

# On the tail risk of violent conflict and its underestimation

Pasquale Cirillo\* and Nassim Nicholas Taleb†

\*Applied Probability Group, Delft University of Technology

†School of Engineering, New York University- (Corresponding author)

**Abstract**—We examine all possible statistical pictures of violent conflicts over common era history with a focus on dealing with incompleteness and unreliability of data. We apply methods from extreme value theory on log-transformed data to remove compact support, then, owing to the boundedness of maximum casualties, retransform the data and derive expected means. We find the estimated mean likely to be at least three times larger than the sample mean, meaning severe underestimation of the severity of conflicts from naive observation. We check for robustness by sampling between high and low estimates and jackknifing the data. We study inter-arrival times between tail events and find (first-order) memoryless of events. The statistical pictures obtained are at variance with the claims about "long peace".

Version 1, March 18, 2015.

## I. INTRODUCTION/SUMMARY

**T**HIS STUDY is as much about new statistical methodologies with fat tailed (and unreliable data), as well as bounded random variables with local power law behavior, as it is about the properties of violence.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Acknowledgments:* Captain Mark Weisenborn engaged in the thankless and gruesome task of compiling the data, checking across sources and linking each conflict to a narrative on Wikipedia (see Appendix 1). We also benefited from generous help on social networks where we put data for scrutiny, as well as advice from historians thanked in the same appendix. We also thank the late Benoit Mandelbrot for insights on the tail properties of wars and conflicts, as well as Yaneer Bar-Yam, Raphael Douady, Charles Tapiero...




Fig. 1. Values of the tail exponent  $\alpha$  from Hill estimator obtained across 100,000 different rescaled casualty numbers uniformly selected between low and high estimates of conflict. The exponent is slightly (but not meaningfully) different from the Maximum Likelihood for all data as we focus on top 100 deviations.

Violence is much more severe than it seems from conventional analyses and the prevailing "long peace" theory which claims that violence has declined. Adapting methods from extreme value theory, and adjusting for errors in reporting of conflicts and historical estimates of casualties, we look at the various statistical pictures of violent conflicts, with focus for the parametrization on those with more than 50k victims (in equivalent ratio of today's population, which would




Fig. 2. Q-Q plot of the rescaled data in the near-tail plotted against a Pareto II-Lomax Style distribution.




Fig. 3. Death toll from "named conflicts" over time. Conflicts lasting more than 25 years are disaggregated into two or more conflicts, each one lasting 25 years.




Fig. 4. Rescaled death toll of armed conflict and regimes over time. Data are rescaled w.r.t. today's world population. Conflicts lasting more than 25 years are disaggregated into two or more conflicts, each one lasting 25 years.




Fig. 5. Observed "journalistic" mean compared to MLE mean (derived from rescaling back the data to compact support) for different values of  $\alpha$  (hence for permutations of the pair  $(\sigma_\alpha, \alpha)$ ). The "range of  $\alpha$ " is the one we get from possible variations of the data from bootstrap and reliability simulations.

correspond to  $\approx 5k$  in the 18<sup>th</sup> C.). Contrary to current discussions, *all* statistical pictures thus obtained show that 1) the risk of violent conflict has not been decreasing, but is rather underestimated by techniques relying on naive year-on-year changes in the mean, or using sample mean as an estimator of the true mean of an extremely fat-tailed phenomenon; 2) armed conflicts have memoryless inter-arrival times, thus incompatible with the idea of a time trend. Our analysis uses 1) raw data, as recorded and estimated by historians; 2) a naive transformation, used by certain historians and sociologists, which rescales past conflicts and casualties with respect to the actual population; 3) more importantly, a log transformation to account for the fact that the number of casualties in a conflict cannot be larger than the world population. (This is similar to the transformation of data into log-returns in mathematical finance in order to use distributions with support on the real line.)

All in all, among the different classes of data (raw and rescaled), we observe that 1) casualties are power law distributed.<sup>2</sup> In the case of log-rescaled data we observe  $.4 \leq \alpha \leq .7$ , thus indicating an extremely fat-tailed phenomenon with an undefined mean (a result that is robustly obtained); 2) the inter-arrival times of conflicts above the 50k threshold follow a homogeneous Poisson process, indicating no particular trend, and therefore contradicting a popular narrative about the decline of violence; 3) the true mean to be expected in the future, and the most compatible with the data, though highly stochastic, is  $\approx 3\times$  higher than past mean.

Further, we explain: 1) how the mean (in terms of expected casualties) is severely underestimated by conventional data analyses as the observed mean is not an estimator of true mean (unlike tail exponent that provide a picture with smaller noise); 2) how misconceptions arise from the deceiving lengthy (and volatile) inter-arrival times between large conflicts.

To remedy the inaccuracies of historical numerical assessments, we provide a standard bootstrap analysis of our estimates, in addition to Monte Carlo checks for unreliability of wars and absence of events from currently recorded history.

## II. SUMMARY STATISTICAL DISCUSSION

### A. Results

1) *Paretian tails*: Peak-Over-Threshold methods show (both raw and rescaled variables) exhibit strong Paretian tail behavior, with survival probability  $P(X > x) \sim \lambda(x)x^{-\alpha}$ , where  $\lambda : [L, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  is a slowly varying function, defined as  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\lambda(kx)}{\lambda(x)} = 1$  for any  $k > 0$ .

We parametrize  $G(\cdot)$ , a Generalized Pareto Distribution (GPD), see Table IV,  $G(x) = 1 - (1 + \xi y/\beta)^{-1/\xi}$ , with  $\xi \approx 1.88, \pm 0.14$  for rescaled data which corresponds to a tail  $\alpha = \frac{1}{\xi} = .53, \pm 0.04$ .

2) *Memorylessness of onset of conflicts*: Tables II and III show inter-arrival times, meaning one can wait more than a hundred years for an event such as WWII without changing one's expectation. There is no visible autocorrelation, no statistically detectable temporal structure (i.e. we cannot see the imprint of a self-exciting process), see Figure 8.

3) *Full distribution(s)*: Rescaled data fits a Lomax-Style distribution with same tail as obtained by POT, with strong goodness of fit. For events with casualties  $> L = 10K, 25K, 50K, etc.$  we fit different Pareto II (Lomax) distributions with corresponding tail  $\alpha$  (fit from GPD), with scale  $\sigma = 84, 360$ , i.e., with density  $\frac{\alpha \left(\frac{-L+\sigma+x}{\sigma}\right)^{-\alpha-1}}{\sigma}$ ,  $x \geq L$ .

We also consider a wider array of statistical "pictures" from pairs  $\alpha, \sigma_\alpha$  across the data from potential alternative values of  $\alpha$ , with recalibration of maximum likelihood  $\sigma$ , see Figure 5.

<sup>2</sup>Many earlier studies have found Paretianity in data, [14],[13]. Our study, aside from the use of extreme value techniques, reliability bootstraps, and compact support transformations, varies in both calibrations and interpretation.

4) *Difference between sample mean and maximum likelihood mean*: Table I shows the true mean using the parametrization of the Pareto distribution above and inverting the transformation back to compact support. "True" or maximum likelihood, or "statistical" mean is between 3 and 4 times observed mean.

This means the "journalistic" observation of the mean, aside from the conceptual mistake of relying on sample mean, underestimates the true mean by at least 3 times and higher future observations would not allow the conclusion that violence has "risen".

TABLE I  
SAMPLE MEANS AND ESTIMATED MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD MEAN ACROSS MINIMUM VALUES  $L$ —RESCALED DATA.

L	Sample Mean	ML Mean	Ratio
10K	$9.079 \times 10^6$	$3.11 \times 10^7$	3.43
25K	$9.82 \times 10^6$	$3.62 \times 10^7$	3.69
50K	$1.12 \times 10^7$	$4.11 \times 10^7$	3.67
100K	$1.34 \times 10^7$	$4.74 \times 10^7$	3.53
200K	$1.66 \times 10^7$	$6.31 \times 10^7$	3.79
500K	$2.48 \times 10^7$	$8.26 \times 10^7$	3.31

## B. Conclusion

History as seen from tail analysis is far more risky, and conflicts far more violent than acknowledged by naive observation of behavior of averages in historical time series.

TABLE II  
AVERAGE INTER-ARRIVAL TIMES AND THEIR MEAN ABSOLUTE DEVIATION FOR EVENTS WITH MORE THAN 1, 2, 5 AND 10 MILLION CASUALTIES, USING ACTUAL ESTIMATES.

Threshold	Average	MAD
1	26.71	31.66
2	42.19	47.31
5	57.74	68.60
10	101.58	144.47

TABLE III  
AVERAGE INTER-ARRIVAL TIMES AND THEIR MEAN ABSOLUTE DEVIATION FOR EVENTS WITH MORE THAN 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, AND 50 MILLION CASUALTIES, USING RESCALED AMOUNTS.

Threshold	Average	MAD
1	11.27	12.59
2	16.84	18.13
5	26.31	27.29
10	37.39	41.30
20	48.47	52.14
50	67.88	78.57

TABLE IV

ESTIMATES (AND STANDARD ERRORS) OF THE GENERALIZED PARETO DISTRIBUTION PARAMETERS FOR CASUALTIES OVER A 50K THRESHOLD. FOR BOTH ACTUAL AND RESCALED CASUALTIES, WE ALSO PROVIDE THE NUMBER OF EVENTS LYING ABOVE THE THRESHOLD (THE TOTAL NUMBER OF EVENTS IN OUR DATA IS 99).

Data	Nr. Excesses	$\xi$	$\beta$
Raw Data	307	1.5886 (0.1467)	3.6254 (0.8191)
Naive Rescaling	524	1.8718 (0.1259)	14.3254 (2.1111)
Log-rescaling	524	1.8717 (0.1277)	14.3261 (2.1422)

## III. METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

### A. Rescaling method

We remove the compact support to be able to use power laws as follows (see Taleb(2015) [12]). Using  $X_t$  as the r.v. for number of incidences from conflict at times  $t$ , consider first a naive rescaling of  $X'_t = \frac{X_t}{H_t}$ , where  $H_t$  is the total human population at period  $t$ . See appendix for methods of estimation of  $H_t$ .

Next, with today's maximum population  $H$  and  $L$  the naively rescaled minimum for our definition of conflict, we introduce a smooth rescaling function  $\varphi : [L, H] \rightarrow [L, \infty)$  satisfying:

- i  $\varphi$  is "smooth":  $\varphi \in C^\infty$ ,
- ii  $\varphi^{-1}(\infty) = H$ ,
- iii  $\varphi^{-1}(L) = \varphi(L) = L$ .

In particular, we choose:

$$\varphi(x) = L - H \log \left( \frac{H - x}{H - L} \right). \quad (1)$$

We can perform appropriate analytics on  $x_r = \varphi(x)$  given that it is unbounded, and properly fit power law exponents. Then we can rescale back for the properties of  $X$ . Also notice that the  $\varphi(x) \approx x$  for very large values of  $H$ . This means that for a very large upper bound, the results we will get for  $x$  and  $\varphi(x)$  will be essentially the same. The big difference is only from a philosophical/methodological point of view, in the sense that we remove the upper bound (unlikely to be reached).

In what follows we will use the naively rescaled casualties as input for the  $\varphi(\cdot)$  function.

We pick  $H = P_{t_0}$  for the exercise.

The distribution of  $x$  can be rederived as follows from the distribution of  $x_r$ :

$$\int_L^\infty f(x_r) dx_r = \int_L^{\varphi^{-1}(\infty)} g(x) dx, \quad (2)$$

where  $\varphi^{-1}(u) = (L - H)e^{\frac{L-u}{H}} + H$

In this case, from the Pareto-Lomax selected:

$$f(x_r) = \frac{\alpha \left( \frac{-L + \sigma + x_r}{\sigma} \right)^{-\alpha-1}}{\sigma}, x_r \in [L, \infty) \quad (3)$$

$$g(x) = \frac{\alpha H \left( \frac{\sigma - H \log\left(\frac{H-x}{H-L}\right)}{\sigma} \right)^{-\alpha-1}}{\sigma(H-x)}, x \in [L, H],$$

which verifies  $\int_L^H x g(x) dx = 1$ . Hence the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_g(x; L, H, \sigma, \alpha) = \int_L^H x g(x) dx, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_g(X; L, H, \sigma, \alpha) = \alpha H \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{(H-L)e^{\sigma/H} E_{\alpha+1}\left(\frac{\sigma}{H}\right)}{H} \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $E(\cdot)$  is the exponential integral  $E_n z = \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{t(-z)}}{t^n} dt$ .

Note that we rely on the invariance property:

**Remark 1.** *If  $\hat{\theta}$  is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of  $\theta$ , then for an absolutely continuous function  $\phi$ ,  $\phi(\hat{\theta})$  is the MLE estimator of  $\phi(\theta)$ .*

For proofs and further exposition see [12].

### B. Expectation by Conditioning (less rigorous)

We would be replacing a smooth function in  $C^\infty$  by a Heaviside step function, that is the indicator function  $\mathbb{1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , written as  $\mathbb{1}_{X \in [L, H]}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{X \in [L, H]}) = \frac{\int_L^H x f(x) dx}{\int_L^H f(x) dx}$$

which for the Pareto Lomax becomes:

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{X \in [L, H]}) = \frac{\frac{\alpha \sigma^\alpha (H-L)}{\sigma^\alpha - (H-L+\sigma)^\alpha} + (\alpha - 1)L + \sigma}{\alpha - 1} \quad (6)$$

### C. Reliability of data and effect on tail estimates

Data from violence is largely anecdotal, spreading via citations, often based on some vague estimate, without anyone's ability to verify the assessments using period sources. An event that took place in the seventh century, such as the an Lushan rebellion, is "estimated" to have killed 26 million people, with no precise or reliable methodology to allow us to trust the number. The independence war of Algeria has various estimates, some from France, others from the rebels, and nothing scientifically or professionally obtained.

As said earlier, in this paper, we use different data: raw data, naively rescaled data w.r.t. the current world population, and log-rescaled data to avoid the theoretical problem of the upper bound.

For some observations, together with the estimated number of casualties, as resulting from historical sources, we also have

a lower and upper bound available. Let  $X_t$  be the number of casualties in a given conflict at time  $t$ . In principle, we can define triplets like

- $\{X_t, X_t^l, X_t^u\}$  for the actual estimates (raw data), where  $X_t^l$  and  $X_t^u$  represent the lower and upper bound, if available.
- $\{Y_t = X_t \frac{P_{20015}}{P_t}, Y_t^l = X_t^l \frac{P_{20015}}{P_t}, Y_t^u = X_t^u \frac{P_{20015}}{P_t}\}$  for the naively rescaled data, where  $P_{2015}$  is the world population in 2015 and  $P_t$  is the population at time  $t = 1, \dots, 2014$ .
- $\{Z_t = \varphi(Y_t), Z_t^l = \varphi(Y_t^l), Z_t^u = \varphi(Y_t^u)\}$  for the log-rescaled data.

To prevent possible criticism about the use of middle estimates, when bounds are present, we have decided to use the following Monte Carlo procedure (for more details [5]), obtaining no significant different in the estimates of all the quantities of interest (like the tail exponent  $\alpha = 1/\xi$ ):

- 1) For each event  $X$  for which bounds are present, we have assumed casualties to be uniformly distributed between the lower and the upper bound, i.e.  $X \sim U(X^l, X^u)$ . The choice of the uniform distribution is to keep things simple. All other bounded distributions would in fact generate the same results in the limit, thanks to the central limit theorem.
- 2) We have then generated a large number of Monte Carlo replications, and in each replication we have assigned a random value to each event  $X$  according to  $U(X^l, X^u)$ .
- 3) For each replication we have computed the statistics of interest, typically the tail exponent, obtaining values that we have later averaged.

This procedure has shown that the precision of estimates does not affect the tail of the distribution of casualties, as the tail exponent is rather stable.

For those events for which no bound is given, the options were to use them as they are, or to perturb them by creating fictitious bounds around them (and then treat them as the other bounded ones in the Monte Carlo replications). We have chosen the second approach.

The above also applies to  $Y_t$  and  $Z_t$ .

Note that the tail  $\alpha$  derived from an average is different from an average alpha across different estimates, which is the

reason we perform the various analyses across estimates.<sup>3</sup>

#### D. Definition of an "event"

"Named" conflicts are an arbitrary designation that, often, does not make sense statistically: a conflict can have two or more names; two or more conflicts can have the same name, and we found no satisfactory hierarchy between war and conflict. For uniformity, we treat events as the shorter of event or its disaggregation into units with a maximum duration of 25 years each. Accordingly, we treat Mongolian wars, which lasted more than a century and a quarter, as more than a single event. It makes little sense otherwise as it would be the equivalent of treating the period from the Franco-Prussian war to WW II as "German(ic) wars", rather than multiple events because these wars had individual names in contemporary sources. Effectively the main sources such as the *Encyclopedia of War* [11] list numerous conflicts in place of "Mongol Invasions" –the more sophisticated the historians in a given area, the more likely they are to break conflicts into different "named" events and, depending on historians, Mongolian wars range between 12 and 55 conflicts.

What controversy about the definition of a "name" can be, once again, solved by bootstrapping. Our conclusion, incidentally, is invariant to the bundling or unbundling of the Mongolian wars.

Further, in the absence of a clearly defined protocol in historical studies, it has been hard to disentangle direct death from wars and those from less direct effects on populations (say blockades, famine). For instance the First Jewish War has confused historians as an estimated 30K death came from the war, and a considerably higher (between 350K and the number 1M according to Josephus) from the famine or civilian casualties.

<sup>3</sup>**Technical comment:** These simulations are largely looking for a "stochastic alpha" bias from errors and unreliability of data (Taleb, 2015, [12]). With a sample size of  $n$ , a parameter  $\hat{\theta}_m$  will be the average parameter obtained across a large number of Monte Carlo runs. Let  $X_i$  be a given Monte Carlo simulated vector indexed by  $i$  and  $X_\mu$  is the middle estimate between high and low bounds. Since, with  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j < m} \|X_j\|_1 = \|X_\mu\|_1$  across Monte Carlo runs but  $\forall j, \|X_j\|_1 \neq \|X_\mu\|_1$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j < m} \hat{\theta}(X_j) \neq \hat{\theta}(X_\mu)$ . For instance, consider the maximum likelihood estimation of a Paretan tail,  $\hat{\alpha}(X_i) \triangleq n \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \log \left( \frac{x_i}{L} \right) \right)^{-1}$ . With  $\Delta \geq x_m$ , define

$$\hat{\alpha}(X_i \sqcup \Delta) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n \log \left( \frac{x_i}{L} \right) - \log \left( \frac{\Delta}{L} \right)} + \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^n \log \left( \frac{x_i}{L} \right) + \log \left( \frac{\Delta}{L} \right)} \right)$$

which, owing to the concavity of the logarithmic function, gives the inequality

$$\forall \Delta \geq x_m, \hat{\alpha}(X_i \sqcup \Delta) \geq \hat{\alpha}(X_i).$$

#### E. Missing events

We can assume that there are numerous wars that are not part of our sample, even if we doubt that such events are in the "tails" of the distribution, given that large conflicts are more likely to be reported by historians. Further, we also assume that their occurrence is random across the data (in the sense that they do not have an effect on clustering).

But we are aware of a bias from differential in both accuracy and reporting across time: events are more likely to be recorded in modern times than in the past. Raising the minimum value  $L$  the number of such "missed" events and their impact are likely to drop rapidly. Indeed, as a robustness check, raising the bar to a minimum  $L = 500K$  does not change our analysis.

A simple jackknife procedure, performed by randomly removing a proportion of events from the sample and repeating analyses, shows us the dependence of our analysis on missing events, dependence that we have found to be insignificant, when focusing on the tail of the distribution of casualties. In other words, given that we are dealing with extremes, if removing 30% of events and checking the effects on parameters produce no divergence from initial results, then we do not need to worry of having missed 30% of events, as missing events are not likely to cause thinning of the tails.<sup>4</sup>

#### F. Survivorship Bias

We did not take into account of the survivorship biases in the analysis, assuming it to be negligible before 1960, as the probability of a conflict affecting all of mankind was negligible. Such probability (and risk) became considerably higher since, especially because of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons.

## IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Figures 3 and 4 graphically represent our data: the number of casualties over time. Figure 3 refers to the estimated actual number of victims, while Figure 4 shows the rescaled amounts, obtained by rescaling the past observation with respect to the world population in 2015 (around 7.2 billion people)<sup>5</sup>. Figures 3 might suggest an increase in the death toll of armed conflicts over time, thus supporting the idea that war violence has increased. Figure 4, conversely, seems to suggest a decrease in the (rescaled) number of victims, especially in the last hundred years, and possibly in violence as well. In what follows we show that both interpretations are surely naive, because they do not take into consideration the fact that we are dealing with extreme events.

<sup>4</sup>The opposite is not true, which is at the core of the Black Swan asymmetry: such procedure does not remedy the missing of tail, "Black Swan" events from the record. A single "Black Swan" event can considerably fatten the tail. In this case the tail is fat enough and no missing information seems able to make it thinner.

<sup>5</sup>Notice that, in equation (1), for  $H = 7.2$  billion,  $\varphi(x) \approx x$ . Therefore Figure 4 is also representative for log-rescaled data.

A. Peaks over Threshold

Given the fat-tailed nature of the data, which can be easily observed with some basic graphical tools like histograms on the logs and QQplots (Figure 6 shows the QQplot of actual casualties against an exponential distribution: the clear concavity is a signal of fat-tailed distribution), it seems appropriate to use a well-known method of extreme value theory to model war casualties over time: the Peaks-over-Threshold or POT [2].

According to the POT method, excesses of an i.i.d. sequence over a high threshold  $u$  (that we have to identify) occur at the times of a homogeneous Poisson process, while the excesses themselves can be modeled with a Generalized Pareto Distribution (GPD). Arrival times and excesses are assumed to be independent of each other.

In our case, assuming the independence of the war events does not seem a strong assumption, given the time and space separation among them. Regarding the other assumptions, on the contrary, we have to check them.

We start by identifying the threshold  $u$  above which the GPD approximation may hold. Different heuristic tools can be used for this purpose, from Zipf plot to mean excess function plots, where one looks for the linearity which is typical of fat-tailed phenomena [1], [2]. Figure 7 shows the mean excess function plot for actual casualties<sup>6</sup>: an upward trend is clearly present, already starting with a threshold equal to 5k victims. For the goodness of fit, it might be appropriate to choose a slightly larger threshold, like  $u = 50k$ <sup>7</sup>.




Fig. 7. Mean excess function plot (MEPLOT) for actual casualties. An upward trend - almost linear in the first part of the graph - is present, suggesting the presence of a fat right tail. The variability of the mean excess function for higher thresholds is due to the small number of observation exceeding those thresholds and should not be taken into consideration.




Fig. 6. QQplot of actual casualties against standard exponential quantile. The concave curvature of data points is a clear signal of heavy tails.

B. Gaps in Series and Autocorrelation

To check whether events over time occur according to a homogeneous Poisson process, a basic assumption of the POT method, we can look at the distribution of the inter-arrival times or gaps, which should be exponential. Gaps should also show no autocorrelation.

<sup>6</sup>Similar results hold for the rescaled amounts (naive and log). For the sake of brevity we always show plots for one of the two variables, unless a major difference is observed.

<sup>7</sup>This idea has also been supported by subsequent goodness-of-fit tests.

Series gaps




Fig. 8. ACF plot of gaps for actual casualties, no significant autocorrelation is visible.

Figure 8 clearly shows the absence of autocorrelation. The plausibility of an exponential distribution for the inter-arrival times can be positively checked using both heuristic and analytic tools. Here we omit the positive results for brevity.

However, in order to provide some extra useful information, in Tables II and III we provide some basic statistics about the inter-arrival times for very catastrophic events in terms of casualties<sup>8</sup>. The simple evidence there contained should already be sufficient to underline how unreliable can be the statement that war violence has been decreasing over time. For an events with more than 10 million victims, if we refer to actual estimates, the average time delay is 101.58 years, with a mean absolute deviation of 144.47 years<sup>9</sup>. This means that it is totally plausible that in the last few years we have not observed such a large event. It could simply happen tomorrow or some time in the future. This also means that every trend extrapolation makes no great sense for this type of extreme events. Finally, we have to consider that an event as large as WW2 happened only once in 2014 years, if we deal with

<sup>8</sup>Table II does not show the average delay for events with 20M(50M) or more casualties. This is due to the limited amount of these observations in actual, non-rescaled data. In particular, all the events with more than 20 million victims have occurred during the last 150 years, and the average inter-arrival time is below 20 years. Are we really living in more peaceful world?

<sup>9</sup>In case of rescaled amounts, inter-arrival times are shorter, but the interpretation is the same

actual casualties (for rescaled casualties we can consider the An Lushan rebellion); in this case the possible waiting time is even longer.

### C. Tail analysis

Given that the POT assumptions about the Poisson process seem to be confirmed by data, it is finally the time to fit a Generalized Pareto Distribution to the exceedances.

Consider a random variable  $X$  with df  $F$ , and call  $F_u$  the conditional df of  $X$  above a given threshold  $u$ . We can then define a r.v.  $Y$ , representing the rescaled excesses of  $X$  over the threshold  $u$ , getting [2]

$$F_u(y) = P(X - u \leq y | X > u) = \frac{F(u+y) - F(u)}{1 - F(u)}$$

for  $0 \leq y \leq x_F - u$ , where  $x_F$  is the right endpoint of the underlying distribution  $F$ . Pickands [7], Balkema and de Haan [8], [9] and [10] showed that for a large class of underlying distribution functions  $F$  (following in the so-called domain of attraction of the GEV distribution [2]), and a large  $u$ ,  $F_u$  can be approximated by a Generalized Pareto distribution:  $F_u(y) \rightarrow G(y)$ , as  $u \rightarrow \infty$  where

$$G(y) = \begin{cases} 1 - (1 + \xi y/\beta)^{-1/\xi} & \text{if } \xi \neq 0 \\ 1 - e^{-y/\beta} & \text{if } \xi = 0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

It can be shown that the GPD distribution is a distribution interpolating between the exponential distribution (for  $\xi = 0$ ) and a class of Pareto distributions. We refer to [2] for more details.

The parameters in (7) can be estimated using methods like maximum likelihood or probability weighted moments [2]. The goodness of fit can then be tested using bootstrap-based tests [6].

Table IV contains our mle estimates for actual and rescaled casualties above a 50k victims threshold. This threshold is in fact the one providing the best compromise between goodness of fit and a sufficient number of observation, so that standard errors are reliable. The actual and both the rescaled data show two different sets of estimates, but their interpretation is strongly consistent. For this reason we just focus on actual casualties for the discussion.

The parameter  $\xi$  is the most important for us: it is the parameter governing the fatness of the right tail. A  $\xi$  greater than 1 (we have 1.5886) signifies that no moment is defined for our Generalized Pareto: a very fat-tailed situation. Naturally, in the sample, we can compute all the moments we are interested in, but from a theoretical point of view they are completely unreliable and their interpretation is extremely flawed (a very common error though). According to our fitting, very catastrophic events are not at all improbable. It is worth noticing that the estimates is significant, given that its standard error is 0.1467.

Figures 9 and 10 compare our fittings to actual data. In both figures it is possible to see the goodness of the GPD fitting for most of the observations above the 50k victims threshold. Some problems arise for the very large events, like WW2 and the An Lushan rebellion<sup>10</sup>. In this case it appears that our fitting expects larger events to have happened. This is a well-known problem for extreme data [2]. The very large event could just be behind the corner.

Similarly, events with 5 to 10 million victims (not at all minor ones!) seem to be slightly more frequent than what is expected by our GPD fitting. This is another signal of the extreme character of war casualties, which does not allow for the extrapolation of simplistic trends.




Fig. 9. GPD tail fitting to actual casualties' data (in 10k). Parameters as per Table IV, first line.




Fig. 10. GPD cumulative distribution fitting to actual casualties' data (in 10k). Parameters as per Table IV, first line.

### D. An alternative view on maxima

Another method is the block-maxima approach of extreme value theory. In this approach data are divided into blocks, and within each block only the maximum value is taken into consideration. The Fisher-Tippett theorem [2] then guarantees that the normalized maxima converge in distribution to a Generalized Extreme Value Distribution, or GEV.

$$GEV(x; \xi) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(-\left(1 + \xi x\right)^{-\frac{1}{\xi}}\right) & \xi \neq 0 \\ \exp(-\exp(-x)) & \xi = 0 \end{cases}, \quad 1 + \xi x > 0$$

<sup>10</sup>If we remove the two largest events from the data, the GPD hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 5% significance level.



This distribution is naturally related to the GPD, and we refer to [2] for more details.

If we divide our data into 100-year blocks, we obtain 21 observation (the last block is the residual one from 2001 to 2014). Maximum likelihood estimations give a  $\xi$  larger than 2, indicating that we are in the so-called Fréchet maximum domain of attraction, compatible with very heavy-tailed phenomena. A value of  $\xi$  greater than 2 under the GEV distribution further confirms the idea of the absence of moments, a clear signal of a very heavy right tail.

### E. Full Data Analysis

Naturally, being aware of limitations, we can try to fit all our data, while for casualties in excess of 10000, we fit the Pareto Distribution from Equation 3 with  $\alpha \approx 0.53$  throughout. The goodness of fit for the "near tail" ( $L=10K$ ) can be seen in Figure 2. Similar results to Figure 2 are seen for different values in table below, all with the same goodness of fit.

$L$	$\sigma$
10K	84,260
25K	899,953
50K	116,794
100K	172,733
200K	232,358
500K	598,292

The different possible values of the mean in Equation 4 can be calculated across different set values of  $\alpha$ , with one single degree of freedom: the corresponding  $\sigma$  is a MLE estimate using such  $\alpha$  as fixed: for a sample size  $n$ , and  $x_i$  the observations higher than  $L$ ,  $\sigma_\alpha = \left\{ \sigma : \frac{\alpha n}{\sigma} - (\alpha + 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i - L + \sigma} = 0, \sigma > 0 \right\}$ .

The sample average for  $L = 10K$  is  $9.12 \times 10^6$ , across 100K simulations, with the spread in values showed in Figure 15.

The "true" mean from Equation 4 yields  $3.1 \times 10^7$ , and we repeated for  $L = 10K, 20K, 50K, 100K, 200K,$  and  $500K$ , finding ratios of true estimated mean to observed safely between 3 and 4., see Table I. Notice that this value for the mean of  $\approx 3.5$  times the observed sample mean is only a general guideline, since, being stochastic, does not reveal any precise information other than prevent us from taking the naive mean estimation seriously.

For under fat tails, the mean derived from estimates of  $\alpha$  is more rigorous and has a smaller error, since the estimate of  $\alpha$  is asymptotically Gaussian while the average of a power law, even when it exists, is considerably more stochastic. See the discussion on "slowness of the law of large numbers" in [12] in connection with the point.

We get the mean by truncation for  $L=10K$  a bit lower, under equation 6; around  $1.8835 \times 10^7$ .

We finally note that, for values of  $L$  considered, 96 % of conflicts with more than 10,000 victims are below the mean: where  $m$  is the mean,

$$P(X < m) = 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{H \log \left( \alpha e^{\sigma/H} E_{\alpha+1} \left( \frac{\sigma}{H} \right) \right)}{\sigma} \right)^{-\alpha}.$$

## V. ADDITIONAL ROBUSTNESS AND RELIABILITY TESTS

### A. Bootstrap for the GPD

In order to check our sensitivity to the quality/precision of our data, we have decided to perform some bootstrap analysis. For both raw data and the rescaled ones we have generated 100K new samples by randomly selecting 90% of the observations, with replacement. Figures 11, 12 and 13 show the stability of our  $\xi$  estimates. In particular  $\xi > 0$  in all samples, indicating the extreme fat-tailedness of the number of victims in armed conflicts. The  $\xi$  estimates in Table IV appear to be good approximations for our GPD real shape parameters, notwithstanding imprecisions and missing observations in the data.




Fig. 11.  $\xi$  parameter's distribution over 100K bootstrap samples for actual data. Each sample is randomly selected with replacement using 90% of the original observations.




Fig. 12.  $\xi$  parameter's distribution over 100K bootstrap samples for naively rescaled data. Each sample is randomly selected with replacement using 90% of the original observations.

### B. Perturbation across bounds of estimates

We performed analyses for the "near tail" using the Monte Carlo techniques discussed in section III-C. We look at second






Fig. 13.  $\xi$  parameter's distribution over 100K bootstrap samples for log-rescaled data. Each sample is randomly selected with replacement using 90% of the original observations.

order "p-values", that is the sensitivity of the p-values across different estimates in Figure 14 –practically all results meet the same statistical significance and goodness of fit.

In addition, we look at values of both the sample means and the alpha-derived MLE mean across permutations, see Figures 15 and 16.




Fig. 14. P-Values of Pareto-Lomax across 100K combinations. This is not to ascertain the p-value, rather to check the robustness by looking at the variations across permutations of estimates.




Fig. 15. Rescaled sample mean across 100K estimates between high-low.




Fig. 16. Rescaled MLE mean across 100K estimates between high-low.




Fig. 17. Loglogplot comparison of  $f$  and  $g$ , showing a pasting-boundary style capping around  $H$ .

## VI. CONCLUSION: IS THE WORLD MORE UNSAFE THAN IT SEEMS?

To put our conclusion in the simplest of terms: the occurrence of events that would raise the average violence by a multiple of 3 would not cause us to rewrite this paper, nor to change the parameters calibrated within.

- Indeed, from statistical analysis alone, the world is more unsafe than casually examined numbers. Violence is underestimated by journalistic nonstatistical looks at the mean and lack of understanding of the stochasticity of under inter-arrival times.
- The transformation into compact support allowed us to perform the analyses and gauge such underestimation which , if noisy, gives us an idea of the underestimation and its bounds.
- In other words, a large event and even a rise in observed mean violence would not be inconsistent with statistical properties, meaning it would justify a "nothing has changed" reaction.
- We avoided discussions of homicide since we limited  $L$  to values  $> 10,000$ , but its rate doesn't appear to have a particular bearing on the tails. It could be a drop in

the bucket. It obeys different dynamics. We may have observed lower rate of homicide in societies but most deaths risks come from violent conflict.<sup>11</sup>

- We ignored survivorship bias in the data analysis (that is, the fact that *had the world been more violent, we wouldn't be here to talk about it*). Adding it would increase the risk. The presence of tail effects today makes further analysis require taking it into account. Since 1960, a single conflict –which almost happened– has the ability to reach the max casualties, something we did not have before.<sup>12</sup>

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Cirillo (2013). Are your data really Pareto distributed? *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 392, 5947-5962.
- [2] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, T. Mikosch (2003). *Modelling Extremal Events*. Springer.
- [3] R. Epstein (2011). Book Review: The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined. *Scientific American*, October 7.
- [4] S. Pinker (2011). *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. Viking Adult
- [5] C. Robert, G. Casella (2005). Monte Carlo Statistical Methods. Springer.
- [6] J-A- Villasenor-Alva, E. Gonzalez-Estrada (2009). A bootstrap goodness of fit test for the generalized Pareto distribution. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 53, 3835-3841.
- [7] J. Pickands III, "Statistical inference using extreme order statistics," *the Annals of Statistics*, pp. 119–131, 1975.
- [8] A. A. Balkema and L. De Haan, "Residual life time at great age," *The Annals of probability*, pp. 792–804, 1974.
- [9] —, "Limit distributions for order statistics. i," *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 77–92, 1978.
- [10] A. A. Balkema and L. de Haan, "Limit distributions for order statistics. ii," *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, vol23, no. 2, pp. 341–358, 1979.
- [11] C. Phillips, C. and A. Axelrod, *Encyclopedia of Wars* (3-Volume Set). Infobase Pub, 2004.
- [12] N. N. Taleb, *Silent Risk: Lectures on Probability, Vol 1*, SSRN, 2015.
- [13] Cederman, Lars-Erik, *Modeling the size of wars: from billiard balls to sandpiles*, 2003.
- [14] Richardson, Lewis F., *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*, Chicago: Quadrangle Book, 1960

<sup>11</sup>Casualties from homicide by rescaling from the rate 70 per 100k, gets us  $5.04 \times 10^6$  casualties per annum at today's population. A drop to minimum levels stays below the difference between errors on the mean of violence from conflicts with higher than 10,000 casualties.

<sup>12</sup>We can rewrite the model with one of fragmentation of the world, constituted of "separate" isolated  $n$  independent random variables  $X_i$ , each with a maximum value  $H_i$ , with the total  $\sum_n \omega_i H_i = H$ , with all  $w_i > 0$ ,  $\sum_n \omega_i = 1$ . In that case the maximum (that is worst conflict) could require the joint probabilities that all  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  are near their maximum value, which, under subexponentiality, is an event of much lower probability than having a single variable reach its maximum.

## VII. APPENDIX I: DATA

The data was compiled by Captain Mark Weisenborn. We thank Ben Kiernan for comments on East Asian conflicts. The complete data set will be made available to the public (open access) once the paper has been accepted for publication.