Shaping Violence Against Civilians in Civil Conflicts: The Role of Ideology

Michael Cheng

Rice University

April, 2021

Abstract

Civilian victimization in civil wars is a critical issue that has drawn significant scholarly attention, particularly in understanding the factors that lead armed groups to target civilians. Among the many factors influencing this phenomenon, ideology has been identified as a crucial determinant. Ideology shapes the goals, strategies, and behaviors of armed groups, and in turn, affects the extent and nature of violence against civilians. This literature review examines the theoretical and empirical research on the relationship between ideology and civilian victimization in civil wars, highlighting key debates, findings, and gaps in the existing scholarship.

Theoretical Perspectives on Ideology and Civilian Victimization

The relationship between ideology and violence against civilians is rooted in broader theories of political violence and conflict behavior. Ideology, in this context, refers to the set of beliefs, values, and goals that motivate and justify the actions of armed groups. Several theoretical perspectives have been proposed to explain how ideology influences civilian victimization:

Instrumentalist Perspective

This approach posits that ideology serves as a tool for mobilizing support and legitimizing violence. According to this view, armed groups use ideology to frame their struggle in moral or existential terms, thereby justifying extreme measures, including violence against civilians, as necessary for achieving their objectives. This perspective suggests that groups with rigid, exclusionary ideologies are more likely to engage in civilian victimization as a means to eliminate perceived enemies and consolidate power.

Constructivist Perspective

Constructivist scholars argue that ideology shapes the identities of armed groups and their supporters, influencing who is considered a legitimate target. In this view, ideology is not just a tool but a constitutive element of group identity, which defines in-group and out-group boundaries. Groups with ideologies that dehumanize or demonize certain populations are more prone to target those populations for violence.

Structuralist Perspective

Structuralist theories emphasize the role of external factors, such as state weakness, ethnic divisions, and economic incentives, in driving civilian victimization. While ideology is

acknowledged as important, these theories argue that it interacts with structural conditions to produce violence. For example, a group with an ethnonationalist ideology may be more likely to victimize civilians if it operates in a region with deep-seated ethnic tensions.

Empirical Evidence on Ideology and Civilian Victimization

Empirical studies have explored the impact of ideology on civilian victimization in various civil war contexts. These studies often utilize case studies, quantitative analysis, and comparative methods to assess the validity of theoretical claims:

Case Studies

Detailed case studies of civil wars, such as those in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Syria, have provided insights into how ideology shapes patterns of violence. For instance, the Rwandan Genocide has been interpreted through the lens of ethnonationalist ideology, where the Hutu-led government used ideology to justify mass killings of Tutsis. Similarly, in Bosnia, the nationalist ideologies of different factions contributed to the widespread targeting of civilians based on ethnic identity.

Quantitative Analyses

Quantitative studies have sought to establish broader patterns by analyzing large datasets of civil wars. For example, research using the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) and Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) has found that groups with ideologies emphasizing ethnic or religious purity are more likely to engage in civilian victimization. Additionally, some studies suggest that ideological groups are less likely to negotiate and more likely to commit atrocities as they view their goals as non-negotiable.

Comparative Studies

Comparative analyses have compared different civil wars or armed groups to understand how ideology interacts with other factors. For example, a study comparing leftist and rightist insurgencies found that leftist groups, often driven by ideologies of social justice, were less likely to target civilians compared to rightist groups, which were more prone to using violence as a means of suppressing dissent and maintaining social order.

Ideology and Civilian Victimization: Key Debates and Challenges

While the literature establishes a link between ideology and civilian victimization, several debates and challenges remain:

Ideological Rigidity vs. Pragmatism

Some scholars argue that ideology may be less important than often assumed, with armed groups being more pragmatic in their use of violence. According to this view, groups may adopt ideological rhetoric to justify actions that are primarily driven by strategic considerations, such as controlling territory or resources.

Variation within Ideological Movements

There is considerable variation in how different factions within the same ideological movement treat civilians. For instance, within Islamist insurgencies, some groups may adhere strictly to ideological tenets that prohibit harming civilians, while others may disregard these tenets in pursuit of military objectives.

The Role of Leadership and Organizational Structure

The influence of ideology on civilian victimization is often mediated by leadership decisions and organizational dynamics. Leaders who are more ideologically committed may push for extreme violence, while those more focused on long-term goals may avoid actions that could alienate the civilian population.

Measurement and Operationalization of Ideology

Another challenge is the measurement of ideology and its influence on behavior. Ideology is often difficult to quantify, and its impact may vary depending on how it is operationalized in different studies. This has led to debates over the best methods for assessing the role of ideology in civil war violence.

Conclusion

The literature on ideology and civilian victimization in civil wars underscores the complex relationship between belief systems and violence. While ideology is a significant factor influencing the behavior of armed groups, it interacts with a range of other variables, including strategic, structural, and organizational factors. Future research could benefit from more nuanced approaches that consider the interplay between ideology and these other determinants, as well as from more robust methodologies for measuring ideological influence. Addressing these gaps could provide a deeper understanding of why and how civilians are targeted in civil conflicts, potentially informing more effective strategies for protecting civilians in war-torn regions.

References

Ahmadov, Anar K., and James Hughes. 2020. "Ideology and civilian victimization in Northern Ireland's civil war." *Irish Political Studies* 35(4): 531-565.

Azam, Jean-Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2002."Violence against civilians in civil wars: looting or terror?" *Journal of Peace Research* 39(4):461-485.

Balcells, Laia. 2010."Rivalry and Revenge: Violence against Civilians in Conventional Civil Wars." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(2):291-313.

Downes, Alexander. 2006."Desperate times, desperate measures." *International Security* 30(4):152-195.

Drake, Charles JM. 1998."The role of ideology in terrorists' target selection." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 10 (2): 53-85.

Fjelde, Hanne, and Lisa Hultman. 2014. "Weakening the Enemy: A Disaggregated Study of Violence against Civilians in Africa." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Hultman, Lisa. 2012. "COIN and civilian collaterals: patterns of violence in Afghanistan, 2004–2009." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 23(2):245-263.

Raleigh, Clionadh. 2012."Violence against civilians: A disaggregated analysis." *International Interactions* 38 (4):462-481.

Salehyan, Idean, David Siroky, and Reed Wood. 2014."External rebel sponsorship and civilian abuse." *International Organization* 68 (3): 633-661.

Sanín, Gutiérrez Francisco, and Elisabeth Jean Wood. 2014. "Ideology in civil war: Instrumental adoption and beyond." *Journal of Peace Research* 51(2):213-226.

Staniland, Paul. 2015. "Militias, Ideology, and the State." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Stanton, Jessica A. 2015. "Regulating militias: Governments, militias, and civilian targeting in civil war." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(5):899-923.

Thaler, Kai M. 2012. "Ideology and Violence in Civil Wars: Theory and Evidence from Mozambique and Angola." *Civil Wars* 14(4):546-567.

Weinstein, Jeremy. 2007. *Inside Rebellion*. Cambridge University Press.

Wood, Reed M. 2010. "Rebel capability and strategic violence against civilians." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(5):601-614.