Encountering Nomads in Israel Defense Forces and Beyond

Philippe Beaulieu-Brossard[1]

Assistant Professor, Canadian Forces College

Yotam Feldmam (2007): "What do you think Deleuze would think about your use of his ideas?"

BG (ret.) Shimon Naveh, OTRI: "He would be enthusiastic, go wild over it."

Ben Zweibelson, JSOU design and innovation program director: "D&G likely would be most pleased with it, and find it ironic that current post-modernist defenders of their work would try to deny the application by the military. D&G might call those defenders of their concept as the new establishment - the guardians of an assemblage that they cannot begin to guard or protect. It is all an illusion... When radical concepts work, they radicalize in all directions.[2]"

Introduction

In October 2016, I organized a workshop gathering sixteen current and retired military commanders, planners, defense scientists and instructors.[3] They had one point in common. They all used critical theory and reflexive informed concepts in the classroom,

in headquarters and/or on the battlefield in the last decade. While some worked together in the past or knew the publications of one another, these defense professionals met as a group for the first time. Perhaps due to this being a prime instance, these defense professionals sought to find a concept consolidating their collective identity. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's (1980) nomad became, surprisingly or not, one of the most reiterated concepts to represent group members. Yet, 'nomad' was not specific enough for some defense professionals. Ben Zweibelson, the design and innovation program director at the Joint Special Operations University (JSOU), was the first to suggest Pandas, a wildlife metaphor, to gain in specificity. For Zweibelson, this metaphor captured the solitary intellectual life of group members, and an 'embarrassment of Pandas', rare and unexpected gatherings such as this workshop. Later, Dr. Alex Ryan, a praised military and public policy design thinking consultant, suggested a metaphor he deemed more precise.[4] He compared the group's history to a journey of giraffes: 'Contrary to a flock or a herd, giraffes will come together and travel together for a while and depart on another path. So, there is a sense of community, but no obligations to remain part of the herd', Ryan suggested. Beyond a great sense of humor, these defense professionals had another point in common. In the last two decades, most crossed the path of retired Israeli Brigadier General (BG) Shimon Naveh. Against all odds, this general contributed in diffusing the least expected concepts in the least expected organizations, some in operational language, some in doctrinal form, and some, as a farce. In echo to the introduction of this volume, this chapter will nonetheless take these concepts seriously.

Two decades earlier, Naveh and his colleagues founded the Operational Theory

Research Institute (OTRI) in Israel. For a growing number of senior officers,

conventional concepts used by Israel Defense Forces (IDF) proved more and more

obsolete from 1973 onwards.[5] These concepts were not adapted for asymmetric conflicts

becoming the norm rather than the exception for the IDF leading to an impression of

failure. As Luke Campbell, Brent Steele and Anna Geis offered in this volume, the

concept of success/failure in war is contingent and deeply political. In this case, it

provided organizational political legitimacy for an alternative. And, OTRI was tasked

with providing such an alternative. To do so, Naveh and his colleagues sought to develop

a methodology and a course for senior officers called the Advanced Operational

Command and Staff Course (AOCSC). Both aimed at unleashing the critical and creative

capacities of officers.[6] As the traditional rationalist military literature was partly to blame

for IDF failures to adapt, Naveh and his colleagues departed from it. They found

inspiration in various sub-fields sharing a more or less neopragmatic epistemology such

as complex systems thinking, architecture and postmodern social theory. The IDF was

not alone in exploring this radical turn. Again, impression of failures in Iraq and

Afghanistan pushed the US Army to also undertake this turn. Senior officers found in

OTRI's products a promising remedy. The US Army School of Advanced Military

Studies (SAMS) recruited Naveh in 2005 to develop a variant of his methodology now

called design thinking. US Special Operations Forces (SOF) also hired Naveh in 2007 to

translate this methodology at the strategic level, that is, the art of anticipating, adapting

and preparing a military organization to face future contingencies. Both the US army

(2015) and SOF (2016) made design thinking mandatory in 2015. The former for planning officers and the latter, for general staffers.

Of all the hundred concepts inspiring design thinking informed defense professionals (hereafter defense professionals), Deleuze & Guattari's concepts seem to withstand the test of time for a small number of enthusiasts. Once central to Naveh's methodology, these concepts turned into footnotes, and footnotes, into analogies. While some in military and business circles still perceive Deleuze & Guattari's concepts and postmodern social theory more broadly as the cutting-edge to be further developed, the content and functions of these concepts are still unclear to both users and observers. As these concepts are used to manage violence, bringing their multiple functions to consciousness is more important than ever.

As caveats, defense professionals building on Deleuze & Guattari, and design and system thinking more broadly, do not linearly apply theory to practice as some may assume in academia. As I explored elsewhere, they rely on a craft or tinkering attitude to knowledge using what they find useful to build their way of thinking and acting without necessarily being consistent with the philosophy (Beaulieu-B., 2019). Sometimes, what is seen as useful is only the mental representation, the 'sound-image' according to Ferdinand de Sausurre. This is the case for most defense professionals explicitly or implicitly referring to the concept of nomad. For instance, Ofra Graicer and Ben Zweibelson are among the few exceptions that are explicitly and substantially using the concept in this chapter. Second, and contra Eyal Weizman (2007), only a minority of a

minority of a minority is finding inspiration in Deleuze and Guattari in comparison to the growing military design movement preferring more accessible seminal sources, especially in doctrine and in management.

In this chapter, I seek to expose three of the numerous functions Deleuze & Guattari's concepts can take in the military, mostly in the IDF, but also in US SOF. Building on the sociological perspective presented in the introduction of this volume, I argue that these concepts offer mental representations to conceptualize the 'world around us […] and ways to act in the world to achieve one's goals' (Ish Shalom 2019: x). These concepts do so in the IDF and beyond inside at least three functions: narrative framing, political and instrumental functions. Narrative framing means that these concepts allow so called 'military designers' to generate a plot giving intent to actors, meaning to artifacts and weaving sequence of events constituting stories enabling to make sense of their community in time and space. In other words, the concept of the nomad contributes in consolidating the identity of the community of military designers and gives it a purpose (Bruner 1991, Roberts 2006). As advanced in the introduction of this volume, concepts are not only socially, but also politically meaningful in three senses: concepts 'offer normative stands and commitments' dovetailing in political measures, concepts enable the inclusion and exclusion of individuals in communities and concepts can be a vehicle of persuasion. I would add to this that conceptual language may amplify or undermine the authority of defense professionals in military or civilian decision-making processes. This political function is especially observed in organizational politics, and exceptionally, in domestic politics. Last but not least, the instrumental function means

that defense professionals directly apply these concepts to improve military practices related to planning in most instances and tactics in rare instances (Eriksson and Norman 2011, 418). The instrumental function remains the explicit rationale for adapting Deleuze & Guattari's concepts. For defense professionals and observers, the narrative framing and political functions are most often implicit, unconscious and, therefore, non-intentional. As a caveat, the simple move of assigning a function to a concept is a political gesture in itself. Neither this chapter nor defense professionals can escape it as expressed in the introduction of this volume. For instance, skeptics often accuse supporters of seeking political or economic gains over instrumental ones in contrast to supporters stressing the instrumental potentials of a concept. The narrative, political and instrumental functions are the few central among several functions possible to understand how concepts work in military practices.

In this chapter, I first offer a brief introduction to Deleuze & Guattari's nomad in relationship to the concepts of war machine and smooth space. This introduction reveals how these opaque concepts provided clues to the IDF to make sense of their environment, on the one hand, and to an idealized self, on the other. In so doing, I seek to clarify these concepts and nuance the impression of incommensurability between the military profession and post-1968 postmodern philosophy. I then move on to expose what Deleuze & Guattari's concepts can do once translated from philosophy to military contexts. I develop examples for each of the three functions summarized above. For the narrative function, I show how several defense professionals found inspiration in Deleuze & Guattari's nomad to make sense of organizational suppression despite bringing the

very same organization closer to professional excellence, from their perspective. For the political function, I focus mainly on how these concepts may enhance or reduce authority in civil-military relations. For the instrumental function, I present the examples of walking through walls in the IDF and of goal-setting in the US SOCOM white paper on design thinking of 2016.

Deleuze & Guattari's Nomad(s)

'In order to achieve desired Degrees of Freedom one must first identify his/her biases, prejudices and axioms carved in institutional 'stone'. These are the borders they must transgress in order to be liberated. And this is why I coined that phase the nomadic one. For nomad people have no baggage, no shackles that tie them to their place, no doctrines or dogmas to adhere to, no fortresses to defend but their own individual freedoms: of movement, of thought, of identity. Nomad people have no ego.'
Dr. Ofra Graicer (2017), IDF Generals' Course Co-Instructor

In the midst of the occupation of Southern Lebanon (1982-2000) and the first intifada (1987-1993), a puzzle became of pressing importance for the IDF. While the IDF could easily win battles, these seem pointless in changing the political status quo over time. For Naveh and his colleagues, discovering Deleuze & Guattari's (1980) radical proposition about war provided clues to resolve this enigma from the late 1990s onwards.[7] This proposition lays on a counterintuitive understanding of the relationship between organizations, conventions, and war. Naveh and his colleagues found inspiration

in this proposition especially for making sense of asymmetric conflicts and to develop a military professional ideal based on an essence of movement.

Deleuze & Guattari lay their proposition on a close reading of Carl Von Clausewitz's (1976) aphorism: 'war is the continuation of politics by other means'. In contrast to the numerous interpreters of Clausewitz, Deleuze & Guattari found their proposition on the very semantic of this aphorism. In this reading, organizations such as states seek to use war to continue politics by other means (Reid 2003). For Deleuze & Guattari, this means that war is an external phenomenon to politics. In turn, politics seek desperately to use war despite never fully controlling it. History abound with examples of states that not only failed to appropriate war, but also by states transformed deeply in attempts to use war (Tilly and Ardant 1975). Some states even collapsed in the process such as Russia in the midst of World War I for instance. For Deleuze & Guattari, this shows that states are powerless in comparison to the power of war. For this reason, they understand war as the most powerful phenomenon in transforming the human condition as a whole including political realities.[8] In other words, war makes more the state than the state makes war.

Deleuze & Guattari rely on a heuristic move to better take this proposition seriously. This move locates war as an extrinsic phenomenon to the state.[9] This results in the concept of war machine in the sense that war is its own machine escaping appropriation from any organization including the state. This is especially the case as war may demand disrupting all conventions in the struggle for survival. The state is the opposite in this regard as it lies on a set of more or less rigid conventions to continuously actualize its existence.

These conventions may include a fixed territory, national identity and a set of rules in the form of a constitution to name a few. As states depend on these conventions, using war involves translating these conventions to the battlefield. States develop formal military institutions for this purpose. For Deleuze & Guattari, the objective of military institutions is to mediate between conventions sustaining the state on the one hand, and the absence of conventions in war, on the other hand. Military institutions do so by disciplining soldiers with rigorous procedures, training and education. These efforts, however, can only be in vain when facing with the contingencies of war. Sooner or later, war will disrupt conventions, and by extension, military institutions and the very states they seek to serve.

Yet, not all organizations require the same respect for conventions. Deleuze & Guattari found inspiration in the anthropology of nomadic tribes to better appreciate nuances in relationships between organizations, conventions, and war.[10] If the essence of the state depends on sustaining conventions at all costs, the essence of nomadic tribes lays on the opposite. Movement in all respect — from one space to the next, from one identity to the next or one rule to the next — is both literally and figuratively the essence of nomadic tribes for Deleuze & Guattari. Being a nomad depends on perpetually refusing conventions as they formalize. The essence of nomads and the essence of war are therefore the same. They are both based on an absence of conventions. Nomads are in harmony with war for this reason. War disrupts the emergence of conventions that may lay the ground for state formation within or outside nomadic groups. In other words, as the conventions of non-state actors such as nomads are more flexible than state

conventions in general, the conventions of the former tend to be more moldable to the contingencies of war. This proposition provided an understanding as to why Israel could not leverage war to change political realities especially when fighting against non-state actors. Sooner or later, war would become too disruptive for state conventions in contrast to non-state actors. War, in itself, would end up tearing down all conventions of the Israeli state before politically defeating non-state adversaries once and for all. Naveh (2002) and his colleagues feared asymmetric conflicts more in the long run than conventional conflicts in part for this reason.

No matter the efforts states invest in appropriating war with military institutions, these efforts will always be in vain in comparison to nomad-like groups escaping the burden of sustaining rigid conventions. These groups will always be in a better position to innovate faster than state armies since their essence is in harmony with war. Deleuze & Guattari (1988, 368) compare state science with nomadic sciences to support this point. State science tends to forbid intuitions in order to develop so-called universal conventions to understand an independent reality. In turn, these conventions provide the required legitimacy for ordering the human condition over a territory in the form of state governance. Nomadic sciences neither have this pretension nor this desire. They are intuitive and holistic as they relate to all aspects of everyday life rather than acting as conventions for supporting an order. While states outmatched nomads by consolidating wealth, production and technology from the late 15th century onwards, they always lacked the critical and creative potentials made possible by more flexible scientific practices (De Landa 1991, 12). States ensured survival by coopting nomadic innovations

for its own interests in time of struggle. This cooptation is nonetheless a risky, if not a Faustian bargain. The radical freedom nomads demand for innovating is just not compatible with the exercise of governance. This radical freedom may end up disrupting the very conventions states require to govern. For this reason, state-nomadic partnerships can only turn into tragic cycles. Despite saving the state in critical moments, the state usually ends up suppressing all forms of nomadic essence until it has no choice, but to enlist it again. In short, the critical and creative potentials of nomads spoke to defense professionals for making sense of insurgencies that proved more resilient, adaptive and innovative than state armies in contemporary conflicts. For the same reasons, nomadic ways of thinking would become a professional model to emulate despite inherent risks of suppression from military institutions.

Movement as essence, the cornerstone of nomadic ways of thinking, became a core principle of Naveh's methodology from the late 1990s to this day (Graicer 2017).[11] As seen above, this means to continuously refuse military conventions as they formalize. Among those, movement as essence implies a radical understanding of space. Nomads never let the idea of a bounded territory formalize. Instead, they continuously reframe their understanding of territory as they travel. They continuously de-territorialize and re-territorialize in Deleuze & Guattari's terminology. Accordingly, they do not seek to respect predetermined routes, but continuously adapt direction to evolving circumstances as they travel in-between necessary stopping points for survival such as oases, wells or shelters. These points are always temporary in comparison to the movement in-between. This is why Deleuze & Guattari (1980, 472) understand nomadic space as smooth: it is

only defined by continuous movement in vast empty and unbounded space such as oceans, deserts, or steppes. States, in contrast, structure a territory — or striate space Deleuze & Guattari's terminology — in an attempt to hold and control it against evolving circumstances. They do so by imposing both material and ideational structures. For instance, the former can take the form of gridding space (urbanism) and the latter, the form of fixed binary identities such as governors/governed, legal/illegal, and so on. States develop desperately against space, while nomads continuously adapt to spatial circumstances. This understanding not only inspired some defense professionals to think more in non-linear ways about space for military operations, but also about time as they set goals to accomplish in the future as I will develop in instrumental functions below.

Although Deleuze (1978) repeatedly voiced opposition to the Zionist ideal, that is, the formation of an Israeli state in claimed historical lands, his professional ideal was not far from defense professionals building on his writings (Dosse 2009).[12] Deleuze embraced movement as essence as a life-work ideal, if not as an objective. He found in war the perfect metaphor for this. As Julian Reid (2003) observed: "The possibility of a form of thought so radical that it wages the violence of war on existing orders of knowledge conditions Deleuze's politico-philosophical project in its entirety." Deleuze developed concepts with the aim of disrupting all conventions by building on war as a metaphor. In his own terminology, he sought to turn his work into a nomadic war machine against the state and its conventions, on the one hand, and against order of thoughts in academia, on the other hand. This would, Deleuze hoped, bring to consciousness what was not thinkable before and, therefore, lead to continuous

intellectual emancipation. In a nod to this ideal of philosophical excellence, Deleuze

(1990, 103) called his colleague Michel Foucault a 'warrior'. He saw in Foucault a

formidable philosopher based on his capability to develop concepts 'waging war' and

disrupting taken for granted orders. This specific intellectual emancipatory project is in

harmony with the intellectual emancipatory project of Naveh and his colleagues albeit in

different fields as seen in Ofra Graicer's quote opening this section. While Deleuze's

vocation responds to his ideal of philosophical excellence, the vocation of defense

professionals responds to an ideal of military excellence. Translating Deleuze &

Guattari's concepts to respond to this latter vocation nonetheless involve greater stakes

even if these concepts are poorly understood or used superficially at first sight. Indeed,

violence is not only metaphorical, but actual in this vocation. Deleuze & Guattari's

concepts may fill multiple functions beyond intellectual emancipation in the military and

society more broadly. The following sections provide examples of implicit (narrative and

political) and explicit (instrumental) functions.

Narrative Framing Functions

If Doctrine stands for the State Apparatus (or institutional interiority), Systemic

Operational Design (SOD) could be its War Machine (or explorer of institutional

exteriority).

Ofra Graicer (2017)

Deleuze & Guattari made available a rich pool of mental representations inspiring

alternative narratives for making sense of selves and others in several sectors. For

instance, several scholars rely on the nomadic war machine to make sense of phenomena escaping state control such as infectious agents, self-organized armed groups such as ISIS, or globalized capitalism (Du Plessis 2017). Defense professionals rely on the nomadic war machine to make sense of the same elements as well. Naveh, for instance, portrayed Israel and the West's elusive 'other' as a Wahhabi war machine manifested in 'nomadic terrorists' in several PowerPoint presentations. This mental representation stressed the lack of Saudi Arabian State control over violent extremists. Another narrative, however, seems more unique to the military. The nomad against the State provides a powerful mental representation for developing stories providing meaning to a group at the fringe of military institutions risking suppression for a professional ideal. This professional ideal lays on becoming an 'institutional war machine' (Graicer 2017). The institutional war machine is a mental representation of an idealized self across time saving the state from itself thanks to intellectual emancipation. Sooner or later, however, tragedy awaits those getting closer to this ideal. The more this ideal appears within reach, the more the state will come to fear for its foundational conventions. As a response, the state will resist, co-opt or purge the institutional war machine until a next crisis requires it. This narrative takes the form of a tragic cycle as it involves a rise in nomadic ways of thinking, then a resistance to them and, finally, forgetting them in military institutions.

While Naveh (2007a) developed this narrative to make sense of three Israeli experiences across time, some US, Australian and Canadian defense professionals express a similar narrative to make sense of their experiences with design thinking (Beaulieu-B. and Dufort 2017). Naveh's study of the evolution of Operational Art in the

IDF is, perhaps, most explicit in using this narrative by weaving past, present and future stories.13 Naveh develops this narrative into three episodes: the Palmach14 (1941-48), Moshe Dayan's Paratroopers (1953 – 1967) and Naveh's OTRI (1995-2005). The Palmach episode is most faithful to both the potential and fate of the nomadic war machine in Naveh's narrative. This is more than a coincidence since this episode takes place during the early state formation of Israel. The Palmach found a mentor in the unorthodox British General Orde Wingate and inspiration in Russian military tradition. From Wingate, the Palmach borrowed the capability to transform its identity to adapt to changing circumstances, and from also the Russian, a smooth understanding of space according to Naveh. Rather than obeying to a 'sedentary' approach 'imposing a pre-designed grid of universal forms', the Palmach would generate thinking and practices unique to each operation making the survival and establishment of the Israeli state possible (Naveh 2007a, 41). Yet, tragedy awaited this success. As part of the consolidation of the Jewish State, Prime Minister Ben Gurion rapidly disbanded the Palmach for a more cohesive IDF (Naveh 2007a, 51).15 Furthermore, Naveh (2007a, 52) claims that this 'coup' turned into suppression as the State prohibited any discussion about Palmach's operational excellence. Likewise, the British Army suppressed Wingate's legacy despite enthusiastic praises for turning a likely defeat into a decisive victory in the Burma campaign in World War II according to Graicer (2015, 5). Considering Wingate's legacy as too 'divisive', Army council members vowed to 'write him down' to avoid any more 'Wingates' in the British Army based on Michael Calvert's account (Graicer 2015, 239). For both the Palmach and Wingate episodes, mythical legacies to build on turned into legacies to be suppressed and suppression, into amnesia16.

Naveh's journey towards developing an 'institutional war machine' inside the IDF gains in significance when inserted as the third and last episode between 1995 and 2005. While Naveh does not refer explicitly to the nomad in this episode, his narrative bears resemblance with the same tragic cycle. Towards the end of this episode, Naveh (2007a, 33) assesses that with OTRI, the IDF had the same ingredients which brought the Palmach to excellence. AOCSC educated generals would prove worthy of this inheritance in Operation Defensive Shield in the West Bank in 2002 and in the Disengagement of Gaza in 2005. Naveh reported an absence of civilian casualties during both and a near absence of Israeli casualties in the former (Matthews 2008). Naveh (2007a, 34) even praised the latter as 'one of the most unique and successful operations in [IDF] history'. As Gracier (2017) observed, Naveh's 'private armies could run loose' as long as the institution did not feel threatened or feared an upcoming war. These two conditions did not last long. Some generals soon perceived AOCSC graduates as a threat to their authority especially in light of operational successes. As for war, the second intifada between 2000 and 2005 followed by the second Lebanon war in 2006 sustained an emergency atmosphere that proved unfertile for theoretical nuances. MG (ret.) Itzak Ben Israel offered that 'sometimes we fight, and things become clear' to explain this lack of appetite for nuances when I met him.[17] What became clear for Ben Israel and his colleagues against OTRI's program was that the IDF could not operate properly with conceptual and terminological confusion in contrast to policy-makers thriving on vagueness as Neta Kramer observed in this volume. Beyond confusion, Naveh's (2007a, 6) narrative understands this episode explicitly as a purge awaiting the right event to be

put into motion. He recalls MG Moshe Kaplinski, the Vice Chief of the General Staff's comments that the IDF must "get rid of Shimon Naveh and Dov Tamari because they could not be controlled." As a result, the General Staff gradually suppressed Naveh and OTRI's supporters through financial irregularity charges, forced retirement or organizational disbandment.[18] 'Purging' the key agents did not completely suppress their concepts from the IDF, but sent them back at the fringe, under censorship or in 'exile'. Again, promises to build on would turn into promises to be suppressed and suppression into amnesia or what Naveh (2007a, 24) calls deliberate institutional 'anti-learning'.

In some instances, this tragic cycle narrative refers explicitly to Deleuze & Guattari's nomadic war machine, in other instances, it bears resemblance with it. The nomad may well save the state from itself, but the more the state regains in confidence and develops, and the more nomadic ways of thinking are suppressed as they run contrary to the possibility of governance. This cyclical narrative generates a symmetry between Naveh's experiences and those of great military legacies, thus consolidating the nomadic war machine as an ideal and appropriating these legacies as part of the very same historical movement. This narrative was in direct opposition to the official institutional narrative by turning what some perceived as 'mumbo-jumbo' into institutional conservatism, 'charlatans' into avant-garde underdogs and heretics into the very definition of military excellence. This narrative also provided group solidarity, a road map for renewing motivation and pursuing attempts at transforming the military despite likely rejection.[19] This narrative was political at least at the institutional level as the next section develops further.

Organizational Political Functions

"When you come with this knowledge, with reasoned insights, to someone who feels

helpless, [...] the political echelon is happy to buy what you offer it. Then you look for

partners that will do it together with you, that will challenge you intellectually, and you

don't find them."

Moshe Ya'alon (Michael 2007, 441)

Naveh and his colleagues preferred contemplating how the nomadic war machine

and other critical concepts could serve instrumental functions or provide mental

representations for better understanding new phenomena. Despite this intent, these

concepts could not remain isolated in a planning room. They would trickle down in

transforming the everyday life of defense professionals inspired by them. Surprisingly or

not, I was unable to find a correlation between defense professionals learning these

concepts and their political views. Perhaps defense professionals refrained from

disrupting deep ontological commitments in their private vocation despite the potential of

nomadic ways of thinking to do so. Defense professionals seemed to be still able to

compartmentalize in concordance with a military professional ideal separating military

from civilian lives. This was less the case in terms of organizational politics. Nomadic

ways of thinking turned into a perpetual reform agenda against military conventions as

already observed above. In other words, the nomad would serve a counter-hegemonic

project in the military realm. In political and public realms, conceptual capacities made

possible by the nomad and other concepts contributed in amplifying the authority of the

IDF above civilian institutions. This was especially the case during Ya'alon general staff member tenure (1995-2005) from regional commander to chief of general staff. In this section, I present the often-implicit political functions of sophisticated concepts including those from Deleuze & Guattari in civil-military relations.

Ya'alon, a key instigator, sponsor and supporter, was aware of the multiple function of these concepts, including the political ones. He understood these concepts as a tool for an 'organizational revolution' in the IDF (Adamsky 2010, 103). These concepts would expand at the organizational levels following Ya'alon progression in the IDF. In each new position from Central Command covering the West Bank (1995-1998) up to Chief of the General Staff, Ya'alon would integrate these concepts and seek to diffuse them to all general headquarters (Michael 2007, 434). Once these concepts trickled down (following Ya'alon's command) or trickle up from AOCSC graduates, the organization would be likely disrupted and change. Adapting Deleuze & Guattari's nomadic war machine made this institutional political function possible. Naveh, as Graicer, were explicit about this function as a byproduct. In an interview with Weizman (2007), Naveh claimed that the primary purpose of using critical theory was 'to critique the military institution itself – its fixed and heavy conceptual foundations' and that OTRI has 'become a subversive node within it'. In other words, the narrative function shared above provided purpose informing a political function of perpetual reform.

Skeptics, however, understood this political function very well. For some like IDF Col. Yehuda Vagman: "The more those ideas were blurred, incomprehensible and non-

implementable, the more creative they were considered, and accordingly, the more they enhanced their producer's status in the organization." (Michael 2007, 435). Most skeptics in the IDF and US armed forces followed Vagman in trading the instrumental function for this political function to make sense of defense professionals. As Neta Kramer suggests in this volume, vagueness, whether intended or not, does something. In this case, vagueness both hindered the effectiveness of the opposition to these concepts between 1995 and 2004 while bolstering the same opposition after the Second Lebanon War in 2005. Also in echo to Kramer and observed by several members of the military design community, the meaning of design has been enlarged to the point of making the concept meaningless and simply used as a cliché or slogan to dissolve its initial disruptive nature.

Using sophisticated concepts enabled performing an implicit demarcation providing a higher status to those using them and a lower status to those not using them, skeptics observed. As a result, several officers attempted to follow these defense professionals to fulfill this political function without paying attention to the instrumental function. In so doing, sophisticated concepts turned into fashionable buzzwords uttered to be accepted as an equal, if not the avant-garde, in a well-respected group. Vagueness associated with these concepts could also consolidate authority by giving the impression to fellow officers that they did not understand their profession despite years of experience according to an interviewee. In other words, speaking the language of sophisticated concepts made the the difference between inclusion and exclusion from an elite group of military intellectuals as presented in the introduction of this volume

Some even claimed that these concepts served mostly political economic functions. Suspicious, they accused enthusiasts of making themselves indispensable in understanding and teaching incomprehensible concepts for economic gains. Others like US Army Special Forces LCol Grant Martin (2017), developed a similar argument with regard to the proliferation of sophisticated concepts as means to legitimate more resources and promotions in military organizations.

For Naveh and his colleagues, these byproduct political functions were a double-edge sword in retrospect. Using sophisticated concepts including those from Deleuze & Guattari raised their status as the sole experts able to develop alternative methodologies, on the one hand. On the other hand, democratizing sophisticated concepts including Deleuze & Guattari to as many officers as possible turned it into ridicule in some cases. Ridicule damaged prospects for individual learning and changing the military institution in the end. When I met him in 2015, Naveh regretted distributing copies of a *Thousand Plateaus* in the IDF and listing it as a mandatory reading at SAMS for this reason.[20] Canadian BG Jennie Carignan, once an international SAMS student, remembered the disdain of her colleagues for this opaque book.[21] The production of SAMS student monographs provides evidence of this. Since 2007, an average of only a single officer student per year quoted Deleuze & Guattari, the peak being 4 students right after Naveh's tenure in 2009.[22] This phenomenon not only occurred at SAMS, but also cursed Naveh and some of his colleagues along their path including during a contract with US Special Operations Forces Command (SOCOM). An interviewee taking part to Naveh's SOCOM design thinking course relied on an infection metaphor to make sense of this

phenomenon. For him, the opacity of these sophisticated concepts combined with Naveh's arrogance generated 'antibodies' to the point that he abandoned after two classes. In short, the political function in the form of amplifying authority was limited to those curious enough to pay attention. Otherwise, these concepts were more counterproductive in this respect.

Consistently with Deleuze & Guattari's holistic assumptions, the political function of concepts applies beyond the military as an institution. Accordingly, integrating sophisticated concepts can only bring operational successes with organizational change in the long run, defense professionals believe. Likewise, organizational change can only be sustainable with society-wide changes in the long run since organizations are not isolated. Therefore, defense professionals mobilize Deleuze & Guattari for holistic critiques and holistic transformation beyond the sole military sector. As Naveh put it: "Theories do not only strive for a utopian socio-political ideal with which we may or may not agree, but are also based on methodological principles that seek to disrupt and subvert the existing political, social, cultural, or military order." (Weizman 2007, 215). As these concepts are intrinsically holistic, they also incite defense professionals to include as many sectors deem relevant as possible for a better understanding. This may or may not include political, economic, social, infrastructure or cultural sectors to name a few although the military does not have jurisdiction over them. Indeed, defense professionals must think beyond the military sector since contemporary issues rarely, if ever fall in a single sector in the 21st century. However, the temptation to move from understanding to influencing the political decision-making process into these

sectors is often difficult to resist. This is especially the case in states without robust

civilian institutions as Yoram Peri (2006) observed in Israel. Concerned by this

phenomenon, Ya'alon explained that this tends to naturally occur, especially when the

gap of knowledge, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, is unbridgeable with civilian

institutions (Michael 2007, 444). For instance, Ya'alon observed that political directives

would become clearer once it could relate to a military plan rather than the other way

around, from civilian planning to military planning. While the IDF had already the upper

hand in civil-military relations in Israel for reasons beyond the scope of this chapter,

developing a sophisticated methodology amplified its authority over civilian institutions.

This political function was therefore a byproduct as it was unintentional in this

specific Israeli case. In other cases, the contrary can be easily imaginable depending on

the intents of defense professionals. For instance, some skeptics traded the instrumental

for the political function to explain the development of the US Army counterinsurgency

manual of 2006 also relying on social scientific concepts (Price 2011). Skeptics claimed

that the objective of the manual was more intended to sell the 'surge' to the US congress

rather than developing counter-insurgency operations. In short, the political functions of

Deleuze & Guattari's nomad and other sophisticated concepts must be nuanced. While

using or promoting these concepts may amplify authority in some instances, it may also

contribute to the contrary, especially when the audience is skeptical. Further research

needs to be conducted to investigate to what extent nomadic ways of thinking contributed

to IDF political support for the disengagement of Gaza in 2005. While these concepts

clearly reinforced Naveh's conviction that Israel should not actualize a fixed territorially

bounded space based on past historical narratives, rare are those who took a Deleuzian detour to take this controversial position (Rynhold and Waxman 2008).

Instrumental Functions

"Our movement through the buildings will push them into the streets and alleys, where we will hunt them down. By doing that we will smoothen the intrinsic striation of the enclave".

Col. Aviv Kochavi, IDF 35th Paratrooper brigade (2002) (Naveh 2005)

For defense professionals, the primary function of Deleuze, Guattari's nomadic war machine is instrumental. They seek to apply these concepts directly to inform better military practices, especially for developing operational and strategic approaches. This function aims at provoking a re-imagination of military practices away from military conventions perceived as a source of failures in contemporary conflicts. For some, applying these concepts enables increasing efficacy manifested in minimal casualties, destruction and use of force. For others, applying these concepts contributes to radical humanist ideals in the form of emancipation from structural constraints to reach individual and professional potentials more fully. In this section, I develop two examples of instrumental functions. The first example illustrates how the IDF 35th Paratrooper brigade built on smooth space during the Second Intifada in 2002. The second shows how specific individuals relied implicitly on nomad-like analogies for goal setting purposes when explaining the US SOCOM white paper on design of 2016.

Figure 1: Nomadic Manoeuvers in Operation Defensive Shield in 2002 (Naveh 2005)

"<Insert Fig01.jpg>"

Deleuze & Guattari's nomadic war machine in collision course with striated space became operational concepts in the development of Operation Defensive Shield in the West Bank in 2002. Before this episode, the IDF refrained from conducting operations in dense urban environment. The urban environment posed heavy casualties risks either in IDF soldiers or civilians as fighters would easily set ambushes and hide among civilians. Col. Gal Hirsch (2016, 166), the Chief of Operations (J-3) and an AOCSC graduate, was convinced of the opposite. He saw operating in Palestinian urban environments as the proper response to heightening violence in the form of suicide bombings and a stepping stone to controlling the West Bank as a whole. Hirsch was alone in sharing this perspective. Against all odds, he disrupted General Staff's assumptions to the point that his operational concept was accepted. This decision set a precedent by disrupting the taboo of operating in dense urban environment. By operating in urban environment, the IDF sought to signal that there would be no safe heaven anymore for fighters seeking to use violence. This, they hope, would provide incentives for a peaceful settlement. The more time passed and the more what is now called urban warfare would become the new normal for the IDF.

Understanding the urban environment as striated space and the IDF as a nomadic war machine transcending it contributed in setting this precedent. Aviv Kochavi, the 35th

Paratrooper brigade commander (now Deputy Chief of General Staff) and also an AOCSC graduate, commanded the operation in Balatta camp in the Nablus area. Naveh's (2005) transcript of a brainstorm session between Kochavi and his officers suggests how they implemented nomadic ways of thinking. The transcript begins with Amir, an IDF officer, reminding the group that the IDF never seized an urban area since 1982, that this instance was not successful, and that this contradicted training. Kochavi replied by finding reinforcement in the concepts of smooth and striated space. He portrayed Palestinian fighters as respecting a striated understanding of space in the very act of fortifying an urban environment. The brigade would surely be unsuccessful by respecting the same logic. Rather, IDF soldiers would be more effective by transforming the striated space into a smooth one. To concretely turn striated space into smooth space, IDF officers generated the surprising military tactic of 'walking through walls' on an unprecedented large scale to bypass ambushes set by Palestinian fighters (Weizman 2006). Officers reinterpreted the battle space by reversing training habits. Opening doors, moving along roads and sidewalks were now forbidden. Instead, soldiers would ignore the urban structure by piercing holes on apartments walls and ceilings and move from block to block until they gained military control of an area. Israel recorded a single casualty. The United Nations recorded 497 Palestinian casualties and large-scale destruction of non-governmental properties (Annan 2002). Deleuze & Guattari's concepts proved useful to make sense of and operate in unfamiliar contexts such as in asymmetric conflicts. In this specific case, these concepts contributed in enabling the IDF to re-engage urban space instead of abandoning it. In other words, and in a nod to Anna Geis in this volume, these concepts 'served to (de-)legitimate certain types of violence'

bringing an impression of potential control, superiority and orientation in a complex urban space.

After departing Israel for the US in 2005, Naveh joined Booz Allen Hamilton's Centre for the Application of Design (CAD). This military contracting firm acted as a medium enabling Naveh, Ryan and other internationals to work for American defense organizations. In return, CAD became the highest concentrated pool of intellectual capital on the application of sophisticated concepts for military purposes in the US at the time.[23] Naveh would first teach and conduct research at SAMS under this organization between 2005 and 2007. In late 2007, William 'Joe' Miller, the Director of Strategy, Plans and Policy (J5) at US Special Operations Command and Naveh's personal friend, requested assistance as his office lacked a methodology for strategic projection.[24] SOCOM contracted CAD to assist in the form of research, development and courses taught by Naveh, James Schneider and Timothy Challans. Few years later, SOCOM departed from this team to develop their own design teaching and research capacities at the Joint Special Operations University (JSOU). When I met Miller, his team and JSOU faculty in 2016, none referred to Deleuze & Guattari's nomad explicitly to the exception of Ben Zweibelson quoted above.

For others working for JSOU in 2016, this concept turned into footnotes, and footnotes, into analogies where its sound image seemed sufficient to achieve a specific function. This was the case for defense professionals taking part in developing the US Special Operations Forces Design Thinking White Paper (2016) or teaching from it. They

relied on nomad-like analogies to explain an alternative to the traditional practice of goal-setting (i.e. the end-state) in the US military. In conventional planning, officers usually reverse engineer the commander's end state in order to develop a linear path towards achieving it according to Col. (ret.) Richard Newton, the lead author.[25] Then, officers seek to respect this path at all costs as if the context would be as fixed as the pre-established 'end state'. In order to show progress, officers rely on as many quantifiable elements as available from body counts to square miles under control for instance. Newton saw this practice as counterproductive. Several officers also confessed that this practice leads them to tweak reports to give the impression of consistency with the linear path and pre-established goal. The linear path as the fixed end state would end up being irrelevant to the emerging context, thus leading to fight in a world that no longer exists.

Figure 2: Reverse Engineering in conventional US Military Planning (Army 2005, 1-24) "<Insert Fig02.jpg>"

Newton suggested alternatives following the literature on foresight. Instead of the end state, he suggested imagining a range of acceptable and unacceptable futures. Instead of the linear path, he suggested becoming familiar with unexpected detours. Newton relied on a 17th-century navigation analogy. Reaching a destination was only possible by muddling through rather than by following a linear path. While non-linearity navigation may seem ineffective, ships reached destination more effectively by continuously adapting to external circumstances, thus leading to a more flexible goal-setting process

according to Newton. For Zweibelson, who became the design and innovation program

director at JSOU in 2017, Newton's vision was at odd with poststructuralism including

Deleuze and Guattari despite relying on nomad-like analogies to explain the US SOCOM

White Paper on design of 2016. From Zweibelson's perspective, Newton as well as

several contractors for JSOU, taught and applied design in a more linear way and closer

to mainstream design thinking developed in the US army before 2017. In a struggle over

defining the future of design education at JSOU in 2016, some individuals may have used

nomad-like analogies not only for instrumental functions, but also for organizational

political ones such as performing expertise.

Figure 3: Navigating in Time and Space in the US SOCOM Design Thinking White

Paper of 2016 (SOCOM 2016, 3)

"<Insert Fig03.jpg>"

In contrast, Zweibelson attempted to develop JSOU's design and innovation

program as consistently as possible with design philosophy and also by explicitly

building on poststructuralism including Deleuze and Guattari's concepts of rhizome,

assemblage, and the nomad as he developed elsewhere (Zweibelson 2017). For instance,

Zweibelson found in Kenneth Stanley's (2015) studies on artificial intelligence a more

persuasive analogy of the unconventional practice of goal setting presented above.

According to Stanley, artificial intelligence proceeds more effectively towards a desired

end state when they are not programmed to reach it. Stanley found that simply assigning a fixed goal incites both artificial and human intelligence to filter out elements that may not directly lead to the goal at first sight. Yet, Stanley showed how these very dismissed aspects may provide stepping stones leading to a satisfactory goal. Both this goal and the means to reach it were more or less thinkable before. This analogy provided a more effective mean to translate Deleuze & Guattari's nomad introduced in US Special Operations Forces few years earlier by Naveh and reintroduced by Zweibelson since 2016. Only time will tell whether this new understanding of time and space will prevent, minimize or enable more violence in the years to come.

Deleuze & Guattari's nomad is among several sophisticated concepts that may serve instrumental functions in the military and other professions. In most cases implementing products resulting from these concepts remain the greatest challenge for defense professionals. Cultural, institutional and idiosyncratic logics often lead to filing and forgetting these products despite their promises. For products surviving these logics, they may make the human condition worst or better depending on one's viewpoint. On the one hand, the military instrumentalization of these concepts may contribute to further violence by enabling operations that were unthinkable before such as in the Ballata camp case. On the other hand, these concepts may provide less violent alternatives than conventional military concepts especially by familiarizing officers to more flexible ways of thinking such as in goal-setting in US special operations forces. The greatest danger may lie in literally taking war as an extrinsic phenomenon to the state, thus dispelling

state responsibility in contemporary conflicts or in romanticizing the unique disruptive capacities of war found in Deleuze & Guattari.

Conclusion

Deleuze & Guattari contributed to the military design thinking movement by making visible alternative ways of thinking the relationship between organizations, conventions and war. This perspective is far from consensual in the literature. Several contributors are quick to denounce the militarization of social sciences and humanities, and especially post-1968 postmodern social theory (Weizman 2006, 2007, Feldman 2007, Price 2011, Levine 2012). They find defense professionals and postmodern social theorists to be at extreme odds in terms of vocation. The former aims at executing the state monopoly over the legitimated use of physical force to borrow Max Weber's (2004) terms. The military institution is responsible for making sovereign power possible over a territory and beyond. On the contrary, postmodern social theorists seek to disrupt the state apparatus and especially the oppressive means making it possible. Despite these differences of vocation, I sought to demonstrate that both groups share the will to disrupt any convention potentially hindering respective ideals of professional excellence. In other words, they both share an essence of movement. Translating this essence in military contexts nonetheless enable different functions than academic ones. As the military profession involves managing violence, these concepts fulfill functions that may profoundly transform the human condition for better or worse.

Once translated into narratives, Deleuze & Guattari's nomad provided alternatives to make sense of selves and others. The nomad collapsed into an idealized self contributing to group formation providing a purpose and a political program of continuous reform. Translated into the logic of politics, the holistic nature of these concepts incited defense professionals to take into account all spheres of human existence and to contribute to decision-making processes in some instances such as in Israel. While these concepts could provide authority and a higher status in some cases, their opacity also led to the contrary and even to ridicule depending on the audience. The act of associating functions to these concepts such as political economic ones was also an integral part of political struggles within and beyond the military institution. Last but not least, the nomad provided inspiration for reimagining movement in time and space. Unthinkable military operations became thinkable, and even normal, on the one hand. On the other hand, the nomad contributed to open less violent possibilities by legitimating flexibility over prized ontological commitments such as holding a fixed territory at all costs in the case of the disengagement of Gaza in 2005, for example. Last but not least and from the perspective of Gramscian theory presented in the introduction of this volume, military design thinking is both counter-hegemonic and hegemonic. Military design thinking is counter-hegemonic as it compels to critically 'reflect on social, economic and political structure into which human beings are locked' and find ways to disrupt these structures to change the status quo. Yet, design thinking could be understood as attempting to manipulate human beings in following specific frames without involving their agency in the process, thus strengthening the agency of military designers over subalterns again from a Gramscian perspective.

Further research needs to be conducted on the potentials, limits and dangers involved in the military use of concepts. Developing further this research program from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge offers promising ways to do so. This research program can focus on how the military produces and uses knowledge and, in return, on what this knowledge makes defense professionals think and do. This research is needed for a better understanding of how the military works, on the one hand, and of how some unexpected concepts may inspire more the military than others in various directions, on the other hand. Without this richer understanding, defense professionals as well as academics advising or criticizing the military may well contribute to aims contrary to their intents without being aware of it. While we will never know whether Deleuze & Guattari would 'go wild over' the military use of their ideas as Naveh put it, contemporary commentators criticizing this military movement became seminal in contributing to it such as Eyal Weizman (2007). In other words, more research needs to be conducted not only on extrinsic militarization, but mostly on intrinsic militarization. While the former debates to what extent defense professionals made 'children in the back' of social theorists in Deleuze's (2003, 15) own terms, the latter debates to what extent the logic of war is already embedded in social theories and, perhaps, in the human condition as well.

References

Adamsky, Dima. 2010. *The culture of military innovation : the impact of cultural factors on the Revolution in Military Affairs in Russia, the US, and Israel*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Annan, Kofi. 2002. Report of the Secretary-General on Recent Events in Jenin, Other Palestinians Cities. New York: United Nations.

Army, US. 2005. Army Planning and Orders Production (FM 5-0). edited by Department of the Army Headquarters. Washington D.C.

Army, US. 2015. Army Design Methodology (ATP 5-0.1) edited by Department of the Army Headquarters. Washington D.C.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Shane Brighton. 2011. "Powers of war: fighting, knowledge, and critique." *International Political Sociology* 5 (2):126-143.

Beaulieu-B, Philippe. 2019. "Critique for Action: Outline of a Craft Turn in Security Practices." *Unpublished paper.*

Beaulieu-B., Philippe, and Philippe Dufort. 2017. "Conclusion: Researching the Reflexive Turn in Military Affairs and Strategic Studies." *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 17 (4).

Bruner, Jerome. 1991. "The Narrative Construction of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1):1-21.

Clausewitz, Carl von. 1976. *On War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

De Landa, Manuel. 1991. *War in the age of intelligent machines*. Swerve eds. ed. New York: Zone Books.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1978. "Les gêneurs." *Le monde*, 7 avril.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1990. *Negotiations: 1972-1990*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 2003. "Lettre à un critique sévère." In *Pourparlers*, edited by Gilles Deleuze, 11-23. Paris: Editions de minuit.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1980. *Mille plateaux*, *Capitalisme et schizophrénie / Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari*. Paris: Éditions de minuit.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1988. *A thousand plateaus : capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone Press.

Dosse, François. 2009. "Les engagements politiques de Gilles Deleuze." *Cités* 40 (4):21-37.

Du Plessis, Gitte 2017. "War Machines Par Excellence: The Discrepancy between Threat and Control in the Weaponization of Infectious Agents." Internatioanl Studies Association Annual Convention, Baltimore, February 22nd.

Eriksson, Johan, and Ludwig Norman. 2011. "Political utilisation of scholarly ideas: the 'clash of civilisations' vs. 'Soft Power' in US foreign policy." *Review of International Studies* 37 (01):417-436.

Feldman, Yotam. 2007. "Dr. Naveh, or, how I learned to stop worrying and walk through walls." *Haaretz*, October 25th. Accessed October 4th, 2013. http://www.haaretz.com/.

Graicer, Ofra. 2015. *Two Steps Ahead: From Deep Ops to Special Ops - Wingate the General*. Dayan base: IDF.

Graicer, Ofra. 2017. "Self Disruption: Seizing the High Ground of Systemic Operational Design (SOD)." In *Reflexive Military Practitioners: Design Thinking and Beyond*,

edited by Philippe Beaulieu-B. and Philippe Dufort. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies.

Hirsch, Gal, and Reuven Ben-Shalom. 2016. *Defensive Shield : an Israeli special forces commander on the front line of counterterrorism : the inspirational story of Brigadier General Gal Hirsch*. Jerusalem, Israel: Gefen Publishing House.

Levine, Daniel J. 2012. *Recovering international relations : the promise of sustainable critique*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, Grant. 2017. "Of Garbage Cans and Paradox: Reflexively Reviewing Design, Mission Command, and the Gray Zone." In *Reflexive Military Practitioners: Design Thinking and Beyond*, edited by Philippe Beaulieu-B. and Philippe Dufort. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies.

Matthews, Matt. 2008. *We were caught unprepared : the 2006 Hezbollah-Israeli War*, *Long war occasional paper*. Fort Leavenworth, Kan.: Combat Studies Institute Press, US Army Combined Arms Center.

Michael, Kobi. 2007. "The Israel defense forces as an epistemic authority: an intellectual challenge in the reality of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 30 (3):421-446.

Naveh, Shimon. 2002. "Asymmetric Conflict: An Operational Reflection on Hegemonic Strategies."

Naveh, Shimon. 2005. "Between the Striated and the Smooth: Urban Enclaves and Fractal Manoeuvres'," An Archipelago of Exception, Barcelona, 11 November.

Naveh, Shimon. 2007a. "Operational art and the iDF: a Critical Study of a Command Culture." *Center for Strategic & Budgetary assessment (CSBa)(September 30,*

2007), written for the Director of Net assessment, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Contract: DaSw01-02-D-0014-0084.

Naveh, Shimon. 2007b. Operational Art and the IDF: A Critical Study of a Command Culture. edited by Department of Defense Office of Net Assessment. Washington.

Peri, Yoram. 2006. *Generals in the cabinet room: How the military shapes Israeli policy*: US Institute of Peace Press.

Price, David H. 2011. *Weaponizing anthropology : social science in the service of the militarized state*. 1st ed. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Reid, Julian. 2003. "Deleuze's War Machine: Nomadism Against the State." *Millenium* 32 (1):57-85.

Roberts, Geoffrey. 2006. "History, Theory and the Narrative Turn in IR." *Review of International Studies* 32:703-714.

Rosen, Stephen P. 2012. "The Impact of the Office of Net Assessment on the American Military in the Matter of the Revolution in Military Affairs." In *Contemporary Military Innovation: Between Anticipation and Adaptation*, edited by Dima Adamsky and Kjell Inge Bjerga, 39-50. New York: Routledge.

Rynhold, Jonathan, and Dov Waxman. 2008. "Ideological change and Israel's disengagement from Gaza." *Political Science Quarterly* 123 (1):11-37.

SOCOM, US. 2016. Design thinking for the SOF enterprise. edited by US Special Operations Command Headquarters. Tampa.

Stanley, Kenneth O, and Joel Lehman. 2015. "Why greatness cannot be planned." *Springer Science Business Media. doi* 10:978-3.

Tilly, Charles, and Gabriel Ardant. 1975. *The Formation of national States in Western Europe*, *Studies in political development*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Weber, Max. 2004. *The vocation lectures : 'Science as a vocation'; 'Politics as a vocation'*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub.

Weizman, Eyal. 2006. "Walking Through Walls: Soldiers as Architects in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Radical Philosophy* (136):8-22.

Weizman, Eyal. 2007. *Hollow land : Israel's architecture of occupation*. London ; New York: Verso.

Zweibelson, Ben. 2017. "Blending Postmodernism with Military Design Methodologies: Heresy, Subversion, and other Myths of Organizational Change. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 17 (4).

INDEX

NAMES:

Hirsch, Gal

Kochavi, Aviv

Martin, Grant

Miller, William

Naveh, Shimon

Newton, Richard

Ryan, Alex

Stanley, Kenneth

Ya'alon, Moshe

Zweibelson, Ben

CONCEPTS:

Design thinking

End state

Narrative

Nomad

Rhizome

Smooth space

Striated space

War machine

2 Beaulieu-B.'s personal interview with Ben Zweibelson recalling his answer to this question asked by a PhD student, Tampa, US-FL, March 6th, 2016.

3 Assistant Professor Philippe Dufort (St-Paul University) and I organized this workshop called Hybrid Warfare: New Epistemologies and Ontologies in Armed Forces held at Canadian Forces College in Toronto, Canada on October 16-17, 2016. The Canadian National Department of Defence's Defence Engagement Program (DEP) provided funding.

4 After several years adapting concepts in US armed forces, Alex Ryan became director of the MaRS Solutions Lab, a prestigious health innovation hub in Toronto in June 2017.

5 While some senior officers started to doubt over IDF conceptual capacities after the Yum Kippur war of 1973, difficulties during the occupation of Southern Lebanon (1982-2000) and the first intifada (1987-1993) accelerated this trend.

6 General Amnon Schachak, the chief of staff, and his deputy Major General Matan Vil'nai passed a resolution to launch both OTRI and the first AOCSC in 1995 (Naveh 2007b, 97). Four themes composed the curriculum: early soviet operational art (e.g. Tukhachevsky, Isserson, Varfolomeev), epistemology (e.g. Kuhn, Cohen, Wilkins), systems theory (e.g. Capra, Maturana), and space perception (Virilio, Deleuze &

Guattari, Tschumi) (Adamsky 2010, 101). Naveh and his colleagues named this methodology Systemic Operational Design (SOD).

7 Beaulieu-B's personal interview with BG (ret.) Shimon Naveh in Herzlya, May 12th, 2015.

8 For Tarak Barkawi and Shane Brighton (2011), this phenomenon is so important that it deserves its own field of inquiry.

9 Deleuze & Guattari found in early mythology the ground to support this claim. In this mythology, the gods of war are in a deeply rooted opposition to the gods of sovereignty (Reid 2003, 63).

10 Deleuze & Guattari uses sedentary groups instead. This category includes states. I directly use states for clarity purposes.

11 Indeed, turning movement into essence into a core principle is a paradox as this would imply moving away from this notion before it becomes a principle.

12 For instance, Deleuze (1978) condemned Israel for not only developing a repressive colonial regime, but also for trying to sell this model around the world in a Op-ed published by *Le Monde* in 1978 .

13 Andrew Marshall's Office of Net Assessment (ONA) of the US Department of Defense, a key US military figure for launching the Revolution in Military Affairs in 1990s, ordered this study (Rosen 2012). In this study, Naveh reveals a thorough research of the nomad as a concept building on Bruce Chatwin's anthropological, Henri Lefebvre's geographical and Deleuze, Guattari & De Landa's philosophical perspectives to name a few.

14 The Palmach was a group akin to a Jewish special force established during the British Mandate of Palestine between 1941 and 1948.

15 Naveh's (2007a, 51) narrative finds support in Eliot Cohen's study according to which "Ben Gurion's decision to disband the PALMACH provided the most crucial condition for the institutionalization of the governmental apparatus and the professionalization of its military component."

16 Of all the great dead nomadic colonels and generals feeding this narrative, T.E. Lawrence seems to be the exception to the rule.

17 Beaulieu-B's interview with MG (ret.) Itzak Ben Israel at Tel Aviv on May 28th, 2015.

18 These charges were abandoned afterward.

19 In a design thinking tutorial at Canadian Forces College in May 2018, BGen. (ret.) Gal Hirsch, a AOCSC graduate and leading military design practitioner, also relied on the nomad to reward disrupting rules and conventions for military effectiveness.

20 Beaulieu-B.'s interview with BG (ret.) Shimon Naveh at the IDF National Defense College in Herzlya on May 12th, 2015.

21 Beaulieu-B.'s interview with BG Jennie Carignan at Canadian Forces College in Toronto on March 29th, 2016.

22 See SAMS monographs collection at the Ike Skelton Combined Arms Research Digital Library at Fort Leavenworth. http://cgsc.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p4013coll3 (Consulted on March 2nd, 2017)

23 Interview with Rolly Dessert, BAH CAD's former senior associate, Fort Leavenworth, US-KS, February 22nd, 2016.

24 Beaulieu-B's personal interview with William 'Joe' Miller in Tampa, Florida on March 14th, 2016.

25 Beaulieu-B's interview with Col. (ret.) Richard Newton in Tampa, Florida on March 7th, 2016.