A unified theory of political violence with foundations in economic theory and political theory

Soumadeep Ghosh

Kolkata, India

Abstract

In this paper, I present a unified theory of political violence with foundations in economic theory and political theory. I construct a mathematical framework that integrates rational choice theory, collective action dynamics, and institutional analysis to explain the emergence, escalation, and resolution of political violence. The theory provides both necessary and sufficient conditions for violent political behavior and offers testable hypotheses for empirical validation.

1 Theoretical Foundations

1.1 Economic First Principles

Political violence emerges from fundamental economic scarcities and distribution conflicts. We begin with three core economic axioms:

- **Axiom 1 (Scarcity):** Resources R are finite such that $\sum_i r_i \leq R$, where r_i represents resources allocated to individual i.
- **Axiom 2 (Utility Maximization):** Each actor i seeks to maximize utility $U_i(r_i, s_i, p_i)$ where r_i is resources, s_i is security, and p_i is political power.
- **Axiom 3 (Opportunity Cost):** Every action carries opportunity cost $C(a)$ representing the value of the best alternative foregone.

1.2 Political First Principles

Political violence operates within power structures and institutional frameworks. We continue with three core political axioms:

- **Axiom 4 (Power Distribution):** Political power P is distributed among actors such that $\sum_i P_i = \bar{P}$, with asymmetric distribution creating potential for conflict.
- **Axiom 5 (Legitimacy):** Political authority requires legitimacy $L \in [0, 1]$, where violence probability increases as L approaches 0.
- **Axiom 6 (Institutional Constraints):** Formal institutions I and informal norms N constrain behavioral choices through enforcement mechanisms.

2 Core Mathematical Framework

2.1 The Violence Decision Function

An actor i chooses violence when expected utility from violence exceeds peaceful alternatives:

$$E[U_i^v] > E[U_i^p]$$

where

1. $E[U_i^v]$ = Expected utility from violence
2. $E[U_i^p]$ = Expected utility from peaceful action

2.2 Expected Utility from Violence

$$E[U_i^v] = p(\text{success}) \times U(\text{victory}) + p(\text{failure}) \times U(\text{defeat}) - C(\text{violence})$$

where

1. $p(\text{success}) = f(P_i, \text{resources}, \text{allies}, \text{state capacity})$
2. $U(\text{victory})$ = Utility from achieving political goals
3. $U(\text{defeat})$ = Utility from failure (typically negative)
4. $C(\text{violence})$ = Direct and opportunity costs of violent action

2.3 Probability of Success Function

$$p(\text{success}) = \frac{P_i^\alpha \times R_i^\beta \times A_i^\gamma}{P_i^\alpha \times R_i^\beta \times A_i^\gamma + P_s^\alpha \times R_s^\beta \times A_s^\gamma}$$

where

1. P_i, P_s = Political power of actor i and state s
2. R_i, R_s = Resources available to actor i and state s
3. A_i, A_s = Allied support for actor i and state s
4. α, β, γ = Technology parameters determining relative importance

2.4 Collective Action Problem

Individual participation in collective violence follows:

$$\textbf{Participate if: } p(\text{pivotal}) \times [U(\text{success}) - U(\text{status quo})] > C(\text{participation})$$

where $p(\text{pivotal})$ represents probability that individual participation affects outcome.

3 Necessary Conditions for Political Violence

3.1 Individual Level Conditions

- **Condition 1 (Grievance):** $\exists$ significant utility gap $\Delta U = U(\text{desired}) - U(\text{current}) > \text{threshold } \tau$
- **Condition 2 (Efficacy):** $p(\text{success through violence}) > p(\text{success through peaceful means})$
- **Condition 3 (Low Opportunity Cost):** $C(\text{violence}) <$ expected benefits from violence

3.2 Group Level Conditions

- **Condition 4 (Collective Identity):** Shared identity I_{group} reduces free-rider problems through selective incentives
- **Condition 5 (Organization):** Organizational capacity O enables coordination and resource mobilization
- **Condition 6 (Resource Mobilization):** Access to resources $R_{\text{available}} >$ minimum threshold $R_{\min}$ for sustaining violence

3.3 System Level Conditions

- **Condition 7 (State Weakness):** State capacity $S <$ minimum deterrent threshold $S_{\min}$
- **Condition 8 (Institutional Failure):** Institutional effectiveness $I_{\text{eff}} <$ threshold for peaceful conflict resolution
- **Condition 9 (Legitimacy Crisis):** Political legitimacy $L <$ critical threshold L_{crit}

4 Sufficient Conditions for Political Violence

Political violence occurs when ALL necessary conditions are met AND:

Triggering Event: An exogenous shock ε shifts cost-benefit calculations such that:

$$\sum_i [E[U_i^v] - E[U_i^p]] > 0 \text{ for a critical mass of actors}$$

This creates a cascade effect where:

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \alpha(V)[N(\text{Grievance} \times \text{Efficacy} \times \text{Organization}) - \beta S(\text{State Response})]$$

where V = level of violence, $\alpha(V)$ = contagion function, β = state effectiveness parameter.

5 Mathematical Models

5.1 Static Equilibrium Model

In equilibrium, violence level V^* satisfies:

$$\frac{\partial[\sum_i E[U_i(V)]]}{\partial V} = 0$$

This yields multiple equilibria:

1. **Peace Equilibrium:** $V^* = 0$ when institutional constraints bind
2. **Violence Equilibrium:** $V^* > 0$ when grievances exceed institutional capacity
3. **Mixed Equilibrium:** Sporadic violence when conditions are marginal

5.2 Dynamic Model

Violence evolution follows:

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = f(\text{Grievances}, \text{State\_Capacity}, \text{Legitimacy}, \text{Economic\_Conditions})$$

Specifically:

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \gamma_1 G(t) - \gamma_2 S(t) - \gamma_3 L(t) + \gamma_4 E(t) + \varepsilon(t)$$

where G = grievances, S = state capacity, L = legitimacy, E = economic stress, ε = random shocks.

5.3 Contagion Model

Violence spreads according to:

$$p(\text{violence}_i) = 1 - \exp\left(-\lambda \sum_j w_{ij} V_j\right)$$

where λ = contagion parameter, w_{ij} = connection strength between actors i and j.

6 Empirical Implications and Testable Hypotheses

6.1 Primary Hypotheses

- **H1:** Political violence probability increases with economic inequality (Gini coefficient).
- **H2:** State capacity (measured by tax collection efficiency, military strength) correlates negatively with violence.
- **H3:** Democratic institutions reduce violence probability through peaceful conflict resolution mechanisms.

- **H4:** Economic shocks (GDP decline, inflation) increase violence probability with a lag of 1-2 years.
- **H5:** Social fractionalization increases violence probability when combined with economic stress.

6.2 Interaction Effects

- **H6:** Effect of grievances on violence is moderated by state capacity:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Violence}}{\partial \text{Grievances}} = \beta_1 + \beta_2(\text{State\_Capacity})$$

- **H7:** Democratic institutions matter most in middle-income countries: $\frac{\partial \text{Violence}}{\partial \text{Democracy}}$ varies with economic development level

7 Policy Implications

7.1 Prevention Strategies

Based on the model, violence prevention requires:

1. **Addressing Root Grievances:** Reduce inequality, ensure inclusive growth
2. **Strengthening Institutions:** Build effective, legitimate governance structures
3. **Maintaining State Capacity:** Ensure adequate security forces and rule of law
4. **Economic Stability:** Prevent economic shocks through sound macroeconomic policy

7.2 Intervention Strategies

During ongoing violence:

1. **Increase Costs:** Raise $C(\text{violence})$ through enforcement
2. **Reduce Benefits:** Minimize $p(\text{success})$ through superior state capacity
3. **Provide Alternatives:** Create peaceful channels for grievance redress
4. **Address Grievances:** Remove underlying motivations

8 Limitations and Extensions

8.1 Model Limitations

1. Assumes rational actors (behavioral factors under-weighted)
2. Limited treatment of ideology and cultural factors
3. Static institutional framework
4. Incomplete modeling of international dimensions

8.2 Future Extensions

1. Incorporate behavioral economics insights (prospect theory, loss aversion)
2. Dynamic institutional change
3. Network effects and social media
4. International spillovers and diffusion
5. Climate change and environmental scarcity effects

9 Conclusion

This unified theory provides a mathematically rigorous framework for understanding political violence rooted in economic and political first principles. The model identifies necessary and sufficient conditions, generates testable hypotheses, and offers policy guidance. While limitations exist, the framework provides a foundation for future theoretical treatises and empirical testing.

The key insight is that political violence emerges from the interaction of grievances, opportunities, and institutional failures, moderated by state capacity and legitimacy. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for both explaining patterns of political violence and designing effective interventions.

References

[1] Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. A. (2006). Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.

[2] Collier, P. and Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and grievance in civil war.

[3] Fearon, J. D. and Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. American Political Science Review.

[4] Gurr, T. R. (1970). Why Men Rebel.

[5] Hegre, H. and Sambanis, N. (2006). Sensitivity analysis of empirical results on civil war onset. Journal of Conflict Resolution.

[6] Lichbach, M. I. (1995). The Rebel's Dilemma.

[7] Olson, M. (1965). The Logic of Collective Action.

[8] Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons.

[9] Skocpol, T. (1979). States and Social Revolutions.

[10] Tilly, C. (1978). From Mobilization to Revolution.

[11] Tullock, G. (1971). The paradox of revolution. Public Choice.

[12] Walter, B. F. (2017). The extremist's advantage in civil wars. International Security.

[13] Weinstein, J. M. (2007). Inside Rebellion.