

KICK-OFF CONFERENCE RESEARCH GROUP

# From Disorder to Order: Conflict and the Resources of Legitimacy



'Tajo Abierto', Decertor, Lima 2012

Leiden University  
20-21 October 2016

Keynote speakers:

Monica Toft  
(University of Oxford)

Sergio Aguayo  
(El Colegio de México-Harvard University)

Ulrich Schneckener  
(University of Osnabrück)



Universiteit  
Leiden



KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE  
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

Presentation.....I

*From Disorder to Order: Conflict and the Resources of Legitimacy* .....I

*Conference organisers*.....2

*Website & Registration* .....2

*Location*.....3

Keynote Speakers Bio .....4

*Monica Toft*.....4

*Sergio Aguayo*.....5

*Ulrich Schneckener* .....6

Conference Programme .....7

*Day 1: Thursday 20 October 2016* .....7

*Day 2: Friday 21 October, 2016* .....8

Conference Abstracts.....IO

*Day 1: Thursday 20 October, 2016* .....IO

*Day 2: Friday 21 October, 2016* .....I5

# Presentation

## From Disorder to Order: Conflict and the Resources of Legitimacy

In contexts of conflict, expansive violence or other forms of disorder, different types of counter-state actors may appear and win legitimacy among the population with the provision of material and immaterial goods and services. Extremist and insurgent groups, such as rebels, terrorists, guerrilla fighters, warlords and self-proclaimed police forces (autodefensas) take over functions normatively assigned to the sovereign state. Counter-state actors become a source of security, health, identity-making and belonging, financing, and other forms of emancipation. By doing so, counter-state actors restore some sense of order within disorder, and are recognised as legitimate authorities.

Even if counter-state actors can themselves be the very source of coercion or violence over larger groups, they can also be perceived as charismatic leaders, or be deeply admired and celebrated in popular culture. This is so because counter-state actors can be perceived as an 'alternative' to weak and inefficient governments, or as a legitimate representative for specific grievances or marginalised groups. The use of violence and insurgency may also underline a larger, shared desire for reshaping the foundations of society, or to discipline a predatory or repressive state. In many ways, counter-state actors can be seen as agents striving for some kind of emancipation or social utopia. How do counter-state actors attain legitimacy? What sort of mechanisms or resources do they employ? What categories or beliefs do they appeal to other than coercion or violence to substantiate this legitimacy?

This conference focuses on the study of competing systems of legitimacy between state actors and their opponents. The conference seeks to integrate a multidisciplinary approach, bringing together academics from history, political science, anthropology, cultural studies, sociology and law drawing on specific case studies across space and time.

The conference aims to analyse both, specific cases and the larger theoretical debates on political legitimacy, state formation, statehood, and cultural production.

This meeting is organised by the research group 'From Disorder to Order: Counter-Societies and the Resources of Legitimacy', financed by the profile area Political Legitimacy at Leiden University and supported by the The Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences KNAW.

Attendance is free; please register before October 14 by filling in this form online (webpage link below). In case of any problem with the registration, write to Karla Medrano at [k.v.medrano@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:k.v.medrano@hum.leidenuniv.nl)

## Conference organisers

**Prof.Dr. Isabelle Duyvesteyn, [i.duyvesteyn@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:i.duyvesteyn@hum.leidenuniv.nl)**



She is Professor of International Studies / Global History at the Leiden University Institute for History and Special Chair in Strategic Studies at the Leiden University Institute of Political Science.

**Dr. Jose Carlos G. Aguiar, [j.c.g.aguiar@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:j.c.g.aguiar@hum.leidenuniv.nl)**

He is specialized in cultures of illegality, intellectual property, borders, security and minority issues. His research interests include the ethnography of marketplaces, legitimacy and legality, intellectual property, security policies and border cities. Personal webpage: [www.josecarlosaguiar.com](http://www.josecarlosaguiar.com) Twitter: @jcgaguiar



## Website & Registration

<https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/events/2016/10/from-disorder-to-order>

# Location

Leiden University  
Gravensteen Room 1.11  
Pieterskerkhof 6, 2311SR Leiden, the Netherlands

## ***How to get to Leiden?***

### **By train**

Visitors arriving by plane at Schiphol airport can take the train to Leiden. Trains depart regularly (every 10 mins) from platform 5 or 6, and the trip takes about 20 minutes. A one-way ticket costs about € 5.00.

## ***How to get to the conference venue?***

### **Walking**

From Leiden Central Station to the conference venue “Gravensteen building” Walking Take the main exit towards the Centre. Cross the station square and keep to the right side of the road. Take the Stationsweg and then the Steenstraat and continue across the Blauwpoortsbrug bridge. On leaving the bridge, turn right and take the Prinsessekade, which will become the Korte Rapenburg. Cross the street and you are on the Rapenburg. Take the third street on your left. This is the Kloksteeg. This streets opens onto the Pieterskerkhof. You will find the Gravensteen on your left, opposite the church.



### **By taxi**

Taxis are located at the front of the station. The taxi fare to the city centre is approximately € 8.

### **By bus**

Buses stop in front of the train station. You can take buses 15, 16, 31, 40, 42, 187, 185, 189. You need a bus which travels along the Breestraat. Ask the driver to let you know when you are at the bus stop in the Breestraat outside “Selexyz” (a bookshop). Walk along the Breestraat and turn right into the Pieterskerkchoorsteeg. Follow this street until you arrive at the Pieterskerkhof. You will find the Gravensteen on your right, opposite the church.

# Keynote Speakers Bio

## Monica Toft

Email: [monica.toft@bsg.ox.ac.uk](mailto:monica.toft@bsg.ox.ac.uk)

Before joining the Blavatnik School of Government in 2012, Professor Monica Duffy Toft taught at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. While there she directed the Initiative on Religion in International Affairs and was the assistant director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies.

She was educated at the University of Chicago (MA and PhD in political science) and at the University of California, Santa Barbara (BA in political science and Slavic languages and literature, summa cum laude). Prior to this, she spent four years in the United States Army as a Russian linguist. Monica's areas of research include international security, ethnic and religious violence, civil wars and demography. Her most recent books include: *Securing the Peace* (Princeton, 2011); *Political Demography* (with Jack Goldstone and Eric Kaufmann, Oxford, 2012); and *God's Century* (with Daniel Philpott and Timothy Shah, Norton, 2012).



In addition she has published numerous scholarly articles and editorials on civil wars, territory and nationalism, demography, and religion in global politics. Her article *Islamists and Nationalists: Rebel Motivation and Counterinsurgency in Russia's North Caucasus* co-authored with Yuri Zhukov was published in the *American Political Science Review* in May 2015. Her most recent opinion pieces are on religious fundamentalism and women's equality in the *Huffington Post* and on the importance of identity politics for Iraq's security at *Project Syndicate*, a column that appeared in 19 publications in five different languages. Monica can also be found on Twitter @mduffytoft.

# Sergio Aguayo

Email: [saguayo@colmex.mx](mailto:saguayo@colmex.mx)

Scholar and political analyst. Sergio Aguayo was born in the State of Jalisco and raised in its capital city of Guadalajara. In 1971, he transferred to Mexico City to study a Bachelor's degree in International Relations at El Colegio de Mexico. He studied his Masters (1971), Doctorate and Post-Doctorate degrees (1977-1984) at Johns Hopkins University. He is a research professor at the Centro de Estudios Internacionales (Center for International Studies) at El Colegio de Mexico since 1977, and holds a Level III -the highest possible- in Mexico's Sistema Nacional de Investigadores (National Researcher System).



He currently coordinates the Seminar on Violence and Peace in that Institution. He has taught at various universities in Mexico, the United States and throughout Europe. In 2014 and 2015 he taught a course on "Violence in the Caribbean Basin" at Harvard University. In March 2015, he was appointed Visiting Professor at Harvard University. His first newspaper article appeared in a local newspaper in Guadalajara in 1971.

He now writes a weekly column in Reforma every Wednesday, as well as 12 other newspapers. Since March 2001, he is a member of Primer Plano, Canal 11's weekly TV show, and from 2009 to March 2015 he participated in Carmen Aristegui's Mesa Política radio program broadcasted by MVS. He has written dozens of books and scholarly articles. The digital version of his latest title, *Remolino. El México de la sociedad organizada, los poderes fácticos y Enrique Peña Nieto*, published by Editorial Ink, was launched in March 2014. In January 2015, the printed version of the book came out, and the English digital version of the book, *The Mexican Enigma*, is now available for purchase.

# Ulrich Schneckener

Email: [ulrich.schneckener@uni-osnabrueck.de](mailto:ulrich.schneckener@uni-osnabrueck.de)

Dr. Ulrich Schneckener is Head of the Research Unit Global Issues at the German Institute for International Affairs (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik - SWP) in Berlin. In 2003 he was recognised with an award from the German Association for Political Science (Deutsche Vereinigung für Politische Wissenschaft - DVPW) and in 2005 received the Peter Becker Prize for Peace and Conflict Studies. From 1996 to 2002 he was also a Research Associate at the Institute for Inter-Cultural and International Studies at the University of Bremen.



Dr. Ulrich Schneckener is a member of the Council on Civilian Crisis Prevention of the Federal Government of Germany. Since 09/2009 Professor of International Relations & Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Osnabrück Since 03/2016 Chairman of the Executive Board, German Foundation for Peace Research.

He was Dean at the School of Cultural Studies and Social Sciences at the University of Osnabrück and Director of the Centre for Democracy and Peace Research of the same university. He was also researcher, member of the Research Advisory Board and Head of Research Group "Global Issues" at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP). In 2005 he was awarded with the Peter-Becker-Price for Peace and Conflict Studies of the Philipps-Universität Marburg.



# Conference Programme

## Day 1: Thursday 20 October 2016

10.00 hrs.

### *Official Opening*

Prof.Dr. Ruud Koole, coordinator research profile Political Legitimacy: Institutions and Identities (Leiden University)

### *Introduction*

Dr. Jose Carlos G. Aguiar & Prof.Dr. Isabelle Duyvesteyn (Leiden University)

10.20 hrs.

### *Keynote address*

Prof.Dr. Sergio Aguayo (Colegio de México/Harvard University): 'Rebels and Counter-societies'

11.00 hrs.

### *Workshop session 1: Rebels and Legitimacy – mapping the issues*

Discussant: Prof.Dr. Rivke Jaffe (Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development Studies and the Centre for Urban Studies, University of Amsterdam)

Eric Schoon (The Ohio State University), 'Configuring Legitimacy: Theorizing the Variable Effects of Legitimacy in Violent Political Conflict'

Adrian Florea (University of Glasgow), 'The Logic of Rebel Governance'

12.00 hrs.

Dr. James Worrall (University of Leeds), 'Re-Emergent Orders: Understanding the Negotiation(s) of Rebel Governance'

Dr. Eric Bähre (Leiden University), 'Violence and social order in South Africa'

13.00

*Lunch*

14.00

*Keynote address* Prof.Dr. Ulrich Schneckener (University of Osnabrück), 'Militia legitimacy'

15.15 hrs.

*Workshop session 2: Rebels in Latin America*

Discussant: Dr. Eric Bähre (Leiden University)

Rodrigo Peña González and Karla Medrano (Leiden University), 'State Order, Militias, and Local Government. Michoacan Case'

Julienne Weegels (University of Amsterdam), 'Understanding Nicaraguan Prison Riots'

Merel de Buck (Utrecht University), 'New forms of political subjectivity from the margins: experiences from community police in Guerrero, Mexico'

17.00 hrs

*Drinks and dinner*

Faculty Club of Leiden University (Rapenburg 73)

## **Day 2: Friday 21 October, 2016**

10.00 hrs.

*Keynote address* Prof.Dr. Monica Toft (University of Oxford), 'Rebels and the State'

10.40 hrs.

*Workshop session 3: Rebels in Africa and Asia*

*Discussant:* Dr. Jose Carlos G. Aguiar (Leiden University)

Prof.Dr. Mirjam de Bruijn and Jonna Both (Leiden University), '(re)New(ed) claims on citizenship/belonging in sub-Saharan Africa'.

Dr. Corinna Jentsch (Leiden University), 'Governance 'of the people, by the people, for the people:' Militias and Political Order in Civil War'

Dr. Romain Malejacq (Radboud University), 'Warlord Governance and Warlord Diplomacy in Afghanistan: The Case of Ahmad Shah Massoud (1979-2001)'

13.00

*Lunch*

14.00

*Workshop session 4: Europe and conclusions*

Discussant: Prof.Dr. Isabelle Duyvesteyn (Leiden University)

Dr. Joost Augusteijn (Leiden University), 'Democracy and Counter-state Actors'

Dr. Lee Seymour (Université de Montréal), 'Peoples, places, and the politics of belonging: Legitimizing claims to contested territory through controlling people'

Dr. Abbey Steele (University of Amsterdam) and Dr Jacob Shapiro (Princeton University), 'Sub-contracting State-building'

16.00

*Farewell tea and cakes*

# Conference Abstracts

**Day 1:** Thursday 20 October, 2016

**Eric Schoon (The Ohio State University), ‘Configuring Legitimacy: Theorizing the Variable Effects of Legitimacy in Violent Political Conflict’**

Email: schoon@email.arizona.edu

Legitimacy is often considered critical in shaping the course and outcome of violent political conflict, yet empirical research reveals a high degree of variation in the effects of legitimacy for rebels and insurgent groups. In this article, we elaborate a configurational model to explain this variability. Integrating insights from organizational studies and research on violent political conflict, we argue that the effects of legitimacy are shaped by distinctive configurations of 1) the type of legitimacy being conferred (i.e., moral, pragmatic or cognitive), 2) the audience conferring legitimacy, and 3) the mode of interaction between an organization and an audience. Using historical and comparative analysis, we examine the effects of legitimacy for three counter-state actors engaged in violent political conflict: the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) in Turkey, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and Jemaah Islamiyah (JI) in Southeast Asia. We show that the effects of legitimacy are highly consistent across cases when the three dimensions are similar, whereas the effects of legitimacy diverge across different configurations. Based on our findings, we elaborate a series of propositions regarding the effects and relational dynamics of legitimacy in violent political conflict.

**Adrian Florea (University of Glasgow), ‘The Logic of Rebel Governance’**

Email: Adrian.Florea@glasgow.ac.uk

Besides waging war, rebels often engage in governance activities whereby they develop institutions that regulate socio-economic and political life in areas under their control. Yet, not all rebel groups establish extensive governance structures. For example, in Gaza, Hamas has built a complex administrative system. By contrast, in northeast Syria, Kurdish militias have struggled to create institutions of local rule. What explains the

variation in rebel governance across multiple conflicts? Using original data, this article offers an empirical examination of several environmental and organizational factors that shape rebel incentives to supply governance. The findings reveal that insurgents are less likely to provide governance when they receive external military assistance and when warfare is ongoing, but are more likely to do so when they are fragmented, are militarily stronger than the government, when peacekeepers are present, and when they rule over a large concentrated minority.

**Dr. James Worrall (University of Leeds), 'Re-Emergent Orders: Understanding the Negotiation(s) of Rebel Governance'**

Email: [j.e.worrall@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:j.e.worrall@leeds.ac.uk)

Order is a frequently under-utilised and under-theorised analytical concept in the study of conflict and post-conflict situations. When the term is deployed it is frequently conflated with the connected, but separate, notion of security, it is often used without explanation or exploration, comes loaded with normative assumptions about ideal types, and is deployed as a descriptive rather than an analytical tool. Yet order as an analytical concept has much to offer the study of societies of all kinds, and especially those experiencing conflict, because it offers the opportunities to explore the everyday politics which connect authorities, rebel movements, criminal gangs and the population itself in a complex mass of intersubjective and power-based interactions and negotiations. Traditionally, the binary distinction between order and disorder is utilised. This obscures the reality that order is always present, and is constantly being negotiated and renegotiated; that it is never pure or static in either its social or political guises. This paper begins by examining the various threads which combine to shape and sustain order and how these elements interact in the negotiation, framing and enforcement of order.

Drawing from political philosophy, sociology and international relations; an analytical framework, centring on the interactions of power, legitimacy, authority and culture, is created to provide tools of analysis to assist in understanding not only how rebel groups are able to establish a durable form of order which is satisfactory to their interests but also how this order is conditioned by pre-existing norms and interests, which themselves are likely to have been altered by conflict. This analytical framework is then used to

specifically explore the processes by which rebel movements continually adapt in their attempts to cement their control. Deploying Hezbollah as a case study, the paper explores the various strategies which the Party of God has utilised to sustain its governance, through its involvement in the negotiation of both social and cultural order, negotiated with different interest groups and authorities within Lebanon. Through an appreciation that rebel orders are built both upon, and alongside, existing social and cultural orders which re-emerge in the aftermath of conflict, we can better understand how rebel order must remain responsive to other forms of order if it is to endure.

**Dr. Eric Bähre (Leiden University), 'Violence and social order in South Africa'**

Email: [ebaehre@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:ebaehre@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

It is persuasive to contrast violence and social order, to associate violence with chaos, disruption, and the transgression of moralities. The absence of violence is then associated with social structure, trust, harmony, and a whole range of equilibria. But this contrast is problematic. First, as the organisers of this conference stress, violence can be deeply embedded in the social order and be much more at home within social norms, moralities, and everyday interactions than we might feel comfortable admitting. Second, there are instances of what Galtung (1969) called structural violence: Social order and harmony can be very violent, exploitative and otherwise destructive. Based on ethnographic fieldwork in South Africa, I raise two questions. First, can we further develop the taxonomy of violence and (dis)order and would that help us to better understand the causes and consequences of violence? Second, at least since Galtung came up with the term structural violence almost half a century ago we know that violence and social order can go together comfortably. If we know this, then why is the belief that violence is against the social order so persuasive? How is the contradiction between violence and social order reproduced, or are there instances where people see violence and social order as reinforcing one another?

**Rodrigo Peña González and Karla Medrano (Leiden University), ‘State Order, Militias, and Local Government. Michoacan Case’**

Email: r.pena.gonzalez@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Email: k.v.medrano@hum.leidenuniv.nl

In December 2006 the Mexican government declared war against organised crime, marking the date as a crucial moment regarding the escalating violence that was about to be unleashed. This war however, unfolded very differently in each region. In this paper we analyze Michoacan state. Michoacan is where the first military operation was carried out to fight organised crime. It is also here where one of the first and most violent attacks occurred: a grenade was detonated at the biggest public plaza on the state’s capital. In this way, the image of war began to take hold of Michoacan’s civil population. Currently, several Mexican states, and particularly the state of Michoacan, are experiencing alarming and expanding levels of violence, as a multitude of groups and actors continuously challenge the government. As several authors are pointing out, it is not that there is a deficit of state but on the contrary, there’s an excess of statehood practices: too many players compete to perform as small states. Within the context this paper aims to describe two cases of rebellion which share the same region and problematic, but so far have reached very different outcomes.

**Julienne Weegels (University of Amsterdam), ‘Understanding Nicaraguan Prison Riots’**

Email: j.h.j.weegels@cedla.nl

Prison riots are often portrayed as outbursts of dormant counter-state anger, worsened by overcrowding and deteriorating prison conditions. Such a perspective, however, does not allow for an analysis of underlying governance structures and their legitimations. When prison governance requires a balancing act between those officially in power and those (to a large extent) practically in power, alternative governance systems are produced, and with them the means by which to dissolve them. In this paper, I research the motives, process and outcomes of two prison riots to see what they tell us about prison governance, the nature of order, legitimacy, and the use of coercive force and creative violence in Nicaragua. Each riot is a situation in which diverse actors mobilize with and

against each other, each to forward their own story, resulting in a multiplicity of performative acts that each shed light on a particular share of this situation. Each riot has its own particular outcome that reconfigures the prison environment and the power relations that permeate it. Against the notion that riots are incidents, I will explain them as both revealing of and integral to the governing structures at stake – structures that are always inherently altered by their occurrence.

**Merel de Buck (Utrecht University;), ‘New forms of political subjectivity from the margins: experiences from community police in Guerrero, Mexico’**

Email: M.A.deBuck@uu.nl

Throughout the last two decades, the socio-political landscape of the southern Mexican state of Guerrero has been significantly influenced by community policing groups who subscribe to principles of indigenous autonomy. The neoliberal era has both enabled and constrained this pluralization of authority by opening up space for self-determination but also reifying boundaries between authorized and unauthorized indigenous people. Under conditions where different state and non-state actors exercise political authority, centralized powers become dis-articulated and space opens up for the construction of new forms of political subjectivity. In this paper, I unravel the distinctive ways in which the recently emerged community policing organization *la Unión de Pueblos y Organizaciones del Estado de Guerrero* [UPOEG] symbolizes and justifies localized authority in the Costa Chica region of Guerrero. I analyze how the UPOEG has constituted itself as authority through collective social practices in the realm of security and address UPOEG's claims to legitimacy which articulate a politics of difference inspired by the notion of *usos y costumbres*. As a result, I argue that the organization upsets state power by evoking new authority registers based on inclusive and translocal forms of representation.



## Day 2: Friday 21 October, 2016

### **Prof.Dr. Mirjam de Bruijn and Jonna Both (Leiden University), '(re)New(ed) claims on citizenship/belonging in sub-Saharan Africa'**

Email: m.e.de.bruijn@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Email: j.c.both@hum.leidenuniv.nl

In this paper we situate the life of young men and women in Africa in the rapidly changing political landscape influenced by the war on terrorism, the advancement of ICTs and new social-political movements. Sub-Saharan Africa has gained attention in international politics not only because of the many international peace keeping missions, but also because it has become one of the central playgrounds in the war on terrorism. We will show how young people are drawn towards radicalist groups or at least develop sympathy for them, not because they are terrorists but because the alternatives to citizenship are lacking. The search for a socio-political identity in the new political configuration has opened up new possibilities to claim belonging that go beyond the nation, but often refer to ethnicity, religion and political opposition and increasingly to a form of global citizenship. This paper is based on long term anthropological-historical research in West and Central Africa. We argue that it is especially the information flows and the connectivity between young people in these regions that has given their search for citizenship/ belonging a new turn and through their actions they support the legitimacy of leaders and groups who are in general considered counter-actors.

### **Dr. Corinna Jentsch (Leiden University), 'Governance 'of the people, by the people, for the people:' Militias and Political Order in Civil War'**

Email: c.jentsch@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

The paper focuses on those armed actors involved in shaping political and social order in civil war who recruit civilians with little to no military training- self-defense forces, vigilantes, and militias that are either aligned with the government or the rebels, or remain independent. Using evidence from the civil war in Mozambique (1976-1992), I

contrast the emergence and organization of rebel-aligned militias with that of militias loyal to the government. Both the rebels, Renamo, and the Frelimo government recruited civilians into auxiliary armed forces to function as a liaison to the civilian population and support the fight against the other. Renamo-affiliated militias were more integrated into Renamo's governance structure and served mainly policing functions. The government-aligned Naparama, in contrast, were more independent of Frelimo and took over military functions. The paper points to a few reasons for this difference, chief among them Renamo's close cooperation with traditional authorities that oversaw the militias and allowed for a tight system of "multi-level governance" in Renamo-controlled areas. The paper broadens the concept of (rebel) governance to one of alternative forms of political order that are shaped by armed actors both in support of and opposition to the state.

**Dr. Romain Malejacq (Radboud University), 'Warlord Governance and Warlord Diplomacy in Afghanistan: The Case of Ahmad Shah Massoud (1979-2001)'**

Email: [r.malejacq@fm.ru.nl](mailto:r.malejacq@fm.ru.nl)

How do warlords build their legitimacy and eventually exert authority? The case of Afghan leader Ahmad Shah Massoud demonstrates that warlords do not only build legitimacy through the internal provision of goods and services to the population under their control, operating as counter-state actors and the primary sources of governance in their communities. In parallel to these governance efforts, successful warlords in fact build legitimacy by projecting authority externally, through the development of their own form of diplomacy, to maximize their position and eventually survive. In this paper, I show that warlords are astute political entrepreneurs with a proven ability to organize violence and the faculty to both exert and transform authority across different realms (ideological, economic, military, social, and political) and at different levels of political affairs (local, national, and international). As such, they are community leaders who control political resources and develop complex survival strategies that extend beyond their territorial realms, even so far as effective interactions with the state and international actors. They have the ability to influence and adapt to the demands (in violence, security, and services) that emanate from the local population, the central state, and the international community, and build their legitimacy accordingly.

**Dr. Joost Augusteijn (Leiden University), ‘Democracy and Counter-state Actors’**

Email: [j.augusteijn@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:j.augusteijn@hum.leidenuniv.nl)

This paper looks into the rise and legitimacy of militias and terrorist actors within democracies in contemporary history. By integrating cutting-edge theoretical approaches on political authority and counter-state actors in the West, the paper will look into the particularities of armed conflicts within advanced democracies. What are the specificities of counter-state actors within democratic systems? What are the differences in regard to (semi)dictatorial or authoritarian regimes?

**Dr. Lee Seymour (Université de Montréal), ‘Peoples, places, and the politics of belonging: Legitimizing claims to contested territory through controlling people’**

Email: [ljm.seymour@umontreal.ca](mailto:ljm.seymour@umontreal.ca)

The South Caucasus hosts multiple overlapping conflicts over the status of contested entities, including the conflicts between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh, and between Georgia and the Abkhaz over Abkhazia, and Georgian and Ossetians over South Ossetia. In each of these conflicts, competing actors deploy a diverse set of strategies to legitimate claims to contested territories. Perhaps the most important site of these legitimacy contests is the control of people. Strategies for managing contested populations tend to reflect the geopolitical preoccupations of legitimating claims to contested territories for domestic and international audiences. This paper surveys the range of strategies and the legitimating logics behind them, including ethnic cleansing followed by promoting settlement on occupied territory to create ‘facts on the ground’; playing politics with passports, citizenship, and legal status; blocking the full integration of IDPs for fear of legitimating the status quo; using vulnerable populations to foster narratives of victimhood and promoting unrealistic visions of an imminent realization of the right to return; and manipulating the numbers and categories of displaced. Control over people has thus become a key battleground for competing claims to territory, often to the detriment of vulnerable displaced populations.

**Dr. Abbey Steele (University of Amsterdam) and Dr Jacob Shapiro (Princeton University; jns@princeton.edu), 'Sub-contracting State-building'**

Email: A.A.Steele@uva.nl

Development assistance, particularly from the United States and major European donors, often takes the form of sub-contracted state-building. Foreign donors hire for-profit firms to provide basic services and to improve or create institutions in developing countries, particularly those experiencing internal conflict. This arrangement creates two counterproductive dynamics: first, it introduces agency problems between funding governments, the recipient states, and the organizations implementing projects; and second, it undermines the long-run development of domestic bureaucratic capacity by creating disincentives for the host government to invest. These dynamics impede service provision by state agencies, and hinder, rather than foster, the legitimacy of state institutions. This paper summarizes the trends in external support to state-building since the 1970s, both in terms of the targets of aid and method of execution. Importantly, we show that contracting through for-profit firms has consistently been a much greater share of U.S. foreign assistance than direct support to foreign governments in conflict zones but not elsewhere, the opposite of what we might want if that aid is intended to bolster the supported country's governance capacity. We then provide a simple theoretical argument for why aid undermines bureaucratic capacity, and present implications of sub-contracted state-building with examples from Colombia.

§ § §