

## SYLLABUS 02/2013

### CAUSES OF INTRASTATE ARMED CONFLICTS: DOMINANT THEORIES AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Henrikas Bartusevičius  
Department of Political Science and Government  
Aarhus University  
Bartholins Alle 7, building 1331, office 217  
8000 Aarhus C  
Tlf: + 45 8716 5594  
E-mail: [henrikas@ps.au.dk](mailto:henrikas@ps.au.dk)

*Class meetings:*

Wednesdays, 15:00 – 18:00 (7-12 weeks)  
(First meeting 15:00 – 17:15)

*Supervision:*

Wednesdays, time to be announced (17, 21 weeks)

*Location (Class meetings):*

Building 1330, room 018

(see Aarhus University map: <http://www.au.dk/en/about/organisation/map/?b=1330>)

*Office hours:*

Tuesdays, 15:00 – 17:00

(please send me an email with preferred time before the meeting)

Dear participant,

I look forward to meeting you in the course on intrastate armed conflicts and their causes. Below you will find a detailed course description that will guide you through your readings and home preparations. I hope you will find this syllabus interesting and informative.

#### I. Course Summary

The course addresses causes of intrastate armed conflicts or civil wars (hereafter conflicts). It aims to help you develop (i) knowledge of the dominant theories on conflict causes and (ii) competences necessary for the application of these theories in empirical analysis of conflict causes (concrete *intended learning outcomes* are specified below). Accordingly, the course is divided into two main parts. The first part focuses on the dominant theoretical models of conflict onset. We will analyse, compare and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the well established theories and concepts such as 'relative deprivation', 'grievance', 'greed' and 'opportunity'.

The second part focuses on empirical research based on the theories and concepts introduced in the first part. The main aim of this part is to learn how to employ and examine the theories in empirical analysis of conflict causes. The focus will be both on qualitative and quantitative studies: 'Are there any factors at the micro level of particular conflicts that are in congruence with one or other theory?'; 'Are there any theoretically-grounded factors at the macro level that are present in the countries that have experienced conflicts?'; 'What patterns do the findings of statistical studies show?'

(Note that this course explicitly deals with the initiation and onset of conflict. The dynamics and termination of conflict are not within the scope of this seminar. Therefore, issues related to conflict prevention, settlement, management and resolution will not be addressed in the seminar)

## **II. Intended Learning Outcomes**

By the end of the course you should be able to:

1. Describe the basic concepts and assumptions of the 'greed', 'grievance' and alternative approaches/theories (see below, Session III) to conflict causes.
2. Explain the theoretical strengths and weaknesses of these approaches/theories.
3. Evaluate these approaches/theories on the basis of their usefulness to explain particular cases of conflicts.
4. Synthesise and employ them in empirical analysis of conflict causes.
5. Generate original hypotheses and explanations of conflict causes.

## **III. Course Materials**

Most of the course readings are articles available online (see links below). The rest of the readings will be available in the form of compendium, which will appear in *Stakbogladden* at the start of the semester (see location here: <http://www.au.dk/en/about/organisation/map/bldg1420/>). Therefore, there is no necessity to purchase any particular book for the course.

## **IV. Course requirements**

*(a) Readings.* The syllabus lists required readings below. You are responsible for completing all of these readings before every class and coming to a class prepared to discuss issues indicated for every session. (Please pay attention to the page numbers indicated in the parentheses).

*(b) Active participation in class discussions.* The course will mainly be run as a seminar. For seminar to be successful it is necessary that you take active participation in class discussions. For the first three sessions I have indicated broad topics/questions that should guide you through the readings and discussions.

*(c) Home preparations.* You are responsible for preparing for every session:

1. (At least) one comment/question on the issue(s) addressed in one of the readings. The comment/question should reflect your critical understanding of the materials:
  - ‘What do the readings contribute to our understanding of conflict causes?’
  - ‘What are the strengths and weaknesses of their theoretical models?’
  - ‘Which elements of the theories sound unconvincing? Why?’
  - ‘What are their methodological strengths/weaknesses?’
  
2. (At least) one *would-be* research question (which you may eventually want to deal with in your home assignment) addressing theoretical, empirical or methodological issues in one of the readings.

Your questions/comments will be distributed to the class and serve as a starting point for discussions. Please send me the questions/comments at least two hours before the start of every session, so that I could make copies for everyone (*you do not need to do this for the introductory session on 6 February*).

*(d) Class activities.* The course is a mixture of lectureries (short lectures), group work and discussions (we will talk about these in detail during the introductory session). We will also watch and discuss documentaries on particular conflicts.

*(e) Assessment.* The assessment method is a home assignment. We will talk about the details of the exam in the first session.

#### V. Calendar

Session	Place	Date	Time
Introductory Session	Building 1330 Class 018	13 February	15:00-17:15
Session I: Relative Deprivation and Grievance		20 February	15:00-18:00
Session II: Greed, Opportunities and Feasibility		27 February	15:00-18:00
Session III: Alternative theories		6 March	15:00-18:00
Session IV: Case Studies I		13 March	15:00-18:00
Session V: Case Studies II		20 March	15:00-18:00
Session VI: Cross-country Evidence		22 March	14:00-17:00
Supervision I	To be announced	24 April	To be announced
Supervision II		22 May	To be announced

## VI. Course outline and schedule

### Introductory session (Wednesday, 13 February):

First session is an introduction to the course. We will quickly look over the formalities and requirements of the course (seminar form, readings, exam, etc.). In addition, we will have a brief discussion on the definitions of intrastate armed conflict and civil war and have a look at general patterns of conflicts over time and space.

#### Focus:

- ‘What is “intrastate armed conflict” and “civil war”?’ – Definitions and measurement.
- ‘How many? Where? How lengthy?’ – Trends and patterns since 1945.

#### Readings (all readings are listed in the order of importance):

1. Smith, Dan (2004) Trends and Causes in Armed Conflict. In Austin et al. (eds.) *Transforming Ethno-Political Conflicts: The Berghof Handbook*. Berlin: Berghof Center for Constructive Conflict Management.  
< <http://www.berghof-handbook.net/articles/section-ii-analysing-conflict-and-assessing-conflict-transformation/> >.
2. Sambanis, Nicholas (2004) what is Civil War? Conceptual and Empirical Complexities of an Operational Definition. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48(6): 814-858.  
< <http://jcr.sagepub.com/content/48/6/814.abstract> >.  
(Main focus: 814-831; 853-857)
3. Kalyvas, N. Stathis (2001) “New” and “Old” Civil Wars: A Valid Distinction? *World Politics* 54(1): 99-118.  
< [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0043887100015963](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0043887100015963) >.
4. Themner, Lotta & Peter Wallensteen (2012) Armed Conflicts, 1946-2011. *Journal of Peace Research*, 49(4): 565-575.  
< <http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/49/4/565.abstract> >.

pp. 93

## PART I – CONFLICTS AND THEIR CAUSES - THEORY

There will be three sessions in the first part of the course. Sessions 1 and 2 focus on ‘grievance’ and ‘greed’ – two of the most influential theoretical approaches in the current debate on conflict causes.

### Session I: Grievance and Relative Deprivation (Wednesday, 20 February):

The first session focuses on the grievance approach and theory of relative deprivation. Although introduced in 1970s, the theory of relative deprivation and political violence (introduced by Ted Robert Gurr) remains one of the most comprehensive and well developed theories on protest and violent conflict to date. Gurr’s seminal work, *Why Men Rebel?*, will serve as the primary source of the theory. We will also deal with Gurr’s later work (2000), which includes elements of ‘identity’ and ‘opportunity’ into grievance approach. In addition, we will look at one of the recent examples of the application of the grievance approach to empirical analysis of conflict causes (Cederman, Weidmann and Gleditsch’s article).

#### Focus:

- ‘What is “grievance approach” and theory of “relative deprivation” and how they explain causes of conflicts?’
- ‘Which aspects of conflicts could not be explained by grievance approach?’
- ‘How can we employ grievance approach to empirically analyze causes of conflicts?’

#### Readings:

1. Gurr, T. Robert (1970) *Why Men Rebel?* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Introduction; Chapters 1 and 2; pp. 16-21 are optional) (In compendium)
2. Gurr T. Robert (2000) *Peoples versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington, D. C.: United States Institute of Peace. (Chapter 3) (In compendium)
3. Cederman, Lars-Erik; Nils B. Weidmann & Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (2011) Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison. *American Political Science Review* 105(3): 478-495.  
< <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=8368186> >. (Main focus on 478-483; 492)

pp. 105

## Session II: Greed, Opportunities and Feasibility (Wednesday, 27 February):

Session Two deals with the greed approach and the so-called 'Collier-Hoeffler model of conflict onset' (hereafter CH model) which has its theoretical roots in the so-called 'resource mobilization' theory (see Snyder & Tilly's article) – the major challenger to the early relative deprivation theory. Since the introduction in early 2000s, the model received enormous attention of the scholarly community and the media. *Greed and Grievance in Civil War* has been one of the most often cited articles in the conflict literature. The model has been covered in the mainstream media (*The Economist*, *The New York Times*, and *The Washington Post*) as well. In this session we will look both at the early CH model and its later modification – 'Feasibility' model. We will also deal with the issue of (in)compatibility of grievance and greed approaches.

### Focus:

- 'Greed', 'financial opportunities', 'military opportunities' and causes of conflicts.
- 'What are the main differences between 'greed' and 'feasibility' approaches?'
- 'Greed and grievance – two sides of the same coin?'

### Readings:

1. Snyder, David & Charles Tilly (1972) Hardship and Collective Violence in France, 1830 to 1960. *American Sociological Review* 37(5): 520-532. < <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2093448> >.
2. Collier, Paul & Anke Hoeffler (2004) Greed and Grievance in Civil War. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4): 563-595. < <http://oep.oxfordjournals.org/content/56/4/563> >. (Main focus on 563-572; 587-589; alternatively, you could read a somewhat more elaborate and less-technical description of the same set of ideas: Collier, Paul (2007) Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and Their Implications for Policy. In Chester A. Crockett; Den Osler Hampson & Pamela Aall (eds.) *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 197-218 (In compendium))
3. Collier, Paul; Anke Hoeffler, & Dominic Rohner (2009) Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 61(1): 1-27. < <http://oep.oxfordjournals.org/content/61/1/1.abstract> >. (Main focus on 1-10; 24)
4. Fearon, D. James & David D. Laitin (2003) Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War. *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90. < [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0003055403000534](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055403000534) >.
5. Keen, David (2012) Greed and Grievance in Civil War. *International Affairs* 88(4): 757-777. < <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01100.x/abstract> >

pp. 110

### Session III: Alternative Theoretical Approaches (Wednesday, March 6):

In the last session of the first part we will examine some of the influential 'alternative' approaches to conflict causes:

- 'Peaceful Woman and Aggressive Man?' – Feminist explanations of conflict.
- 'A Clash of Generations?' – Demographics and conflict.
- 'Conflict is all about females?' – Evolutionary psychology foundations of conflicts.
- 'Favoring kin over non-kin?' – Ethnic nepotism and conflict.
- 'Fighting for survival?' – Neo-Malthusian explanations of conflict.

#### Readings:

1. Caprioli, Mary (2005) Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(2): 161-178.  
< <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0020-8833.2005.00340.x/abstract> >.
2. Urdal, Henrik (2006) A Clash of Generations? Youth Bulges and Political Violence. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(3): 607-629.  
< <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2006.00416.x/abstract> >.
3. Kanazawa, Satoshi (2009) Evolutionary Psychology Foundations of Civil Wars. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(1): 25-34.  
<<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=3501852&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0022381608090026> >
4. Vanhanen, Tatu (1999) Domestic Ethnic Conflict and Ethnic Nepotism: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Peace Research*, 36(1): 55-73.  
< <http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/36/1/55.abstract> >.
5. Homer-Dixon, F. Thomas (1999) Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases. *International Security*, 19(1): 5-40.  
< <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539147> >.

pp. 106

## PART II – CONFLICTS AND THEIR CAUSES – EMPIRICS

Part II shifts to empirical research. It provides a number of examples of empirical studies employing theoretical approaches/theories introduced in the first part and attempts to address the question of 'how well do the theoretical approaches/theories explain the onset of particular conflicts?'

### Session IV: Case Studies I ('resource curse' – a source of greed or grievance?) (Wednesday, March 13):

#### Sierra Leone:

1. Silberfein, Marilyn (2004) The Geopolitics of Conflict and Diamonds in Sierra Leone. *Geopolitics* 9(1): 213-241.  
< <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14650040412331307892> >.
2. Keen, David (2003) Greedy Elites, Dwindling Resources, Alienated Youths: The Anatomy of Protracted Violence in Sierra Leone. *International Politics and Society* 2: 67-94.  
< [http://www.fes.de/ipg/IPG2\\_2003/ZEITSCHRIFTE.HTM](http://www.fes.de/ipg/IPG2_2003/ZEITSCHRIFTE.HTM) >.
3. Humphreys, Macartan & Jeremy M. Weinstein (2008) Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(2): 436-455.  
< <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2008.00322.x/abstract> >.

#### Bougainville:

1. Thompson, Herb (1991) The Economic Causes and Consequences of the Bougainville Crisis. *Resources Policy* 17(1): 69-85.  
< <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/030142079190027S> >
2. Regan J. Anthony (2003) The Bougainville Conflict: Political and Economic Agendas. In Karen Ballentine & Jake Sherman (eds.) *The Political Economy of Armed Conflict: Beyond Greed and Grievance*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 133 – 166. (In compendium)
3. *The Coconut Revolution* (2000) video recording, Stampede Films, Luton.  
(We will watch this documentary in the class)

pp. 128

**Session V: Case Studies II ('alternative factors' – international context, leaders, fear and obedience  
(Wednesday, 20 March):**

Colombia:

1. Guaqueta, Alexandra (2003) The Colombian Conflict: Political and Economic Dimensions. In Karen Ballentine & Jake Sherman (eds.) *The Political Economy of Armed Conflict: Beyond Greed and Grievance*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 73-106. (In compendium)

Bosnia:

1. Kalyvas N. Stathis & Nicholas Sambanis (2005) Bosnia's Civil War: Origins and Violence Dynamics. In Paul Collier & Nicholas Sambanis. *Understanding Civil War*. Volume 2: Europe, Central Asia, and Other Regions, 191-231. (Available online at <http://www.statsbiblioteket.dk/> )
2. Mueller, John (2000) The Banality of 'Ethnic War'. *International Security*, 25(1): 42-70  
< <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/action/doSearch?searchText=the+banality+of+ethnic+war> >. (pp. 42-58)
3. *The Death of Yugoslavia* (1995), Part 4, video recording, BBC documentaries.  
(We will watch this documentary in the class)

Rwanda

1. Hintjens, M. Helen (1999) Explaining the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda. *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 37(2): 241-286.  
< [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0022278X99003018](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022278X99003018) >.
2. Mueller, John (2000) The Banality of 'Ethnic War'. *International Security*, 25(1): 42-70  
< <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/action/doSearch?searchText=the+banality+of+ethnic+war> >. (pp. 58-70)

pp. 150

**Session VI: Cross-country Evidence (Friday, 22 March, 14:00 – 17:00):**

*Readings:*

1. Ross, L. Michael (2004) How Do Natural Resources Influence Civil War? Evidence from Thirteen Cases. *International Organization*, 58(1): 35-67.  
<<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=197304&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S002081830458102X>>.
2. Stewart, Frances (2002) Horizontal Inequalities: A Neglected Dimension of Development. *QEH Working Paper Number 81*, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.  
< <http://www3.geh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/gehwp/gehwps81.pdf> >.
3. Dixon, Jeffrey (2009) What Causes Civil Wars? Integrating Quantitative Research Findings. *International Studies Review*, 11(4): 707-735.  
< <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2009.00892.x/abstract> >.

pp. 102