

## Dynamics and Interplay between International Politics and War Economy

Mudassir Mehdi\* Riaz Ahmad† Arif Jameel‡

p- ISSN: 2521-2982

e- ISSN: 2707-4587

L- ISSN: 2521-2982

### Headings

- [Introduction](#)
- [Political Economy and International Wars](#)
- [Globalization and Privatization of War](#)
- [Dynamics of war politics](#)
- [Civil Wars and War Politics](#)
- [Predatory War Economy](#)
- [Commercial War Economy](#)
- [Social-Political Economy](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [References](#)

### Abstract

The experiences of developed countries about the cost of adjustment were quite different; therefore, it is very complex to analyze the interplay between these two variables relationship between military spending and economic development of the country; this also brought the significance of war politics, economies and the political economy of war industries at domestic, regional and international level. Therefore, it is necessary to take care of reallocating the national budgets for adopting the policies of conversion to aid structural adjustments in different sectors of the economy in developing countries. The circumstances differ; it is important to concede the role of military spending in socio-economic development and its effectiveness in economies. Only when the information on these variables are available, then the policies will be made possible at the national and international level for any developing countries to meet the challenge of development. This will lead the nourishment of human capital and human development index.

**Key Words:** Interplay Politics, War Economy, Globalization, Political Economy

### Introduction

There are many different causes which are having deep roots in the nature of governance, leadership, economic situation, international context and history. To analyze any war, there is a need to emphasize its particular context and specific circumstances. The importance of war profits and the impact of globalization and the failure of the state are the two important themes that stand out in the “political economy” of several contemporary conflicts.

“Contemporary conflicts” are oftentimes described as “internal conflicts or civil wars”. The concept of “internal conflict” can be considered misleading because the dynamics of these conflicts are seldom purely “internal”. The war economies, which are characterized by so-called civil wars, are in many cases sustained by links between belligerents and the global economy. Many contemporary conflicts last longer due to the global changes in the international economy and the associated weakened role of the nation-state.

The term globalization is used for changes that are commonly present as cultural and economic integration. However, it causes the emergence of the processes of disintegration and differentiation within societies too. The most dramatically visible case can be seen in the South, where different individualities

\* The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

† Assistant Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration, Xi'an Jiaotong University, China.

‡ Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China. Email: [arifjamil24@gmail.com](mailto:arifjamil24@gmail.com)

measures are set which are different from the nation-state category. "Resorting violent conflict" is also accompanied by this in several cases. By increasing "social justice" and improving government, the structure can lead to political and economic growth. Although the expended injustices of the economy relate to globalization, still it can stimulate alternative political and economic growth. These contemporary issues in this globalized world are deeply affected by the state role. The nation-state can drive the development of the latest model.

### Political Economy and International Wars

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, both in the West and the rest of the states were adopting the path of the socialists since 1970. But on the other hand, there is a decline in the state's role in the economy. On a global, regional and national level, the tendency is to focus on the deregulation of the economy and the influence on markets is growing. This had caused effect upon the legality and power of a country that has been busted [\(Best, et al. 2011\)](#).

In the South, the consolidation process of "nation-state" is successfully reversed during the last four decades, and this is possible by cutting the connection in building the state by Northern countries and by giving importance to the economic relation's globalization. In the process of disengagement, while considering decolonization as the first phase, the second phase was the "client state relationship of the superpower" association with the adjustment of structure and the end of cold war support. The third stage is in progress through the "development assistance". After the snipping of international aid, the volunteer and private sectors did the growing proportion of the remaining resources, which is the responsibility of the state.

The aftershocks of the economic collapse and decrease in foreign support affects the population and society as the state did not provide "social justice or public goods"; rather, it becomes a powerful instrument of the governing authorities, at this stage of the failure of a state cause a decrease in legitimacy, power and competency. The greedy regimes always play and promote this process along with the debt crises for their own advantages. Imposing, programs of structure adjusting, failing conditions of trade and cunning business behavior are also played by these regimes [\(Bitzinger 2009\)](#).

Deregulating of the international level trading is escorted with the divergence of routes for trading in the earlier counties of South along with the socialists. Semi legal and illegal activities have been weakened the economic system of a state. Sometimes the expansion of informal economies may be encouraged by favourable environment for those groups that radiate on the continuation rather than the resolution of conflict [\(Dombrowski and Eugene 2006\)](#). Afghanistan can be viewed as a shattered state structure that is affected by the war. On the other hand, economies dependent on illegal activities like smuggling, dealing with arms and the production of drugs are responsible for sustaining the Taliban and their rivals.

The informal economies, which are generating profits and working through the personal benefits of western multi-nationalists, armed groups, mafias, did not play any role in the objectives of the society. In contrast, privatization, being the core interest of "Northern liberalism", is now transformed into a basic tool politically controlled by the "Southern rulers". It offers different terms of chances for reorganizing the networks of the clients, confirm new allied partners and personal benefits, gains and rewards with the support of foreign investors. When an economy is privatized to an international company, it permits the ruling party to deny resources, whether they are social and financial, to the opposition and those who can meet possibly challenge it as well as building networks of foreign support and hard money [\(Gilroy and Williams 2006\)](#).

### Globalization and Privatization of War

The process of globalization presents a result with the possibility of more chances for the sustainability of

war economies by “external commercial links”. Furthermore, separatism is encouraged by the failure of the state and warlordism violence emergence give the change of strong means of economic and political control to the warlords. War can provide two types of factors that affect the state condition, which is Privatization of Governance and Violence, and Warlordism. The term war can be referred to the period of 1916-1929 in China, in which one hundred and sixty wars between the autonomous military governors were fought when the central government collapse [\(Barbieri 1996\)](#) Warlords are actually the strongman who takes control of a region through their capacity to wage war and facilely able to organize a war economy. The warlords initiate through activities of an external commercial for their sustainability, and they keep the weak central authority at bay.

An increase in the privatization of security and violence has the same meaning as Warlordism, where international and domestic economic activities are combining with violence. When the monopoly of the state is preempting over legitimate violence, allow the private security corporations, mercenaries, mafias, self-defence groups and para-military units to get access to resources of the state. The issues of weak institutions, ignorance and poverty can be resolved by several techniques like civil society measures, conflict resolution and sustainable development. “A political economy approach stresses, on the contrary, that the association of instability and violence is more than a fugitive phenomenon”.

If the transition between states of war and peace is seen thoroughly, then it has become increasingly blurred. There is no exact one condition that could be seen clearly, but neither there totally peace or war rather an uncertain status and vulnerability connected with the occurrence of violence [\(Kim and Rousseau 2005\)](#).

War can be better defined by the approach of the political economy. It sees war as the developing of alternate means of protection, power and profit rather than just breaking down a specific system. In these alternative means, violence serves psychological, security and economical, working far beyond its function by the politicians to retain or change the administrative and legal framework [\(Barbieri, The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace? 2009\)](#).

## **Dynamics of war politics**

Poor countries are more vulnerable to wars—a country transit from peace to war when there is negative or slow growth. The intergroup violence is usually caused by a situation which is played upon deliberately to serve economic and power interest of a specific group. A specific or targeted group can be borderline by racist policies and discourses, denying political rights and not giving access to the basic resources like administrative positions, education and activities of the economy. When such circumstances are created, the people choose their side by political identity and their identity act as a mean of survival and a secure way to get group support and resources.

The issue of competing for the resources and reaching an acceptable solution to adjust can be worse when;

- The politicians select to mobilize backing from those groups who are deeply concern about ethnicity and inequality. The dictatorial use of power to get submissiveness is also a type of violence.
- In a political context, violence can be helpful to maintain or access the state power, keeps the population and clients involve war and creating a local-level power base. Violence is a political instrument used for achieving power, preventing a change in law or rules through the policies of progressiveness.
- Violence can assist economically by providing financial benefits in high budgets of military and controlling the resources of the state, and allowing it for illegal activities like fleecing, trafficking and ransack. It also assists in the justification of “protection money”, which maintain a monopolistic control of trade and helps in controlling resources like relief goods and labor.
- The perpetrators get security through violence when the state is not going to provide them security or a guarantee of impunity for their crimes in the past. In some modern wars, young men are not

as safe as a civilian, but they are safer with they are part of an armed group. Communities can also be protected by force like a self-defence unit.

- When a country is facing a legitimacy crisis and “lack credibility” due to past failures or corruptions (Gleditsch 2009).

The failure of the state, the rise of corruption, legacy and the violence in economic and political regimes since the 1970s in Liberia and Sierra Leone was directly connected with the political economy of war in the 1990s. Unequal distribution of power and wealth and economic failure aggravates both grievances and greed. Distinguishing between “social and antisocial, a success story among socialist countries, Yugoslavia ran into a worsening debt crisis from the mid-1970s”. To get the credits, of IMF needs austerity and deregulation measures. Due to no restructuring process and the suffering of exports from the crisis, the ratio of social deterioration, poverty and unemployment rise in Yugoslavia. From 1990 to onward, Yugoslavia confronted with an extreme crisis of budgetary with no amount for payment and was regularly defaulter of salaries (Gleditsch 2009).

Big entrepreneurs and certain criminal groups of the parallel economies exploited the situation when the power is held by the elites of the country. These entrepreneurs develop links with political elites of various republics for various purposes; to legitimize their activities, extend their ventures, to exercise a hold over scarce resources, to control public assets and funds as well as contracts in progress, and to exploit the unorganized economy. The trade barriers structure within or between states has a role in the collapse of the economy and fragmentation of the internal markets like the quasi embargo between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia (Barbieri and Keshk 2011). In several cases like the economic sanctions in Serbia and also the war, it acts as a “violent political economy” and temporary authority of the elites of the “nationalist republicans” and the criminal gangs (Allan and Allan 2000).

## Civil Wars and War Politics

When civil conflicts are involved in the wars, they become a vicious circle of investment decrease and cause slow-down in the economic growth of the country. It also causes to trigger new phases of social unrest and disaster for resources. “By reversing the cycle, it involves new policies possibly backed by massive aid infusion delivered in a way that addresses the fundamental causes of conflict”. Sometimes the interference of the international community can also run a risk of worsening the conflict. The same phenomena occurred during the military interventions of the Cold War period. When the commercial and geopolitical objectives motivate the international of external factors, it remains a danger. Although NATO’s intervention based on a humanitarian basis bring back security to Albanian Kosovars, at first, it exasperated their dilemma dramatically.

As it is already mentioned about the financing war, belligerents may eternalize any conflict to become enough source of getting political power as well as economic profit. For doing this, they required income produced through an economy of war. In reward, the war economy will determine the impact to some amount that war has on local populations and even on the course of the conflict (Gleditsch 2009).

## Typologies of War Economies

There are several forms of War economies that are not jointly exclusive (Bitzinger 2009). Any political and military alliance can adopt many of these forms as per the needs of geographical circumstances, foreign, local, commercial and political connections, the capacity of its troops, and according to the local resources available (Best, et al. 2011).

## Predatory War Economy

Armed groups are those which are emerged out of local populations and forced labor. If the short-term schemes of survival are effective, then the political economy of this type results in the “progressive

prostration” of the available resources and vanishing the political support (Renamo post-1983 in Mozambique is an example of this). The results of this war economy have an impact on the population and cause death, poverty and massive displacement. To a geographical extent, this impact is limited unless the armed forces of the government adopt this type of strategy or there is a total collapse of the state.

### **Commercial War Economy**

The commercialization recourses generated locally, for example, jewels, wood or the trading of felonious things; for example, many modern economies of war are started due to drugs. The militant parties intentionally create financial reservations after getting control of running resources and its route in a War Economy adapted. Foreign states grant loans, arms donations taxes, profits remittances taxes.

Areas like ports, commercial networks already developed with third parties, plantations and mine are economically profitable for the political economy of war. If other redistribution schemes or economic sectors exist, then the war economy will have a moderate impact on the population. If there is the protection of illegal sectors or contribution for opening a new economy, then the impact will be positive. But in most of the commercial war economies, limits the developing of other sectors, become enclave economies, exploit them like in Liberian force labor of rubber plantation and limit the participation of civilians like the diamonds and oil sectors in Angola. The commercial war economies also tend towards the criminalization of the conflict and fragmentation of the authority.

### **Social-Political Economy**

- Even distribution of power within the society.
- The economy is contributed by all the members of the society
- The economic load of war and adjustments are distributed evenly.
- The wealth can be expanded through productivity and is not finite.
- The economic activities take part in the provision of public goods.

In the context of political-economic war, armed groups, smaller in size, requires small local or external support acts in a deliberate way to get widespread backing. Such small groups are vulnerable to disapproval by the local population and remain on the clemency of the political choice of the locals. The economies of guerrilla wars have a very small impact on the local people until the counter-insurgency measures target the civilians, for example, the relocation of population and bombing of US in Latin America and Indo-China (Napoleoni 2010).

### **State War Economy**

This form of a war economy is designed through an organized political group like mostly “states through quasi-legal taxation of revenues or profit as well as foreign and domestic borrowing. Only the political groups can benefit from this model of war economy when they have foreign credit, reachable local savings and a well-developed taxation system. The form of a war economy is usually believing to have the ability to protect the civil population. But still, the effectiveness of this model can cause an industrial scale war which can have dangerous effects on civilians if they target the population.

### **Foreign Alliance War Economy**

Armed groups always ready to set up military sanctuaries inside neighboring countries along national boundaries in order to gain foreign protection and economic or logistical support, for example, AFDL in Congo and Contras in Honduras, an Alliance of “Democratic Forces for Freedom”. To establish a military bastion in the state, these types of armed groups are also depended on foreign allies. These groups highly rely on foreign support and host countries as it is not easy to control the local population, which flee the

areas near the borders where the majority of the local resources and fights take place. Before choosing political terror or unless economic sabotage strategy is adopted, this type of war economy has a small impact on the local people.

### Humanitarian War Economy

The civil populations are provided with the international resources and protection after giving them a status of international refugees; they are kept within “safe havens” provides a “humanitarian sanctuary” to the armed groups like the Bosnian army in the Bosnian enclave, the Afghan Mujahideen in Pakistan and the Khmer Rouge in Thailand. There are many advantages of humanitarian sanctums like political authority, population control, resources and protection. Sanctum misuse can be imposed upon relief organizations by the armed groups, but it also is motivated or accepted by the “political consideration of the donor state”. Although this type of war economy can have little impact on the outside sanctuary population directly, it can have a scourging impact indirectly, for example, the impact on the population of Cambodia due to Chinese, Thai and Western support for the Khmer Rouge in the 1980s and the impact on the people of Tutsi who were attacked by the refugee Hutu militias in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (Klare 2001).

### Guerrilla War Economy

Armed groups like the LTTE in Sri Lanka, which can only be counted with the help of local resources, develop close relations with the local people through political conversion. Such armed groups are very vulnerable in the case of withdrawal due to their strong support from the local population due to harsh discretion and forced displacement by the opposite groups. Hence, they need to have frequent movement for the security of the local supporters like Maoist guerrillas in China (Napoleoni 2010). A variation of the “guerrilla economy” is that of;

- The people are usually considered as prey to the activity of the economy
- Few members from the society are required for the economic project
- On few unaccountable free and illegitimate agents have the power in hand
- The level of human rights abuses is low, and an antisocial political economy
- The activities of the economy did not take part to provide public goods.
- The economic activities and wealth finite are hypothetical instead of productive
- The economic burden of war and adjustment distributed unevenly.
- Abuses of human rights are common.

During the war of political economy in Somalia, Orthodox explains that it overstates the influence of environmental stress and clique and understate the role of elites who were self-interested and the economic stratification of society. If it is viewed from the perspective of the political economy, rival between militant's groups that conquered has immortalized long term patterns of alienation and exploitation.

The existence of inequality was increased by Barre's nationalization of the infrastructure of urban, industry and land (Alesina and Spolaore 1997). When the resources are distributed and are given to the supporters of the regime, it reinforced the rich elite class consist of politico businessmen, and the landless Somalis are left as urban penurious, wage laborers and underclass. Studying the history of Somalians in this context, they are exploited by the outsiders in unfriendly institutions, which was played upon easily by the local leaders and turn the communal fears into antipathy and justify the militant groups like the protectors of clan interests. The competition for resources and survival intensifies the Power struggles between these elites, which rewards the popular militant support at a minimum level. In such struggle types, no individual or groups is able to claim an overall victory; rather, several highlighted contents with functioning “status quo of competition” and outright losers are produced in a large number. The vulnerability of the people rise,

and their livelihood collapses which cause an increase in powerlessness against criminal and political violence, unstable and biased markets and lack of access. (Klare 2001).

### **Localization of War Economy**

Local resources are very important in the war economies as they not only fall in external support for the struggle for arms but also due to the lack of ideology to mobilize the population for economic support. When both the opposition parties come to the fact that they cannot be dependent on foreign support any longer, they start surviving by developing an economic network and exploiting the local resources. It happens as it did for the "Kosovo Liberation Army" when Diaspora remittances to UN and NATO support become the war economy in place of heroin trafficking. More conflicts are developed for the control of main resources as have dealer capital wars like war is financed privately for serving economic objective. The availability of the latest weapons and the non-functioning of laws for trans-border trade on a large scale aggravate the treat. For example, the RUF (Revolutionary United Front) was supported by the Liberians in the diamond areas of Sierra Leone. The open war economy during wartime is the flow of main resources as the business sector does not grow because transactions and investments require stability, trust and security. Entrepreneurs play their role by supporting peace and did not reward those who are waging war. Nonetheless, war can be seen as a social process, which has the power to create new markets and destroy some of the existing ones and also make some people rich and ruin some others. (Best, et al. 2011).

Being an important distinction, it may be part of any study of "whether particular economics activities in wartime are condemned as criminal". It is insufficient to judge the criminality issue specifically in the light of "whether violence is used directly". It is also important to study how the local population respond to the constraints and opportunities of the context of war and to the disincentives and incentives of violence. The identification of losers and winners, along with the linkage of international and local economics, may also be considered carefully. The foreign governments and corporations can also be considered criminals rather than tag the "parochial entrepreneurs" of the informal economy as guilty.

Sometimes, the focus of the armed group is shifted due to the economic agenda of the war. They become more focused to control the resources rather than controlling the population. When the belligerents find the local resources more important for them, the activities of their military shifts towards the areas of economic importance. From an economic point of view, the population is considered as a hindrance to commercial activities or an interesting source in the shape of a labor. The local population can be exploited as slaves by the belligerents, or they can evict them forcefully, or migrant labor can be brought as they are easier to control and more professional. For example, in Angola, Congolese digging diamonds in UNITA areas and in Cambodia, the Burmese and Thai mining and logging in Khmer Rouge areas. Likewise, the illegal economic activities can be protected by armed groups like opium producers in Burma and Afghanistan and coca producers in Colombia. (Napoleoni 2010). "Foreign support tends to centralize and consolidate power within armed groups enabling the leaders to distribute assistance to their supporters in a top-down process. The opposite may be true when the group's resources come from predation or commercial activities".

The "criminalization of conflict" can also be related to the need of linking with an established large criminal network, which is controlling the illegal market like drugs consuming in major countries like Europe and the US. (Allan and Allan 2000).

It is necessary for the significant groups to understand and change the narrative and incentive, which makes violence "a solution" rather than "a problem", and this understanding can bring a violent conflict to an end. When the causes of violence are considered important for the survival of the economy at the local level, even committed command will not be able to control their followers, especially when they have fragmented authority. (Kappen 1995) And such a situation can cause enough delay in the process of peaceful transition.

A powerless population is often vulnerable to conflicts as economic violence and belligerence can deliberate result in their disempowerment. The welfare and protection of the people during a political war economy depends on the representativeness and legitimacy of the political structure and the robustness of the economy. The absence of a legitimate political structure can cause a thriving war economy. Several negative economic activities can develop in the situation of the war economy. For example, they will sell their natural resources to the international buyers at a tax-free price like timber in Cambodia and looting of assets and forced transfer from the wealthy groups that are politically marginalized, for example, cattle from Sudanese Dinka and household goods from the Bosnian Muslims. The war economy does not support the interests of the common people, and they are not getting any incentive or advantage from such activities. Likewise, although there is a legitimate political structure present in Northern Ireland, it still does not prevent the existence of a war economy, but the presence of such structures still looks after the economic interest of the common people. The impact of war is affected by the vulnerability both in terms of microeconomic and macroeconomics. In short, the performance and structure of the economy and the access of people to resources, services and goods is affected by war. The exposure to different types of economic violence can be better understood by studying the relationship of population to the authorities of the state and different warring groups. It can also be helpful to determine the “coping strategies” that is expected to adopt in response.

## Conclusion

War economically impact the vulnerable typical macro-economics, and the consequences are as under;

- Shortage situation, where a specific part of the population will face a shortage of specific goods.
- The collapse in the exchange rules and regulation of economics will cause great uncertainty, a decrease in the trust level, and commerce will shift towards transactions of low risks like the barter system.
- There will be pessimism which will cause behaviors of short-term opportunities, the vulnerable groups will sell their assets at much lower prices, and there will be a decrease in the investments.
- There will be a decrease in exports, imports, food production and income.
- Due to the increase in military expenditures, the budget deficits will increase, and the ratio of tax revenue will decrease.
- There will be economical and geographical fragmentation, and alternate channels of commerce like smuggling will develop.
- The exchange rates and price structures will be biased due to manipulation by the politico-military groups.
- Hyperinflation will disturb the balance of goods prices and salaries. As compared to international wars, internal wars cause more severe consequences as they are so politically divisive. The economic sectors like the construction industry, which are dependent on the local demand for capital goods, manufacturing sector which is dependent on the capital investments and the service sector, which is dependent on high transaction level, suffers more than other sectors.
- economies are worst affected by war when:
  - There is a low average income
  - Low tax base or when the tax is dependent on a few sectors.
  - The vital commodities like drugs and fuel are imported, which affect the earning of the export. This can cause a decrease in the prices of export, economic sanctions, and devaluation of the local currency.
  - Less flexible economy or little capacity to switch between products for import and for the destruction of productive capacities like power stations and bridges.
  - High dependency on the market, transport and financial system.



- Economies, which are more dependent on agriculture, are more resilient to war until they targeted directly.

War has profound effects on social integration, households and individuals within among and within communities at the microeconomic level. Another technique to analyze this is to study the entitlements of the people when they have the powers and rights to access important resources, services and goods. Stewart Fitzgerald distinguish between them as;

- Direct Entitlements: those items which are consumed as well as produced by the household like picking food from wild and subsistence agriculture.
- Market Entitlements Items that can be bartered, bought or can earned through work like wage labor and petty trading.
- Public Entitlements: services and goods that can be provided publicly like water, education and health services.
- Civic Entitlements: services and goods provided by relatives, community organizations and relief agencies like remittances and gifts etc.
- Illegal Entitlements: resources acquired by threat or use of violence or theft like stolen goods etc.

The responsibility to guarantee and regulate entitlements access is basically the state's responsibility. This shows that the problem of entitlements loss is interconnected with the failure of the state. The entitlements distribution determines the powerlessness and power within or among different groups in a war economy [\(Sachs and Warner 2001\)](#). The capacity of the people to cope is affected by the change in entitlements, which guarantees their immediate survival and also avoid destitution, and the recovery means are secured. When people lose entitlements, they are forced to choose a coping technique like access to relief supplies, migration or selling assets. Population, whose coping strategies are manipulated or blocked deliberately, are the most vulnerable [\(Bitzinger 2009\)](#).

Destroying stocks of security (devaluation, vandalism and looting) Security stocks/savings. Destroying the structure of production (army recruitment, production network fragmentation and displacing the population). Production Reduction of consumption (low incomes, resource shortages) Consumption International markets External/international trade Limitation of the scale of exchanges and purchasing power (lack of transport, devaluation, limited inputs) Local trade Destruction of production systems (factories, roads, public utilities) Natural resources Limitation of access (mines, insecurity) Destruction (bombing, fires, pollution) Limited access to external markets (destruction of exit ports, embargo) The Economic Impact of War International markets Prevention of access to means of production (sanctions, no foreign investment, weak local currency)[\(Beck and Webb 2003\)](#)."

To study and understand the political economy of war, the important key is to understand the inequalities between two provided groups. Political marginality and material poverty make a group vulnerable. In some cases, the wealth in the absence of military and political power can risk the group to expose it to predatory violence, and poverty can prove a coping mechanism rationally [\(Boehmer, Economic Growth and Violent International Conflict: 1875–1999 2010\)](#). The belligerents are able to get benefit from a war economy, although war causes collateral economic damages. The belligerents use economic violence to weaken their opponents [\(Blainey 1988\)](#) Rebel groups like UNITA in Angola and Sendero Luminoso in Peru use systematic sabotage as a deliberate strategy that can save billions of dollars damages in a specific time period. But on the other hand, economic violence done deliberately is not always connected to a specific political master plan. It can sometime represent to scale up violence like political parties hires petty criminals and thugs to get personal objectives of wealth and power [\(Boehmer and Sobek, Violent Adolescence: State Development and the Propensity for Militarized Interstate Conflict 2005\)](#).

Violence can be directed towards undermining the capacity of a targeted group to handle without engaging in a war economy or seeking access to humanitarian relief through violence. Moreover, violence may be calculated for destroying the recovery potential of a group. Target groups and population in different

ways are vulnerable to different types of economic violence, which is dependent on the relations with the powerful authorities and with combatant armed groups.

### **Neglect**

The population is affected by the political and economic ruling elites and also influenced by the foreign states and international corporations. No specific group is targeted generally. Both the international community and the local authorities are not interested in helping solve the direct and indirect economic problems caused by war. The majority of the population is trying hard to survive in a drowning economy except for the merchant class and the armed groups, for whom the war is a lucrative economy like in the case of Angola. The situation is worse in the misgoverned and poor countries where the wars are forgotten by the international community, and they did not receive any relief from the international agencies rather; they deter the private investments by the foreigners.

### **Exclusion**

Measures should be considered to exclude some groups from the economy by accessing public markets and goods. This step can cause political motivation and will weaken the power base of the targeted groups' political war economy or can motivate the cardinal groups economically and increase their profit. One of the examples is the Serbs, when in the early 1990 in Croatia, they were excluded from the jobs and vice versa.

## References

- Alesina, A., & Spolaore, E. (1997). On the Number and Size of Nations. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1027-1056.
- Allan, J. A., & Allan, T. (2000). *The Middle East Water Question: Hydropolitics and the Global Economy*. London: *Bloomsbury Academic*.
- Barbieri, K. (1996, February 1). Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict? *Journal of Peace Research*, 33(1), 29-49.
- Barbieri, K. (2009). *The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace?* *University of Michigan Press*.
- Barbieri, K., & Keshk, O. M. (2011). Too Many Assumptions, Not Enough Data. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 168-74.
- Beck, T., & Webb, I. (2003). Economic, Demographic, and Institutional Determinants of Life Insurance Consumption Across Countries. *World Bank Economic Review*, 17(1), 51-87.
- Best, S., Nocella II, A. J., Kahn, R., & McLaren, P. (2011). *The Global Industrial Complex: System of Domination*. Texas: *Lexington Books*.
- Bitzinger, R. A. (2009). *The Modern Defense Industry: Political, Economic, and Technological Issues*. Santa Barbara, California: *Praeger Security International/ABC-CLIO*.
- Blainey, G. (1988). *Geoffrey Blainey, Causes of War*, 3rd Ed. *Simon and Schuster*.
- Boehmer, C. R. (2010). Economic Growth and Violent International Conflict: 1875-1999. *Journal of Defence and Peace Economics*, 21(3), 249-268.
- Boehmer, C. R., & Sobek, D. (2005). Violent Adolescence: State Development and the Propensity for Militarized Interstate Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(1), 5-26.
- Dombrowski, P., & Eugene, G. (2006). *Buying Military Transformation: Technological Innovation and the Defense Industry*. *Columbia University Press*.
- Gilroy, C., & Williams, C. (2006, January 09). *Service to Country: Personal Policy and the Transformation of Western Militaries* (Illustrated ed.). Michigan: MIT Press. January 9, 2019, Belfer Center Studies in International Security (The MIT Press): <https://mitpress.mit.edu/book/service-country>
- Gleditsch, K. S. (2009). *All International Politics Is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. *University of Michigan Press*.
- Kappen, T. R. (1995). *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Kim, H. M., & Rousseau, D. L. (2005). The Classical Liberals Were Half Right (or Half Wrong): New Tests of the 'Liberal Peace', 1960-88. *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(5), 523-43.
- Klare, M. T. (2001). The New Geography of Conflict. *Foreign Affairs*, 49.
- Napoleoni, L. (2010). *Terrorism and the Economy: How the War on Terror Is Bankrupting the World*. New York: *Seven Stories Press*.
- Sachs, J. D., & Warner, A. (2001). The Curse of Natural Resources, *European Economic Review*, 45(4-6), 827-838.