involvement in the economic sector is certainly not unique to Egypt, and is common among developing economies and those transitioning to market systems, as Abul-Magd (2017, 117) indicates. The phenomena has been termed "milbus", or the military-business

connection, which occurred after the International Monetary Fund and World Bank began encouraging fiscally conservative economic policies in transitioning economies. As a means of coup-proofing their regimes, leaders began hiding military expenditures in complex transactions within the budget (Abul-Magd 2017, 113-114).

After Sadat's assassination on October 6, 1981 by Islamic fundamentalists, Mubarak continued his predecessor's neoliberal policies and keeping the military satisfied, but under control. The Gulf War of 1991 provided an opportunity for Egypt's further role as regional proxy for the United States. In exchange for overflights of U.S. planes of Egyptian territory and Egyptian participation in the coalition to oust Iraqi forces from Kuwait, George H.W. Bush forgave approximately \$ 10 billion in Egyptian debt, half of its total debt owed. In return, Egypt adopted the Washington Consensus model, which was consistent with its neoliberal infitah policies, and joined the World Trade Organization in 1995 (Rutherford, 2008, 199).

The 1990s – 2000s saw further entrenchment of the milbus arrangement in Egypt. Starting in 1991 with the end of the Gulf War, the military gained even more control over the production of civilian goods, producing everything from luxury cars to durable goods to canned food. In addition, it began purchasing large tracts of land and constructing toll roads, establishing commercial farms, building housing for officers and soldiers, and operating river transport firms on the Nile. These military entrepreneurs became immensely wealthy, avoided taxation, and were unaccountable elites with extensive social contacts and influence, with the military holding a virtual monopoly on construction and the production of civilian goods (Abul-Magd 2017, 113).

Troops became a source of cheap, non-union labor, and were paid paltry wages. Punishments for soldiers who did strike fell under military jurisdiction, and in one example

where striking soldiers opposing working conditions resulted in their being charged with “exposing military secrets” and court-martialed (Abul-Magd 2017, 113-114, 134-135). According to Abul-Magd (2017, 155-156), these corrupt arrangements, which included inefficiency, major deterioration of public services, clientelism and cronyism, contributed to the further erosion of the economy and widened the social disparities already present in Egyptian society, and was a significant factor leading to the protests against the regime’s corruption during the Arab Spring in 2011.

### **Political Structure and the Muslim Brotherhood**

Maye Kassem (2004, 1-11) describes how Nasser instituted a personalized authoritarian structure, which then became neo-sultanistic under Sadat and Mubarak. She describes this type of regime as one in which the leader, or chief executive, is above the law and immune from any political restraints. He may alter his own power by enacting laws to suit his own political needs, thus making the regime extremely durable.

Power has been highly concentrated in the hands of the chief executive under all of Egypt’s presidents since the 1952 Free Officers Coup, and the legislature is merely a rubber stamp to formalize the laws desired by the president. Although nominally independent, the judiciary is severely constrained by the president, which not only appoints judges and public prosecutors, but also controls their salaries. Article 173 allows the chief executive to supervise affairs of judiciary organizations. For example, 63% of the 1971 constitution details the powers of the executive, the legislative 25%, the ministers and judiciary 7%, respectively. Article 112 empowers the president to promote and oppose laws. He may rule by decree (Article 147), declare a state of emergency (Article 148), appoint and dismiss the cabinet (Article 141), draft the state budget (Article 115), and craft the general policy of the state (Article 138). All of these

powers demonstrate the president's supremacy over the legislature and judiciary (Kassem 2004, 24-25).

A further illustration of the subordinate position of the legislature compared to the executive is that during the 1970-71 legislative session, only 8% of the bills that were passed were initiated by the legislature. Although Sadat implemented a weak multiparty system in 1976, by 1979, only 20% of the bills that were passed had originated in the legislature. During Mubarak's first legislative actions, the executive initiated 427 bills and international agreements, whereas only 27 came from the legislature. Although the 1984-87 period represented the pinnacle of Egyptian multiparty participation, 98.5% of all bills were initiated by the executive. To reverse this growing multipartism, Mubarak de-liberalized the political system from 1990-2000. As a result, by 1997 a full 100% of all bills were initiated by the executive. As further evidence of the legislature's subordination to the executive, during the 1996-97 parliamentary session, 250 of 454 members did not participate at all in the legislative process, and of those that did, 90% did so by giving speeches extolling the virtues of Mubarak (Kassem 2004, 23-24, 29-30, 35-36).

Sadat's token political liberalization provided limited opportunities for opposition groups to use the political process to gain parliamentary seats and to achieve a modicum of autonomy, but when these groups were perceived as having become too politically powerful, they were quickly suppressed. During the 1980s and 1990s, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) gained control of syndicates and other professional associations, and in the 2005 legislative elections, won 88 of 454 seats in Egypt's lower parliament (Cook 2007, 3). The Brotherhood criticized the disparity between what was allowed under the constitution, and what occurred in practice. It criticized the regime's close cooperation with the United States and Israel, arguing that the political-military

regime was remiss in its duties to protect Egypt, and saw the close integration between Egypt's military and the U.S. as a threat, which favored Israel at Egypt's expense. In 1987 the MB advocated an end to Egypt's Camp David obligations because of the Israeli response to the Intifada, and argued Israel was in violation of its own obligations under Camp David. As the military had done since 1952, the Brotherhood portrayed itself as the guardian of Egypt, looking out for the best interests of the state and its people (Cook 2007, 85-87).

The Brotherhood also advocated economic reforms, such as ending usurious policies, closing the wage-price gap, relying less on Western financial organizations and more on Islamic financial institutions. They also sought free and fair elections, direct election of the president, granting budgetary powers to the People's Assembly instead of the president, and a more equitable power balance between the president and legislature. In short, the Muslim Brotherhood was calling for greater democratic practices, which threatened the military-political elite (Cook 2007, 83-85). "As Supreme Guide Talmasani declared during the Ikhwan's [MB] efforts to secure legislative representation, 'We want more freedom to the point where a citizen can stand up and, without fear, tell the ruler, 'You have erred''" (Cook 2007, 83).

The regime under Sadat and Mubarak benefitted from granting some autonomy to the Brotherhood, which served as a release valve to reduce built-up tensions among the masses. Having denounced political violence in the 1970s, the MB was also useful to the regime in denouncing radical, and more violent, Islamic groups, such as al Jihad and Jama'a Islamiyya. Although the MB was using democratic mechanisms and advocating more democratic policies, they were tolerated as long as they did not threaten the political-military status quo (Cook 2007, 77-82).

A state of emergency has been in place since the 1981 assassination of Sadat and has been continuously renewed every three years under Mubarak. Although different from martial law, emergency powers allow the indefinite arrest and detention of people suspected of political crimes and of people congregating in groups of over five people. In addition, political activities may be censored, and no appeals process exists (Kassem 2004, 38).

The MB advocated an end to the regime's emergency powers, an independent judiciary, and the abolition of the Supreme State Security Court, and the Socialist Public Prosecutor, which had extra-judiciary powers and operated outside the realm of the written law. The Brotherhood argued that these laws fueled the fire for more radical Islamic groups to target the regime, as their political options were limited, making them think that violence was the only way to facilitate change. Repealing these laws and adhering to the rule of law would result in more peaceful societal conditions (Cook 2007, 85).

By 1992, terrorist attacks from groups like Jama'a Islamiyya were on the rise, and Mubarak realized the alliance with the MB had failed to stem the tide of more radical Islamists. The MB had managed to elect significant numbers of its members to the boards of prominent syndicates, such as the bar, doctor's, dentist's, and teacher's syndicates. In 1992 the MB had 14 of 25 seats in the bar association, a group which gave official sanction to the actions of the regime. The government therefore began a crackdown on the MB, arresting prominent leaders, closed loopholes by raising thresholds for elections to syndicate boards, and as Sadat had done in the 1970s, accused various syndicates of financial irregularities and on occasion even brought local elections to an end (Cook 2007, 89-91, Brooks 1998, 39).

This ended the Muslim Brotherhood's role in politics until its brief stint during Morsi's reign after the 2011 Arab Spring. As Cook argues, the Brotherhood's limited political role was

essentially a contest with the regime over Egypt's institutions, which were established by and for the authoritarian regime starting in 1952 onwards. These written and unwritten authoritarian rules and norms made chances of democratic penetration extremely difficult (Cook 2007, 134-135). As discussed below, Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) also discuss the significance of norms and institutions in the stability of regimes, echoing Cook's (2007) argument with regard to Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey.

To relate back to the territorial peace, as democratic elements appeared after the signing of the 1979 peace treaty, this should have continued unabated. However, in Egypt, the democratic groups threatened the political dominance of the authoritarian leadership, allowing the leadership to rely on established authoritarian institutions to reverse such democratic openings. Thus, merely resolving a territorial threat does not appear to affect the democratization process, at least in the case of Egypt. Another way to look at this is that the authoritarian regime was not in place as a response to territorial threats from Israel, but rather the leadership existed to maximize power for itself, regardless of the external military situation. Resolution of territorial threat had no impact on the authoritarian regime as far as Sadat and Mubarak were concerned; they sought to continue their power indefinitely, and their efforts to control the military, the legislature, and other civil societal groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood are evidence to support this assertion.

### **Civil Society**

As is the case in many authoritarian regimes, civil society in Egypt was institutionalized under executive control, and used by the chief executive to bestow public goods to gain support among the masses, while checking the power of economic elites. When any such groups began

gaining too much power for the chief executive's liking, a combination of legal mechanisms and state coercion were implemented to curtail this growth of power and influence.

By 1952, the year of the Free Officers' Coup, there were an estimated 500 trade unions consisting of 150,000 members. By 1958 in the early years of the Nasser era, there were 1,350 trade unions with over 430,000 members (Kassem 2004, 89-91). As part of Nasser's flirtation with socialism, a series of laws were enacted that greatly increased worker benefits, including increased sick days, paid holidays, and guaranteed state employment for all high school and university graduates. This increased Nasser's popularity among the masses and was designed to co-opt labor (Kassem 2004, 93). The establishment of the General Federation of Egyptian Trade Unions (GFETU) placed all labor unions under the control of one federation to ensure state control over these groups. In 1961, Nasser nationalized large numbers of commercial and manufacturing businesses to check the expanding financial power of the owners of these enterprises (Kassem 2004, 92-93). In addition, a law enacted in November 1963 required half of the legislature to be comprised of workers and peasants, and all candidates had to be Arab Socialist Union (ASU) members, a move that empowered the ASU to excluding any individual it chose from membership. Kassem (2004, 95) notes how Nasser's generous provision of public goods among the labor sector guaranteed its loyalty, removing any need to strike. In doing this, Nasser co-opted labor and a large segment of the mass public, buying their loyalty and preventing the creation of autonomous civil society organizations advocating change or opposition to the regime.

Sadat's experiences with labor would be far more tumultuous than his predecessor. After Sadat's implementation of *infitah* in 1974, income inequality in Egypt soared. Labor groups accused the regime of abandoning its unwritten bargain with workers that had been established

under Nasser, and sporadic strikes broke out throughout Egypt, which were brutally put down by the military and security forces (Kassem 2004, 100-102). As Kassem (2004, 102) notes, by 1981 most union representatives were in prison, although Sadat continued to bestow direct patronage to labor to bring the strikes to an end by raising salaries and pensions.

On paper, the number of civil society associations continued to expand under Mubarak, although in practice these groups remained as weak as they had under the previous two presidents. There were 23 trade union federations, 24 professional associations, 17 legal political parties, and 17,000 nongovernmental organizations that enjoyed state recognition (Kassem 2004, 104). Whereas benefits and salaries had increased under Nasser and, at times, under Sadat, Mubarak's embrace of neoliberal policies resulted in the reduction of these benefits, the ending of state subsidies, and ended the policy of guaranteed state employment for high school and college graduates. When met with strikes, the Mubarak regime would grant a modicum of concessions, but labor demands under Mubarak began surpassing the material and took on political elements (Kassem 2004, 109).

Although syndicates likewise increased in number during Nasser's presidency, they were expected to remain politically aloof. In 1952 only 9 syndicates existed in Egypt. This number expanded to 14 during the Nasser era. Syndicate membership increased from 179,838 in 1963 to 307,817 by 1971 (Kassem 2004, 96). When the Bar syndicate publicly supported a return to parliamentary politics in 1954, a law was quickly passed dissolving the syndicate (Kassem 2004, 97). After being reinstated years later, the Bar syndicate council was again dissolved after referring to Sadat as the "treasonist president" because of his signing of the peace deal with Israel in 1979, and its prominent leaders were tried in military courts and imprisoned (Kassem 2004,

104). Thus, these groups were securely under government control, allowed to exist as long as they remained subservient to the regime.

Mubarak's policies towards syndicates followed the same unwritten rule as those of his predecessors: stay out of politics and do not threaten the regime. A case in point came after the Cairo earthquake in 1992. Aid groups were quickly dispatched by the Muslim Brotherhood, resulting in the establishment of aid stations, medical assistance to survivors, and the provision of food and clothing. "While the Islamists worked round-the-clock, little to no response came from the government for at least thirty-six hours"(Kassem 2004, 113). Unsurprisingly, the public praised the rapid response of the Brotherhood and loudly condemned the lack of government response. To preempt any future such occurrences, the regime used its emergency law powers, in place since Sadat's 1981 assassination, to ban any non-governmental groups from participating in emergency relief; from then on, only government agencies were allowed to provide such assistance (Kassem 2004, 114).

### **External Great Powers and Democratization**

Levitsky and Way (2010) describe ways in which authoritarian regimes can be undermined and replaced with democratic ones. One important element in achieving this end is Western leverage, defined as a country's "vulnerability to external democratizing pressure" (Levitsky and Way 2010, 40). Thus, according to these scholars, if a country is vulnerable to Western action intended to punish a regime for certain undemocratic behavior (such as the threat or imposition of economic sanctions), and that regime has little bargaining power with the West, leverage is high. However, they also mention that autocratic states serving strategic Western interests possess the bargaining power to withstand Western efforts at democratization, citing Egypt as one specific example (41). Oftentimes, with respect to such regimes allied to the West,

or otherwise serving geostrategic purposes, such pressures to democratize are virtually absent. Thus, Western democracies may greatly assist efforts towards democratization, as in Ukraine in 2005 and 2014, or they may hinder such efforts when they occur, as in Egypt and Bahrain during the Arab Spring in 2011. In each case, the push for or abstention against democracy in such countries appears more about realist power calculations rather than the promotion of altruistic Western political norms.

Brownlee (2012) details the U.S. political-military relationship with Egypt under Sadat and Mubarak, which took shape as a consequence of the Camp David Accords and resulting peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Because of the extensive military, economic, and political support provided by the United States, it assumed a role in Egyptian politics more akin to a domestic political actor instead of a detached foreign power (Brownlee 2012, 10). Two significant events in 1979 helped to shape the U.S.-Egyptian partnership: the signing of the peace treaty with Israel, and the Iranian Revolution. As discussed above, the peace treaty officially put an end to the threat of war between Israel and Egypt, with US military aid to Egypt and Israel an incentive for both sides to keep the peace. Not only did this aid modernize the Egyptian military, a goal Egypt had been trying to achieve over the previous several decades by seeking arms deals from both the Soviet Union and the United States, but it also was a form of patronage bestowed to the Egyptian military, helping to “coup-proof” the Sadat and Mubarak regimes from the military. The arrangement continued and intensified under Mubarak, with Egyptian cooperation increasing in response to major regional crises, such as the 1991 Gulf War and the War of Terror from 2001 onwards. In addition to the receipt of American military largesse, the milbus system provided additional lucrative benefits to high-ranking generals and officers under Mubarak, with Abul-Magd (2017) referring to Egypt as a “republic of retired generals” (153).

The U.S. granting of U.S. military aid as an incentive to maintain peace with Israel also extended to Jordan, which was designated a “major non-NATO ally” by the United States, a designation enjoyed by Israel, South Korea, Australia, Egypt, and Japan (Brooks 1998, 31). The Jordanian military buys U.S. military equipment and undergoes joint training exercises with American forces, which helps to instill pro-Western sentiments among the Jordanian military. By 1997, 25% of Jordanian males were enlisted in the military, despite a formal peace treaty with Israel (Brooks 1997). Groups opposed to this relationship in Jordan include the Muslim Brotherhood, and members of the mass public, whose hopes for a peace dividend after the 1994 treaty with Israel have so far gone unrealized because of this clientelistic relationship between the American and Jordanian militaries. Furthermore, Brooks (1998, 70, 72) notes how Jordan’s King Hussein had to delay implementing democratic reforms in the 1990s because of popular and political opposition to the peace treaty with Israel. As with Egypt, democratic openings run the risk of allowing groups opposed to the Jordanian-U.S. relationship and the Jordan-Israeli peace treaty to gaining political influence that may undermine both.

These findings provide another alternative to territorial peace explanations as to why peace does not necessarily result in reduced army size; for reasons having to do with big business and autocrats maintaining large militaries as a form of coup-proofing, external peace may simply force militaries to find alternate rationales to maintain large budgets and sizes, as any bureaucracy tries to do. As a case in point, “Egypt’s armed forces have numbered some 450,000 since the mid-1970s, despite the country’s peace treaty with Israel” (Brooks 1998, 44).

With the change of regime brought about by the 1979 Revolution, Iran immediately ceased being a major U.S. ally in the Middle East and became a primary threat. Fears that Iran would export its revolutionary ideas across the region spurred U.S. policymakers to quickly seek

a replacement, a role Sadat was all-too-eager to play. Thus, the altered political landscape of the Middle East allowed for the acquisition of new partners, and Washington's remaining on friendly terms with Egypt, which controlled the vital Suez Canal, was crucial to ensure the uninterrupted flow of oil from the Persian Gulf.

Any notions of democratization from below would imperil this strategic arrangement with the United States, as was demonstrated by the Palestinian Authority's elections in January 2006. Although recognized as being free and fair by international monitors, Hamas's victory was displeasing to the United States and Israel, and the Bush administration dismissed the democratic election results, arguing that the new Palestinian government was illegitimate because it consisted of armed terrorist groups that called for the destruction of Israel (Brownlee 2012, 99-100).

American geostrategic interests would again trump grassroots democratic protests in February 2011 in Bahrain, home of the U.S. Fifth Fleet in the Persian Gulf. Because King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa was a U.S. ally, the implementation of democracy could have threatened the ability of the United States to maintain its naval base in the country, so it ignored the use of lethal force from another regional ally, Saudi Arabia, in crushing this Bahraini democratic movement (*New York Times* February 17, 2011).

Brownlee (2012) argues that the refusal of the United States to pressure the Mubarak regime to democratize and to support the grassroots pro-democracy demonstrations allowed the continuation of Egyptian authoritarianism. States whose militaries do not play political roles and do not serve strategic interests of the United States, according to Brownlee, are more likely to democratize, as the successful push for democratization in Tunisia illustrates. Tunisia did not

play a vital strategic role for the United States, and its military was not politically active (Brownlee 2012, 155).

### **The Arab Spring: The Military Seizes an Opportunity to Re-Enter Politics**

Although it has been described above why the push for democratization from below failed during the Arab Spring, the completion of this chapter requires a brief examination of the military's role in seizing power, opting to eventually jettison its support for Mubarak while seizing its opportunity for political domination in 2011, an opportunity it had been denied for six decades.

As the protests in Tahrir square grew to the hundreds of thousands, the military considered its options. As the generals and security apparatus realized in 1952 when the initial possibilities about which groups would hold power were being considered, those groups with significant financial and political stakes realized that democracy would place limits on these privileges, subjecting them to public scrutiny at best and requiring actual competition and redistribution of these benefits to a larger share of the population at worst. Estimates of the military's share of the Egyptian economy ranged from five to forty-five percent (Fadel 2011), with the higher estimates likely more accurate. The mass public movement from below provided the military the perfect opportunity to abandon its support for the aging autocrat Mubarak, while winning support from the new, albeit temporary, political actor – the people. Although the security forces that had been built by Sadat and maintained by Mubarak killed hundreds and injured thousands of Egyptians in its attempts to maintain the Mubarak presidency, the military did not become involved at that time. In signaling its refusal to use force against the protestors, the military determined Mubarak's reign was over, and he resigned on February 11, 2011, handing over power to SCAF.

This was but the first phase of the military's careful calculus of easing back into power. Mohammad Tantawi became the de facto head of state, declaring the suspension of the constitution and dissolution of parliament while the military ruled for six months, ostensibly to ensure a smooth transition to civilian government. By November 2011, as pressure mounted from the people for the military to hasten its transition to civilian rule, it began using force, resulting in outright clashes between the military and the people and dozens of injuries and deaths. In June 2012 Muslim Brotherhood candidate Mohammad Morsi won the elections and became Egypt's first democratically-elected president.

Two issues are significant with respect to this brief flirtation with democracy. The first involves the peace treaty with Israel, which had become increasingly unpopular over time among the majority of the Egyptian population. Although realizing majority popular support when it was negotiated by Sadat in 1979, as described above, many Egyptians became disheartened by Egypt's new role as American proxy in the Middle East under Mubarak, including his deference to Israel (Brownlee 2012). A Pew Research poll conducted in May 2011 found that 54% of Egyptians thought their country should annul its peace agreement with Israel. Support for annulment was slightly higher among low income groups, with 60% in favor, while only 45% of those with higher incomes in favor of annulment. Education levels were also significant, with 59% of those with a primary education or less in favor of annulment of the treaty, while 40% of those with a college degree or higher favored its annulment. The same poll revealed that only 20% of Egyptians held favorable views of the United States (Pew Research, 2011). This finding is contrary to the territorial peace, as it argues that democracy should result after the resolution of territorial threats. Not only did this not happen, but the authoritarian regime consolidated its hold on power. Democracy itself could likely have reversed the peace treaty.

The second issue of significance with Egypt's potential move in a democratic direction involves American geostrategic calculations. American ties to the Egyptian military have been robust since 1979, with significant U.S. investment having gone into the understanding that Egypt would serve as a status quo ally in the Middle East. Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018, 205) also note how post-Cold War U.S. policy generally encouraged democratization around the world until the end of the Obama administration, albeit with exceptions - when U.S. geopolitical interests were at stake, as in Russia, China, and the Middle East.

Although speaking the rhetoric of global democratization, when one compares the historical record of how vigorously the United States pushes for democracy against geostrategic considerations, one sees a clear pattern involving the prioritizing of strategic interests over democratization, unless the two are compatible. For example, the U.S. supported democratization in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s, in the 2003 Rose Revolution in Georgia, the Orange Revolution in Ukraine in 2004-2005 and again in 2013, and the Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan in 2005 – all of which involved geostrategic power calculations with Russia. The United States mounted invasions of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003 to topple unfriendly regimes and to attempt to install democratic regimes, among other goals. It participated in UN-sanctioned and NATO-led establishment of a no-fly zone over Gadhafi's Libya in 2011, and officially declared that Bashar al-Assad must step down from power in Syria, commencing air operations in that country from August 2014 to present. Alternatively, U.S. support for democratization was muted in the Palestinian elections in 2006, and in Egypt and Bahrain in 2011. During the Cold War, U.S. outright opposition to democratically-elected regimes is also well-documented, with a few of the most notable examples being the CIA-sponsored coups against Mohammad Mossadegh in Iran in 1953 and

Arbenz in Guatemala in 1954; support of coups that bring authoritarian rulers to power, as with Suharto's coup in 1967; or support of coups which topple democratic regimes, as with the military coup by Augusto Pinochet in Chile on September 11, 1973. In all cases, there is one underlying factor: realist geostrategic calculation.

Similar to the opposition of the Bush administration to Hamas's political victory in the elections of the Palestinian Authority in 2006, the Obama administration was similarly lukewarm to the possibility of the ouster of an American ally in the Middle East, in no small measure because of the possibility of Islamists replacing him. Egyptian protestors were quite aware that the tear gas cannisters, which were one means of repression used against them by Mubarak's security forces, had been manufactured in the United States, as they were clearly labeled (Smith 2011). The support or opposition of a great power for the democratization in a country is an important factor in its success or failure, a finding receiving considerable support from numerous scholars (Skocpol 1979, Kassem 2004, Levitsky and Way 2010, Brownlee 2012, Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018).

Initially, Morsi appeared to be reversing the role of the military in politics, forcing the retirement of several cabinet-level ministers and high-ranking officers, including the Defense Minister, and commanders of the Navy, Air Force, and Air Defense (Hessler 2017). He appointed Mubarak's director of military intelligence, General Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, to the position of Minister of Defense.

Morsi's first year of rule was generally supported by Islamists, but opposed by large segments of the population, including the police and opposition members, such as Mohammad ElBaradei, former head of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Large street protests resumed to oppose Morsi. These protests were a culmination of Morsi's unpopular accumulation

of power that granted the president extrajudicial powers as the new constitution was being discussed, which was very popular with Islamists, but far less so with liberal-minded reformers.

On July 3, 2013, Morsi was ousted in a coup. On March 26, 2014, General al-Sisi, the product of Egyptian-American military cooperation (Sisi had received instruction at the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania), resigned from the military and announced he would run for the vacant presidency in the upcoming May elections. His victory returned Egyptian rule to a former military officer, which had been the practice since the 1952 Free Officer's Coup.

Under al-Sisi, the military is the actual behind-the-scenes ruler of Egypt, having built up a formidable economic power base after having been marginalized by Sadat, and continued building this base under Mubarak's neoliberalism via its milbus system. The story of Egyptian politics since 1952 is one of competing power centers, consisting of the political leadership, the military, and the security apparatus. Over the past six decades, a tug-of-war between these three dominant groups has persisted, with the political leadership coming from the military sector and co-opting the security apparatus to check the military, which tried unsuccessfully to reassert power under Nasser in 1967 and Sadat in 1970, before being outmaneuvered and weakened each time. Ironically, it was the close military cooperation with the United States achieved under Sadat and the neoliberalism of Sadat and Mubarak that increased the military's power. The former provided the military with state-of-the-art military equipment, which increased its formidability while simultaneously allowing it to decrease its overall levels of manpower, while the latter made the milbus arrangement possible, which was a patronage network to high-level officers, tying in their own personal fortunes to the fate of the regime. After these arrangements became institutionalized, the military had accumulated enough power and popular support to

where it was no longer reliant on presidential patronage, and it moved to capture the presidency, thus ensuring its position of dominance remained unchallenged. Maye Kassem (2004) correctly cast skepticism over the possibility of future Egyptian democracy considering the authoritarian institutions constructed over decades that fostered Nasser's personal authoritarian rule and then its transition into a neo-sultanistic arrangement under Sadat and Mubarak.

### **Conclusion: Applying the Territorial Peace to Egypt**

The above Egyptian case study demonstrates how the territorial peace theory does not consider important variables that influence regime type, and in so doing does not provide a valid account of the effect of threat on regime type. In sum, Egypt's authoritarian regimes were not responses to territorial or security threats, but rather resulted from domestic power struggles among various leaders, between the political leadership and the military, and later reinforced by external great power pressures. One critique of the territorial peace theory is that it omits a description of the process of democratization after the resolution of territorial threats. The Egypt case study demonstrated that the authoritarian regime continued unabated after the 1979 peace treaty, which resolved Egypt's territorial threats.

Despite the territorial threat posed by Israel, Egypt felt secure enough to become involved in a war in Yemen in 1962, which drained the military of much-needed manpower, equipment, and finances. Were the Israeli military threat significant enough to result in the creation of an Egyptian garrison state, complete with fortified borders and total political and social militarization, involving troops in a distant war would have been unthinkable, as those military forces would have been desperately needed to secure the nation. On the contrary, the military itself posed a direct threat to Nasser and Sadat's leadership, far more so than did any Israeli threat. Sadat's decision in the immediate aftermath of the 1973 war to reduce military

expenditures and troop levels – while its primary security threat continued to occupy Egyptian territory- was also in direct contradiction to the territorial peace.

Furthermore, authoritarianism made the peace treaty with Israel possible, and democracy threatens to end the treaty. Sadat was able to make unilateral concessions to the Israelis and the United States at Camp David, despite strong objections from his military and political advisors, while the Israelis could cite public opposition as a reason not to make various concessions. Although a majority of Egyptians supported Sadat's peace mission with Israel in 1979, today that support has eroded. With Egypt's role as regional gendarme of the United States, a role it played well from the Persian Gulf War in 1991 through the U.S.-led War on Terror, Egyptian public opinion grew weary of its leaders agreeing to serve the interests of the United States and Israel. The Pew Research poll cited above is indicative of this weariness, and illustrates the risks that democratization poses to the role of Egypt as regional security guarantor as well as continued peace with Israel.

This finding also casts doubt on the universal applicability of the democratic peace as well: democracy in Israel, the Palestinian authority, Jordan, and/or Egypt would be unlikely to resolve the animosity between those groups. Rather, leaders would likely have to respond to popular demands to behave harshly towards perceived enemies, leading to escalated chances of conflict. Although further research would have to be conducted on this, this case study reveals little evidence to support the view that democratic elections would result in more peaceful relations between Israel and its neighbors. As was mentioned above, King Hussein delayed the implementation of democratic openings in Jordan for fears of reversing the peace treaty with Israel.

The role of external great powers in this case is also significant. As has been mentioned, U.S.-Egyptian relations greatly improved after the 1979 peace treaty with Israel, and lucrative military deals and aid from the U.S. to Egypt greatly improved the technological sophistication of the Egyptian military. The authoritarian regime under Mubarak served U.S. interests in the region, and when democratic elements threatened this regime, the Obama administration continued supporting the authoritarian regime, contrary to U.S. pro-democratic rhetoric. The role of external great powers lending support to a regime illustrates unaccounted for variables in the territorial peace theory, which significantly alter key assumptions of that theory.

As the case study illustrates, democratization is a complex process, reliant of a mix of unique variables interacting at specific times. The only elements of democracy were evidenced in small part by certain segments of the military during the 1952 coup, which may not have resulted in a long-term democracy, and was present again among grassroots groups during the Arab Spring. This grassroots movement was suppressed by the security apparatus with the use of US aid and was not embraced by the United States because of Egypt's strategic role in the region. After the peace treaty, few democratic openings occurred in practice within Egypt, save for sporadic efforts by the Muslim Brotherhood to place some constraints on the authoritarian leadership. This fundamental lack of efforts among domestic groups to democratize is contrary to the expectations of the territorial peace. The authoritarian institutions continued to evolve to repress democratic openings and civil societal groups. The key players consisted of the political leadership, the security services, and the military, and was reinforced by the role of US support.

A few questions, however, remain, along with the possibility of future research. Had the military governed Egypt, perhaps it would have behaved more in line with the territorial peace? A military regime may have cited the Israeli security threat as continued justification for large

military budgets, centralized political power, and the refusal to democratize – a situation that the South Korean case study which follows appears to bear out. Although the Egyptian army approved of the peace treaty, it was a recipient of generous amounts of high-tech U.S. military equipment that came as a stipulation of the peace treaty, and thus the military was not a significant political actor at that point (Brownlee 2012, 35). Thus, perhaps the Territorial Peace is more applicable to specific authoritarian regime types (such as s military dictatorships) than others?

This case study demonstrates the difficulty of applying systemic theories such as the territorial peace to complex processes like democratization. In this example, the resolution of territorial threats was neither necessary, nor sufficient to facilitate democracy. However, perhaps the theory is more applicable to certain regime types, such as military regimes or ethnocratic states? This will be addressed in the theory chapter, and future research will also be suggested based on the findings from the case studies.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **SOUTH KOREA**

This case study will illustrate a main argument of this dissertation: that territorial peace identifies important elements which can shape regime type, but that other key factors are ignored and omitted from consideration in the theory, variables which have a very significant role in influencing regime type. In this case study, territorial peace theory accurately predicts the establishment of a highly centralized political and security apparatus in response to territorial /security threats, as well as justification for authoritarian groups to monopolize political power, with their legitimacy derived in large part as a response to this threat. These authoritarian groups control the military and security apparatus, which may be used to suppress domestic opposition when the dominant power structure is challenged. In some cases, a garrison state may be established, as was the case in South Korea in the early 1970s.

However, security/territorial threat is not the sole factor in shaping regime type. Ethnic nationalism plays an important role in fostering not only electoral democracy for the dominant group or depriving the minority group from participation in politics (as demonstrated in the Israeli case study), but can also contribute to a reduction in threat perception when shared ethnicities exist in neighboring states, as will be demonstrated in the case studies on South and North Korea. As has been shown in the Egyptian case study, the role of external great powers is important in supporting regimes, making them more able to resist internal challenges. These powers may pressure an authoritarian regime to democratize, they may reinforce an authoritarian

regime, or do both at different times depending on geostrategic realities and goals. Cultural and economic variables are also significant. As will be demonstrated in this case study, widespread economic development, including investment in human capital and the cultivation of a sizeable middle class, helped facilitate bottom-up democratization, as student and labor groups backed by majorities within the middle class supported democratic opposition candidates and pressured the authoritarian regime to liberalize and democratize. Popular or cultural attitudes for or against democratization, the presence and strength of civil society groups willing to agitate for democratization were also significant. Therefore, the South Korean authoritarian regime lost legitimacy because of political, economic, and cultural changes, which ushered in a democratic regime despite an existential territorial threat. Contrary to territorial peace, the democratic regime greatly improved relations with North Korea while simultaneously distancing itself from its American ally, although remaining careful not to sever the alliance completely.

South Korea entered the international system as an authoritarian regime, but despite a persistent security threat on its only border, democratized in 1987. Although South Korea benefitted significantly from U.S. military protection, the consensus among its population and its democratic reformers was that this alliance reinforced the authoritarian regime; if South Korea was to democratize, it would have to adopt a role as more of an equal partner in its relationship with the U.S. South Korea experienced various autocratic governments since becoming a state in 1948 until 1987, the year it officially democratized. Its only experience with democracy prior to 1987 was a nine-month period during the Second Republic under Prime Minister Chang Myon, from 1960-1961, which ended in a military coup. There were two major efforts towards bottom-up democratization in South Korea. The first was in 1980 and proved unsuccessful. The second, successful effort occurred in the mid-1980s. This case study will identify the factors that

supported the authoritarian and democratic regimes within the context of the territorial peace theory in an attempt to identify reinforcing factors for each regime type.

### **Syngman Rhee and Authoritarian Rule**

Japan occupied and administered Korea from 1910-1945. After Japan's surrender in 1945, Korea was divided along the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel and separated into U.S. and Soviet spheres of control. As Hastings (1987) describes, the U.S. military occupied the region south of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel, with the State Department favoring a trusteeship plan with the USSR gradually to withdraw their respective forces and allow the Koreans to determine their own government. The U.S. military, headed by General John R. Hodge, lacked an understanding of Korean history, language, and culture, and perceived the situation in Korea within the context of containing Communism, as in the late 1940s the Cold War was beginning to take shape (Hastings 1987). The U.S. military administration in the south began grooming right-wing Korean politicians for future leadership positions and selecting them for governing councils. The U.S. also established the National Police force for the Republic of Korea (ROK), in which 53% of the officers and 25% of the rank-and-file had been trained by the Japanese, who had been very brutal in their methods, including use of torture (38). Likewise, the U.S. created the constabulary forces, which would later become the South Korean military, and allowed only enlistees who had not been Japanese prisoners. This prevented Korean nationalists from serving and encouraged the participation of Koreans who had collaborated with the Japanese to enlist.

Along with establishing what would become a brutal coercive apparatus for domestic and national defense, the U.S. military favored Syngman Rhee, who was not only a staunch anti-Communist, but had lived for decades in the United States, and was able to curry favor with Americans because he spoke English and understood American culture. Just as the Soviets were

intent on establishing a Communist leadership north of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, so too was the United States checking Communism south of it.

In November 1947, the United Nations General Assembly approved a plan to supervise elections for a unified Korean government, after which all foreign military forces would withdraw. The Soviets and North Koreans rejected UN oversight of elections and boycotted them. Syngman Rhee favored moving ahead with elections, despite protest from nearly all opposition parties, who argued that holding elections while Communists were boycotting them would undermine chances for Korean unity. After the UN Interim Committee decided that elections would proceed, widespread repression began in the south to terrorize not only Communists, but any group opposed to the political right. During the six weeks leading up to the elections, 589 Koreans were killed and over 10,000 processed at police stations (Hastings 1987, 41).

The UN determined the election, in which 95% of eligible voters in South Korea participated, to have been a “valid expression of the free will of the people”, with right-wing groups gaining a majority in the government (Hastings 1987, 41). On July 24, 1948, Syngman Rhee became South Korea’s first president, and immediately began establishing a dictatorship. Ministers acting contrary to Rhee’s wishes were fired, restrictions were imposed on the press, and Rhee assumed personal control of the police and military. Police arrested 89,710 people between September 1948 and April 1949. Rhee’s most outspoken political rival, Kim Ku, was assassinated at Rhee’s request in June 1949. The military was also combating Communist guerillas in the mountains, which it eventually succeeded in defeating. It is within this context that the last U.S. military forces withdrew from South Korea, despite Rhee’s request for them to remain. From the American perspective, because Soviet forces had likewise withdrawn from

North Korea, also known as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), there existed no reason for the continued presence of U.S. troops in the South (Hastings 1987, 42, 46-47).

Despite a democratic South Korean constitution at independence, Rhee rapidly began establishing a brutal authoritarian regime. According to Diamond, Linz, and Lipset (1989, 268-270), Rhee managed to consolidate his political power because of the presence of a centralized police force under political control, a culture of obedience to authority and to the state, the presence of an internal and external Communist threat, and the absence of coordinated civil societal groups. Under Rhee, political opponents were repressed, elections rigged, and the constitution was amended to expand his dictatorial control over the state. Yet, despite Rhee's authoritarian policies, important changes were occurring within South Korea during this time. Although democratic norms within the country were minimal, after the end of the Korean War in 1953 urbanization proceeded rapidly, along with universal education. The urban and semi-urban regions of the country were highly literate, and this increase in education led to growing calls for free and fair elections among the population. By the mid-1950s, political attitudes polarized between the pro-government Liberal Party, and the anti-government Democratic Party. This polarization along pro- and anti-democratic lines is contrary to the territorial peace, which predicts a decrease in political polarization during an existential territorial threat.

Prominent democratization scholars argue that South Korean authoritarianism was not consolidated until the 1970s, with democratic elements still present during the 1960s (Diamond, Linz, and Lipset 1989, 275). The authoritarian Rhee regime collapsed because of widespread student protests against election fraud in March 1960, where prime minister Chang Myon replaced Rhee, ushering in the Second Republic. Although this period was democratic, it lasted only nine months, as mentioned above. South Korea was polarized socially and politically

between the right and left, with the latter favoring harsh punishment of officials in the Rhee regime that had committed human rights abuses. However, Myon's commitment to due process and liberal democracy resulted in inconsistent punishments of these officials, alienating both the left and right. In short, because of serious social polarization, compromise was impossible; a faction from either the left or right was required to rule at the cost of complete suppression of the other. As will be discussed later, after democratization in 1987 a push for national reconciliation developed among many democratic reformers and nationalists. During the brief democratic Second Republic, radical groups also sought reunification with the North (Lee 2007, 483).

Despite the July 1960 election having been the most democratic to that point, the social and culturally conservative attitudes among urban and rural voters strongly opposed leftist parties, leading to right-wing parties in parliament that supported the military and business interests. The military began suppressing leftist groups, and ultimately toppled the Myon government in a May 1961 coup, with Major General Park Chung Hee taking power. The primary reasons for the coup included Myon's inability to defend the country from internal and external Communist threats, its inability to achieve widespread economic growth, and its corruption. Although Rhee had maintained strict control over the military, with it being subservient to the political structure, Park's military became directly involved in politics, establishing an authoritarian military regime (Diamond, Linz, and Lipset 1989, 270-273, 281-282).

Although Park purged rival military officers, banned over 4,000 opponents from the Myon regime from political participation, and created a new constitution to expand executive powers and weaken the legislature, the elections of 1963 and 1967 were "reasonably" fair, with either side standing an equal chance to win. Some scholars argue that Park's 1963 electoral

victory actually preserved democracy, noting that the military would have assumed control had Park lost, destroying the constitution. During the 1960s, South Korea still had a relatively free press, the opposition had relative freedom to organize and participate in elections, and the people enjoyed freedom of speech (Diamond, Linz, and Lipset 1989, 274-275).

The most repressive elements of the Park regime did not appear until 1972 with the Yushin reforms, which were a response to growing student protests opposing the repressive nature of the military regime along with its foreign and economic policies, which they felt were “reactionary”. Yushin, meaning “revitalizing reforms”, occurred between 1973-1979 and included amending the constitution to extend a third term to the presidency. This was necessary because of the close elections in 1963 and 1967, and Park felt that outright election tampering would spark major protests and further delegitimize his regime. The Yushin period was characterized by a highly centralized political structure and the establishment of a garrison state, thus consolidating South Korean authoritarianism (Diamond, Linz, and Lipset 1989; Kim and Vogel, 2011).

During the Yushin era, Park suppressed South Koreans’ efforts to promote unification with the North, resulting in increased North Korean guerilla operations against the South (Kim 2014). Although these steps appear to be consistent with the territorial peace, they also reflect the desire of Park to consolidate control to prolong his leadership position, as democratic elections posed a threat. Kim (2014, 37) argues that both Kim Il Sung in the North and Park in the South relied on bilateral dialogue to reinforce their respective holds on power. According to this argument, the end goal was the continuation of elite political control rather than securing borders. Park certainly used the perceived territorial threat from the North to reinforce his own hold on power. In this situation, a security threat provides justification for a regime to refuse to

democratize and for the current leadership to remain in power indefinitely, ostensibly to deal with the threat.

With the implementation of the Nixon Doctrine in 1969, Park began a nuclear weapons program after the United States established plans for a complete troop withdrawal from South Korea within five years. To back up its claim, the U.S. reduced troop levels in that country in 1971 from 61,000 to 40,000. This reduction in American support occurred amid an increased threat from North Korea. In the late 1960s, North Korea had increased a series of belligerent actions, including shooting down a U.S. EC-121 intelligence plane, detaining the crew of the USS Pueblo, and staging a commando raid on South Korea's Blue House, which is South Korea's equivalent of the U.S. White House. Estimates of North Korean conventional military strength were three times that of South Korea's. The Park regime thus began a nuclear weapons program and a surface-to-surface ballistic missile program amid these developments. Park began pursuing a policy of self-reliance, where South Korea would be responsible for its own security. In line with the territorial peace, Kim (2001, 57) notes that Park opposed political liberalization because of the security threat South Korea faced, and that authoritarianism under Park increased after the partial U.S. troop withdrawal.

As South Korea sought assistance from France, Canada, India, and other countries in developing its nuclear weapons program, U.S. policy opposed nuclear proliferation in East Asia, and pressured those states to end nuclear cooperation with South Korea. In addition, the U.S. reduced military aid to South Korea in 1976 by one-half (Kim 2001, 64). Carter pledged that same year to withdraw all U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea within five years. South Korea lacked the infrastructure to maintain its nuclear program without outside assistance, but continued development of its surface-to-surface missile program.

North Korea's economic decline during the 1970s reduced the degree of threat perceived by the South, and Park's 1979 assassination effectively ended its nuclear program, as his replacement, President Chun, sought closer U.S. relations to bolster his sagging legitimacy. Chun ended South Korea's policy of self-reliance for defense, and after Chun ended South Korea's nuclear program the U.S. renewed close military cooperation. As a consequence of renewed U.S. defense commitments, South Korea reduced its defense budget from 4% to 1.3% of GDP, and the Reagan administration supplied the country with high-tech military technology, bolstering its security (Kim 2001).

This demonstrates how security fears increased the level of authoritarianism in South Korea, and led to the implementation of a nuclear weapons program, which is consistent with the territorial peace. The renewed U.S. security umbrella reintroduced leverage that was used to urge democratization in the late 1980s by the Reagan administration, as (Fowler 1999) describes below.

The United States played a role in establishing and supporting South Korea's authoritarian regime and its move towards democracy. This is consistent with arguments made by Levitsky and Way (2010), and Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018), regarding the role of great external powers in the maintenance or alteration of a country's regime type. In the Egyptian case study, the U.S. role in supporting that country's authoritarian regime during the Arab Spring was demonstrated, which helped to blunt democratization from below.

As mentioned above, as the North Korean economy stagnated in the late 1970s, groups within the ROK's democratic opposition, particularly students, grew cynical of the regime's referencing the Communist threat as justification for its authoritarian policies. Park was assassinated in October 1979 by the head of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency because of

Park's plans to use the military to violently repress student protests, which were increasing in frequency in response to his growing authoritarianism. He was replaced by Chun Do Hwan, who continued Park's authoritarianism. However, two major pushes for democratization from below occurred during the Chun regime, one in 1980 and the other in 1987.

Fowler (1999) argues that of the two periods of emerging democratization in South Korea, it was U.S. support for the regime in 1980 and U.S. pressure against it in 1986-87 that helped foster democratization. Fowler applies a geopolitical argument to explain contradictory U.S. policy during these two periods. In 1979, as opposition to the Park regime became more overt, regime soft-liners and hard-liners adopted different strategies. The government became more permissive of popular dissent and protest as the economy entered recession, releasing over 1,000 political prisoners. Regime hardliners then reversed course in August 1979, arresting members of the New Democratic Party (NDP) opposition, raiding NDP headquarters, and closing opposition newspapers. Opposition leader Kim Young-Sam was expelled from the National Assembly, and in resulting protests, five students were killed and over 500 arrested (Fowler 1999). Park ordered the declaration of martial law in the cities of Pusan and Masan, and, as mentioned above, was assassinated in October 1979 by his intelligence chief, ostensibly to prevent a larger crackdown on civilians. The martial law military commander, General Chung, had noted that over ten thousand South Koreans would be killed in a North Korean attack, and he would prefer to crack down on one thousand protestors, who were inviting attack from the North (Fowler 1999, 267-268).

The Chun Do Hwan government undertook steps of token liberalization, including the release or reduction of sentences of 1,722 political prisoners in December 1979, reduced press censorship, and restored the political rights of opposition leader Kim Dae-Jung. This latter move

allowed both opposition leaders, Kim Dae-Jung and Kim Young Sam, referred to as “the two Kims”, to compete against the current regime. This move divided the opposition, which had likely been the intent of regime hardliners. By May 1980, between 40,000-50,000 students were protesting the Martial Law Command in Seoul, and hardliners moved to extend martial law over the entire country. After doing so, the two Kims were once again arrested, with the pretext for their arrest being North Korean troop movements (Fowler 1999, 269).

On May 18, 1980 student demonstrations in the town of Kwangju resulted in the deployment of Korean special forces units to restore order. The protest grew to over 100,000 there after several students were killed by the military on the first day. The military enacted a siege of the town, lasting one week, which resulted in 230 civilian deaths and over 1,740 arrests. The unofficial death toll ranges from 600-2,000 (Fowler 1999).

Since the South Korean military was under the command of U.S. officers (a situation lasting until 1994), many Koreans blame the U.S. for allowing the Kwangju massacre to occur (Fowler 1999, Lee 2007). Fowler (1999) argues that the U.S. did not want to create another Iran and authorized the use of force at Kwangju to avoid severe damage to the relationship between both countries. However, as the second push for liberalization occurred in 1986 with the opposition insisting on revising the constitution to allow direct popular elections, the Reagan administration pressured the regime to adhere to popular wishes and democratize or face withdrawal of U.S. support. Whereas other factors are often cited for the success of the second attempt at liberalization from 1986-1987, such as strong support from the middle class and labor groups during this period, Fowler (1999) notes that these groups also actively supported the first wave of democratization in 1979-80, which was unsuccessful. It was U.S. pressure from the Reagan administration to democratize that proved instrumental for the regime to agree to

demands from below to democratize, as the Carter administration did not place such pressure on the regime for fears of creating another Iran.

At issue by the mid-1980s was the democratic opposition's calls to reform the constitution to allow for the direct election of the president. The current law allowed for the indirect election of the president via an electoral college, which benefitted the authoritarian party candidates. President Hwan's June 10, 1987 decision to unilaterally end debate on constitutional reform outraged large sectors of the middle class, and widespread protests erupted across the country. Adding to the protestors' outrage was publicity surrounding the murder of student protestor Park Chong Chul in police custody, which had initially been covered up. Amid escalating nationwide protests, Hwan's choices were to either crush these protests with military force and risk the outbreak of civil war or concede to the opposition's demands and amend the constitution and face the possibility of losing the next election. Considering the Hwan regime had been seeking improved U.S. relations, and the United States had become increasingly opposed to South Korea's authoritarianism, Hwan chose the latter option. Although the amended constitution was adopted on October 22, 1987, it had two major flaws which put the democratic opposition at a disadvantage. First, the winner was determined by a simple plurality, and second, the constitution did not provide for a vice president. Because the opposition was badly divided, the ruling DJP won and Roo Tae Woo became president (Sung-Joo, 1988; Kim 2006).

After democratization in 1987, the ROK began efforts to improve relations with the North. President Roh Tae Woo reversed the zero-compromise stance with North Korea that had been the policy during the authoritarian era and implemented the *nordpolitik* approach. This policy primarily sought more open and amicable relations with China, North Korea, and the

Soviet Union. Democratic opposition leader Kim Young Sam visited Moscow in 1988 and 1990, and commerce was reestablished with the North in 1988. Trade greatly increased between North and South Korea, with the South conducting \$ 642 million in trade with the North by 2002 (which was one-quarter of North Korea's total trade) and having provided \$ 400 million in financial assistance to the North between 1988-2002. In addition, trade between China and South Korea increased seven-fold by 1990. By 2003, China replaced the United States as South Korea's largest trading partner. The *nordpolitik* strategy not only improved relations between South Korea and its Communist neighbors, but it also rendered the 1961 Soviet-North Korea security treaty largely irrelevant. Economic interdependence replaced ideological affiliation during the democratic period (Chung 2003, Krieckhaus 2017).

Even greater efforts towards peace came during the presidency of Kim Dae-Jong in the 1990s, with the establishment of a Peace Foundation in 1994 and a Sunshine Policy with the North, which encouraged greater commercial ties between the two states by lifting investment ceilings. In addition to seeking to unify families separated by the Korean War, Kim Dae-Jong developed a three-stage formula for reunification, which would begin as a confederation, advance to a federation, and then to a unified state (Chung 2003).

Civilian control of the military was largely achieved during reforms from 1994-1996 where authoritarian institutions established during the garrison state of the 1970s were removed (Zhu, Diamond, and Shin 2001). Military spending was reduced between 1988-1992, and again from 2008-2012 despite an existential security threat from the North (Kim 2014, 127). Although these findings are indicative of democratic consolidation, Kim (2014) notes that authoritarian legacies remain, the most important being a lack of civilian control over the Ministry of National

Defense (MND). Kim (2014) argues that a further reduction in military control over the MND is unlikely in the near future because of the on-going security threat.

These findings provide key insight with respect to both the democratic and territorial peace theories. Contrary to the dyadic democratic peace claims, Chung (2003) and Lee (2007) demonstrate that democratic regimes can facilitate amicable relations with an authoritarian regime. Lee (2007) also demonstrated that after a state democratizes, increased nationalism incentivizes leaders to seek greater autonomy from constraining alliances, which may degrade significantly as the newly democratic state asserts itself. Regarding the territorial peace, South Korea's democratic leaders sought peaceful relations with the North after democratization and *before* resolving their territorial dispute, with large segments of their population favoring improved and closer relations with North Korea. Although the legitimacy of South Korea's authoritarian governments was derived as a consequence of the Communist threat, often labeling democratic opposition leaders as being pro-Communist, relations between these governments and the North were rigid and uncompromising in their refusal to negotiate. After democratization relations improved, with South Korea's presidents reflecting the wishes of their people to expand cordial ties with the North and attempt to bring the two Koreas closer to reunification. Both democracies and autocracies may seek peace with hostile neighbors, however, as the Egyptian case study illustrates. In the Egyptian case, Sadat negotiated peace between Egypt and Israel and recent polls indicate opposition to the peace treaty among a majority of Egyptians. Thus, in Egypt's case, democracy could mean reversing the peace treaty with Israel, which is in direct contradiction to the territorial peace and democratic peace theory. The fact that Koreans share the same ethnicity, culture, and history north and south of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel, a boundary established by a Cold War geopolitical compromise, is significant in

explaining Koreans' desire to reunify. Korean nationalism extends across the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel, as several scholars have noted (Chung 2003, Lee 2005).

### **Democratization and Nationalism**

One finding in the democratization literature describes an increase in nationalism in newly democratic states and how this often leads to war and violence (Mansfield and Snyder 1995). In some cases, new democracies may reduce their security dependence on former allies. Lee (2007) notes how this occurred not only between South Korea and the U.S. after 1987, but also the U.S. and Philippines after democratization in 1986, and newly democratic Eastern European states and Russia after 1989. Lee (2007) argues that this occurs because of a significant increase in nationalism and a desire for autonomy in newly democratic states. This finding is consistent with Chung (2003), discussed above, who found that relations between North and South Korea, as well as between South Korea, China, and the Soviet Union, all improved significantly after South Korea's democratization in 1987. An increase in pan-Korean nationalism within the South Korean population and political leadership was a key factor in driving the cooperative and peaceful overtures to the North. Not only do improved relations with the North negate the need for a close US-South Korean alliance, but as Lee (2007) argues, South Korea has sought a more equitable relationship with the U.S. since democratization. Chung (2003) showed that 70% of South Koreans blamed the U.S. for the strength of the authoritarian regimes because they derived so much support from their American ally. This finding was echoed in Fowler (1999), as described above. Thus, the smaller the American military presence in South Korea, the more likely democratization would be. Some nationalists perceive North Korean nuclear weapons not as a threat to the South, but as a defense against outside powers (Carpenter and Bandow 2004, 28). They argue that such weapons would boost Korean defense

and prestige in the event of unification with the North. Instead of perceiving North Korea as a military threat, the new nationalist elites perceived the communist state as a victim of bellicose U.S. foreign policy. Bush's 2002 declaration of North Korea as part of an "Axis of Evil" was a case in point and was widely condemned by many South Korean nationalist elites, as it ran counter to South Korea's policy of engagement and reconciliation with the North (Lee 2007, 480-482).

South Korean nationalists are more likely to view their northern counterparts as fellow Koreans divided by Cold War politics rather than as mortal enemies. Four-fifths of South Koreans favored unification with the North, and approximately 90% of South Korean high school students reported that they could be friends with North Koreans (Chung 2003). In addition, South Korean attitudes towards the United States grew less warm, particularly by the early 2000s in large part in disapproval for the U.S.-led War on Terrorism. Although older Koreans with memories of the Korean War had more favorable attitudes towards the U.S., younger Koreans felt the U.S. had prolonged authoritarianism in their country, and saw the U.S. as having excessive influence in South Korean politics. A 1999 poll found that 12.2 % of South Koreans believed the U.S. would be their main enemy after reunification with the North (Carpenter and Bandow 2004, 17). By 2003, 46% of South Koreans held unfavorable attitudes towards the United States (Lee 2005).

These findings are directly contradictory to both the territorial and democratic peace theories. Whereas the territorial peace argues that resolved border disputes and reduced security threats lead to democracy, in South Korea's case, democracy was achieved *despite* a territorial threat, and led to a desire among a majority of South Koreans for improved relations with their northern, ethnic brethren. As mentioned above, despite the continued existence of a security

threat to South Korea's only border, after democratization Lee (2007) found that relations diminished between South Korea and their American security guarantors, despite the development of North Korean nuclear weapons capabilities. The democratic peace focuses on democratic dyads, noting their proclivity to maintain peaceful relations with one another and to settle disputes between themselves short of war. The South Korean case demonstrates that democracies may also be the drivers of peaceful relations with autocracies, at least in cases of common ethnicity.

Although this push for reconciliation was present during the nine-month democratic Second Republic as well as the post-1987 democratic era, Lee (2007) explains that South Koreans are still divided regarding the degree of threat perception posed by the North. A Defense White Paper labeled the North as a "direct threat", and 59% of South Koreans viewed the North's nuclear capability as a "critical threat". A substantial majority continues to favor the U.S. alliance, with 31% favoring an end to the U.S. alliance (Lee 2007, 486-487).

### **Domestic Factors in Democratization**

Although scholars disagree over whether strong economic growth results in democratization (Lipset 1960, Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson 2008), others argue that democracies, once established, do not collapse once per capita income exceeds a certain point (Zhu, Diamond, and Shin 2001). South Korea's economy grew at a spectacular pace over a few decades. In 1960 its economy was the size of many African states, and today its economy is ten times that of average African GDP, and 80% that of the OECD average. Average incomes surpass that of China but are still only a third that of Japan's (Kriekhaus 2017).

Kriekhaus (2017) provides an interesting observation about South Korea's economic growth that has implications for the territorial peace. Noting that Japan was responsible for

building Korean infrastructure, developing a modern, meritocratic bureaucracy and police force, and a Western system of private property during its colonial period from 1905-1945, and the post-WW II U.S. military occupation suppressed the left, enabling the development of capitalism, this lay the foundation for significant economic growth. During the authoritarian period, the territorial threat from the North prompted Park to rapidly develop the economy in order to create a strong financial base to increase its military power to defend the country. This brisk economic growth created the conditions for a large and educated middle class, which prominent democratization scholars argue are important for creating the conditions of democratization, namely the expansion of political rights and the rule of law (Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub, and Limongi, 1996). Thus, stimulating economic growth for military purposes could also create the conditions necessary for eventual democratization, particularly if a large middle class is established. Territorial threats could therefore, under certain conditions, result in eventual democratization if this model were followed.

Park's authoritarianism made it easier to facilitate economic growth, particularly as his regime enjoyed support from the private sector. Between 1967-1987, South Korea's economy grew by 7% per year, which created a large middle class, with 65% of South Koreans identifying as such. In addition to the economic growth, democratic norms were permeating South Korean society. South Korea's model of export-led industrialization instilled in its increasingly literate and educated population the desire to join the modern group of democracies with large and growing economies. Widespread communication also made the spread of information possible, making it difficult for the authoritarian regime to withhold information or to repress its population (Diamond, Linz, and Lipset 1989, 293-294).

However, South Korea's rapid economic growth also cut both ways. The growing middle class tended to credit the current regime with its economic success and feared an alteration of the status quo could hinder future growth and put their middle-class status in jeopardy. The middle class was also largely conservative, and the inequality produced by economic growth produced radical groups agitating for redistribution. These fears reinforced support for the authoritarian regimes of both Park and Hwan.

### **Hindrances to Democratic Consolidation**

Although South Korea democratized in 1987, some scholars note weaknesses in their democracy. To be sure, all democracies vary in terms of level and strength of democracy, and a summary of these weaknesses in the South Korean case is useful to determine social and political divisions. These weaknesses include a reduction in economic growth since democratization (Kriekhaus 2017); a decrease in attitudes favoring democracy (Zhu, Diamond, and Shin 2001); weak political institutions, political polarization within the media, politics, and society, and cleavages between civil society and political groups (Lee 2005, Kim 2006).

Economic growth slowed after democratization in 1987 and saw a continued shock during the 1997-1998 Asian Financial Crisis. Economic inequality has increased, while employment opportunities for college graduates have decreased, and the middle class in the early 2000s saw a reduction in numbers (Lee 2005, Kriekhaus 2017). Although it is common for rapid economic growth to eventually subside, particularly after democratization, 65% of South Koreans in 1998 reported economic growth to be more important than democracy, and 71% said that economic crises made it necessary for the president to expand his powers (Zhu, Diamond, and Shin 2001). Thus, crises themselves can result in support for expanded executive powers; in this case it was not a security crisis that led to the desire for expanded executive powers, but

rather economic stagnation. Political scandals and corruption are also responsible for eroding democratic legitimacy, and respondents also cited these factors as reasons for their reduced support for democracy. It is important to remember that this low point for democratic support coincided with the 1997-1998 financial crisis, and that Zhu, Diamond, and Shin (2001) found that overall support for democracy was high in South Korea, although support was far higher among younger Koreans than older.

Civil societal groups were instrumental in rallying the pro-democratic opposition against authoritarianism in the 1980s, they saw a reduction in number during the early 1990s as democracy began consolidating because of a lack of a common focus. They have recently began adopting positions in other areas, such as the environmental and foreign policy, education, consumer protection, and human rights (Lee 2005, Kim 2006).

South Korean society is split between progressives and conservatives. The former favor a welfare-state democracy with reconciliation, and possible eventual reunification, with North Korea. Conservatives favor a free market economic policy with reduced government intervention, and view labor unions as a threat to economic growth, which has become more anemic since the mid-1980s. Conservatives are more likely to support the status-quo with respect to the U.S.-ROK military alliance. Although conservatives still see North Korea as a security threat, this perception has diminished. The role of the media further exacerbates this social polarization. Broadcast media is predominantly progressive, while the print media is largely conservative (Lee 2005).

## **Conclusion**

As the South Korean case study illustrates, the presence of a territorial threat on a state's border may increase the risk of authoritarianism for many reasons. Although the territorial peace

theory argues this occurs because security threats necessitate the establishment of large standing armies to defend the state, which also makes the politicization of the military more likely. In addition, there may be a reduction in political polarity as leaders of multiple factions circle the wagons to defend the country, and the population expects the leadership to take measures to defend them against possible attack. Other reasonable hypotheses not mentioned within the territorial peace theory include opportunities for political elites to exploit popular fears of attack and persuade the public that fears of attack are greater than they actually are to justify expanding executive powers, for example. Whether real or imagined, security threats in this case study clearly served to facilitate decades of authoritarianism in South Korea.

Evidence to support the territorial peace in this case study include the authoritarian regimes' legitimacy in South Korea coming in large part from the security threat. The authoritarian regime pursued economic growth policies to support a larger military, which likely set into motion the seeds for future democratization as the economy grew and GDP per capita increased. The security apparatus was politicized. A highly centralized garrison state was created by the early 1970s after an increase in hostile actions by the North. The ROK began a nuclear weapons program after a superpower ally planned to reduce defense commitments, but the nuclear program ended after a renewed U.S. security commitment and after the North Korean economy stagnated, reducing the level of perceived threat. Lastly, the authoritarian regime engaged in widespread violence, repression, and coercion against its own population, justifying it by citing the internal and external Communist threat.

However, a main conclusion of this case study is that while territorial peace may increase the risk for the establishment of an authoritarian regime necessitated by security requirements, there are multiple variables that may reverse this likelihood or erode authoritarianism while the

territorial threat continues. As shown above, during the Park regime in the 1960s elections were contested between the authoritarian regime and a democratic opposition. There existed a high level of political polarization between the right and left in politics and society, in direct contradiction to the territorial peace. As the economy grew and a thriving educated middle class developed, tolerance for the human rights abuses committed by the authoritarian regime decreased, and democratic norms began pervading the country. The ROK democratized after two major democratic movements, despite a continued security threat from a neighboring authoritarian regime that began a nuclear weapons program and eventually tested and continued to upgrade them. After democratization, ethno-nationalist sentiments among the population increased, resulting in a diminished security alliance with the United States and a de-emphasis of the security threat from the DPRK. In addition, the democratic regime initiated numerous overtures designed to improve relations with their hostile neighbor, including the possibility of eventual reunification. Since many South Koreans equated the presence of U.S. troops in their country as both hindering these peace efforts with the North and historically having aided the authoritarian regimes in the South, this led to efforts by the democratic nationalists to reduce the U.S. military presence there, while not ending it entirely. These findings are contrary to Colaresi (2004), as the ROK's democratic government was responsive to public desires for closer ties with the DPRK; dovish actions were rewarded rather than punished, as the regime respond to popular will to foster closer ties with the DPRK. This likely has to do with the close ethnic ties between the two Koreas and the presence of foreign troops on South Korean soil, which, as has been shown, many South Koreans equated with support for the authoritarian past. Nationalism appeared to increase in the ROK after democratization, in line with Lee's (2007) findings. Lastly, military spending was reduced in the ROK after democratization, while the territorial

peace argues that democratization and then reduction in military spending occurs only after the resolution of territorial disputes. This finding is consistent with Huntington's (1991) statements about newly democratic states reducing defense spending while modernizing their militaries.

As with the case study on Egypt, the role of external great powers was significant in influencing regime type; in this case, U.S. pressure for the authoritarian ROK regime to democratize in the late 1980s was very significant. The U.S. not only reinforced the authoritarian regimes in the ROK, but was significant in their replacement with democratic ones. The role of such powers cannot be ignored, and the territorial peace does not consider them in its calculations.

The contribution of this case study is that it demonstrates that systemic theories like the territorial peace may be problematic because of their inability to account for multiple variables responsible for democratization or its absence. This case study showed that although the territorial peace accurately predicted authoritarianism in South Korea which was often justified by the ongoing territorial and security threat, the complex interaction of other variables eventually resulted in the democratization of the South despite an existential security and territorial threat. A common ethnicity with their northern neighbor, widespread economic growth, an active civil society and NGOs, widespread and sustained popular demands to democratize, and pressures from an external great power to either support the authoritarian regime or pressure it to liberalize were all significant variables in South Korea's democratization process. Because there are so many such variables unique to each country, this raises the question of the utility of the application of such grand theories to a generalizable theory. As has been shown in previous chapters, the territorial peace accurately predicts regime type in some

cases, but not in others. Examining where it is accurate and inaccurate provides a better understanding of the application of the theory.

## CHAPTER VII

### NORTH KOREA

Applying the territorial peace theory to the Korean peninsula is an enigmatic process. A people with a shared ethnicity, history, and culture were divided by great foreign powers for geopolitical reasons. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) invaded the Republic of Korea (ROK) to forcibly unite the two countries under communist rule but was unsuccessful. A ceasefire ended the fighting, but to date, no formal peace treaty has been signed. Although both Koreas have experience with authoritarian regimes, after four decades South Korea democratized despite an official state of war and a significant territorial treat on its only border, while the North remains a communist personalistic dictatorship. The territorial peace theory would predict neither country should democratize until *after* a formal peace treaty had been signed. At that point, the need for large standing armies, a highly centralized political apparatus, and political unity would diminish, creating more favorable conditions for democratization.

However, in the Korean cases the territorial peace does not consider the multiple variables that explain regime type, such as the nature of the regimes established upon independence, their separate constitutions and formative institutions, their guiding state ideologies, the role of great regional powers within the Cold War context of regime formation, interethnic sentiments, or economic growth and performance over time. As was demonstrated in the South Korean case, not only did South Korea democratize *during a state of war*, but its most peaceful overtures to the North and its communist allies occurred *after* South Korea

democratized. A territorial peace hypothesis would posit that the DPRK has not democratized because of a perceived threat from the ROK and/or its American ally. However, as will be demonstrated in this chapter, other explanations are far more logical and are supported by evidence. Although some scholars and military experts argue that the ROK and the U.S. enjoy a significant conventional military advantage over the North (Cho 2009, Bennett 2012), the latter possesses a formidable nuclear deterrent and continues to develop its missile technology to extend its capacity for delivering nuclear weapons far into U.S. territory, not to mention South Korean territory. In addition to its nuclear capabilities, North Korea maintains significant chemical and biological weapon stockpiles, and enjoyed conventional military superiority from the 1950s until the early 1970s, when its economy began to rapidly decline. Lastly, it has benefitted from an alliance with China and the Soviet Union/Russia since independence, both of whom had formal security guarantees for decades to defend the North against invasion, while South Korea, as was demonstrated, has witnessed oscillating military commitments from the United States over the years, with the strong possibility during the 1970s of the termination of that alliance.

This chapter will demonstrate that the Leninist-Stalinist nature of the North Korean regime is responsible for its lack of democracy rather than any variables explainable by territorial threat. This case raises an interesting application of the territorial peace, but one based on ideological, rather than territorial, threats. As will be shown, North Korea instituted a major military buildup during the 1960s in response to perceived threats from what the regime labeled American capitalist imperialism, rather than from any perceived threat on its southern border. Its dynastic leadership under Kim Il Sung was unyielding in its perseverance of Stalinist political and economic dogma despite a changing international political and economic structure. This led

to increasing economic stagnation. After the end of the Cold War, the DPRK's abandonment by traditional allies which had provided the regime with economic and military aid, and the death of its founding leader in 1994 forced a restructuring of the regime under Kim Jong Il, with a military-political alliance and the pursuit of nuclear weapons to guarantee regime survival in a changing environment. The primary purpose of this dynastic regime was survival at all costs, despite inter-Korean peace talks and efforts towards rapprochement.

### **Formation of the Communist Regime**

The post-World War II division of Korea was discussed in Chapter VI. Both the Soviet Union and the United States were establishing regimes in the North and South, respectively, that reflected either communism or anti-communism. As Buzo (1999, 19) discusses, out of the Soviet short list of possible political leaders in North Korea, Kim Il Sung was preferred for several reasons. He had been a guerilla fighter in Manchuria against the Japanese occupation. He also had no political experience and had limited education, making him more dependent on his Soviet supporters. Thus, both the Soviet Union and the United States installed their respective ideological puppets in Korea.

As communism did not offer solutions to extant problems in Korea in the 1940s, its appeal among the citizenry was limited (Buzo 1999, 15). However, communist ideology provided a focus around which North Koreans could unite – the military reconquest/liberation of the South as a major step towards realizing the completion of the revolution. This was attempted during the Korean War from 1950-1953, which led to the near total destruction of the DPRK. Despite this failure, the military liberation of the South remained a central focus of the Kim Il Sung regime, which saw a resurgence in the late 1960s, as will be discussed below.

The North Korean constitution was written in Russian, a further indication of the direct imposition of Soviet political and ideological influence on the regime. The constitution was amended in 1972 after Kim Il Sung had developed his highly centralized cult of personality. In this capacity, Kim served as both head of state, head of the armed forces, and head of the judiciary. Kim was elected by the Supreme People's Assembly for four-year terms, which was in reality the rubber stamp of the leader. As Buzo (1999, 37, 55) notes, North Korea's regime under Kim Il Sung was a blend of Leninist and Stalinist elements; Leninist in Kim's total control over the Korean Worker's Party and the goal of national reunification under a socialist system, and Stalinist in its extreme centralization and cult of the personality. North Korea is unique among communist states as it lacks even a modicum of the typical checks present in other Leninist systems, with no motivation to provide for the needs of its twenty-five million citizens.

The development of a cult of personality was the central Stalinist element of the Kim Il Sung regime and criticisms became increasingly rare. Although in the early phase of the regime there existed party members who questioned the leadership, over time these elements were purged from the political and military apparatus as Kim consolidated his control over the regime and the state. Buzo (1999, 42-43) details the political, ideological, economic, and personal aspects of the regime that were uniquely Stalinist in nature, such as the use of violence as the means to a revolutionary end, reverence for the Great Leader, crediting all achievements as stemming from his wisdom and leadership, and a highly centralized and collectivized economic and agricultural sector.

In the mid-1950s Kim first developed the idea of *Juche*, or self-reliance in political, military, and economic spheres. *Juche* was a rejection of decades of foreign intervention in Korea, whether from outright colonialism or in Great Power meddling in Korean affairs. The

DPRK applied *Juche* to capitalist and communist states at various times, demonstrating its willingness for self-reliance whenever the regime chose.

Kim Il Sung's Stalinist worldview remained long after de-Stalinization occurred in the USSR under Khrushchev. Buzo (1999, 163, 171) notes how until Kim Il Sung's death he characterized global affairs as a dualistic struggle between imperialism and socialism, in which Korea played a vital role. Similarly, Kim's economic focus was primarily Stalinist as well, characterized by large heavy industrial projects guided by centralized planning. These projects proved ill-conceived, expensive, and a waste of desperately-needed resources.

In 1962 a significant rift occurred between Pyongyang and Moscow which exacerbated North Korea's trajectory of independence and led to significant militarization of the state. Kim Il Sung had interpreted the Soviet decision to withdraw missiles from Cuba at the conclusion of the Cuban Missile Crisis as Soviet capitulation to the West, and a sign of weakness. Washington's escalating military involvement in Vietnam also confirmed Kim's view of American imperialism encroaching into Asia as Soviet resolve to check this faltered. South Korea was among the few allied states to deploy combat troops to Vietnam in support of the American war effort there. Kim Il Sung's speech to the Second KWP Conference in October 1966 allows for an understanding of Kim's perception of the United States as a growing global imperial threat, where he cites aggressive U.S. imperialist actions in Cuba and Vietnam (Buzo 1999, 69). It is significant that Kim does not mention South Korea as constituting a threat, but rather emphasizes international American imperialism.

Buzo (1999, 69) points out that the DPRK faced no threats on the Korean Peninsula during the mid-1960s, nor were there threats within the Soviet Bloc. On the contrary, both China and the Soviet Union had concluded a Treaty of Friendship with the DPRK in 1961. The Park

regime in the ROK at this time was focused primarily on domestic economic development and did not engage in threatening rhetoric or actions towards the North until later. However, this did not prevent the DPRK from increasing its guerilla operations against the South, from 88 in 1965 to 985 in 1968 (Kim 2014, 36).

DPRK military spending soared from 6% in 1964 to 30% in 1967, increasing to four times that of the Soviet model in proportional terms (Buzo 1999, 67). Thus, in 1962 the DPRK became a garrison state in response to a perceived threat from what Kim viewed as American international imperialism. This presents an interesting alternative view of the territorial peace; instead of a territorial threat resulting in the creation of a highly militarized garrison state, the perceived threat was from a distant ideological adversary with global military projection capabilities. Regarding North Korea's decision to become a garrison state in the 1960s, Buzo (1999, 78) notes that the "colossal proportions of this build-up and its enduring nature cannot be explained by any objective analysis of possible threats to the DPRK at the time, but rather as a reflection of the profoundly militarist nature of Kim Il Sung's world view". Additional research on state centralization and militarization originating from such perceived ideological threats is therefore justified.

Cho (2009, 97) makes a similar argument, noting that the threats to the North Korean regime arise not from external sources, but rather from "internal contradictions". While some scholars have noted the qualitative military advantage enjoyed by the ROK and U.S. over the North (Cho 2009, Bennett 2012), the DPRK's possession of nuclear weapons offsets this conventional advantage, as does its close alliance with China. Cho (2009, 87) cites Article 2 of the Sino-North Korean Treaty of Amity, which specifies automatic Chinese involvement in the event of another Korean war. These two strong deterrents afford the DPRK significant

reassurance of territorial security, yet the regime persists. Thus, a closer examination of the goals of the DPRK regime are warranted.

After the death of Kim Il Sung in July 1994, Kim's heir Kim Jong Il feared he lacked the prestige of his father and the backing of the Party. To counter these weaknesses, Jong-II implemented the Military First policy on January 1, 1995. This policy placed the military in direct control over politics, economics, and foreign policy, thereby making the military personally loyal to Jong-II. Jong-II had attributed the collapse of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe to weak military power, so by politically empowering the military apparatus, Jong-II sought to prevent such regime collapse in North Korea (Cho 2009, 78).

As Cho (2009, 78-79) describes, under the Military First Policy, the National Defense Commission was the chief department within the national power hierarchy, and Jong-II was its chairman. Jong-II also served as General Secretary of the Korean Workers Party and the Supreme Commander of the Korean People's Army. The significance of this was that first, military officers became primary powerholders and stakeholders in the regime, and second, North Korean citizens were no longer the primary focus of the regime, as they are in most socialist states, but instead were potential threats. The famine of 1995-1997 demonstrates the inconsequential status of the citizenry in the eyes of the regime, where up to one million of the DPRK's twenty-two million citizens starved to death (Kaplan and Denmark 2011). Noland (1996) argues this famine was the result of calculated political decisions rather than actual food shortages, which is further evidence of the regime's willingness to sacrifice large numbers of its civilian population to meet its own ends.

## **Regime End Goal: Survival**

The one constant goal of the Kim dynasty from 1948 to present has been regime survival. Kim (2014) details how both the Kim Il-Sung regime in the North and Park regime in the South used inter-Korean dialogue and the possibility of peace and unification to win support for and to consolidate their respective regimes. Depending on the conditions the DPRK is experiencing at the time determines the discussion agenda. For example, during the 1990s and 2000s the DPRK sought dialogue to win concessions in the form of fuel oil and economic aid, keeping the regime in power. In August 1960, Kim Il-Sung proposed peace with the ROK in exchange for mutual recognition of each other's political systems and sought cultural and economic exchange. However, neither leader would sacrifice their own ideological positions or power for reunification, so these talks broke down (Chung 2003). After Park rejected the possibility of reunification in the mid-1960s, North Korean guerilla and special operations activities against the South soared, as was described above. Thus, as Cho (2009) and Kim (2014) argue, the primary goal of the North Korean regime is its own survival, which would have been jeopardized by efforts towards reunification.

Détente between China, the U.S., and USSR in the early 1970s occurred as the North Korean economy began stagnating. This forced drastic cutbacks in defense spending, erasing the North's military superiority over the South. This power imbalance potentially threatened regime survival, at least in the eyes of the leadership, necessitating its development of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons and allowing it to maintain parity with the U.S. and ROK. Such a policy is rational, as Monteiro (2014) argues that a state that develops nuclear weapons has essentially guaranteed its systemic survival. Since acquiring nuclear weapons, the DPRK has used them as bargaining chips to attain concessions from the U.S. and other states. This policy was expedient,

particularly after the collapse of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, which were significant sources of military and economic support for Pyongyang. These weapons also demonstrate the strength of the Kim regime, putting North Korea in the club of nuclear powers.

It is for these reasons that Bennett (2012) argues the U.S. and ROK should engage in punitive actions which weaken the Kim regime itself, rather than broad approaches like sanctions, which harm the North Korean people. Direct military action against North Korean forces would also serve to rally the military behind the leader and strengthen a failing regime. Citing increased DPRK aggression which coincided with Kim Jong Il's declining health, such as the 2010 shelling of Yeonpyeong island and the sinking of the South Korean ship *Cheonan*, Bennett (2012, 128, 140) argues that an otherwise failing regime is supported by elites who unite against South Korea and the United States - an argument consistent with the territorial peace. Similarly, as mentioned above, Cho (2009) has argued that the regime under Kim Il Sung viewed the North Korean people as internal enemies and consequently politicized the military, giving it a stake in regime survival. Bennett (2012, 135) also notes the regime's indifference to the starvation deaths of hundreds of thousands of DPRK citizens. Kim has successfully used Washington and Seoul's retaliation for nuclear research and testing to rally the military and political elites against these foreign threats, thus reversing perceptions of a weakening regime (Bennett 2012, 129-130). Park and Kim (2010) note that as popular support for Kim Jong Il decreased between 2000-2010 and the economy continued to stagnate, the state began extorting the money of civilians. They also note how Kim Jong Il resorted to using the country's nuclear arsenal as a bargaining chip for desperately-needed external resources and easing of sanctions. Thus, the North's militaristic endeavors are attempts to signal strength and unity against an

ideological enemy rather than one posing a specific territorial threat. Such actions portray an otherwise failing regime as strong and assertive.

Bennett (2012) therefore argues that U.S. policy should focus on denial of North Korean use of WMD, which is its most significant asset, while choosing policies which further erode the regime's support structures, preventing its ability to rally elites and the military. He suggests a joint U.S.-ROK policy of viewing DPRK nuclear tests and missile launches as signs of growing regime instability, and to move humanitarian aid supplies close to the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) after such displays to demonstrate to North Korean citizens the West's willingness to assist their needs in light of an increasingly unstable and failing regime. This would undermine the North's sole reason for such aggressive displays, which are to demonstrate power and receive concessions. This policy underscores the North Korean regime's abandonment of the general welfare of its people, and its sole focus being total control of state. Thus, in its current form, notions of democratization are unrealistic, no matter the changing security environment.

Both Noland (1996) and Kaplan and Denmark (2011) argue that the DPRK is unlikely to liberalize for fear of setting into motion a destabilizing chain of events that would result in the end of the regime. This argument is supported by historical evidence from the 1980s. North Korea took token steps towards liberalization of its economy during the nadir of relations with the Soviet Union in the early to mid-1980s, but as relations improved with the USSR, the Kim regime abandoned reforms and returned to Stalinist economic policies and reliance on its communist ally. Importantly, these brief liberal openings were designed to safeguard the regime rather than to seriously consider adopting an East Asian economic model. Thus far, Noland (1996) has proven correct in the DPRK's ability to muddle through, adopting various policies on an ad hoc basis to maintain regime survival.

## **Geopolitical Factors**

It has been noted in previous chapters the role that external powers play in regime survival or collapse. Analyses of the territorial peace are incomplete without consideration of such variables. The Korean peninsula has geopolitical significance, as it is located where multiple great power interests converge. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, many of these powers prefer the status quo. Although Tang (1999) argues a unified Korea would be an optimal situation for promoting regional peace and economic prosperity, he notes U.S. opposition to this scenario because it renders continued American troop presence in Korea and Japan, and therefore East Asia, unnecessary. Clinton's Defense Secretary William Cohen stated in the 1990s that American troop levels would remain unchanged even if Korea reunified (Tang 1999, 467). Additionally, Russia has articulated its opposition to continued U.S. troop presence in a unified Korea, making comparisons to "an Asian edition of NATO's eastward expansion" (Tang 1999, 466).

McCoy (2017, 28-29) notes the geostrategic importance of the Eurasian landmass as articulated by Sir Alfred Mackinder, who argued that the power that controlled Eurasia controls the world. McCoy (2017) notes that American geo-strategists and political elites are quite familiar with Mackinder's argument, which provides an explanation of NATO's eastward expansion during the 1990s and 2000s along with the encirclement of China with U.S. military bases and the introduction of U.S. forces in Central Asia immediately after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Therefore, notions of a complete U.S. military withdrawal from either South Korea or Japan in the near future appear extremely unlikely.

Similarly, China prefers a friendly buffer state on its border and opposes a pro-Western, democratic united Korea, especially one basing U.S. troops (Bennet and Lind 2011). A unified

Korea also poses problems for Japan, since relations with Korea have been antagonistic because of Japan's history of brutal colonialism on the peninsula. Should Korea maintain the North's nuclear stockpile after unification, as some in the South have stated is their purpose (Carpenter and Bandow, 2004), this raises the possibility of Japan quickly developing their own nuclear arsenal as a check. Lastly, South Korea would likely strongly oppose a continued American military presence in a unified Korea, particularly since anti-U.S. sentiments rose sharply in the South after democratization, as has been demonstrated in the South Korean case study.

Therefore, the convergent interests of China, Russia, Japan, and the U.S. largely favor maintaining the status quo on the Korean peninsula, as any sudden revisions pose serious dangers, particularly in consideration of the DPRK's nuclear stockpile. Any sudden regime collapse in the North could be extremely dangerous, requiring close coordination between China, the ROK, and the U.S., all of whom would likely have large numbers of troops involved in a massive humanitarian operation in the DPRK in case of such an event, as Bennet and Lind (2011) describe. Because of this, the DPRK regime continues to "muddle through", as Noland (1996) argues is the most likely scenario.

Relating to the territorial peace, because all of the states involved appear to favor the status quo, save for efforts in the ROK to take steps towards reunification, external great powers will likely continue sending the necessary aid to the DPRK that would keep the regime in place and prevent its collapse. Regime collapse would destabilize the region and be costly financially as well as dangerous from a regional security standpoint. Therefore, as with the other cases, the influence of great external powers on regime type is significant, and is something that the territorial peace does not consider.

## **Post-Cold War Realities**

The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 had serious effects on the North Korean regime. Half of North Korea's foreign trade had been with the Soviet Union, and as communism collapsed in 1989 and 1990, this trade decreased significantly, with dire effects for the DPRK's economy. Elements of Ceausescu's regime in Romania had been modeled on the DPRK, and its violent overthrow in December 1989 was cause for alarm in Pyongyang, as socialist regimes were unraveling and toppling rapidly. In addition, the reform-minded Gorbachev began abandoning old socialist dogma and seeking liberalization in the DPRK. It is ironic that the Soviet Union in the early 1990s urged the DPRK to liberalize, which the Kim regime rejected and continued to embrace Stalinist dogma. Kim Il Sung was convinced, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that even as communist regimes collapsed in Eastern Europe this system would eventually win out over Western capitalism, and the events in Eastern Europe were temporary setbacks in the Manichean struggle between capitalism and communism. Yet, Gorbachev had recognized the significance of the economic miracle in South Korea and began fostering closer ties to that state while distancing itself from the isolated and increasingly stagnating North. Soviet economic aid was significantly reduced, and military aid ended in 1988, with joint military drills between the USSR and DPRK ending the following year. As Soviet-ROK relations improved, the 1961 Soviet-DPRK mutual defense treaty was no longer relevant (Buzo 1999, 187, 195; Chung 2003).

Similarly, China began developing closer ties to South Korea during this time, as has been discussed. As those two states increased lucrative trade ties, China and the Soviet Union abandoned their opposition to accepting South Korea's application for membership in the United Nations, a position the North had opposed, assuming such a development would hinder

unification efforts. Even more damaging to the North was China's formal announcement in the summer of 1987 of non-intervention in the event of another Korean war (Buzo 1999, 185).

All of these developments appeared to make continued survival of the North Korean regime increasingly unlikely, particularly with the death of Kim Il Sung in July 1994. As Ogden and Anderson (2008) note, U.S. policy was based on this assumption, which was to take little direct action and wait out a seemingly inevitable regime collapse. However, as has been mentioned above, Kim Jong Il's successful assumption of power and adoption of the Military First policy prevented such a collapse. In addition, the DPRK's acceleration of its nuclear program during the 1990s becomes more understandable in light of these serious and incremental economic, political, and geostrategic setbacks.

Buzo (1999, 195-197) discusses the reasons for North Korea's accelerated nuclear program during the 1980s and 1990s. Although the North's procurement of nuclear weapons was part of a decades-long process which began in the 1960s with Soviet assistance, including Soviet hardware and technology transfers to the DPRK (*The Washington Post* March 9 2018), the program continued incrementally during the 1980s and 1990s as a means of countering the military superiority of the South and the United States. As discussed above, acquiring a nuclear weapons stockpile along with vast quantities of chemical and biological weapons allowed the regime to increase its chances of survival in an international environment that was witnessing the collapse of communist regimes. In addition, Kim Il Sung's isolated, Manichean worldview developed from his background as an anti-Japanese guerilla fighter and was further shaped by Stalinist dogma. This narrative presented the communist North as a bulwark against capitalist imperialism and kept the possibility of the forcible liberation of the South alive.

Over the last two decades, however, the Kim Jong Il and Kim Jong Un policy has been to enhance the regime's chances of survival by increasing the sophistication of its missile and nuclear technology. Learning lessons from Libya and Iraq, the North's regime is reinforcing its security against ideological threats, which are largely of its own making. As has been stated, opening the door to piecemeal liberalization would be extremely risky for the regime, as events could get out of hand and culminate in the rapid overthrow of the dynasty, as the Romanian revolution demonstrated.

## **Conclusion**

This case study demonstrates the complexities and nuances of regimes, and how their existence is explained by multiple complex variables. As with other communist regimes, North Korea's regime was based on assumptions about economics, politics, and the international order. Such communist regimes are led by a single, often charismatic, leader under single-party leadership, independent of whether there exist territorial threats to the state. Thus, highly centralized states with large standing armies are typically the nature of communist regimes, which are as likely to perceive internal threats as external ones, against whom they must remain eternally vigilant. International threats from what such regimes perceive as imperial and capitalist become the focus of threat, adding a new dimension to the territorial peace. As has been discussed, the formative periods of both North and South Korea were based around the respective Cold War powers in control of each region. Consequently, North Korea developed along a stringent Stalinist model. The Soviet selection of Kim Il Sung brought with it the individual personality of this leader as anti-Japanese guerilla fighter with limited education and no initial political experience. Thus, his leadership style was molded by the Soviet Union, which was his primary source of political, economic, and military support for decades as Kim

consolidated his personal rule over the country as well as the political institutions of the regime. Kim's Leninist-Stalinist worldview resulted in viewing South Korea as a weak regime ruled by imperialists, with its subjects yearning for socialist governance. Therefore, his goal was the military liberation of the South, a goal that was not abandoned after the North's destruction, largely by U.S. airpower, during the Korean War.

To view this case in the context of the territorial peace, a counterfactual may be useful. Although counterfactuals cannot be considered evidence, it is highly unlikely that had the North won the Korean war and conquered the South, that a Korea united under communist single-party rule would have democratized over time. Although most of the former communist regimes in Eastern Europe democratized after 1989, other communist regimes did not. Thus, it is possible for communist regimes to democratize, however, there is little evidence to demonstrate that the DPRK's communist dynastic regime exists because of a security threat. Instead, it has been demonstrated that its regime was created by the Soviet Union during the Cold War and continues to exist at the wishes of the dynasty, which enjoys almost total power and authority. It should be remembered that the Soviet Union's liberalization during the 1980s led to the rapid dissolution of the regime with no democratic outcome in Russia, although democratization occurred within some of the former Soviet republics. Communist dogma requires single-party rule by a vanguard elite until the threat of global capitalism and imperialism has been defeated by worker revolution, at which time the state gradually withers away. Therefore, a unified Korea under Kim Il Sung would almost certainly have remained under single-party, dynastic rule for as long as the regime could remain viable, despite having no territorial threats and surrounded by two major allied communist powers. The lack of a territorial threat would have been replaced by the ever-present threat of capitalist imperialism, namely Japan and the United States. This threat

would have served the purpose of unifying the political elite, the military, and some segment of the population against this external, but not territorial, security threat, an element that is captured by the territorial peace in some way.

It is difficult to argue that South Korea poses a security threat to the North, considering the numerous peace overtures made not only by the South's democratic governments, but also by its active non-governmental organizations and among large majorities of its population. Inter-ethnic solidarity is strong among South Koreans, many of whom do not see North Korea's nuclear arsenal as a threat to fellow South Koreans, but rather as a check against U.S. aggression. North Korea's nuclear arsenal effectively guarantees state and regime survival against foreign military conquest, as Monteiro (2014) argues. Lastly, China prefers a buffer state on its border and would likely not allow any overt acts of aggression from the U.S. or ROK to militarily topple the regime.

North Korea's dynastic regime and its refusal to adopt the East Asian model of economic export-led development explain its current stagnation. Its dynastic leadership continues to embrace an antiquated Stalinist political and economic model, and the sole purpose of this dynasty is survival. The civilian population's role is to support the regime, and thus the people have proven expendable and inconsequential. The trajectory of the DPRK since the end of the Cold War had been to continue to muddle through.

Although the territorial peace captures some essential elements of a regime facing perceived threats, which primarily serve to unify a ruling elite and elements of the population in support of the leadership, this regime is unlikely to democratize under the existing dynasty. North Korea's lack of democratization is not the result of an existential security or territorial threat, but rather comes from the institutions and the basic purpose of the regime itself, which

involve total control of state by a single, charismatic individual with absolute control over the military and security services. Therefore, the territorial peace concept of a sequential resolution of territorial conflicts followed by an increased likelihood of democratization is difficult to apply to North Korea, as the regime's end goal is continued rule, and the resolution of territorial disputes or formal peace would likely not have any impact on the regime itself. It is a highly centralized garrison state not because of a specific security threat, which is essentially nonexistent, but because such a situation is necessary to maintain total regime control over the state and to guarantee its own survival. In this case, the desire of individual dynastic members to rule indefinitely over the country explain its inability to liberalize and democratize to a far greater extent than do explanations of territorial or security threats from abroad, although the regime manufactures notions of such threats for purposes of unity among military and political elites, which enhances regime survival.

## **CHAPTER VIII**

### **CONCLUSION**

The examination of these four cases that do not conform to the territorial peace calls into question the universal applicability of systemic theories such as the territorial peace. Although the theory accurately predicts the reduction in political polarity in response to territorial threats to a large degree and the unifying influence a common enemy provides within social and political spheres, the main results the theory posits did not occur. Its central argument is that states facing major territorial threats are more likely to maintain large standing armies, centralization of political power, and a unified political elite and a public intolerant of diverse opinion in order to realize the greatest likelihood of meeting the existential threats. However, in states facing lesser threats, this situation may not apply. All three components of this assumption (large standing armies, reduced political polarization and centralization of political power, and intolerance for diverse views among the population) are inherently inconducive to democracy and democratization. Therefore, the primary contribution of the territorial peace theory to the field of International Relations is that it presents a counter argument to the democratic peace theory. Whereas the democratic peace argues that democracies do not go to war with other democracies (i.e., democracy results in peace), the territorial peace argues that democracy is more likely to obtain in states that have resolved border/territorial disputes (i.e., peace results in democracy).

Although certainly a logical argument, and one that has been supported by several quantitative studies, an examination of cases contrary to territorial peace theory has raised several interesting questions. First, how applicable are such broad systemic theories to complex mechanisms such as the processes of democratization, which rely not on a few variables, but many? As all four cases have demonstrated, democracy was either maintained, developed, or failed to develop contrary to the predictions of territorial peace theory. These cases also demonstrate the complexities of democracy, democratization, and authoritarianism. How significant is the resolution of a territorial dispute among two states compared to variables such as economic performance, those states' geopolitical significance viz a viz great regional and/or global powers, elite willingness to democratize, cultural attitudes towards democracy or authoritarian governance, levels of human capital, and the strength of civil societies? The role of institutions is also significant, as authoritarian institutions may reinforce authoritarian regimes, and democratic institutions may reinforce democratic ones, although exceptions exist. If an authoritarian state with robust institutions and a similarly developed political and security apparatus were to resolve its territorial disputes, it is unlikely that this alone would trigger a democratic change, all else being equal.

The Israeli case undermines the theory because the country entered the system as a democracy and remained democratic despite extreme security threats that persisted for over two decades. Although Gibler (2012) notes that Israel is an exception to territorial peace theory, it is worthwhile to examine why this is so. The fact that Israel entered the system as a democracy does not imply that the democracy could not have collapsed because of the significant territorial and security threats it faced. But it did not, thus contradicting territorial peace theory.

The explanations for this outcome include the democratic traditions of Jewish communities in hostile states during the diaspora, the formation of democratic Israeli institutions, the respect of political elites and the population for democracy, the nature of the military and how it evolved to deal with security threats, and a shared ethnicity. Because the Jewish population shared the risks of annihilation in the event of a military defeat, the need for a coercive authoritarian regime was absent. The bulk of the population shared the burden of defense, which became socialized norms within Israeli society. Although Israel is a multiethnic state, it has also been characterized as an ethnocracy, with the bulk of political power and rights belonging to the founding ethnic group. This arrangement allowed the dominant ethnic group to remain so, while gradually sharing power with minority groups after 1967 without ceding too much authority. A question raised during this research involves whether ethnocracies provide a security advantage within a dangerous environment, thus inoculating them against the need for a coercive political apparatus directed at the dominant group. Instead, that coercion is focused on potentially threatening ethnic groups within the state in the name of national survival.

The Egyptian case study presented a contradiction to territorial peace theory: why it failed to democratize after signing a peace treaty that resolved its territorial disputes. Although Egypt presented a far greater territorial threat to Israel in the two decades after Israeli's independence in 1948 than vice versa, the latter remained democratic while the former failed to democratize. Although there were fledgling democratic elements within Egypt at independence and decades later during the Arab Spring, the overriding reason for Egypt's sustained authoritarian regime involved domestic political-military arrangements, authoritarian institutions, the personal ambitions of the leadership to remain in power, the lack of powerful democratic

political actors with popular support, and and failure of great powers to pressure the regime to democratize.

This case demonstrates many of the problems with territorial peace theory, as it fails to take into consideration numerous complex variables that heavily influence democratization. Thus, although territorial disputes were resolved with the 1979 peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, which according to territorial peace theory opens the way for democratization, political calculations resulted in the diminished role of the military and an elevated role of security forces for the purpose of maintaining Sadat's, and later Mubarak's, authoritarian regimes. The military found its own lucrative economic niche as its political power was reduced, and bided its time until the Arab Spring, after which it seized power under Sisi. Thus, a domestic power struggle between the military and political leadership for control of the country occurred independently of territorial threats. In addition, for geostrategic and geopolitical reasons, the United States not only refused to back the Egyptian democratic movement, it supplied the authoritarian regime with teargas and other weapons to suppress it, as it did with Bahrain, home of the US Fifth Fleet. Variables such as great power influence are omitted from the calculus of territorial peace theory, despite their significance in determining regime type. The final contradiction with the Egyptian case is poll data which suggests a democratic Egypt would jeopardize the peace treaty with Israel, as it has become increasingly unpopular among the Egyptian mass public. The territorial peace suggests democracy forms after the resolution of territorial disputes, which is assumed to endure. In the Egypt case, democracy would jeopardize the peace treaty. This poses a problem for both the territorial and democratic peace theories, providing interesting avenues of future research.

This raises an additional important conclusion drawn from this study: that systemic theories backed by quantitative analysis may be fundamentally flawed in that they rely on unquestioned data from respected groups such as Freedom House and Polity that may incorrectly classify states as democratic. Such systemic theories are limited in their applicability. Studies yielding highly statistically significant results receive publication and are then reified (Ish-Shalaom, 2013), and then become axiomatic within the discipline. This study indicates that such systemic theories should be viewed with more skepticism than they currently are.

South Korea is a third non-confirmatory case. According to the territorial peace, it should not have democratized because of the threat posed by the DPRK on its only border. Although South Korean authoritarian leaders cited the North Korean threat as justification for the continued rule of those leaders and the need for a large military for security purposes, domestic and international changes gradually brought about its democratization. The ROK saw widespread economic growth and an increase in education levels among the population. At the same time, the population grew intolerant of the regime's continued human rights violations, particularly the Kwangju massacre and the highly publicized murders of student protestors by police. As larger segments of the population began to equate democracy with modernization and a necessary and prestigious step for that country to formally join the developed world, pressure from various American presidential administrations on the authoritarian regime helped implement the establishment of a democratic regime by 1987, despite the existence of a formal state of war between North and South Korea.

In the Korean cases, pan-ethnic sentiments are important, as poll data have demonstrated that South Koreans are less concerned the North would use nuclear weapons against them, and instead report that those weapons are to deter the U.S. Likewise, many South Koreans after

democratization saw their oppressed Northern brethren as being in need of assistance, with unification an eventual goal instead of violence and war. Thus, issues of trust may be stronger among states sharing common ethnicities than those who do not. Contrary to Owsiak's (2013, 728) statement that "settled borders are both necessary and sufficient conditions for democratization" is not supported by the evidence from this case study.

The North Korean case presented the final challenge to territorial peace theory. First, the DPRK was the aggressor in the Korean War and enjoyed military superiority over the South for about three decades. In addition, North Korea enjoyed protection from two strong regional allies who guaranteed its survival - China and the Soviet Union. The DPRK's acquisition of nuclear weapons in the early 2000s essentially guaranteed its survival as a state, serving a similar purpose as the resolution of territorial threats, yet the country made no move to democratize. As the case study demonstrated, with the "Military First" policy, Kim Jong Il began viewing the civilian population as a domestic threat. Despite the DPRK's considerable military advantage, it was South Korea that democratized while the North remains a closed totalitarian society.

Second, the formative Kim Il Sung regime rigidly viewed the United States as the primary threat to the DPRK rather than South Korea, whose capitalist regime was oppressing fellow Koreans who sought liberation by the communist North. Because regime survival was the primary goal of the Kim dynasty, notions of territorial peace proved meaningless with respect to North Korea.

### **Implications for the Territorial Peace**

These findings present an important point for future research: does the territorial peace apply more to certain regime types than others? It seems unlikely that dynastic regimes would choose to democratize for any reason, as that involves giving up power. The Kim dynasty's primary goal has been to remain in power, a goal that democratization would destroy. Similarly,

as the Egyptian case demonstrates, personal authoritarian regimes are hesitant to democratize even after peace treaties with former adversaries, as doing so would risk removal from power. This does not preclude a negotiated settlement between strong democratization groups and the leadership to agree to free and fair elections, particularly if the leadership was granted favorable benefits in the event of a loss. Perhaps military regimes may be the most likely to adhere to territorial peace prescriptions and return to the barracks after the resolution of a territorial threat? The democratization literature suggests that military regimes are the shortest-lived types, while personalist systems last longer, and one-party regimes are the longest-lived (Geddes 1999).

Geddes (1999) also finds a strong correlation between economic development and democratization. As Hadenius and Teorell (2007) show, authoritarian collapse results in replacement by another authoritarian regime type more than three-quarters of the time, and results in democratic regimes in just under one-quarter of the time. Multiparty military regimes are the most likely to transition into democracies.

These findings within the democratization literature should be applied to the territorial peace to assess whether certain regime types respond differently to territorial threat, as regime goals differ widely across regime type, as has been alluded to above. Important in the calculus for the likelihood that authoritarian regimes democratize involve more than the resolution of territorial threats, and even then, this may have little impact on democratization, as has been demonstrated by the Egyptian and North Korean cases. Other important variables not mentioned by the territorial peace involve the strength and type of authoritarian institutions, personal decisions by the leadership to democratize, the presence of a viable democratic opposition with support from important social groups (such as the business sector, the military, civil societal

groups, NGOs, or other important social groups), economic growth and GDP per capita, and support for the democratic opposition or the authoritarian regime among external great powers.

If different regime types respond differently to threats, such a finding could also explain a related question to security and the territorial peace, which is: why don't all nuclear powers democratize? As has been argued above, Monteiro (2014) argues that nuclear powers have essentially guaranteed their survival in the state system. If correct, most nuclear powers should gradually democratize. Of the nine known nuclear powers, four (44.4%) are non-democratic. If democratization was as dependent on territorial security as the territorial peace assumes, nuclear powers should also be democracies. All current nuclear powers were democracies before developing those weapons, while the four non-democratic states were not democracies before or after developing their nuclear arsenals. Thus, the acquisition of nuclear weapons appears to have no impact on regime type. This observation is important, because if Monteiro (2014) is correct then significant improvements in territorial security and state survival with the advent of nuclear weapons has no impact on altering regime type. Thus, regime type is either a function of something else entirely, or regimes can be parsed into types and evaluated differently as each has different objectives and support structures.

The primary problem of territorial peace theory is its assumption that regime type is unidimensional; if territorial threats are resolved then democratization becomes more likely. The democratization literature demonstrates the authoritarian transition to democracy. As has been demonstrated in this study, the size of a state's economy and the distribution of wealth, the type and strength of political institutions, ethnic considerations, personal leadership and elite attributes, a viable opposition, and the role of external great powers all influence regime types.

Territorial peace theory appears to accurately predict certain responses to territorial/security threat, namely increased militarization and a decrease in party polarization. Savvy authoritarian leaders have a personal interest in using security threats as a rationale for refusing to share political power, as the South Korean case has illustrated. However, what remains unanswered is how long these conditions last from the onset of the territorial threat. The literature on rally effects (incidents where large segments of the population rally around the leadership in response to a foreign policy crisis) finds a temporary surge of support for the leadership in response to crises rather than an enduring one. Are longstanding territorial threats met with responses that threaten democracy or its establishment, or is threat met with varied responses across cases depending on other factors? American history is replete with examples of restrictions on civil liberties during wartime, from the founding of the republic to the onset of the War on Terrorism. However, military size and party polarization have fluctuated in the United States, and it is today more polarized than it has been in decades. Territorial peace theory may have less to do with democratization and more to do with providing a template for how states respond to threat. If this is so, it provides less of a challenge to the democratic peace than has been thus far assumed.

### **Future research**

Based on these case studies, there are several avenues for future research to continue to refine the applicability of the territorial peace theory. Case studies of military regimes and their response to territorial threats are warranted to determine whether these regimes are more likely to develop as a response to territorial or security threats, and whether such regimes are more likely to cede power to democratic elements after the resolution of those threats. This research would address the possibility of whether certain regime types are more likely to develop in response to

territorial threats, and whether one reason why military regimes are the shortest-lived is because they arise in response to specific problems. As was noted in the Introduction, Weeks (2012) found that variation among authoritarian regimes and their institutional structures placed differing levels of constraints on their ability to use military force.

A second avenue for future research involves investigating the duration of the reduction in political polarization and increased military buildup in response to territorial or security threats. Is it a permanent arrangement lasting decades, with the military assuming an active political role, or can the political apparatus prevent the military from encroaching into the political sphere? It depends on multiple factors.

Third, how do regimes gauge threats? The assumption of territorial peace theory that all states respond similarly to threats is unrealistic. The North Korean case demonstrates that political elites are guided by survival. Kim Il Sung perceived a greater threat from the United States and the ideology it represented more than he did with respect to South Korea, which he perceived as an exploited population seeking liberation by communist forces. Kim responded to the American threat by creating a garrison state, although the dispute between the U.S. and DPRK was not territorial, but instead ideological. Nasser involved Egyptian troops in combat operations in Yemen despite a territorial threat on Egypt's border. Various regime types and individual leaders perceive threats differently, and thus respond to them in a variety of ways. The research from these cases supports that conclusion. Similarly, why authoritarian nuclear powers do not democratize is likewise enigmatic, considering the unlikelihood of an invasion of a nuclear power.

Finally, an interesting avenue for future research involves a detailed examination of ethnocratic responses to security threats, both internal and external. Possible cases of interest

would include South Africa, Turkey, Belgium, Latvia, and Estonia. As scholars have provided definitions of ethnocracies, if these states so designated respond similarly to perceived threats, territorial peace theory may provide a useful explanation for this. A common ethnic group fearing conquest may be more likely to become an ethnocracy in response to perceived threats as a survival mechanism. Coercion, rather than directed inwards towards the dominant ethnic group, is focused outwards on the threatening group. Such a finding would marry anthropological, psychological, and political science explanations, which the territorial peace does. Similarly, additional case studies on conflict among states containing shared ethnic groups would be beneficial in contributing to a theory of threat perception. As the Korean case studies showed, although both states engaged in a brutal war and experienced long-term mistrust, they have also expressed kinship ties, viewing their counterparts across the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel as ethnic brethren in need of liberation and reunification.

## REFERENCES

- Abul-Magd, Zeniab. *Militarizing the Nation: The Army, Business, and Revolution in Egypt*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, James A. Robinson, and Pierre Yared. 2008. "Income and Democracy". *American Economic Review* 98(3): 808-842.
- Arian, Asher. *The Second Republic: Politics in Israel*. Chatham House: Chatham, 1998.
- Ashkenazy, Daniella. *The Military in the Service of Society and Democracy: The Challenge of The Dual Role Military*. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 1994.
- Ben Meir, Yehuda. *Civil-Military Relations in Israel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Bennett, Bruce W. and Jennifer Lind. 2011. "The Collapse of North Korea: Military Missions and Requirements." *International Security* 36(2): 84-119.
- Bennett, Bruce W. 2012. "Deterring North Korea from Using WMD in Future Conflicts and Crises". *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 6(4), 119-151.
- Bernhard, Michael, Christopher Reenock, and Timothy Nordstrom. 2004. "The Legacy of Western Overseas Colonialism on Democratic Survival." *International Studies Quarterly* 48: 225-250.
- Bremer, Stuart A. 1992. "Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(2): 309-341.
- Brooks, Risa. 1998. "Political-Military Relations and the Stability of Arab Regimes". *International Institute for Strategic Studies. Adelphi Paper 324*.

- Brooks, Risa. 2006. "An Autocracy at War: Explaining Egypt's Military Effectiveness, 1967 And 1973." *Security Studies* 15:3, 396-430.
- Brownlee, Jason. *Democracy Prevention: The Politics of the U.S.-Egyptian Alliance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and Alastair Smith. 2008. "Political Survival and Endogenous Institutional Change." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(2): 167-197.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce; James D. Morrow; Randolph M. Silverson; and Alastair Smith. 1999. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791-807.
- Bunce, Valerie J. and Sharon L. Wolchik. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Buzo, Adrian. *The Guerilla Dynasty: Politics and Leadership in North Korea*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1999.
- Carey Sabine C. 2010. "The Use of Repression in Response to Domestic Dissent." *Political Studies* 58(1): 167-186.
- Carpenter, Ted Galen and Doug Bandow. *The Korean Conundrum: America's Troubled Relations with North and South Korea*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- Cho, Seong-Ryoul. 2009. "North Korea's Security Dilemma and Strategic Options". *The Journal of East Asian Affairs* 23(2): 69-102.
- Chomsky, Noam. "The Israel-Arafat Agreement". *Z Magazine*, October 1993.
- Chung, Chien-peng. 2003. "Democratization in South Korea and Inter-Korean Relations". *Pacific Affairs* 76(1): 9-35.

- Colaresi, Michael. 2004. "When Doves Cry: International Rivalry, Unreciprocated Cooperation, and Leadership Turnover." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3): 555-570.
- Cook, Steven A. *Ruling But Not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Dafoe, Allan. 2011. "Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace: Caveat Emptor". *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 247-262.
- Dahl, Robert. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Dahl, Robert. 2005. "What Political Institutions Does Large-Scale Democracy Require?" *Political Science Quarterly* 120(2): 187-197.
- Davenport, Christian. 2007. "State Repression and the Tyrannical Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 44(4): 485-504.
- DeRouen, Karl and Jeffrey Peake. 2002. "The Dynamics of Diversion: The Domestic Implications of Presidential Use of Force." *International Interactions* 25(2): 191-211.
- Diamond, Larry; Juan Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset. *Democracy in Developing Countries: Asia*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1989.
- Dixon, William. 1994. "Democracy and the Peaceful Settlement of International Conflict." *American Political Science Review* 88: 14-32.
- Dowty, Alan. *The Jewish State*. University of California Press: Berkeley, 1998.
- Doyle, Michael W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12(3): 205-235.
- Evron, Yair. *Israel's Nuclear Dilemma*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Fadel, Leila. "Egypt's Military Guards Its Own Power". *The Washington Post* November 12, 2011.

Farnham, Barbara. 2003. "The Theory of Democratic Peace and Threat Perception." *International Studies Quarterly* 47(3): 395-415.

Feldman, Shai. *Israeli Nuclear Deterrence: A Strategy for the 1980s*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Fisher, Max. "Why is the U.S. okay with Israel having Nuclear Weapons but not Iran?" *The Washington Post* December 2, 2013.

Fowler, James. 1999. "The United States and South Korean Democratization". *Political Science Quarterly* 114(2): 265-288.

Friedberg, Aaron L. 1992. "Why Didn't The United States Become a Garrison State?" *International Security* 16(4): 109-142.

Gartzke, Erik. 1998. "Kant We All Just Get Along? Opportunity, Willingness, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 1-27.

Gartzke, Erik. 2000. "Preferences and the Democratic Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 44(2):191-210.

Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace". *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166-191.

Gat, Azar. 2007. "The Return of Authoritarian Great Powers." *Foreign Affairs* 86(4): 59-69.

Geddes, Barbara. 1999. "What Do We Know About Democratization After Twenty Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* (2): 115-144.

Gerring, John. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Gibler, Douglas M. 2010. "Outside In: The Effects of External Threats on State Centralization." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: 1-26.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2007. "Bordering on Peace: Democracy Territorial Issues, and Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 51(3): 509-532.
- Gibler, Douglas M. *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Gibler, Douglas M. and Jaroslav Tir. 2014. "Territorial Peace and Democratic Clustering." *The Journal of Politics* 76(1):27-40.
- Gibler, Douglas M. and Jaroslav Tir. 2010. "Settled Borders and Regime Type: Democratic Transitions as Consequences of Peaceful Territorial Transfers." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(4): 951-968.
- Gibler, Douglas M. and Jamil M. Sewell. 2006. "External Threat and Democracy: The Role of NATO Revisited". *Journal of Peace Research* 43(4): 413-431.
- Goertz, Gary and Paul F. Diehl. 1992. "Toward a Theory of International Norms: Some Conceptual and Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(4): 634-664.
- Goertz, Gary and Paul F. Diehl. 1993. "Enduring Rivalries: Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Patterns." *International Studies Quarterly* 27 (2): 147-171.
- Goertz, Gary and Paul F. Diehl. 1995. "The Initiation and Termination of Enduring Rivalries: The Impact of Political Shocks." *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (1):30-52.
- Gordon, Neve. *Israel's Occupation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Graham, Benjamin A.T., Michael K. Miller, and Kaare W. Strøm. 2017. "Safeguarding Democracy: Powersharing and Democratic Survival." *American Political Science Review* 111(4): 686-704.

- Hadenius, Axel and Jan Teorell. 2007. "Pathways from Authoritarianism". *Journal of Democracy* 18(1): 143-157.
- Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Halbfinger, David M. and Isabel Kershner. "Israeli Law Declares the Country the 'Nation-State of the Jewish People'". *The New York Times* July 18, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/19/world/middleeast/israel-law-jewsarabic.html>
- Hastings, Max. *The Korean War*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Hessler, Peter. "Egypt's Failed Revolution". *The New Yorker*. January 2, 2017.
- Horowitz, Dan and Moshe Lissak. *Origins of the Israeli Polity: Palestine under the Mandate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Horowitz, Dan and Moshe Lissak. *Trouble in Utopia: The Overburdened Polity in Israel*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- Huntington, Samuel. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.
- Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone, 1996.
- Huth, Paul K. 1996. "Enduring Rivalries and Territorial Disputes, 1950-1990". *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15(1): 7-41.
- Ish-Shalom, Piki. *Democratic Peace: A Political Biography*. The University of Michigan Press, 2013.
- Kandil, Hazem. *Soldiers, Spies, and Statesmen* London: Verso, 2014.

- Kaplan, Robert D. and Abraham M. Denmark. 2011. "The Long Goodbye: The Future North Korea". *World Affairs* 174 (1): 7-21.
- Kassem, Maye. *Egyptian Politics: The Dynamics of Authoritarian Rule*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2004.
- Kessler, Glenn. "Iran's Claim that Israel has 400 Nuclear Weapons." *The Washington Post*. May 1, 2015.
- Kim, Byung-Kook and Ezra F. Vogel. *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Kim, Ki-Joo. 2014. "The Soldier and the State in South Korea: Crafting Democratic Civilian Control of the Military." *Journal of International and Area Studies* 21(2): 119-131.
- Kim, Seung-Young. 2001. "Security, Nationalism, and the Pursuit of Nuclear Weapons and Missiles: The South Korean Case, 1970-82." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 12(4): 53-80.
- Kim, Sunhyuk. "Civil Society and Democratization in South Korea". In Armstrong, Charles K. *Korean Society: Civil Society, Democracy, and the State (Asia's Transformations)*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Kimmerling, Baruch. *The Interrupted System: Israeli Civilians in War and Routine Times*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1985.
- Kimmerling, Baruch. *Clash of Identities: Explorations in Israeli and Palestinian Societies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kriekhaus, Jonathan. 2017. "Geopolitics in South Korea's Economic Success". *Asian Perspective* 41: 43-69.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1941. "The Garrison State". *American Journal of Sociology* 46(4): 455

468.

- Lee, Sook-Jong. 2005. "Democratization and Polarization in Korean Society". *Asian Perspective* 29(3): 99-125.
- Lee, Dong Sun. 2007. "Democratization and the US-South Korean Alliance." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 7(3): 469-499.
- Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown Publishing, 2018.
- Levitsky, Steven and Lucian A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linz, Juan. 1990. "Transitions to Democracy." *The Washington Quarterly* 13(3): 143-164.
- Linz, Juan and Alfred Stepan. 1978. *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lipsett, Seymour Martin. *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Prescott: Anchor Books, 1960.
- Maoz, Zeev and Bruce M. Russett. 1993. "Normative and Structural Causes of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 87: 624-638.
- McCoy, Alfred W. *In the Shadows of the American Century: The Rise and Decline of US Global Power*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2017.
- Mendelsohn, Ezra. *On Modern Jewish Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Monteiro, Nuno P. *Theory of Unipolar Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Mousseau, Michael. 1997. "Democracy and Militarized Interstate Collaboration." *Journal of Peace Research* 34(1): 73-87.

Mousseau, Michael. 2000. "Market Prosperity, Democratic Consolidation, and Democratic Peace". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(4):472-507.

Mueller, John. *Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Noland, Marcus. 1996. "Why North Korea Will Muddle Through". *Foreign Affairs* 76(4): 105-118.

Ogden, Robert F and David A. Anderson. 2008. "U.S. Foreign Policy Toward North Korea: A Way Ahead." *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 2(3): 72-119.

Ophir, Adi, Michael Givoni, and Sari Hanafi. *The Power of Inclusive Exclusion: Anatomy of Israeli Rule in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. New York: Zone Books, 2009.

Owsiak, Andrew P. 2013. "Democratization and International Border Agreements". *The Journal of Politics* 75(3): 717-729.

Park, Myoung-Kyu and Philo Kim. 2010. "Inter-Korean Relations in Nuclear Politics." *Asian Perspective* 34(1): 111-135.

Pew Research <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/06/07/balancing-act-national-security-and-civil-liberties-in-post-911-era/>

Pew Research <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2011/05/18/overturn-egypt-israelpeace-agreement/>

Podeh, Elie and Onn Winckler. *Rethinking Nasserism: Revolution and Historical Memory in Modern Egypt*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004.

Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 1996. "What Makes Democracies Endure?" *Journal of Democracy* 7(1): 39-49.

- Quinlivan, James T. 1999. "Coup-Proofing: It's Practice and Consequences in the Middle East". *International Security* 24(2): 131-165.
- Rabinovich, Abraham. *The Yom Kippur War*. New York: Random House, 2004.
- Rauchhaus, Robert. 2009. "Evaluating the Nuclear Hypothesis: A Quantitative Approach". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (2): 258-277.
- Reiter, Dan and Allan C. Stam. *Democracies at War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Robinson, Shira. *Citizen Strangers: Palestinians and the Birth of Israel's Liberal Settler State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Rose, Richard and William Mishler. 2002. "Comparing Regime Support in Non-Democratic and Democratic Countries." *Democratization* 9(2): 1-20.
- Russett, Bruce and John Oneal. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: Norton, 2001.
- Rutherford, Bruce K. *Egypt After Mubarak*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Sachar, Howard M. *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010.
- Schmitter, Philippe C and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy is...and Is Not." *Journal of Democracy*. Johns Hopkins University Press 2(3): 75-88.
- Shafir, Gershon. *A Half Century of Occupation: Israel, Palestine, and the World's Most Intractable Conflict*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Shimshoni, Daniel. *Israeli Democracy: The Middle of the Journey*. New York: Free Press, 1982.

Singer, J. David. 1958. "Threat Perception and the Armament-Tension Dilemma." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2(1): 90-105.

Skocpol, Theda. *States and Social Revolutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Smootha, Sammy. 1990. "Minority Status in an Ethnic Democracy: The Status of the Arab Minority in Israel." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13(3): 389-413.

Smootha, Sammy. 2002. "The Model of Ethnic Democracy: Israel as a Jewish and Democratic State." *Nations and Nationalism* 8(4): 475-503.

Smith, Emily. "Controversial Tear Gas Cannisters Made in the USA". CNN, January 28, 2011, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/africa/01/28/egypt.us.tear.gas/index.html>

"State of the Union; Excerpts from President Clinton's Message on the State of the Union", January 26, 1994. *The New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/01/26/us/state-union-excerpts-president-clinton-s-message-state-union.html?pagewanted=all>

Sung-Joo, Han. 1988. "South Korea in 1987: The Politics of Democratization". *Asian Survey* 28(1): 52-61.

Tang, Shiping. 1999. "A Neutral, Reunified Korea: A Chinese View." *Journal of East Asian Affairs* 13(2): 464-483.

Tilly, Charles. *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Tomz, Michael R. and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2013. "Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 107(4): 849-865.

Tyler, Patrick. *Fortress Israel*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012.

Warrick, Joby and Julie Vitkovskaya. "North Korea's Nuclear Weapons: What You Need to Know." *The Washington Post*, March 9, 2018. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2018/03/06/5-things-to-know-about-north-koreas-nuclear-weapons/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.6eb5da78fbbb](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2018/03/06/5-things-to-know-about-north-koreas-nuclear-weapons/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.6eb5da78fbbb)

Weeks, Jessica L. 2012. "Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict." *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 326-347.

Yaniv, Avner. *National Security and Democracy in Israel*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993.

Yiftachel, Oren. *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Zhu, Yun-han, Larry Diamond, and Doh Chull Shin. 2001. "How People View Democracy: Halting Progress in Korea and Taiwan." *Journal of Democracy* 12(1): 122-136.