

The Causes And Consequences Of War Globally

¹AMON RIMAMTANUNG STEPHEN,²YAKUBU ENGANYA,³ITYOUGH SAAKUMA,⁴GALADIMA YAHAYA KAPPY

¹department Of Political Science And International Relations, Federal University Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria

²department Of Political Science And International Relations, Taraba State University, Jalingo, Nigeria

³institute For Distance Education And Life-Long Learning, Taraba State University, Jalingo, Nigeria

⁴department Of Public Administration, Taraba State Polytechnic Suntai

Abstract: The causes and repercussions of war are complex and far reaching. Modern tools of war provide armies the capacity to kill dozens of people efficiently and brutally. But the costs of war extend far beyond immediate battle losses. Although media attention normally fades quickly after a cease fire has been signed, this is when the most dramatic consequences kick in. We investigate three types of consequences: economic, political and health. A significant lot of work has been carried out in the past decade on the economic repercussions of conflict. Wars and other kinds of military warfare decrease trade among nations state .Military conflict between countries is often accompanied by the establishment of partial or whole trade embargoes on the interchange of goods. Conflict may also restrict trade flows by raising the price to private agents of engaging in international enterprise.

Keywords: Causes, Consequences, War, Globally

Introduction

The ramifications of the evil of war are profound and far reaching. Modern tools of war provide armies the capacity to kill dozens of people efficiently and brutally. But the costs of war extend far beyond immediate battle losses. Although media attention normally fades quickly after a cease fire has been signed, this is when the most dramatic consequences kick in. We investigate three types of consequences: economic, political and health. A significant lot of work has been carried out in the past decade on the economic repercussions of conflict.

However, international wars and tend to be significantly devastating at physical capital. A second effect is the disruption generated by combat and the sometimes related societal dysfunction. For example, some roads become dangerous and hence extra costs are paid in accomplishing the same result. Civil rights may be suppressed, and there is evidence that the suppression of such liberties will tend to diminish the efficiency of public expenditure (Isham, Kaufmann & Pritchett, 1996).

While the breakdown of social order and the absence of a distinct front line is more typical to international war. A third effect is the diversion of governmental expenditure from output-enhancing activities. For example, as the army and its powers are grown, the police force and the rule of law decline. The enforcement costs of contracts inevitably grow and the security of property rights is reduced. The costs of expenditure diversion coming from conflict have been assessed by (Knight et al.1996).

Wars and other types of military warfare hinder trade among among nations state. Military conflict between countries is often accompanied by the establishment of partial or whole trade embargoes on the interchange of goods. Conflict may also restrict trade flows by raising the price to private agents of engaging in international enterprise. However some nation's state still engages in war due of control of economic resources or revenge.

The Concept of War

War is, in principle, only permissible between states, which are considered sovereign political entities, according to international law. Therefore; units at the highest level of political organisation can resolve their disagreements by war. Conflicts on a global scale tend to devolve into anarchy, in contrast to the relatively well-organised systems that govern domestic disputes, according to the vast majority of thinkers who have studied war from a sociopolitical perspective. It has been noted that state institutions, such the foreign office and the military forces, are intimately involved in wars. The stakes of war may be the life or death of states when warfare is portrayed from an international perspective (Aron, 1966). In his 1911 definition of war, von Clausewitz emphasised that it is "an act of violence intended to compel our opponents to fulfil our will." He went on to say, "War is nothing but a continuation of political intercourse, with a mixture of other means." The political act where by states resort to armed action to determine which is more powerful and can thus impose its will on the other, when they are unable to resolve a dispute over their duties, rights, or interests, was defined by (Sorel, 1912) as war.

Wars are "armed conflict between population group's conceived of as organic unities, such as races or tribes, states or lesser geographic units, religious or political parties, economic classes," according to (A. Johnson 1935). Since it encompasses not only

political units but also any type of population unit capable of turning to arms as a means of dispute settlement (Bernard, 1944). Argues that this definition may be seen as roughly sociological. The lack of indication on the length of the dispute or the number of disputing parties suggests that the term may be excessively broad. The current usage of this term could be expanded to include riots. The even more general and all-encompassing definition of war offered by B. Russell in 1916 as "conflict between two groups, each of which attempts to kill and maim as many as possible of the other group in order to achieve some object which it desires" is even more comprehensive. Generally power or wealth" is what Russell says motivates men to battle.

According to Wallace (1968), "the sanctioned use of lethal weapons by members of one society against members of another" is the definition of war. A separate policy-making organisation directs the efforts of trained troops operating in teams, with the non-combatant population providing various forms of support.

Causes of war are:

The Individual/ Human Level of Analysis

Sigmund Freud (1968) is one of several psychologists who have drawn the conclusion that animosity is hardwired into human beings from birth due to their genetic programming and psychological makeup, in light of the recurrent occurrence of war. In a similar vein, ethnologists like (Lorenz, 1963) propose that, unlike most other species, humans engage in intra-specific violence rather than inter-specific. One way to classify the negative aspects of war is according to its ferocity. One other thing realists thought was that the desire for power is something everyone has from birth. So, they buy into Charles Darwin's theory of evolution and natural selection, which states that life, is a struggle for existence and that the traits that don't help one succeed are wiped out. Although the nature vs. nurture debate over aggression's biological roots has not been resolved, the majority of social scientists now contend that aggressiveness is more of a cultural trait than a biological one and that war is a learnt habit. "Aggression is a predisposition acquired early in life as a function of socialisation, and so is a learnt rather than biologically fixed behaviour," argues Ted Robert Gurr (1970), whose claims are backed by behavioural studies. Behavioural scientists have also cast doubt on the idea that a nation's character makes it more likely to go to war, as some psychologists have argued. A nation's character can change and manifest in many ways. In contrast to their violent pasts, Sweden and Switzerland have learnt to resolve their differences peacefully since 1809 and 1815, respectively. The results disprove the theory that aggressive tendencies are hardwired into some populations.

The State/National Level of Analysis

It is commonly believed that states' propensity to engage in conflict is contingent upon factors such as their governments, sizes, ideologies, locations, populations, wealth, economic performance, military capabilities, and level of education. An underlying assumption of state-level analysis is that different types or classes of states will have different war participation rates. Some of the potential causes of state-level war include the length of time a state has been independent, with the belief that newly-formed states are more likely to have internal political instability, making them more vulnerable to wars. Conflicts may break out for internal factors such as poverty, militarisation, economic systems, government types, and nationalism (Waltz, 1959).

The Systemic Level of Analysis

According to classical realists, innate flaws in human character are the root causes of war. On the other hand, neo-realists believe that conflicts arise from global-level shifts in power dynamics, namely, as a result of the international system's decentralised nature, which forces independent nations to depend on themselves to ensure their safety. The behaviour of states within the international system can be influenced by changes in the system's nature. Take an example, for instance. There were a number of wars sparked by the Cold War era's competitive and conflictual international structure (Singer, 1961).

Theoretical framework

The realist viewpoint, upon which this work is based, holds that security concerns are the central focus of statecraft. On the matter of security, realists are more likely to lean towards the conservative side because they doubt there can be peace in a global system where states are not accountable to anybody and where individuals put their own interests ahead of those of the collective. For realists, "political realities are power realities and that power must be countered with power and self-interest is the primary datum in the action of all groups and nations" (Herzog, 1963:88) means acknowledging that politics isn't a place for ethics and logic. When it comes to anarchic situations, realists are quick to point out those international laws and multilateral organisations can't handle the problem.

Additionally, they have a pessimistic outlook on the likelihood of human nature achieving peaceful goals. As a result, realists agreed with Hobes (2008). View of human nature, which holds that people are fundamentally violent, self-centred, competitive, and

destructive. Realists aren't big on moralising when it comes to global politics, and they see conflict as an inevitable part of global life. Over the turbulent years leading up to and including World War II and the Cold War, the majority of realism ideas had an impact on strategic studies. Notion such as deterrence, weapons and disarmaments, flexible reactions, overwhelming response, brinkmanship, and détente were heavily impacted by the early American strategists who shaped the development of modern strategic philosophy. While realists were pessimistic about the current international system's ability to bring about peace and security, idealists were optimistic about its potential.

They pushed for a cooperative strategy to address peace issues via global organisations and protocols. Additionally, they advocated for arms control and disarmament as means to achieve global harmony. There was a remarkable congruence between the idealists' 'democratic peace' concept and the worldwide tidal wave of democratisation that hit emerging nations just after the cold war ended. A possible solution to the international system's anarchy, according to the democratic peace thesis, would be to spread democracy to countries that currently do not have it. Post-Cold War global collaborations, especially inside the UN system, have been on the rise, suggesting a return to liberalism in contemporary strategic thinking.

Another indicator of liberalism is the growing cooperation between Russia and the United States to reduce the strategic weaponry stockpile. Concern for safety and security is the dominant idea in strategic planning, as mentioned in the introduction. Almost all of the leading strategic thinkers agree that achieving world peace and security is an important step towards ensuring humankind's continued existence on Earth. Even though various strategists may have diverse ideas about how to achieve peace, they all share a concern for this elusive goal. Peace and security are indicators that normative concerns and ideals form the basis of the strategy.

The Evil Nature of War is categories based on sub-headings they are:

The Economic Damage Effect

Wars have an impact on the economy as much as any other part of society. Food shortages are a common result of their destruction of agricultural systems. Rising food prices caused by food shortages can, in certain critical situations, set off famines. Instead of stemming from a complete dearth of food, famine is a problem with food distribution and poverty, as pointed out by Dreze and Sen. War not only destroys crops and disrupts food distribution systems, but it also erodes basic infrastructure, making it harder to get reliable power, clean water, and modern restrooms. Damage to or complete breakdown of essential services including water purification, sewage treatment, electricity generation, communication networks, and healthcare infrastructure is a common result of wars in which the opposing sides deliberately aim their attacks at these critical locations. The objective of this strategy is to bring up social chaos and anarchy in order to weaken the other side. Blockading food supplies, setting crops on fire, and infecting besieged towns with infectious diseases are all tactics that have been used in warfare for a long time (Thomas & Neumayer, 2016).

On one hand, King and Martin argue that technological and strategic advancements in the military have resulted in "increasingly severe public health consequences of war," on the other hand, Garfield & Neugut insist that "modern weaponry and tactics extend the battlefield to the entire society, including civilians." In particular, harm to the healthcare and medical infrastructure will have a negative impact on the civilian population. Medical professionals, including doctors and nurses, have either died or left the nation, leaving hospitals and pharmacies in ruins. Due to a lack of public funds and a deteriorating economy, both public and private health care systems are severely underfunded and under provided. Not only are urgent medical issues not promptly handled, but vital preventative measures that have positive effects on health in the long run, such immunisation and monitoring programs, are simply halted.

As an example, a World Health Organisation evaluation of Bosnia's healthcare system from 1992 to 2000 found that: "Humanitarian aid programs covered up to 70% of pharmaceutical supplies during the war and the years after it, according to some estimates". The availability of certain drugs and their dosages dictated the course of treatment in many cases. These worries are likely to increase as other nations become more difficult to access and as media attention on certain military situations decreases. But in wars, not only are health services less accessible, but medical equipment is typically damaged as well. (Thomas & Neumayer, 2016) use the World Health Organization's estimate that 40% of medical equipment was rendered inoperable due to the civil war in Bosnia.

Because of this, the cost of healthcare and pharmaceuticals is increasing at an alarming rate, putting the poor at risk of dying from seemingly insignificant illnesses because they cannot afford treatment. Wars naturally have a major impact on ordinary incomes and economic growth rates due to the disruption they cause to agricultural systems and infrastructure. The impact of war, both global and domestic, on GDP growth and per capita income is typically estimated to be substantial and negative. According to Collier, the average yearly rate of decline in per capita income during civil wars is 2.2% when compared to its counterfactual. This is the same average effect that Thomas & Neumayer found (2016).

Civil wars can wreak economic havoc in certain places and for longer periods of time than in others. As an example, prior to the start of the civil war, Nicaragua's per capita income was \$4,276. At the conclusion of the Civil War, the per capita income had dropped to \$1,913. This represented a yearly decline of roughly 6.5%; when contrasted with the average growth rate of 2.5% after the war, the relative loss in wealth was approximately 10% per year. The life expectancy ratio of men and women in Nicaragua rose between 1978 and 1979 (meaning that males made up the majority of combatants killed in the war), but fell in the years after the conflict ended, likely because females made up the majority of indirect casualties. Not only do wars reduce average wages, but they also affect both the absolute and relative prices (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

It is becoming more difficult for the majority of people to meet their basic needs since their income is not keeping pace with inflation. Products with the least elastic demand i.e., those with the greatest unmet needs such as potable water, food, electricity, and medicine tend to see the most drastic price hikes. Why do you think women will be more hit hard by the economic fallout of war than men? Famines and spikes in food prices are more likely to impact women. Nutritional deficiencies in vitamins and iron can have a disproportionately negative impact on women's health. Girls and women also lose out when it comes to food distribution in societies where men hold most of the power. The elimination of basic health care services has a disproportionate impact on women due to their unique reproductive roles. Damage to healthcare facilities has a multiplicative effect on obstetric care, leading to an increase in the incidence of miscarriages and mother and infant death (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

As an example, a recent research conducted by the International Red Cross revealed an alarmingly high maternal mortality rate of 3% in the sections of the civil war-ravaged Congo that are under rebel control. The high rates of maternal mortality can be attributed to several factors, including having children at a young age (twenty-year-olds make up 20% of the total fertility rate), having an excessive number of pregnancies and births (approximately seven per woman), having a short time between pregnancies (the average is less than two years), becoming a mother at a late age, and, in the case of unwanted pregnancies affecting 30% of teenagers, to induced clandestine abortions. A significant decrease in the life expectancy of women in the Congo can already be attributed to this dreadful situation regarding health treatment in areas devastated by civil war. Because men are often given preferential treatment when it comes to resources, a significant decline in purchasing power will have a different impact on women than men.

As resources become more limited, the discriminated-against group will inevitably feel the pinch even more acutely. Instead than being rooted in biology, much of the negative effects of war on women stem from what Carpenter terms "preexisting gendered social structures." For instance, women often face several risks since they are disproportionately responsible for caring for their families and for obtaining essentials like water, food, and fuel for cooking. According to Thomas & Neumayer (2016), violent conflict has a disproportionately negative impact on women in societies where gender discrimination is prevalent even when the country is at peace.

Displacement Effect

When people are displaced from their homes due to armed conflict, they often seek refuge in makeshift structures. Even worse, they often have to flee their homes and find safety in makeshift refugee camps in neighbouring countries or as internally displaced peoples (IDPs). Because of this, infectious diseases like malaria, measles, acute respiratory disorders, and diarrhoea, as well as STDs like HIV/AIDS, spread more rapidly and frequently became epidemics. People with poor mental and physical health tend to succumb to illnesses more quickly than those with stronger immune systems (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

In refugee camps, health is very bad. The refugee camp mortality rate, according to Toole's calculations, can be as much as 100 times greater than the average death rate in the nation in question. People in internally displaced person (IDP) refugee camps may be directly hit by the fighting or have their aid efforts slowed or halted because of the ongoing conflict in the area. It is unusual to find data that is separated by gender, but Toole uses statistics from a Burmese refugee camp in Bangladesh to show that the infant mortality rate for girls was 3.5 times higher than for boys and that the infant mortality rate for females was twice that of males. We do not intend to imply that women's lives would have been better off outside of refugee camps, but there is no question that there are significant disparities in mortality rates among camp residents (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

The situation can get worse if cultural norms demand that women practice specific forms of feminine hygiene in complete seclusion from males, which is sometimes not practicable in refugee camps. The probabilistic argument is fairly strong, but there is no reason to assume that displacement due to militarised conflicts has a detrimental effect on the gender difference in life expectancy. Because of the poor healthcare in refugee camps and the potential over-representation of women there, the gender gap in life expectancy is expected to narrow as the number of displaced people increases (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

The Sexual Violence Effect

As a third consequence, violence against women is institutionalised as part of a "gender ideology." Sexual slavery takes many forms, but one of the most common is the trafficking of girls and women into brothels or other types of forced sexual service in the military. Estimates indicate that the Serbian military systematically raped at least 20,000 women and girls and killed many more during the Bosnian civil war. There is also evidence that Serbian militia deliberately targeted young, fit-for-battle males from Bosnia and, later, Kosovo in order to put an end to armed resistance. However, all figures should be treated with caution. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) prosecutes crimes against humanity, including so-called gender crimes, committed by individuals targeting and victimising women during the Balkan conflicts. In a similar vein, the recently formed Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) enumerates as crimes against humanity punishable by prosecution "rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilisation, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity" (Article 7). The Bosnian conflict is far from the first one in which reports of systematic rapes and murders of women have surfaced (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

Another reason rape was used in subsequent wars was to transmit STDs like HIV/AIDS, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Vaginal injuries! Sexually transmitted infections are more common in women who have experienced rape, which is a common side effect. Equal protection under the law should apply to women in times of conflict. As stated in the 1950 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, civilians "shall be at all times humanely treated, and shall be protected especially against acts of violence," with women "shall be especially protected against any attack on their honour, in particular against rape, enforced prostitution, or any form of indecent assault" under Article 27. The UN Security Council has issued a call to "all parties to armed conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse, and all other forms of violence in situations of armed conflict." This action is in response to the fact that numerous warring parties fail to uphold their responsibilities under humanitarian law and the Geneva Convention (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

Conflict and the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy

Every stage of a conflict, from planning to execution, is a time of death. Military spending tends to spike just before a conflict breaks out, diverting funds that might otherwise go into healthcare and other social services. Those who lose their lives as a direct result of fighting are the most visible fatalities of any conflict. Wounds are a leading cause of death and disability among both military personnel and civilians. Combat and military actions are more likely to have an impact on men. The direct causes of war should have a greater impact on men than women, given that the majority of soldiers in most armies are male (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

The number of women killed directly by military operations is exactly proportional to the number of civilians killed directly. Still, we can't assume that female soldiers die at a higher rate than male ones. However, indirect results of war might include large casualties and other detrimental impacts on public health. There are a number of ways in which wars reduce life expectancy indirectly. Armed conflict not only reduces the ability to cope with the increase in unfavourable health conditions, but it also creates conditions that lead to increased morbidity and mortality. For both biological and primarily socioeconomic reasons, the myriad indirect negative effects on health and death are likely to have distinct effects on men and women. We explain the unequal impact of militarised conflicts on men and women by identifying three indirect impacts in the sections that follow (Neumayer & Thomas 2016).

These consequences are known as the sexual violence impact, the displacement effect, and the economic harm effect. Evidently, these consequences do not operate in isolation but can readily amplify one another, intensifying the people's predicament. For the sake of clarity, we will address the three impacts independently and then in sequence, bearing in mind their interaction effects. Next, we go on to the theoretical portion, where we explain why the impacts will be amplified in cases of ethnically motivated violence or when the country's core political system has crumbled (Neumayer & Thomas, 2016).

The effects of war on physical health

The health and wellbeing of individuals and communities are profoundly impacted by war, both in the short and long term. It is extremely challenging, if not impossible, for people to reach their full potential when they are sick. The HIV/AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa demonstrates how a society can suffer from excessive mortality and extensive disability, which in turn hinders economic growth and development. Both physical and mental health are impacted by the indirect and direct effects of conflict on health. There are unique dangers for women. The impact on physical health is the most glaring and immediate consequence of war and violent conflict. Both soldiers and civilians suffer heavy casualties and disabilities in times of war. According to the United Nations (2014), the region experiencing the highest number of failed governments and the highest number of refugees and internally displaced people is the one most plagued by death, disease, and injury.

Countries like Iraq, Palestine, Somalia, Sudan, and Syria that have had long-term or massive-scale civil wars or occupations are the main emphasis of this chapter. These nations are chosen to demonstrate the extent of vulnerability and failure; they include Syria's

humanitarian crisis, Iraq's failed rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts, Palestine's occupation, Somalia's failed state, and Sudan's failed development. State and non-state institutions "Lack the capacity, accountability, or legitimacy to mediate relations between citizen groups and between citizens and the state, making them vulnerable to violence," and many of these nations have endured cycles of violence. While the causes and effects of the violence and war have been different in each of these nations, they have had a commonality with other Arab nations embroiled in conflict (UN, 2014).

The reasons why Nations state engages in war with one another are:

Religion

It is reasonable to assume that there are rationales for a conflict between theocracies, or states governed by adherents of different faiths. Determining the agents' goals is the key. Something as abstract as the expansion of one religion's adherent base or the complete elimination of another could serve as the driving force behind the objective. It is possible that no amount of effort or bargaining power could ever calm an aggressive person down in such a situation. One possible explanation for why such goals are not driven by rational considerations is that leaders frequently make excuses, such as claiming to be guided by a higher power or religious code, rather than acting freely.

Consequently, leaders in such contexts may not see themselves as "optimising" or "choosing" paths, but rather as conforming to predetermined directives. From our point of view, it is even more crucial that such agents cannot be negotiated with. That is, these agents may have a self-serving agenda that conflicts with the autonomy and well-being of another group, even if legally binding agreements exist. Therefore, a leader who believes in acting as a conduit for a higher power is fundamentally different from a leader who is actively selecting and optimising, even if his or her speech is religious in character. Considering this, it is possible to rationally comprehend many conflicts that are believed to have a religious basis. The crusades and the Thirty Years' War are two well-known examples that are generally thought of as religious battles to illustrate this concept (Matthew, & Massimo, 2019).

A coalition of national and subnational forces was the aggressor in the crusades, which added complexity to the conflicts, yet they all came together behind a common religious banner. The Christian coalition's shared interests are questionable beyond the rhetoric. According to Fisher (1992), when asked about the crusaders' motivations, they likely had a mix of religious zeal and the more practical desire to divide up the profits. Nevertheless, once again, the political realisation of Christian unity eluded us. In addition to dividing their newly conquered eastern lands into several principalities, the Crusaders kept fighting amongst themselves in Europe. The fact that they were unable to reconcile their narrow objectives with the overarching principle that had motivated them was the exact reason they were unable to retain control of the East. (Fischer 1992:438). Thus, the politics of the Crusades, while showing that religious ideas can have some political effect, remained alliances circumscribed by the exigencies of power" (1992:443). With numerous armies fighting on multiple fronts, the crusades were essentially an effort to seize or reclaim control of a wide variety of areas, from the Iberian peninsula and Constantinople to Jerusalem and other cities in the Middle East.

From our vantage point, the crusades occurred in part because people couldn't be trusted to keep their word, there were many different groups fighting on different fronts, and there were big problems with communicating and gathering information (for example, see Runciman (1951–4)). So, the crusades may be partially made sense of by bringing together the rationalist viewpoints that we'll go over later. Regarding the 30-year war, it is worth noting that religious divisions emerged in Europe prior to 1618 as a result of various protestant reforms and movements. Some leaders utilised religious motivation to rationalise their actions and rally the troops, but the instability was also caused by a struggle for power between multiple parties and the absence of legally binding agreements. Gutmann (1988) posits that the inflexibility of imposing a power distribution so drastically different from the official one upheld by the pope and imperial power was a major factor in the failure of numerous settlement efforts.

The concepts of autonomy and territory outlined in the 1648 war-ending Westphalia accords provided the groundwork for contemporary governments, while also severing ties between certain territorial and religious issues. Catholics and Protestants lived side by side in some areas in an effort to foster religious tolerance, but religious leaders were barred from exercising power over individuals in other areas. So, while religion was a driving force in the 30-year battle, territory, peace, and autonomy were also factors, and the various factions were able to work together to reach a complex, self-sustaining arrangement. According to Matthew and Massimo (2019), the long-running conflict between Israel and the Palestinians could be seen as an example of a religious conflict that is frequently explained in irrational ways.

On the other hand, a rationalist perspective might be more fruitful. The numerous diverse groups that make up either side of the dispute make it very difficult to reach a lasting, believable compromise, which is a major obstacle to ending this conflict in the Middle East. Despite the rationalist nature of the Oslo peace accords' adherence to land for peace ideals, both sides resorted to blaming "fundamentalism" when violence escalated again. It is more helpful to look at this disagreement through the rationalist prism of multilateral bargaining, which we will examine later on. This looks to be a bilateral war, but it is actually multilateral

because both the Israelis and the Palestinians represent many different constituencies. Because states in such contexts wind up being inconsistent in their decision-making as they collectively aggregate the desires of many diverse individuals, agreements may be impossible even with completely rational individual actors. We go into greater into on this rationalist explanation later on (Matthew, & Massimo, 2019).

Revenge

Another cause for war that one would naturally classify as non-rationalist is vengeance. Nevertheless, there is a significant difference between an emotional form of vengeance and what one may term revenge in a recurrent game, specifically the punishment phase associated with various trigger techniques. One of the non-rationalist explanations is the emotive version. 5 When people act out of emotional vengeance, it's because they're still hurt over something that happened in the past; they aren't thinking about the possible incentive effects or making a strategic decision in advance. Even more uncommon are wars sparked by vengeance; yet, the Iliad provides a vivid account of the Achaeans' motivations during the Trojan War (Matthew, & Massimo, 2019).

Ethnic cleansing and other ideological mass killings

Similar to our previous discussion of religion, the desire to gain a larger part of society's resources, both now and in the future, might theoretically justify the incentives to eradicate another ethnic group or minority ideological group (see, for example, (Esteban & Ray 2008)). Rather than appealing to reasoned decision, adherents of such ideologies rely on other principles to support their rigid stances. One of Hitler's main goals was to confirm his race's supremacy (Matthew, & Massimo, 2019).

Despite the fact that Hitler's insane ambitions and ethnic supremacy were factors in his actions, rationalist explanations can shed light on the Second World War by revealing why the parties involved did not want to avert conflict by making concessions. The Munich Agreement, for instance, collapsed owing to issues with credible commitments; this would have been the case regardless of the presence or absence of ethnicity or insanity, as we shall see below. Finally, it's important to note that wars can sometimes break out because certain leaders are insane. Even in this case, the line between rational and non-rational is blurry; as we'll see when we examine Schelling and others' "spiral" theory of war, the dread of an opponent's lunacy might motivate a reasonable attack. This kind of reasoning falls under the rationalist umbrella since even completely rational actors may become involved in conflict due to their inherent bias towards assuming that other people aren't as rational as they are (Matthew, & Massimo, 2019).

Conclusion

Wars take lives, but their effects are felt by many more than just the casualties. War not only kills people on both sides, but it also forces people to flee their homes and destroys the infrastructure of their communities. There is irreparable damage to economic, political, and social institutions. War has serious repercussions for progress. Wars break out between certain states as a result of competing claims to territory and resources.

References

- Hobbes, T., (2008) *Leviathan* New York: New York Oxford University Press
- Kenneth Waltz (1959) *Man, the state and war: a theoretical analysis*
- Krasner (1995) *for an account of the role of territory and autonomy principles*
- Matthew O. Jackson and Massimo Morelli Forthcoming in the *Handbook on the Political Economy of War*, edited by Chris Coyne, Elgar Publishing Revised: December 2009
- Runciman, S. (1951) *The History of the first crusades and the foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* Cambridge University press
- Singer J. D, (1961) *The levels of analysis problem in international relations world politics*
- Ted Robert Gur (1970) *Why men Rebel* Princeton University
- Thomas Plumper and Eric Neumayer (2016) *The Unequal Burden of War: The Effect of Armed Conflict on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy* UN, (2014) *The Effects on Youth of War and Violent Conflict The Reasons for Wars – an Updated Survey*