

Greed or Grievance for Explaining Civil Wars: Revisiting the Literature

Gloria Erica Atsriku¹, Ernest Darkwa²

^{1,2} Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands

Abstract- This paper examines the greed versus grievance model as motives for explaining civil wars. The paper argues that both greed and grievance are important for explaining civil wars. As such, no single explanation, be it, greed or grievance can be said to be the most important or sole cause for explaining civil wars; as the cause and explanation of a violent conflict or civil war, may depend on a specific context, time, and place. Other equally significant factors, such as a weakened governance system, a breakdown of the social contract, and horizontal inequalities might also play a crucial role in triggering violent conflicts, depending on the specific context and the country in question. Grievance and other horizontal inequalities might trigger the start of civil wars, with greed coming in as a means to secure some form of wealth, especially where there exist some rich natural resources, such as gold, diamond, etc. The resources may also serve as way of financing the conflict. No single explanation can therefore be said to be the most significant in analyzing violent conflicts.

Keywords- Civil Wars, Explanation, Greed, Grievance, Internal Conflict, Motives, Violent Conflict.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, the greed and grievance model as motives for civil wars has seen much debates among scholars. Civil wars are defined as “internal conflicts with at least 1000 related combat deaths per year” (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004:565). In distinguishing civil wars from massacres, both the rebel groups and the government forces might have suffered at least five percent of the fatalities (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004:565). Civil wars tend to badly affect a country’s economy, which in turn affects the citizen’s livelihood, as well as degrading the country’s political institutions, human capital, and physical infrastructure (Chambers and Conway, 1992). Civil wars are also seen by some scholars as among the causal factors of the income-gap existing between developed and developing countries (Blattman and Miguel, 2010:4-5). This paper explores the value of the greed versus grievance model as motives for explaining civil wars, as well as the main criticisms that have been levelled against it.

In doing this, the paper is guided by the following research question. “To what extent does the greed versus grievance model explains the motives for civil wars”? In addressing the topic, and the research question, the paper briefly looks at the theoretical underpinnings, considering some explanations on the motivation for rebels. It then examines the premise, and contributions of greed versus grievance model. The paper further examines some criticisms that have been levelled against the model, assessing the extent to which, greed versus grievance model explains the causes of civil wars. It also briefly analysis the extent to which the greed versus grievance model explains the motives for the Liberian civil war. The paper is significant in the sense that it will add up to the literature on the motives for civil wars, by examining the extent to which, greed or grievance explains the causes of civil wars, considering the fact that, there are other equally-significant factors apart from greed and grievance that might necessitate conflicts in different situations and context. Varying sources and forms of motivation might therefore trigger the outbreak of internal conflicts, and as such, the paper will help in unpacking the extent to which greed versus grievance thesis explains the motives behind civil wars. The paper employs a qualitative approach, using relevant existing literature on the topic.

Prior to the greed versus grievance explanations of civil wars, debates on the causes of civil wars mainly concentrated on irrationality, as well as inexplicably primordial characteristics of humans as triggers for civil wars (Pugh and Cooper, cited in Berdal, 2005:688). Furthermore, debates on the causes of civil wars that came up at the time of the Cold War, mainly focused on anthropological perspectives (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:48). These were based on colonial cognizance that saw developing states as been traditional, as well as backward as explanations for most of the rebellion and civil wars that emerged during the period after their colonial rule (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:49). Beswick and Jackson (2015:49) have argued that such analysis of conflict based

on anthropological frameworks were exceedingly context-specific, seeing developing countries as having backwardness and traditional qualities that geared the outbreak of conflicts. This actually indicated a crisscross in relation to networks of global political, economic procedures and approaches and suggested a relatively lesser position or task by global actors in averting and settling civil wars and rebellions (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:49).

However, the greed versus grievance model provided by Collier and Hoeffler, as motives for civil wars, has become much influential even though it has faced several criticisms from a number of scholars (Beswick and Jackson, 2011:41). The greed versus grievance model is an economic model to the explanation of internal conflicts. The model was used to find the causes of internal conflicts between 1960 and 1999 in 161 countries that were studied (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004:563-564). The model saw economic factors (greed-based explanations), which were explained with regards to opportunities for looting natural resources, as been more powerful in analysing internal conflicts than political factors (grievance-based explanations) (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004: 588-589). The model used proxy measures to represent each concept. With regards to proxy measures for greed, the model gave the following variables as indicators; dependence on primary commodity exports, which is measured based on the exports to the GDP, the number of young males within the country, as well as the average years of schooling that have been done by the population (Collier and Hoeffler, 2001:3-7). With this, Collier and Hoeffler, considered these variables as opportunities that paved way for funding civil wars. With regards to grievance, Collier and Hoeffler proxied the following variables; existence of inequality, measured based on the Gini coefficient, political repression, measured based on indicators of political and civil rights, low-economic growth, ethnic grievances, as well as the utility of rebellion which is seen as a meld measure that encompasses the rate of spending on defense, the anticipated timeframe of conflict, as well as the possibility for success (Collier and Hoeffler, 2001:6-7).

Despite the high influence of the greed versus grievance model, several scholars have criticized the validity of the statistical values and the proxies used. For instance, Nathan (2005:2) has argued that the greed versus grievance analysis by Collier and Hoeffler, come with a number of theoretical, methodological and empirical flaws that affect the reliability of the results thereby creating unjust conclusions. The main argument of the paper is that the causes of civil wars are quite complex, and vary from different situations and context, therefore, greed versus grievance model cannot adequately capture all the causes of conflicts across countries, as different conflicts could have different motivations, which may not necessarily be based on greed or grievance. Other factors, such as institutional weakness and breakdown, as well as breakdown of the social contract may also be equally important. It therefore becomes necessary to analyze conflicts in specific context of the society in question. Thus, moving away from general statistics across countries in analyzing the causes of conflict to a more focus on specific country case-studies becomes very significant (Nathan, 2005:11).

The paper is structured into five main sections. Following the introduction, the second section looks at the theoretical underpinnings, considering explanations on rebel's motivation given by scholars. This considers the literature on the motivation for rebel groups. The third section examines the premise of the greed versus grievance model as well as the contributions of the model to the understanding of conflicts. The fourth section unravels the main criticisms that have been levelled against the model. The section then briefly look at the Liberian civil war, and examine the extent to which the greed versus grievance model explains the motives for the Liberian civil war. The fifth section concludes the paper. In the next section, I look at the theoretical underpinnings, considering explanations on the motivation for rebels.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS: EXPLANATION ON THE MOTIVATION OF REBELS

Over the last two decades the literature on the causes and consequences of conflicts have widely been enlarged to encompass several factors. Most studies have shown the causes and consequences of civil wars as well as the effects of civil wars on the future of populations, physical assets and investments (Rodrik, 1999; Cerra and Saxena, 2008). Other studies have shown the effects of civil wars and violent rebellions on social institutions, political institutions, health and human capital (Shemyakina, 2006; Bellows and

Miguel, 2006). As noted by Keen (2010:12) internal conflicts creates substantial obliteration of properties, livelihoods and infrastructure.

The numerous conclusions on the mass effects of internal conflicts over the past few decades have led to significant studies by scholars on the causes of internal conflicts across the globe. A number of models have since then come up, explaining the causes of internal conflicts. Prominent among these models have been the theories that look at the motivation for internal conflicts. These have included the international relations framework (ie. Vinci, 2006) and feasibility perspective (ie. Collier et al., 2006).

The research on the motivation for internal conflicts have looked at motivations by different groups including rebels (ie. Sanin, 2003), government forces (ie. Theidon, 2009), and other paramilitary forces. Therefore it could be argued that a number of research have given different motivations for rebels and other citizens to embark on internal conflicts. These have included the motivation by greed and grievance (Collier and Hoeffler, 2000, 2004, 2006), motivation by economic prosperity (Le Billion, 2001), motivation by ideology (Faust, 1990), motivation for power (Vinci, 2006), motivation which are triggered by religious and ethnic hatred (Lindberg, 2008). Stewart (2000) also brought in the idea of horizontal inequality in identifying the inequality that may exist between groups instead of the inequality that might occur between ethnically homogenous people in analyzing the causes of conflicts.

One major model for the motivation for internal conflicts which has become very influential over the last two decades is the greed versus grievance model given by Collier and Hoeffler. The greed versus grievance model which came as an economic approach to explaining the motivations for internal conflicts saw greed-based explanations as more significant than grievance-based explanations. Despite the influence of the greed versus grievance explanations it has come under numerous criticisms from scholars.

THE PREMISE OF THE GREED VERSUS GRIEVANCE MODEL

The greed versus grievance model came as an economic approach to understanding the causes of civil wars which to a large extent was kindred to some economic constraints (Collier, 2001:1-3). To a greater extent, this had to do with a lower-level of education among a majority of young men within the population, the existence of resources that were lootable, as well as economic inequality (Collier, 2000:94-5). A distinction is made by Collier and Hoeffler between greed and grievance as motives for conflict by assigning different proxy measures for each of the concepts. The model considered economic factors (greed-based explanations) as more significant in explaining the causes of civil wars than the politically motivated factors (grievance-based explanations).

With greed as a motive for civil wars the model associates the causes of rebellions and civil wars with the availability of “opportunity” which is seen as greed (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004). Opportunities here may be divided into three major facets including recruitment, geography and financing (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:89). The proxy variables that were used in representing greed included; the dependence on primary commodity exports, the number of young men in the country, the average years of education that has been undertaken by the people as well as other indicators that were used as opportunities in terms of providing funds for civil wars, such as subventions that are drawn from hostile governments, donations that come from the diaspora, extortion and dependence on natural resources. (Collier and Hoeffler, 2001:2-7). The model argued that in a country that rely mostly on natural resources (primary commodity exports), with greater part of the people been young males with a limited access to employment opportunities, which tends to be proxied by not having access to schooling as a whole, but with the availability of opportunities that enhances looting (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004), then greed becomes an essential factor in explaining civil wars (Beswick, 2013:31-32). According to Murshed and Tadjoeeddin (2009:89) the greed approach was therefore viewed as indicating opportunities that rebel movements encounter. Greed was seen as a relevant explanative factor in analyzing civil wars.

The grievance-based explanations on the other hand considers the following proxy measures as indicators. This included political repression, inequality (which is measured using the Gini coefficient), low economic growth, religious and ethnic hatred, political

exclusion (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004). Considering these variables, Collier and Hoeffler argued that grievance-based explanations were less significant in explaining conflicts compared to greed (Beswick, 2013:30-31).

The extent of dependence on natural resources (primary commodity exports) was seen as the highest risk factor, and this was seen as highly linked with the economic explanation of internal conflicts as based on greed (Collier and Hoeffler, 2001:17). With this, it could be seen that rebels are considered as been led by motives of greed in a situation in which economic avenues including military salaries and looting act as a motivation for them. However, Keen (2000:283) has argued that “war could interlock into crime and as such, there is the need in reconsidering the link between the two”. Duffield (2001) has criticized the greed versus grievance model by Collier and Hoeffler, as been biased and unjust for regarding all rebellions as illegitimate as it gives an explanation of rebels as being usually criminals. Nevertheless, it should be noted that latter works by Collier have tended to shift the emphasis on only greed as a major factor for conflict to other factors such as the feasibility of the violence (Keen, 2012:757). The greed model despite a shift to the feasibility of the conflict, still considers economic motives as significant given less attention to grievances (Keen, 2012:757). Stewart on the other hand attaches more attention to horizontal inequalities as well as the grievances that come with it (Stewart, 2008:3). Keen (2012:757) has noted that Collier’s work seems to be suitable in a political sense and this might explain to some extent why the model achieved such a larger and impressive following over the years. The greed model however provides some useful understandings to analyzing internal conflicts. In the next sub-section, I examine contributions of the greed versus grievance model in analyzing civil wars.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE GREED VERSUS GRIEVANCE MODEL

The greed versus grievance model as an explanation for conflicts has contributed a lot to the understanding and analysis of internal conflicts. In this part of the paper, I examine some contributions of the greed versus model towards the understanding of internal conflicts and rebellions.

To start with, it could be argued that the greed versus grievance model brought to the attention significant issues on how civil wars are started and prolonged, as well as how civil wars are funded through shadow economies (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51). The relevance of shadow economies as a tool for funding civil wars is brought to light by the greed versus grievance approach, by identifying the key trends that natural resources play in financing civil wars. As noted by Beswick and Jackson (2015:51), the model to a greater extent showed the part played by natural resources in conflicts, thereby depicting such trends as resource-led wars.

It further shows the growth of quantitative research that aims at exploring a deeper framework for the reasons behind civil conflicts and the linkage between economic and political-based motives for conflict (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51). Collier and Hoeffler’s paper afterwards in collaboration with Dominic Rohner in 2009, indicated that both greed and grievance as well as quantitative and qualitative research are significant in analyzing internal conflict (Collier et al., 2009).

Furthermore, the model provided policy makers with a means for avoiding and managing civil wars (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51; Beswick, 2013). Therefore, it suggested that with a regulation of the economic opportunities and practices that enhances conflicts, the likelihood and prolonging of civil wars could be brought down theoretically (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50). However, it could be seen that the remedies provided by the framework appeared to be quite simplistic, focusing on the opportunities of natural resources (primary commodity exports) and the possibility of securing funds from diasporas by rebel groups (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50).

In addition, the model asserted to give a path for predicting countries that were highly prone to civil wars to their statistical analysis (Beswick, 2013). By analyzing the major measures that may be influenced significantly through interventions that aims to lower the risk of civil wars. The statistical approach used by the model and the social science-approach adopted to some extent also provided a simplification of the kind of civil conflicts that policy makers were entangled with (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50). Keen (2012:757-8) has noted that the need for promoting a higher number of peacekeepers comes as a very relevant point. For

instance, the problems that came as a result of removing peacekeepers from Rwanda in 1994, brings more attention on this (Keen, 2012:757-8). Therefore, the need for increasing peacekeepers during and even after massive conflict situations as outlined by Collier cannot be overlooked when analyzing conflicts.

Again, the economic motive given by Collier and Hoeffler as a motivation for conflict is very relevant in several instances of violent conflicts, as a number of conflicts have been seen to be precipitated by this. For instance, the greed and grievance model as outlined by the authors can be related to key examples that generate into war-economies, such as the Kimberley process, and the numerous submissions on violence, and civil wars by the panel of experts of the United Nations (UN) (Keen, 2012:757-8).

The attention on the need for an extended and liberal aid system just after and long period after violent conflicts is also relevant (Keen, 2012:758). This to a greater extent helps in keeping and sustaining the post-conflict society in terms of its security and paving way for a stable economy in mending up the broken state of affairs that may have occurred following the conflict.

Another significant point that is made by Keen (2012:757-9) is the attention that is given to having an open and more accountable system and procedure of finance by international banks, when it comes to extraction and trade of natural resources. This allows for a fair and equitable system which further enhances the trade in natural resources and the distribution of gains to various groups or parties concerned. Despite the influence and contributions of the model, it had many shortcomings which have been examined by numerous scholars. The next section examines criticisms of the greed versus grievance model.

CRITICISMS OF THE GREED VERSUS GRIEVANCE MODEL

The greed and grievance model despite its widespread influence on the literature on civil wars have come under numerous criticisms from scholars around the globe. Nathan (2005:2) has argued that the greed versus grievance approach come with many flaws of theoretical, empirical and methodological, which generate findings that are biased and unjust.

To start with, Nathan (2005:2) sees the greed versus grievance model as having “a deficiency of inadequacy with regards to most of the statistics that were employed in studying the causes of civil wars”. The model explains the causes of internal conflicts without studying the actual nature of civil wars and the nature of rebels without actually studying and considering the actual nature and trend of rebellions and rebel groups (Nathan, 2005:2). The statistical data used by Collier and Hoeffler in analyzing causes of civil wars is biased in nature, as it focusses on a particular trend which considers the dependence on natural resources based on looting that comes with opportunities for extorting the natural resources (Nathan, 2005:2). This is made from a tie up of the rate of natural resource exportation and the inception of internal conflict to the GDP (Nathan, 2005:2). Murshed and Tadjoeeddin (2009:92) have posited that the empirical debate with regards to the relation existing between the greed model and the natural resource opportunity, has to do with the projection existing between natural resource rent and the methods used for the estimation and the measurement problems. Other measures such as the mechanism in which the reliance on natural resources may be linked to grievance-based motives instead of greed-based motives (Humphrey, 2005). There could also be the situation where the availability of the natural resource could be a motivation for a third party such as corporations and states with a view of necessitating the violent conflict (Humphreys, 2005).

Moving on, the greed versus grievance model is seen as having flaws with regards to the appropriateness of the proxies employed. Not all the variables used by the greed versus grievance model can be measured, and this makes the proxies to some extent inappropriate in critically analyzing civil wars, using the proxies (Nathan, 2005:3). Most of the proxies used are not measurable numerically (Nathan, 2005:3). In measuring economic inequality, Collier and Hoeffler uses the Gini coefficient, however not all the proxies for the other variables are measurable, which to a greater extent affects the analysis (Nathan, 2005:3). The greed versus grievance model sees the possibility of internal conflicts as been funded by extorting primary commodities (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004:567), however, the variables that are used for natural resources such as diamond, raw materials, food and non-food products are just ratios relating to primary commodity exports and does not necessarily reflect the extortion by rebel groups (Nathan, 2005:3).

This suggests that the risk of internal conflicts may be as a result of response to bad governance and state failure and not necessarily on the opportunities that rebels may have for financing their activities. (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102). This is because primary commodity exports may be connected with grievance and not solely on greed as this may have strong relations with the nature of bad bureaucratic governance, improper management of the economy, and official corruption (Nathan, 2005:4).

In addition, the proxies used by Collier and Hoeffler, does not really measure the variables it claims to measure (Nathan, 2005:6). The apprehension with regards to the proxies used for the measures makes the findings of the survey with regards to the regression equivocal to substantiate without a critical and adequate analysis (Nathan, 2005:6). This kind of critical and adequate analysis of the measures are not carried by Collier and Hoeffler, but rather they draw inferences by just considering the hypothesis that depicts the proxies that are employed (Nathan, 2005:6). Furthermore, Cramer (2002:1851-1852) makes a point similar to the argument raised by Nathan (2005) in bringing out some flaws of the proxies used in the greed versus grievance hypothesis. Cramer elaborates on some arbitrariness with regards to the proxies. For instance, Cramer argues that, the case of employing inequality with regards to income as a variable for prospective expenditure by government within a particular analysis and as a proxy in explaining grievance in an analysis that comes afterwards, and also the reliance on natural resource may come as reason for one analysis, as well as opportunity with other analysis (Cramer, 2002:1851-1852).

Also, in relating the proxies provided by the greed versus grievance hypothesis, it could be seen that it becomes difficult in ascribing variables on an individual basis despite the fact that such variables could be measurable to some extent on greed or grievance explanations (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50). This is because even though the variables provided by the greed versus grievance model may be relevant in analyzing the causes of internal conflicts, the analysis should not be simply skewed to a greed and grievance base for its explanations. As a comprehension of the peculiar nature and varying trends of greed-based (economic), and as grievance-based (political), may relate in creating a specific form of violent conflict (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50; Nathan, 2005:6-7). From this, it could be argued that a comprehension of the particular as well as the varying paths and kind of opportunities and natural resources relating it with the specific situations in which particular civil wars may happen is key, when analyzing civil wars (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:50; Beswick, 2013).

Further on the criticisms, regarding the appropriateness of the proxies employed by the greed and grievance model, the models are not adequate when it comes to measuring and analyzing the variables of conflict (Keen, 2012:761). The argument by Collier and Hoeffler that the greed-based explanations are much significant, when it comes to explaining violent conflicts is very questionable. This is because in the analysis of the greed versus grievance hypothesis, not having access to educational opportunities by the population is seen as a proxy measure for greed, however, considering several cases like that of Sierra Leone, it could be realized that a major contributing grievance that most of the young men and fighters encountered was having limited access to educational opportunities (Keen, 2005). This shows that some of the proxies that are used by the model as representing greed could equally be used as measures for grievance with a key example been the limited access to education which is employed as a measure for greed. Nevertheless, a recent work by Collier, together with Mans Soderbom and Hoeffler on "post-conflict risk" indicated that a lower growth in the economy and lower per capita income come as proxies used for the feasibility of the violence or conflict (Collier et al., 2006). This comes in with the explanation or reason that such variable tends to reduce the cost of recruitment of rebels, however they could in a way also be observed as indicators for grievance (Keen, 2012:761-762). Therefore, with a change with regards to the meaning of proxies employed the conclusions might also change turning to the other side of the equation (Keen, 2012:761-762).

Another problem that can be identified is that the statistical data from the national level used may not necessarily provide answers to some of the key questions raised. That is, even though the model provides a picture on the causes of conflicts, it does not necessarily provide a broader image of the conflicts, basing on the statistical data taken from the national country-data information that were gathered in making the analysis (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51; Nathan, 2005). This is because most internal conflicts within less-developed economies are not necessarily enclosed within the national borders of the countries in question. An example that can be considered here for instance, is the case of the Mano river area, considering the diamond spots in West Africa, which

can be found in countries, including Guinea, Liberia as well as Sierra Leone (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51). However, the diamond spots might contribute varying reasons for civil wars within each of the areas in question. Nevertheless, varying forms of civil wars may emerge on areas which are boundary areas to other jurisdictions, but not be easily gettable by the government interference and this may provide space for the rebel movements to have quick access to the spots in question when there is less-government control of the area (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51).

A key criticism that is also leveled against the model is whether the same approach is applicable to varying forms of civil wars. This is because the motive behind different rebellions may highly differ depending on the situation, location and context. For instance, even though there might be some similarities in motivations, the motive for the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC) in Colombia, the Lord's Resistance Army of Uganda (LRA), as well as the MOIST Movement within Nepal, might differ significantly (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51). Furthermore, considering the same rebel groups, there might be varying motives behind the rebellions and as such, making a simplification of different conflicts to the hypothesis of the greed versus grievance model becomes quite ambiguous and unfair (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51).

Another key point is that the model is seen to be engaging in much selective-approach in its analysis (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51-2; Humphreys, 2005). The quick contrast made between greed and grievance is in a way not clear. This is because the two concepts in relation to conflicts are entwined and therefore cannot be separated easily by employing some proxies and simple equations (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51; Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102). The findings of the model are perceptive to the countries that were under the study and the value of data that were employed (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51; Nathan, 2005). Notwithstanding the selectiveness of the data and definitions, close to a fraction of the cases demonstrates that greed-based explanations are not necessarily the most significant (Beswick and Jackson, 2015:51; Nathan, 2005). Therefore, in analyzing civil wars, the specific situation and context of the society and extent to which the social contract within the country fulfils its conditions, and the capacity of the governance system are equally significant to other factors like greed and grievance, horizontal inequalities, and other possible motivations that might also spark violent conflicts.

Despite the relevance of the model in analyzing internal conflict, other equally significant factors need to be considered when analyzing internal conflicts. For even the motivations for greed or grievance to substantiate, there must be the presence of an important factor such as, a weakened social contract, as described by (Addison and Murshed 2001; Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102). This is in a way related to a lower state capacity, which narrows down to the general administration of the country. Even with the availability of resources that pave way for looting and mobilization of people for conflict, if the country or state in question possesses the needed capacity both formal and informal, the conflict is not likely to spread into a wider sphere of violent conflict (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102). A presence of a strong and effective social contract that allocates resources fairly and has a potential of amicably resolving disputes and differences may to a large extent prevent the space for behaviors that are opportunistic and may trigger the looting of resources in necessitating conflicts on a larger scale (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102).

Also within countries, the violence may breakout in a situation where the stipulated procedures towards the allocation of resources becomes weakened or even breakdown. That is, the outbreak of civil wars may be the result of the weakened or breakdown of these procedures set down for allocation and distributing resources, and not necessarily the absence of the arrangement (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102-3). This may not necessarily be motivated by greed and or grievance, but a weakened or breakdown of the system in place that allocates, shares and distribute resources. Violence that emerge over the allocation of resources are very common with some examples been the cases of Nigeria and Indonesia, which gradually picks up regional, as well as ethnic-classifications (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:102-4). This explains the aforementioned point that the factor social contract is very relevant when it comes to analyzing the causes of internal conflicts within specific context and situations as this could enhance the possibility of war, if greed or grievance motives exist in such situations. In analyzing the outbreak and continuation of conflicts within states, the extent and level to which the contract that binds the rulers and the people becomes necessary to consider.

Furthermore, several conflicts over the past years have been seen to be as a result of fiscal disputes. This explains a situation where a country's fiscal policy procedures do not pave way for equitable and fair distribution of state resources (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:104). This according to Murshed and Tadjoeeddin (2009:104) creates room for certain groups who may feel not treated fairly to resort to using forceful measures in taken up some resources for themselves; this mostly comes about because of a weakened institutional structure or weakened social contract between the government and the population. A key example that can be considered is the case of Ivory Coast, during the regime of Houphouet-Boigny. Houphouet-Boigny during this time distributed resources and state money to particular ethnic groups, which gradually led to massive instability and subsequent breakdown of the social contract (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:104). This led to a proportion of the country feeling unfairly treated and gradually led to conflicts which affected the general stability and growth of the country. Greed or grievance does not necessarily create conflicts, but other factors such as, unfair, and unequal distribution of state resources and unjust fiscal policies might work hand in hand in necessitating violent conflicts.

Another important argument is that civil wars tend to be less in democracies as well as autocracies that are well-established than in hybrid regimes (Hegre et al., 2001). This further shows that the risk of civil war is more in regimes that are in transition and democracies that are not complete ("anocracies") when there is the presence of weakened institutional capacity of the country compared to fully-established democracies. Murshed and Tadjoeeddin (2009:104) have argued that a number of less-developed states are to a large extent democracies that are not complete and faces threats of conflict when the basic provisions of the social contract are not fulfilled by the ruling regime or government. These domestic factors during the Cold War interplayed with other factors that were external and necessitated conflicts by supplying ideological and financial resources to both rebels and ruling classes (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009: 104-5). This circumstance gradually leads to grievances which come as a result of the weakened institutional structures and a weakened or breakaway social contract, enhancing unfair allocations of resources within the country, which further distorts internal peace and stability. The situation could further exacerbate tendencies for greed motives which may come as a means for taking charge and dominating the resources of the state (Murshed and Tadjoeeddin, 2009:104-5). The points emphasized here supports the argument that greed and grievance alone are not sufficient in explaining violent conflicts, as equally relevant factors such as, the nature and kind of governance system that promotes equal and fair allocation of public goods and other state resources may also be important.

A criticism that is also leveled against the model is that the assertion by Collier that inequality does not necessarily precipitate conflict is not accurate (Keen, 2012). Collier argued that inequality either measured with regards to ownership of land or as income inequality, show a little influence when it comes to analyzing conflicts compared to greed-based factors (Collier, 2000). However, Collier's reference to inequality was more of the vertical inequality; that is inequality that comes between individuals and households within a country, but not considering horizontal inequalities that comes between groups, as noted by Stewart rather gives a more accurate explanation on how inequalities trigger civil wars in countries (Keen, 2012:760). Keen argues that Gurdun Ostby's contribution to a chapter in the book, "Horizontal Inequalities and Conflicts" indicated that between the period 1986 to 2003 there was a higher possibility of civil conflicts appearing in countries that showed much horizontal inequalities, including inequalities between groups with regards to whether the groups are differentiated in terms of their religion, ethnic affiliation etc. (Keen, 2012:760). For instance, the impacts of vertical inequalities in terms of income were not seen to be the most significant factor that triggered violent conflicts within Indonesia (Keen, 2012:760). In addition to this, Murshed and Gates (2004:1-15) have noted that communities in Nepal that experienced massive deprivations was a major triggering factor for the violence by the Maoist Movement. This again brings out the fact that greed as seen by the model's hypothesis as the most important factor when it comes to analyzing internal conflicts is not adequate as other equally-significant factors, including socio-economic inequalities may play a role in necessitating conflicts in different situations.

Adding up to the debate on the role of horizontal inequalities and civil wars, Ostby in his econometric assessment makes an important point that both economic and political inclusiveness with regards to the government machinery pave way for bringing down the rate

of civil wars (Ostby, 2004). Stewart et al., (2008: 290-91) have noted that in their country case-studies, they found that countries like Bolivia as well as Ghana, both experience significant socio-economic inequalities which are much horizontal, however, these countries have not experienced so much violent conflicts compared to other countries in similar situations. This they argue that violence and internal conflicts may be much higher in countries where there are massive horizontal inequalities in the form of socio-economic inequalities which could be directed to specific groups, and where there is much exclusion of a group or some groups with regards to government leadership and key positions (Stewart et al., 2008:289-91). For instance, in Ivory Coast, there were much horizontal inequalities, which were directed on particularly the northern part and therefore the massive exclusion of the people from the north in terms of governmental administration in 1995 acted as a major factor for the violence that occurred (Langer, 2004). This explains that in a society where there are much horizontal inequalities alongside massive exclusion of particular groups in the government or political affairs, the likelihood and risk of violence become very high. The next part looks at a brief analysis of how the model explains the motives for the Liberian civil war.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF HOW THE MODEL EXPLAINS THE LIBERIAN CIVIL WAR

Liberia, the oldest African country with regards to political independence experienced a terrible civil war in the 1990s. The first phase of the civil war started in 1989 and came to a halt in 1996. However, the civil war relapsed in 1999 and finally ended in 2003. A collective number of factors contributed to the start and continuation of the war which led to the lost of valuable life and properties. The factors included greed as well as grievance. However, there were equally-significant factors including bad governance, institutional weakness and socio-economic malaise. No single factor can therefore be used to explain the causes of the war, as the causes involved a wide range of factors, ranging from socio-economic to political factors (Kieh, 2009:9).

Greed and grievance may work hand in hand in necessitating conflicts. Only greed should not be seen as the most significant factor when it comes to analyzing civil wars, as grievances might together with other equally-significant factors act in a complementary sphere in different situations to precipitate internal conflicts. Also, grievance may serve as motivation for starting a conflict with greed motives coming in where there are some rich natural resources to finance the war, and also serve as a source of wealth for the fighters (Call, 2010).

Considering the Liberian civil war, it could be argued that several factors relating to grievances accounted for the gradual start of the conflict. Samuel Doe's repetition of exclusionary structures that existed during the previous Americo-Liberian regime contributed greatly to trigger the start of the war. Also, discrimination and political repression, particularly against the Manos and Gios contributed to the start of the attacks that led to the first phase of the civil war led by Taylor and his rebel group, the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) (Call, 2010:349-50; Kieh, 2009).

Furthermore, it could be argued that Doe's continuation of the patron-client system created the space for a wider ethnic division, which contributed largely to the factors leading to the start of the war (Call, 2010: 349). As noted by Adebajo (2002:46) the repressive measures and ethnic-discrimination created by Doe is a single most important factor that sparked tensions necessitating the emergence of the civil war. From this, it could be seen that grievance-based factors were very key in starting the tensions that gradually led to the outbreak of the civil war and not necessarily based on the greed-based factors. Greed motives began to set in and fuel the continuation of the war as the rebels saw the resource availability as a means to enhance themselves in the form of wealth (Call, 2010:349-50). It also helped the rebels in acquiring the needed resources necessary for keeping them, providing source of income and financing of their activities. It could be said that even though greed-based factors particularly, the looting of natural resources, such as diamond sustained the continuation of the conflict, grievance-based factors as noted above were key in starting the war.

Economically, the country was not very strong with much grievance on the part of the population, which together made it necessarily in starting the war. For instance, during Doe's regime the economy of Liberia faced much decline (Call, 2010:349-51). There were large percentages of youth unemployment, lower levels of education and overall poor standards of living for the ordinary citizen

(Call, 2010:349-51). All these added up to the grievances of the population and acted as reason to the youth to join the rebel group in facilitating the attacks in 1989 and in the early 1990s, which set the space for beginning the civil war.

Also, there were other factors such as the weakness of the state institutions and the breakdown of the social contract that put together contributed to the war (Call, 2010:349-50). According to Fearon and Laitin (2003:75-7) in a situation where there exist weak institutional structures in a state with high dependence on natural resources, it paves way for the outbreak of conflicts. The weak state structures therefore contributed immensely to the civil war. It could be seen that despite the fact that the warlords in Liberia gained massively in the natural resource export, with a report of an estimated export of about 300 million US dollar value of diamonds by the warlords in 1995, the greed-based explanations cannot sufficiently explain the motives for the start and continuation of the war (Call, 2010:350; Atkinson, 1997:9).

In addition, with regards to the recurrence of the civil war, Call (2010:365-366) argues that the recurrence of the war was not necessarily triggered by greed motives but by grievances, repression and exclusion that some sections particularly, Krahns and Mandingos of the population especially the opposition experienced during Charles Taylor's administration. It could be seen that Taylor was no different from Doe's regime (Call, 2010:365). Taylor continued the repressive and exclusionary behaviors towards the opposition, particularly against the Krahns and Mandingos. This further intensified the plight of the people which gradually led the opposition groups to reorganize into rebel groups forming the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD) to fight Taylor, leading to a relapse of the war from 1999-2003 (Call, 2010:365-366). For instance, as at 1997 to 1999, Taylor's government had politically contributed to the killing of about 357 people (Human Rights Watch, 1999). All these killings were politically motivated by Taylor's regime.

Also, the poor socio-economic and political situations after the first civil war and particularly during the regime of Taylor served as grievances that contributed to the recurrence of the conflict. For instance, during the year 2001, the rate of poverty in Liberia was 76.2%, with the rate of extreme poverty at 52% (Kieh, 2009: 24). Majority of Liberians were unable to meet basic needs, particularly food and shelter during this time. Greed-based factors tended to set in continuing the war, mainly as a means of financing the rebels and providing a means of income and wealth for the rebels. It could therefore be noted that, even though greed-based factors are significant in explaining motives for civil wars, the grievance-based factors might be key in explaining the start of the civil war, with greed setting in with the availability of natural resources to finance and fuel the continuation of the conflict.

CONCLUSION

The paper has explored the greed versus grievance model as motives for explaining civil wars. It has examined the extent to which greed versus grievance explain the causes of civil wars. The model is an economic approach to analyzing the causes of civil wars and uses proxy measures for each concept. For greed, the model uses variables including; the dependence on natural resources (primary commodity exports), which is measured by a ratio of the exports to the GDP, the years of education undertaken, as well as the number of young males within the population. From this, the model argues that within a country which depends significantly on primary commodity exports with large number of the population been young men, with limited opportunities for employment which might be due to lack of education and where there are much opportunities for gratification by looting, then greed becomes a substantial factor in examining the causes of conflict. For grievance, the proxy measures include; inequality, ethnic-grievances, utility of rebellion, political repression, low economic growth etc. From this, the model concludes that greed-based explanations are more significant in explaining civil wars than grievance-based ones.

Considering the extent to which greed or grievance explains the causes of civil wars, it could be seen that neither greed or grievance is sufficient in analyzing civil wars. Both may be equally important in analyzing civil wars depending on the specific context and situation of the conflict. However, there are other equally significant factors, including the presence of a weak governance and institutions, breakdown of social contract and horizontal inequalities that might help analyze conflicts depending on the specific country and situation. Therefore, it could be stated that neither greed or grievance is sufficient in analyzing the causes of conflict,

but other equally-important factors, including a breakdown of the social contract, a weakened governance institutions and horizontal inequalities are necessary in analyzing the causes of internal conflicts.

Furthermore, with the argument by the greed versus grievance model that greed-based explanations are more significant in explaining the causes of civil wars is questionable. This is because both greed and grievance may work hand in hand in necessitating the outbreak and continuation of internal conflicts. Greed might not necessarily necessitate the outbreak of civil wars, but grievance-based factors and other horizontal inequalities as outlined by Stewart and others, may be very significant in fueling outbreak of the conflict. Greed may set in as a way for financing the conflict and acting as source of wealth for the rebels where there are available natural resources that can be looted. Therefore, in examining the extent to which greed versus grievance model explains motives for civil wars, it could be argued that even though it might play a significant role in assessing the causes of civil wars, greed and grievance are not sufficient in analyzing the causes, as other equally-important factors, like horizontal inequalities, institutional weakness and breakdown as well as breakdown of social contract, might play a key role in triggering internal conflicts.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Future research could employ quantitative as well as qualitative methods and use of comparative case studies of different countries in analyzing how the greed and grievance model explains the causes of violent conflicts. It could also focus on the extent to which institutional weakness, weakened governance and security apparatus and a weakened social contract, alongside how greed and grievance may trigger the outbreak violent conflicts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Special thanks go to John Prosper Adotey of the University of Cape Coast for his support and encouragements. The paper received no specific funding from any organization in the public, private or not-for-profit sector.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adebajo, A. (2002). *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG and Regional Security in West Africa*. London, Boulder, CO, Lynne Rienner.
- [2]. Armin, L. (2004). "Horizontal Inequality and Violent Conflict": The case of Cote d'Ivoire". CRISE Working Paper, No 13. Oxford, Queen Elizabeth House, Oxford University.
- [3]. Atkinson, P. (1997). *The War Economy in Liberia: A Political Analysis*. London, Report of the Overseas Development Institute.
- [4]. Bellows, J. & Miguel, E. (2006). "War and Institutions: New Evidence from Sierra Leone". *American Review*, 96(2):394-399.
- [5]. Beswick, D. (2013). *Conflict in Developing Countries*. School of Government and Society, IDD, University of Birmingham.
- [6]. Beswick, D. and Jackson, P. (2015). *Conflict, Security and Development: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- [7]. Beswick, D. and Jackson, P. (2011). *Conflict, Security and Development: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- [8]. Berdal, M. (2005). Beyond Greed and Grievance, and not too soon: A Review Essay. *Review of International Studies*, 31(4): 687-689.
- [9]. Call, C. (2010). Liberia's War Recurrence, Grievance over Greed. *Civil Wars* 12(4):347-369.
- [10]. Cerra, V & Saxena, C. (2008). Growth Dynamics: The Myth of Economic Recovery. *American Economic Review*, 98(1):439-457.
- [11]. Collier, P. (2006). Economic Causes of Conflict and their Implications for Policy, In Crocker, C.A, Hampson, F.O, and Aall, P. (eds). *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington DC, United Institute of Peace Press, 197-218.
- [12]. Collier, P., Hoeffler, A. & Soderbom, M. (2006). *Post-Conflict Risks*. Oxford, Center for the Study of African Economics, Oxford University.

- [13]. Collier, P. (2000). "Doing Well out of War", In David Malone & Mats Berdal (eds). *Greed and Grievance, Economic Agendas in Civil War*. Boulder, CO, Lynne Rienner Pub, 91-111.
- [14]. Collier, P. & Hoeffler, A. (2001). *Greed and Grievance in Civil War*. World Bank Policy Research Paper 2355. Washington DC, World Bank.
- [15]. Collier, P. & Hoeffler, A. (2004). *Greed and Grievance in Civil War*. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4): 563-95.
- [16]. Collier, P., Hoeffler, A. & Rohner, D. (2009). *Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War*. *Oxford Economics Paper*, 61(1):1-27.
- [17]. Cramer, C. (2002). *Homo Economicus Goes to War: Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and the Political Economy of War*. *World Development*, 30(11):1845-1864.
- [18]. Duffield, M. (2001). *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. London, Zed Books.
- [19]. Faust, D.G. (1990). *Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South*. Louisiana State University Press.
- [20]. Fearon, J. D. & Laitin, D. D. (2003). "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War", *American Political Science Review*, 97: 75-90.
- [21]. Gerring, J. (2007). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- [22]. Hegre, H. Gudrun, O. & Clionadh, R. (2009). *Poverty and Civil War Events: A Disaggregated Study of Liberia*. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53:598-623.
- [23]. Human Rights Watch (1999). "Liberia, World Report. New York, Human Rights Watch.
- [24]. Humphreys, M. (2005). "Natural Resources, Conflict and Conflict Resolution: Uncovering the Mechanisms". *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(4): 508-537.
- [25]. Keen, D. (2000). *Incentives and Disincentives for Violence*, In Berdal, Mats and Malone, David (eds). *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*. Boulder, CO, Lynne Rienner.
- [26]. Keen, D. (2010). *Complex Emergencies*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- [27]. Keen, D. (2005). *Conflict and Collusion in Sierra Leone*. Oxford, James Currey.
- [28]. Keen, D. (2012). *Greed and Grievance in Civil War*. *International Affairs*, 88(4): 757-777.
- [29]. Kieh, G. K. Jr. (2009). *The Roots of the Second Liberian Civil War*. *International Journal on World Peace*, 26(1): 7-30.
- [30]. Kieh, G. K. Jr. (2004). *Irregular Warfare and Liberia's first Civil War*. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 11(1): 57-77.
- [31]. Le Billion, P. (2001). *Angola's Political Economy of War: The role of Oil and Diamonds*, *African Affairs*, 100:55-80.
- [32]. Lindberg, J. (2008). *Running on Faith? A Quantitative Analysis of the Effect of Religious Cleavages on the Intensity and Duration of Internal Conflicts*. The Peace Research Institute of Oslo.
- [33]. Murshed, S.M. & Gates, S. (2004). "Spatial Horizontal Inequality and the Maoist Insurgency in Nepal". *World Institute for Development Economic Research*, 1-15.
- [34]. Murshed, S. M & Tadjoeddin, M. Z. (2009). *Revisiting the Greed and Grievance Explanations for Violent Internal Conflict*. *Journal of International Development*, 21:87-111.
- [35]. Nafziger, E. W & Auvinen, J. (2000). *Economic Causes of Humanitarian Emergencies*, pp. 91-145, in E. W. Nafziger, F. Stewart & R. Vayrynen (eds), *War, Hunger and Displacement: The Origins of Humanitarian Emergencies*, 1. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [36]. Nathan, L. (2005). *The Flightful Inadequacy of Most of the Statistics: A Critique of Collier and Hoeffler on Causes of Civil War*. LSE Discussion Paper No.11. Crisis States Research Centre.
- [37]. Østby G. (2008). *Inequalities, the Political Environment and Civil Conflict: Evidence from 55 Developing Countries*, In Stewart F. (ed) *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict. Conflict, Inequality and Ethnicity*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- [38]. Pugel, J. (2007). "What the Fighters Say: A Survey of Ex-combatants in Liberia". Feb-March 2006. United Nations Development Program.

- [39]. Rodrik, D. (1999). 'Where Did All the Growth Go? External Shocks, Social Conflict, and Growth Collapses'. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 4(4):385-412.
- [40]. Sanin, F. G. (2003). *Criminal Rebels? A Discussion of War & Criminality from the Colombian Experience*. Crisis States Program Working Paper 27, London School of Economics.
- [41]. Shemyakina, O. (2006). "The Effect of Armed Conflict on Accumulation of Schooling: Results from Tajikistan". *Households in Conflicts Network Working Paper* 12.
- [42]. Stewart, F. (2002). Horizontal Inequalities as a source of Conflict, In Fen Osler Hampson and David Malone, (ed). *From reaction to conflict prevention: opportunities for the UN System*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, page 105-138.
- [43]. Stewart, F., Brown, G. and Langer, A. (2008). "Major Findings and Conclusions on the Relationship between Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict. In *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict Understanding Group Violence in Multi-Ethnic Societies*. London, Palgrave: 285-300.
- [44]. Theidon, K. (2009). "Reconstructing Masculinities: Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration of Former Combatants in Colombia". *Human Rights Quarterly*, 31:1-34.
- [45]. Vinci, A. (2006). "Greed-Grievance Reconsidered: The Role of Power and Survival in the Motivation of Armed Groups". *Civil Wars*, 8 (1):25-45.

