SECURITY DIMENSIONS
NO. 30; 2019 (22–39)
DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0013.7549

State Security Policy and Changing the Nature of the Conflict after the End of the Cold War Rivalry

Aleksandra Korczyc*

ABSTRACT

The aim of the paper is to try to determine the essence of the new face of armed conflict. Liberia is the main point of reference in the analysis for two reasons. Firstly, Liberia is the oldest independent republic on the African continent and its establishing is linked to paradoxical events begun in 1821, when black people settling in the vicinity of Monrovia, former slaves liberated from South American cotton plantations, reconstructed a slave-like type of society, taking local, poorly organised tribes as their subjects. Secondly, Liberia proves that the intensity of changes in armed conflict does not have to be strictly dependent on the size of the land: a country of small geographical size can equal or even exceed countries with several times larger surface in terms of features of "new wars". In 1989 in Liberia, the nine-year presidency of Samuel Doe, characterised by exceptional ineptitude and bloody terror, led to the outbreak of clashes

* Aleksandra Korczyc, M.A., War Studies University, Warszawa; correspondence address: War Studies University, ul. gen. Antoniego Chruściela "Montera" 103, 00-910 Warszawa, Poland; e-mail: aleksandra.korczyc@gmail.com

between government forces and the opposition from National Patriotic Front of Liberia, led by Charles Taylor. Thus, the first civil war in Liberia was begun, that lasted until 1997 and became an arena of mass violations of human rights, leaving behind 150,000 dead victims and about 850,000 refugees to neighbouring countries.[1]

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received: 14.06.2019 Accepted: 28.06.2019

Keywords
new war, Liberia, conflict, Cold War

1. Introduction

The conflict in Liberia, like the conflict in Sierra Leone, which began in March 1991, or the conflict in Angola, which lasts since the Cold War, proves that the war changed its character over the last few decades. The classical war used to be a conflict between sovereign states recognizing one another, that had international legal subjectivity and owned disciplined armies operating under organized command and financed by efficient tax system. The conflict of this kind was ruled by strictly determined regulations at the level of international law. Nowadays, classical war is more and more often replaced by a new type of organized violence of domestic character, which is labelled in literature as "postmodern conflict", low-intensity conflict, or "new war".[2] In present-day conflicts, as a result of the privatisation of war, states lost their monopoly on using violence in favour of parastatal structures and private persons – beginning from internal opposition groups proclaiming false slogans of freedom and democracy, child-soldiers and local warlords, through international private military companies offering mercenaries, to oil and diamond corporations, for which giving up violence means the loss of lucrative income.

Prior to the analysis of the change in nature of armed conflicts after the end of Cold War rivalry, it is necessary to determine what conflict is from

[1] "UNMIL. Misión de las Naciones Unidas en Liberia", http://www.unmil.org/content.asp?ccat=history (accessed 05.02.2019).

[2] K. Pawłowski, *Spory i konflikty międzynarodowe*, [in:] *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, M. Pietraś (red.), Lublin 2007, p. 358.

the viewpoint of international relations. Conflicts are usually defined as disputes which take a fierce form and pose the threat of the use of armed force, in which violence has already been used.[3] They arise when there are contradictions of interest between parties, and the resulting claims of one party are rejected by the other. Lack of mutually satisfying solutions leads to a crisis situation and to the transformation of a dispute into a conflict, which entails the possibility of using armed force by opposing parties. At this stage it is still possible to resolve the conflict applying means of non-military character.

However, if parties begin military activities, armed conflict between them will start, i.e. a conflict in which all forms of armed struggle take place (besides classical, regular wars of inter-state character, they also include military intervention by other international legal entities, border clashes, civil wars, rebellions, insurrections etc.). The parties of such a conflict are states, international organisations, nations, ethnic groups or intrastatal groups. Armed conflicts that also include participants who are not entities of international law replace now more and more often the concept of war traditionally understood by international law as the state of armed struggle between states, which is the opposite of the state of peace.

The division of armed conflicts into international conflicts and non-international conflicts has essential importance for the topic of this paper. The range of rights and obligations resulting from the regulations of international law is wider in the first category than in the second category. [4] **International armed conflicts**, according to the definition of the Department of Peace and Conflict Research and International Peace Research Institute,[5] include **inter-state armed conflicts** (arising between two or more states, which stand out against one another individually or in a group by forming international coalitions), and **non-systemic armed conflicts** (carried on between the state, i.e. an international legal entity, and a non-state group coming from the outside of its territory). In turn, non-international, i.e. **domestic armed conflicts**, include **internal armed conflicts** in the strict sense (carried out between the armed forces of a state and other organized armed groups constituting internal opposition, without the intervention

[3] *Ibidem*, p. 351.

[4] R. Bierzanek, J. Simonides, *Prawo międzynarodowe publiczne*, 8th revised edition, Warszawa 2005, pp. 394–411, 431–436.

[5] "Uppsala universitet", http://www.pcr.uu.se/conferenses/Euroconference/nilspetter-papper.pdf (accessed 06.05.2018).

of other states), and **internationalised domestic armed conflicts** in the internal sense, where intervention of other states or international organizations takes place.

Calculations made by the researchers of Uppsala Universitet[6] show that between 1946 and 2006 there were 232 armed conflicts in the world. In the analysed period **conflicts of domestic character** had a dominant position, totalling 169, among which only a limited number (42) were **internationalised** as a result of external military intervention. A decidedly smaller part were **conflicts of international character**. Among them 42 were **interstate** conflicts and the period of their largest intensity lasted from 1946 until the second half of the 1970s. The least numerous category (21) includes **non-systematic conflicts**, the intensity of which co-occurred with the process of decolonization.

These calculations prove that the character of armed conflict began to evolve gradually during the Cold War confrontation. The confirmation of this thesis can be found in Kaldor's distinction between so-called "old wars" and "new wars".[7] In this typology "old wars" corresponded to the European order formed after the Westphalian Peace of 1648. This historical event put the final end to the supremacy of the emperor and the pope. It also opened in the history a new chapter of European international relations, based on the principle of equality between sovereign, centralised and hierarchically organised states with clearly defined borders. When countries became monopolists of means of war and the only entities entitled to declare and wage war, the doctrine of the balance of power began to develop. According to this doctrine, the power of one country or group of countries is constantly controlled by the balancing powers of other countries. The aspirations of the states to dominate and their intention to acquire territory were the causes of the outbreaks of "old wars". It was additionally facilitated by the fact that the developing doctrine of international law as well as the custom regarded military conquest as legal acquisition of territory.[8] The parties of the conflict, which was begun by the act of declaration and ended by the act of peace, sought a solution in great, decisive battles, while the conduct of military activities was regulated by the provisions of war law (*ius in bello*).

[6] *Idem*, http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/graphs/type_reg.pdf (accessed 06.05.2018).

[7] M. Kaldor, *New and Old Wars. Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge 1999.

[8] R. Jackson, G. Sorensen, *Wprowadzenie do stosunków międzynarodowych. Teorie i kierunki badawcze*, Kraków 2006, p. 3.

The denationalization of military activities and the loss of the monopoly of the state on using violence caused the far-reaching marginalisation of part of contemporary war law formulated in the Vienna Conventions of 1949 and the Additional Protocol I of 1977. It also made it impossible to apply the peaceful means of settling disputes provided in Chapter 6 of The Charter of the United Nations.

In the next section of the paper, the attempt at the identification of the factors which led to the change of the face of contemporary armed conflict, based on the three levels of analysis proposed by Kenneth Waltz, with special regard to Liberia, is made.[9]

2. Factors which led to the change of the face of armed conflict

Focusing on the first level of analysis in Waltz's classification, i.e. **the level of the individual**, the explanation for the change in the armed conflict is sought in the personalities, observations, choices, and activities of particular decision-makers and participants of events. William Tolbert, President of Liberia since 1971, was an example of a legitimate leader with dictatorial penchant, completely out of touch with the problems of society. While William Tubman, his predecessor, enjoyed power which was not limited by obligations, Tolbert was fascinated by money.[10] During Tolbert's administration corruption increased drastically, and the whole social elite followed him in the assumption that holding a public position does not mean tasks and obligations towards society but rather an effective way of improving one's personal financial situation. Finally, on 12 April 1980, Tolbert was murdered in his own residence by a group of soldiers demanding overdue soldier's pay. The group was led by Samuel Doe. Thus, as a result of a violent coup d'état, the power was taken over by a man dressed in a uniform with little reading and writing skills, completely unprepared for the role of ruler, characterised by aggressiveness and erroneous perception of reality. Doe surrounded himself with people from his tribe, Krahn, who, like him, from overwhelming poverty and lack of education gained access to lucrative power that ensured rapid social advancement. The only way to preserve this state of possession was to diversify society and to begin terror against everybody who actually or presumably belonged to another tribe. Hostility that grew

[9] K. Mingst, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[10] R. Kapuściński, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

systematically between ethnic groups together with the ineptitude of Doe's government were conducive of rebellion, which was begun in 1989 by the National-Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) led by Charles Taylor, who was a former clerk in Doe's government. Taylor represented yet another type of leader, which in the majority was the opposite of Samuel Doe. An intelligent person with higher education, clearly defined objectives and a well thought-of agenda returns to the country to take advantage of the breakup of basic state structures to pursue his own, exclusively materially defined interests. The use of violence enabled Taylor to access natural resources in the conflict area. Thus, for Taylor it was potential wealth, not real poverty, that, combined with dictatorial oppression, became an important reason for beginning rebellion.

However, leaders themselves are not always the only factors leading to the emergence of conflict. In countries which are the arenas of "new wars", high structural unemployment and high percentage of young, inactive people with no prospects in society usually occur. "The journey to Monrovia", as Kapuściński reports, "takes many days of the march through difficult to cover tropical wilderness. Only young, strong people could handle it. And just they came to the city." In the conditions of lack of employment, these people were not able to join legal functioning economy, in this way losing access to the world of consumption and to the disciplining mechanisms of regular, permanently paid work. Due to lack of professional and developmental prospects, as well as frustration caused by glaring differences in material status, they were recruited by local war leaders and got weapons, which became a tool serving not only for their purely physical survival, but also for gaining systematic advancement in society, from which they had been excluded so far.[11] Doe's coup d'état in 1980 shows how humiliation, combined with sudden gain of power which was not preceded by the process of instilling military discipline, leads to excesses with the use of violence, in which accumulated hatred is combined with the uncontainable desire of showing one's own strength. The reason of Doe's coup d'état were not the ambitions of particular leaders (it should be pointed out that the assassination of William Tubman by Doe's group was accidental) but the desire to gain recognition in society. This recognition was gained by a group of tribes that sook revenge for the harms done to them by American Liberians, using means exceeding the norms binding in a legally functioning state.

[11] H. Münkler, *Wojny naszych czasów*, Krakow 2004, p. 99.

The **second level of analysis** is the **level of the state**, which indicates that wars occur because of the internal structures of states, the level of ethnic homogeneity, the type of government (democracy or authoritarianism), the type of the social and economic system, or the groups of interests within the country.[12] According to the classic three-element definition by Georg Jellinek, the state is an entity that consists of a specific territory, a human community living on this territory, and a sovereign, supreme state authority that governs this territory and this community. The doctrine of international law extends this definition by adding the ability of state authority to act internationally as the fourth element.[13] Among the attributes of the contemporary statehood, the most important one is a stable, effective government that enables the state to exercise its rights and fulfil the adopted obligations under international law. In a country with an extremely difficult economic situation and strong cultural, ethnic or religious tensions, state power disappears. As a result, the ability to make effective decisions is lost, both in internal and external relations. Above all, this affects the fulfilment of the basic function of the state, which is the provision of security, well-being, order, justice and freedom. "Where the ability of the state to force the will of the majority disappears, these people begin to decide about war and peace, who show the greatest readiness to use violence".

In the case of Liberia not only the dictatorial rule of Doe, but also the tribal structure of society led to the disappearance of the structures of the state and its control mechanisms. Tribalism, i.e. the persistence of a strong clan and tribal division in a national society is a characteristic feature of Liberia already since 1821, when liberated slaves from South American cotton plantations, calling themselves American Liberians, began to settle in the neighbourhood of present-day Monrovia. In order to distinguish themselves from native inhabitants of Liberia, the emigrants banned all close contacts with the sixteen local tribes, denied them civil rights, and thereby debarred them from taking part in the governance of the state. The period of Doe's reign was the time of the revenge of the oppressed tribes, which after the elimination of American Liberians began to see enemies among one another. The problem of tribalism is quite common on the African continent and disputes do not arise because of the borders set in colonial times but because of internal rivalry between the tribes for power and the

[12] K. Mingst, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

[13] R. Bierzanek, J. Simonides, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

choice of social and economic system. In addition to ethnic conflicts dating back to precolonial times, the example of Bosnia and Herzegovina showed that religious and cultural differences are equally important.[14]

Both these factors, however, seem to be overshadowed nowadays by economic grounds, which act as specific means of mobilisation rather than as real causes of conflicts. Competition for natural resources plays an important role, and among them, diamonds have the greatest importance and publicity. The trade in these precious stones, together with the participation in profits by international corporations with licences to extract diamonds in the areas occupied by rebels, is the main reason for the de-ideologisation of conflict. This also ensures a permanent source of financing for military activities. Trade in raw materials was the main motive of Charles Taylor's activities, who, according to estimates, earned around 3.8 billion USD on illegal trade in diamonds and timber. According to the data from the 1980s, in the last decade before the beginning of the civil war, the export of diamonds from Liberia amounted 200,000 to 300,000 carats yearly, worth around 20 to 30 million USD.[15] Referring to the data of the Diamond High Council (Hoge Raad voor Diamant, HRD), the imports of Liberian diamonds into Belgium amounted to 31 million carats only between 1994 and 1998, with an average of six million carats per year.[16] Diamonds were mined on a large scale in Sierra Leone, where 55 million carats were officially extracted between 1930 and 1998. According to an average price of 270 USD per carat in 1996, the total value of output amounted 15 billion USD.

The **third and highest level of analysis**, as Kenneth Waltz primarily emphasized, is **the level of the international system**. Here the explanation is based either on the anarchic features of this system or on the strong and weak points of international organisations.[17] The majority of new wars in South-Eastern Asia and Black Africa take place in the areas which up to the middle of the twentieth century were under the colonial rules. With the development of science and technology, especially military technology,

[14] H. Münkler, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[15] *Land Grabbing and Land Reform. Diamonds, Rubber and Forests in the New Liberia*, "Global Policy", http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/liberia/2007/07landgrabbingliberia.pdf (accessed 08.05.2019).

[16] "Sierra-Leone.org", http://www.sierra-leone.org/heartmatter.html (accessed 08.05.2019).

[17] "Słownik języka polskiego", http://netsprint.sjp.pwn.pl/haslo.php?id=2578794 (accessed 08.05.2019).

as well as means of communication and transmission of information, the impact of the geographical factor on the power status decreased significantly. Large colonial estates became more and more of a financial burden and were no longer signs of the power of the state. In 1960 the General Assembly of United Nations adopted a declaration on admitting the independence of the colonial countries and their people. It stated that colonialism was the threat for international security and peace, and obliged the colonial states to put an end to this practice in all its forms. However, the borders of state structures determined by the colonial powers remained intact. Consequently, new states were established, which were ethnically, culturally and religiously highly diversified, and the conflicts between these groups had already long been exploited by the metropolises to strengthen their rule. Additionally, state-building processes on the African continent became the opportunity for the local political elites to exhort to freedom and independence to gain wide economic privileges and interests, mainly through glaring corruption and the pillage of natural resources.

The Cold War rivalry between the Western and and the Eastern Bloc also contributed to the destabilisation of young and poorly organised states. After the end of the Cold War, these states faced the problem of lack of further financing and interest from previously competing powers. Another problem they faced were the huge resources of cheap and easy-to-obtain weapon. Great African armies created to support democratic or socialist allies (such as the modern, well-equipped army of Meginstu in Ethiopia, totalling 400.000 people) would cease to exist in a few moments with the break-up of the bipolar international environment. Thus new "armies" were established, consisting of unemployed determined young people.

The factors contributing to the change of the face of contemporary armed conflicts are the basis for determining the essence of new wars on the strength of the five features, as specified by Pawłowski.[18]

3. The essence of new wars

In countries in which the authorities abdicated as actual monopolists of war, conflicts are characterised by a multitude of parastatal and private entities involved in fights. Regular, government armed forces, which are poorly equipped, poorly trained and have little morale due to their low and also often irregular salary, are practically the weakest party of the conflict. New

[18] R. Kapuściński, *op. cit.*, pp. 222–245.

war becomes a way of life and individuals equipped with weapons at the expense of the general public and the future of the state acquire several times greater income than they would be able to earn in the frames of legally functioning economy.

In conditions where markets are not protected by the state and the exchange of goods is regulated using weapons, war becomes the true element for so-called *warlords*. *Warlords*, including, among others, Charles Taylor, or his former comrade in arms, Prince Johnson, are in general former officers, public officials, former ministers, or simply clever people, who are greedy for money and other advantages that can be taken from the break-up of the state (to which they often contributed themselves). These resources help them establish their own, informal and dictatorial mini-states, which become inexhaustible sources of income for them. The cheapest recruits they can enlist, due to their low awareness of risk, susceptibility to manipulation, lack of prospects and low requirements, are child-soldiers, whose cruelty grows in direct proportion to the poverty, misery and exclusion that surrounds them. According to the estimates of Human Rights Watch, between 200,000 and 300,000 child-soldiers served in fights in more than twenty countries around the world.[19] In a significant number of cases children are either kidnapped or voluntarily recruited and enlisted into troops through incentives of potential benefits. They do it less frequently for religious reasons or due to obligations towards ethnic group. *Warlords* do not have to pay them, because weapons and a sense of belonging are for these children a sufficient asset, owing to which the can demonstrate power and ensure physical survival.

The transfer of the majority of financial resources (sent by *warlords* abroad, mainly to bank accounts in Europe and the United States), as well as of the natural resources of given country (such as crude oil, metal ores or diamonds) absorbs the so-called *failed states* into the globalised international economic environment, which develops its destructive influence without encountering resistance from stable state structures.[20] This results in the involvement of transnational private military companies (PMC) in fights, offering special expert assessments and services relating to military activities, such as the contribution of government troops in the fight against

[19] "Human Rights Watch", http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/crp/index.html (accessed 10.05.2019).

[20] H. Münkler, *op. cit*., p. 18.

guerrillas in terms of logistics, trainings, specialists, protection of civilians and occupied strategic areas, as well as protection of key facilities of large mining corporations or the lives of certain individuals in the zone of war. At present there are about 90 private military companies in the world, whose personnel is present in over 110 countries of the world, the largest number of contracts being performed in Iraq.[21] What can be treated as a sign of globalisation is also the operation of regular, peaceful armed forces under the auspices of international organisations. In Liberia this has been done since 1990 by the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG). The organization was established on the initiative of the leader of Nigeria, General Ibrahim Babangida. It managed to capture Monrovia, but it left the rest of the country to warlords. In 1993 ECOMOG obtained the support of UN, which established the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)[22] under the Security Council Resolution S/RES/1509 of 9 September 2003. Its mandate includes, among others, overseeing the implementation of cease-fire, the support for humanitarian assistance, and activities for the protection of human rights.

An important feature of new wars is the fact that they occur in conditions of the disintegration of basic state structures, while the fight taking place inside these countries is motivated by ethnic, cultural and religious reasons. Tribalism that is characteristic for African countries based on a sense of exclusivity, separating and diversifying, as well as the assumption of strong domination over others. Thus it contributes to the loosening of the cultural and social integration of society and, therefore, to the systematic fragmentation of the state. In these circumstances, planned activities occur, directed against entire ethnic groups in order to destroy them or to force them to leave their places of residence.

Cultural and ethnic differences played a special role in Rwanda, where 800,000 people were killed in 1994 in fights between the tribes Tutsi and Hutu. The genocide of men, women and children from the tribe Tutsi, as well as Hutu, who objected to dictatorship, was planned and efficiently organised by the governing elites. It lasted a hundred days and took place in front of the international community.

[21] K. Pawłowski, *op. cit.*, p. 358.

[22] "UNMIL. Misión de las Naciones Unidas en Liberia", http://www.unmil.org/content.asp?ccat=history (accessed 05.02.2019).

In turn, the rebellion of the Black population in Torit in the southern part of Sudan began in 1955 due to the political and economic domination of Arabs from the north. The rebellion began a conflict which has already been lasting for 50 years, took 2 million victims and forces more than 4.5 million people to leave their places of residence.[23]

The next element of the essence of new wars is the departure from the objectives, methods and means of conducting military activities characteristic for old wars. The purpose is now not to gain territory and exercise sovereign power over it, but to compete for power and resulting privileges within the state, as well as to control areas with high economic value. Ethnic, cultural and religious differences become the factors contributing to the undertaking of activities aimed at the elimination of people with different identity from these areas through planned genocides, sexual violence and the erasure of all traces of their culture. New wars end, as a rule, when the participants start to behave as if the peace came, forcing others to similar behaviour. In this situation it is not the will of the majority that is exercised; it is the will of minority, exercised by means of violence. As a result, even small armed groups, when dissatisfied with the results of achieved peace, can easily lead to renewal of fights.

Furthermore, new wars are characterised by lack of yet another feature of classic inter-state wars. Namely, in new wars there is no such thing as settling the contentious issue in a decisive battle, which was a strong bargaining argument in negotiations begun immediately after the clash. On the contrary, the armed activities of the participants of new wars are carried on in accordance with the recommendations of Mao Tse-Tung: to wait the enemy out. They are limited to so-called "strategic defence", i.e. retreat and dispersal. Opponents avoid decisive confrontation because the end of the war means for them the end of their lucrative sources of income. Their activities are not subject to the obligations of the contemporary provisions of humanitarian law of armed conflicts. The rules, codified in Geneva Conventions of 1949 with additional protocols I and II of 1977, are addressed to subjects of international law. In the absence of effective sovereign state authority in the area of fights, the parties that breach the provisions are generally not brought to criminal responsibility.

[23] *Przegląd wybranych obecnych i minionych konfliktów afrykańskich*, "Ośrodek Informacji ONZ w Warszawie", http://www.unic.un.org.pl/afryka/index.php?id=2 (accessed 11.02.2019).

Due to the means of conducting military activities, new wars become very cheap to maintain. As a rule, they are conducted using light weapons: assault rifles, hand grenades, anti-personnel mines. Civil infrastructure and civil means of transport serve for moving. The great popularity of light weapons results from several reasons. Firstly, enormous resources thereof are left as the remains of the military equipment provided by the participants of Cold War rivalry. Furthermore, according to the calculations of *ControlArms*, approximately 1135 companies in more than 98 countries produce and sell 8 million light weapons each year and there are currently around 639 million of light weapons in the world.[24] Enormous resources and ease of access to these weapons cause that their prices is often lower than the costs of their production. Finally in new wars it mainly comes to permanent violence against civilians, so light equipment is completely enough for carrying out short skirmishes in difficult terrain of the massacres of civilians. In classical wars the participants were professional, well-trained soldiers. In new wars, recruitment of youth and children takes place, and this happens in the conditions of the decay of the state, internal anarchy, and the destruction of educational institutions. As contemporary military equipment is easy to operate, these recruits can start fighting without proper training, which contributes to the practical disappearance of professionalism and military discipline.

An important phenomenon is the intensification and far-reaching brutalisation of the majority of acts of violence against the civilian population. In new wars at the end of the 20th century, 80% of killed or injured people were civilians and only the remaining 20% of victims were soldiers.[25] Brutality and ruthlessness of armed groups, and ethnic cleansing of civilians, force the civilians either to leave a given area or to supply permanently fighting troops. It causes that new wars are more and more often called "degenerated wars". An often used form of violence are massacres made due to revenge, hostility, ethnic, religious or cultural hatred. Massacres are often perpetrated in a chaotic manner, without a specific reason, only motivated by a sense of impunity in the conditions of disappearance of courts and legal investigation authorities. There are no open clashes carried out so as to impose the attacker's will on an armed opponent that makes resistance,

[24] "Control Arms", http://www.controlarms.org/the_issues/index.htm (accessed 11.02.2019).

[25] H. Münkler, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

but pressure is exerted, fear management and the brutalisation of activities against defenceless people occurs, so that they are completely obedient to the will of violent people.

A characteristic identification sign of new wars became streams of refugees, and camps established in order to stop them, due to which the efforts of neighbouring countries and international organisations to stop and then stifle internal fights regularly failed. Difficult sanitary conditions in the camps, together with inactivity and isolation cause radical atmosphere, which may result in the growth of support for one of the parties of the conflict, ensuring that *warlords* have permanent reserves in recruiting young people. The inhabitants of the camps, providing support to one of the armed groups, also become the target of attack for the opposite party. However, the stronger, the more brutal and the more effective attack will be conducted, the more the attacker will be discredited in the eyes of the public opinion. Then the opposite party can invoke this circumstance to legitimise its activities in order to obtain the support of particular members of international community.

Among the features of contemporary armed conflicts, there are also their specific economic mechanisms, where violence serves as a means of obtaining income and a tool for regulating asymmetrical conditions of exchange, which Münkler defines as the privatisation of state functions of protection and regulation. New wars are no longer financed by efficient tax system and production excesses, but in the first instance by sacking, intimidating and blackmailing civilians. Continuous robbery, frequently combined with ethnic cleansing and sexual violence, causes that long-term consequences of military activities are much more serious for society than in the case of traditional inter-state conflicts. Genocide and a large stream of refugees not only deprive the society of the ability to organize itself and to decide about the path of development, which would enable the reconstruction of state structures with legally functioning economy; but also isolate the society from international humanitarian aid. Camps for refugees established by international humanitarian organisations and by the United Nations Organisation, to which stocks of food and medicines are provided, become next inexhaustible sources of income for the parties participating in the conflict. Convoys with international aid are detained and searched by fighting parties, and they take all the items that are necessary for financing military activities. Besides the appropriation of part of the goods from humanitarian aid, armed groups of *warlords* are also, especially in the case

of smaller non-government organisations, the main providers of services in the range of the transport of goods and the protection of the employees of these organisations against attacks. In this way international organisations, paradoxically, while supporting the victims of wars, simultaneously finance the initiators of these wars.

However, the most profitable endeavour for *warlords* is the occupation of the parts of a given country which are rich in natural resources. The analysis carried out by the World Bank in 2000 showed that the majority of the 47 researched domestic conflicts was motivated by the fight for natural resources. On the basis of over dozen categories, it was fixed that the countries, which are the most dependent on natural resources (the export of these resources being a quarter of national product), were threatened with more than 20% probability of the outbreak of armed conflict, while in a country without raw materials the threat reached only half a percent.[26]The role that the sale of diamonds and giving licenses for their extraction to transnational corporations played in the subsidization of the *warlords* of armed conflicts was first emphasized in *A Rough Trade* report published by Global Witness.[27] The report, concentrating on the conflict in Angola, states that the size of revenue generated by UNITA (*United Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) between 1992 and 1998 was 3.72 billion USD. Initial lack of responsibility and transparency in international diamond trade enabled the rebels to achieve key markets, including the largest market located in Antwerp. To emphasize close connections between diamonds and the activity of *warlords*, Global Witness applied a new conversion rate of human life, according to which 1% of world output coming from Sierra Leone equals to 50,000 killed people and at least one million refugees, and 200,000 killed people and at least one million refugees in Liberia. The largest scale of this phenomenon occurs in Angola, from where 6% of world output comes, bringing 500,000 killed people and 1.7 million refugees, and also in Democratic Republic of Congo, where the number of killed people is at least 3.3 million.

[26] W. Malendowski, *Nowa jakość konfliktów zbrojnych na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*, [in:] W. Malendowski, *Zbrojne konflikty i spory międzynarodowe u progu XXI wieku*, Wrocław 2003.

[27] *A Rough Trade*, "Global Witness", http://www.globalwitness.org/media_library_detail.php/90/en/a_rough_trade (accessed 12.05.2019).

4. Conclusions

After analysing the factors and the essence of new wars, the question arises whether the new face of armed conflicts is the threat for international security. Among the conditions characteristic for new wars, there are mass homicides of the members of certain social groups, forcing the members of these groups to live in conditions aimed at partial or complete physical destruction, and stopping of births carried out in order to destroy in part or in full whole ethnic, cultural and religious groups. All these practices are defined by *Convention on Prevention and Punishment of Crime of Genocide* of 9.12.1948, in Article II, as felony of genocide. Article I of this Convention states that genocide is a felony in the sense of international law, which is condemned in the civilized world and whose principal perpetrators and accomplices will be brought to criminal responsibility. Furthermore, the parties of the conflict commit permanent violation of the provisions of Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and Additional Protocols of 8 June 1977. The reaction of international community was to establish in 1994 the International Tribunal for Rwanda (Rwanda) with legal seat in Arusha, Tanzania. Then, under the Security Council Resolution of United Nations Organisation of 2000 and the agreement between Secretary-General of United Nations Organisation and the government of Sierra Leone, Special Tribunal for Sierra Leone was established, in front of which Charles Taylor was accused. Both Tribunals rule in the cases of felonies against humanity, the violations of Article III of Geneva Conventions of 1949, and the violations of the Additional Protocol II to these conventions of 1977. These include felonies such as murder, physical and psychological maltreatment, collective punishments, acts of terrorism, robbery, and sexual crimes. An essential threat caused by new wars is their far-reaching internationalisation. In weak states with broken structure, without police or courts, non-state entities perform activity, not necessarily military activity, which crosses borders. Using violence, these entities gain strength systematically.

Robert Cooper, characterizing pre-modern world (including Somalia, Liberia and Afghanistan), defined it as "post-imperial pre-state chaos". He also emphasized that trade with raw materials due to global criminal networks can be carried out even after imposing sanctions and that drug cartels and transnational mining corporations have a powerful lobby at their disposal. Finally, he stated that terrorist groups, for which the conditions of the break-up of the state are an ideal basis for trainings and attacks on developed countries of OECD, pose real threat for international commu-

nity, forcing it to intervene.[28] Peacekeeping missions undertaken by United Nations Organisation, such as *United Nations Mission in Liberia* (UNMIL) are an example of the attempts of overcoming the existing crisis situations by the international community. However, it seems to be an important question whether the missions undertaken by United Nations Organisation or North Atlantic Alliance in order to prevent effectively new wars should not take some characteristic features of the new type of armed conflicts. In the situation in which peacekeeping forces are not sufficiently effective in combating rebel groups, it seems to be a risky move and yet simultaneously an appropriate move to entrust carrying out peacekeeping mission to private military companies.

References

1. *A Rough Trade*, "Global Witness", http://www.globalwitness.org/media_library_detail.php/90/en/a_rough_trade (accessed 12.05.2019).
2. Bierzanek R., Simonides J., *Prawo międzynarodowe publiczne*, 8th revised edition, Warszawa 2005.
3. "Control Arms", http://www.controlarms.org/the_issues/index.htm (accessed 11.02.2019).
4. Cooper R., *Pękanie granic. Porządek i chaos w XXI wieku*, Poznań 2005.
5. "Human Rights Watch", http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/crp/index.html (accessed 10.05.2019).
6. Jackson R., Sorensen G., *Wprowadzenie do stosunków międzynarodowych. Teorie i kierunki badawcze*, Kraków 2006.
7. Kaldor M., *New and Old Wars. Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge 1999.
8. Kapuściński R., *Heban*, Warszawa 2008.
9. *Land Grabbing and Land Reform. Diamonds, Rubber and Forests in the New Liberia*, "Global Policy", http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/liberia/2007/07landgrabbingliberia.pdf (accessed 08.05.2019).
10. Malendowski W., *Nowa jakość konfliktów zbrojnych na przełomie XX i XXI wieku* [in:] W. Malendowski, *Zbrojne konflikty i spory międzynarodowe u progu XXI wieku*, Wrocław 2003.
11. Mingst K., *Podstawy stosunków międzynarodowych*, Warszawa 2006.
12. Münkler H., *Wojny naszych czasów*, Krakow 2004.

[28] R. Cooper, *Pękanie granic. Porządek i chaos w XXI wieku*, Poznań 2005.

13. Pawłowski K., *Spory i konflikty międzynarodowe*, [in:] *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, M. Pietraś (ed.), Lublin 2007.
14. *Przegląd wybranych obecnych i minionych konfliktów afrykańskich*, "Ośrodek Informacji ONZ w Warszawie", http://www.unic.un.org.pl/afryka/index.php?id=2 (accessed 11.02.2019).
15. *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne*, M. Pietraś (ed.), Lublin 2007.
16. "Sierra-Leone.org", http://www.sierra-leone.org/heartmatter.html (accessed 08.05.2019).
17. "Słownik języka polskiego", http://netsprint.sjp.pwn.pl/haslo.php?id=2578794 (accessed 08.05.2019).
18. Smillie I., Gberie L., Hazleton R., *The Heart of the Matter. Sierra Leone Diamonds & Human Security*, http://www.sierra-leone.org/heartmatter.html.
19. "UNMIL. Misión de las Naciones Unidas en Liberia", http://www.unmil.org/content.asp?ccat=history (accessed 05.02.2019).

Cite this article as:
A. Korczyc, *State Security Policy and Changing the Nature of the Conflict after the End of the Cold War Rivalry*, "Security Dimensions", 2019, no. 30, pp. 22–39, DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0013.7549.

Licence: This article is available in Open Access, under the terms of the Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0; for details please see https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the author and source are properly credited. Copyright © 2019 University of Public and Individual Security "Apeiron" in Cracow