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Description: Thesis (Ph.D.)--Georgetown University, 2008.; Includes bibliographical references. This study examines the proliferation of militias and other armed groups who act in conjunction with, but outside, the state's military apparatus. Groups like the Sudanese janjaweed, the Serbian paramilitaries, and Colombian self-defense forces figure prominently in a host of contemporary conflicts in the developing world. They are widely identified as banes of human and international security and harbingers of anarchy. Their very existence violates the Weberian ideal-type of the state as a monopolist over the use of force. I argue, however, that reliance on non-state violence-wielders has been a common form of military development and is not necessarily associated with state failure. I use small, medium, and large-n methods to develop a theory of how and why developing states rely on non-state actors to implement coercion. Through historical case studies of Indonesia and Iraq, regional comparisons of Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and statistical analysis across eighty-five cases, I draw the following conclusions: First, decolonization was a critical juncture that led states to adopt different techniques for organizing coercion. Specifically, revolutionary states tended to decentralize coercive power by assimilating former revolutionary fighters into informal local militias. In contrast, non-revolutionary states directly inherited European-trained armies with more conventional, centralized organizational patterns that placed the use of force firmly in state hands. Second, post-colonial conditions of regional competition compelled some states to continually upgrade and centralize coercive power, while states facing weaker external challengers could co-opt militias for counterinsurgency without needing direct control over coercion. By exploring the dynamics of state-militia relations and the historical and structural factors that inhibit or enable the use of state-sponsored militias, I highlight the futility of many efforts at state reconstruction aimed to regain the illusory monopoly over coercion. The emergence of both centralized and decentralized institutions of violence are responses to the international system and can scarcely be addressed through piecemeal efforts at the country level. Rather, I suggest that violence devolution may alleviate, rather than cause, some of the dangers commonly attributed to frail or failed states.
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Advertisement - story continues below. Devolution from above: the origins and persistence of state-sponsored militias. Article. Ariel Ahram. This article uses a sequential mixed method approach to examine the origins and persistence of paramilitaries and state-sponsored militias in the developing world. Combining comparative case studies of Southeast Asia and the Middle East with statistical analysis, it shows that revolutionary decolonization produces more decentralized and localized force structures, while direct inheritance of colonial armies leads to more conventional force structures. First in the West, and now in our country, vegetarianism is becoming more and more popular - a food system, from which proteins of animal origin are excluded. Simply put, adherents of this direction completely or partially refuse to eat meat, replacing it with plant products. For some, such a nutrition system is a reflection of the psychological rejection of violence against animals, for some - it. The oldest theory about the origin of the state is the divine origin theory. It is also known as the theory of divine right of Kings. The exponents of this theory believe that the state did not come into being by any effort of man. It is created by God. The King who rules over the state is an agent of God on earth. The King derives his authority from God and for all his actions he is responsible to God alone. Obedience to the King is ordained to God and violation of it will be a sin. The King is above law and no subject has any right to question his authority or his action. The King is responsible Devolution. Quite the same Wikipedia. Just better. Devolution differs from federalism in that the devolved powers of the subnational authority may be temporary and are reversible, ultimately residing with the central government. Thus, the state remains de jure unitary. Legislation creating devolved parliaments or assemblies can be repealed or amended by central government in the same way as any statute. In federal systems, by contrast, sub-unit government is guaranteed in the constitution, so the powers of the sub-units cannot be withdrawn unilaterally by the central government (i.e. without the consent of the sub-units being granted through