Kappa (working title)

Marius Swane Wishman[1]

[1]*Department of Sociology and Political Science, NTNU*

8th April 2022

Abstract

***Keywords*—**

1 Introduction

In North West Indonesia 1976, GAM (Gerkan Aceh Merdeka: Free Aceh Movement) declared independence for the province of Aceh, under the leadership of Hasan di Tiro, a descendent of the last Sultan of the Aceh region. Initially the movement consisted of the remnants of an old religious network, with its roots in the old Sultanate and armed struggle against the Dutch. The resulting conflict lasted until 2005 and resulted in an estimated 3402 combat related fatalities after 1989 (Aspinall 2009, Pettersson & Eck 2018, Sundberg & Melander 2013).

In Ethiopia 1975, the Dirge regime tried to arrest the Sultan of Aussa. However, anticipating the move, the Sultan's son had already sent men to neighboring Somalia to train in guerilla warfare (Shehim 1985). The Sultan evaded arrest and launched the Afar Liberation Front (ALF) organized around the men trained in Somalia. The heavy handed response of the Ethiopian military left over a thousand civilian casualties (https://ucdp.uu.se/conflict/363).

In 1960, in the newly formed Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville) (current Democratic Republic of the Congo) South Kasai declares unilaterally to have seceded from the nascent Republic under the leadership of traditional chief Albert Kalonji (Nzongola-Ntalaja 2002). He then preceded to have his father declared the new Mulopwe, thus resurrecting the royal title of the Luba kingdom (1585-1889). His father promptly abdicated handing the title to Kalonji (now styling himself Albert Ditunga, "homeland"). South Kasai fought for independence for just over two years, provoking a campaign by the Congolese armed forces that at the time was characterized by UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld as an act of genocide (Nzongola-Ntalaja 2002).

There is no shortage of examples where previously independent states are involved in outbreaks of organized violence. Yet, both in the media and in the academic literature these examples are referred to as ethnic conflicts, and surprisingly little attention has been given to their connection to past statehood. On the other hand, there are also examples of old state institutions working for peace, mediation and reconciliation. For example [that guy in Burkina Faso]. [Another example of peace inducing]. The nascent academic literature on organized violence and the legacies of past statehood reflects these diverging sets of examples. While

some, in line with the examples given above, find a conflict inducing effect of past states (Englebert et al. 2002, Paine 2019), others argue that past experience of statehood provides experience and institutions that are peace inducing (Wig 2016, Wig & Kromrey 2018, Depetris-Chauvin 2016). Yet, all but one of these articles conceptualize states in terms of currently (politically relevant) ethnic groups and to what degree these groups have connections to past states. This risk excluding states that are not readily tied to a current politically relevant ethnic group. It further risks discrediting experiences of statehood of groups who have lived as part of states for hundreds of years, without being the dominant ethnic group. Additionally, this literature has been almost exclusively limited to Africa. The diverging conclusions in the literature could in part be a result of the paucity of quantitative data on past statehood. The literature has been limited to using either the Murdoch map, which codes "jurisdictional hierarchy" of ethnic groups, or the State Antiquities Index, which measures country level experience of statehood (including from foreign rule). In summary, there is a need for more and better data, in order to answer the puzzle of whether there is a positive or negative association between state histories and organized violence. Potentially, both statements are true, but vary according to circumstances. In which case, what determines when and where past statehood is conflict inducing or peace inducing?

How is organized violence shaped by the underlying topography of historical statehood? This thesis seeks to answering this overarching research question, adding to our general understanding of organized violence. While increasing the general understanding of key concepts is a goal in itself for any academic discipline, this understanding will hopefully contribute to the vital goals of conflict prevention and de-escalation, however small and indirect this contribution may be.

The thesis addresses this research question across four individual articles and contribute to the literature through substantial data collection[?], and novel theory building, which breaks new ground on a so far "under-researched" part of the larger peace- and conflict research. The thesis has contributed to two data projects. The Anatomy of Resistance Campaigns (ARC) and the Geo-International Systems Data (Geo-ISD). The ARC project collected yearly data on 1,426 organizations engaging in maximalist dissent (non-violent and violent) in Africa from 1990 to

2015. The Geo-ISD geocodes the borders of independent states in Africa from 1800 to 1900, which are used to generate a measure of their respective historical presence per 0.5 X 0.5 degrees grid cell.

When historical state legacies are located far from the capital, they provide *symbols of sovereignty* that can be use to mobilize for violence, and *local elite networks* are often left behind and can mobilize their networks if their interests are threatened by the government. While on the other hand, when located near the capital, historical state legacies provide a *foundation* on which modern states could be built. Both in terms of institutions and legitimacy.

The number of historical state legacies within a country matters because the more of these there are, the more likely that one or more of them will be located in a remote part of the country (and thus be conflict inducing). Furthermore, increasing the number of potential claims making actors incentivises the government to punish (engage in conflict) groups it would otherwise accommodate in order to prevent other groups to make similar demands.

Whereas local elite networks might have incentives to violently oppose the government, they also have incentives to minimize the amount of violence between local groups and communities. Just as the state does on a country level, and just as historical states did in their time. Therefore, historical state legacies provide local institutions and traditions of conflict resolution, as well as build up trust between communities, which prevent outbreaks and escalation of communal violence. Where little or no historical state legacies exist, and the modern state is weak or absent, groups are limited to less effective mechanisms (such as intra group policing) to keep the peace. In other words, when it comes to *communal violence* there is an inverse relationship between historical state legacies and organized violence.

In summary, the thesis finds that the historical legacies of statehood's relation to organized violence varies according to:

1) Where in the modern state the historical state legacies are located. More historical state legacies being conflict inducing far from modern capitals, and conflict reducing when close.

2) How many distinct historical state legacies there are within a country's boundaries. More distinct historical state legacies leading to more conflict.

3) Type of organized violence. While there is more state-based violence in areas with historical more historical state legacies, there is less communal violence.

2 Concepts

The following section will discuss some of the key concepts of the thesis, and in so doing elaborate on the broader academic literature and tradition on which it builds and of which it is a part.

2.1 Statehood and historical legacies

2.1.1 Degrees of statehood/"stateness"

[Three conceptualisations of the state from Clapham - admin, idea and system.]

At the core of the thesis lies the concept of "the state". However, the term is ambiguous. Three of the four individual articles in the thesis use a specific operationalisation, derived from Butcher & Griffiths (2019) and Butcher & Griffiths (2017), but the concept merits further discussion than what the article format allows. The subject of the thesis requires a definition that is broad enough to include African and Asian states in the nineteenth century and modern European states. It needs to be flexible to the changes in how we think of the state across time (even in Europe, states were very different from today), as well as across space. While at the same time it needs to draw the line at some point to say what is not a state. To this end the thesis employs Clapham (1996)'s three aspect of the state, which allows assessing degrees of statehood along three axes.

The first aspect of the state is the *administrative*. The ideal of which is an organization (government) which exercises sovereign jurisdiction (the final legal arbiter) over a given population and territory. To exercise this sovereignty the government controls a coercive apparatus (military and police forces), which is

usually financed by taxing the population. In return, modern states are usually expected to ensure the welfare of its citizens/population (externalities, health, security, education etc.). A state in this sense may be more or less able to control its population, and more or less able/willing to provide welfare.

The second aspect of the state is the "idea of the state", as constructed in the minds of at least those who run it, but usually also a portion of the population living within a state. This construction provides legitimacy for its institutions and its use of coercive force (governmental legitimacy), and for who, or where it should rule (territorial legitimacy). Today most states draw their governmental legitimacy, their right to rule, from claiming (more or less truthfully) to rule on behalf its citizens through democratic principles.[1] Historically, various forms of religious justification has been the norm (divine right of kings in Europe, the mandate of Heaven in China, or rulers claiming to be gods or dependents of gods themselves [what's the legitimation for caliphs and amirs?]). Claims to territorial legitimacy (or lack thereof) usually rests on a mix of historical precedence and the principle of national self determination. Past claims include, rights to inheritance, religiously based rights to world conquest, or the infamous "white mans burden". The "idea of the state" and legitimacy is key to ensuring compliance with minimal use (or threat) of coercion. [Reference Buzan and others in this section]

The third aspect of the state is the system of international recognition. States recognising each other, and respecting (or even protecting) each others sovereign territories. In the current globalized world, international recognition has become essential to participate in international transactions. States that are lacking in the first and second aspects of statehood can lean more on the international system, through aid (both from other states but also non-state actors) and ideology. Prior to the 20th century, multiple international state systems existed. Even as late as the 19th century what mattered to most Muslim rulers was recognition by the Caliph in Istanbul, not what the kings or queens of Europe considered had to say on the matter. Similarly in East Asia China (the Middle Kingdom) was at the center of its tributary-based international system, while South East Asia was organized in the Mandala state system [Northedge and others?].

[1] Even the most blatant autocracies make this claim. [cite Fukuyama?]

States can conform to each of these three aspects to a greater or lesser extent. In other words, states have an overall degree of statehood, but also a qualitative variation in terms of the individual aspects. [Poor performance] in one aspect can be compensated, but only in part by strong performance in other. Taiwan for example, has a robust and well functioning state apparatus, and is de facto in undisputed control of its territory, enjoys a high degree of legitimacy and [compliance] from its citizens, but struggles with a lack of full international recognition. Israel has a [strong] administrative statehood, and enjoys recognition from the most relevant actors (the exception being several Muslim majority countries), but is viewed as largely illegitimate among many of its Palestinian population [fair assumption?] (roughly 20% of its population). Somalia (and other so-called "failed states") [score] poorly across all three aspects of statehood. The Somali government barely functions in and around the capital, let alone the rest of its [purported] territory. Its government is viewed as corrupt and illegitimate. Its borders do not reflect the settlement of the Somali ethnic group, lacks any historic president, and are the product of exogenous factors (external diplomatic negotiations). What little claim to statehood Somalia has rests almost exclusively on the international system. [Link to artificiality here?]

[Relevance of state creation/formation/building. Contrasting the "natural" process with the artificial]

Scott (2017) Against the grain - state formation - a look at how states first emerged

Scott (2009) Art of not being governed - limitations of states historically

Clapham (1996) Africa and the international system - persisting and novel forms of limited/artificial statehood

Empirical implications of artificial states

Alesina et al. (2011) Artificial borders

Englebert et al. (2002) Dismemberment and suffocation

Ito (2020) Ethnic partitioning and conflict

Cederman et al. (2013), Salehyan (2009), Weidmann (2015) Transborder ethnic kin and conflict

2.1.2 Legacies

Legacies of states, institutions and conflict

Putterman (2008) Neolithic revolution

Bockstette et al. (2002) States and markets, the advantage of an early start

Nunn (2020) Historical development

Michalopoulos & Papaioannou (2018)

Michalopoulos & Papaioannou (2016)

Michalopoulos & Papaioannou (2013)

Borcan et al. (2018)

Englebert (2000)

Besley & Reynal-Querol (2014) Historical conflict -¿ more conflict

Fearon & Laitin (2014) Does conflict have deep historical roots?

Dincecco et al. (2019) Historical conflict -¿ economic development

Wilfahrt (2018) Institutions and politics

Wilfahrt (2021)

Hariri (2012) Autocratic legacy

2.1.3 Historical state entities and Pre-colonial states

Using different terms for the same *concept* (needs to be defined and discussed) applied in different *contexts*.

2.2 Collective dissent and organized violence

2.2.1 Maximalist dissent

Chenoweth and Stephan and ARC definitions. A few of the greats of the non-violent dissent literature.

2.2.2 Civil Conflict/violence OR Intrastate conflict/violence

Motivations - Gurr, why men rebel - Wood, insurgent collective violence

Definitions

Types:

State based

Non-state

Communal violence

3 Theoretical/conceptual framework

Looking for the connection(s) between the two overarching concepts. What links has been found? What has not been done? What is this thesis adding to this literature?

Institutionalist/longe durée? Acemoglu and Robinson - persisting institutions and stickiness.

Main "thrust" is that "it depends". Expand on the answer to the puzzle in the introduction. It depends on the relationship between the modern state and old state(s), and on the type of violence.

Some more prior literature: Griffiths (2016) Ahram (2019)

4 Analytical approach

Data narrative (inductive/deductive). Empirical tradition.

Discussion of maps to uncover the state?

Discussion of "state presence"?

5 Article summaries

6 Concluding remarks

References

Ahram, A. I. (2019), *Break All the Borders: Separatism and the Reshaping of the Middle East*, Oxford University Press.

Alesina, A., Easterly, W. & Matuszeski, J. (2011), 'Artificial states', *Journal of the European Economic Association* **9**(2), 246–277.

Aspinall, E. (2009), *Islam and Nation: Separatist Rebellion in Aceh, Indonesia*, Studies in Asian Security, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.

Besley, T. & Reynal-Querol, M. (2014), 'The Legacy of Historical Conflict: Evidence from Africa', *American Political Science Review* **108**(2), 319–336.

Bockstette, V., Chanda, A. & Putterman, L. (2002), 'States and markets: The advantage of an early start', *Journal of Economic growth* **7**(4), 347–369.

Borcan, O., Olsson, O. & Putterman, L. (2018), 'State history and economic development: Evidence from six millennia', *Journal of Economic Growth* **23**(1), 1–40.

Butcher, C. & Griffiths, R. (2019), 'The International Systems Dataset: Version 2.0', *Data Codebook* .

Butcher, C. R. & Griffiths, R. D. (2017), 'Between Eurocentrism and Babel: A Framework for the Analysis of States, State Systems, and International Orders', *International Studies Quarterly* **61**(2), 328–336.

Cederman, L.-E., Gleditsch, K. S., Salehyan, I. & Wucherpfennig, J. (2013), 'Transborder ethnic kin and civil war', *International Organization* **67**(2), 389–410.

Clapham, C. (1996), *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival*, Vol. 50, Cambridge University Press.

Depetris-Chauvin, E. (2016), State History and Contemporary Conflict: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa, Documentos de Trabajo 475, Instituto de Economia. Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

Dincecco, M., Fenske, J. & Onorato, M. G. (2019), 'Is Africa Different? Historical Conflict and State Development', *Economic History of Developing Regions* **34**(2), 209–250.

Englebert, P. (2000), 'Pre-colonial institutions, post-colonial states, and economic development in tropical Africa', *Political Research Quarterly* **53**(1), 7–36.

Englebert, P., Tarango, S. & Carter, M. (2002), 'Dismemberment and suffocation: A contribution to the debate on African boundaries', *Comparative Political Studies* **35**(10), 1093–1118.

Fearon, J. D. & Laitin, D. (2014), 'Does Contemporary Armed Conflict Have'Deep Historical Roots'?'.

Griffiths, R. D. (2016), *Age of Secession*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Hariri, J. G. (2012), 'The Autocratic Legacy of Early Statehood', *American Political Science Review* **106**(3), 471–494.

Ito, G. (2020), 'Why does ethnic partition foster violence? unpacking the deep historical roots of civil conflicts', *Journal of Peace Research* p. 002234332095737.
URL: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022343320957377

Michalopoulos, S. & Papaioannou, E. (2013), 'Pre-colonial ethnic institutions and contemporary african development', *Econometrica* **81**(1), 113–152.
URL: https://doi.org/10.3982%2Fecta9613

Michalopoulos, S. & Papaioannou, E. (2016), 'The Long-Run Effects of the Scramble for Africa', *American Economic Review* **106**(7), 1802–1848.

Michalopoulos, S. & Papaioannou, E. (2018), Historical Legacies and African Development, Working Paper 25278, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Nunn, N. (2020), 'The historical roots of economic development', *Science* **367**(6485).
URL: https://doi.org/10.1126%2Fscience.aaz9986

Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2002), *The Congo from Leopold to Kabila : a people's history*, Zed Books, London.

Paine, J. (2019), 'Ethnic Violence in Africa: Destructive Legacies of Pre-Colonial States', *International Organization* **73**(3), 645–683.

Pettersson, T. & Eck, K. (2018), 'Organized violence, 1989–2017', *Journal of Peace Research* **55**(4), 535–547.

Putterman, L. (2008), 'Agriculture, diffusion and development: Ripple effects of the neolithic revolution', *Economica* **75**(300), 729–748.

Salehyan, I. (2009), *Rebels without Borders: Transnational Insurgencies in World Politics*, Cornell University Press.

Scott, J. C. (2009), *The Art of Not Being Governed : An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*, Yale Agrarian Studies Series, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Scott, J. C. (2017), *Against the grain*, Yale University Press, London.

Shehim, K. (1985), 'Ethiopia, Revolution, and the Question of Nationalities: The Case of the Afar', *The Journal of Modern African Studies* **23**(2), 331–348.

Sundberg, R. & Melander, E. (2013), 'Introducing the UCDP georeferenced event dataset', **50**(4), 523–532.
URL: https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022343313484347

Weidmann, N. B. (2015), 'Communication networks and the transnational spread of ethnic conflict', *Journal of Peace Research* **52**(3), 285–296.

Wig, T. (2016), 'Peace from the past: Pre-colonial political institutions and civil wars in Africa', *Journal of Peace Research* **53**(4), 509–524.

Wig, T. & Kromrey, D. (2018), 'Which groups fight? Customary institutions and communal conflicts in Africa', *Journal of Peace Research* **55**(4), 415–429.

Wilfahrt, M. (2018), 'Precolonial Legacies and Institutional Congruence in Public Goods Delivery: Evidence from Decentralized West Africa', *World Politics* **70**(2), 239–274.

Wilfahrt, M. (2021), *Precolonial Legacies in Postcolonial Politics*, Cambridge University Press.
URL: https://doi.org/10.1017%2F9781108996983