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I am happy to report that the Research Council of Norway has renewed the Centre for the Study of Civil War for another five years, 2008–12, as a Centre of Excellence. Nine of the thirteen centres were positively evaluated in December 2006, and we received one of the top ratings. I will let the conclusion from the evaluation report speak for itself:

The Committee’s overall rating of CSCW is exceptionally good, and its strong international reputation is well deserved. The Centre, backed by PRIO, has put Norway on the map as the place for internationally leading research on civil war. The excellence has been achieved in a relatively short period of time, partly by adopting a sharp focus … and by engaging already accomplished senior scholars in the field, while at the same time caring to train well the next generation of scholars. The existence of detailed plans already at this stage for how to build upon the CSCW’s achievements after the end of the Centre’s ten-year life, so that these are not lost, is much welcomed.

In addition to the good news regarding the renewal of CSCW as a Centre of Excellence, the European Science Foundation also approved a European Collaborative Research Projects (ECRP) grant beginning in August 2007 to support GROW-net (Geographic Representation of War), a network of researchers at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH), University of Essex and CSCW.

These grants combined with those sources listed at the end of this report help us to meet the main objective of the Centre for the Study of Civil War, which is the multidisciplinary study of why civil wars break out; how they are sustained; what it takes to end them and to preserve a civil peace. There were some changes to the CSCW structure in 2006. The working group lead by Kristian Berg Harpviken (Transnational and International Facets of Civil War) completed a successful first year and has expanded CSCW collaboration with researchers from the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI).

Civil war remains by far the dominant form of armed conflict in the world today. As reported in the 2006 annual data feature in Journal of Peace Research on ‘Armed Conflict and Peace Agreements’ by Harbom, Högbladh & Wallensteen, 31 intrastate armed conflicts (involving at least 25 battle-related casualties) were being fought in 22 different countries in 2005. There were 32 intrastate armed conflicts in 2004. These numbers constitute a significant drop since the early 1990s; in 1992, we recorded 51 active armed intrastate conflicts.

Since 2000, we have witnessed slight shifts in the aggregate numbers from year to year, but the list of wars changes dramatically from year to year. For example, while ten conflicts active in 2004 were no longer ongoing in 2005, nine conflicts that had not been active in 2004 restarted. Many of these wars do not formally end through victory or negotiated settlement; they are low-intensity conflicts that slip below the 25 battle-casualty threshold only to rise above it a few years later. In other words, a larger number of conflicts simmer on without resolution than the statistics indicate.

In contrast to these low-intensity conflicts is the conflict in Iraq. Classified in our datasets as an interstate war in 2003, it is now classified as an internationalized intrastate war – war being defined by 1,000 or more battle deaths in a year. In both 2005 and 2006, battle casualties in Iraq have far exceeded those of all other wars.
**Children in Armed Conflict**

Three hundred thousand child soldiers in the world today – the figure is repeated over and over, year after year by NGOs, international organizations and governments with only the best of intentions. A web search with ‘child’, ‘soldiers’ and ‘number’ as keywords shows how extensively this number – almost certainly mythical – is cited. We certainly would never expect this number to be constant; indeed, with the end of conflict in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Angola (countries with extensive use of child soldiers), the number should have fallen. But the figure 300,000 was estimated in 1994 and has been cited, for the most part uncritically, ever since.

Before anyone can begin to develop an effective policy to address the problems of children in conflict, we need better information about these children as well as a different understanding of the humanitarian impact beyond the simple count of children in armed groups. Fortunately, a handful of researchers, several of them affiliated with CSCW, are now addressing this problem with extensive, robust and systematic research.

CSCW Visiting Scholar Vera Achvarina co-authored an article with Simon Reich that appeared in the Summer 2006 issue of *International Security* (one of the top three international relations journals, ranked by citations). This article brings us much closer to knowing how many children have been recruited and where. More importantly, their work shows that the number of children recruited varies considerably from country to country but is not simply related to levels of poverty or number of orphans.

In 2006, Centre Associate James Pugel conducted a nationwide, random-sample survey of ex-combatants in Liberia that reveals key differences between the rebel groups regarding recruitment and treatment of children (and adults). Some groups recruited a high proportion of child soldiers while others employed almost none. The reasons given for joining the rebels varied considerably across armed factions, as did their success in post-conflict reintegration. Pugel concludes that disaggregated information on rebel groups is critical for the success of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programmes.

CSCW Director Scott Gates and Centre Associate Jens Chr. Andvig attempt to explain this variation from country to country and group to group by focusing on the organizational demand for recruiting children. They demonstrate that contextual factors alone cannot explain why some armed groups focus their recruitment efforts on young children while other groups in a similar situations recruit none.

To broaden the inputs to this research, CSCW and the Ford Institute for Human Security (directed by Simon Reich) at the University of Pittsburgh coordinated two workshops on Building Knowledge About Children in Armed Conflict. Former Executive Deputy-Director of UNICEF Karin Sham Poo gave the keynote address at the inaugural meeting, and Andrew Mack, Director of the Human Security Centre, University of British Columbia, gave a plenary lecture at the Pittsburgh meeting. Jo Becker, Advocacy Director of the Children’s Rights Division at Human Rights Watch, has played a prominent role throughout.

In connection with the Oslo workshop, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs hosted a seminar with Sham Poo and Betty Bigombe, a former mediator in the Ugandan civil war and recently a key advocate for the children suffering in northern Uganda. In addition, CSCW workshop coordinator Ingeborg Haavardsdottir wrote the text for the exhibition ‘Terrified and Terrifying – Stories of Child Soldiers’, on display 8 September–3 December at the Nobel Peace Centre.

These activities have been designed to gather academics, representatives of key NGOs and government officials to address a range of questions related to children and armed conflict. By bringing together diverse expertise, we hope to generate both greater understanding of the problem and innovative policy proposals.

---

**Civil War in Ancient Greece and Today**

Do essays on a 2,400-year-old historical narrative have any place in studies of civil war today? And if so, what can we learn from them?

The Working Group on Microfoundations of Civil War has focused on individual decisions that lead to the initiation, continuation or cessation of civil war. In February 2005, Working Group Leader Jon Elster hosted a workshop at Columbia University in New York on the most famous historical work to raise just these issues, Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War*. A special issue of the *Journal of Military Ethics* (JME) was subsequently dedicated to this subject in late 2006 (vol. 5, no. 4). In the main, the issue comprises papers presented at the workshop. CSCW associates Gregory Reichberg and Henrik Syse were a driving force behind the workshop and guest editors for the special issue. The JME issue encompasses historical reflections on the dilemmas raised by Thucydides, their significance for current research on the causes of armed conflict, and their relevance for the teaching of military ethics.
But do these old essays have any place in a journal devoted to the study of military ethics? And does an author who is usually credited with being the ‘father of political realism’ belong within the confines of normative debate? Allowing an issue of JME to Thucydides makes it clear that the answer to those questions is yes. Indeed, few works on war have such relevance for military ethics as Thucydides’ account of that brutal contest known as the Peloponnesian War.

This does not mean, however, that we can simply lift ready-made lessons from this venerable Athenian historian and apply them to warfare as it exists today. Any such attempt would sidestep the enormous differences in culture and historical circumstance that divide Thucydides’ time from our own. But, inversely, if we were to believe that there is little or nothing about Greek society in 400 BCE that is of relevance to current war-fighting and its attendant moral challenges, our vision would be hopelessly shortsighted as well.

Thucydides remains a vital presence because he was able to articulate so forcefully central topics in international relations and normative theory that are still very much with us today: the risks inherent in being a lone superpower; the dynamics at work when military power becomes an end unto itself; the peculiarity of debates that reduce deep normative dilemmas to calculations of self-interest; and, not least, the contrast between civil and interstate wars, and the deep moral tragedy that is especially attendant upon the former.

Of central importance to this collection of texts is the interplay between institutional and individual factors in assessing the moral character of the Peloponnesian War in particular and civil war in general. On the one hand, norms must be communicated in and through institutions. But, on the other hand, there are always certain individuals who count more than others when major decisions are made, and whose character and choices can decide the outcome of an armed struggle. The articles in this special issue cover both of these aspects: institutions, on the one hand, and the power of individual decisions, on the other. In this way, the articles cast important new light on a dynamic that cuts through the entire Peloponnesian War and is still present today.

### Consistent Institutions Enhance Political Stability

In an article published in the *American Journal of Political Science*, CSCW authors Scott Gates, Håvard Hegre, Mark Jones and Håvard Strand contribute to the study of how political institutional structures affect political instability.

Whether or not a country’s political system is likely to endure has important consequences for the living conditions of its citizens, for its international relations, and for the risk of civil war. The study of the link between democracy and war has been central in CSCW research since the launch of the Centre. In a much-cited study, Hegre, Ellingsen, Gates & Gleditsch (2001) show that countries with semi-democratic regimes and recently established institutions have high risks of civil war. The AJPS article specifies in much more detail what constitutes an ‘inconsistent’ or ‘semi-democratic’ regime, and contributes to the explanation of why such regimes are unstable.

Partly based on a classic study by Harry Eckstein & Ted Gurr, the article classifies polities as autocracies or democracies based on three institutional dimensions: election of the executive, constraints on executive decision-making authority, and extent of political participation. In the figure reproduced below, these three dimensions form a cube within which political systems may be classified.

![Institutional Cube](https://www.prio.no/cscw)

The article shows empirically and theoretically that strongly autocratic and fully democratic regimes exhibit the greatest stability because they are self-enforcing equilibria. Executives in autocratic systems will have an incentive to resist the introduction of institutions that allows open and regulated participation, institutions that restrain the executive and institutions that subjects executive recruitment to elections. These consistent autocracies are found in the lower left corner of the cube. Any combinations of institutional characteristics that are slightly more democratic than the consistent autocracies will be unstable, since the executive will be willing and able to concentrate power. Consistent democracies are located in the upper right corner. A different set of incentives apply to actors in such institutions. Although the incumbent executive might prefer a system that secures power in the future, the institutions of elections, popular participation and strong parliaments makes a transition to consistent autocracy virtually impossible. Hence, since the risk of being voted out of office is high, the incumbent party shares the opposition’s interest in retaining institutions that allow it to compete for the position as executive in the next election. All combinations of institutions in the middle of the cube lack such self-enforcing characteristics and are inherently unstable.

---

Norway in the Lead on Conflict Research

In a study of the literature on armed conflict over the period 1996–2006, the ISI Web of Knowledge places PRIO in a central position in the field. Norway ranks as the country with the third highest number of citations and the highest average number of citations per publication. This is mostly due to research at the Centre for the Study of Civil War, *Journal of Peace Research*, edited at PRIO under the leadership of CSCW Research Professor and Working Group Leader Nils Petter Gleditsch, is the world’s third most widely cited journal within conflict research. Moreover, JPR published four of the five most cited articles in the last two years.

The ISI Web of Knowledge lists the 20 institutions with the highest number of citations overall in the field of conflict studies, and here PRIO is the only one that is not a university in the United States.

Five CSCW associate researchers – Håvard Hegre, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Nils Petter Gleditsch, James Fearon and Anke Hoeffler – are among the 20 most frequently cited authors on armed conflict. Nils Petter Gleditsch was also interviewed as part of this feature.

The ISI Web of Knowledge records citations in academic articles in 22,000 academic journals. Once a month, it publishes analyses of Special Topics to provide citation analyses and commentary for selected scientific research areas that have experienced notable recent advances or are of special current interest. Most of these are in the natural sciences, but in November 2006 the topic was ‘Armed Conflict’.

CSCW Conflict Datasets: New Releases in 2006

In collaboration with the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University, CSCW releases annual updates of the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset. The current version, presented in a feature article in the September 2006 issue of *Journal of Peace Research*, includes information on all armed conflicts worldwide between 1946 and 2005.

Among other things, the updated conflict dataset shows that the positive trend towards fewer armed conflicts in the world continues. In 2005, there were 31 active armed conflicts, only 5 of which reached the level of ‘war’ (at least 1,000 battle-related deaths in a calendar year). In contrast, 1992 saw 51 different armed conflicts, including 18 wars.

An important extension to the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset is the Battle Deaths Dataset, originally released in 2003. A new and completely updated version was released in September 2006. The Battle Deaths Dataset contains annual estimates of casualties for all wars since 1900 and all armed conflicts since 1946, and shows that fewer people were killed in combat in 2005 than in any previous year since the end of World War II.

A second, ongoing extension of the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset is the ACLED data project. Initially released in 2006, the Armed Conflict Location and Events Data structure the information on armed conflicts by single events, containing information on the type of event (e.g., reported battle, non-combat movements, rebel headquarters) with exact dates and geographical coordinates wherever possible. Currently, the ACLED dataset covers eight countries in western and central Africa and is expanding rapidly.

Since its establishment, the Centre has devoted significant attention and resources to the development of a joint dataset repository and portal on the PRIO/CSCW website. Both the CSCW and *Journal of Peace Research* require the posting of ‘do-files’, codebooks and other information necessary to replicate analysis. The CSCW data repository today includes 14 new or updated datasets grouped thematically into four categories:

- Data on Armed Conflict
- Data on Governance
- Geographical and Resource Datasets
- Economic and Socio-Demographic Data

Over 30 additional datasets and log files developed by CSCW staff or associates for articles that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals are also accessible through the PRIO/CSCW data portal. Finally, the portal contains over 170 links to datasets or authors’ homepages in connection with articles published in JPR. Since such links to external pages are not always stable or reliable, all authors are now asked to make the data directly available on our own website.
Two civilians mutilated by government controlled militias during the recent civil war in the Southern Sudan. Photo: Øystein H. Rolandsen, PRIO
Working Group Activities

Microfoundations of Civil War
Leader: Jon Elster, Columbia University

The Working Group convened on 17-18 August in Oslo for a workshop on the role of ‘first actors’ in civil wars, led by WG member Roger D. Petersen. As noted in the concept paper, a country may be experiencing disorder or protests but the situation is not a civil war until the leadership of one group or another (this could be the government) resorts to violence and another party follows suit. Some workshop presentations focused on the agents behind this transformation: on individual choices, beliefs and interactions (including within the framework of collective action theory). Others examined the social networks, organizational structures or historical narratives in which these individuals are embedded (with attention to both rational and non-rational motivations that arise in this social context). One participant presented a simulation of the spread of violence per se, using agent-based modeling to address definitional issues. Another examined the puzzling empirical finding that engineers are vastly overrepresented in radical Islamic movements. In 2006, the Working Group obtained funding jointly with PRIO’s Ethics, Norms and Identities Programme for a two-year project on accountability in transitional justice. A main component of this project is the WG’s continued collaboration with scholars in Colombia.

Values and Violence
Leader: Ola Listhaug, NTNU

The major publication from this Working Group in 2006 was The Three Yugoslavias: State Building and Legitimation, 1918-2005 (Indiana University Press/Woodrow Wilson Center Press), by Sabrina Ramet. The 1991-95 war of Yugoslav succession convinced many observers that interethnic violence was endemic to politics in Yugoslavia and that the Yugoslav meltdown had occurred because of ancient hatreds. Ramet places emphasis on the failure of the state-building project and the absence of political legitimation, rather than on ineluctable or abstract historical forces. In the article ‘Public Opinion on the Role of Religion in Political Leadership: A Multi-Level Analysis of Sixty-Three Countries’ (Japanese Journal of Political Science), Matthew Carlson and Ola Listhaug ask if there are significant variations across major religious faiths about the proper political role of religion. They find that Muslims are somewhat more likely than followers of other faiths and denominations to say that religious beliefs are important in selecting leaders, but that Muslims do not stand out as especially favourable towards the view that religious leaders should use their positions for political influence. One MA thesis in political science at NTNU was completed in 2006; ‘Explaining Prejudice in South Africa’, by Malin Pedersen.

Civil Peace
Leader: Scott Gates, PRIO

This Working Group’s designation reflects the aim to study both the processes of conflict resolution and the conditions for enduring social, economic and political stability. To better understand long-term peacebuilding, this group focuses on the development of institutions that can serve to mitigate or supplant the conditions that cause and sustain armed civil conflict. Peace depends essentially on the laying down of arms. Yet, obtaining a ceasefire or the signing of a peace treaty may not be enough to ensure peace. Unless the economic, social and political conditions that led to a conflict are addressed, armed conflict is likely to erupt again and again. In this regard, this group examines the institutional basis of civil peace. In August 2006, a workshop on ‘Power-Sharing in Post-Conflict Societies’ was co-organized with CSCW’s Working Group on Governance and Peace. Kaare Strøm and Scott Gates will continue to work on this topic. Research also continued on ‘Post-Conflict Justice’ as part of the World Bank project on ‘Post-Conflict Transitions’. Members of this Working Group have also been conducting research on DDR (Demobilization, Disarmament and Reintegration), with a particularly focus on the reintegration of child soldiers into post-conflict societies.

Governance and Peace
Leader: Kaare Strøm, University of California, San Diego

Governance structures typically affect the outbreak as well as the resolution of armed conflict and civil war. This Working Group explores the mechanisms through which democratic institutions engender peace either by preventing conflict in the first place or by facilitating its resolution. More specifically, we examine the different pathways of political transformation. Are certain institutional structures more conducive to peaceful democratization than others? And what institutional arrangements are more prone to groups taking up arms in opposition to the state? In August 2006, several Working Group members and other researchers participated in a PRIO conference on ‘Power-Sharing in Post-Conflict Societies’, organized by Kaare Strøm and Scott Gates, who will be conducting further research on this topic. Magnus Öberg and Kaare Strøm are editing a book on ‘Resources, Governance Structures and Civil Conflict’, based on a workshop that they directed at the Joint Sessions of Workshops of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) in 2004. Other research within this working group focuses on the consequences of rent-seeking politics for civil peace.
Conflict and Economic Performance
Leader: Karl Ove Moene, UiO

This Working Group’s research agenda implicitly criticizes mainstream economics for its lack of coherent treatment of conflicts and its neglect of social mechanisms. In contrast, we emphasize analysis that combines social and economic factors while acknowledging their interdependence. In 2006, the Group continued to focus on societies between war and peace, the resource curse and mathematical models. A workshop held 18-19 June in Oslo featured papers on corruption, governance and institution-building during and after war, and counterterrorism. Group researchers are also well integrated with the Polarization and Conflict (PAC) network, a project supported by a grant from the EU 6th Framework Programme.

Transnational and International Facets of Civil War
Leader: Kristian Berg Harpviken

Major sources of civil war are located beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. International factors have to do with either the direct actions of other states or the complex interactions within the system of states. The Working Group addresses regional and global sources of state failure, particularly in the context of a joint Strategic Institute Program with researchers from the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI). Relatedly, we study the conflicted nature of internationally driven peace interventions, such as the one in post-9/11 Afghanistan. When it comes to the transnational facets, the group has focused particularly on the emergence and maintenance of terrorist networks, as well as on the potential for refugee and wider diaspora populations to engage in ways that drive conflict or promote peace. In 2006, the Working Group changed leadership and then reoriented its research agenda towards a stronger focus on the transnational dimensions of civil war.

Environmental Factors in Civil War
Leader: Nils Petter Gleditsch, PRIO

We define environment as physical factors that condition human conflict, such as physical distance, mountainous terrain, caves, forest cover, rivers and the availability of natural resources. Resource scarcity plays an important role in neo-Malthusian theories of conflict, and climate change is widely predicted to exacerbate such scarcities. A special journal issue on the relationship between climate change and conflict is in progress. Population pressure is also an important part of the Malthusian model of conflict. Henrik Urdal submitted his doctoral dissertation on demography and internal armed conflict and published an article on youth bulges and conflict. Additional doctoral dissertations are under way within the working group. Work has continued on how shared water resources stimulate international conflict as well as cooperation, and two articles on rivers and conflict were published in 2006. The Working Group is increasingly moving towards the study of conflict with data disaggregated to the subnational level. Some work has also started on relating environmental factors to non-state conflicts, that is, armed conflicts where the government is not an actor.
Doctoral Projects

Doctoral projects Completed

A Liberal Theory of Third-Party Intervention in Ongoing Wars, 1945–99
Aysegul Aydin
Dissertation Advisers: Patrick M. Regan (Binghamton University) & Scott Gates (PRIO)
This project drew on insights from the economic liberalism research programme to improve our understanding of conflict expansion in interstate disputes. Its analysis of the state–society dimension of economic interdependence emphasizes the role of economic interest groups in foreign policymaking in general and intervention policies in particular. States perceive the conflicts of their trading partners with third parties as threatening to their interests, it claims, and they attempt to protect important economic ties by intervention. Moreover, external actors will be less likely to intervene against trading states with extensive economic ties because these ties are informative about the states’ willingness to join conflicts involving their trading partners.

Prospects for the Future: Towards Civilizational Clashes?
Tanja Ellingsen
Dissertation Advisers: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO & NTNU) & Øyvind Østerud (UiO)
Huntington’s ‘clash of civilizations’ thesis suggests that post-Cold War conflicts are shaped by cultural dissimilarities. The nation-state is being replaced by religion as a source of identity. Testing the validity of these claims, this dissertation investigates the extent to which people identify themselves in terms of civilizations and whether alliances can be explained by cultural similarities. It also explores the relationship between civilizational belonging and conflict, both inter- and intrastate. Data are drawn from the World Values Survey, the Penn World Tables, the UNGA (voting data) and the Correlates of War and Uppsala/PRIO conflict datasets.

Sins of Omission or Sins of Commission? Governance and Civil War
Hanne Fjelde
Dissertation Advisers: Erik Melander (Uppsala University) & Håvard Hegre (PRIO & UiO)
This dissertation project draws on the distinction between institutions that regulate the access to political authority and the exercise of this authority. While an extensive literature looks at how formal political institutions affect actors’ incentives to initiate armed conflict, the empirical research on how governance is related to armed conflict contains vast lacunae. This project examines how the risk of internal armed conflict is related to how governments make and implement decisions about disputed issues, such as how to redistribute wealth and provide public goods. It will rely on time-series data on political corruption, bureaucratic quality and public spending as well as case studies of particular countries.

Corrective Justice in War Settlements
Pablo Kalmanovitz
Dissertation Advisers: Jon Elster (Columbia University & CSCW) & David Johnston (Columbia University)
Contemporary just war theorizing focuses predominantly on problems of just cause for war (jus ad bellum) and rightful conduct during war (jus in bello) and tends to neglect the question of how wars ought to end (jus post bellum). How should the justice of a war outcome be assessed? This project will focus on corrective justice after war and discuss claims of reparation and punishment that stem from wrongful actions in war. Particular attention will be paid to the institutional and political conditions necessary for the application of corrective justice.

Religion and Civil Conflict
Ragnhild Nordås
Dissertation Advisers: Ola Latham (NTNU & CSCW) & Scott Gates (PRIO)
Given recent attention to the impact of religion on political outcomes, this project investigates how religion affects intrastate political violence, such as political terror and civil conflict. Scholars point out the mismatch between theories of intrastate conflict — which emphasize interaction between governments and rebel groups — and most empirical analysis — which uses country-level indicators and pays little attention to local-level phenomena or non-state antagonists. This project therefore integrates information on rebel groups and local factors into a more dyadic perspective. The project also speaks to the challenge of discerning religious factors in conflict by modeling interactions of explanatory variables with a focus on the contexts in which religion becomes important.

Natural Resources and Armed Civil Conflict
Päivi Lujala
Dissertation Advisers: Ragnar Torvik (NTNU) & Scott Gates (PRIO)
This project aims to identify natural resource types relevant to violent conflict. It collects spatial data on resource distribution and analyses how different resource types affect the risk; duration, type and location of conflict. In particular, it examines how rebels’ access to natural resources shapes the characteristics of armed civil conflict. The project will produce new datasets on the worldwide location of diamond and gemstone deposits, petroleum reserves and drug cultivation.

Ongoing Doctoral Projects

Conflict and Cooperation in International River Basins
Marit Brochmann
Dissertation Advisers: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO & NTNU) & Håvard Hegre (PRIO & UiO)
Water is an essential resource for human survival. It is also of great importance to industrial development and trade. This project builds on earlier research on conflict and cooperation in internationally shared rivers but extends the focus to examine the overall interaction, conflict and cooperation studied together instead of separately. More specifically, the project examines whether countries that share rivers interact more, either positively or negatively. It will also investigate the effect of signed water treaties on later water-specific interaction. Through issue coding of claims over the use of a river raised by one state towards another, specific water disagreements and whether or not they become militarized will be examined.

Natural Resource Management and Internal Armed Conflict
Helga Malmin Binningsbø
Dissertation Adviser: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO & NTNU)
Previous research shows that natural resource abundance and dependence increase the risk of violent conflict. Since natural resources are located in specific areas and have to be exploited where they are, the ‘resource curse’ they may entail must be actively managed. In addition, if natural resources lead to conflict, questions of natural resource management must be addressed in conflict termination. This project aims at understanding in greater detail the institutions that constitute natural resource management throughout the world. In particular, the project will investigate the relationships between resource management institutions and internal armed conflict, including how they have been used as mechanisms to prevent further conflict.

Sins of Omission or Sins of Commission? Governance and Civil War
Hanne Fjelde
Dissertation Advisers: Erik Melander (Uppsala University) & Håvard Hegre (PRIO & UiO)
This dissertation project draws on the distinction between institutions that regulate the access to political authority and the exercise of this authority. While an extensive literature looks at how formal political institutions affect actors’ incentives to initiate armed conflict, the empirical research on how governance is related to armed conflict contains vast lacunae. This project examines how the risk of internal armed conflict is related to how governments make and implement decisions about disputed issues, such as how to redistribute wealth and provide public goods. It will rely on time-series data on political corruption, bureaucratic quality and public spending as well as case studies of particular countries.
Endogenizing Ethnicity in the International Escalation of ‘Ethnic’ Conflict
Martin Austvoll Nome
Dissertation Advisers: Jeffrey T. Checkel (UIO & CSCW) & Scott Gates (PRIO)
The prominence of ethnic identity in politics may be as much a consequence as a cause of civil war. The project is designed to endogenize ethnicity—to let it explain and be explained—while theorizing the mechanisms linking (1) organized civil violence, framed by perpetrators and victims as being ‘ethnic’, (2) the involvement of groups in such violence having putative ethnic kin in a neighbouring country, and (3) the choice by actors in kin countries to escalate the civil violence by intervening in support of a conflict party.

How Can Geography Contribute to Our Understanding of Civil Wars?
Clionadh Raleigh
Dissertation Advisers: John O’Loughlin (University of Colorado), Håvard Hegre (PRIO & UIO) & Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (UCSD & University of Essex)
The study of civil war has recently seen an increased interest in geographic analysis. However, several key deficiencies persist as most studies rely on country-level information, rarely referring to the variation below the state level. A focus on the political geographies of conflictual places and an understanding of the dynamics between centre and local is required to move civil war theory and empirical work forward. With theories and information grounded on both the local and the state level, this project addresses why conflict erupts in particular places at particular times.

Civil War Society: Southern Sudan, 1955–2004
Øystein H.Rolandsen
Dissertation Advisers: Endre Stiansen (PRIO) & Helge Fjære (UIO)
Taking the conflict-ridden southern region of Sudan as its point of departure, this project investigates recent theories on the relationship between civil war, state and society in Africa. The project utilizes rich empirical material from fieldwork and unpublished sources spanning the time from Sudan’s independence until the recently signed peace agreement. The project will be concluded with a series of articles.

Anita Schjøset
Dissertation Advisers: Hayward R. Alker (University of California) & Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO & NTNU)
This project analyses relationships between governmental institutions and states’ engagement in conflict internationally during the period 1816–2002. Special emphasis is placed on temporal and spatial variations of these relationships. The project has involved data collection and analysis of three institutional dimensions: (1) type of electoral system, (2) type of executive system and (3) type of federal system. Preliminary results suggest that there are institutional and spatial differences in states’ conflict involvement and indicate caution when democratizing for peace.

Ethnic Prejudice in Contemporary European Societies
Zan Strabac
Dissertation Advisers: Kristen Ringdal (NTNU) & Ola Listhaug (NTNU & CSCW)
The main focus of this project is the relationships between ethnic identities, ethnic prejudice and violence. The dissertation consists of a set of empirical articles, using quantitative analyses and survey data from countries of former Yugoslavia and Eastern and Western Europe. Special attention is devoted to two factors: (1) the impact of religiosity on ethnic prejudice and ethnic identities; and (2) the impact of previous experiences of war-related violence on ethnic intolerance.

Political Regimes and Civil War Revisited
Håvard Strand
Dissertation Adviser: Håvard Hegre (PRIO & UIO)
The relationship between political regime type and civil war is not an unfamiliar topic of study. However, recent scholarship has failed to converge on a conclusion. This project aims to bridge that gap. It will contribute new data on both political regimes and armed conflicts, facilitating in turn more precise methods, such as duration analysis and multi-process models. Both the analyses and the data-gathering will be based on democracy theory, which will offer more valid operationalizations than those currently available in the literature.

Demography and Domestic Armed Conflict
Henrik Urdal
Dissertation Advisers: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO & NTNU) & Øystein Kravdal (UIO)
Demographic pressures have featured prominently in the debate over the new security challenges in the aftermath of the Cold War. This project addresses the relationship between demography and internal political violence, empirically analysing the security implications of population growth and density, and of ‘youth bulges’. The dissertation consists of four different articles; two of these have been published and two are under review. The dissertation was submitted in October 2006 and defended in February 2007.

Development, Horizontal Inequalities and Civil War
Gudrun Østby
Dissertation Advisers: Scott Gates (PRIO) & Anne Julie Semb (UIO)
Inequality is a grievance factor that is largely dismissed by recent statistical studies of civil war. However, such studies tend to focus exclusively on inter-individual inequality, ignoring the importance of group identity. This project will analyse systematic inequalities between ethnic/religious/regional groups (horizontal inequalities) as a potential cause of domestic armed conflict. On the basis of national household surveys in developing countries, the project develops a comprehensive dataset on horizontal inequalities along economic, social and political dimensions. The analysis involves large-N statistical event history models as well as case studies of particular countries.
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Total turnover in 2006 was 18,804,000 NOK (Excluding in-kind funds). The CoE Grant counts for 65% of this, and the total person-year effort came to 18,8.
PRIO

PRIO was founded in 1959. It was one of the first centres of peace research in the world and is Norway’s only peace research institute. PRIO is an autonomous, non-profit foundation which is independent and international in staff and perspective. Research at PRIO concentrates on the driving forces behind violent conflict and on ways in which peace can be built, maintained and spread. In addition to theoretical and empirical research, PRIO also conducts policy-oriented activities and engages in the search for solutions in cases of actual or potential violent conflict.

Centre of Excellence

Centre of Excellence (CoE) is a designation accorded to CSCW by the Research Council of Norway. The CoE scheme was introduced in Norway with the intention of bringing more researchers and research groups up to a high international standard. In 2002, after an extensive and competitive selection process led by international experts, the council awarded CoE status to 13 of 129 applicants. PRIO’s proposal was judged to be of exceptionally high scientific quality. The total number of Centres rose to 21 in 2006 when a new round of applications was held in addition to a midway evaluation for all existing CoEs. CSCW secured a second 5-year period of funding after the evaluation again receiving top scores from the referees.