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ABSTRACT

PATH DEPENDENCE IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS: RESOURCES, REGIMES, AND INTERVENTIONS

Ivan Medynskyi
Old Dominion University, 2015
Director: Dr. David C. Earnest

This dissertation investigates the patterns of path dependence in intrastate conflicts. It is motivated by three research questions: What factors determine a particular outcome of a civil war? How strong is their impact? What are the causal mechanisms in play? To examine these questions, this study introduces a theory of path dependence to the study of intrastate conflicts that bridges the gap between analyses of the phases of contention.

First, it examines the broad understanding of path dependence that highlights the impact of initial conditions on civil war outcomes. Then, this dissertation explores the narrower notion which focuses on the role of timing and sequence of internal factors and intervening events in shaping different resolutions to intrastate conflicts. Using multinomial logistic regression and event history models to analyze initial conditions, intrinsic features, and intervening factors in influencing the probability of particular civil war outcomes, this study identifies relevant agencies that can be utilized to shape solutions for current and future instances of armed civil conflicts. Finally, three case studies test the applicability of the path dependence theory through outlining the narratives, incorporating quantitative findings, and identifying causal mechanisms.

The empirical findings of the initial conditions models emphasize the relevance of conflict spillover, non-lootable resources, and structure of bipolarity. An investigation
into the factors that ‘lock in’ a particular civil war outcome highlights the role of UN and regional intergovernmental organizations in accelerating a compromise outcome; explains the variation in dynamics behind democratic and autocratic regimes; but surprisingly finds no support for the relationship between the size of the armed forces and conflict outcome. Although case study analysis supports the validity of the empirical results, it also points at the potential limitations of the quantitative design. Since this study follows a mixed methods approach, it effectively compensates for the drawbacks of different types of analysis.
Для моєї Родини

For my Family
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A road of thousand miles begins with a single step. I am deeply grateful to my dissertation committee chair, Dr. David Earnest, who not only encouraged me to make the first step toward this project, but also patiently guided through the tumultuous process of drafting the ideas, testing the assumptions, and defending the findings.

In the light of path dependence theory that I elaborate in this study, the advice of Dr. Kurt Gaubatz regarding the topic and methods was a critical initial condition that shaped the course of the dissertation towards more robust results. Dr. Jesse Richman’s guidance through a quantitative dimension and Dr. Austin Jersild’s suggestions regarding the qualitative approach served as tipping points that shifted the path of my work toward a comprehensive understanding of an intrastate conflict. Aside from their counsel with the dissertation, I want to express my gratitude to all committee members as well as Dr. Simon Serfaty, Dr. Steve Yetiv, and Dr. Peter Schulman, who shared their knowledge regarding the complex nature of international relations.

I would like to recognize Dr. Regina Karp for her outstanding role in ensuring the success of every student in the Graduate Program in International Studies. I would also like to acknowledge the Fulbright Program, Old Dominion University, Open Society Foundations, and Institute for Humane Studies for making my graduate experience diverse and rewarding. Finally, I am thankful to my family who always believe in me and friends who make my life complete.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST OF TABLES</th>
<th>ix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1
   - FROM A PEACEFUL REVOLUTION TO AN ARMED CONFLICT: WAR IN UKRAINE ...................... 5
   - TIPPING THE SCALES OF CONFLICT .................................................................................. 8
   - ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION ............................................................................. 10
   - CONCLUSION .................................................................................................................. 13

2. INTRASTATE CONFLICTS AND PATH DEPENDENCE ............................................................ 14
   - INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................. 14
   - DEBATES IN THE STUDY OF INTRASTATE CONFLICTS ................................................... 15
   - SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO CIVIL WARS .................................................................. 46
   - APPLICATION OF THE PATH DEPENDENCE THEORY TO THE STUDY OF INTRASTATE CONFLICTS ........................................................................................................... 52
   - TIPPING POINTS IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS .................................................................. 65
   - CONCLUSION .................................................................................................................. 73

3. METHODOLOGY AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES ............................................ 75
   - IDENTIFYING INTRASTATE CONFLICTS ......................................................................... 75
   - METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................................. 78
   - OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES .......................................................................... 89
   - DEPENDENT VARIABLE .................................................................................................. 90
   - INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ........................................................................................... 90
   - CONTROL VARIABLE ...................................................................................................... 101
   - MISSING VARIABLES ..................................................................................................... 101
   - CONCLUSION .................................................................................................................. 102

4. QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE ONSET CONDITIONS AND OUTCOMES IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS .............................................................. 103
   - INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................. 103
5. QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE TIPPING POINTS IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS .......................................................... 117
   INTRODUCTION ...................................................................... 117
   NARROW DEFINITION OF PATH DEPENDENCE ..................... 118
   MULTINOMIAL LOGISTIC REGRESSION ANALYSIS .................. 120
   PARAMETRIC SURVIVAL MODEL (WEIBULL) .......................... 122
   COX COMPETING RISKS PROPORTIONAL HAZARDS MODEL ...... 126
   COMPETING RISKS ANALYSIS USING FINE AND GRAY MODEL ... 136
   CURRENT FINDINGS AND THE EXISTING LITERATURE ON THE OUTFONES OF INTRASTATE CONFLICTS ............................. 148
   CONCLUSION ...................................................................... 155

6. CASE STUDIES .................................................................. 157
   INTRODUCTION ..................................................................... 157
   THE FIRST CHECHEN WAR OF 1994-1996 .............................. 159
   AFRICA’S WORLD CHECHEN WAR (THE SECOND CONGO WAR) OF 1998-2002..... 170
   THE SECOND SRI LANKA TAMIL CIVIL WAR OF 2006-2009 ........... 189
   CONCLUSION ...................................................................... 197

7. CONCLUSIONS .................................................................. 199
   INTRODUCTION ..................................................................... 199
   EMPIRICAL FINDINGS ............................................................. 200
   THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS ........... 212
   POLICY IMPLICATIONS .......................................................... 214
   RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH ..................... 217
   LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY ............................................... 218
   CONCLUSION ...................................................................... 219

BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................. 221

APPENDIX ......................................................................... 230

VITA .................................................................................. 233
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive Research Design Framework</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exogenous Tipping Points and Civil War Outcomes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Endogenous Tipping Points and Civil War Outcomes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research Design A</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Design B Exogenous Tipping Points</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Design B Endogenous Tipping Points</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Descriptive Statistics of the Onset Factors and Outcomes of Civil Wars Models</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coefficients of the Onset Factors and Outcomes of Civil Wars Models</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marginal Effects of the Onset Factors and Outcomes of Civil Wars Models</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Marginal Effects of the Narrow Concept of Path Dependence Models</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coefficients of the Parametric Survival Model (Weibull)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hazard Ratios of the Parametric Survival Model (Weibull)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Coefficients of the Cox Survival Model</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hazard Ratios of the Cox Survival Model</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Coefficients of the Fine and Gray Competing Risks Model</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sub-Hazard Ratios of the Fine and Gray Competing Risks Model</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Event History (Survival) Analysis of Intrastate Conflict Outcomes</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis of Intrastate Conflict Outcomes</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Overview of the First Chechen War</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Overview of Africa’s World War</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Overview of the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The Results of Event History (Survival) Models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The Role of Autocracy in a Government Success Model</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Role of Democracy in a Rebels’ Success Model</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UN Intervention in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intervention by Regional IGOs in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intervention by Regional IGOs in a Rebels’ Success Model</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State Intervention for Government in a Rebels’ Success Model</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Role of Ethnic Fractionalization in a Government’s Success Model</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Role of an Oil Exporting Economy in a Government’s Success Model</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Role of an Oil Exporting Economy in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Role of Religious Fractionalization in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cumulative Incidence (CI) Functions for Civil War Outcomes</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CI Function for Autocracy Factor in a Government’s Success Model</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CI Function for Democracy Factor in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CI Function for UN Intervention Factor in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. CI Function for IGOs Intervention Factor in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. CI Function for Government-biased Interventions in a Rebels’ Success Model</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. CI Function for Rebel-biased Interventions in a Rebels’ Success Model</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CI Function for Rebel-biased Interventions in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. CI Function for an Oil Exporting Economies in a Compromise Model</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. CI Function for Religious Fractionalization Factor in a Compromise Model ........147
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“Everything that has a beginning has an end.”

The Oracle, *The Matrix Revolutions*

War appears to be endemic to human history, yet it is a finite process. Every armed conflict that was started out of greed, grievance, misperception or overconfidence eventually loses its momentum and culminates in a cessation of violence. While we always strive to understand the underlying causes of war to potentially prevent it, once the armed conflict has started we leave it to its own devices as if it is impossible to understand the underlying causes of its termination. Closer examination of the millennia-long scholarship on war indicates the disproportionate emphasis on how conflicts start, rather on why they end or the way they end. Contemporary inquiries into the nature of conflict focus on the causal contributions of motives and opportunities on the onset of hostilities, while overlooking the causality behind their termination. This study introduces the idea of path dependence to the study of civil wars by synthesizing the existing approaches to study of intrastate conflicts with discourses on process evolution in order to demonstrate how the initial conditions of war and tipping points shape the outcomes of conflict.

The increasing interest in the phenomenon of civil wars is not surprising given the tectonic trends in the global conflict dynamics. The technological, political, and economic progress of our civilization is closely related to the sophistication of the ways we kill each other. The nature of war, however, has changed in the past seventy years as
the number of wars between states has diminished, while conflicts within national borders have become more frequent (Figure 1). The advance of weapons of mass destruction and global confrontation between the victors of the Second World War shifted the dynamics of conflict to the intrastate level. The academic and policy worlds soon followed with the development of a new scholarly field that focused on the causes and consequences of civil wars.

Figure 1. Trends in Various Types of Armed Conflicts, 1945-2007.¹

The primary contribution of the intrastate conflict research agenda was an inquiry into the factors that influence the probability of war onset. Recent scholarship moved beyond the causes of civil wars and investigated the dynamics of conflict, chances of its recurrence, and the impact of third party interventions. The main drawback of the current

¹ The graph is constructed by author using the data from the Correlates of War project.
state of affairs in the field of civil wars lies in the reductive approach that treats the conflict as the sum of different stages rather than a continuous process. Application of path dependence theory, however, allows for analysis of an intrastate conflict in its entirety. The main assumption about path dependence is rather intuitive and postulates that previous stages in the process make causal contributions to the subsequent stages – or in other words history matters. Originally applied to explain economic processes and technological transformations, path dependence theory was recently introduced by Paul Pierson into the study of political processes.² He argued that the phenomenon of path dependence can be analyzed through a broader concept that focuses on the “causal relevance of preceding stages in a temporal sequence” and a narrow concept that investigates “social processes that exhibit increasing returns.”³ In this dissertation, I extrapolate path dependence theory to the study of intrastate conflicts and evaluate the explanatory power of both the broad and narrow definitions. While the existing scholarship examines either separate phases of civil war or factors that affect its dynamics, the theory of path dependence bridges the gap between the onset of war, period of confrontation, and its outcome by examining the causal links between different periods.

My analysis of seven decades of the intrastate armed conflict reveals similar patterns of war development that have not been limited to a particular geographic region or a time period. Across the instances of civil wars, certain initial conditions such as the presence of oil or hostilities in the neighboring countries have shaped the outcome of conflict, while other crucial factors such as ethnic diversity or abundance of easily

³ Ibid, 252.
extractable resources such as diamonds have no effect. Just as the initiation of war appears to be contingent on a set of greed and grievance factors, so do its outcomes largely depend upon the presence or absence of relevant onset features as well as tipping points. The idea of the internal capacity of the state and external interventions to have the power to shift the course of conflict and maximize the probability of government’s success, rebels’ victory, or a compromise lies at the core of the tipping point hypothesis. Here I argue that the state capacity represented by the size of government’s armed forces and regime type as well as the third party interventions by international, regional, and state actors can significantly alter the path of conflict and “tip” the scales of war. Indeed, the models of path dependence through the prism of tipping points reveal the importance of fluctuations in state capacity and the timing for interventions.

Although path dependence theory effectively synthesizes fragmented scholarly approaches to the phenomenon of civil war, the true test of my findings lies in understanding the direction of current intrastate conflicts and predicting their outcomes. This study closely examines civil wars in Russian autonomous republic of Chechnya; the Democratic Republic of Congo; and Sri Lanka. Throughout these three cases of conflict between the central government and insurgents, common patterns in initial conditions and intervening factors have shaped the outcomes of conflict. Given the insights that theory of path dependence reveals about the dynamics of civil wars, it is valid to theorize about the potential developments of internal conflict in the war-torn eastern regions of Ukraine, where pro-Russian separatists are battling the central government.
From a Peaceful Revolution to an Armed Conflict: War in Ukraine

To illustrate the significance of tipping points, one can consider the current war in Ukraine. The course of an intrastate conflict has been shaped by foreign military intervention as well as the tragic events surrounding the destruction of the Malaysian Airlines Flight 17. Along with unique initial conditions that were present at initiation of hostilities, these events have the capacity to determine the outcome of war.

Since the demise of the Soviet Union and collapse of the bipolar system of international relations, the power distribution has shifted dramatically across the globe. The frozen conflicts that were kept intact by the rigid Cold War realities have been unraveled, which in turn produced the loci of instabilities and violence. An outbreak of the violent conflict in Ukraine; the breach of its sovereign borders; impending energy resources warfare; and ongoing exchange of sanctions between Western states and Russia bring the current state of affairs in Europe to a new threat level. Unlike unrest in Caucasus, Transnistria, and Central Asia, an intrastate conflict in Ukraine can be hardly classified as “frozen” considering the absence of hostilities in the past. Even after the Russian-Georgian war of 2008, the possibility of the Russian-backed insurgency or a direct Russian invasion has been considered probable, but highly unlikely.

In the past ten years, Ukraine has gone through two fundamental socio-political processes: the Orange Revolution of 2004 and Euromaidan of 2013/2014. While the reasons behind the onset of the revolutions are somewhat similar since both were caused by the dissatisfaction with the political regime and its decisions, the way they progressed and the outcomes that they brought are astonishingly distinct. The Orange Revolution
brought millions of people on the streets in 2004 in a sign of protest against an election fraud of the aspiring presidential candidate Viktor Yanukovych. The peaceful character of the demonstrations and absence of hostilities from the police and other armed structures has made the Orange Revolution an example of non-violent resistance.

Widespread corruption, rising authoritarian grip, and finally a last-minute decision to halt the signing of the Association Agreement with European Union in exchange for lavish credit from the Russian Federation have led thousands of people on the streets of Kyiv in the fall of 2013 to express their dissatisfaction and demand the signing of the agreement with EU. What started as a peaceful process quickly escalated into a brutal beating of the demonstrators who were primarily students. The next couple months have consolidated the citizens in the face of growing aggression of the presidential administration such as bloody clashes with special units of police, humiliation of protesters, their disappearance and, tragically, deaths. The apogee of conflict – deadliest clashes between Euromaidan demonstrators and armed units including snipers and heavily armed units between February 18th and 24th – resulted in hundred people killed and thousands injured. Against all odds, demonstrators were able to hold their ground and push back the police. In the face of imminent repercussions, Yanukovych and his administration have fled the country and the provisional government has been established by the leaders of Euromaidan.

The success of the protestors, however, has sent signals not only to other regions of Ukraine that have supported the escapee president, but also to the neighbors, including the Russian Federation which openly supported Yanukovych and his struggle against Euromaidan. On March 16th, 2014, the Crimean autonomous republic held the fictitious
referendum that was backed by “green people,” Russian forces that however did not have any insignia. In a landslide approval voting, Crimea declared independence that was not recognized by Ukraine or the international community, but has been widely deemed as a fair and just by Russia. Shortly after, Crimea joined the Russian Federation as a new administrative unit. Separatist tendencies have spread further in the southern and eastern parts of Ukraine. Scenarios similar to those in Crimea were executed in several oblasts, but only in Luhansk and Donetsk, were separatists able to find the support – and not in a small part due to the incoming financial and military assistance from the eastern neighbor. The ensuing Anti-Terrorist Operation carried out by the Ukrainian army and the National Guard is aimed at curbing the foreign military assistance to separatists and reestablishing constitutional order in Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts.

A year-long intrastate conflict in Eastern Ukraine took the lives of thousands of soldiers and civilians. Although several definitions were given to this armed conflict including anti-terrorist operation, civil war, or Russian invasion of Ukraine, the term “hybrid war” has been widely used to capture the peculiarities of the foreign intervention conducted through the use of special forces, mercenaries, cyber attacks, and informational warfare in addition to providing military equipment and training for the insurgents. This type of tactics along with its permanent seat on the UN Security Council allowed the Russian Federation to claim its non-involvement into the intrastate conflict in Ukraine. Given this new trend in conflict dynamics that put the Baltic countries as well as Kazakhstan to alert, it is critical to trace both the onset factors that led to the outbreak of violence as well as intervening conditions that can ultimately change the course of war. These illustrate the importance of path dependence in civil wars.
Tipping the Scales of Conflict

Current approaches to the study of intrastate conflicts are not equipped to delve into the peculiarities of a specific war in all its totality and tend to analyze factors that shape a particular stage of hostilities. Moreover, they rarely focus on the ongoing conflicts and the ways to solve them. The theoretical approach that I develop in this dissertation synthesizes path dependence and civil war scholarship to provide avenues to hypothesize about the possible courses that the conflicts can take in the observable future. From the path dependence standpoint, intrastate conflicts are shaped by the initial conditions during the start of the war as well as internal factors and external interventions that “tip” the scales of conflict. The war in Eastern Ukraine is no exception.

In Ukraine, several onset factors that are traditionally associated in the civil war literature with the outbreak of conflict have provided causal contribution to the initiation of hostilities in the Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts. From the greed and grievances perspective, this region has both the motivation factor of the ethnic Russians that comprise approximately 35 percent of the population as well as opportunity factor of non-lootable resources (coal and shale gas). As subsequent chapters show, my quantitative analysis of the conflict dynamics for the past seventy years finds little evidence for connection between ethnicity and the outcomes of a civil war. At the same time, non-lootable resources such as oil appear to be connected with the minimization of the rebels’ chances to succeed. Since both coal and oil are non-lootable resources, it is valid to assume that separatists cannot easily finance their activities through coal mining.

The primary factor that contributed to the onset of intrastate conflict in Eastern Ukraine and could potentially shape its outcome is war contagion or spillover of hostilities. After the annexation of Crimea, the Russian Federation contributed to the outbreak of conflict by providing financial, military and technical support for pro-Russian insurgents. My analysis indicates that wars shaped by contagion are less likely to result in a government’s victory and more likely in a compromise.

The caveat here is that war spillover is oftentimes associated with third party intervention. Indeed, Russian military intervention in the summer of 2014 has shaped the course of the war. Towards the end of July, separatists’ forces were in full retreat and Ukrainian forces were close to capturing their last strongholds. The incursions of regular Russian troops, which were constantly denied by Moscow, have shifted the tides of war. They led to heavy casualties on both sides and signing of provisional ceasefire agreement in Minsk in September, 2014. It is possible that the direct Russian involvement could have occurred earlier. Yet, the destruction of the Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 over Donetsk region on July 2014 has attracted international attention to the war in Ukraine and intervened into the strategic calculations. Both the Malaysian Airlines tragedy and Russian August invasion can be considered “tipping” points as they shifted the course of the conflict. This dissertation evaluates the impact of such tipping points on the outcomes of civil wars. Through a series of statistical inquiries and case studies, it identifies the patterns of path dependence in intrastate conflicts. In essence, I devise a study that answers the following questions: What factors determine a particular outcome of a civil war? How strong is their impact? What are the causal mechanisms in play?
Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of seven chapters, bibliography and an appendix. The introductory chapter outlines the contemporary scholarship on intrastate conflicts; introduces the theory of path dependence as the framework for analyzing civil wars as a continuous process; and, discusses the central research question and methodological foundation of the dissertation.

The second chapter of the dissertation introduces theoretical approaches to the study of war and security in general and intrastate conflict in particular. Here, I trace the development of the literature on the causes and consequences of war from the time of antiquity to the modern era. Next, I propose a classification of the intrastate conflict literature according to the phases of war that it addresses. Thus, my evaluation is focused on works that (a) analyze factors behinds the onset of civil wars; (b) elements that shape conflict dynamics; (c) the impact of third party interventions; and (d) debates around the ways civil wars are resolved. I provide an overview of sociological inquiries into contentious politics, state capacity, and causal mechanisms in civil wars. Furthermore, I evaluate the existing approaches to the path dependence and elaborate on the ways they can be applied to the study of intrastate conflicts. I extrapolate the broad and narrow notions of path dependence to evaluate the dynamics of civil wars. Evaluation of the impact of initial conditions on the outcome of a war builds up on the former concept, while the analysis of endogenous and exogenous tipping points investigates the latter definition of path dependence. Here, I also speculate about the causal mechanisms of tipping points such as the type of regime of the state in which war occurs, the
peacekeeping missions by the United Nations, or regional intergovernmental organizations.

Chapter three outlines a detailed analysis of the research design, methodology, and explanatory variables. Here, I provide an overview of the existing approaches to defining a civil war and discuss the reasons behind my choice to utilize the Correlates of War Project’s definition of an intrastate conflict. By following the logic of mixed methods research, I devise three analytical frameworks to examine hypotheses pertaining to initial conditions and tipping points in shaping path dependence in civil wars as well as to examine the causal mechanisms behind them through case studies analysis. Finally, I discuss the design of the OTIC and the TPIC datasets that I develop and use to test the hypotheses of the first two analytical frameworks.

The fourth chapter investigates whether the factors that lead to the start of the armed conflict may affect how civil wars are resolved. In this section, I briefly describe the logic behind the power of initial conditions, and follow with the output of the multinomial logistic regression analysis of the onset-termination hypotheses. I provide both the results with three civil war base outcomes and marginal effects to account for directionality and magnitude of the explanatory variables. I discuss the findings of the quantitative tests in the context of path dependence dynamics as well as in their relationship to the existing literature on intrastate conflicts. The examination of the opportunity and motivational factors, spillover effects, and control for the Cold War period produces a comprehensive picture for the broad concept of path dependence in intrastate conflicts.
Chapter five of the dissertation addresses the narrow concept of path dependence in civil wars by evaluating the impact of endogenous and exogenous tipping factors on the outcome and duration of a civil war. Specifically, I focus on the timing and sequence characteristics of path dependence. The TPIC dataset reflects these features through structuring each new exogenous tipping point as a separate period during which the civil war may come to an end. Here, I apply a multinomial logistic regression analysis and three event history (survival) models to test the hypotheses derived from the narrow concept of path dependence. While the earlier inquiries into the analysis of civil war outcomes utilized parametric survival models and the most recent studies applied the Cox proportional hazards model, I argue that these approaches do not satisfy the main assumption about the dependence of competing risks in the outcomes of civil wars. Instead, I apply a semiparametric proportional hazards model developed by Fine and Gray that controls for the fact that three possible outcomes of intrastate conflicts are interdependent. Finally, I provide a comparative analysis of all three survival models to check the consistency of the findings across the specifications.

The sixth chapter of the dissertation offers a detailed examination of three cases of an intrastate conflict through the lens of initial conditions, tipping factors, and causal mechanisms of path dependence. The selection criteria of the cases reflect a variation in the civil war outcome, the presence of exogenous or endogenous tipping factors as well as in- and out-of-sample cases of civil wars. The three civil wars analyzed in this study are the First Chechen War that ended in the victory of rebels; Africa’s World War where warring sides reached a compromise; and, Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War that concluded with the success of the government. The first two intrastate conflicts were
included in the OTIC dataset, while conflict in Sri Lanka is a recent case that I have utilized to test the predictive and explanatory power of the path dependence theory.

The concluding chapter summarizes the main findings of the empirical models and discusses their applicability for the analysis of the individual cases of intrastate conflicts. Next, I outline theoretical and methodological implications of the path dependence theory in civil wars. I discuss here policy relevance and limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research.

**Conclusion**

Uncovering the intrinsic dynamics that shape the direction and outcomes of intrastate conflicts can improve our understanding of the most pervasive type of conflict in modern history. Undoubtedly, the frequency of civil wars will increase given the negative effects of globalization; the thawing of frozen conflicts; global nuclear stalemate; and the state of affairs in the contemporary security framework that has evolved to prevent interstate rather than intrastate warfare. This study offers an initial step toward identifying causal mechanisms that lead to unique civil war outcomes. Policy implications of this study can be used to shift the chances of the government’s or rebels’ success in conflict. Yet, caution should be exercised when interpreting the findings of the quantitative approach since the case studies analysis reveals the complexity of civil war dynamics.
CHAPTER 2
INTRASTATE CONFLICTS AND PATH DEPENDENCE

Introduction

The Cold War nuclear stalemate diminished the probability of full-scale interstate war, but instead indirectly encouraged conflicts of smaller scale. The increasing number of intrastate conflicts during last fifty years produced a new way of thinking about conflict in international relations. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of asymmetric threats, scholars diverted their attention to the study of how conflict originates within the state; what influences its dynamics; and how it is possible to end the confrontation. This chapter examines the state of the field regarding intrastate wars, identifies the civil war sub-debates, and analyzes political science, sociology and formal modeling perspectives on internal conflicts. It elaborates on the definitions of civil wars; onset and termination; path dependence; tipping points; and other related notions. Furthermore, this section focuses on the development of path dependence scholarship in economics and political science literature and extrapolates its main findings to the sphere of intrastate conflicts. Finally, I provide a research design that captures the dynamics of civil war as a path dependent process that goes beyond juxtaposition of onset and termination cases. By introducing the concept of tipping points in civil wars and analyzing how these factors shape the path of a particular type of intrastate warfare, I substantiate not only the existence of the path dependence, but also uncover general trends behind civil war dynamics.
Debates in the Study of Intrastate Conflicts

After the end of the Second World War, intrastate wars became the dominant type of a military conflict. In the wake of reassessing the post-Cold War distribution of power, identification of modern threats and challenges as well as determination of the contemporary meaning and role of security, scholars of international relations diverted their attention to the study of conflict within states. In the following section, I propose the analysis of the intrastate conflict scholarship through the prism of the evolution and current state of affairs in the civil war debate; discussion of the semantic and methodological approaches to the study of civil war; and outlining the limitations and areas for future improvement and development. First, I limit the scope of academic investigation to the mainstream international security scholarship that specifically addresses the notion of intrastate conflict. The sociological and game theoretical viewpoints are analyzed later in this chapter.

The last century was an era of a tremendous breakthrough in all spheres of development – space exploration, information revolution, global markets, the list can go on forever. At the same time, progress brought not only a better quality of life, but also a more efficient way of combating rivals at the domestic and international levels. Two devastating world wars revealed the horrific potential of humankind to exterminate its own kin at an unthinkable scope and rate. Only after the invention of the most deadly weapon, the nuclear bomb, did states realize the unbearable cost of war at the global scale. The common knowledge entered the realm of military and political thinking that
was best summarized by Albert Einstein: “I don’t know [what weapons will be used in the Third World War]. But I can tell you what they’ll use in the Fourth — rocks!”

The ensuing stalemate characterized the conflict dynamics of the Cold War period. Two superpowers separated the world into spheres of influence and only at the peripheral regions using proxy states engaged in *de facto* military confrontation. Strategists on both sides developed new doctrines that adapted to the bipolar distribution of power. The bourgeoning neorealist school of thought has viewed bipolarity as the most stable form of international system. Indeed, the number of interstate wars has significantly decreased following the Second World War after the ensued Soviet-American demarcation of the world. However, as the wars between states have become less frequent, confrontations within the national borders started to characterize global conflict dynamics. This tendency continued beyond the Cold War era, where intrastate wars were waged at the periphery of superpower rivalry or in the Third World.

Academic interest in analyzing the phenomenon of civil war has largely resulted from the reassessment of security field after the end of the Cold War. Despite the growing frequency of intrastate conflicts and simultaneous decrease of wars between states since the Second World War, academic interest was largely focused on the latter type. The peak of intrastate conflicts in the early 1990s sent a signal about the changing security environment and attracted attention of policy-makers and scholars alike. While seminal inquiries into the nature of conflict within the states have originated before the peak of intrastate violence, the advance of quantitative research methods and accumulation of the recorded history of intrastate conflicts by Correlates of War project
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and the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) catalyzed the academic discipline. Currently with no strict agenda on the table, the civil war debate incorporates a variety of research topics that are oftentimes interconnected between each other as well as with external scholarly discourses.

Within the overarching intrastate conflict discipline, it is possible to identify several central sub-debates. The most diverse and prolific research topic addresses the reasons behind the onset of civil wars. This sub-debate attempts to capture the conditions and factors that stimulate or inhibit opponents in the internal conflict to engage in the armed hostilities. The second scholarly sub-debate focuses on the elements that characterize the dynamics of civil war. The third and arguably the most related to the discipline of international relations sub-debate revolves around the notion of third party interventions: when they occur, under what conditions, and whom do they support? Finally, scholars debate about the solutions to civil wars. While some view institutions or third party interventions as the answer, others consider partition of the state as the most viable solution. These sub-debates are, of course, not exhaustive determinants for the study of civil war and there exists a wider pool of so-called “gray areas” that in some way are related to the phenomenon of internal conflict. These are repression, genocide, secession, political violence, revolution, failed states, terrorism, and ethnic conflicts to name a few. However, since the primary focus of this study is the analysis of the intrastate conflict, the following overview of scholarship emphasizes four abovementioned sub-debates: onset, dynamics, third party intervention, and termination of the intrastate wars.
As I argued earlier, the academic and policy awareness about the fact that civil war represents the bulk of conflict incidence across the world appeared only after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Globalization trends revealed the existence of the conflict zones that previously were outside of the bipolar competition. Moreover, frozen conflicts that were contained by the military might of Soviet empire started to unravel in the early nineties. Civil wars in Yugoslavia, Caucasus, Transnistria, and other ethnically diverse regions have commenced following the vacuum of power. Aside from the collapse of empires and the advent of globalization, the United Nations, which was no longer a hostage of ideological rivalry, started to exercise its legitimate role of a peacekeeper and peace mediator and gave greater voice to the problem of internal conflicts.

Academic response to these structural transformations started to unfold in the early 1990s. During this period, several seminal works arguably “set the tone” for the subsequent understanding of the nature of civil wars. In 1994, David Singer and Melvin Small offered a new revised dataset on international and civil wars. The following year, James D. Fearon published the seminal work “Rationalist Explanations for War” in which he suggested the reasons why bargaining fails and states occasionally go to war, which can also be extended to analyze intrastate conflicts. Four years later, Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler in “Greed and Grievance in Civil War” offered an examination of conditions that force actors to engage in intrastate rivalry by focusing on the grievances and opportunities for seizure of export commodities. In 2002, Gleditsch and other scholars from Uppsala Conflict Data Program in collaboration with Peace Research
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Institute Oslo developed an Armed Conflict Dataset that provides conflict data from the period of 1946 to the present.

While it is possible to arbitrarily distinguish scholarship on intrastate conflicts through the prism of schools of thought (institutional liberalism, structural realism, constructivism, etc.), it is more appropriate to classify the research contributions in terms of variable preferences and methodological approaches. Most of the articles under review have utilized statistical evaluation of intrastate conflicts; formal modeling; or a combination of both. It is also worthy of notice that the overwhelming majority of scholarship is the product of American and European academic environments; this fact can arguably limit the scope of ideas as well as the audience. Finally, it is worth noting that the United Nations and particularly the World Bank have expressed interest in the subject of civil wars and on multiple occasions have funded related projects. Thus, the World Bank in the 1990s sponsored a comprehensive project on the economics of conflict that involved the efforts of leading academicians (including Collier and Hoeffler).³


The civil war debate does not revolve around one particular issue. Instead, it serves as an umbrella for several sub-debates, which touch upon various aspects of internal conflict. Here, I focus on various topics that reflect the complexity of the phenomenon of civil war and draw inferences about particular stages of internal conflict, characterize the intrinsic processes, and speculate about the external variables.
Onset of Intrastate Conflicts

The first and probably most crucial question that the discipline attempts to answer is why civil wars occur in the first place. That is to say, scholars go beyond the traditional understanding of origins of war in faulty human nature or universal greed. Instead, they aim to apply robust methodological techniques and test models that are peculiar to civil war. The main points of contestation in this sub-debate are the conditions inside the state that lead to civil wars; underlying and immediate factors; economic and political preconditions; resources that could be used to instigate the internal conflict; and, the unique aims of potential rebel groups.

A quite simple and straightforward yet very influential explanation of the outbreak of civil war was given by Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler in “Greed and Grievance in Civil War.” Their main argument is based on the supposition that the onset of civil war is dependent upon the motivation of rebel groups and opportunities to fulfill those motivations. Collier and Hoeffler argue that dissatisfactions of various social groups within the state, which in turn shape the motivations of rebels, are ubiquitous and, to a certain degree, always present. Previous literature on the civil war outbreak constantly emphasized various motivational factors, but failed to explain the relative low incidence of the actual internal military conflicts. Collier and Hoeffler hypothesized that rare occurrence of civil war is related to the lack of opportunities on the behalf of the rebel groups to enforce their grievances. Using econometric methods to test previous
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models and their own ideas about the onset of civil war, the authors have analyzed seventy-nine intrastate wars in the time span from 1960 to 1999.\textsuperscript{5}

Aside from a wide variety of motive-based approaches to civil wars, Collier and Hoeffler highlight two seminal works that enhance our understanding of the internal conflict. The first alternative view on the motive-opportunity relations was offered by Herschel Grossman, who hypothesized about the importance of lootable resources, which provide sufficient incentives for rebel groups to engage in the hostilities.\textsuperscript{6} Another crucial refinement to the onset literature was made by Jack Hirshleifer through adding a new determinant of perception that effectively altered the dyad of motive and opportunity. The possibility of misperceiving grievances could significantly alter the quality of internal military conflict.\textsuperscript{7}

After testing several greed and grievance models of civil war, Collier and Hoeffler concluded that opportunity rather than motivation is responsible for the outbreak of conflict. Among the opportunity variables, the authors identify the availability of finances (primary commodity exports), the cost of rebellion, and military advantage as the most significant factors.\textsuperscript{8} On the other hand, intuitively crucial motivational factors such as inequality, political rights, ethnic polarization, and religious fractionalization proved to be of a little significance (ethnic conflict, however, proved to be adversely related to the outbreak of conflict). Finally, the authors suggested that the significance of

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid, 563.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, 564.
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid, 588.
opportunities and motivations can be substantially increased by the size of the population.  

The scholarship on the economic determinants of intrastate conflict onset has burgeoned following the introduction of the greed and grievance paradigm. In The Political Economy of Armed Conflict, Karen Ballentine, Jake Sherman and their colleagues emphasize the significance of the war economy in contemporary civil conflicts. Using as a starting pointed the theory developed by Collier and Hoeffler that diminishes the factors of ethnic heterogeneity; level of political rights; economic mismanagement; and regime type on the emergence of civil conflicts, Ballentine and Sherman evaluate the role of various natural resources as the “greed” factor. Furthermore, they offer a series of case studies, including Colombia, Nepal, Bougainville, Kosovo, Sri Lanka, and Burma, with the goal of moving beyond the dichotomous profit-seeking versus justice-seeking dichotomy of greed and grievance theory.

The focus on six pivotal conflicts in different parts of the world offered a more robust understanding of specific preconditions for an intrastate war; mechanisms that trigger the conflict; and the solutions for peaceful settlement. The main advantages of such an approach are the assessment of cases at the regional and global scale; tracing comparisons between similar preconditions and outcomes of geographically distant conflicts; and evaluation of the effectiveness of tools that seek to reconcile the dispute. While the large-\(n\) quantitative analysis of the intrastate conflict conducted by Collier and Hoeffler suggested that the majority of civil wars are triggered by the opportunity factor,
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the more in-depth case study perspective suggests that the reality is far more complex and involves both economic and non-economic determinants.\textsuperscript{12}

One of the applications of the motive-opportunity dyad to analyze the peculiarities of civil wars in the African continents was proposed by Charles Cater.\textsuperscript{13} In the elaboration of the post-Cold War conflict dynamics in Africa, Cater tests four dominant theories of causes of war: economic predation; kleptocratic states; horizontal inequalities; and, weak states theories.\textsuperscript{14} Cater grounds the economic predation variable in Collier’s assumption about the salience of the rational striving for financial profit that explains predatory motives of intrastate groups.\textsuperscript{15} The correlation between the corruption of “shadow” state leaders and the rise of the warlords, observed by William Reno, associates the cause of civil war with the redistribution of wealth within this dyadic pair, thus explaining the phenomenon of kleptocratic states.\textsuperscript{16} Frances Stewart’s interpretation of “horizontal inequality” points to the regional, ethnic, class, and religious group identities that can be dissatisfied with its political participation, economic assets, employment and income inequalities, as well as its social access and situation.\textsuperscript{17} Finally, to explain the idea of the weak state, Cater refers to Ayoob’s findings on causes of civil war in developing countries. He emphasizes the weakness of these states that results from the excessive use of power to address internal problems due to the lack of political institutions and the dominance of military elements in dealing with domestic issues.\textsuperscript{18}

Through the prism of these four theories, Cater concludes that in the cases of Angola,
Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of Congo, economic determinants could not explain the incidence of civil war. In reality, he observes, the intrastate conflicts in Africa are driven by “cyclical patterns of state failure and mobilization of resources for insurgency – each having interrelated economic and political dimensions.”

Different economic and political preconditions for civil wars still require a trigger or catalyst to transform financial, political or other motives into the practical action. To distinguish between the general preconditions and immediate triggers, Michael E. Brown offers a new framework that identifies underlying causes and then includes the proximate or permissive causes of internal conflict. In comparison with Collier and Cater, Brown does not consider political and economic factors to be sole explanations for the onset of intrastate conflict, but also adds structural and cultural variables. The weakness of states; intra-state security concerns; and ethnic geography contribute to the structural causes, while discriminatory political institutions; exclusionary national ideologies; inter-group politics; and elite politics fall into political factors group. The idea of economic problems; discriminatory economic systems; and the economic development and modernization issues are grouped under the social/economic causes of civil war. Finally, cultural/perceptual factors include problematic group histories and patterns of cultural discrimination.

According to Brown these four underlying causes of internal conflict can be catalyzed under several conditions. The aggravation of the certain factor can be analyzed
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within the framework of elite-level or mass-level catalysts and internal or external developments.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, the four combinations of triggering factors (elite/mass triggered versus internally/externally driven) or the sole impact of one of them can change the dormant character of the underlying cause and lead to the emergence of civil war.\textsuperscript{24}

Another influential theory for understanding the outbreak of civil war was developed around the earlier discussed idea of the primary export commodity or lootable resources. After Collier and Hoeffler identified primary commodity exports as the most influential factor in the onset of civil wars, several academic articles attempted to verify and improve their findings. The most prominent critique of the Collier and Hoeffler’s analysis was made by James Fearon in “Primary Commodity Exports and Civil War.”\textsuperscript{25} Fearon challenges the argument that primary commodity resources are the main factor for funding insurgencies by referring to a similar study by Fearon and Laitin published in 2003 that produced an opposite result where primary resources did not have an independent effect on the onset of internal conflict.\textsuperscript{26} Fearon explains these discrepancies by criticizing Collier and Hoeffler’s methodology and data manipulations. He argues that five-year cycles used in Collier and Hoeffler’s analysis fail to adequately capture the conflict onset since the problem of missing data causes the pool of observations to become extremely limited. Instead, through focusing on a country-year format and additional statistical techniques, Fearon was able to more systematically and consistently encompass the variables and observations, which revealed the weakness of the primary

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, 15.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, 16.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid, 485.
commodity exports’ argument. Nevertheless, the author does not dismiss the role of primary commodities as a primary source of rebel funding, but stresses their diversity ranging from diamonds to drugs to oil exports. Fearon’s refined models revealed that it “seems unlikely that oil exports (or cash crops) predict higher civil war risk because oil provides better financing opportunities for would-be rebels,” but in fact fuel resources might “indicate a weaker state given the level of per capita income and possibly a greater ‘prize’ for state or secessionist capture, both of which might favor civil war.”

While James Fearon primarily focused on fuel resources as indicators of civil war outbreak, Päivi Lujala, Nils Petter Gleditsch and Elisabeth Gilmore in “A Diamond Curse? Civil War and a Lootable Resource” using novel data on diamond production to speculate about the impact of this export commodity on the onset of internal conflict. The authors accept the general framework of understanding the civil war through motivation and opportunity factors, but also add the third dimension of identity, which manifests itself through group formation. These three determinants are crucial in analyzing the influence of natural resources, particularly of the lootable type. The ability of rebel group to loot resources may serve as a motivation for insurgency and opportunity for financing their activity as well as for building a group identity around a particular commodity. The discussion of lootable resources evolved primarily along the lines of geographical location, concentration of resources, and their type. Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore focus on diamonds as a unique type of lootable resources. They elaborate further by distinguishing two groups of diamonds: primary diamonds located in the kimberlite
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pipes (geological structures where diamonds are usually found) and controlled by government and secondary diamonds that are more easily excavated and extorted.\textsuperscript{31} This major distinction offered a novel insight into the onset dynamics of civil war. According to Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore, diamonds do not generally affect the risk of internal conflict outbreak, but they do impact civil wars. Thus, the type of diamonds plays a critical role in the outbreak of civil war: secondary diamonds (lootable resource) can be easily exploited by rebel group, while primary mine-type diamonds minimize the risk of conflict onset.\textsuperscript{32} To sum up, diamonds have an influence on the civil outbreak under certain circumstances and further studies on lootable resources might benefit from this distinction.

The role of ethnic rivalries and, consequently, causes of ethnic conflict has been an important dimension for the study of civil wars. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the spread of democracy coincided with the resurgence of nationalism and a spike of intrastate warfare. Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner see this trend not as an accident, but rather as a complex phenomenon that encompasses the history of nation- and state-building; the evolution of ethnic conflict; inconsistency between ethnic fragmentation and democratic polities; and, of international involvement in solving protracted ethnic violence.\textsuperscript{33} The collection of theoretical approaches to the study of ethnic conflict and a series of case studies that test these theories in the volume \textit{National and Ethnic Conflict} edited by Michael E Brown, Owen R. Cote, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller,

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 543.  
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highlight the complex nature of the ethnic conflict.\textsuperscript{34} The overarching theme in this volume is the diversity of ideas rather than the sole consolidated approach about the causes of civil war. The authors generally agree on the intricacy of civil conflict and often advise unique multifaceted solutions for each particular case. They refer to the nationalism and ethnicity not only as inherent causes, but also as triggers of other internal and international factors of internal rivalry.

An alternative view on the role of ethnic factors in the onset of internal conflict was developed by James Fearon and David Laitin in “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” They posit that the spike of civil wars during the early 1990s was the result of the fifty-years-long protracted conflicts that had been revived after the end of the Cold War. Fearon and Laitin’s study of insurgency conditions suggests that “state weakness marked by poverty, a large population, and instability – are better predictors of which countries are at risk for civil war than are indicators of ethnic and religious diversity or measures of grievances such as economic inequality, lack of democracy or civil liberties, or state discrimination against minority religions or languages.”\textsuperscript{35}

Another crucial research area of the onset of internal conflict focuses on the aims of rebel groups through the introduction of the literature on motivational factors. David Sobek and Caroline L. Payne in the article “A Tale of Two Types: Rebel Goals and the Onset of Civil Wars” propose to classify civil wars in terms of legitimacy (in which rebels aim at changing the relationship between state and society) and replacement (in


which rebels aim at changing the government).\textsuperscript{36} The authors made an underlying assumption that the dynamics of conflict would be fundamentally different based on the goals that the rebels pursue. Thus, using Tilly’s “polity” model that explains the relationship between government, members of the society, and challengers that do not have low-cost access to resources, Sobek and Payne construed that in civil wars of replacement rebels are primarily concerned with the benefits of winning in order to get access to lootable resources.\textsuperscript{37} On the other hand, civil wars of legitimacy are more complex and presuppose longer duration and increased viability of rebellion by the possibility of lootable resources’ extraction.\textsuperscript{38} Their analysis reveals that the wars of replacement should be associated with short duration, where the longevity of rebels’ viability is not significant, but access to lootable resources is a primary concern. At the same time, Sobek and Payne observed for wars of legitimacy, motivated by the factor of viability/greed instead of grievance, “a fairly strong relationship between the viability measures and the risk of civil war of legitimacy onset, which only became stronger when the expected duration of the conflict increased.”\textsuperscript{39}

\textit{The Dynamics of an Intrastate Conflict}

The motivation, opportunity, identity triad is widely accepted as an overarching analytical framework for understanding the causes of civil wars. At the same time, previous studies utilized primarily multivariate models that require quantifiable variables.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, 220.
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to test the core hypotheses of the study. Yet the pursuit for statistically significant results sometimes simplifies reality and fails to capture the intrinsic dynamics of civil war. Oftentimes, qualitative inquiries into the nature of intrastate conflict could uncover and describe the mechanisms and trends that are overlooked or discarded during the large-\(n\) analysis.

A series of case studies of ethnic conflicts by John Mueller points out the heterogeneity of the social composition of the battling ethnic groups. By focusing on civil wars in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, Mueller advances the argument that the notion of ethnic wars as we know it is misguided. He suggests that “ethnic warfare more closely resembles nonethnic warfare, because it is waged by small groups of combatants, groups that purport to fight and kill in the name of some larger entity,” which is, by and large, passive and controlled by these combatant groups.\(^{40}\) Moreover, for the abovementioned cases, perennial hatred was not a primary factor for the perpetuation of the internal crisis. Instead, “bands of opportunistic marauders recruited by political leaders and operating under their general guidance” engaged in the looting and carnage that was later associated with the whole ethnic group.\(^{41}\) In Yugoslavia, Mueller argues, politicians might have been at the inception of the confrontation and sparking hatred, but the atrocities and looting were conducted by common criminals, thugs, prison inmates, or even soccer hooligans.\(^{42}\)

Civil war in this region was characterized by a unique dynamic structure. In the first “takeover” stage, well-armed thugs recruited by political leaders emerged in the areas without central authority and police forces. Mueller points out that at this stage the

\(^{41}\) Ibid, 42-43.
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general population felt confused rather than exhibiting hatred. In the ensuing “carnival” stage, these groups of thugs engaged in pillaging and looting that were occasionally joined by opportunistic marauders and other criminals. During the “occupation and desertion” phase, these criminal groups did not limit the hostilities to a single ethnicity, but terrorized the entire population in the region.\textsuperscript{43} In conclusion, Mueller remarks that ethnic war does not simply resemble Hobbesian \textit{bellum omnium contra omnes}, but ethnicity appears to function as merely an ordering device, not a motivational factor. In cases where ethnic groups did engage in the uncontrolled war against everyone, organized criminal groups were behind the larger population. As the solution to such types of crises, Mueller suggests the provision of third party interventions and international policing. Finally, he makes a provocative inference about the possibility of ethnic war sparking anywhere if the conditions were similar to the discussed case since the thugs and criminal elements exist in every state.

In a response to John Mueller, Anna Simons acknowledges the critical role of armed thugs in internal conflicts yet criticizes his emphasis on hatred as a primary motivation for ethnic conflict. She offers an alternative factor of fear, explaining that fear fueled by propaganda can unite citizens to take actions under the conditions of the state’s failure to provide the security.\textsuperscript{44} Armed thugs and criminals spread fear through atrocities, which reawaken the previous experience of violence. Despite Mueller’s argument about the absence of hatred between ethnic groups, fear based on the previous history of violence stimulates the general population to restore violent behavior.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, 53-58.
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Third Party Interventions in Intrastate Conflicts

The phenomenon of external intervention in civil war is one of the most developed and contested subtopics in the literature on civil wars. One explanation for the popularity of this issue lies in the policy-related implications of third party interventions. Ironically, scholars who analyze this topic represent a predominantly American and European academic discourse, which might to an extent offer foreign policy suggestions for great power decision-making. The fact that the United States and lately the United Nations have engaged in a multitude of interventions ranging from humanitarian to security concerns stimulated scholarly endeavors to capture the conditions, motivations, and effectiveness of third party interventions.

A crucial aspect of third party interventions is the ability to sustain peace in the aftermath of civil war. Virginia Page Fortna in the article “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace after Civil War” examines the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping operations in the post-conflict areas, specifically focusing on the intrastate cases. Previous multivariate models have offered mixed results: some studies suggest that comprehensive, multilateral efforts under the UN auspices do in fact allow for a longer-term more stable environment, while other more sophisticated approaches do not find the connection between third party intervention and lasting peace.\(^{46}\) Fortna argues for the refined approach in the analysis of the peacekeeping interventions by differentiating between the pre- and post-Cold War periods as well as between UN peacekeeping missions and operations by other organizations. Moreover,

she critically examines the way data is treated in previous research and points to some major drawbacks. Thus, previous data treated conflicts that resumed after twenty years and conflicts that resumed after two months similarly, which skewed perceptions about the effectiveness of the peacekeeping interventions. Moreover, Fortna emphasizes the peculiarities of each case, arguing that peacekeepers are usually sent to the areas where peace is rather fragile due to variety of factors, but not to areas where peace exists per se. Finally, the major caveat of the previous approach lies in the equal treatment of all peacekeeping missions without distinguishing between post-conflict operations and interventions during the ongoing civil war.

After the revision of the previous data, Fortna came to the conclusion that peacekeeping interventions do prolong peace, but they have become more effective after the end of the Cold War. Among all types of peacekeeping missions, traditional and observer types had the strongest effect in reducing the risk of war outbreak, while multidimensional missions had a fifty percent chance of success. In sum, peacekeeping operations proved to be efficient and even though the “presence of international personnel is not a silver bullet, of course, it does not guarantee lasting peace in every case, but it does tend to make peace more likely to last, and to last longer.”

Civil wars tend to be contagious and neighboring states have an incentive to intervene in the conflict to prevent the outbreak of internal conflict within their own borders. While the possibility of the civil war spillover is a potential threat, it is important to identify under what conditions states are likely to intervene. Jacob Kathman in “Civil
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War Contagion and Neighboring Interventions” devised a criterion to measure the civil war contagion likelihood and explains the historical precedence of such interventions. Using the traditional motivation-opportunity framework for understanding civil war, Kathman acknowledges that since war is very costly, state utilities in terms of opportunism or threat response should be sufficiently high. Yet previous research has not accommodated the proximity as a potential difference between interveners, which led Kathman to hypothesize that contiguous states are facing qualitatively different threats. Consequently, the reasons behind state decision to intervene are based on “the attributes of the conflict state, the characteristics of the third party, and the affective dyadic links between the intervener and the war participants.” Kathman also prioritizes the research on the diffusion of interstate war to explain how geographic ties between neighbors that manifested in “ethnic affinities, security ties, and political relationships” can motivate a proximate state to engage in civil wars. The tests of intervention onset in terms of infection risk as a primary independent variable supports the hypothesis about the qualitatively different threats for neighboring states.

A critical role of a third party intervention is to stop the atrocities and bloodshed associated with the civil war. While such an intuitive assumption seems to be the only one possible, empirical analysis is required to verify this relationship. Dylan Balch-Lindsay and Andrew J. Enterline in “Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration, 1820-1992” examine whether third party interventions prolong or shorten the
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duration of intrastate conflict. They combine the viewpoint of Patrick Regan who suggested that a third party intervenes to end the conflict quickly and cite Karl Deutsch as well as Rodolfo Stavenhagen who considered that “third parties intervene for less benevolent reasons, including lengthening the duration of a civil war in order to distract, or drain the resources of, rival states, or simply to plunder the resources of the civil war state itself.”

Balch-Lindsay and Enterline make an important observation by arguing that the decision to intervene is not only costly but also requires the understanding of the systemic dimensions in terms of domestic participants and other external actors. The originality of Balch-Lindsay and Enterline’s empirical testing of third party intervention relies on the assumption that civil war is embedded in the international system, which affects the cost and benefit analysis of the third parties. The results reveal that the duration of civil war is contingent upon the coherence of motivations of the third parties: “an equitable distribution of third party interventions corresponds to a greater likelihood that a stalemate will emerge and the civil war will endure for a significantly longer period of time.” This conclusion confirms the intuitive logic that the longevity of war is related to the effectiveness of goals and actions coordination between third parties.

Previous studies about the impact on conflict duration of third party interventions on behalf of government or rebels have offered mixed results. In the article “Going in When it Counts: Military Intervention and the Outcome of Civil Conflicts,” Stephen Gent suggests that instead of conflict duration, one should consider the outcome as the primary
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concern of third parties. He argues that military third party interventions are costly and therefore will commence only if the marginal effect from them will be at the highest point.\textsuperscript{58} The empirical analysis of this refined perspective on third party interventions revealed that the “relative capability of the rebels has a statistically and substantively significant impact on the likelihood that a conflict will experience a military intervention on behalf of the government and the rebels.”\textsuperscript{59} This finding supports previous claims about the utility maximizing strategy of the third parties.

\textit{Solutions to Intrastate Conflicts}

The most challenging question in the civil war debate is finding solutions to internal conflict. Articles discussed in this section provide empirical evidence for the partition based on ethnic or geographic principle as well as allowing for a victory of either side in conflict as possible opportunities to end civil war.

The existing literature on civil war suggests two different approaches for ending intrastate wars. The dominant majority of scholars agree that ending conflict through negotiated settlement as soon as possible is the top priority to halt human suffering as well as economic and political collapse. On the other hand, some scholars (Edward N. Luttwak and Robert Wagner) suggested that civil war should last until only one side emerges victorious, which is encapsulated in a catchphrase “give war a chance.”\textsuperscript{60} In order to test the validity of both arguments, Monika Duffy Toft in the article “Ending

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, 730.
Civil Wars: A Case for Rebel Victory?” conducts analytical and empirical tests and suggests that termination of modern civil wars requires both cooperation and avoidance of downplaying the punishment for both sides. The regression models that focused on the type of civil war termination revealed three major trends:

First, civil wars ending in negotiated settlements are much more likely to recur. Second, negotiated settlements are no more likely to lead to democracy than other types of settlements. Rather, rebel victories are more likely to produce this result. Third, economic growth trends do not seem to be correlated with the type of civil war termination.

These conclusions undermine the academic and policy-makers’ assumptions about the benefits of negotiated solutions. Extending the time horizon is imperative to judge the effectiveness of peace longevity and level of democracy. It appears that in a long run, such settlements lead to the recurrence of civil war and more bloodshed. On the other hand, rebel victory in the longer run establishes stronger peace conditions and provides gradual democratization. Toft argues that for negotiated settlements to be more effective than rebel victory, they should incorporate provisions of long-term benefits as well as punishment mechanisms enforced by third parties in case one side decides to defect from a negotiated settlement.

Territorial partition is often considered a solution to an intrastate conflict. Nicholas Sambanis and Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl in the article “What’s in a Line? Is Partition a Solution to Civil War?” evaluate the costs and benefits of territorial partition and demonstrate the weakness of this argument through a series of empirical tests. They closely examine the ethnic security dilemma as an explanation for conflict reduction after
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territorial partition by focusing on two crucial claims: “the claim that ethnic power sharing is particularly unstable and the related claim that ethnic identity is easily identifiable, making targeting of individuals for violence easier after ethnic war.” While this theoretical assumption makes a case for the effectiveness of territorial partition, Sambanis and Schulhofer-Wohl’s empirical models that focused on the recurrence of war following such peace transitions have shown no significant connections.

In the response to the earlier studies by Nicholas Sambanis that refuted the effectiveness of partition, Carter Johnson in “Partitioning to Peace Sovereignty, Demography, and Ethnic Civil Wars” points at methodological and theoretical limitations of the previous research and makes a claim for the effectiveness of ethnic partition. Johnson views the main flaw of Sambanis’ analysis in using new borders instead of demographic separation of ethnic groups as the indicator for partition. According to Johnson, introduction of the new Postpartition Ethnic Homogeneity Index (PEHI) to capture the effectiveness of partition revealed that “in all cases where the PEHI showed a complete separation of warring minorities, there were no war recurrences and no occurrences of low-level violence for at least five years after the end of the ethnic civil war.”

Another direction of inquiry into the termination of intrastate conflicts touched upon the factors that can explain a particular civil war outcome. By examining the impact of third party interventions on the civil process, Dylan Balch-Lindsay, Andrew K. Enterline, and Kyle A. Joyce have observed the effect of foreign support on the duration
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of various civil war outcomes. In this rare study that looks at interactions among the stages of conflict, the authors applied a Cox competing risks model to analyze the time to different intrastate conflict outcomes while controlling for elements of separatists wars, factor of democracy, and economic development among others. Their findings indicate that foreign support increases the likelihood of the military success of the side that received assistance, while in the situation when third parties extend help to both sides of conflict, negotiated settlements does not appear to be a viable solution.

An alternative approach to explaining outcomes of internal conflicts was proposed by James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin in the paper “Civil War Termination.” Using a “random narratives” method to examine the causal mechanisms behind a civil war settlement, the authors have found that “civil wars will tend to end when there is a significant shock to the relative power or cost tolerance of one side or the other, such as the beginning or end of major foreign support to government or rebels.” Furthermore, the authors criticize the existing assumption about the clear distinction between military victory and negotiated outcome solutions on the basis that any civil war outcome already incorporates a degree of negotiation between warring sides. Instead, they propose to focus on center- and autonomy-seeking wars as a more applicable theoretical framework for the study of civil war termination. Finally, while focusing on examining case studies and not large-n statistical tests, Fearon and Laitin contended that foreign support and
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changes in the government or rebel leadership are possible causal mechanisms in ending civil wars.\textsuperscript{71}

\textit{Limitations of the Quantitative Approaches in the Study of Intrastate Conflicts}

Ted Robert Gurr’s “Why Minorities Rebel: A Global Analysis of Communal Mobilization and Conflict since 1945” and Michael D. Ward, Brian D. Greenhill and Kristin M. Bakke’s “The Perils of Policy by P-Value: Predicting Civil Conflicts” address the intricacies of intrastate conflict using quantitative methods. The scope and questions that the authors ask vary greatly. On one hand, Ted Gurr’s article is a clear example of a traditional approach for the analysis of internal conflict using statistical tools. On the other hand, Ward, Greenhill, and Bakke focus on broader issues of predictability and critique the pitfalls of using the very same statistical methods for determining the onset of conflict.

Emphasizing the state-centric focus of the previous research on conflicts, Gurr offers a new approach that focuses on the communal groups and asserts the main purpose of the research in testing “elements of a general model of the conditions under which communal groups mobilize for political action to assert and protect group interests.”\textsuperscript{72} Gurr determines a dependent variable as an extent of a protest or rebellion that communal groups perpetrate against their governments in the 1980’s, and then opens a broader discussion about defining and categorizing communal groups. The author provides a
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lengthy overview of peculiarities of ethnoclasses, ethnonationalitites, communal 
contenders, military sects and indigenous peoples, but also recognizes the theoretical 
complexity of cross-national study of such diverse actors that are broadly associated with 
the term communal groups. Through breaking down previous academic findings about 
motives behind protests and rebellions, Gurr determines the key aspects of the general 
model such as political action, grievances, and mobilization. For each of these core 
variables, the author develops a categorical codification. Furthermore, he creates 
additional indicators by adding economic, political, and demographic attributes as well as 
chronological periodization to the core variables. Not surprisingly, Gurr builds his central 
hypotheses on the effects of democracy and democratization on the severity of protest 
that a communal group will exercise:

1. Institutionalized democracy facilitates non-violent communal protest.
2. In democratizing autocracies, democratization is predicted to facilitate 
mobilization for violent communal protest and rebellion.

Gurr does not go into detail while explaining methodological instruments he used 
for analyzing the behavior of the communal groups. The author confines himself to 
determining correlations between communal protest and rebellion indicators as well as 
providing exploratory regression analysis. However, since the author developed 
categorical dependent variables for his model, binomial regressions were utilized to 
determine the relationship between the indicators. What he lacked in methodology, the 
author compensated for in extensive analysis of findings. After providing a detailed 
overview of five group models and highlighting correlation nuances, Gurr created two 
complete models of Communal Protest and Communal Rebellion in the 1980s. Statistical
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analysis of these models supports Gurr’s argument that mobilization and one of two types of grievances have a significant explanatory power in both Communal Protest and Rebellion.

Outlining methodological shortcomings in the works of Ted Gurr, a renowned pundit in the sphere of conflict studies, is rather challenging. While many gray areas such as preoccupation with large-\(n\) comparisons, complications of codification, and peculiarities of groups were pointed out by the author, one can argue that greater attention could be given to clarifying the methodological basis of research. Since the study covers the period from 1945 to 1989, it might benefit from time-series analysis. Moreover, Gurr only briefly mentions the effects of the lag variable which are clearly important since such a large chronological period was examined.

While Gurr denies the pursuit of maximizing the variance, his results depend entirely on identifying statistical significant relationships. In “The Perils of Policy by P-value: Predicting Civil Conflicts” Michael D. Ward, Brian D. Greenhill and Kristin M. Bakke argue against an indivisible focus on statistical significance, and instead offer a set of tests to analyze the predictive efficiency of the often-cited models of civil wars. For their analysis, the authors utilize results from Fearon and Laitin’s article “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War” as well as Collier and Hoeffler’s “Greed and Grievance in Civil War.”

Models of civil war occurrence developed by above-mentioned authors were used for building policy actions by the United States and the World Bank. Policy application of their findings speaks to concerns regarding the precision and dangers of self-fulfilling predictions. Ward, Greenhill, and Bakke argue that current models have to
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be diligently scrutinized with a particular focus on the statistically significant variables. The authors subject Fearon and Laitin as well as Collier and Hoeffler’s models to the test of predictability based on the dichotomous indicator (war or no war) and amount of generated false positives.

To illustrate the dependency of false and true positives in each model, the authors generated Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) plots for both models. The ROC plot describes the relationship between the conflicts that were predicted correctly to the number of false positives. Both models performed poorly as they produced almost the same amount of false negatives as positives when the threshold of statistical significance becomes lower. In the next test, the authors analyzed the predictive power of models by gradually removing the most significant variables. After excluding these indicators (GDP and Population), the authors observed that the new model with minimal predicting power outperformed previous models and inferred that “the inclusion of statistically significant variables can actually reduce our ability to make correct predictions.”75 While that analysis was performed using an existing dataset, Ward, Greenhill, and Bakke went further and introduced a cross-validation out-of-sample analysis. Using four smaller subsets of country-year observations, the authors tested each model and calculated the area under the curve (AUC) to determine predictive power. Although both models reached reasonable level of predictions, the authors notice that they didn’t suffer from overfitting.76 Yet again, new models that were less parsimonious but without statistically significant variables showed better results, rather than those where statistically significant indicator being the only covariate.
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While Ward, Greenhill, and Bakke’s study provides a substantial critique of the traditional approaches to conflict occurrence (including Gurr’s work), there are still a few drawbacks to point out. It is certainly true that the caution should be exercised when one claims that statistical significance is associated with the predictive power. At the same time, the authors do not propose a remedy for this conundrum aside from in-sample and out-of-sample validity methods. The overview of these two articles speaks to the limitations of the current empirical analysis in the sphere of intrastate conflicts. The research design of this study, which relies on the quantitative methods, addresses the issue of reliance on statistically significant variables by investigating their explanatory power through a series of case studies.

**Prospective Directions for the Debate**

The civil war debate has been developing at a steady rate since the end of the Cold War through accumulation of knowledge and contestation of ideas. With some level of confidence, it is possible to characterize this debate as mature with defined topics, methodology, and exchange of ideas. However, the maturity of the debate does not mean that it has exhausted its analytical and factual potential, but instead suggests that the theoretical boundaries as well as seminal works have being largely outlined. The availability of prior large-

.datasets, chronological and cross-country extent of internal conflicts as well as the possibility of comparative analysis add up to the prevalence of empirical methods. While such studies give policymakers concrete results, which aim at general applicability, they
sometimes fall short due to problems of data availability and methodological manipulations.

The possible solution to the overwhelming reliance on statistical significance lies in applying statistical inferences to real-life scenarios, which will reveal the nuances not captured by the “wide-angle” lens. The second possible direction of further research might be based on incorporating new unique internal conflicts in which access to global social networks, application of modern warfare, and changing mindset of third parties had a tremendous impact. For example, this area of analysis can be applied toward understanding the phenomenon of the Arab Spring and its larger impact in the Middle East. Third, potentially productive avenue for future inquiries into the nature of intrastate warfare lies in exploring cultural and religious factors, globalization and mass media. These factors start to characterize heavily the dynamics of the contemporary civil wars such as crises in Syria and Iraq, while ignoring them arguably means failing to capture the future of intrastate conflict.

Overall, the civil war debate is characterized by the fragmentation of the central phenomenon of civil war into several sub-debates that analyze particular stages of internal conflict: onset, dynamics, third party intervention, and solutions. The dynamics of the intellectual exchange of ideas was heavily influenced by critical phases: compilation of the comprehensive intrastate conflict datasets; introduction of the motivation-opportunity-(identity) framework; elaboration of the resource extraction approach; and, empirical testing of civil war solutions. The civil war field, by and large, grew by borrowing the ideas from related disciplines (sociology, economics, psychology, etc.), elaboration of the statistical techniques, and accumulation of empirical evidence.
Finally, time really matters in this debate because a couple of decades from now it will be possible to clearly distinguish between the civil wars of the Cold War period, post-Cold War, and modern (2010+) types of internal conflicts.

**Sociological Approach to Civil Wars**

Following the quantitative revolution in social sciences, a growing locus of scholarship on causes and consequences of civil war shifted toward an empirical examination of conflict. The formidable quantitative inquiries into creating the typology of wars that consequently could be utilized to establish temporal and cross-sectional trends has fundamentally altered the debate about the existence of armed violence. Even this study of the onset and termination of civil wars falls under largely a similar paradigm of applying statistical methods for observing underlying links behind the armed conflict. While statistical models become more complex, empirical tests more robust, and p-values get smaller, the focus is shifting from viewing wars in their totality towards disaggregating the armed conflict into stages and examining each in as a separate phenomenon.

Instead of making an argument against an empirical method, I advocate for the symbiotic approach between scholarship that uses large-sample-size quantitative models and sociological inquiries into contentious politics pioneered by Sidney Tarrow, Charles Tilly and Doug McAdam. The first body of literature, which I examined earlier, offers a methodological and typological background regarding the internal wars. The second paradigm that focuses on contentious politics bridges the gap between different stages of
conflict through offering an overarching framework of processes and mechanisms of contention.

Several seminal works including *Dynamics of Contention* by McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly and *Contentious Politics* by Tilly and Tarrow offer voluminous theoretical insights into the similarities between various forms of contention such as strikes, nationalism, democratization, social movements, revolutions and civil wars. In contrast to previous studies, the contentious politics paradigm generates an understanding of conflict in its totality by emphasizing the persistence of contention among agents within the society. Thus, instead of fitting the complex phenomena of social movements and civil wars within robust “artificial” limits that are quantifiable, Tarrow, McAdam, and Tilly offer the view of contention as a continuum that can fluctuate from the “contained” to “transgressive” phase. Such a theoretical framework is better equipped to highlight the importance of dynamic nature of the conflict.

According the Tarrow, McAdam and Tilly, contentious politics is an “episodic, public, collective interaction among makers of claims and their objects when (a) at least one government is a claimant, an object of claims, or a party to the claims and (b) the claims would, if realized, affect the interests of at least one of the claimants.”

Furthermore, the degree of contentious politics can vary from the contained form where “all parties to the conflict were previously established as constituted political actors” to a transgressive form where “at least some parties to the conflict are newly self-identified
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political actors” and/or “at least some parties employ innovative collective action.” In other words, politics is inherently contentious but the form of claim-making that is exercised varies from well-established “peaceful” mechanisms to innovative tactics that are “unprecedented or forbidden within the regime in question.” The majority cases of contentious politics such as social movements, civil wars or nationalism are transgressive in nature, meaning that they involve actions that exist outside the established rules of the game and that also means using violence to achieve the claims.

In the *Dynamics of Contention*, the authors outline how environmental, cognitive, and relational mechanisms and processes explain the sudden shifts in the “sustained contentious episode: a regime collapses, a guerrilla group comes to power, a set of activists shift from terror to collaboration.” In terms of the current study, the mechanisms outlined by McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly correspond to the onset factors of civil war, while the sudden shifts in contentious politics fall neatly as the termination of the intrastate conflict. While the authors identify a wide variety of mechanisms such as the depletion of resources, individual commitments to collective action, brokerage, certification or coalition formation, all of them, in principle, serve as triggers to contentious shifts that are coterminous with the termination factors proposed in this study.

The goal of the *Dynamics of Contention* is to explain how various forms of contentious politics, be it a social movement, democratization or even wars, have similar patterns of development. At the same time, Tilly and Tarrow in *Contentious Politics* suggest that in comparison to other form of contention, lethal conflicts including civil
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wars have unique characteristics. The authors posit that “the high stakes of claim making and the problem of sustaining armed force” are factors that distinguish large-scale lethal conflicts from other forms of transgressive contentious politics. Furthermore, they contend that despite these peculiar features, lethal conflicts do in fact follow similar mechanism. Here, Tilly and Tarrow warn against two common misperceptions about armed conflict: reasons behind large-scale wars lie not in the mind of perpetrators, but are complex and multifaceted; and not all large scale wars are unique, but rather follow certain general principles that can be discerned and compared.

In Contentious Politics, Tilly and Tarrow make a crucial observation about the possibility of the occurrence of lethal conflict. The primary determinant of the state’s ability to prevent the outbreak of violence rests in the character of the political regime that is reflected through the “capacity of its central government and its degree of democracy.” Tilly and Tarrow define capacity as “the extent to which governmental action affects the character and distribution of population, activity, and resources within the government’s territory.” Furthermore, they define democracy through the political rights, level of influence that citizens have over their government, and how well they can be protected against governmental agents. According to the authors, fluctuations in capacity can lead to either regime split or transfer of power: “high-capacity states reduce the threat by making it difficult for anyone to create rival concentrations of coercive means with their territories,” while the “low-capacity states more often face precisely the
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threat that some rival actor will build up a major concentration of coercive means and use it to topple the existing rulers.”

Specifically, in regards to civil wars, Tilly and Tarrow identified two broader groups depending on the regime type: “relatively high-capacity regimes, however democratic or undemocratic, containing significant zones that escape central control” and “low-capacity undemocratic regimes.” Both the theory of transgressive contentious politics as well as linkage between contentious mechanisms and sudden shifts outlined in *Dynamics of Contention* and their application toward the armed lethal conflicts in *Contentious Politics* offer a theoretical and methodological ground for an investigation of the inherent relationship between the form of the intrastate conflict onset and its termination. The goal of this research is to establish the trends within this framework and explain them from both macro level approach and by looking at individual cases.

The study of the state capacity as an element of contentious politics and by extension of intrastate conflict has its roots in the literature that investigates the impact of governance on the economic performance. In the seminal article “State Capacity and Economic Intervention in the Early New Deal,” Theda Skocpol and Kenneth Finegold have analyzed state capacity not through the prism of the ability of the government to intervene in the economic affairs of the state, but also through the efficiency of such intervention. Recent scholarship views state capacity as a necessary precondition for economic growth as it draws attention to “the authority of the state within its territory —
the capacity to maintain order and enforce the laws — and the administrative capacity to develop, fund, and carry out its policies.”

In the interdisciplinary literature on conflict and development, weak state capacity has been widely associated with the fragile state and consequently with the higher risk of civil war or international conflict. Thus, Timothy Besley and Torsten Persson analyzed state capacity in terms of the fiscal capacity to collect taxes and legal capacity to support markets. Through modeling internal conflict dynamics, the authors have suggested that “high resource dependence may jointly trigger a high propensity toward conflict, low income, and low investments in legal and fiscal capacity.”

Cameron G. Thies in the article “Of Rulers, Rebels, and Revenue: State Capacity, Civil War Onset, and Primary Commodities” using the predatory theory indirectly tests the assumptions put forth by Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow regarding the role of state capacity in the civil war onset. By assuming state capacity to be a function of its fiscal size and strength, Thies found no relationship between state capacity and the onset of civil war. At the same time, his inquiry into the role that various resources play in conflict suggested that many primary commodities, including oil, in fact enhance state capacity defined through fiscal dimensions. While administrative, bureaucratic or fiscal elements of a state capacity are obviously valid determinant of the government’s ability to intervene into economic or
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social life of the society during periods of peace, factors of military capacity and quality of political institutions can shed additional light during the period of civil conflict.98

Application of the Path Dependence Theory To the Study of Intrastate Conflicts

Civil wars are complex and multifaceted phenomena. The starting point for the analysis of intrastate conflict dynamics lies in a choice that the researcher makes regarding the nature of this type of war. The choice is simple: civil wars are unique events and should be analyzed on case-by-case basis, or civil wars are inherently similar and the goal of the researcher is to uncover those commonalities. I adhere to the second approach and suggest that not only do intrastate conflicts follow common patterns in regards to their onset and termination, but also that the fluctuations in the initial onset conditions of conflict are responsible for differences of civil war resolution. In this study, I apply the concept of path dependence in intrastate conflicts as both the theoretical construction to explain the overarching dynamics of war and the analytic tool for testing hypotheses about the onset-termination dynamics.

In addition to the initial research design that compares the instances of civil war onset and termination, an analysis of the civil war through the lens of path dependence requires establishing the common theoretical framework; application of the path dependence paradigm to the study of intrastate conflicts; and elaboration of the methods that are used to capture civil war dynamics. Although the idea of path dependence was thoroughly examined in the social science literature in the past decades, the wide variety

of notions that was generated in the recent scholarship offers competing rather than complementary definitions of the path dependence.

Characteristics of the Path Dependence

While the idea of path dependence seems rather intuitive, it is critical to examine theoretical approaches to this multifaceted concept. The most common definition of the path dependence describes it as a process in which the outcomes are dependent on the choices that were made in the earlier stages. Yet, this simplistic understanding has been gradually revised to accommodate and explain a great number of phenomena in technological, economic, and political dimensions. Path dependence as a concept found its earlier description and application in the field of economics. The seminal work by Paul A. David, which focused on the famous success story behind the QWERTY keyboard, offered a platform for the subsequent debate about the nature of path dependence. David defined this phenomena as “one of which important influences upon the eventual outcome can be exerted by temporally remote events, including happenings dominated by chance elements rather than systematic forces.”

The essential quality of path dependence that he emphasized was its non-ergodicity as “stochastic processes like that do not converge automatically to a fixed-point distribution of outcomes.” Although the notion of ergodicity has a wide
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application in the fields of mathematics, physics, and probability theory, in this study I adhere to the economic application of this concept. In simple terms, an ergodic system is one not susceptible to frequent changes meaning that the same theories can be applied repeatedly overtime to explain it. The idea of non-ergodicity was further developed by Paul A. David in the paper “Path Dependence, Its Critics and the Quest for ‘Historical Economics’.” Through the elaboration of path-independent processes whose dynamics “guarantee convergence to a unique, globally stable equilibrium configuration” and through defining ergodic stochastic systems as those where “there exists an invariant (stationary) asymptotic probability distribution that is continuous over the entire feasible space of outcomes – that is, a limiting distribution that is continuous over all the states that are compatible with the energy of the system,” David concludes that the non-ergodic processes are characterized by the inability to “shake free of their history, are said to yield path dependent outcomes.” Thus, his particular interest with dominance of QWERTY over other more efficient types of keyboards emerged from the hypothesis about the degree to which “history matters” in the economic analytical framework.

One of the earliest applications of the idea of path dependence in the sphere of political science revolved around the processes of development. According to Kevin Morgan, the seminal works of Albert Otto Hirschman The Strategy of Economic Development and Karl Gunnar Myrdal Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions ignited the interest in the notion of path dependence and “cumulative causation as the key
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self-reinforcement mechanism.”

While also not directly using the term of path dependence, Timur Kuran elaborates on the reasons behind the spontaneous onset of the revolutions in Eastern Europe in the late eighties and alludes to the power of the initial conditions. He builds up on the structuralist approaches to revolutions proposed by Theda Skocpol by emphasizing the distribution of thresholds and shifts in the public and private preferences of citizens. Kuran’s theory that focuses on revolutionary bandwagoning emphasizes the duality of an individual that is “powerless because a revolution requires the mobilization of large number” and, at the same time, “very powerful because under the right circumstances he may set off a chain reaction that generates the necessary mobilization.”

Despite the fact that the idea of historical causality has been used by the students of politics for millennia and the elaboration of exactly how and why history matters occupied the minds of the prominent thinkers of old and new, it was still an economic approach to path dependence that shed new light on the power of cause and effect.

\textit{Two Notions of Path Dependence}

The majority of recent scholarship on path dependence refers to Paul Pierson’s article “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics” as the bridge
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from economic foundations to political applications of this phenomenon. While noting that earlier works in sociology did mention the importance of temporal factors, sequence or small-scale events, Pierson contends the overwhelming assumption in the field was that macro outcomes result from macro reasons.\textsuperscript{110} To investigate the application of path dependence in the social science, he elaborated on its main premise of increasing returns.

According to Pierson, the idea of increasing returns can be applied in two ways:

First, they pinpoint how the costs of switching from one alternative to another will, in certain social contexts, increase markedly over time. Second, and related, they draw attention to issues of timing and sequence, distinguishing formative moments or conjunctures from the periods that reinforce divergent paths. In an increasing returns process, it is not only a question of what happens but also of when it happens.\textsuperscript{111}

Pierson sees a wide applicability of path dependence in politics in terms of study of power asymmetries, collective action, and institutions. Yet, the traditional definition of path dependence as the impact of prior events on later outcomes seems to be limited in explaining the abovementioned instances. He argues that it is important not only to outline the path, but also to understand why things occurred in a particular manner.

Building up on Margaret Levi’s elaboration of path dependence as a process in which the reversal from a particular course is costly (the notion of switching costs), Pierson suggests that the notion of increasing returns can also be analyzed as “self-reinforcing or positive feedback processes.”\textsuperscript{112} Reflecting on existing approaches to path dependence, he outlines a broader definition that highlights “causal relevance of preceding stages in a
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temporal sequence” and a narrow definition emphasizing “social processes that exhibit increasing returns.”

In his seminal article, alongside providing a definitional foundation, Pierson outlined conditions that are specifically relevant for path dependence processes in politics. Thus, under the narrower definition that stresses the factor of increasing returns, path dependence is characterized by multiple equilibria of the outcomes; contingency or the impact of small events that occur at the right moment; the critical role of timing and sequence; and inertia or resistance to deviate from the path. Adopting the analytical framework of path dependence implies the need for reassessment of the established approaches to understanding the political processes, be it institutional development or inquiries into asymmetries of power.

In regards to the problem statement outlined in this study, it is imperative to analyze the applicability of the path dependence paradigm in analyzing the onset-termination dynamics of intrastate conflict. According to Pierson, the key implication of path dependence for political science is the “need to focus on branching points and on specific factors that reinforce the paths established in these points.” Hereafter, I propose a theoretical framework that extends Pierson’s argument into the study of the intrastate conflicts. Table 1 below provides an overview of the path dependence framework developed in this study.
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Table 1. Comprehensive Research Design Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design A</th>
<th>Research Design B</th>
<th>Research Design C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial conditions</td>
<td>Quantitative large-(n)</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipping points</td>
<td>Quantitative large-(n)</td>
<td>Comparative qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The central point of inquiry in this study is the analysis of the relationship between the onset and termination of intrastate conflicts. Specifically, I hypothesize that the outcome of civil war, be it a victory of the government, compromise or success of the rebels, is intrinsically related to the factors which are commonly understood to have caused a particular intrastate conflict. Although it is possible to test empirically the correlation between the onset and termination variables (what I will label Research Design A), this approach, while satisfying the requirements for the broad definition of path dependence, tells very little about the dynamics of the process and the mechanisms involved.

To investigate and explain fluctuations in civil war outcomes through the lens of civil war onset factors, it is imperative to treat an intrastate conflict as a path dependent process. Here, I borrow the narrow definition that was elaborated by Paul Pierson where increasing returns serve as a key determinant of the path dependence. Furthermore, I investigate the effect of branching points or tipping factors that are responsible for preventing the deviation from a particular course of action or in our case, civil war outcome (what I call Research Design B). This approach is also consistent with the
theoretical framework of contentious politics that I use to justify the importance of the comprehensive approach toward analyzing intrastate conflicts. Both Pierson in article “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics” and Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow in *Dynamics of Contention* have highlighted the importance of tipping factors or sudden shifts in understanding the dynamics of political processes.\(^\text{116}\)

*Path Dependence and Intrastate Conflicts*

Both approaches to understanding path dependent processes that are outlined in this chapter are self-sufficient in their own right. The initial research design that offers a large-\(n\) study of intrastate conflicts following the end of the World War II stresses the possibility of inherent correlation between onset and termination factors. It also treats the null hypothesis regarding the absence of such interrelation with equal attention, since the finding of no relationship between causes of civil wars and the ways they are solved can contribute to the critical debate about modern peacemaking efforts. An absence of path dependence will not only provide a better understanding about the nature of intrastate wars but also devise viable approaches toward mitigating the most prolific type of violent conflict. If the analysis finds no reasonable signs of path dependence in intrastate conflict, it would be valid to assume the uniqueness of each particular civil war and the need for an in-depth country-specific inquiry into nature of internal conflict. On the other hand, if the large-\(n\) analysis provides sufficient data to validate the claim of path

dependence in intrastate conflict, this alone will be enough to investigate further the possibility of the correlation/causation conundrum through proceeding to what I will label Research Design C that focuses on case studies.

In a sense, the comparison of the onset and termination of intrastate conflicts that I propose in Research Design A follows the logic of the broad definition of path dependence that Paul Pierson summarized as “causal relevance of preceding stages in a temporal sequence.”¹¹⁷ The observation of correlation or lack of thereof between the starting conditions and outcomes in internal warfare would satisfy the requirement for the broad definition of path dependence. Detecting path dependence in intrastate conflicts for the selected period of time would be substantial in itself not only because of the novelty of the methodological approach, but equally because of the research and policy implications. While contemporary scholarship has entertained the idea of path dependence in intrastate conflicts, it largely avoids the analysis of the broader definition of path dependence, instead attempting to evaluate the bargaining mechanisms rather than testing the overarching assumption.¹¹⁸

The broad definition of path dependence also allows for testing the presence of path dependence in intrastate conflict only through juxtaposing the onset and termination elements without justification for the possible intervening variables that could impact the course of the civil war. While it is possible that exogenous or endogenous forces can affect the outcome of the intrastate conflict, the requirement for observing path

dependence in the broad context is satisfied with the presence of at least two stages of the process. Since this will be the first attempt at testing path dependence in intrastate conflicts, it is not required to extend the process stages beyond the onset and outcome conditions. Upon the initial testing purported in the Research Design A, I proceed with elaborating the factors that could trigger changes in the outcome following the start of civil war.

In Research Design B, the broad definition of path dependence is narrowed down to explain the dynamics behind the process through the introduction of factors that could account for the phenomena of increasing returns and switching costs. Both in the contentious politics and economics scholarship, these factors were suggested to be the tipping points or branching points respectively.\(^\text{119}\) The observation of path dependence in civil wars in a broader sense postulating “that what has happened at an earlier point in time will affect the possible outcomes of a sequence of events occurring at a later point in time” is crucial on its own.\(^\text{120}\) Yet, actually tracing mechanisms that could account for heightening the switching costs and increasing returns by testing the hypothesis of the tipping points will provide more fruitful research agenda and policy implications.

While attempts have been made to transfer and adapt the logic of path dependent processes from the economic sphere to the political realm by outlining not only the mechanisms, but also characteristics of such processes, little attention was given to the


areas outside of power asymmetries, collective action, and institutions.\textsuperscript{121} Hereafter, I theorize about the applicability of W. Brian Arthur’s features of increasing returns and Paul Pierson’s review of path dependence characteristics of political process to the study of war in general and intrastate conflict in particular.

In the seminal work \textit{Increasing Returns and Path Dependence in the Economy}, which Paul Pierson utilized to extrapolate the logic of path dependence into political sphere, renowned economist W. Brian Arthur outlined four features that describe the self-reinforcing mechanisms.\textsuperscript{122} These are multiple equilibria or unpredictability of the outcomes; possible inefficiency of the outcome; lock-in or inflexibility of the outcomes once the increasing returns are in play; and, path dependence or non-ergodic dynamics. While such self-enforcing or autocatalytic systems are observed in physics, chemistry, and biology, Arthur’s primary purpose was to search for such processes in the field of economics. Many scholars including Arthur turned to the dominance of certain technologies such as QWERTY or VHS as the most evident systems that exhibit increasing returns. Can intrastate wars exhibit the path dependence dynamics? While this question will be elaborated in subsequent chapters through a series of statistical tests, it is equally important to analyze internal warfare through the four features that Arthur suggested in the abovementioned work.

As I have mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the nature internal conflict is still debated. The primary concern is whether we should treat each case of civil war as a unique phenomenon or suggest that there are similar patterns in civil war dynamics that

can be observed across temporal and spatial dimensions. I adhere to the second postulate and argue that we can uncover similarities throughout various instances of internal warfare. Whereas the recent scholarship on intrastate conflicts has been largely successful at "discovering" inherent tendencies in the civil wars’ onset, dynamics, and termination, the claims regarding the possibility of predicting the outcome of war have not entered in the mainstream literature.

The second aspect of self-enforcing systems, the inefficiency of the outcome, stems from the assumption that war in itself is the suboptimal result that is more costly than peace. Following James Fearon’s seminal hypothesis about war as a failure of the bargaining process, it is valid to assume that in intrastate conflicts the outcome is oftentimes inefficient.\(^{123}\) The third feature, lock-in or inflexibility of switching to alternative outcomes, can also characterize intrastate conflicts. Later in the chapter, I elaborate the lock-in feature through outlining exogenous or endogenous tipping points in the course of civil war. Finally, by juxtaposing the onset factors with the various outcome of intrastate conflict as I do in Research Design A, it is valid to assume that civil wars are non-ergodic systems where the differences in the earlier conditions influence the later stages. All four features that Arthur outlined for self-reinforcing systems (path dependent processes) in the field of economics can be applied to study of intrastate conflicts.

If we agree with Carl von Clausewitz that war is simply a continuation of politics by other means, than perhaps we can also elaborate on the applicability of Paul Pierson’s characterization of path dependence processes in politics to the study of intrastate

conflicts. According to Pierson, path dependence in the narrower definition that stresses increasing returns in social processes is characterized by the multiple equilibria; contingency; a critical role for timing and sequencing; and inertia.124 Both Pierson and Arthur consider multiple equilibria or unpredictability of the outcome as the inherent feature of the path dependence. Indeed, in economic, political, and war dimensions it is increasingly complicated to predict correctly the outcome of the process. Pierson’s second characteristic, contingency or “relatively small events, if they occur at the right moment, can have large and enduring consequences,” can, although selectively, be applied to the study of intrastate conflicts.125 The power of small events – like the self-immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi in 2010 that arguably sparked revolution in Tunisia or use of social media by activists to initiate revolution in Egypt the same year – has given rise to assumptions that small scale events could cause large-scale consequences. Yet, the countless incidences of similar actions like for example self-immolation by Tibetan protestors against Chinese rule did not led to the outbreak of civil war. These contrasting results highlight the third aspect of path dependence in political sphere, the critical role of timing and sequencing. Finally, Pierson’s feature of inertia that is consistent with Arthur’s lock-in characteristic can be found across the variety of intrastate wars. I argue that internal and external forces create a positive feedback and establish conditions under which switching to alternative outcomes is unlikely. I elaborate this assumption reflected in the Research Design B in the subsequent parts of this dissertation.

124 Ibid, 263.
Tipping Points in Intrastate Conflicts

Four sub-debates in the field of intrastate conflicts that I outlined earlier in this chapter share the reductive approach. They generated valuable insights into the nature of war, yet rarely communicated between each other. Introduction of the path dependence theory offers a dialogue that connects different stages of conflict. Although theoretically there can be a multitude of factors that could and do intervene in the course of civil war, modern scholarship on intrastate conflict stresses the significance of certain internal and external determinants. Below, I outline several of these factors or tipping points that alter the flow of intrastate conflict. These factors can be grouped into two large categories. The first group is characterized by the presence of exogenous forces in the conflict such as the involvement of the United Nations as a global collective security institution; military peacemaking intervention by the regional intergovernmental organization; and, state-led third party intervention on the behalf of either rebels or the government.

Table 2. Exogenous Tipping Points and Civil War Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Tipping Point</th>
<th>Civil War outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>Rebels win</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 2, I summarize my expectations about the correlation between different exogenous tipping points and civil war outcomes. I argue that the presence of
United Nations forces in an intrastate conflict would be more conducive to a compromise outcome since the primary task of the peacekeeping missions is to prevent hostilities from warring sides and encouragement of a compromise rather than siding with either government or rebel counterpart. While UN peacekeeping activities are aimed at mediation and provision of avenues for peace dialogue, it is important to outline several caveats that could explain this peculiar outcome of internal conflict.

The idea of peacekeeping was not originally integrated in the Charter of the United Nations, but rather appeared as a response to the changing dynamics of conflict on a global scale. Although civil wars and domestic unrest occasionally erupted, they were disproportionately less numerous than conflicts between nation-states. The pivotal change in the global conflict environment occurred in the second half of the twentieth century following the devastation of the Second World War, as the number of intrastate conflicts superseded the incidence of wars between the states.126

Despite the global ideological confrontation and de jure absence of provisions regarding peacekeeping, the United Nations were able to initiate lightly armed observer missions in the late 1940s with the aim of monitoring ceasefires and providing buffer zones between combatants. These were the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and the Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, which still maintain their presence in the Middle East and Jammu and Kashmir areas respectively.127 After mediating the Suez Crisis, peacekeepers started to be distinguished by the blue berets and

helmets symbolizing neutrality. Gradually, the idea of preventive diplomacy was incorporated in peacekeeping rhetoric. But it was not until the end of the Cold War that peacekeeping was able to unleash its true potential.

From 1989 onward, the number of peacekeeping operations and personnel significantly increased and the thinking behind these missions’ tactical and strategic purpose evolved. The traditional functions of peacekeeping such as monitoring ceasefires have been expanded “from helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, to human rights monitoring, to security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants.” The shift toward more humanitarian dimensions also required new types of actors such as police and civilian personnel, in addition to the military forces that still remain essential for security purposes.

In 2000, the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council conducted a series of high-level discussions on the future of peacekeeping called the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations. The final document prepared by a group chaired by Lakhdar Brahimi outlined the current state of peacekeeping’s major drawbacks and avenues for improvement. The Brahimi Report pointed out three strategic activities of the UN in the sphere of peace operations: conflict prevention and peacemaking; peacekeeping; and, peacebuilding. The first step, conflict prevention and peacemaking, aims at addressing the structural sources of conflict and, if the conflict has erupted, providing mediation and diplomatic solutions. The second step, peacekeeping, has evolved from the traditional
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role of being a barrier between warring sides into a complex operation with the participation of civilian counterparts. Finally, it describes peacebuilding as a process of creating space for peace to thrive, which consists of “reintegrating former combatants into civilian society, strengthening the rule of law … ; improving respect for human rights through the monitoring, education and investigation of past and existing abuses; providing technical assistance for democratic development … ; and promoting conflict resolution and reconciliation techniques.”

The transformation of UN peacekeepers from being merely buffer zones between two warring states to engaging actively in the internal conflict on behalf of one of the parties is a substantial factor for the objective analysis of the UN interventions as a tipping factor and is duly acknowledged in the present inquiry. While the role of UN forces as a tipping factor in intrastate conflicts tends to favor compromise-oriented solutions, the involvement of the regional intergovernmental organizations and its impact on the war outcome appears to be less straightforward. Regional intergovernmental organizations that intervene in intrastate conflicts vary significantly in terms of political, economic and military capacity to fulfill the mission; internal cohesion; and legitimacy in the country of involvement. Moreover, the majority of organizations that are actively intervening in intrastate conflicts were either formed following the end of the Cold War or relieved of the bipolar global gridlock that prevented them from an active engagement. Despite these differences, intergovernmental organizations such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, the African Union or the League of Arab States tend to intervene following the resolution from the United Nations and, therefore, abide to the same

\(^{131}\) Ibid.
principles of halting the hostilities and securing peaceful solutions. Thus, it is possible to make a tentative hypothesis that the involvement of regional intergovernmental organizations is also conducive to a compromise solution. At the same time, the results of the tests could suggest the discrepancies of the outcomes due to the factors that have been discussed earlier.

The role of third party interventions in the course of an intrastate conflict has been extensively examined in the scholarship on civil wars. The central focus in this subfield was generally on the duration of civil war or duration of peace after the civil war in case of third party interventions. Other areas of interest included the role of contagion in the decision of states or international organizations to intervene or decision-making of a third party based on the expectations of civil war outcome.

A particularly interesting work for the current analysis of path dependence was Clayton L. Thyne’s study *How International Relations Affect Civil Conflict: Cheap Signals, Costly Consequences* in which he focused on the role of signals that states sent to the parties of intrastate conflict in terms of onset, duration and outcome. His comprehensive analysis suggested that the outcome of the civil war is “closely linked to expectations developed prior to the onset of rebellion.” Although Thyne bases his analysis on the bargaining theory of war to substantiate the role of signals that a third

---


party sends and claims that all stages on internal conflict are interrelated, his analysis
does not make a direct claim about the existence of path dependence through increasing
returns and switching costs in civil wars. Thyne’s findings suggest that external actors’
supportive or hostile actions toward the government do, in fact, influence the outcome of
the conflict. Therefore, despite certain difference in the research design, Thyne’s
conclusion could be contrasted with results of the present inquiry about the role of the
exogenous tipping points in the civil war outcomes.

Table 3. Endogenous Tipping Points and Civil War Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous Tipping Point</th>
<th>Civil War outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High military capacity</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low military capacity</td>
<td>Rebels win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic regime</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic regime</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second group of tipping factors that is introduced into the models of intrastate
conflict to test path dependence dynamics delves into the structural characteristics of civil
wars (Table 3). The fluctuations in the parameters of these endogenous features could
alter the course of the internal conflict through creating the environment in which
switching toward the alternative outcome will be too costly. In a sense, endogenous
factors are aimed at capturing the internal dynamics of civil war that exist outside of
direct influence by either government or rebel forces. The two types of endogenous
tipping points introduced in the present inquiry are the size of the government’s military
forces and fluctuations in the regime type.
Both endogenous tipping factors were identified by Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow as determinants of the government’s ability to prevent the outbreak of conflict.\textsuperscript{134} According to the authors, government capacity and the level of democracy shape the effectiveness of regimes in the contentious politics. Their definition of state capacity as the “extent to which governmental action affects the character and distribution of population, activity, and resources with the government’s territory” effectively captures all aspects of regime’s control during the non-war period.\textsuperscript{135} While focusing on tax extractive and bureaucratic features of a regime might be useful in analyzing the onset conditions for civil wars, understanding the dynamics of the armed conflict period requires focusing the attention on the military capabilities of a state.

The capacity of the political regimes to crack down on rebels is an abstract notion that could encompass several determinants. The first indicator of a government’s strength is the availability of offensive military capabilities that can be construed in terms of armed forces size, its resolve, and training. Here, I focus on the military capacity defined through the number of military personnel available to the government to topple the rebellion. The logic of correlation between the size of the army and the onset, duration and termination of an intrastate conflict has been extensively examined in the scholarly literature.\textsuperscript{136} While not necessarily an effective predictor of the onset of civil war as are other military proxies such as the GDP per capita or military expenditures, military personnel per capita can provide better insights into the termination dynamics of

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid, 55.
Another indicator of regime effectiveness in contentious periods is the level of democracy, which could be captured through the POLITY IV indicators. Tilly and Tarrow define democracy as the “extent to which people subject to a given government’s authority have broad, equal political rights, exert significant influence (e.g., through competitive elections and referenda) over government personnel and policy, as well as receive protection from arbitrary action by governmental agents such as police, judges, and public.” In a sense, the form of government whether it is more democratic or authoritarian could inform the outcome of the internal conflict by pointing at the options that the government has in combating the rebels. The ability of an authoritarian government to exercise military force on rebels without repercussions to its own political survivability would allow them to avoid pressures from their own population and therefore would have the ability to rally more resources to topple the rebellion. At the same time, the government that is neither authoritarian nor democratic does not have an advantage of rallying resources and is more likely to fail in combating rebel forces. It is harder to hypothesize about possible outcomes of civil war in democratic regimes since by definition the inclusive politics and influence over government’s actions should prevent the civil wars from occurring in the first place. Nevertheless, if intrastate conflict does occur and the regime maintains enough political features to be considered democratic, it is valid to assume that the existing mechanisms and institutions would enable rebels and the government to address the grievances peacefully and deliver a compromise outcome.

137 Ibid, 283.
Conclusion

The existing scholarship on civil wars dates back to the accounts of conflict within states in the ancient world. The development of perspectives on the causes and consequences of intrastate conflicts is associated with the historic milestones such as the end of the Second World War, nuclear stalemate, and the fall of the Soviet Union. Current debates in the sphere of internal armed violence revolve around four distinct areas: onset of war, conflict dynamics, third party interventions, and conflict outcomes. Furthermore, the study of intrastate conflicts has burgeoned in the recent years through focusing on interdisciplinary approaches that involved sociology and formal modeling. While certain methodological limitations imply the use of caution when devising policy implications for predicting the dynamics of civil wars, the burgeoning of the discipline not only highlights the relevance of understanding the nature of the most abundant form of armed violence, but also indicates the potential for innovative approaches to the study of intrastate conflicts.

The justification proposed in this chapter regarding the intervening factors that influence the course of the civil war and fixate certain outcomes are not exhaustive, but primarily serve as a logical exercise to propose testable hypotheses. Thus, I theorize that these tipping points when introduced by the external actor into the intrastate conflict (exogenous group) or are triggered by the internal factors (endogenous group) lead to unique civil war outcomes by increasing returns for a particular path and consequently elevating costs of switching to an alternative course of action. In chapter 6, I proceed with devising and testing models of path dependence in intrastate conflicts based on these
exogenous and endogenous factors. Thus, I transform theoretical justifications regarding the impact of tipping factors proposed above into quantifiable parameters.

Rather than filling a missing niche in the existing literature on intrastate conflicts, this study generates a novel argument about whether or not history matters in civil wars through juxtaposing the onset and termination elements. Furthermore, the current approach encompasses the sociological perspectives of Tilly, Tarrow and McAdam about the turning points in contentious politics and the theory of path dependence that was primarily elaborated through the inquiries in the field of economics.

The following chapter elaborates on three research frameworks introduced here and describes methodological tools that are used for each section. Furthermore, I provide information about two datasets that I have created to test the hypotheses of the Research Design A and B. Finally, I outline independent, dependent, and control variables and explain techniques I used to address the problem of missing values.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES

Identifying Intrastate Conflicts

The notion of war has entered the lexicon as violence became a norm in solving disputes between tribes, cities, and nations at the dawn of our civilization. It is certainly true that we have some general understanding of the term, but for the purpose of this dissertation I outline the definition of war and then highlight the difference between intrastate conflicts and other types of warfare. While trivial and pervasive, the notion of war can be boiled down to the intrinsic elements that define it. Yet, it is the details that allow us to distinguish war from other forms of violence. According to Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, war can be defined as:

a. A state of usually open and declared armed hostile conflict between states or nations;

b. A period of such armed conflict.¹

This explanation, despite being rather vague, points to the traditional misconception that the right to wage wars primarily belongs to states and nations. Possibly a tribute to our past when interstate war was indeed one of the ways to solve disputes between nations, war nevertheless has evolved beyond the domain of states and nations. In fact, after the World War II the number of wars between countries has slowly decreased, while the incidence of armed conflict within states has been on a steady rise.

Following the quantitative revolution in the social sciences the primary approach in academia toward understanding the phenomenon of war lies in outlining a definition that will distinguish it from other types of conflicts. The fathers of quantitative revolution and founders of an influential Correlates of War project, Melvin Singer and David Small, have suggested defining war through the prism of violence. Thus, they contended that “not only is war impossible without violence (except of course in the metaphorical sense), but we consider the taking of human life the primary and dominant characteristic of war.”

Indeed, the focus on violence and specifically on the numerical component that Singer and Small encapsulated in the number of battle-related deaths gives us an abstract distinction between various types of violence.

If the primary focus in understanding war is violence captured in terms of war casualties, then what are the distinctions that make civil wars different from other forms of conflict? In order to operationalize the civil war, one must reflect on the intrinsic dynamics of this particular type of conflict. A wide variety of projects and academic inquiries have emerged in the last fifty years attempting to define civil war in terms of quantifiable variables. While it was obvious that for intrastate wars the central confrontation would occur between the actors within the national border, a boundary between the numbers of casualties that would distinguish civil war from civil conflict became a central point of a disagreement.

Three seminal projects have advanced our understanding about the character and mechanisms of the civil war: the Correlates of War project; “Greed and Grievance in Civil War” by Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler; and the Uppsala Conflict Data Program.

---

(UCDP) Armed Conflict Dataset. The war typology that the Correlates of War project offers has been constantly evolving to reflect the difference in the character of diverse forms of violent conflict. Thus, the initial distinction of international wars and civil wars that was proposed by Melvin Small and David Singer has been since updated to differentiate interstate, extra-systemic, colonial, intercommunal and other types of wars.³ Meredith Reid Sarkees in the guide to the fourth version of the Correlates of War project dataset “The COW Typology of War: Defining and Categorizing Wars (Version 4 of the Data)” has suggested the following definition of civil wars:

The classification of civil war was built on three dimensions: internality, types of participants, and the degree of effective resistance. In general, a civil war was defined as any armed conflict that involved; (1) military action internal to the metropole of the state system member; (2) the active participation of the national government; (3) effective resistance by both sides; and (4) a total of at least 1,000 battle-deaths during each year of the war.⁴

An important revision to the Correlates of War definition was made by Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler who accepted the 1,000 deaths threshold for an internal conflict, but also suggested that “in order to distinguish wars from massacres, both government forces and an identifiable rebel organization must suffer at least 5% of these casualties.”⁵ The critics of the Correlates of War project arbitrary benchmark of 1,000 deaths argued that it does not adequately reflect the dynamics of the modern internal conflict. Consequently, researchers at Uppsala Conflict Data Program suggested that the civil war must be defined as “a contested incompatibility that concerns government or territory or both, where the use of force between two parties results in at least 25 battle-

⁴ Ibid, 5.
related deaths in a single calendar-year. In addition, if the government does not participate as an actor in the internal conflict it cannot technically be considered a civil war. In my study, I adhere to the definition developed by the Correlates of War project and construct a new dataset that tests path dependence in intrastate conflicts based on the observations and outcomes of civil wars from the COW Project’s database.

**Methodology**

The primary goal of my research is to identify the patterns in the onset and termination dynamics of the civil wars. As stated earlier, the existing literature has focused extensively on each stage of the intrastate conflict, but has not inquired into the phenomenon in all its totality. Therefore, it is imperative to conduct a cross-sectional evaluation of these tendencies or lack thereof regarding the civil wars that have been recorded and systematized.

The analytical framework of this dissertation relies on the mixed methods research paradigm. The initial inquiry into the correlation between the onset factors and civil war settlement options are conducted through several empirical tests. The subsequent elaboration of civil war dynamics introduces the exogenous and endogenous tipping points to substantiate the narrow definition of path dependence. This step requires empirical refinements of the original hypotheses by including the intervening variables that control for temporal and sequential assumptions of path dependence. Finally, I propose a series of case studies that examine the explanatory power of the empirical

---

6 Ibid, 249.
findings regarding path dependence in intrastate conflicts. In sum, the proposed research design follows the logic of mixed methods.

While I designate three separate research approaches, I do not suggest that they are sequential, such that I need to test the hypotheses of Research Design A to get to B and, finally, to C. Instead, I consider all three frameworks to apply simultaneously to the central point of inquiry about path dependence in intrastate conflicts. Therefore, the logic of the mixed methods approach is to test a theory from different angles where each research design has a specific role in analyzing the wider picture of civil war dynamics.

As Poteete, Janssen, and Ostrom in *Working Together: Collective Action, the Commons, and Multiple Methods in Practice* suggest, “case studies and small-N comparative research designs offer advantages for concept and theory development as well as evaluation of hypothesized causal sequences and mechanisms.” Since the core aspect of this dissertation is to develop and test a theory about the path dependence dynamics in intrastate conflict, methodological pluralism is required to investigate macro level hypotheses and delve into nuances through micro-level case studies.

In order to determine the overarching patterns between the start and end of civil wars and influence of endogenous and exogenous tipping points, two comprehensive datasets, Onset-Termination of Intrastate Conflicts (OTIC) and Tipping Points in Intrastate Conflicts (TPIC), are introduced here that incorporate data from the Correlates of War (COW) project Dataset of Intra-State Wars v. 4.1 and the Dataset of National Material Capabilities v. 4.0; James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin’s dataset for the article “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War”; the POLITY IV Project Dataset; Nathan Black’s
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contagion dataset from “When Have Violent Civil Conflicts Spread? Introducing a Dataset of Substate Conflict Contagion”; the Diamond Dataset (DIADATA) by Elisabeth Gilmore, Päivi Lujala, Nils Petter Gleditsch & Jan Ketil Rød; Third Party Peacekeeping Missions, 1946-2012 (Version 3.0); and, the World Development Indicators dataset.\(^8\)

The current OTIC database consists of 127 cases of civil war that encompass immediate post-World War II period and span until the most recent episodes of an intrastate conflict that were codified in Correlates of War project.

A series of multinomial logistic regressions are utilized to test the hypotheses regarding the dynamics of the termination and the onset of civil wars. Specifically, multinomial logistic regressions are applied to test the relationship between civil war outcomes and onset factors for Research Design A. The analysis of the impact of tipping factors in Research Design B involves the investigation of the temporal dimensions of conflict. To analyze the impact of the internal and external factors that could lock in the particular outcome of the conflict, I introduce a survival analysis framework. In particular, I investigate the competing risks assumptions regarding the interaction between multiple outcomes of civil wars and explanatory variables using the Cox proportional hazards model and the Fine and Gray method for competing risks model.

---

The analysis of the three cases outlined in the Research Design C requires a qualitative approach with the focus on application and elaboration of path dependence in specific instances of intrastate conflict.

**Research Design A**

Given the broad definition of path dependence, the outcome of the civil war, whether it is the victory for government, compromise or victory of rebel forces, is dependent upon the factors that are considered to be behind the onset of the intrastate conflicts. The model that tests this argument encapsulates various types of the onset determinants such as the presence of lootable resources (secondary diamonds); an oil exporting economy; religious and ethnic fractionalization; possibilities of civil war spreading to other countries (contagion); and, a dummy variable for the period during and after the Cold War. The following hypotheses encapsulate the proposed interactions between onset conditions and civil war outcomes.

**Hypothesis #1.** Civil wars in countries with the presence of the lootable resources (secondary diamonds) are more likely to end up in the victory of rebels. Conflict or bloody diamonds are commonly known factors in sparking armed confrontations in various regions of the world. In an article “A Diamond Curse? Civil War and a Lootable Resource,” Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore argued about the influence of secondary diamonds on instigating ethnic intrastate conflict. Thus, it is imperative to examine if diamonds continue to have an important role after the initiation of the hostilities.

---

Hypothesis #2. Civil wars that occurred in countries with an oil-exporting economy are more likely to end up with victory by the government. There is a formidable body of literature that connects oil with intrastate conflicts. In their seminal article, Fearon and Laitin have observed the effect that oil has on the outbreak of civil war.\(^{10}\) Given these dynamics it is valid to assume that this lootable resource will also be pivotal in shaping the outcomes of civil conflicts.

Hypothesis #3. Civil wars in countries that were affected by the conflict contagion are more likely to end up with rebels’ victory. By and large, previous analysis of the geography of conflict suggests that when a civil war erupts, neighboring states are likely to be affected by the spillover of the hostilities. Moreover, a country does not need to be located in the close proximity of an intrastate conflict to be affected by the armed violence. In the modern age, indirect financial and military contribution to spark the conflict can be provided by states and non-state groups located in different regions and even continents. Specifically, these tendencies apply to ideological or religiously motivated spillover of conflict. Here, I aim at evaluating whether or not these indirect causal contributions influence resolutions of civil wars.

Hypothesis #4. Civil wars in countries that are characterized by religious homogeneity are more likely to result in government’s victory. Alternatively, if civil wars occur in countries that are characterized by religious heterogeneity, they are more likely to result in rebel’s victory.

Hypothesis #5. Civil wars in countries that are characterized by ethnic homogeneity are more likely to result in government’s victory. Alternatively, if civil wars
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occur in countries that are characterized by ethnic heterogeneity, they are more likely to result in rebels’ victory. Ethnic and religious tensions are traditionally identified as the culprits for internal violence. Yet, quantitative studies found little support for ethno-religious causes of intrastate conflict onset. Case studies analysis, however, proved to be more fruitful in understanding the dynamics of war in ethnically and religiously diverse societies. My analysis aims at empirically testing the impact of these factors on the ways civil wars are resolved. To clarify a theoretical design of this section, table 4 provides a summary of the main hypotheses, dependent, independent, and control variables.

Table 4. Research Design A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #1</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil wars in countries with the presence of lootable resources (secondary diamonds) are more likely to end up in the <strong>victory of rebels</strong>.</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Secondary Diamonds</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #2</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil wars that occurred in countries with the oil-exporting economy are more likely to end up with the <strong>government victory</strong>.</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Oil Exporting Economy</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #3</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil wars in countries that were affected by the conflict contagion are more likely to end up with <strong>rebels’ victory</strong>.</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #4</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil wars in countries that are characterized by religious homogeneity are more likely to result in <strong>government’s victory</strong>. Alternatively, if civil wars occur in countries that are characterized by religious heterogeneity, they are more likely to result in <strong>rebel's victory</strong>.</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis #5</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil wars in countries that are characterized by ethnic homogeneity are more likely to result in <strong>government’s victory</strong>. Alternatively, if civil wars occur in countries that are characterized by ethnic heterogeneity, they are more likely to result in <strong>rebel's victory</strong>.</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Ethnic Fractionalization</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the history of civil wars, the international community had occasionally to intervene in order to prevent the continuation of violence. While the official reasons behind the involvement of the United Nations peacekeepers such as preventing humanitarian disaster or separation of warring sides is widely known and openly stated, it is imperative to trace whether or not the intervention of the UN is correlated with one of the three intrastate conflict outcomes. Aside from the involvement of the UN that is oftentimes paralyzed by the power play of the permanent members at the Security Council, insufficient resources or the will to intervene in civil wars, regional intergovernmental organizations are becoming a decisive factor in shifting the odds of the internal conflict. Since interventions by United Nations (H6) or the regional organizations (H7) that require the mandate from the Security Council are geared toward mitigating the conflict rather than assisting one of the interested parties, the pursuit of compromise appears to be the most logical outcome.

Unlike the global and regional intergovernmental organizations, states or state-led coalitions can interfere in the course of the civil war with or without the UN approval and do not necessarily pursue a peaceful solution. I expect to observe a higher probability of government victory given that the third party state supports government forces (H8). In contrast, if the state intervention supports rebels, I expect the rebellion to succeed (H9). The table below summarizes the abovementioned hypotheses.
Table 5. Research Design B Exogenous Tipping Points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Tipping Point</th>
<th>Civil War outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>Rebels win</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In *Contentious Politics*, Tilly and Tarrow make an intriguing observation about the possible reasons behind the occurrence of lethal conflicts. Thus, the primary determinant of the state’s ability to prevent the outbreak of violence rests in a character of political regime that is reflected through the “capacity of its central government and its degree of democracy.”\(^\text{12}\) According to the authors, fluctuations in this capacity can lead to either regime split or transfer of power: “high-capacity states reduce the threat by making it difficult for anyone to create rival concentrations of coercive means with their territories,” while the “low-capacity states more often face precisely the threat that some rival actor will build up a major concentration of coercive means and use it to topple the existing rulers.”\(^\text{13}\) Specifically, in regards to civil wars, Tilly and Tarrow identified two broader groups depending on the regime type: “relatively high-capacity regimes, however democratic or undemocratic, containing significant zones that escape central control” and “low-capacity undemocratic regimes.”\(^\text{14}\)

\(^\text{13}\) Ibid.  
\(^\text{14}\) Ibid, 153.
Traditionally, state capacity has been widely examined in the scholarly literature through the prism of economic and administrative performance, economic intervention and development.\textsuperscript{15} In recent years, the notion of state capacity has been widely applied to the study of conflict and its dynamics.\textsuperscript{16} Although different determinants are used to capture the effects of state capacity such as tax burden, economic interference, the ability of a state to extract resources, in this study I focus on the size of government’s military personnel as a proxy for a state capacity during the intrastate conflict.\textsuperscript{17} Specifically, I created a variable based on the Correlates of War National Material Capabilities dataset that encompasses military capacity as a ratio of all military personnel to the total of state’s population.

Thus, I hypothesize that the civil wars in which the state has high military capacity are more likely to be conducive to the success of the government (\textit{H10}). Likewise, if the state maintains only a small military force, rebels are more likely to succeed (\textit{H11}). Alongside military capacity, I test the degree of democracy in the outcome of a civil war. Given that the country has democratic institutions in place, I hypothesize that the government and rebel forces are more likely to enter into a compromise agreement (\textit{H12}). I expect to observe the success of the government if the state regime is authoritarian (\textit{H13}). Furthermore, it is crucial to test the interactions

\begin{footnotesize}


\end{footnotesize}
between military capacity and regime type to capture their influence on the outcome of intrastate conflict. Table 6 summarizes these hypotheses.

Table 6. Research Design B Endogenous Tipping Points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endogenous Tipping Point</th>
<th>Civil War outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High military capacity</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low military capacity</td>
<td>Rebels win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic regime</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic regime</td>
<td>Government wins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Design C

The overarching trends between onset and termination of intrastate conflicts and the impact of tipping factors that substantiate path dependence are empirically tested in this study. In this section, rather than focusing on large-\(n\) and small-\(n\) testing, I intend to develop a causal narrative about the impact of initial conditions on the outcome of civil wars. I select three cases based on outcome criteria such as the civil war that ended with the government victory; civil war that culminated in the success of rebellion; and a case of a compromise outcome. The cases that I review in this dissertation are the First Chechen War of 1994-1996; Africa’s World War (the Second Congo War) of 1998-2002; and, the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War (Eelam IV) of 2006-2009. Chechen and Congolese intrastate conflicts are part of the OTIC dataset, while the Second Sri Lanka
Civil War is a recent war and analyzed in this study to test the applicability of the quantitative tests to out-of-sample cases. In sum, the focus of the analysis is the impact of exogenous and endogenous factors on the increasing returns and amplification of switching costs in each of cases.

**Operationalization of Variables**

As a foundation for the Onset-Termination of Intrastate Conflict dataset, I utilize a Correlates of War (COW) project Dataset of Intra-State Wars v.4.1 that I modified by limiting the instances of civil wars chronologically to the period from 1945 to 2007. In the period after World War II, bilateral and then multilateral system of international relations have fundamentally shifted from the previous periods. Furthermore, I have excluded four out of seven types of internal wars that Meredith Reid Sarkees has identified in the Correlates of War project Dataset of Intra-State Wars: “the war was transformed into another type of war; the war is ongoing as of 12/31/2007; stalemate; and, conflict continues at below war level.”

The primary reason for excluding the abovementioned outcomes is to provide more robust inferences regarding the possibility of the path dependence in intrastate conflicts. It is also worth noting that according to the Correlates of War project dataset there can be four types of intrastate conflicts: civil wars for central control, civil wars

---

over local issues, regional internal, and intercommunal. In the time frame that I use for my dataset, the majority of intrastate wars are civil wars for central control or over local issues with the exception of the First Nigeria Christian-Muslim war (1999-2000) and the Second Lebanese war (1975-1976) that are codified as intercommunal.

**Dependent Variable**

The single dependent variable that I utilize in this study is the outcome of the intrastate conflict is obtained from the Correlates of War (COW) project Dataset of Intra-State Wars v.4.1. Three possible intrastate conflict outcomes are:

1. Side A (Government) wins
2. Side B (Rebels) wins
3. Side A and Side B reach a compromise

**Independent Variables**

*Lootable Resources (Primary and Secondary Diamonds)*

The current literature on civil wars highlights the importance of lootable resources such as precious stones, narcotics and other valuable, easily transportable goods in sparking intrastate conflicts. For my dataset, I focused primarily on the industry of

---

secondary diamonds mining. Since this type of diamond extraction does not require heavy equipment to mine and the end product is easily transportable, it becomes a lucrative source of enrichment and contention. To capture diamonds as the onset factor in civil wars, I turn to the DIADATA that was developed by Elisabeth Gilmore, Päivi Lujala, Nils Petter Gleditsch & Jan Ketil Rød and focused on recording the diamond occurrence across the globe. According to the authors, the account of diamond occurrences “was compiled through an intensive literature search of academic databases and journals, national geological survey reports, and industry databases and reports.”

DIADATA encompasses the record of both the year of discovery and the year when the location was mined for primary and secondary diamonds. To juxtapose adequately the presence of diamonds with the particular intrastate conflict, I had to clarify the geographical presence of this factor. For example, I designate a war to be influenced by lootable resources if diamonds were discovered during the occurrence of intrastate conflict and within the region of conflict. In contrast, if in Russia diamonds were discovered in 1946 but in the Ural Mountains, it had no impact on intrastate conflicts between Bolsheviks and Ukrainian Partisans in 1945-1947 or Forest Brethren of Baltic region in 1945-1951. Since there is no conclusive evidence of diamond production during Paraguay war of 1947 and Seventh Colombian civil war (1948-1958) both instances are codified 0.

1 – primary or secondary diamonds are present

0 – no diamonds

---


21 Ibid, 5.
Contagion

Occasionally, intrastate wars can be influenced by the spillover of the conflict from the neighboring states or influenced by the external actors. The factor of contagion has been extensively debated both in terms of definitions and quantitative ways to capture this phenomenon.22 The critical aspect of codifying the contagion factor is whether or not to consider possibilities of war spillover not only from immediate neighbors, but also from geographically distant locations. I adhere to the latter assumption and thus incorporate the contagion variable from Nathan Black’s Dataset of Substate Conflict Contagion, 1946-2007.23 He defines contagion as the phenomenon that occurs when “a substate conflict makes a causal contribution to the onset of a civil war in another state.”24 Furthermore, Black outlines the distinction of his notion of contagion from the one which focuses on the neighboring states: “my definition allows contagion to occur between non-contiguous states; instead of only considering pairs of states which border each other, I consider pairs of states in the same ‘neighborhood,’ where each neighborhood is a region of geographically and historically similar states that influence

Finally, Black is explicit about the plausibility of war contagion only if the instigating state adopts one of three actions:

Evangelization, the deliberate sponsorship of nascent rebel groups abroad by a state that has experienced a violent regime change; Expulsion, the deliberate transfer of combatants across borders by a state in conflict; and Meddling with Overt Partiality, the deliberate interference in another state’s substate conflict that subsequently leads to conflict in the interfering state.26

In his dataset, Black gives an extensive analysis of the possibility of contagion within intrastate conflict dyads from 1946 to 2007. In my dataset, I adapt Black’s codification of contagion through binary variables to the instances that I shortlisted from the Correlates of War dataset (government wins, compromise or rebels win). The following codification focuses on incidence of contagion:

1 – actual contagion observed
0 – no contagion

Non-lootable Resources (Oil Exports)

In contrast to scholarship that evaluates the impact of lootable resources on civil war, identifying the non-lootable determinants of intrastate conflict goes a little further than outlining the presence of primary or secondary diamond deposits in a given state. Among the plethora of the non-lootable resources such as oil, gas, metals, and others, the primary role as a factor in internal conflict dynamics is given to the access and production of oil. In this study, I utilize the oil exports indicator that was developed and codified by James Fearon and David Laitin for their article “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid, 9.
Civil War” as the onset variable for non-lootable resources. In their dataset, Fearon and Laitin proposed a binary variable for oil exporting countries by identifying “country-years in which fuel exports exceeded one-third of export revenues, using World Bank data.” In the addendum to their original paper, the authors specified their technique for outlining the variable:

We next created a binomial variable marking country years that had greater than 33% fuel exports. This dichotomous variable was then extended forward for each country for the most recent years if these lacked data, and backwards for missing years prior to 1960, on the assumption once countries come “on line” for oil production they generally stay there (this assumption was checked to a significant extent by going through the data and making country-specific inquires where we had doubts or concerns).

Since their dataset is limited chronologically to the year 1999, I have used the same approach to outline the missing country-year observations from 1999 to 2007 (15 observations in total) by referring to fuel export indicators from the World Development Indicators (WDI) dataset. The factor of fuel exports as a percentage of merchandise exports was not available for Chad and Liberia. According to the WDI dataset, Chad’s merchandise exports accounted for $3,080,945,195 in 2005. In the report “Chad’s Oil Troubles,” Carin Zissis provided the value of Chad’s oil exports in 2005 which was equal to $400,000,000 in direct revenue. Thus, Chad in 2005 oil exports accounted for only 13% of its overall merchandise exports and it is codified in the dataset as 0. CIA World Factbook 2002 does not indicate oil or other energy resources as export products of


1 – an oil exporting country

0 – not an oil exporting country

\textit{Ethnic Fractionalization}

To measure the ethnic factor as the determinant of the civil war onset, I borrow an indicator for ethnic fractionalization that was developed by Fearon and Laitin in “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” The authors have compiled this index based on the ethnolinguistic fractionalization (ELF) methodology outlined in \textit{Atlas Narodov Mira} with data added from \textit{CIA World Factbook, Encyclopedia Britannica}, and the Library of Congress Country Studies.\footnote{James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” \textit{The American Political Science Review} Vol. 97, no. 1 (Feb., 2003): 78.} According to Fearon and Laitin, ethnic fractionalization can be determined by measuring the “probability that two randomly drawn individuals in a country are from different ethnolinguistic groups.”\footnote{Ibid.}

In my dataset, I extrapolate the ethnic fractionalization index into the binary variable through codifying any country observation where the index is 0.15 or smaller as ethnically homogenous societies (0) and a country observation where the index is larger than 0.15 as ethnically heterogeneous societies (1).

0 – ethnically homogenous societies

1 – ethnically heterogeneous societies
Religious Fractionalization

Differences in religious beliefs are commonly attributed to instigation of conflicts including civil wars. Religious diversity in a given country can arguably be used to measure the impact of religion on the onset of intrastate conflict. For this study, I use Fearon and Laitin’s religious fractionalization index that they proposed in “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” This index is modeled after the ethnolinguistic fractionalization methodology by measuring the probably that any two persons share different religious beliefs.34

In this study, I similarly extrapolate the religious fractionalization index into the binary variable through codifying any country observation where the index is 0.15 or smaller as religiously homogenous societies (0) and country observation where index is larger than 0.15 as religiously heterogeneous societies (1).

0 – religiously homogenous societies
1 – religiously heterogeneous societies

Regime Type

The contemporary scholarship on intrastate conflicts introduces the factor of regime type either as a primary explanatory variable or a control factor for the onset or duration of civil war. In this study, I investigate the role of regime type in the path dependence dynamics of a civil war by analyzing how it can be associated with a particular conflict outcome. The most widely used source of data regarding regime type

34 Ibid, 79.
and the elements that determine whether the regime is democratic, anocratic or autocratic is the POLITY IV Project. I utilize the Revised Combined Polity Score (POLITY2) that codes countries on the scale from 10 (most democratic) to -10 (least democratic) and also better adapted for time series analysis. Thus, I created three dummy variables for each regime type:

- 10 to 6 – democracy
- 5 to -5 – anocracy
- -6 to -10 – autocracy

Finally, for the research design that focuses on the duration of conflict by analyzing the total duration rather than annual duration, I averaged out the Polity score by calculating the mean of total years minus first and last years if the war lasted more than three years and mean of two years if it lasted for only that period.

Military Capacity

The ability of a government to extract resources, control population or impose its will using military resources has been extensively examined in the modern literature on conflicts. In this study, I do not focus on the efficiency of bureaucracy or the ability to extract taxes effectively, and instead consider the size of the government military forces to be the most applicable proxy for state capacity during the war period. While a state does really on bureaucracy and taxes to control its population, it seems reasonable to

---

assume that these elements would be jeopardized during the armed conflict (especially for the territory controlled by the rebels). At the same time, the functionality of the armed forces in principle remains the same during peaceful and conflict periods.

To capture the military capacity of the government, I use the National Material Capabilities dataset (v. 4.0) of the Correlates of War project. This dataset offers six elements of state capabilities including the size of military personnel. I adjust this number by calculating military capacity as a ratio of military size to the total population. For the survival analysis that examines the total duration of civil war and not annual intervals, I constructed the following formula to capture the average military capacity.

\[
\text{Average military personnel per 1,000} = \frac{(\text{Military personnel/total population}) \cdot 1000}{\text{total number of years}}
\]

Due to the character of several civil wars, it is important to discuss missing values and alternative sources to substitute missing data:

- The Georgian War of 1991-1992 started on December 26, 1991 and ended in March of 1992. Since the missing value for 1991 in NMC accounts only for five days, it is reasonable to use the value for 1992 instead.

- The Second Somalia War of 1991-1997: following initial confrontation between governmental and rebels forces in 1991, the Somali National Army and other security forces were disbanded.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, the missing values can be treated as no military personnel and codified it as 0.

- The Dniestrian Independence War of 1991-1992 started on December 26, 1991 and ended on July 2 of the following year. The missing value for 1991 can as well

be downplayed due to the war occurring primarily in 1992. Thus, the value for 1992 is used.

- During the Third Somalia War of 2006-2008, the government troops of Somalia had approximately 10,000 active duty personnel according to a report by the BBC.  

- The NMC dataset does not provide information about the size of Armed Forces of Liberia during the Second Liberia Civil War of 1992-1995 for the years 1994 and 1995. The World Development Indicators dataset shows that the Liberian army size was 21,000 strong in 1995. For the year 1994, I combine the average of armed forces size of the previous and subsequent years.

- According to the World Development Indicators dataset, the armed forces personnel in Liberia during the Third Liberia Civil War of 1996 accounted for 22,000 active duty soldiers.

The United Nations Intervention

While technically not an intervention, peacekeeping missions of the United Nations are undoubtedly an intervening factor in the course of intrastate conflicts. Interventions on the behalf of the United Nations varied in essence, scope, and size. Nevertheless, it is critical to understand whether or not this global security organization can be a tipping point that establishes a path dependent solution to civil wars. Using the

---


39 Ibid.
dataset on third party peacekeeping missions compiled by Mark J. Mullenbach, I matched UN peacekeeping with the records of civil wars for the period from 1945 to 2007. 40 His dataset includes not only the incidence of intervention but also the objectives of every mission. Thus, it is worth noting that the majority of the intervention had been aimed at observing a ceasefire or monitoring disarmament and disengagement of warring sides.

*Intervention by Regional Intergovernmental Organizations*

To capture the role of regional intergovernmental organizations I used the same Mullenbach’s dataset “Third Party Peacekeeping Missions, 1946-2012 (Version 3.0).”41 Most of the missions that were led by regional IGOs were aimed at the military observation of ceasefires. IGO intervention is a dummy variable.

*Intervention by States in Support of Rebel Forces or the Government*

The original Correlates of War dataset on intrastate conflict that I used to outline three outcomes to civil wars also has information on the timing of third party intervention by the state and the side they chose to support.42 Thus, I introduce the dummy variables for state intervention on the behalf of the government and on the behalf of the rebel

---

41 Ibid.
forces. I do not treat instances where the support was provided to both warring sides as a separate variable.

**Control Variable**

With the onset of the Cold War and the ensuing bipolar system of international relations there was hardly a place on the globe that was out of the interest for two superpowers. Therefore, I include in this dataset the dummy variable for the Cold War to control for the period before and after bipolar confrontation.

- 1 – intrastate conflict occurred during the Cold War
- 0 – intrastate conflict occurred after the Cold War

**Missing variables**

The Correlates of War dataset has missing values for some of the entries for days. I substitute the missing values for days by the middle of the month – day 15. One entry for third party intervention in the Mozambique Civil War of 1982-1992 was missing values for month and day. I consider the third party intervention to have started at the beginning of the year – January 1st.
Conclusion

The mixed methods research framework outlined in this chapter provides a comprehensive evaluation of the theory of path dependence. By focusing on the broad and narrow concept of path dependence, I outline hypotheses that test overarching trends behind initial conditions and outcomes of civil wars as well as analyze the impact of tipping points in shaping conflict dynamics. Furthermore, I introduce two datasets for testing path dependent dynamics in civil wars and describe the logic behind the selection of multinomial logistic regression analysis and event history (survival) models. In subsequent chapters, I provide an empirical analysis of two notions of path dependence, while also evaluating their explanatory power by applying the findings into several cases of intrastate conflicts.
CHAPTER 4
QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE ONSET CONDITIONS AND OUTCOMES
IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS

Introduction

The central point of inquiry in this chapter is to identify the relationship between factors that could instigate intrastate conflicts and three possible civil war outcomes. Adopting the broad notion of path dependence that postulates the influence of earlier stages of the process onto the latter stages, I hypothesize about the influence of the initial conditions on the civil war dynamics. I argue that if intrastate conflicts are initiated in the presence of lucrative lootable resources or energy reserves such as oil, ethnic or religious heterogeneity, or by the means of contagion from other conflict areas, a specific civil war outcome, be it the victory of the government forces, compromise, or success of rebels, is intrinsically connected with a distinct onset factor. Following a series of multinomial logistic regression analyses, several onset factors such as oil exports, contagion and the Cold War appeared to have an influence on the outcome of the civil war. Nevertheless, it is equally important to acknowledge the factors that had no effect on the way intrastate conflict ended such as secondary diamonds, ethnic and religious fractionalization since the absence of the relationship can inform about civil war dynamics.
Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis

While the majority of conflicts that occurred from the period following the end of World War II ended up with the government’s victory and only less than a fifth witnessed the success of the rebels as can be seen in Table 7, the results of the multinomial logistic regression models illustrate that the compromise outcome is strongly related with certain onset conditions. Table 8 provides the output of the regression models given three different base outcomes. Table 9 provides the analysis of marginal effects for three different intrastate conflict outcomes.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Wins</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55.91</td>
<td>55.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>82.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebels Win</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Coefficients of the Onset Factors and Outcomes of Civil Wars Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government Wins base outcome</th>
<th>Rebels Win base outcome</th>
<th>Compromise base outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebels Win</td>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Gov. Wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>-1.32*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-1.33*</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>-0.85*</td>
<td>-1.47***</td>
<td>0.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of observations</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Standard errors provided in parentheses
Table 9. Marginal Effects of the Onset Factors and Outcomes of Civil Wars Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginal effects</th>
<th>Government Wins</th>
<th>Rebels Win</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>0.09 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.2 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.25** (0.12)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>-0.17* (0.1)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.12* (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>0.18 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.16* (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>0.26** (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.09)</td>
<td>-0.16** (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, of observations</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Oil, Contagion, and the Cold War

The underpinning assumption about the interrelation between the onset and termination factors that I have outlined in the previous chapter has been partially confirmed. Among the factors that are considered in the scholarly literature on intrastate conflicts to be the determinants of the civil war onset, an oil exporting economic structure and, to an extent, a factor of contagion are found to be related to a particular civil war outcome. Moreover, the control factor of whether or not an intrastate conflict occurred during or after the bipolar confrontation between superpowers has had a substantial impact on the way the particular war has ended. In a sense, considering the path
dependent process in intrastate conflicts through the prism of importance of previous stages (onset factors in this case), it is reasonable to claim that certain onset conditions do indeed influence to outcome of the conflict. Now that we have confirmed the presence of path dependence, it is imperative to discuss the directionality and magnitude of the onset factors that proved to be significant as well as to interpret the meaning of the factors that have shown no relationship with the civil war outcomes.

Oil Exports

Energy resources and specifically oil have been usually associated with intrastate conflicts. The notions of a resource curse and an oil curse have been widely popularized in the media as the explanations for the lack of development or reasons for instigating armed conflicts. These hypotheses have been tested by James Fearon and David Laitin who in “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War” have concluded that “the ‘median country’ had a 10% chance of civil war over a decade, whereas the same country as an oil exported would have an estimated 21% chance.”¹ Similar assumptions were provided by David Collier in “Natural Resources, Development and Conflict: Channels of Causation and Policy Interventions” where he argued that “in many situations, natural resources will be located in regions where some political groups – albeit often on the fringe – are already claiming autonomy” and thus oil and other natural resources can provide additional reasons for armed conflict outbreak.²

My analysis of the path dependence dynamics in intrastate conflicts showed substantive and statistical significance for the factor of countries with oil exporting economies. Thus, in comparison to the base outcome of the government’s victory, the rebels win outcome will be less likely if the country in conflict has the oil exporting economy. Conversely, if the base outcome is a success of rebels, the government victory is more likely given that the country has more than a third of its exports revenues in oil (H2). The analysis of marginal effects of three outcomes suggested that if the country has an oil-exporting economy, the probability of the rebel victory decreases by 25 percentage points.

Even though Fearon and Laitin have found the significant effect that oil exporting economies have on the outbreak of the intrastate conflict, they nevertheless expressed their concern about the tendency of states whose exports are heavily influenced by oil to be associated with a weaker state apparatus. The argument revolved around an assumption that “oil producers tend to have weaker state apparatuses than one would expect given their level of income because the rulers have less need for a socially intrusive and elaborate bureaucratic system to raise revenues – ‘a political Dutch disease’.” At the same time, Fearon and Laitin discarded the proposition that oil is a good indicator for financing the rebels and instead hinted at the other lootable resources. Can these two propositions regarding the role of oil in the onset of conflict explain the likelihood of government to succeed and rebellion to fail?
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Given the assumption of an oil exporting economy as a proxy for weak state apparatus and factor in the higher likelihood of conflict outbreak, my analysis suggests an intriguing finding about the higher probability of the government succeeding in a civil war. The explanation can lie in a second aspect of the oil factor as a source for funding the military activities. While not a readily available option for rebels, oil offers more opportunities for the government that has the technology and infrastructure to utilize this resource. It is also worth noting that marginal effects analysis negates the statistical significance of oil in terms of government’s victory. At the same time, the substantive and statistical significance of oil in terms of rebels’ prospects for success remains consistent in both tests. The adverse effect of an oil exporting economy on the likelihood of rebels’ victory outcome can be partially explained through the lens of funding sources. In order to gain the benefits from oil resources, the rebel forces would need to control the whole production process including the extraction, storage, transportation, and refinery. Therefore, in the presence of an oil exporting economy, rebel forces would require absolute victory to control the production cycle. A similar requirement applies to government, yet the analysis suggests that central forces are more likely to be effective in utilizing oil resources to fund their war efforts.
Contagion

The issue of war contagion has been widely circulated in the media and has found support among scholars who investigated this phenomenon. Halvard Buhaug and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch in “Contagion or Confusion? Why Conflicts Cluster in Space” find evidence for the neighborhood effect in the spillover of conflicts.⁴ Erika Frosberg in her dissertation “Neighbors at Risk: A Quantitative Study of Civil War Contagion” provides new evidence on the conflict contagion effect through focusing on sources and targets while specifying the importance of various factors such as ethnic composition, length of borders, mountains and others.⁵ Nathan Black further elaborated on the various contagion factors and provided substantive evidence for the spillover effect.⁶

Scholarship on contagion in intrastate conflict provides sufficient evidence for the presence and impact of this phenomenon. My analysis further suggests that contagion has a disproportionate effect on the likelihood of the government chances of winning the conflict and a compromise solution. Given the base outcome of the success of government’s forces, an intrastate conflict is more likely to result in a compromise if it was caused by contagion. Likewise, if the base outcome is a compromise, the government is less likely to topple the rebellion and would likely to seek a peaceful resolution. These findings are both statistically and substantively significant and support my hypothesis.
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about the effect of contagion as a path dependent determinant of civil war. Marginal effects analysis does not support my $H3$ that implied the success of rebels in a country affected by war contagion. Instead, the results of the analysis suggest that the probability of the government victory decreases by 17 percentage points while the chances of a compromise outcome increase by 12 percentage points.

Several possible mechanisms can explain the effect of contagion on the dynamics of the intrastate conflict. First, if the intrastate conflict was instigated by the another civil war, the rebels forces from the sender state could provide not only indirect financial support and supply of weapons, but also innovative practices and techniques such as the use of social media during the Arab Spring. Second, the success of civil wars in the states that caused the contagion may unite the factions that are fighting against the central government and rally their resolve and strength. Finally, the effect of contagion provides the incentives for other states to intervene in the conflict to curtail the possibility of civil war in their own territory or to prevent the spread of armed conflict in the region. All these factors undermine the ability of the government forces to succeed, but, at the same time, they do not provide enough leverage for the rebels to achieve a decisive victory either. The likelihood of the compromise outcome might stem from possibility of the involvement of external forces to mitigate the spread of the war contagion. In the subsequent chapters, I test the role of third party interventions as the exogenous tipping points in determining path dependence dynamics of civil wars.
The Cold War

It is not a secret that the bipolar stalemate that followed after the Second World War has dominated all areas of economic, political, and security relations between states. Two superpowers, the United States of America and Soviet Union, virtually divided the globe into spheres of interest. On one hand, there was a system of alliances and bilateral security arrangements led by the US. On the other hand, the Warsaw Pact and other communism-inclined states followed the lead of the USSR in world affairs. While these two regions have enjoyed relatively limited armed conflict incidence after 1945, countries that have found themselves in the so-called Third World appeared to be heavily affected by the superpower confrontation. Both sides systematically provided assistance to rebels or governments depending on their ideological postures through not merely expressing moral support, but by offering financial, military, and technical resources.

Therefore, the results of including the control variable that captured the time period before and after the Cold War proved to have strong substantive and statistical significance. Given the base outcome of the government’s victory, success of the rebellion or compromise outcome proved to be less likely during the Cold War. At the same time, given the base outcome of rebels’ victory or compromise, the intrastate conflict was more likely to result in the success of the government if the intrastate conflict occurred before 1991. The test of marginal effects suggests that during the Cold War the probability of the government’s success in intrastate conflict increased by 26 percentage points, while the compromise outcome decreased by 16 percentage points.
During the period of the Cold War, two superpowers had a disproportionate impact not only in international relations in general, but also on the dynamics of intrastate conflicts in particular. The support for rebels or governments during civil wars was determined through the lens of Realpolitik, rather than the notions of human rights and responsibility to protect. The focus on the human security in third party interventions is a relatively novel concept that was initiated through the United Nations peacekeeping efforts only after the collapse of the bipolar system of international relations. Paraphrasing the famous saying attributed to Franklin Roosevelt’s assessment of Nicaraguan ruler Anastasio Somoza that even though Somoza was a ruthless dictator, he was nevertheless our ruthless dictator, it becomes clear that the full-fledged support of the loyal dictatorial regimes was an acceptable course of action against the possibility of communist rebellions. This logic equally applies to the Soviet Union that defended dictatorial regimes in North Korea, Cuba and other countries to safeguard their influence across the globe. This unequivocal adherence to national interests rather than humanitarian concerns has defined the success of government forces and failure of peaceful settlements during the Cold War.

**Diamonds, Ethnic and Religious Fractionalization**

*Secondary Diamonds*

The impact of lootable resources on the outbreak of intrastate conflict has supporters among the general audience where the topic of blood diamonds was
popularized in the movie industry as well among scholars of civil war. Political scientists at PRIO, Päivi Lujala, Nils Petter Gleditsch and Elisabeth Gilmore, reported in “A Diamond Curse? Civil War and a Lootable Resource” the findings that support the claim about the impact of secondary diamonds on the possibility of the specific type of civil war onset (ethnic war).  

At the same, they found that primary diamonds had the adverse effect on the possibility of the war outbreak. While their findings may hold true for the intrastate conflict onset, secondary diamonds were found to have no statistical significance across all three civil war outcomes. This finding is rather interesting in a sense that even if the secondary diamonds are an easy source for financing the rebels’ cause as I have outlined in the $H_1$, in reality the presence of this type of lootable resources does not significantly affect a particular civil war outcome.

While secondary diamonds might present a substantial risk for intrastate conflict, they are not likely to provide a decisive upper hand to either government or rebels, nor are they conducive to the compromise solution. However, secondary diamonds as a proxy for lootable resources does not capture other potential sources for funding rebellions. The inclusion of data on narcotic substances and other alluvial gemstones could shed new light on the role of lootable resources in the path dependence dynamics of intrastate conflicts.
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Following the multinomial logistic regression analysis, I also found little support for the \( H4 \) which states that civil wars in the countries that are characterized by religious homogeneity are more likely to result in government victory; and \( H5 \) which suggests that if civil wars occur in the countries that are characterized by the ethnic heterogeneity, they are more likely to result in rebels’ victory. In contrast to diamonds, onset factors of ethnic and religious fractionalization were found by James Fearon and David Laitin in “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War” to have little substantive and statistical significance. Similarily, the output of the regression analysis finds no support for ethnic heterogeneity as the possible factor in determining path dependent dynamics in intrastate conflicts. While the religious fractionalization factor had exhibited a slight indication of statistical significance when taking the base outcome of a government victory and a compromise, it proved to have no statistical significance when tested for the marginal effects.

Ethnic and religious diversity are equally unlikely to instigate intrastate conflict or to determine its outcome. The fact that the state has multiple ethnic groups and various religious adherents or the society is characterized by ethnic and religious homogeneity, does not provide sufficient evidence to consider these two factors as determinants of path dependence in intrastate conflict. Echoing the findings of David Collier and Anke Hoeffler regarding the prevalence of opportunity-motivated onset of civil wars over
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gread-motivated models, it is valid to extrapolate this assumption towards the outcomes of intrastate conflicts.

**Conclusion**

The inquiry into the path dependence in civil wars through the broad concept provided evidence for the interaction between the initial conditions and the outcomes of conflict. Unlike previous scholarship that has suggested the prevalence of the opportunity factors over grievance variables in explaining the outbreak of conflict, current study does not provide such a clear cut distinctions for the factors that shape the solutions to civil wars. Instead, the palette of onset conditions appears to be eclectic as it highlights the importance of oil exporting economy; contagion; religious fractionalization; and the Cold War. The logic behind the diversity of the explanatory variables lies in the alteration of calculations of the warring sides. Thus, while secondary diamonds can provide incentives for the rebels to start a war, they do not guarantee successful outcome for them or the government. Arguably, different mechanisms enter the strategic and tactical calculations of the counterparts in the course of an intrastate conflict. These dynamics can be examined through the narrow concept of path dependence that focuses on the role of timing and sequence. Therefore, in the next chapter I outline endogenous and exogenous tipping factors that shape the path of intrastate conflict.
CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION OF THE TIPPING POINTS IN INTRASTATE CONFLICTS

Introduction

The analysis of intrastate conflicts through the lens of path dependence provides sufficient evidence of the presence of interrelation between the onset conditions and the outcome. Indeed, the results suggest that certain factors at the initial stages of conflict impact the probability of the specific civil war outcome. While these findings support the general argument of the dissertation, further investigation into the mechanisms that “lock in” a unique path to the civil war outcome is required to understand the underlying dynamics of path dependence.

In this chapter, I analyze intrastate conflicts through the prism of the increasing returns framework that was elaborated by Paul Pierson in the article “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics.” Specifically, I focus on the temporal dimensions of conflict and the effect of tipping points on the probability of the specific outcome and increasing the cost of switching to alternatives. I classify tipping points in terms of the internal or endogenous characteristics of the state in which civil war occurred and through external or exogenous shocks that influence the direction of a conflict. Thus, I elaborate on Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow’s insights regarding the role of state capacity in determining the outcome of the civil war to control for
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endogenous impact. To examine exogenous shocks, I rely on the well-established scholarship regarding the role of third party interventions on the duration and outcome of civil wars. I also test the impact of several onset factors that may influence the outcome after the initiation of the conflict. These control variables are the presence of lootable and non-lootable resources; ethnic fractionalization; and religious fractionalization. Ultimately, I anticipate to observe how external and internal tipping points influence the dynamics of intrastate conflicts and influence the likelihood as well as duration of a particular outcome.

**Narrow Definition of the Path Dependence**

In “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics,” Paul Pierson extends the economic understanding of path dependence and the notion of increasing returns to the domain of political science. According to Pierson, political life analyzed through the framework of increasing returns is characterized by multiple equilibria of the outcomes; the role of small events that occur at the right time; a critical role of timing and sequencing; and inertia or resistance to deviate from the path. I argue that these characteristics can be equally applied to the study of intrastate conflicts, which in turn would characterize it as a path dependent process.

The dependent variable that I utilize to test path dependence hypotheses in the dissertation is the outcome of civil war. For this study, I limited the inquiry into the cases where government victory, rebels’ success or compromise has been observed. The Correlates of War dataset extends the possible outcomes to encompass stalemate, conflict
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2 Ibid, 263.
continuation at lower level, ongoing conflict or transformation into another type of war. This variety of outcome supports the first characteristic of a path dependent process, namely, multiple equilibria of possible conclusions. As my previous analysis suggested, the power of relatively small events such as the factor of contagion can also be applied to the dynamics of the intrastate conflict. The investigation of the temporal dimension of these events through the models that I propose in this chapter would further support the increasing returns argument. Similarly, the role of timing and sequencing in intrastate conflict can be verified using the temporal models that trace the influence of tipping points on the civil war outcome. Finally, observing strong statistical and substantive evidence that the onset factors do in fact determine the outcome of the intrastate conflict and consequently identifying similar results in temporal models would suggest that the resistance to change argument can be applicable to the study of intrastate conflicts.

The first assumption of the narrow definition of path dependence, existence of multiple equilibria, is consistent with three possible outcomes of an intrastate conflict, yet the second factor that underlines the power of small events is more challenging to conceptualize. The answer to what constitutes a ‘small event’ in an intrastate conflict appears to be rather subjective. If for example one considers the intervention by the UN peacekeepers to be a game changing event in the civil war, does the relative size of the mission matter? Or can the presence of international peacekeeping contingent in itself be deemed as a big event? While the discussion of the role of micro events is relevant in the context of intrastate conflicts, I argue that satisfying the other three conditions of the narrow definition of path dependence is sufficient to apply the abovementioned theoretical framework to the study of civil wars.
In this chapter, I specifically address the third and fourth characteristic of the path dependence dynamics: the role of timing and resistance to change. By using survival model analysis, I expect to examine not only the interrelation between endogenous and exogenous tipping points, but also the influence of these factors on the duration of an intrastate conflict. Thus, I test the impact of these factors by using parametric survival models (Weibull distribution); Cox proportional hazards models; and, proportional hazards models for the subdistribution of a competing risk proposed by Jason P. Fine and Robert J. Gray. Also, before testing the temporal dimensions of an intrastate conflict, I test the role of tipping factors and onset conditions through multinomial logistic regression analysis.

**Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis**

Table 10 provides the results of the marginal effects of three outcomes of intrastate conflicts. I outline here the coefficients of marginal effects rather than the output with three different base outcomes since with the former approach it is easier to interpret the directionality and magnitude of the explanatory variables. I test both exogenous and endogenous tipping factors along with variables for secondary diamonds, oil exporting economies, ethnic fractionalization, and religious fractionalization. I did not include the contagion factor in the analysis since it becomes theoretically irrelevant after the start of confrontation, unlike other onset factors that retain their impact across the whole period of civil war.
Table 10. Marginal Effects of the Narrow Concept of Path Dependence Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government Success</th>
<th>Rebel Success</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.31 (0.2)</td>
<td>-0.36* (0.21)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>0.14 (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.09)</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>0.01 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.01)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.1)</td>
<td>-0.1 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.16** (0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>-0.37** (0.17)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.19* (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>0.12 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.17 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>0.04 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.07 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>0.11 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.1 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.05 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.2 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.15* (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.1)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractionalization</td>
<td>0.15 (0.15)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Standard errors are in parentheses.

Both oil exports and religious fractionalization remain substantively and statistically significant here and in the initial conditions model that I have tested in the previous chapter. While religious fractionalization decreases the probability of a compromise outcome by roughly 15 percentage points in both models, the factor of oil exports in new model now indicates the increase in probability of a compromise outcome and has no effect for a rebel victory. The analysis further suggests that in democratic regimes the likelihood of the rebel victory decreases by 36 percentage points, while autocratic regimes or size of the armed forces do not appear to be related with any of
three outcomes. UN peacekeeping forces, as I have hypothesized, are more conducive to the compromise outcome. Thus, presence of the “blue berets” increases the likelihood of the compromise by 16 percentage points. The peacekeeping missions by regional intergovernmental organizations are also increasing the likelihood of the peaceful settlement, yet they also decrease by 37 percentage points the possibility of the government’s victory. In contrast to the missions lead by intergovernmental organizations, state interventions that supported government or rebels did not have an effect on the particular outcome of an intrastate conflict.

**Parametric Survival Model (Weibull)**

The contemporary scholarship on intrastate conflicts offers several approaches to the analysis of the temporal dimensions of civil wars. Depending on the knowledge about underlying distribution, baseline hazard or survival time, scholars have adopted different models to test for the civil war duration. Oftentimes, to test for the robustness of the analysis, the scholarship incorporates both parametric and semi-parametric models.⁴ In this chapter, I apply two most frequently used models, the Weibull parametric survival model and the Cox semi-parametric survival model. In the table 11 and 12, I report hazard coefficients and hazard ratios using Weibull parametric survival model. The duration in this model is measured in days.

---

Table 11. Coefficients of the Parametric Survival Model (Weibull).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>\textit{Weibull Coefficients}</th>
<th>Government Success</th>
<th>Rebel Success</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.4***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.02*</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>1.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td>-6.17***</td>
<td>-4.26***</td>
<td>-15.87***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(3.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ln_p_cons}</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.58***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
Table 12. Hazard Ratios of the Parametric Survival Model (Weibull).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government Success</th>
<th>Rebel Success</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weibull Hazard Ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>30.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(37.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(3.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln_p _cons</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Bottom values are robust standard
Endogenous Tipping Points

Among three endogenous tipping factors, only the size of the governmental forces appeared to be statistically significant for the Government success model. Thus, the size of the military personnel increases the hazard rate and decreases the duration of the intrastate conflict. At the same time, the analysis of the hazard ratio suggests that the increase in the hazard rate is insignificant.

Exogenous Tipping Points

According to the model, interventions by regional intergovernmental organizations are decreasing the expected duration in the compromise outcome, while in government success and rebel success models it had no effect. The hazard ratio for a regional intergovernmental organization implies a substantial increase in the hazard rate. Furthermore, the analysis suggests that when individual states are intervening to support the government, the expected duration of conflict actually increases in the rebel success model. Thus, foreign state intervention on the side of government decreases the hazard rate by 64%.

Onset (Control) Factors

Consistent with the multinomial analysis, the factors of oil exporting economies and religious fractionalization are statistically significant in survival models. Thus, non-
lootable resource of oil decreases the expected duration of conflict (increasing the hazard rate by 312%), while religious diversity increases expected duration (decreasing hazard rate by 64%) in the compromise model.

**Cox Competing Risks Proportional Hazards Model**

Recent scholarship on the duration and outcome of civil wars utilizes the Cox semi-parametric model for analyzing competing risks. While this model has advantages over parametric models since it does not rely on the distributional assumptions and does not require information about the baseline hazard for estimating hazard ratio, the data under the analysis must meet two requirements to satisfy the application of the Cox model. The first assumption is the non-informative censoring, which stipulates that the missing observations occurred at random (opposite to informative censoring where missing observations are not at random). The second assumption is the proportionality of hazard functions over time. The dataset on intrastate conflicts that I am using for the analysis does not have missing values, thus satisfying the first assumption. To evaluate the proportional hazards assumption, I tested all three outcomes of intrastate conflicts. For the rebel success model, the factor of democracy violated the proportional hazards assumptions. Following the technique proposed by Box-Steffensmeier, Reiter, and Zorn,

---


6 Ibid., 516.
I have interacted democracy with the natural logarithm of time and introduced a new variable into the rebel success model.\textsuperscript{7}

I used the Efron method for handling ties in all three models. Following the approach outlined by Balch-Lindsay, Enterline, and Joyce, I have estimated civil war days as the unit of analysis.\textsuperscript{8} There are 127 cases of intrastate conflicts from 1945 to 2007 and total of 536 spells (observations). Similarly to the previous parametric survival model, I am testing the effect of endogenous (democracy, autocracy, and military personnel) and exogenous (UN, IGO, and state interventions) tipping factors that are time-varying covariates and onset factors (secondary diamonds, oil exporting economies, ethnic and religious fractionalizations) that are time-invariant covariates. In the tables 13 and 14, I report coefficients and hazard ratios of Cox proportional hazards model respectively.

\textsuperscript{7} Janet M. Box-Steppensmeier, Dan Reiter and Christopher Zorn, “Nonproportional Hazards and Event History Analysis in International Relations,” The Journal of Conflict Resolution Vol. 47, no. 1 (Feb., 2003): 44.

Table 13. Coefficients of the Cox Survival Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rebel</th>
<th>Rebel2(^9)</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>7.72***</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(2.17)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy*(ln(time))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.86***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>0.44(^*)</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>1.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td>2.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-1.79**</td>
<td>-1.82**</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-46.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>1.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.86***</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-1.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

\(^9\) Rebel2 model provides hazard ratios of the Cox competing risks model after testing for the violation of the proportional hazard assumption. The factor of democracy violated the proportional hazard assumption and, thus, I multiplied it by the natural logarithm of time.
Table 14. Hazard Ratios of the Cox Survival Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rebel</th>
<th>Rebel2</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cox Proportional (Hazard Ratios)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2254.74***</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(4903.83)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy*(ln(time))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>1.55*</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>6.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(4.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
<td>3.24*</td>
<td>16.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
<td>(13.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>2.04**</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>6.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
Following the Cox proportional hazards model analysis, the factor of the military personnel has lost its effect on the government success and is no longer statistically significant. At the same time, a new approach has suggested that in the government success model autocratic states are more likely to decrease the expected duration of conflict (Figure 2). Thus, autocratic regimes increase the hazard rate by 55% in the conflict that end up with the government’s victory. Democracy is statistically significant in the rebel success and indicates that democracy decreases the duration of conflict (Figure 3).

Figure 2. The Role of Autocracy in a Government Success Model.
As I hypothesized earlier, the United Nations peacekeeping interventions are statistically significant in the compromise outcome model. UN peacekeepers decrease the time to compromise outcome and increase a hazard rate by 502% (Figure 4). Similar effect is observed for the interventions by regional intergovernmental organizations. However, this type of intervention decreases not only the expected duration of compromise outcome (Figure 5), but also expected duration of rebel victory (Figure 6). Finally, as one can see in the Figure 7, state intervention supporting the government prolongs the expected duration in the rebel success model (hazard rate decrease by 84%).
Figure 4. UN Intervention in a Compromise Model.

Figure 5. Intervention by Regional IGOs in a Compromise Model.
Figure 6. Intervention by Regional IGOs in a Rebels’ Success Model.

Figure 7. State Intervention for Government in a Rebels’ Success Model.
In addition to oil exporting economies and religious fractionalization that were significant in the parametric model, ethnic fractionalization was found significant and negatively related in the government success model. Thus, ethnically heterogeneous societies increase the expected duration of conflicts that ended in the success of government (Figure 8). In contrast, if the country is an oil producing economy, the duration of civil war will decrease given the success of the government (Figure 9). In the compromise outcome model, non-lootable resource of oil was found to decrease the duration of conflict (Figure 10), while religious fractionalization on the opposite increased the time of civil war (Figure 11).

Figure 8. The Role of Ethnic Fractionalization in a Government’s Success Model.
Figure 9. The Role of an Oil Exporting Economy in a Government’s Success Model.

Figure 10. The Role of an Oil Exporting Economy in a Compromise Model.
Traditional approaches to the analysis of the competing risks have utilized the Cox model for the cause-specific hazard functions. By assuming the non-informativeness and using identical predictors across the different outcomes, it is possible to conduct parallel tests and then compare the results. Yet, according to Montfort, Fennema, and Ghidey: “in the presence of competing failure events that impede the event of interest, a standard analysis using Cox regression is able to produce incidence-rate curves that either (1) are appropriate only for a hypothetical universe where competing events do not occur

or (2) are appropriate for the data at hand, yet the effects of covariates on these curves are not easily quantified.” Therefore, to account for the presence of competing risks, I utilize the semiparametric proportional hazards model for the subdistribution developed by Jason P. Fine and Robert J. Gray that uses the partial likelihood principle and weighting techniques.\textsuperscript{12}

The underlying assumption in this study is that the outcomes of the civil war such as the government victory, success of the rebels or compromise are influencing each other. In a sense, the increase in the risk of a particular outcome should decrease the risks for the occurrence of other outcomes. Thus, under the condition that the competing risks for three outcomes are not independent from each other, it is more appropriate to estimate the cumulative incidence.\textsuperscript{13} In the Figure 12, it is clearly seen that the likelihood of the government success outcome is significantly higher after approximately 1,000 days of an intrastate conflict. At the same time, the probability of rebel success and a compromise outcome are similar throughout the whole period.


In the tables 15 and table 16, I report the coefficients and sub-hazard ratios respectively of the Fine and Gray competing risks model. While the earlier examined parametric survival model and cause specific survival model are critical steps in understanding the path dependence dynamics in civil wars, they are also useful for comparative purposes in regards to the Fine and Gray model.
Table 15. Coefficients of the Fine and Gray Competing Risks Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rebel</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>2.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for govern-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-1.58*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.95*</td>
<td>-16.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-1.94***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.
Table 16. Sub-Hazard Ratios of the Fine and Gray Competing Risks Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rebel</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>5.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(3.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>8.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(5.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>7.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
<td>(5.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>1E-07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(1E-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.4 )</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Endogenous Tipping Points

The analysis of the government success model through the Fine and Gray competing risk test indicates that the impact of autocratic regimes on the expected duration of an intrastate conflict. Thus, civil wars in states with authoritarian governments tend to be shorter, increasing the sub-hazard ratio by 67 percentage points. It can be seen in Figure 13 that after 2,000 days of war the autocratic regime factor...
increases by 20 percentage points the probability of government success. The factor of democracy appeared to be statistically significant in the compromise outcome model. In intrastate conflicts that ended up in a peaceful settlement, the democratic regime variable tended to decrease the expected duration of war. Furthermore, democracy dramatically increases the likelihood of the compromise from the early days of an intrastate conflict (Figure 14).

Figure 13. CI Function for Autocracy Factor in a Government’s Success Model.
Exogenous Tipping Points

Both the intervention by the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations are statistically significant and positively related in the compromise outcome model. The presence of the UN peacekeepers and forces under the command of the regional IGOs has an equally substantial effect on lessening the duration of the wars that ended in a compromise. Both types of intervention increase the probability of a compromise by 10 percentage points after 3000 days of fighting (Figures 15 and 16). State interventions that support the government tended to prolong the duration of the conflict in the rebel success model and also reduce the probability of the rebellion’s success (Figure 17). In contrast, when states intervened on the behalf on the rebels, these
civil wars appeared to be shorter and the chances of rebellion to succeed increased by 20 percentage points after 1000 days of conflict (Figure 18). However, such interventions tended to prolong intrastate conflicts that ended with the compromise outcome, even though the decrease in the hazard rate was rather small.

Figure 15. CI Function for UN Intervention Factor in a Compromise Model.
Figure 16. CI Function for IGOs Intervention Factor in a Compromise Model.

Figure 17. CI Function for Government-biased Interventions in a Rebel’s Success Model.
Figure 18. CI Function for Rebel-biased Interventions in a Rebel’s Success Model.

Figure 19. CI Function for Rebel-biased Interventions in a Compromise Model.
Onset (Control) Factors

While lootable resources (secondary diamonds) have not been statistically significant in all survival models, the factor of an oil exporting economy appears to be relevant throughout the entire study. Fine and Gray competing risks analysis indicates that oil is statistically significant in the compromise outcome model and indicates the shorter duration of civil war when this non-lootable resource is present. Furthermore, oil increases the cumulative incidence of a compromise outcome (Figure 20). Finally, the test revealed that it takes longer for the compromise outcome to be achieved in the societies with high religious diversity. The probability of the compromise outcome is 7 percentage points lower if the society is religiously heterogeneous (Figure 21).

Figure 20. CI Function for an Oil Exporting Economies in a Compromise Model.
Figure 21. CI Function for Religious Fractionalization Factor in a Compromise Model.
Current Findings and the Existing Literature on the Outcomes of Intrastate Conflicts

The results of four different tests including multinomial logistic regression analysis and three types of survival analysis provide sufficient support for the assumption about the application of a narrow definition of path dependence to the study of intrastate conflicts (Tables 17 and 18). Overall, the findings are predominantly consistent across all models both in terms of statistical significance of the factors and their explanatory power.

Although all four tests are equally valuable to validate the robustness of the results, Fine and Gray competing risks model is used here as the primary test since this method satisfies the narrow definition of the path dependence. Thus, focusing on the type of an intrastate conflict termination through the prism of competing risks to satisfy the multitude of outcomes assumption; codifying each intervention by third parties as a new event that could end war to satisfy the sequence and timing assumption; and, finally, observing statistically significant factors to satisfy the inertia assumption make both the dataset and methodology a valid framework for the testing of a narrow definition of path dependence.
Table 17. Event History (Survival) Analysis of Intrastate Conflict Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Rebel</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weib</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>F&amp;G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.55*</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for government</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for rebels</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diamonds</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractionalization</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy *ln(time)</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

14 Hazard ratios of the Cox competing risks model after testing for the violation of the proportional hazard assumption. Since the factor of democracy violated the assumption, I multiplied it by the natural logarithm of time.
Table 18. Multinomial Logistic Regression Analysis of Intrastate Conflict Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Marginal Effects</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Conditions</td>
<td>Tipping Points</td>
<td>Initial Conditions</td>
<td>Tipping Points</td>
<td>Initial Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical confidence levels: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Standard errors are in parentheses.
The analysis of endogenous and exogenous tipping points as well as control factors provided not only support for the path dependence in intrastate conflicts, but also hinted at mechanisms at play that could shed the light on the reasons behind a particular civil war outcome. Both the Cox proportional hazards model and the Fine and Gray competing risks model provided strong evidence for the role of the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations in decreasing the duration of the civil war that resulted in the compromise. Similarly, the multinomial regression model and survival analysis approach indicated that both the UN and regional IGOs are likely to increase the probability of a peaceful settlement solution ($H_6$ and $H_7$). These results suggest the strong evidence that peacekeeping missions do indeed minimize the conflict duration and lead to a compromise outcome. Furthermore, Virginia Page Fortna in “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace after Civil War” finds evidence that once the civil war is over, peacekeeping forces help maintain peace for longer periods.\(^\text{15}\)

Yet, one has to be cautious about this particular finding for two reasons. First, the United Nations has a record of sending its troops to the locations where there is a peace to keep. In other words, this international organization is likely to send troops to solve intrastate conflicts where the prospects of the compromise are readily attainable. Second, the primary objectives of the UN peacekeepers and forces from such IGOs as the African Union, ECOWAS, League of Arab States, European Union, and Commonwealth of Independent States are to observe ceasefire or monitor disarmament and disengagement of warring sides. Therefore, such mission statements indicate that the UN and IGOs

appear to be facilitators of the ascending compromise outcome rather than instigators.
Yet again, it is possible that these international bodies first broker a compromise outcome through diplomatic means and then provide peacekeepers. In such scenario, the role of the UN and regional IGOs as the lock in mechanisms for the compromise path dependence can be valid.

Competing risks tests have found no support for my hypothesis about the effect of the state intervention for the government forces on the likelihood of the government success outcome or changes in its duration (H8). While not affecting the government victory outcome, state intervention for the government forces prolonged intrastate conflicts where rebels eventually succeeded. In contrast, when a third party state provided military support for the rebels, the time till the rebel forces would succeed tend to decrease (H9). This is an important finding given the voluminous scholarly debate regarding the impact of state interventions on the outcome of civil wars. Thus, Stephen E. Gent in “Going in When it Counts: Military Intervention and the Outcome of Civil Conflicts” using Patrick M. Regan dataset that sets the bar for the civil wars at 200 fatalities and applying Cox proportional hazards model, has found similar results in regards to rebel-biased interventions and the probability that rebels will win. However, his analysis further suggested that the rebel-biased interventions are also associated with the negotiated settlements outcome and that government-biased interventions have no effect on the way the civil war will end.

In the article “Third-Party Intervention and the Civil War Process” Dylan Balch-Lindsay, Andrew J. Enterline, and Kyle A. Joyce have conducted a similar study that

---

17 Ibid, 724-725.
focused on the type of third party intervention and its influence on the civil war outcome. They have used an earlier version of the Correlates of War dataset with the 1000 battle related deaths threshold for the intrastate conflicts for the period from 1816 till 1997, while my study focused on the period after the Second World War until 2007. Similarly to Stephen E. Gent, the authors applied the Cox proportional hazards model to test hypotheses about civil war outcomes. Their finding about the statistically significant and positive impact of rebel-biased interventions on the likelihood of the rebel victory is consistent with Stephen E. Gent’s results and my conclusions. Yet, in their study rebel-biased interventions were found to be negatively associated with the government victory and positively with the compromise, while government-biased interventions were found to shorten the duration of the compromise and the government success outcomes. The variability in the conclusions between the studies can be caused by several factors. The first factor is the difference in the datasets between the thresholds in civil wars fatalities. The second element is the difference in the time periods under investigation. The third factor is the variability of explanatory factors across studies. Finally, the difference in the results can be explained by fact that the previous studies have utilized Cox proportional hazards models assuming the independence of the outcome risks, while I applied Fine and Gray model that incorporates the dependent risks assumption. This approach is an important contribution of my study to the scholarship on intrastate conflicts.

The role of regime type and military capacity in the determining the civil war outcome has been an equally heated debate in the scholarship on intrastate conflicts. In crafting the hypotheses regarding the impact of endogenous tipping points on locking in a

---

19 Ibid, 355.
particular conflict outcome, I mostly referred to the assumptions put forth by Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow in *Contentious Politics*.\(^{20}\) By extending their observations regarding the ability of a state to prevent the outbreak of the rebellion through the prism of the regime type and capacity into the likelihood of a particular intrastate conflict outcome, I suggested that high military strength of the government armed forces should be related to the government victory outcome. However, throughout all four tests, military capacity has not been associated with the government success, rebel victory or compromise outcome. A 2004 study by Karl R. DeRouen, Jr. and David Sobek employing a data from Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis on civil wars from 1944 till 1997 has found strong support for the role of armed forces across all civil war outcomes.\(^{21}\) The contrast in findings can be partially explained by the Research Design And testing methods, yet it is critical to further investigate the factor of military capacity.

While military capacity might not be a critical tipping point in determining the path of the civil war, regime type has appeared to affect the intrastate conflict outcome. Thus, as hypothesized democratic regimes tend be associated with the compromise outcome (*H12*). Furthermore, democracies tend to decrease the duration of the conflict that ends in the negotiated settlement. While hypothetically democratic societies are characterized by the mechanisms to addresses grievances to prevent conflicts, they are not immune from civil wars. However, the presence of democratic institutions implies credible mechanisms for establishing a dialogue between the government and rebels and provides space to address grievances for both sides. Autocratic regimes, on the other hand, lack such mechanisms, but also can afford to ignore public opinion that usually

---

prefers peaceful settlement to prolonged bloody war. My analysis further supports this assumption as autocratic states are largely associated with the government success outcome and the decrease in its duration (H13). The majority of the civil war literature that aims at explaining the outcome of conflict treats regime type as a secondary explanatory variable or simply a control factor that should be included in the tests. Furthermore, the democracy variable is given preference to anocratic or autocratic regimes in these studies. My analysis, however, incorporates both regime types and offers inferences about their impact on the civil war outcomes and duration. While Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow have suggested that undemocratic regimes are more prone to instigate a civil war, my study suggests that they are also more likely to topple the rebellion.

Conclusion

The analysis of the narrow concept of path dependence through the framework of three event history models revealed statistically and substantively significant tipping points that have the capacity to shape the outcomes of a civil war. The factor of government’s military strength appears to have no effect on the way intrastate conflicts are resolved. At the same time, the regime type of democracy was found to be conducive

---

to a compromise resolution, while government’s victory was more likely in autocratic states. Interventions by UN and IGOs decreased the time of a civil war and ultimately led to a negotiated settlement. Rebel-biased interventions increased the chance of the rebellion’s success, whereas state-based interventions increased the duration of a civil war. In the subsequent chapter, I apply the results of broad and narrow models of path dependence to three cases of civil wars to investigate causal mechanisms that shape the course of the conflict.
CHAPTER 6

CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The investigation into the broad and narrow notions of path dependence has supported the hypotheses about the influence of the initial conditions as well as temporal and sequence factors on the outcomes of intrastate conflicts. Viewing civil wars as an overarching process rather than the sum of different stages offers a novel perspective on the dynamics of the conflict and mechanisms that have the potential to lock in a particular settlement option. This chapter outlines the stories of three civil wars, incorporates the findings from onset factors and tipping points models, and proposes causal mechanisms that explain the particular outcome of an intrastate conflict.

While there is no commonly agreed approach in social sciences as to what constitutes a case study, I adhere to the supposition put forth by Poteete, Janssen, and Ostrom in Working Together: Collective Action, the Commons, and Multiple Methods in Practice that views the case study through the prism of the unit of analysis since it “offers an empirical interpretation of the theoretical subject of study.”\(^1\) Indeed, a focus on a specific civil war through outlining the development of conflict in general and crucial milestones in particular, provides a compelling test for the models and addresses possible limitations of the study.

The case selection for this chapter was based on the way the intrastate conflict ended as well as the presence of endogenous and exogenous tipping points. Thus, three cases that are analyzed in this study are the First Chechen War of 1994-1996 that resulted in the victory of rebels; Africa’s World War (Second Congo War) of 1998-2002 in which a compromise between warring sides was achieved; and, the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War (Eelam IV) of 2006-2009 where the government toppled the rebel forces. The last case was not included in the original dataset and is introduced here to test the applicability of my findings for out-of-sample civil wars. Each case study involves a brief account of the war, discussion of the initial conditions, evaluation of the tipping factors’ impact, and analysis of the causal mechanisms that led to a particular civil war outcome.
The First Chechen War of 1994-1996

Table 19. Overview of the First Chechen War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Rebels’ Victory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime Type</td>
<td>Anocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel per 1,000</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of an Intrastate Conflict

The roots of the First Chechen War can be traced back to the history of the policies conducted by the communist regime toward the local populace. Yet, a direct impetus for the independence of Chechnya lies in the chaos and vacuum of power that
resulted after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Many autonomous republics within the Russian Federation felt that the appropriate moment had come for the proclamation of national rights and liberties in the light of the weakening grasp of Moscow. Indeed, many autonomous entities sought to proclaim independence in the early nineties. However, after the first president of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, succeeded in establishing control over the turbulent political system, many autonomous republics searched for a new agreement with the central authority.

As of 1994, Moscow managed to negotiate federal treaties with the majority of the autonomous republics, including powerful and independence-seeking Tatarstan. And if in the case of Tatarstan, agreement was achieved by relatively peaceful methods, relations with the Republic of Chechnya included the use of force in 1991 and 1992, which after a severe repulse from the Chechen government of Dudayev forced Russian troops to conduct a covert operation in the fall of 1994. John P. Hardt and his colleagues provided insight into the reasons for the Chechen crisis and argued that “Dudayev has made numerous extreme, hostile statements against Russia, and some suggest that Yeltsin bears a personal animus against Dudayev.” Therefore, animosity between Russian and Chechen leaders multiplied by decentralization tendencies after the collapse of the Soviet Union appeared to be significant factors that predetermined the First Chechen War. As of the year 1994, the situation in Chechnya escalated significantly and under these circumstances Boris Yeltsin opted for decisive actions.

---

3 Ibid., 37.
4 Ibid.
Initial attempts of the federal government to solve the conflict through engaging the Chechen opposition to seize the Chechen capital, Grozny, on November 26, 1994 failed. The assistance of the Russian Federal Counterintelligence Service in this operation did not alter the outcomes of the attack. To put things in perspective, in their account of the Chechen conflict, Trenin, Malashenko, and Lieven compare the November 1994 attack on Grozny to the Bay of Pigs invasion.\(^5\) Unable to localize conflict to only Chechen authorities, Yeltsin decided to engage in a full-scale campaign that would include regular troops. After massive air strikes, ground forces started a march toward Grozny in December of 1994.\(^6\) The war lasted for almost two years and resulted in the signing of the Khasav-Yurt agreement in August, 1996. In fact, this treaty stipulated the \textit{de facto} defeat of Moscow in the First Chechen War. Analyzing the reasons for Russian failure to establish control over Chechnya, one could be startled by the situation when a former “superpower” loses a war to a significantly weaker opponent. The first factor that led to Moscow’s defeat was the disastrous situation at the strategic and tactical levels of Russian military decision-making. Other factors were political intrigues within the Russian government and a worsening economic situation. However, despite all these drawbacks federal troops succeeded in confronting Chechen insurgents in conventional battles and controlling the majority of Chechen territory. So what forced Moscow to give concessions to Chechen separatists and sign an unfavorable agreement?


The disintegrative tendencies in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union continued to haunt newly independent republics, including the Russian Federation. In the Caucasus, several frozen conflicts erupted in Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan in the early 1990s and sent ripples across the region. Decentralization tendencies in Chechnya were undoubtedly encouraged by similar outbreaks in the neighboring republics. Yet, the factor of contagion appeared to be inconsistent with the findings of the quantitative models of initial conditions as Chechen rebels succeeded in confronting the federal forces and securing victory. As I have argued in chapter 5, the spillover of the civil war brings innovative tactics into the battlefield. While the rebels were not able to withstand Russian forces in conventional warfare since federal forces have significant advantage in airpower and artillery, they succeeded in using asymmetric tactics involving a guerrilla counteroffensive and terrorist attacks. The findings of the model suggested that government is less likely to succeed in civil wars caused by contagion, while, at the same time, compromise outcome becomes more likely. In a sense, success of the Chechen rebels can be interpreted as de facto defeat of the federal forces, but also as a negotiated settlement as de jure Chechnya still remained part of Russia after Moscow Peace Treaty of 1997.

An oil-exporting economy as the onset factor has been associated with the decreasing chances of the rebels to succeed in the intrastate conflict. Yet, in the case of First Chechen War the role of oil appeared to be more complex. In the initial model of path dependence that focused on the initial conditions, I codified the impact of oil
through identifying countries where this non-lootable resource accounts for the third of the merchandise exports. While Chechnya has historically contained both oil deposits and refining capabilities, the fraction of Chechen oil in overall Russian production was relatively low.\(^7\) Thus, war in Chechnya has not influenced the capabilities of the Russian government to deploy forces or support military activities. This caveat must be taken into account when interpreting the results of the large-\(n\) studies of intrastate conflict, especially if the dataset contains observations for large countries like Russia.

I have argued in previous chapters that rebel forces are unlikely to benefit from the oil as this resource is not easily extractable, transportable and thus does not provide immediate financial benefits. Yet, Anna Politkovskaya, a Russian journalist and human rights activist who was assassinated allegedly due to her professional work, provided insight into the role of oil during the conflict in Chechnya. In her book *A Dirty War: A Russian Reporter in Chechnya*, Politkovskaya argued that oil wells served as a payment for the supporters of the Chechen rebel leaders.\(^8\) Moreover, given the unpopularity of the war in Russia, pervasive corruption, and dominance of criminal warlords, lucrative business emerged in Chechnya that involved the criminal elements from Russia and Chechen bandits trading in the spoils of war, including oil.\(^9\) Therefore, looking at the micro level of civil war in Chechnya, the oil factor might have increased the chances of the rebels’ victory.

Finally, the factor of religion during the First Chechen War played a role both in the terms of Russian and Chechen confrontation as well as the dynamics within the

---


\(^9\) Ibid, 309.
rebellion. The competing risks analysis suggested that in religiously diverse societies, warring sides take a longer time to reach a compromise. In the case of Chechnya, overwhelmingly Muslim rebel forces opposed religiously diverse but increasingly Orthodox Christian federal forces. Within the separatist movement, two approaches defined the actions of the rebels: a moderate wing that has led by Chechen President Dudayev and a radical wing led by military commander Basayev who adhered to the Wahhabist traditions. Whereas religiously driven rhetoric was used by the Chechen troops to rally support against federal forces and impeded the compromise decision, infighting within the separatist movement appeared to be a greater issue both in terms of the likelihood of the conflict outcome as well as the outbreak of the Second Chechen War in 1999.

*Tipping Points*

The First Chechen War was an isolated intrastate conflict in a sense that there was no foreign military intervention or international peacekeeping mission. The international community remained largely an observer in this civil war. Russia as the successor of the Soviet Union retained one of the largest military forces and nuclear arsenal making a third party intervention a risky endeavor. Finally, as the permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, Russia had the opportunity to veto any decision of the body and insisted on considering the Chechen conflict an internal affair.

Although Russia made significant transformations in its political system after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it has been defined as neither autocracy nor democracy in
the POLITY IV dataset. The analysis of the civil war outcomes through the prism of competing risks suggested that authoritarian regimes favor government success outcome, while democratic societies prefer compromise. Russia during the period of the First Chechen War was arguably a combination of the democratic transformations alongside growing authoritarian powers of President Yeltsin, especially in the aftermath of Russian Constitutional crisis of 1993. In sum, exogenous and to a lesser extent endogenous factors had minimal effect on the course of civil war in Chechnya.

*Mechanisms*

Traditional interpretations of the success of the rebels during the First Chechen War point at political and economic instability within Russia as well as poor Russian military decision-making and planning. Yet, if one considers the framework of path dependence in its narrow sense, it becomes increasingly useful to consider the impact of small events as well as the role of timing and sequence during the intrastate conflict. In case of the First Chechen War, the power of small events can be analyzed through prism of terrorist tactics by Chechen separatists. Moscow appeared to be unprepared for asymmetrical warfare that on the other hand had a significant impact not only on the government, but also on Russian society as a whole. Two major terrorist attacks by Chechen separatists appeared to be crucial determinants of Moscow’s defeat in the First Chechen War.

The most striking act of terrorism that the Russian government experienced during the First Chechen War was the raid on a hospital in Budennovsk on June 14, 1995.
During this attack hundreds of hospital personnel and patients were taken hostage. Interestingly, the attack occurred at the end of spring of 1995 when Russian troops achieved significant success over Chechen separatists and forced them to retreat to mountainous regions.\(^\text{10}\) Two suppositions explain the change of separatists’ tactics. Some conspiracy theorists trace connections between the terrorist leader, Basayev, and the Russian government arguing that certain officials were interested in the continuation of the war.\(^\text{11}\) Other sources claim that the attack on Budennovsk was a coincidence triggered by accident.\(^\text{12}\) Another perspective on this incident is offered by Dianne Leigh Sumner who cites the leader of terrorists during the Budennovsk attack, Shamil Basayev: “They say that Budennovsk was terror. And the fact that the Russian Air Force is bombing our villages every day – that is not terror? ... [Budennovsk] was a response reaction. We were compelled to resort to extreme means in order simply to survive. I am not a bandit … Russia is breaking all the international laws and the United Nations does nothing.”\(^\text{13}\) In sum, various evidence suggest that the attack was well planned and unexpected which also explains its effectiveness.

The Budennovsk massacre lasted six days. On June 14, 1995 approximately one hundred rebels led by Basayev entered the city where they met other rebels that were spread around Budennovsk. The targets of Basayev troops were a hospital, maternity clinic, bank, communication center, town hall, and the local internal affairs department, which they failed to seize.\(^\text{14}\) The element of surprise and swiftness of the attack shocked


\(^{11}\) Ibid, 23.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
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Russian authorities even more so since the city was located outside of the conflict zone and virtually meant the spillover of war outside of Chechnya. As federal forces surrounded the city, Basayev demanded “amnesty for all Chechen fighters and free elections for Chechnya.” Already killing 91 people in the initial attack on the city, rebels proceeded with the execution of hostages after several unsuccessful siege attempts by Russian forces. Basayev was holding almost 1,500 hostages including pregnant women. These factors forced Moscow to make concessions to terrorists and accept their demands for a cease-fire and “direct negotiations between Russia and Chechen President Dudayev.”

The stalemate period appeared to be very short for establishing a bilateral agreement and the active fighting was restored. Once again Chechen separatists failed to withstand federal troops in conventional warfare. Under such circumstances, the rebels made a decision to utilize similar terrorist tactics. This time the target of the rebels became the hospital in town Kizlyar of the neighboring republic Dagestan. On January 9, 1996, 256 Chechen separatists lead by Salman Raduyev entered Kizlyar and captured the hospital with around 2,000 people. On their way, separatists destroyed an airfield and killed 25 civilians. This time the rebels decided not to stay on the premises, but to move back to Chechnya using hostages as a “live shield”. However, federal troops were also ready for decisive actions and blocked the road near village Pervomayskoye where Chechen rebels were supposed to pass. Near the village, they captured another 100

---
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civilians and 37 soldiers and took cover in the neighboring building. Five days of negotiations did not bring any changes since this time Russian authorities refused to negotiate with the rebels and planned a siege. The ensuing three days of fighting could have resulted in a complete Russian victory, but Chechen separatists received reinforcement and partially succeeded to retreat (their leader Salman Raduyev also escaped). Leaving 150 terrorists and 40 hostages killed, this operation could be evaluated as neither a success nor a failure for Russian forces, while the objectives of the terrorists also were not achieved.

Once again the decision-making process toward the Chechen attacks ironically became a hostage of a political process. Yeltsin’s appointment of the FSB head responsible for hostage conflict resolution, Barsukov, can be evaluated as a critical mistake since Barsukov spent his entire career at the Kremlin and had only vague experience in dealing with terrorist attacks. This fact along with the government’s failed attempts to raise public approval led to a significant drop of president’s approval rating as “millions of television viewers saw him telling clumsy lies and looking as if he were absolutely out of touch with reality.” In contrast with Budennovsk, federal troops had not considered the possibility of negotiations and launched a full-scale siege paying less attention to the hostage casualties. The results of the operation were devastating: a high toll of hostage casualties and the escape of Chechen separatists, multiplied by the public dissatisfaction with the war, became the final nails in the coffin of the First Chechen War.

---
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These unfavorable outcomes for Moscow were the result of the lack of preparation of the federal forces for new Chechen tactics. However, a bigger cause behind the defeat of the federal forces was Russian political decision-making. Lilia Shevtsova argued in *Yeltsin's Russia: Myths and Reality*: “the actions by the Chechens…rocked all of Russia and temporarily paralyzed its leadership.” Moreover, in this particular period a greater confrontation remained at the high political level. Being on a foreign trip, the Russian president gave an order to utilize military force against rebels who attacked the hospital. When the siege ended with a debacle, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin entered the scene by succeeding in negotiations with the rebels to release the hostages. The acceptance of Basayev’s demands meant a huge strike against Russian military prestige. At the same time, the Communist-led opposition in Duma tried to adopt an impeachment resolution against Yeltsin. Despite the fact that the attempt was unsuccessful, the President’s positions were weakened by the resignation of key ministers in power departments.
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Africa’s World War (the Second Congo War) of 1998-2002

Table 20. Overview of Africa’s World War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Compromise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime Type</td>
<td>Anocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel per 1,000</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of an Intrastate Conflict

The presence of conflict seems to be endemic to the region of equatorial Africa. With the advent of the era of colonization, it has experienced one of the most devastating violent outbreaks. Throughout almost five hundred years of the European occupation and
about sixty years of independence, violent conflicts became part of the history. Humanitarian disasters, wars for resources, and political struggles are mundane headlines of the news from this part of the African continent. Part of the problem lies, obviously, in the historical development of the region during colonial times and, specifically, the way these territories were divided, administered, and eventually tied to the metropolis. While various factors contribute to the onset and dynamics of the modern conflict in equatorial Africa, the underlying problem is the colonial legacy.

The most vivid and tragic example is the present day Democratic Republic of Congo. Since its independence in 1960, the vicious cycle of violence, corruption, and secessionism has paralyzed the state and condemned the society to suffering the consequences of constant fear and socioeconomic deprivations. The last two decades brought unparalleled destruction as the country faced civil wars, massive human rights violation, and de facto humanitarian catastrophe. Several factors are crucial to the dynamics of the conflict within the DRC: ethnic violence, the presence of hostile neighboring countries, natural resources, weakness of central government, and secessionist movements. At the same time, the involvement of the United Nations, African Union, and participation of the world’s major powers reflect not only the fact that third parties are instrumental in solving this conflict, but also that civil war in Congo could not be contained within its national borders.

The countries that comprise the Great Lakes Region of Africa have historically been intertwined in terms of population, culture, and economic relations. Despite the plethora of domestic grievances, the end to President Mobutu’s rule came from external calamity. One of the most tragic catastrophes in the recent history, the genocide in
Rwanda of 1994 has impacted the fragile balance in the DRC that was then called Zaire as almost 1.2 million Hutu refugees relocated to the Kivu, a region that is populated by Tutsis. Two years later, the Mobutu opposition, Alliance des Forces Democratiques pour la Liberation de Congo, led by Laurent-Desire Kabila and supported by Rwanda and Uganda, initiated a rebellion that resulted in removal of the decades long dictatorship and renaming the country to the Democratic Republic of Congo. Yet, Patricia Daley points out that the newly established leader not only failed at curbing systemic problems, which he inherited from the Mobutu regime, but also utilized state resources to strengthen the military and buy back the support of allies. These drawbacks in addition to the involvement of neighboring countries in the conflict inadvertently led to the outbreak of the second civil war in Democratic Republic of Congo.

In ironic twist of events, the rebellion against Kabila started in the same region of Kivu with the support from his former ‘friends’ where “the Rassemblement Congolais pour la Democratie (RCD-Goma) is supported by Rwanda, while the Mouvement pour la Liberation du Congo (MLC) and the RCD-Bunia, a break-away of the RCD-Goma, are sponsored by Uganda.” At the same time, Kabila was promised military assistance from Angola, Zimbabwe, and Namibia, which effectively elevated the scale of the conflict to the regional level. Support on each side came not due to friendly intentions, but as a strategic calculation which involved ethnic and economic dimensions. Elites on each side were eager to utilize insecurity to achieve their parochial interests at the expense of

---

peace. Filip Reyntjens underlines the paradox of the conflict environment in the Democratic Republic of Congo: “local, national and regional state and non-state actors indeed act rationally, engaged as they are in cost-benefit analyses, whose outcome often shows that war, instability and state decay are more attractive than peace, stability and state reconstruction.”

The anti-Kabila rebellion further destabilized the Democratic Republic Congo, while the scope of parties involved and a deteriorating humanitarian situation attracted greater attention from international community. Rwandan troops march toward Kinshasa in 1998 with the aim of the quick toppling of Kabila, but were thwarted by the involvement of the DRC allies Angola, Zimbabwe, and Namibia. With neither side able to achieve decisive victory, the DRC was de facto divided between three warring counterparts: the Rassemblement Congolais pour la Democratie (the Rwandan supported rebel group) controlled the east; Mouvement pour la Liberation du Congo with the backing from Uganda dominated northern parts; and Kabila forces securing the rest of the country. In light of the stalemate, all sides agreed to the peace dialogue that culminated with signing the Lusaka Accord in 1999. The military component of the agreement outlined “a cease-fire, the deployment of a UN force, the neutralization of ‘negative forces’ (including Rwandan and Burundian rebel groups) and the withdrawal of foreign armies,” while the political provision focused on the “the organization of an ‘inter-Congolese dialogue’ aimed at agreeing on the terms of a transition to a democratic form of government, and the re-establishment of the authority of the state throughout the entire country.

---
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national territory.” The fragile ceasefire was constantly under the threat of relapse as every side regularly accused the other of violations. The United Nations Security Council was equally concerned about the domestic application of the accord specifically in regards to the exploitation of natural resources by external actors.

The assassination of Laurent-Desire Kabila in 2001 and the succession of his son, Joseph, as the leader of a state symbolized a new stage in the history of the DRC. While gradual steps were taken to ameliorate the conflict, withdraw foreign presence, and institute provisional government, the country again faced a crisis as the results of the 2006 Presidential elections, which Kabila won, were not accepted by the opposition candidates. A new rebellion erupted in the ill-fated province of Kivu and other regions of the DRC. For the past seven years the national army, FARDC, has consistently attempted to address the rising tides of secessionism and instability. The involvement of the United Nations in the conflict since 1999 as the Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo or MONUC and following the new stage in operation as the Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or MONUSCO appeared to be instrumental in addressing one of the most violent and complex intrastate conflicts in the Great Lakes region of Africa.

Several factors that I have analyzed in the model of initial conditions have been present at the onset of the civil war in the Democratic Republic of Congo. First and foremost, the spillover of the conflict from nearby intrastate wars that ravaged the states surrounding the DRC made direct causal contributions. Thus, refugees that were escaping genocide, rebels that failed in their countries, and foreign armed forces that brought to power President Kabila all contributed to the onset of civil war in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The factor of contagion in the Africa’s World War is consistent with the model of path dependence in intrastate conflicts that focused on the impact of initial conditions on the outcome. Thus, spillover of civil war in the DRC has a cascading effect that resulted in the third party intervention. Interestingly, various neighboring states provided first indirect and in the later stages direct military support both to the government forces and insurgent groups. The stalemate between different factions in the war prompted brokerage and subsequent involvement of regional and international organizations culminating in a compromise settlement. Arguably, the onset factor of contagion is associated with the compromise outcome because it prompts interventions from the UN and regional IGOs to curb the spread of violence, which was the case for Africa’s World War.

While the Democratic Republic of Congo has vast fuel resources including oil, its primary export commodities include copper, cobalt and other non-ferrous minerals.34 At the same time, the presence of lootable resources in the conflict areas has been identified
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by the United Nations Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as the source of financing rebel activities as well as criminal elements that were interested in perpetuating the conflict.\(^{35}\) The Panel’s Report has highlighted the complexity of the civil war and post-conflict reconstruction in the DRC as not only rebel groups, but also states that intervened and supported them militarily in the conflict had a stake in the resources-rich neighbor. According to the Report, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, and Uganda anticipating the involvement of the United Nations peacekeeping missions altered their approach to controlling the DRC resources by withdrawing armed forces, but leaving criminal elements to sustain illegal extraction and, as a result, the propensity for conflict reoccurrence.\(^{36}\) While my quantitative models of path dependence found no connection between diamonds and intrastate conflict outcome, the case of Africa’s World War implies the connection between lootable resources and third party intervention by states. Furthermore, focusing exclusively on diamonds and oil may limit the explanatory potential of the models as in the case of the DRC such lootable resources as tantalum, gold, and coltan were instrumental in causing and sustaining conflict.

The civil war in Democratic Republic of Congo was largely driven by ethnic violence rather than religious differences. Thus, spillover of the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis in neighboring Rwanda into the DRC led to the continuation of the interethnic conflict that then involved local tribes that were dissatisfied with the influx of
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immigrants.\textsuperscript{37} As the conflict ravaged the country, old ethnic rivalries reemerged and were exacerbated by the vacuum of power after the withdrawal of warring sides according to the ceasefire agreement. The stark example of such ethnic confrontation was the Ituri conflict in the eastern province of the DRC that “erupted in the wake of Ugandan Army withdrawal in compliance with peace agreements and international pressure.”\textsuperscript{38}

Since the existing scholarship on civil war in the DRC does not provide any insights into the role of religion in affecting conflict dynamics, it is problematic to extrapolate further the factor of religious diversity as a determinant in path dependent process.

\textit{Tipping Points}

After the end of the Cold War, the long lasting authoritative grip of the President Mobutu that ruled the Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire at that time) slowly diminished. Since 1990 the POLITY IV Project has identified the DRC as anocratic. The regime type that is neither democratic nor autocratic has lasted in the Democratic Republic of Congo after Mobutu’s death in 1997 and surpassed the period of the second civil war itself. Since the civil war erupted only a little more than year after the First War in Congo, President Kabila had not only a limited time to implement democratic changes that were desired by Congolese people, but even less incentive to do so given the increasing fear of the presence of foreign troops.\textsuperscript{39} Thus, stuck in a regime limbo Kabila

did not have avenues to use democratic institutions to establish credible commitments with the warring sides or autocratic instruments to topple unpopular moods within the country. Furthermore, he relied militarily on Rwandan and Ugandan strength to topple the previous government of Mobutu and thus failed to establish effective national armed forces. While the regime type and military capacity are useful dimensions for examining an intrastate conflict in the DRC, it is the exogenous tipping points that played a decisive role in the initiating the war, sustaining the violence, and eventually locking in the particular civil war outcome.

Indeed, the name of an intrastate conflict, African World War, implies the involvement of the regional parties that had their security, financial, and political interests in influencing the dynamics of the conflict. The analysis through the lens of path dependence dynamics is rather complex in this particular case since third party interventions supported both government and rebels troops as well as involved peacekeeping missions from the United Nations and regional IGOs. Yet, the key factor in solving the puzzle is focusing on the sequence and timing factors, or in other words in what order did the interventions occur. The significance of timing and sequence has been stressed by Paul Pierson in this analysis of the narrower notion of path dependence and confirmed by my models of the intrastate conflict.

The results of the competing risks models indicated that rebel-biased interventions tend to result in the rebels’ victory. As the Rwandan and Ugandan governments became dissatisfied with the newly established Kabila’s regime, they backed up the Rassemblement Congolais pour la Democratie (RCD) rebel group and instigated the conflict. The swiftness and scale of the attack almost granted rebels a victory, but the
involvement of government-biased intervention from Angola and Zimbabwe prevented Kabila’s demise. In the presence of support for government and rebel troops, combined with the diversification of rebel groups and their motives, the possibility of decisive military victory of either side appeared to be highly unlikely. The ensuing Lusaka Accord of 1999 that established a ceasefire was regularly violated by warring sides and the assassination of President Kabila in 2001 imbued conflict with reinvigorated fervor. Yet, it was the involvement of the United Nations peacekeepers that played the pivotal role in the emergence of the compromise outcome in the African World War. In the next section, I outline the evolution of UN missions and mechanisms that locked in the compromise solution.

**Mechanisms**

The United Nations has been involved in the peace operations in Congo since the early years of its independence from Belgium. As the transition period was marked with violence, Belgian forces moved troops to Congo to restore order, which were not welcomed by the Congolese government that in turn asked the United Nations to provide protection from foreign aggression. The United Nations Operation in the Congo (Opération des Nations Unies au Congo or ONUC) was established in July 1960 and at its apex consisted of 20,000 personnel that were “originally mandated to provide the Congolese Government with the military and technical assistance it required following

---


the collapse of many essential services and the military intervention by Belgian troops” and later had to expand their mandate due to the complex conflict situation. The secessionist trends within Congo became a prominent topic on the agenda of ONUC that initially been tasked with protection from external forces. The situation has deteriorated even further after the tragic events on September 17, 1961 when the airplane that carried Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld crashed in the region of the nowadays Zambia en route to the meeting to discuss the future of the secessionist Katanga province. In 1964, following the prevention of secessionist movements and external aggression, the ONUC finished its operation in Congo, but structural problems that arose during their four-year mandate not only threatened the future of peacekeeping, but also jeopardized the feasibility of the United Nations in general.

The role of the United Nations was equally crucial for mediating the Second Congo War following the instability spawned by the removal of the three-decade-long regime of Mobutu and rise to power of Laurent-Desire Kabila. After the signing of the Lusaka Accord in 1999 that culminated the internal conflict exacerbated by the participation of neighboring countries, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1279 and established an Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). Two weeks prior to the inception of the MONUC operation, on November 16, 1999, the Organization of the African Unity dispatched a Joint Monitoring Commission to observe the fulfillment of the Lusaka Accord.
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Initially, MONUC was tasked with traditional peacekeeping functions, ceasefire monitoring, but not surprisingly had to update the initial mandate due to the complex situation in the field. Observers of this intrastate conflict highlighted the need for a more robust approach to peacekeeping given the complexity of the situation that would require introduction of the Chapter VII peacekeeping.\textsuperscript{46} According to article 42 of the UN Charter, in cases where peaceful settlement of conflicts is not attainable the UN can authorize enforcement mechanisms “by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.”\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, following the 2002 agreement between warring sides to form a transitional government, MONUC was authorized to disarm the rebel groups but still lacked the enforcement mechanisms.\textsuperscript{48} Not only the mandate but also the undersized peacekeeping mission prevented MONUC from swiftly responding to the increasing levels of violence in the eastern provinces of the DRC. Under the deteriorating peace conditions, the UN Security Council adopted the resolution 1484 (2003) which authorized deployment of European Union troops under the Chapter VII of the UN Charter.\textsuperscript{49} French-led Operation Artemis was the first instance of the independent European Union crisis management mission and was successful in providing security in the Bunia region, weakening militia groups, delivering humanitarian


aid, and ultimately saving time for establishing a more reinforced UN peacekeeping presence in the area.\textsuperscript{50}

While officially the African World War ended on December 16, 2002 with government and rebel groups singing of the Global and All-Inclusive Agreement to form transitional government, local conflicts in Kivu, Ituri, and Katanga provinces continued despite the presence of international peacekeepers. In this light, it is critical to emphasize both the role of the United Nations as the mediator of the compromise outcome for the civil war and also as an active enforcer of the peace process during the post-compromise period.

\textit{Lessons Learned}

In the light of the findings regarding the role of international involvement in shaping the compromise outcome in civil wars, it is imperative to investigate further path dependent dynamics in the DRC. Thus, in this section I will focus on the evolution of MONUC into MONUSCO and elaborate on how actions of the UN intervention brigade helped secure the compromise outcome through active enforcement measures.

The need for a “robust force” in the secessionist regions of Democratic Republic of Congo forced the UN Security Council to expand the mandate of MONUC with Security Council Resolution 1565 (2004) that authorized the increase of personnel by roughly 6,000 peacekeepers with the tasks of protection of civilians, discouraging violence, providing security to the UN personnel, ceasefire observation, and
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disarmament. As of 2010, the MONUC was 20,000 peacekeepers strong and expanded its mandate to assisting with electoral process, training the Congolese national army (FARDC) and gradually preparing for the transition that would reflect the realities of the modern situation in the DRC.

The United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) was established in May 28, 2010 on the basis of MONUC to reflect the ‘new stage’ in the history of the Democratic Republic of Congo. In reality, however, MONUSCO was not different from its predecessor since its mandate emphasized similar provisions: “to use all necessary means to carry out its mandate relating, among other things, to the protection of civilians, humanitarian personnel and human rights defenders under imminent threat of physical violence and to support the Government of the DRC in its stabilization and peace consolidation efforts.” Moreover, the composition of the peace operation, “a maximum of 19,815 military personnel, 760 military observers, 391 police personnel and 1,050 personnel of formed police units,” remained similar to MONUC, even though suggestions have been made about reducing the number of peacekeepers. With the approved budget of almost $1.5 billion for 2013-2014, MONUSCO remains by and large the largest external guarantee of security in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Yet, addressing the structural roots of intrastate conflict is a slow process and would require participation of various non-state actors that must operate in a secure environment. The recurring attacks from rebel groups backed by
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neighboring countries jeopardize peacebuilding attempts. While the United Nations peace operations traditionally relied on protecting rather than enforcing, it was imperative in the case of the DRC to reformulate current postulates in order to address efficiently the transnationally supported rebel groups.

The idea behind a more muscular vision of the United Nations is not new. According to Article 45 of the UN Charter, “to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action.” The UN Military Staff Committee that was charged with coordinating military actions of the UN was paralyzed by the Cold War stalemate and to this day remains largely dysfunctional. As an alternative, the United Nations authorized the creation of the peacekeeping forces that have evolved from merely ceasefire observers to the complex instrument aimed at preventing conflict, mediating reconciliation, and addressing the roots of conflict. However, peacekeepers have generally lacked the enforcement component and this limitation was effectively utilized against them in various intrastate conflicts.

In Congo, the situation has been drastically different both during the first involvement of the UN (ONUC) as well as during the recent peace operations (MONUC and MONUSCO). The creation of the UN Force Intervention Brigade in the spring of 2013 with the aim of neutralizing armed groups in the DRC was viewed as a paradigmatic shift not only for peace operation in Congo, but also for peacekeeping in general. While certainly a more offensive mandate was a required measure in the light of deteriorating conflict environment in the eastern provinces, UN considerations about

using stronger actions are not novel in this particular case, but in fact the topic of enforcement measures have been on the agenda since the UN’s first involvement during the early years of Congo’s independence. Thus, the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC) that was established in July 1960 and consisted of 20,000 peacekeepers became a victim of the Cold War rhetoric and *de facto* “became an enforcement army for the central government, which the UN Secretariat created with Western support.” The refusal of the USSR and France to pay the fees and resistance of other troop contributors to UN control led to a major split within this organization. That not only cast a shadow on the role of peacekeepers in offensive operations, but also undermined the UN’s involvement in the whole region of Great Lakes of Africa.\(^{57}\)

The seminal Brahimi Report on the future of peacekeeping criticized the current peace operations that oftentimes lack personnel or sufficient authority to respond efficiently to the modern crises. The call for a “robust force” has been reflected in the changing mandate of MONUC that was initially tasked with ceasefire observance, but later incorporated disarmament, electoral assistance, and security of civilians and UN staff. Durch and his colleagues in *The Brahimi Report and the Future of UN Peace Operations* posit that “the first operational test of these new principles and force requirements awaited the Security Council’s July 2003 expansion of MONUC’s mandate to ‘use all necessary means’ in the DR Congo’s northeastern district of Ituri, where extreme inter-ethnic violence had erupted in the wake of Ugandan Army withdrawal in

---
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compliance with peace agreements and international pressure.” Following the adoption of Resolution 1565 (2004), the UN Security Council authorized the expansion of the MONUC staff and strengthening the enforcement provisions of the mandate.

However, in comparison to the previous cases the UN Force Intervention Brigade had one important distinction. It was the first time in peacekeeping history that the mandate permitted direct offensive operations against rebel forces. The initiative to create the intervention brigade came following high-level talks between all the Great Lake region countries, United Nations, African Union, and other African regional organizations that culminated in signing of the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region on February, 24th 2013. The next month the UN Security Council adopted resolution 2098 (2013) in which it condemned the activities of rebel groups such as “the M23, the FDLR, the ADF, the APCLS, the LRA, the National Force of Liberation (FNL), the various Mayi Mayi groups and all other armed groups and their continuing violence and abuses of human rights, including summary executions, sexual and gender based violence and large scale recruitment and use of children.” Article 9 of this resolution authorizes the creation of an intervention brigade which would be directly subordinate to the MONUSCO commander and be responsible for “neutralizing armed groups as set out in paragraph 12 (b) below and the objective of contributing to reducing the threat posed by armed groups to state authority and civilian security in the eastern DRC and to make space for

stabilization activities."\textsuperscript{62} Reference to paragraph 12(b) outlined the possibility of working jointly with or independently from FARDC (Congolese army) and the obligation to follow international law when engaging with combatants.

The actions of the Intervention Brigade that was initially viewed by international NGOs as rather another problem than a real solution to the crisis in Congo has proven its effectiveness in a joint operation with Congolese army that pushed rebel group Movement of March 23 (M23) outside of Congo and virtually led to its collapse. The 3,000-strong brigade that consisted of Tanzanian, Malawi, and South African troops under the UN command after successfully combating M23 has pledged to combat other rebel groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo.\textsuperscript{63} While clearly a game changer, the UN Intervention Brigade’s future largely depends on its success in addressing remaining rebel groups. The government of Democratic Republic of Congo and FARDC are still not able to provide political and security guarantees for the whole nation without the external support from international organizations such as the UN. Even though the situation that the UN found itself in the 1960s is unlikely to occur, both the Congolese government and foreign forces have to be rather cautious about the Intervention brigade’s tactics and its interaction with local population.

The involvement of the United Nations peacekeeping mission and Organization of African Unity’s observation commission has been pivotal in establishing a fertile ground for the dialogue between the warring sides in the light of the military deadlock. At the same time, international and regional organizations lacked enforcement mechanisms to
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prevent the outbreak of violence following the ceasefire of 1999. Gradually, the scope and size of the mission increased, thus contributing to the compromise between rebel groups and government forces in 2002. If not for the UN that sustained fragile peace after the peace agreement, the intrastate conflict in the DRC probably would have continued at the national level rather than been isolated to local provinces. Transformation of the MONUSCO and actions of the UN intervention brigade proved to be crucial in securing peace through active enforcement measures.
The Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War of 2006-2009

Table 21. Overview of the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Government wins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime Type</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel per 1000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations intervention</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional IGO intervention</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exports</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Fractionalization</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of an intrastate conflict

There are different approaches toward outlining the temporal dimensions of the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War. One approach argues for treating the entire period of confrontation in Sri Lanka as a continuous process, in which the Second Sri Lanka Tamil
Civil War that is also called Eelam War IV is the last stage of the war that lasted almost 26 years. In fact, this makes civil war in Sri Lanka one of the longest periods of intrastate violence since the end of the Second World War. In this study, I adhere to the classification developed by Correlates of War project that treats the period of conflict from 1983 to 2002 as the first Sri Lanka Tamil War and conflict that started in 2006 as the ongoing Second Sri Lanka War. The Correlates of War Dataset v.4.1 was published before the end of the Second Sri Lanka Tamil War. The intrastate conflict has effectively culminated with the victory of the government forces over the remnants of Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) on May 18, 2009.

Undoubtedly, the Second Sri Lanka Tamil War has its roots in the previous periods of the intrastate conflict as the same factors that sparked violence two decades before led to the outbreak of conflict in 2006. After gaining independence in 1948 from the British government, Sri Lanka found itself facing the classical post-colonial dilemma of managing the redistribution of the power between ethnic groups. Tamils that are the minority ethnic group in Sri Lanka enjoyed dominant status during the colonial period, but after the independence Sinhalese who represent the biggest ethnic group have stated their claim on power. Initially non-violent Tamil protests gradually transformed into violent separatist movements and brought to the stage militarized groups such as the LTTE in the 1970s. Full-fledged intrastate conflict that officially erupted in 1983 has been characterized by periods of intense violence and ceasefires as well as third party
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intervention by India in the late 1980s. After two decades of fighting, government and rebel forces agreed to enter a peace process that was supported by the mediation efforts of the international community.

Despite the high hopes from all sides of conflict for the peace process and joint efforts to address the consequences of the 2004 tsunami disaster, mutual distrust, internal struggle within the rebel movement and ascension to power of the nationalist Sinhalese parties eventually jeopardized reconciliation efforts. In 2006, government forces launched an offensive operation against LTTE formally starting the Eelam War IV. Gradual advancement of the Sri Lankan troops in the eastern and northern regions of the country in 2007 culminated in the spring of 2009 when the Tamil Tigers acknowledged that the military resistance has no prospects for success.

**Initial Conditions**

In the case of civil war in Sri Lanka, adopting the terminology popularized by Collier and Hoefler, grievance inducing factors such as ethnic cleavages and religious differences have a better explanatory power regarding the onset of conflict than control over natural resources. Sri Lanka is not an oil exporting economy and does not possess lootable resources that can be a potential source for conflict. At the same time, a long
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history of ethnic violence that is complicated by the religious mosaic of Sri Lankan society has been identified as the culprit of instability in the country. Traditional interpretations of the civil war in Sri Lanka picture an inherent feud rooted in the colonial past between Buddhist Sinhalese and Hindu Tamils. Yet, another faction of Muslim Tamils joined the conflict dynamics in the eastern provinces.\textsuperscript{73} In a sense, ethnic and religious factors are by and large aligned when it comes to differentiating government troops and rebels. Indeed, ethno-religious differences in Sri Lanka are consistent with my analysis of the broader definition of path dependence that focuses on the initial conditions. Religiously diverse societies are less likely to find a compromise solution to their intrastate conflicts. While some argue that the first civil war in Sri Lanka ended in a compromise, it is valid to argue that an end of hostilities in 2002 was a mere prelude before the final act of the civil war. This also explains why other sources do not divide Sri Lankan civil war into two separate instances of intrastate conflicts, but rather treat it as a continuous process.

Another interesting perspective on the conflict dynamics was proposed by Benedikt Korf in the article “Greed and Grievance in Sri Lanka” in which he argued that ethnic and religious differences determine the line between territories that each warring side claims to control for political and economic benefits.\textsuperscript{74} In turn, these “gains made by conflict entrepreneurs and war winners feed grievances caused by perceived discrimination, exclusion, and inequality among ethnic groups.”\textsuperscript{75} The mutually
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reinforcing greed and grievance dynamics provide enough momentum for the prolonged sustenance of an intrastate violence.

_Tipping Points_

The international response to the crisis in Sri Lanka has been limited to the declarations and statements by the United Nations, European Union, United States and other major players to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. At the onset of the conflict, third parties were hesitant to support openly the Sri Lanka government, but as the outcome of the war seemed clear Iran, China, and India pledged military, economic, and political support for the ruling regime.76 Toward the end of the war, the UN Human Rights Council witnessed a heated confrontation between the Western powers who proposed a resolution that will label actions by Sri Lankan armed forces and LTTE alike as war crimes, while a counter-resolution supported by India, Russia as well as other members from Asia, Africa, and Latin America argued for the non-interference principle.77

In the light of the increasing power of the Responsibility to Protect and human security principles, the involvement of the third parties was nevertheless highly unlikely not only because of the impasse at the UN level, but increasingly because of the swiftness of government’s military offensive on the rebel positions. In the case of Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War, external forces had minimal effect on the outcome of an intrastate conflict, yet in terms of post-conflict process Sri Lanka remains largely under

---

77 Ibid, 106.
the heavy pressure from the Western powers for its negative record of violating human rights during the conflict.

According to the POLITY IV dataset, during the period of second civil war Sri Lanka was a democratic state. Indeed, Sri Lanka is considered to be one of the oldest democracies in South Asia.\(^78\) Yet, during the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War observers have argued that the President Mahinda Rajapaksa has used the fear of the LTTE to maintain a firm grip over the government.\(^79\) After the conflict ended, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay expressed her concerns with deepening of the authoritarian direction in Sri Lanka as the new legislation provided the president with more power over the judiciary branch.\(^80\) Despite Rajapaksa’s popularity after winning a three decade conflict, he lost the 2015 Presidential elections and the newly elected government vowed to curb authoritarian legislation and guide Sri Lanka toward a more democratic society.\(^81\)

Although technically Sri Lanka was a democracy during the civil war, authoritarian elements – which according to my analysis in the previous chapters are pivotal for increasing the chances of the government’s success – were present during President Rajapaksa’s rule. In this light, it is valid to argue that the Sri Lankan government had used an image of LTTE as an enemy to garner more control over political checks and balances and to ignore pressures from domestic and international

communities. In the case of Sri Lanka, an internal tipping point of regime type was an indirect cause of the government’s success. The primary determinant of the intrastate conflict outcome was the continuous military offensive on the rebel forces with no intentions for a compromise solution. It is imperative to examine the role of military actions as the mechanism of path dependence in intrastate conflict given that the quantitative analysis found little support for this factor.

**Mechanisms**

Aside from reliance on military power to solve the intrastate conflict, the factor of the previous war outcome and the factor of the “War on Terror” appear to be the main elements of the path dependence dynamics during the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War. Jayadeva Uyangoda points out the resilience of the government military forces that not only gradually captured territories under the LLTE control, but also did not hesitate to target civilian areas where rebels were hiding.\(^8^2\) It is also important to note that despite the decrease of the size of the armed forces during the war, the rise of military expenditures and military performance resulted in “a qualitative change in the capabilities (enhanced force multiplier) of the Sri Lankan forces, as the Sri Lankan Armed forces destroyed, killed or captured most of the LTTE forces.”\(^8^3\) While across all instances of intrastate conflicts since the Second World War the size of the armed forces was not related with a particular civil war outcome, in the case of Sri Lanka, decisive actions of
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government forces even in the face of a humanitarian disaster have predetermined its victory in the conflict.

The Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War was a recurrence of the protracted conflict and as I argued earlier can be considered as a last episode of the conflict that lasted for almost thirty years. The war that started in 1983 and ended in the compromise in 2002 was characterized by periods of ceasefire and active combat. The volatility of the settlement attempts made both sides distrustful, which coupled with the lack of mechanisms to sustain commitments, led to the resurgence of conflict. The government and the LTTE consistently violated the 2002 truce and as the full-fledged war erupted in 2006, military victory appeared to be the preferable war outcome.

Finally, the global response to the terrorist attack on a World Trade Center in New York on September 11, 2001 was the critical shift that minimized the chances of the negotiated settlement and led to the government’s victory. The US-led “War on Terror” has not only changed the geopolitical map in the Middle East, but also affected large number of separatists groups around the globe. The addition of the LTTE to the US State Department terrorist list put it among such notorious groups as Al Qaeda, Hizballah, and Shining Path, which dramatically altered its image in the world community.84 Diaz and Murshed further suggest that the new discourse on the war between Sri Lankan armed forces and the LTTE has labeled the government’s struggle as “a virtuous campaign, where the violence of war could be justified as a moral obligation against terror.”85 Labeled as the terrorist group, the LTTE lost an important source of funding from Tamil

Diaspora as the international community started targeting their sympathizers and sponsors. Therefore, a change of attitudes from the international community toward the LTTE, justification of the military actions, and loss of financial support justify the argument about the path dependence of the government success outcome in the Second Sri Lanka Tamil War.

**Conclusion**

Three case studies reviewed in this chapter addressed the variation of factors, both at the early stages of conflict and in the later phases, that shaped different outcomes of civil wars. One immediate observation following the comparative analysis of intrastate conflict is the caution with the reliance on the large-\(n\) statistical results. It is evident in the qualitative overview of three conflicts that statistically and substantively relevant indicators of path dependence are useful as the first place to look for explanation of causal mechanisms, yet the reality proves that relationship behind the civil war dynamics is rather complex.

In the case of First Chechen War, causal mechanisms behind the onset factor of oil appeared to be complicated by the existence of illegal trade between rebel forces and criminal elements from the Russian Federation. Moreover, the outcome of intrastate conflict can be interpreted both as the success of rebels and also a compromise since *de jure* Chechnya remained part of Russia. The decisive role in determining the outcome of an intrastate conflict can be attributed to asymmetric warfare of Chechen rebels such as terrorist attacks that paralyzed Russian political establishment. In this regard, it is
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possible to trace parallels with the First Sri Lanka Tamil War that also ended in a compromise after the LTTE started using asymmetric tactics.

Furthermore, both the Second Chechen War and the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War ended in a decisive victory of the government as it was able to cut international support for the rebels, label them as terrorist organization after the US-led “War on Terror,” and, ultimately, conduct ruthless military operations that bordered on violations of the human rights. In contrast, the Second Congo War is the example of how international involvement by the modern UN peacekeepers that have the mandate for active military engagement can establish the mechanisms for a stable peace. In all three cases, initial conditions, tipping points, or small events shaped the path dependent dynamics that are responsible for the variation in intrastate conflict outcomes.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

Introduction

Intrastate conflicts are complex and multifaceted phenomena. Existing analytical approaches tend to deconstruct intrastate conflicts into phases and evaluate each stage separately. While such a method generated valuable inferences about the nature of civil war, it ultimately lacks the overarching understanding about how the stages of war interact with each other. This dissertation overcomes this limitation by integrating the theory of path dependence into the intrastate conflict discourse through outlining the patterns where a particular outcome of a civil war is conditioned by the initial character of a conflict, internal features of a state, and intervening factors. Indeed, viewing an intrastate conflict as a dynamic, continuous process that is shaped by internal and external forces allows the construction of the set of testable hypotheses about path dependence in intrastate conflicts. The theory of path dependence proved to be an innovative framework for analyzing intrastate conflicts.

The research design of the dissertation that is shaped after the mixed methods approach provides the comprehensive evaluation of path dependence conjectures while controlling for the drawbacks of the large-n analysis and focusing on individual cases. The results of quantitative tests provide considerable evidence for both the broad conception of path dependence that emphasizes the role of the initial conditions in framing the outcomes of the process as well as the narrow conception that highlights the
critical role of exogenous and endogenous tipping points. Case studies analysis has supported the validity of the quantitative findings, yet also hinted at the potential limitations of the large-$n$ approach. Instead, focusing on individual cases of civil wars provided an insight into the causal mechanisms that shape the outcome of the conflict. In the next sections, I provide a synthesis of the empirical findings, discuss theoretical and policy implications, and discuss potential limitations of the current study.

**Empirical Findings**

A quantitative inquiry into the broad concept of path dependence has provided sufficient evidence to support several hypotheses that tested the impact of the initial conditions on the outcomes of civil wars. The logic behind the design of this particular methodological framework was partially informed by the motive-opportunity paradigm of conflict onset. Thus, I have identified secondary diamonds and an oil-exporting economy as the opportunity structures, while religious and ethnic diversity of the society as the motive (grievance) agencies. The factor of contagion does not fit within this classification, yet remains a decisive determinant of the civil war initiation. Finally, the control variable for the Cold War is introduced in the dataset to capture the impact of the bipolar system of international relations.

To account for the impact of the initial conditions on the outcomes of a civil war, I have conducted a series of multinominal logistic regressions. The findings of these tests have provided substantial evidence for the interrelation between the onset and termination phases of the conflict. Unlike previous studies that focused on the greed and
grievance paradigm in which opportunity determinants were found to be closer related to
the onset of civil war than motive-based factors, my inquiry into path dependence
dynamics has found little evidence for this clear-cut distinction. On the contrary, when it
comes to explaining the outcome of the civil war, the opportunity factor of oil; the motive
factor of religious fractionalization; the factor of contagion; and, the Cold War era have
been found statistically and substantively significant. The eclecticism of the relevant
onset factors can be explained by the fact that there are different calculations and
expectations about the war before and after the initiation of hostilities.

Thus, in the recent scholarship on conflict onset, secondary diamonds that are
easily extractable and tradable were found to be related with the start of the civil war as
they can serve a lucrative source for financing the rebel cause. My analysis found no
support for the role of secondary diamonds in determining the outcome of the intrastate
conflict. Indeed, while the decision to rebel can be explained by the presence of lootable
resources, secondary diamonds do not provide sufficient dividends for the success of
rebels’ cause nor do they prolong or shorten the duration of the conflict itself. The factor
of oil, however, has been consistently relevant in increasing the chances of war onset and
in shaping the path to its termination. Thus, if a third of the country’s export revenue is
from oil, the chances that the rebels succeed go down by a quarter. It is also interesting
that previous studies have found that oil-exporting economies are more likely to
experience a civil war, although as my analysis suggests the chance of rebels’ victory are
very slim.

The spillover of the conflict from troubled neighboring states appears to be
undermining the chances of the government to topple the rebellion. I have argued that the
reasons behind government’s defeat might lie in the spread of innovative practices and
techniques as well as in rallying the resolve and strength of the rebels after witnessing the
success of similar uprisings in the neighboring areas. However, the results of the
multinomial logistic regression analysis indicated that the civil wars caused by contagion
are also likely to end in a compromise. The logic here is that war spillover incentivizes
other states and international organizations to intervene in the conflict to prevent the
outbreak of a civil war in their own states or the region in general. Further investigation
into impact of the third party interventions confirmed my assumptions.

Finally, an investigation into the impact of the international environment in which
civil wars occurred provided strong evidence for the influence of the Cold War dynamics
on the outcome of intrastate conflicts. During the period of bipolar system of
international relations, proxy wars that were waged by US or Soviet Union or intrastate
conflicts where superpowers were indirectly involved had less of a chance to end in a
compromise and were more likely to be won by government forces. With the collapse of
the USSR, the evolution of the UN peacekeeping, the ascent of the globalization era and
the human security paradigm, the dynamics of the intrastate conflict have been altered. It
is imperative to further investigate the nature of the contemporary international system
and its impact on the dynamics of civil wars.

The empirical inquiry into the narrow concept of path dependence supported the
hypotheses about the impact of endogenous and exogenous tipping points on reinforcing
the chances of a particular outcome of a civil war. This research design is aimed at
investigating the temporal dimensions of conflict, the sequence of events, and
explanatory factors that “lock in” a unique path to the civil war outcome. Through
applying various event history (survival) models that were utilized in the previous scholarship and introducing a novel approach that accounts for the dependence of competing risks between three intrastate conflict outcomes, I have examined the consistency of results across the methods. Table 13 summarizes the findings of the Fine and Gray model that I have utilized to test the narrow concept of path dependence in intrastate conflicts. In sum, it outlines whether or not a particular tipping point or control factor reinforced a hypothesized outcome and what its effect was on the duration of that particular outcome.

Table 22. The Results of Event History (Survival) Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized outcome</th>
<th>Confirmed</th>
<th>Effect on duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exogenous Tipping Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional intergovernmental organizations intervention</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for government</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State intervention for rebels</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endogenous Tipping Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High military capacity</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low military capacity</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic regime</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic regime</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary diamonds</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil exporting economy</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic heterogeneity</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious heterogeneity</td>
<td>Rebels</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The empirical investigation of intrastate conflicts through the lens of the narrow concept provided not only strong support for the theory of path dependence in civil wars, but also informed about causal mechanisms behind a particular civil war outcome. As hypothesized, both the interventions by the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations increased the chances of the compromise solution and decreased the duration of conflict. While this finding implies the efficiency of international peacekeepers, in reality, the UN and regional IGOs’ interventions are conditioned upon their mandate that presupposes ceasefire observance and monitoring of disarmament as well as the presence of the environment that is already conducive to peace. Thus, these organizations intervene only when the prospects of a compromise are high. Although this hypothesis calls for the discussion of selections effects, it is also worth of noting that each peacekeeping operation is preceded by extensive diplomatic efforts to ameliorate the conflict, which can be distinguished as the early stage of the third party intervention. Mechanisms and instruments of the international involvement in intrastate conflicts are complex, yet it is clear that their participation increases the probability of a negotiated solution. The endogeneity problem that is evident with these types of interventions requires a detailed investigation in future research. Subsequent studies should include a distinction between peacekeeping missions that have an observer status and those that require an active enforcement as in the case of the intervention brigade in the DRC.

Unlike international and regional intergovernmental organizations, interventions by individual states are geared toward the support of one of the warring sides. Thus, rebel-biased state interventions tend to maximize the chances of the rebellion’s success,
while minimizing the overall duration of conflict. Contrary to my assumption, state-biased interventions in fact did not increase the chances of government forces succeeding, yet they prolonged confrontations that resulted in a rebels’ victory. These findings differ from the previous scholarship on intrastate conflict outcomes, which can be attributed to the difference in codifying civil wars, methodological frameworks, and historical periods under review. Ultimately, the results of this dissertation have to be interpreted in terms of this particular research design and inferences drawn here are pertinent to the most recent dataset available.

The event history analysis found no support for the degrees of state military capacity, codified in term of the armed personnel as a fraction of total population, in determining the outcome of the civil war. It appears that neither maintaining a sizable army guarantees the success of the government, nor the presence of limited military contingent presupposes the victory of rebels. In contrast to state capacity, regime type has been closely associated with a particular civil war outcome. In autocratic states, government forces have a higher chance of success and the civil war tends to be shorter. The logic behind the prevalence of the government’s victory stems partially from the repressive capabilities of the autocratic state that is aimed at rallying public support and catalyzing resources. In contrast, in democratic societies the government is affected by public opinion that prefers peace to a prolonged warfare. In the presence of democratic institutions, warring sides can utilize credible mechanisms for establishing a dialogue to address grievances. The results of the event history models supported this expectation by indicating that a democratic regime decreases the duration of the intrastate conflict and eventually leads to the compromise outcome.
None of the hypotheses about the initial conditions of the intrastate conflict that I have adapted to the analysis of the narrow concept of the path dependence were confirmed. I aimed at observing the effect of several onset factors that had the capacity to retain their impact on the outcome of civil wars such the presence of secondary diamonds; an oil-exporting economy; ethnic fractionalization; and religious fractionalization. While I have not found the support for the hypothesized interactions, the onset (control) factors have, in fact, influenced the odds of certain civil war solutions. Intrastate conflicts in oil-exporting economies and religiously diverse societies tend to end in a compromise. Substantively, however, the effect of these explanatory variables was only relatively significant. Given the plethora of statistical findings, it was imperative to develop the causal narratives of the path dependence mechanisms by analyzing how initial conditions and tipping points influenced the outcomes in a specific case of a civil war.

To account for the variation in the conflict outcomes, three cases of civil war reviewed in this dissertation are the First Chechen War of 1994-1996; Africa’s World War of 1998-2002; and the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War of 2006-2009. The first two wars are part of the OTIC and TPIC datasets that I have used to test empirically the path dependence in civil wars. The intrastate conflict in Sri Lanka is the out-of-sample case that I have selected to test the predictive power of the empirical findings. Ultimately, case studies analysis allowed moving beyond the framework of initial conditions and tipping points and investigating the power of small events and their sequence.

The crisis in Chechnya in the early 1990s occurred against the backdrop of the decentralization tendencies that were caused by the dissolution of the Soviet Union.
Weakness of the federal political apparatus, the failed military campaign, and the unpopularity of war ultimately forced Moscow into negotiations, which *de facto* meant the victory of Chechen separatist. Conflicts in the nearby republics, the presence of oil, and religious fractionalization have been contributing to the onset of the civil war. Yet, the in-depth analysis of the empirical findings through the lens of the Chechen case suggested the relationship between onset conditions and conflict outcomes to be more complex than anticipated earlier. While none of the significant variables were able to predict the outcome of the conflict, a closer look at the dynamics of war revealed that oil, for example, was not used to finance rebels directly, but served more as a payment for loyalty of different warlords for the rebel causes. It also was a part of the illegal resource trade that involved both Chechen rebels and Russian criminals. Spillover of war tends to result in compromise, and technically after the Moscow Peace Treaty of 1997, the Chechen crisis ended in a negotiated settlement as *de jure* Chechnya still remained part of Russia.

Endogenous tipping points had a minimal effect on shaping the path of the war given the fact that Russia was neither a democratic nor fully autocratic state. Since the Russian Federation retained a seat on the UN Security Council and possessed a vast nuclear arsenal, neither peacekeeping mission nor foreign interventions were viable options in the First Chechen War. From the path dependence standpoint, the pivotal determinant of the civil war outcome appeared to be the asymmetric warfare that Chechen rebels utilized after they failed to confront Russian federal forces in a conventional way. Two major terrorist attacks by Chechen separatists, the Budennovsk and Pervomayskoe hostage crises, shifted the scales of war in favor of the rebels. These
attacks were poorly handled by Russian forces and sent political ripples across the Kremlin. The power of small events such as the acts of terrorism has had a considerable role in shaping the outcome of the First Chechen War.

Unlike the intrastate conflict in the Northern Caucasus, the dynamics of the Second War in Congo or “Africa’s World War” were shaped by the regional and international interventions. Moreover, the region of the Great Lakes has been characterized by the persistence of intrastate and interstate warfare for decades. Rooted in the colonial past, the history of the Democratic Republic of Congo has been written by violent conflicts, autocrats, and natural resources. Africa’s World War can be considered a continuation of the previous hostilities that revolved around the demise of the President Mobutu’s authoritarian regimes. Only two years after Zaire was renamed the Democratic Republic of Congo, revolutionary forces that brought Laurent-Desire Kabila to power attempted another power shift. Rebel forces supported by Rwanda and Uganda who were dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the new country came close to their goal, only to witness how other regional powers such as Angola, Zimbabwe, and Namibia provided military assistance to President Kabila that led to the stalemate between warring sides.

The path dependence dynamics in this intrastate conflict have been shaped by both initial conditions and tipping factors. Thus, the spillover of conflict from neighboring states was an important determinant for the uprising in the eastern provinces of the DRC. The empirical findings from the test of the broad concept of path dependence are consistent with outcomes of this war as a factor of contagion was associated with the compromise outcome. Yet, as I have argued earlier, the causal mechanism behind the contagion-compromise link lies in the probability of third party intervention such as UN,
which was the case in the Africa’s World War. A similar connection can be traced to the conflict over the lootable resources that are abundant in the DRC. While secondary diamonds were not found to be statistically or substantively significant in determining the outcome of the conflict, in this particular case they have been closely associated with the decision of regional powers to intervene and even retain their influence. A report by UN experts confirmed the connection between the persistence of conflict, lootable resources, and neighboring states’ decision to intervene.

The pivotal dimension in determining the path of the conflict outcome in the Democratic Republic of Congo was the involvement of foreign states, regional intergovernmental organizations, and ultimately the United Nations. Since the event history analysis highlighted the connection between civil war outcomes and third party interventions, it was imperative to investigate the sequence of their involvement and causal mechanisms in play. According to empirical findings, rebel-biased state interventions tend to result in the rebellions’ success. Indeed, the existing evidence suggests that President Kabila’s forces were in full retreat and if not for the foreign military support, would have quickly lost the war. Therefore, in Africa’s World War the stalemate resulted from the involvement of the third parties on both sides of conflict. The compromise was possible, however, only with the involvement of the United Nations that possessed instruments for establishing the ground for negotiations and mechanisms to upheld commitments between the warring sides. Moreover, after the compromise was successfully brokered, the Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo or MONUC gradually evolved into a proactive force that had the capacity not only to guarantee security, but also act militarily against the remaining rebel groups.
Finally, the analysis of the out-of-sample case of the Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War has revealed the importance of the regime type and state capacity in determining the path of the government’s victory. An intrastate conflict in Sri Lanka was one of the most prolonged periods of internal armed violence in the twentieth century. The Second Sri Lanka Tamil Civil War is often considered as a last phase of the conflict that lasted almost three decades. I use the classification that distinguishes two wars since the negotiated settlement that was reached between Sri Lankan government and Tamil rebels in 2002 was rather promising in solving the conflict, while the war that lasted between 2006 and 2009 represented a qualitatively new level of confrontation.

Sri Lanka is neither an oil-exporting country nor it is rich in secondary diamonds, yet the conflict dynamics were driven by the ethno-religious cleavages between Buddhist Sinhalese and Hindu Tamils. Greed and grievance symbiosis in the case of Sri Lankan civil war is responsible for the persistence of conflict in this republic. Yet, this analytical framework cannot explain the outcome of the second civil war. The key element of the government’s success in toppling LTTE lies in the combination of resilient political regime, the military capacity of a state, and the absence of international involvement. While Sri Lanka is the oldest democracy in South East Asia, during the period of civil war, the incumbent government was characterized by the firm grip on power mechanisms, which many observers have classified as having authoritarian elements. Indeed, the administration of the President Rajapaksa utilized an image of LTTE as an enemy to gain control over the political system and to ignore pressures from domestic and international communities.
The experience from years of conflict has discouraged the government from attempting to use military means to subdue LTTE to enter into negotiations. The international community that has consistently pressured the Sri Lankan government to follow this course of action has also lost its credibility after peace talks broke down in 2006. In this light, decisive military actions against rebel forces appeared to be the only logical conclusion. Unlike previous decades of conflict, the government gained an upper hand over the LTTE not only militarily, but also through labeling them as a terrorist organization and, thus, cutting international channels for financial and military support. In sum, understanding the path dependent dynamics in the case of Sri Lanka requires a closer look at the factors that were not included in the statistical inquiry as well as elaboration of elements that had an indirect influence, such as military tactics or the absence of international support.

All three cases of intrastate conflict have revealed the complexity of the war that oftentimes cannot be captured by the large-n studies. Nevertheless, the mixed methods approach allowed a comprehensive examination of civil wars at the micro and macro levels, while revealing the underlying causal mechanisms and overarching trends. For example, investigation of the civil war in Chechnya and Sri Lanka through the prism of path dependence has revealed critical similarities between the two instances. Thus, in both cases, the first episode of conflict ended in a compromise decision (de jure in Chechnya) as the rebel forces utilized asymmetric warfare tactics such as hostage-taking and suicide attacks. In both scenarios, despite the government’s military superiority, terrorist tactics sent ripples across political and economic systems forcing warring sides to enter into negotiations. During the second phase of conflict, both governments
answered with resilient military attacks that bordered on human rights violations against
the asymmetric tactics of the rebels. Furthermore, both governments labeled the rebel
groups as terrorist organizations after the United States announced its global War on
Terror. In both cases, the rebel cause was compromised by the change in international
perception, which in turn led to dissipation of financial support from abroad. The absence
of international involvement, as in the case of the Africa’s World War, has also
determined the success of the government. To conclude, the research design that follows
the logic of mixed methods provides mutually reinforcing analytical tools to evaluate a
complex phenomenon like an intrastate conflict while controlling for different levels of
analysis.

Theoretical and Methodological Implications

The contemporary scholarship on intrastate conflicts relies on well-developed
theoretical and methodological discourse to analyze the complex nature of civil wars. The
study of intrastate conflicts is arguably moving in the direction of becoming a discipline
in itself not only because this type of conflict dominates over other forms of violence, but
increasingly because of the analytical and practical resources devoted to this topic by
various entities ranging from the United Nations and states to major think tanks and
individual scholars. Under these circumstances, it is imperative to connect the existing
piecemeal inquiries into the nature of civil wars and develop an overarching theory of an
intrastate conflict. The theory of path dependence, which in a broader sense argues that
previous stages of conflict influence the subsequent phases and as a narrower concept
focuses on factors that lock in a unique outcome of war, is a potential candidate for analyzing intrastate conflict as a continuous process.

Aside from outlining a unifying theoretical framework, the theory of path dependence provides methodological instruments to devise testable hypotheses. In this dissertation, I have operationalized the broad and narrow concepts of path dependence through outlining the factors that lead to the onset of civil wars and tipping factors that shape the outcome of the civil war respectively. To test the relationship between the initial conditions of and solutions to civil wars, I have applied multinomial logistic regression analysis. While evaluating the coefficients for government victory, rebels’ success, and compromise with three different base outcomes was useful to observe the pairwise dynamics, I found the analysis of marginal effects to be better suited for interpreting the magnitude of the explanatory variables.

An empirical evaluation of the narrow definition of path dependence requires a different approach since this research design focused on the temporal dimensions. The existing scholarship on civil war dynamics and outcomes applied event history (survival) models as a method to investigate the duration of the conflict. In this regard, the transition from the approaches that focused on parametric models to articles that used Cox competing risks model implies the continuing search for more appropriate tools to capture the dynamics of civil wars. In this dissertation, I have introduced a model developed by Jason P. Fine and Robert J. Gray that accounted for the interdependence of civil war outcomes. The application of the proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk provided estimators for the cumulative incidence for the explanatory variables in a particular conflict outcome while holding other outcomes
as competing risks. I have conducted a comparative analysis of the Weibull parametric, Cox competing risks and Fine and Gray models to investigate the robustness of estimates across the methods. The results suggest that while the statistical significance of explanatory variables does not differ considerably, hazard and sub-hazard ratios vary across the models. Thus, the interpretation of the magnitude for a particular variable appears to be related to the methodological tool that the researcher is using. Given the fact that the Fine and Gray model is better suited for analyzing the competing risks of civil war outcomes, it is valid to give this model a preferred position for the interpretation of the explanatory variables’ magnitude.

Finally, case study analysis proved to be instrumental in outlining causal mechanisms behind the relevant as well as overlooked determinants of the path dependence dynamics in civil wars. Only in combination with inquiries into individual cases of civil war it is possible to develop the narratives for the empirically significant factors. While methodological pluralism is critical to advance the knowledge of civil wars, it is equally imperative to acknowledge differences in the analysis while making policy prescriptions and predictions.

Policy Implications

This dissertation identified patterns of path dependence in intrastate conflicts, which can be directly implemented in devising tactical responses to the existing internal crises as well as drafting strategic policy prescriptions for generating a particular civil war outcome. It is beyond doubt that the pervasiveness of intrastate conflicts in global
conflict dynamics requires a solid systematic response not only from great powers and international organizations, but also from state leaders as well as commanders of rebel forces in the countries ravaged by civil wars. As of 2015 there are more than a dozen major intrastate conflicts on four continents where the count of fatalities passed a thousand deaths threshold. Civil wars in Yemen, Eastern Ukraine, Syria and Iraq, Somalia, and Nigeria among others are unique in their own right, yet share similarities in regards to the initial conditions and tipping points that can shape their outcome.

Given the history of the United States’ involvement in the intrastate conflicts during and after the end of the Cold War, it becomes clear that recent actions by the world’s only superpower lack not only strategic but increasingly tactical consistency. The Obama Administration’s poor record of handling recent outbursts of internal violence from the Middle East to Eastern Europe can be partially attributed to the lack of grand strategy. However, it is valid to assume that the existing approaches to dealing with insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan has created the atmosphere of hesitance in dealing with intrastate crises that is reminiscent of the US withdrawal from the international scene after the 1993 Mogadishu debacle.

The findings of this dissertation highlight the role of the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations peacekeeping missions in generating compromise outcomes. In the light of the US uncertainty about its posture in global security governance, it appears imperative for UN to assert its status and enhance the capacity of its peacekeeping forces as was demonstrated through the creation of the intervention brigade during the crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Obviously, the UN Security Council remains the hostage of the power play and ill-fated reform
attempts will hardly allow this international body to become a dominant force in solving intrastate conflicts across the globe. The prospects of the regional IGOs taking the vacant spot of the UN appear to be equally bleak considering the crisis of identity of NATO; political and financial instability within the EU; and the lack of cohesion among the members of the African Union. In this light, governments and rebels in civil wars of the twenty-first century appear to be the smiths of their own destiny. Understanding the initial conditions of the war, capitalizing on the internal features of the state, and managing the involvement of the third parties give either side an advantage in shaping the path of an intrastate conflict.

Investigation into the future of civil wars is another dimension of this study. Recent academic inquiries into the dynamics of civil war have been actively explored by the US policy-making community. For example, the CIA sponsored the Political Instability Task Force, a joint group of political scientists, to investigate the quantitative dimensions of states’ vulnerability to lethal violence. The findings of major think tanks and academic projects such as the Peace Research Institute Oslo and the Correlates of War project have been actively used in understanding intrastate conflicts and formulating policy approaches. Therefore, the current dissertation contributes in a similar fashion to the tacit symbiosis between the academic and policy discourses on intrastate conflicts. The analytical and methodological framework devised in this study can be used to generate solutions for the ongoing and potential outbreaks of the intrastate violence.
Recommendations for Future Research

As I have argued earlier, the introduction of the path dependence theory into the study of intrastate conflicts generates a new analytical debate about the continuity of and change in civil wars. While this dissertation rests on the well-established civil war discourse, integration of the path dependence paradigm requires further discussion about applicability of its central assumptions to the study of war. It is imperative to further develop a theory behind causal mechanisms of initial conditions, intervening variables, and the power of small events. Given that the central theoretical tenets of path dependence are extrapolated mainly from the economic literature, it is equally important to analyze the dynamics which are unique to the study of intrastate conflicts.

From the methodological standpoint, future inquiries have to account for the wider spectrum of civil wars that are not limited to the period from the Second World War to 2007. Another potential avenue for improvement lies in utilizing a different classification of civil wars that lowers the death threshold per year from 1,000 to 25 such as in the dataset developed by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program. Future studies can also benefit from expanding the state capacity factor to include bureaucratic and administrative components. While the current research design focused on the democratic and autocratic regime types, it is also critical to investigate the role of anocratic regimes. Further inquiries into the broad concept of path dependence will benefit from expanding the explanatory factors beyond those that are tested in this dissertation.

Finally, the ultimate test for the findings of this study lies in devising policy relevant suggestions. The case studies chapter of this dissertation provides a tentative
framework that combines the evaluation of the statistical results with outlining causal narratives of a unique civil war path. Subsequent policy analysis can utilize this framework, while also capitalizing on the features and practical applications of the path dependence mechanisms.

**Limitations of the Study**

To investigate the patterns of path dependence in civil wars, this study has utilized a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Given the nature of the empirical approach, this dissertation relied on generating the dataset based on secondary sources. As a direct consequence, the findings of this study are contingent upon the validity of the data gathering techniques of other scholars. Even though conflict dynamics in the past seventy years were characterized by the prevalence of civil wars, the total number of observations is relatively small for detecting strong correlations between explanatory variables and civil war outcomes. Thus, the results of several models of path dependence may have been skewed as the test sample has not contained a sufficient number of civil wars with required parameters.

By and large, present and previous inquiries into intrastate conflict have been limited by the availability of data and relevance of proxy variables. For example, the current study did not find a sufficient link between military capacity and the civil war outcome. Part of the reason may be the choice of proxy variable that could be better represented by either military spending or the quality of armed forces. Similar drawbacks can be attributed to the indices of ethnic and religious fractionalization. In this
dissertation, these variables have not been associated with the particular solution to a civil war, even though the conflict narratives were fueled by ethnic or religious grievances. The central conundrum, however, is to interpret the absence of statistical or substantive significance as the indicator of the actual dynamics of civil war or to search for the measure that would appear to be relevant.

Finally, despite certain theoretical and methodological limitations, the findings of this dissertation remain credible. With the mantra that correlation is not causation in mind, the mixed methods approach mitigates the drawbacks of quantitative and qualitative methods by capitalizing on their symbiotic interaction. Empirical results that were provided by the large-\(n\) analysis have been examined in a specific civil war environment, while mechanisms that have been uncovered in the case studies will be added to the future quantitative inquiries into the nature of an intrastate conflict.

**Conclusion**

The onset of the intrastate conflict, its development, and termination do not exist separately in the vacuum. The contemporary literature on civil wars created artificial stages of conflict that appear to be independent from each other. This dissertation introduced a theory of path dependence that provides analytical and methodological instruments to analyze an intrastate conflict as a continuous process. The primary contribution of the new discourse on civil wars lies in connecting initial conditions, internal features of a state, and intervening factors in shaping the path of the conflict and its outcome.
The mixed methods approach introduced in this dissertation offers a constructive analysis of path dependent dynamics through the prism of multinomial logistic regression, an event history model, and a series of case studies. The evaluation of the broad concept of path dependence that focuses on initial conditions in shaping the outcomes emphasized the relevance of conflict spillover, non-lootable resources, and character of the international system. The analysis of the narrow concept, which describes the factors that “lock in” a particular civil war outcome, pointed at the role of the UN and regional intergovernmental organizations in accelerating the compromise; highlighted the dynamics behind democratic and autocratic regimes; and, found no support for the relationship between the size of the armed forces and conflict outcome. Finally, case studies of three civil wars, which ended in different ways, revealed unique intrinsic causal mechanisms behind each outcome.

Path dependence theory is a useful tool for understanding civil war as a process where preceding stages and tipping points can determine the outcome of conflict. The analysis of conflict dynamics in Chechnya, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Sri Lanka revealed the complex nature of war and significance of timing and sequence of interventions as well as power of small events. Research design outlined in this study has the potential to generate new insights into the future of ongoing intrastate conflicts in Ukraine, Syria, Yemen and other war-torn states.
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APPENDIX

LIST OF INTRASTATE CONFLICTS FROM 1945 TO 2007 ACCORDING TO THE CORRELATES OF WAR PROJECT INTRA-STATE WAR DATA (V 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Description</th>
<th>Start Year - End Year</th>
<th>Conflict in Location</th>
<th>Start Year - End Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish Ukrainians</td>
<td>1945-1947</td>
<td>Iraq-Shammar</td>
<td>1959-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Brethren</td>
<td>1945-1951</td>
<td>First DRC (Zaire)</td>
<td>1960-1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Civil War, Phase 2</td>
<td>1946-1950</td>
<td>North Yemen</td>
<td>1962-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Revolt</td>
<td>1947-1947</td>
<td>Algerian Revolutionaries</td>
<td>1962-1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1947-1947</td>
<td>Second DRC (Jeunesse)</td>
<td>1963-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Burmese</td>
<td>1948-1951</td>
<td>First Ogaden</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Colombian</td>
<td>1948-1958</td>
<td>First Rwanda</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni Imamate</td>
<td>1948-1948</td>
<td>First South Sudan</td>
<td>1963-1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1952-1952</td>
<td>First Chad Rebellion</td>
<td>1966-1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia Darul Islam</td>
<td>1953-1953</td>
<td>First Guatemala</td>
<td>1966-1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Burundi</td>
<td>1972-1972</td>
<td>Second Chad (Habre Revolt)</td>
<td>1980-1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodesia</td>
<td>1972-1979</td>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>1981-1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overthrow of the Shah</td>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>Third Chad (Deby Coup)</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Start Year - End Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Start Year - End Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1989-1989</td>
<td>First Congo (Brazzaville)</td>
<td>1997-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cambodia Civil</td>
<td>1993-1997</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire Military</td>
<td>2002-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth DRC</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Fifth Chad</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Rwanda</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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