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Director’s Introduction

At the Centre for the Study of Civil War, we continue to do what we have been doing from the start, pursuing the multidisciplinary study of why civil wars break out, how they are sustained, and what it takes to end them and to preserve a civil peace. Every year that I have written my director’s introduction, I have reported on the extent of civil conflict in the world today. Civil conflict remains, by far, the most common form of armed conflict. As reported in the 2008 annual data feature in Journal of Peace Research, “Dyadic Dimensions of Armed Conflict, 1946–2007” by Lotta Harbom, Erik Melander & Peter Wallenstein, 34 intrastate armed conflicts (involving at least 25 battle-related casualties) were being fought in 25 different countries in 2007. Only one conflict exceeded 1,000 battle deaths, a threshold that is often used to distinguish a war from other forms of armed conflict. Since 2000, the number of armed conflicts has shifted only slightly from year to year. Moreover, most outbreaks of conflict in recent years have merely been recurrences of previously active conflicts that have been temporarily dormant. We have seen very few truly new conflicts in the present millennium. In 2007, for the first time since 2004, two new conflicts were recorded – a conflict over governmental power in Niger and a territorial conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo – while two previously recorded conflicts (in Mali and Pakistan) were restarted by new actors. Latent conflicts that reignite or escalate after one or more years of very low intensity constitute the predominant form of warfare in the world today.

Among the grants received in 2008 by the Centre, most noteworthy were those for Ragnhild Nordås & Kazuhiro Obayashi’s project on “Mobilization and Modus Operandi of Rebel Groups” (from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs); Åshild Falch’s research on “Why Does Peace Remain Elusive in Burundi?” (from NOREF); and Kaare Strøm & Scott Gates’s research on “Power-Sharing, Agency and Civil Conflict” (from the US National Science Foundation).

CSCW continued to be active in advising policymakers in 2008. In collaboration with the International Centre for Geohazards at the Norwegian Geotechnical Institute and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), an assessment of natural and conflict-related hazards in the Asia-Pacific region was developed. This will help OCHA in shaping its disaster-mitigation policies to include the problems of latent conflict. Another area where CSCW manifested the policy relevance of its research was in relation to power-sharing – a frequently prescribed arrangement aimed at reducing the risk of civil conflict by guaranteeing potentially warring parties a role in a country’s government. With support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, CSCW conducted research in six African countries and found that the degree to which power-sharing agreements are able to promote civil peace depends on the relative military capacity of the fighting parties, as well as on the potential role of “spoilers”. A principal conclusion was therefore that power-sharing should not be prescribed universally.

Power-Sharing

Power-sharing arrangements – such as grand coalitions, supermajority requirements, proportionality in political and administrative bodies, and segmental autonomy – aim to reduce the risk of civil conflict by guaranteeing potentially warring parties a role in a country’s government, thus lessening the stakes of political contestation.

In 2007 and 2008, CSCW researchers looked at five countries in Africa to investigate the effects of power-sharing agreements. Significant differences exist between the five countries studied with regard both to the implementation of power-sharing and the rationale for adopting such institutions.

Examination of the countries yielded valuable lessons as to how power-sharing has performed with regard to conflict prevention, peacebuilding and good governance. Power-sharing is not a universal remedy that will suit all conflict situations. Primarily, the warring factions need to be of relatively equal size. Another important conclusion drawn from the countries studied is that power-sharing has been more effective in ending violence than in promoting good governance.

Conflict Prevention

In Kenya, the power-sharing arrangement established in 2008 did prevent political violence from escalating into civil war, which clearly was a possible outcome at the time. The fact that the incumbent president believed he could get away with electoral fraud indicates that the Kenyan judiciary is not sufficiently independent to prosecute the office of the presidency. Under such circumstances, a grand coalition agreement appears to be a good alternative.

In Nigeria, power-sharing has been used to keep the country together and to discourage secessions. While this effort has to some extent failed, the country has avoided sliding into full-scale civil war. Ideally, federalism should hinder the centre from becoming too strong and distribute power equally between the states. Unfortunately, in Nigeria, the political system is very centralized and highly corrupt.

Conflict Resolution and Durable Peace

In Liberia, the transitional grand coalition delivered on its most important task, taking the country from civil war (1989–2003) to democratic elections. In Sierra Leone, the failure of power-sharing triggered a response from third parties that effectively ended the war (1991–2002). In both cases, heavy third-party security guarantees were critical in achieving peace. Also in both cases, peace has been durable.

Burundi’s three power-sharing arrangements failed to include all the parties to the conflict, and thus provoked the prolongation of the civil war (1994–2005). However, the most recent power-sharing agreement has been fairly successful with regards to diminishing the country’s ethnic divisions. With the inclusion of the last rebel group in 2008, there is now hope for durable peace also in this country.

Good Governance

Several of the countries examined are better governed today than they have been traditionally. The conflicts in Liberia and Sierra Leone were both rooted in previous regimes’ bad governance. However, both countries have made real progress since their conflicts ended, though the contribution of their previous power-sharing arrangements to that end remains unclear.

The development of the federal structure in Nigeria has in some instances been an obstacle for power-sharing rather than a stabilizing factor.

The grand coalition government in Kenya is slated to tackle a number of divisive issues in the coming years, including constitutional review, prosecution of alleged perpetrators and land reform. These issues will put the coalition to a test.

Lessons learned

Four of the five countries have had examples of some form of grand coalition government. Such arrangements have primarily been introduced to hinder spoiler problems.

We find that inclusive power-sharing institutions are most effective when they are set up as transitional governments terminating with free and fair elections. The lessons from Liberia, particularly when contrasted with those from Burundi, indicate that allocating a role for civil society in this process also improves the chances of a positive outcome.

Yet, several of these countries could also benefit from improved post-election protection of political competition to promote good governance, through institutions such as independent courts and electoral commissions. In Burundi, for instance, the party that won the previous election enjoys control over the government, the parliament and the constitutional court – a combination that is detrimental to the future of democracy in that country.

The project was supported by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and resulted in six reports and eight policy briefs. The reports will form the basis of an edited volume on power-sharing in Africa.
Mapping Natural Disasters and Armed Conflict

As part of a team led by the Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI), CSCW researchers analysed the risks of natural and conflict hazards in the Asia-Pacific region, along with levels of exposure of the region’s populations to those risks. The main objectives of the project were to identify areas in Asia-Pacific with high levels of future risk of natural disaster and conflict, and to develop a simple methodology that would enable policymakers and practitioners to update the project’s risk assessments in the future. CSCW researchers Halvard Buhaug, Åshild Falch, Scott Gates and Siri Aas Rustad supplied the necessary conflict analysis for the project.

About two-thirds of the world’s deaths from natural disaster occur in Asia, which further hosts nearly half of today’s armed conflicts. Also, while the world as a whole has seen a significant decline in the frequency of armed conflicts since the early 1990s, there has been little discernible evidence of this trend within Asia. Acknowledging this, the Bangkok regional office of the UN’s Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) funded the present research team to assess the challenges in the region. Alongside CSCW and NGI, members of the team came from the Earth Institute at Columbia University, UNEP/GRID-Europe, and Stene & Lahidji SARL. The final report and main findings of the project were presented to OCHA at a seminar in Bangkok in January 2009 that included participants from various UN agencies, NGOs, embassies and academic institutions.

The conflict component of the project consisted of three parts: a country-level assessment of conflict risk in the Asia-Pacific region; a subnational conflict assessment for high-priority countries; and an assessment of population exposure in high-risk areas. In the first stage, a country-level statistical analysis of conflict prevalence based on global empirical data for the period 1951–2004 served to establish the relative influence and magnitude of country characteristics. The regression coefficients from this analysis were then combined with updated information on the independent factors to produce up-to-date estimates of conflict likelihood within the next calendar year. This showed considerable intraregional variation in predicted probability of conflict. Some countries appeared very unlikely to undergo civil conflict within the next year whereas a handful of other countries were almost certain to experience conflict. A notable absence of countries in the middle-risk zone reflected the polarized characteristics of the region: A number of countries are currently undergoing conflict (India, Burma/Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand) or have just escaped from it (Nepal and Indonesia), while the remaining countries of the region have avoided conflict for more than a decade.

Despite their prevalence in quantitative research on civil war, country-level assessments can be misleading. This is particularly true for geographically large countries, because levels of conflict-promoting factors such as poverty and political exclusion often vary considerably within country boundaries. Indeed, the fact that the majority of the territories of India, Indonesia and Thailand are unaffected by the violence currently affecting those countries and might not be considered particularly exposed is completely concealed by the aggregate results. From a policy or practitioner perspective, knowing where conflict is within a given country will quickly become crucial information. Hence, the main challenge of this project was to conduct a subnational assessment of conflict likelihood for countries of particular concern to OCHA.

The subnational conflict risk assessment was conducted at the level of the first-order administrative district for 12 high-priority countries in the region. Four factors were considered important in this regard: socio-economic status, ethno-political exclusion, location vis-à-vis the capital and prior conflict history. From these factors, a country-specific conflict-risk index was constructed, expressing the estimated probability of observing armed conflict relative to the least conflict-prone region in the country. To allow comparison between countries, the relative scores were then joined with the estimates from the national conflict-risk analysis. The map below presents the subnational results visually, providing a nuanced picture of where armed conflict is more likely in relation to a country-level assessment. In fact, a national conflict-prediction map would show all of India in bright red owing to the very high likelihood of conflict in the remote northeastern and northwestern parts of that country.

Finally, the population levels of the subnational regions were taken into account to provide an overview of the potential number of people at risk of armed conflict. For OCHA, knowing the joint impacts of conflict risk, on the one hand, and the size of an exposed population, on the other, is crucial for the preparation and prioritization of future relief operations.

In the map below you can see the 12 countries with a later addition of China, Burma/Myanmar and Bhutan.

Estimated subnational risk of conflict
Civil war continues to be a major cause of suffering in the developing world. The post-conflict situation — that is, the situation during the first ten years following the termination of a conflict — is increasingly important in efforts to reduce the incidence of civil war.

In 2008, CSCW Associate Håvard Hegre, together with Ibrahim Ebadawi and Gary Milante, guest edited a special issue of *Journal of Peace Research* (vol. 45, no. 4, July 2008) on the Aftermath of Civil War, following a research project funded by the World Bank and the Research Council of Norway.

The introductory article of this special issue demonstrates the increasing importance of the post-conflict situation for actors involved in efforts to reduce the global incidence of armed conflict. The number of ongoing conflicts in the world saw a steady increase from 1950 onwards, reaching a peak in 1991–92. Since then, the world has seen a remarkable decrease in the number of such conflicts. This encouraging trend, however, may have faltered. The editors of the special issue discuss three plausible explanations for such a change. The first is that an increase in the share of recurrences of conflict is the result of a decrease in the number of entirely new conflicts. A second explanation is that there has been an accumulation of conflicts up to a point where no conflict reasonably can be seen as unrelated to past ones. A third — and less optimistic — potential explanation is that conflicts have become harder to end in recent years.

**The Articles**
The remaining articles in the special issue investigate the importance of peacekeeping troops, elections, aid, capital flight, and exclusion of parties from peace agreements in post-conflict situations.

Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler & Måns Söderbom analyse the risk of civil-war relapse in post-conflict situations. While higher post-conflict income and faster growth significantly reduce the risk of such a relapse, democratization and post-conflict elections are found to be associated with higher risks, not lower ones. High peacekeeping expenditure was also found to significantly reduce the risk of further conflict.

Desirée Nilsson evaluates the claim that all-inclusive peace agreements are more likely to see peace prevail than agreements that exclude one or more actors. The evidence supports her argument signatories to a peace agreement are more likely to keep the peace than non-signatories. The results further show that, while peace agreements that leave out one or more actors are likely to see the overall peace break down owing to violence involving excluded parties, the exclusion of actors does not influence whether signatories to a peace agreement stick to an agreed peace.

Indra de Soysa & Eric Neumayer explore the relationship between ethnic diversity and military spending as a means to avoid civil conflict. They find that militarization is inversely related to ethnic diversity, which suggests that preventive militarization cannot explain the reduced risk of conflict in ethnically diverse societies. Their work supports previous findings that militarization does not crowd out public services, suggesting that the underprovision of public goods in highly fractionalized societies is more likely due to failure to reach a consensus and lack of coordination.

Victor Davies studies the relationship between inflation and capital flight in a post-conflict environment. He argues that the effect of inflation on capital flight should be particularly strong in post-conflict economies, and finds strong support for this hypothesis. The key implication is that low inflation helps to stem and reverse capital-flight flows in post-conflict countries.

Aderoju Oyejusi analyses the probability of rebel participation by youths in three states (Bayelsa, Delta, Rivers) from the oil-rich Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Youths in communities located close to oil fields, at some distance from the state capital, and with a low endowment of social infrastructure are more likely to see a willingness to join rebel groups. Recruits in rebel movements are likely to be individuals with lower income levels, lower educational attainment, asset immobility, no marital bonds, or hail from the dominant ethnic group in the Niger Delta.

Finally, Colin Jennings & Hein Roelfsema propose a model of centralized and decentralized decisionmaking for two rival groups investing in conspicuous public goods in a single state. The authors explore these results in the context of Northern Ireland and the breakup of the former republic of Yugoslavia. In the first case, the authors argue that centralization has resulted in the election of more extreme leaders as voters engage in strategic voting under a centralized system. The authors also contend that, following the breakup of the republic of Yugoslavia, more moderate leaders were elected in Serbia and Croatia.
Recent International Criminal Court (ICC) indictments in relation to Sudan, Uganda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have attracted a degree of controversy. Advocates argue that international trials set a precedent for international law and accountability, and that international justice is essential for ensuring peace and respect for human rights, as well as for strengthening democracy and the rule of law. Opponents argue that ICC indictments interfere with peace efforts and stand in the way of obtaining negotiated settlements to the respective conflicts.

The effects of post-conflict justice (PCJ) efforts can be addressed empirically. In order to ascertain how post-conflict societies address the wrongdoings of past political violence, a dataset of PCJ processes has been developed by CSCW researchers. Motivated by the transitional justice literature – and in particular by Jon Elster’s (2004) book Closing the Books (New York: Cambridge University Press), which focuses on processes of democratization – the focus of the PCJ project at CSCW has been on transitions to peace.

PCJ efforts include trials, truth commissions, compensation of victims, purges and exile and amnesty. In light of its positive standing, some people claim that PCJ efforts are more widely employed today than is actually the case. Also, there is little evidence to suggest that certain forms of PCJ dominate or are more popular at particular times than others. However, there is a slight variation here, such as the spikes in offers of amnesty surrounding the end of the Cold War but no real trend favouring one effort over the other is discernible.

Different types of PCJ correspond with the different ways in which wars are brought to an end. The accompanying figure shows that PCJ efforts tend to be most associated with victory by one side of a conflict. Indeed, trials may be viewed as the pre-eminent form of ‘victor’s justice’. In contrast, the use of non-PCJ policies – exile and amnesty – is most often evident when wars are formally settled through negotiation. Providing compensation for the victims of a conflict is most likely to occur after a negotiated settlement. Armed conflicts involving neither a clear victor nor a negotiated settlement, but terminated nonetheless, exhibit a mix of trials, amnesties and exiles.

The data compiled in this project provide opportunities for empirically exploring the role of judicial mechanisms and conflict over time. They cover all terminated armed conflicts with at least 25 annual battle-related deaths during the period 1946–2006, drawing on the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Database version 4-2007. This dataset offers conflict scholars the chance to include PCJ variables in their analyses or, alternatively, permits PCJ scholars to use armed conflict data to test outstanding hypotheses on PCJ implementation and outcomes. The dataset includes 357 post-conflict situations for the specified period. The PCJ efforts in our dataset were implemented either internationally or domestically, but constitute attempts to address violence related specifically to a particular conflict. In addition to the presence or absence of a PCJ effort, the target of the PCJ is also recorded.

The ongoing project involved CSCW researchers Helga Malmin Binningsbø, Jon Elster, Scott Gates and Cyanne E. Loyle.
CSCW Working Groups

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

Important dynamics of civil wars transgress national boundaries. External factors can be international, such as engagement of one state in another’s conflicts, or they can be transnational, as when armed groups mobilize across borders or when new norms, ideas and practices spread from one conflict location to another. This working group is committed to theoretical development, addressing insights and limitations in both the transnational and international relations literatures. Our methods include case studies, small-n comparative studies and large-n quantitative studies. The group draws on a rich variety of empirical sources, from ethnographic work and elite interviews to historical archives to datasets. Ultimately, we aim to understand how ‘external’ forces and actors shape internal armed conflict.

Microfoundations of Civil War
Leader: Jon Elster, Columbia University

Focusing on the individual decisions that lead to the initiation, continuation or cessation of civil war, this working group seeks to identify how root causes of civil war shape the motivations and constraints of individual action. Centrally important is what one might call the ‘hermeneutic problem’ of identifying motivations of leaders and followers in insurgency movements. How to impute motivations when statements about motivation may themselves be motivated? The group will look at what role religion plays in civil war, and it will study belief formation more generally in a civil war setting.

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

This group defines the environment in the broad sense of physical factors that condition human affairs, such as distance, mountains, rivers, forest cover and availability of natural resources. Environmental factors play an important role in assessing neomalthusian vs. ‘cornucopian’ theories of conflict. What are the effects of resource scarcity and abundance? Is climate change associated with conflict? What role does cooperation play vs. conflict in a situation of scarcity? We also consider the demographic aspect of neomalthusian concerns, as well as ethnic distinctions as potential causes of conflict and as convenient ways of organizing conflicts.

Civil Conflict and Economic Performance
Leader: Karl Ove Moene, University of Oslo

This working group aims at integrating the role of conflicts for economic performance and the role of economic conditions for the onset of conflicts within formal economic models. This is an important challenge. It implies a widening of the scope of economics to integrate social issues and things that really matter. The group’s research agenda is built on an implicit criticism of technocratic mainstream economics for its lack of a coherent treatment of conflicts and neglect of social mechanisms. In contrast, this group tries to make a case for analysis that combines social and economic factors while acknowledging their interdependence. The working group is a ‘joint venture’ of CSCW and of the Centre of Excellence at the University of Oslo on Equality, Social Organization, and Performance (ESOP).

Values and Violence
Leader: Ola Listhaug, NTNU

Our study of values, attitudes and public opinion looks at violent societies and generally peaceful societies, as well as countries undergoing a transition away from violence. The main aim is to demonstrate if and how values are related to violence in societies. One important empirical focus is the impact of religion, but we also study tolerance, trust, prejudice and respect for human rights, and how these values vary between countries and relate to conflicts between groups within societies. In post-war societies we study values to assess the strength of latent conflict.

Civil Peace
Leader: Kaare Strøm, UCSD

The main aim of this group is to explore the conditions that constitute and promote civil peace. This entails analyzing the processes of conflict resolution as well as the social, economic and political conditions that lead to civil peace. To better understand long-term peacebuilding, we focus on the development of institutions that can serve to mitigate or supplant the conditions that cause and sustain armed civil conflict, for instance transitional governance, transitional justice and various forms of power-sharing.

Human Rights, Governance and Conflict
Leader: Sabine Carey, University of Nottingham

Conflict and human rights violations are closely intertwined. During a civil war, torture and political killings are particularly common. But governing structures also affect the respect of governments for the human rights of their citizens. This working group aims to disentangle the triangular relationship between human rights, governance and conflict. In particular, we focus on the role of human rights and governing structures during the escalation of conflict, their contribution to the severity and duration of conflict, and their role in establishing a viable and secure peace after the cessation of warfare.

Dynamics of Institutional Change and Conflict
Leader: Håvard Hegre, PRIO

This working group studies the interplay of the processes of civil war onset and termination, changes to political institutions, and the societal changes brought about by ‘modernization’. These changes have closely related explanations. Democracies fail to prevent conflict in the developing world in part because they are vulnerable to reversals to authoritarian rule – often by means of violence. Similarly, democratization is a political conflict that sometimes turns violent. Socio-economic factors affect strategies and goals of the parties to the political conflict. At the same time, political stability affects societal changes. The group brings together specialists on different aspects of this nexus, and also seeks to identify institutions that may lift countries out of the ‘conflict trap’.
Editorial Boards with CSCW participation in 2008

American Journal of Political Science
Cooperation and Conflict
European Journal of Philosophy
European Political Science
Foreign Policy Analysis
Globalizations
Government and opposition
Inquiry
Internasjonal Politikk
International Interactions
International Political Sociology
International Studies Perspectives
International Studies Quarterly
International Studies Review
Journal of Military Ethics
Journal of Peace Research
Norsk Statsvitenskapelige Tidsskrift
Pacific Focus
Peace review
Philosophy of the Social Sciences
Political Analysis
Political Geography
Scandinavian Political Studies
Social Science Information
Theory and Decisions
The primary focus of this dissertation is academic and political optimism related to the creation of a more peaceful world through the spread of democracy. The dissertation argues that such optimism is premature so long as the spatial validity and theoretical arguments of the ‘democratic peace’ remain untested and underdeveloped. Building on the assumption that domestic politics can constrain foreign policy decision making, the dissertation develops a theoretical framework that emphasizes the relevance of institutions for decisions about conflict. It argues that democratic institutional subsystems such as electoral, executive, and federal systems, constitute constraining mechanisms in relation to foreign policy decision making. Drawing on the researcher’s own collection of data on institutional indicators during 1816–2002, the project’s empirical analysis suggests that the institutional setup of individual democracies does affect their conflict behaviour at the international level, with electoral systems having the strongest and most consistent impact. The thesis shows that the associations between democratic institutions and international conflict are unique in each geographical region, and that they change over time. In the light of recent trends in the growth of democracy and democratic institutions, the project suggests that prospects for increased levels of peace vary considerably between regions. It concludes with a warning that ‘zones of conflict’ may develop alongside ‘regional zones of peace’ in regions characterized by large numbers of autocratic states if democratizing states in those regions adopt the most conflict-promot ing institutions.

**Ongoing Doctoral Projects**

**Conflict and Cooperation in International River Basins**
Marit Brochmann
Dissertation Supervisors: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO/NTNU) & Håvard Hege (UIO/CSCW)

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 process – with conflict and cooperation studied together instead of separately. More specifically, the project examines whether countries that share rivers interact more – whether positively or negatively. It also investigates 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, it will look at specific water disagreements and whether or not they become militarized.

**Prospects for the Future: Towards Civilizational Clashes?**
Tanja Ellingsen
Dissertation Advisers: Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRIO/NTNU) & Øyvind Østerud (UIO)

Samuel Huntington’s ‘clash of civilizations’ thesis suggests that post-Cold War conflicts are shaped by cultural dissimilarities, and that the nation-state is being replaced by religion as a source of identity. Testing the validity of such 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 Value Survey, the Penn World Tables, UN General Assembly records (voting data), and the Correlates of War and Uppsala/PRIO conflict datasets.

**Post-Conflict Peace: Political Inclusion and Pardon or Preclusion and Punishment?**
Helga Malmin Binningel
Dissertation Supervisors: Scott Gates (PRION/NTNU) & Nils Petter Gleditsch (PRION/NTNU)

This project investigates how various institutional arrangements affect peace in countries ravaged by civil war. In this context, one relevant question is how post-conflict societies address wrongdoings committed during war – whether justice efforts emphasizing punishment or pardon, or both, are employed, and whether the use of such mechanisms hinders resumption of violence. Rebel groups are also frequently appealed through inclusion in political decision making, and the PhD project studies how political power-sharing influences post-conflict peace. Further; the project investigates the often neglected role of resource management, especially wealth-sharing, in efforts to terminate civil war. In addition to statistically analysing the influence of post-conflict justice, power-sharing and wealth-sharing on post-conflict stability, the project conducts an in-depth analysis of the 1999 Lomé peace agreement to examine how power-sharing and wealth-sharing contributed to a peaceful resolution of the civil war in Sierra Leone.

**Civil War Society: Southern Sudan, 1955–2004**
Øystein H. Rolandsen
Dissertation Supervisors: Endre Stiansen (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) & Helge Pharo (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 violence and the state in Africa. The project utilizes rich empirical material from fieldwork and unpublished sources spanning the time from Sudan’s independence until the 2005 peace agreement. The project will be concluded with a series of articles.

**Health Effects of Civil War**
Christin M. Otnhauug
Dissertation Supervisors: Espen Sjøastad (Noragric), Håvard Hege (PRION/UiO) & Ingrid Nyborg (Noragric)

Much conflict research has focused on why civil conflicts break out and how they are sustained, but less attention has been paid to the consequences they have on afflicted populations. While more men are usually killed in battle, research indicates that women are more affected by the long-term, indirect legacies of war. This project aims at investigating how civil conflict has affected maternal and child health in selected Sub-Saharan African countries, through the use of household survey data paired with disaggregated conflict data in addition to field work.
Explaining Foreign Interventions in Civil Wars: Mechanisms of Transnational Ethnic Affinities

Pablo Kalmanovitz
Dissertation Supervisors: Jeffrey T. Checkel (Simon Fraser University/CSCW) & Scott Gates (PRIO)

Civil wars have a way of attracting foreign interventions. According to one count, external countries intervened in 89 of 138 civil wars during the period 1944–94. Though the correlates of intervention are manifold, this project deals with one in particular: transnational ethnic affinities. Several studies suggest that transnational ethnic affinities are associated with interventions in civil wars. When parties to civil wars have co-ethnic kin in other countries, the involvement of those countries is more likely. Although ample theoretical and comparative work supports the notion that transnational ethnic affinities are associated with interventions, it remains an empirical regularity in need of explanation. This project begins the search for such an explanation. Its central question is thus: By what mechanisms are third-party military interventions in civil wars linked with transnational ethnic affinities?

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 access to political authority and the exercise of that 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 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 Supervisors: Jon Elster (Columbia University/CSCW) & Thomas Pogge (Yale University)

Contemporary just war theorizing has focused primarily on questions of just cause of war (ius ad bellum) and rightful conduct of war (jus in bello), primarily on questions of just cause of war (jus ad bellum) and rightful conduct of war (jus in bello), tending to neglect the question of how wars ought to end (ius post bellum). What should be the guiding principles of justice in the aftermath of war? This project focuses on issues of corrective justice, that is, on claims of punishment and reparation due after harmful actions in war. Particular consideration is given to the institutional division of labour between the national and transnational orders in the implementation of principles of corrective justice.

Religion and Civil Conflict

Ragnhild Nordas
Dissertation Supervisors: Ola Listhaug (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 modelling interactions of explanatory variables with a focus on the contexts in which religion becomes important.

Resources and Peace: Power-Sharing and Wealth-Sharing in Post-Conflict Situations

Siri Aas Rustad
Dissertation Supervisors: Scott Gates (PRIO) & Håvard Hegre (Uio/CSCW)

The project seeks to examine under what conditions wealth-sharing and power-sharing can most effectively help foster civil peace and stability. Power-sharing and wealth-sharing can help reduce the threat of conflict by giving all potential conflictual parties a stake in peaceful cooperation, along with a set of mutual guarantees of security and basic interests. The project focuses particularly on Nigeria, and on how Nigeria’s oil wealth and the wealth-sharing arrangements dealing with it have contributed to conflicts in that country.

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. Such studies, however, tend to focus exclusively on inter-individual inequality, ignoring the importance of group identity. This project will analyze 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, along with case studies of particular countries.

The Economic Effects of Democracy and Dictatorship

Carl Henrik Knutsen
Dissertation Advisers: Håvard Hegre (Uio/CSCW) & Helge Hveem (UiO)

How do political institutions affect economic outcomes? This project explores differences between democracies and dictatorships, with a particular focus on how these political systems affect economic growth and other economic variables, such as physical and human capital formation. The project also explores the relationship between differences in economic outcomes and different types of dictatorships, as well as how contextual factors affect economic policy in dictatorships. At the theoretical level, the project aspires to isolate and examine different channels and mechanisms, through which political institutions affect for example economic growth, but also engage in clarification of interrelations between different mechanisms through the construction of formal models. The empirical work consists mainly of statistical analysis related to the different subtopics examined, but also includes structured comparative studies of selected countries. The project also deals with issues related to the conceptualization and measurement of democracy.

Democratic Values in Southeast Europe

Karín Dyrstad
Dissertation Advisers: Ola Listhaug (NTNU/CSCW)

Democracy has been expanding rapidly since the collapse of the Soviet Union, although some of the new democracies remain rather fragile. For the states of the former Republic of Yugoslavia, democracy is important both in its own right and as a building block towards a peaceful Balkan region. The aim of the project is to analyze to what extent citizens of former Yugoslavia share democratic values like tolerance and trust, compared to other Europeans, and to examine the effect of conflict upon individual attitudes and behaviour. The project will be based on individual survey data, together with context variables for both the regional and the national level.

Climate Changes, Natural Disasters and the Risk of Violence in India

Rune Slettebak
Dissertation Advisers: Indra de Soyja (NTNU/CSCW) & Henrik Urdal (PRIO)

This project investigates whether natural disasters may have caused increased levels of conflict in India in the past. Bearing in mind warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that natural disasters can be expected to increase in strength and frequency in coming years, the project focuses on climate-related disasters, such as droughts, floods and storms. Given the relevance of climate changes, considerations of whether past patterns can be used to predict future trends is an integral part of the project.
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In addition, over 40 conference papers were presented by CSCW staff in 2008.
CSCW Projects in 2008

- A New Agenda for European Security Economics (EUSECON) (4), (1)
- Armed Conflict Location and Events Dataset (ACLED) (6)
- Balkan Conferences (2), (1)
- Why does peace remain elusive in Burundi? (7)
- Prediction and Policy Evaluation in Conflict Research (1)
- CSCW Data Management, Training, Cross-Cutting and Centre Office (1)
- Disaggregating the Study of Civil War (OYI) (2), (1)
- Geographical Representations of War (GROW) (5), (1)
- Going Home to Fight? Explaining Refugee Return and Violence (2)
- Kaushik Roy – Military History (1)
- Natural hazards and civil conflicts in Asian countries (8), (1)
- Nepal Research Papers (3)
- NORAD Result Reports 2008 (9)
- Polarisation and Conflict (PAC) (4), (1)
- Political Demography (2), (1)
- Political Institutions, Development and a Domestic Civil Peace (OYI) (2), (1), (13)
- Power Sharing Agreements, Negotiations and Peace Processes (3), (1)
- Power-sharing Agency and Civil Conflict (10)
- Religion and Civil War (1)
- Resources and peace: Power Sharing and Wealth Sharing in Post-Conflict Situations (11)
- Social Implications of Climate Change (6)
- State Failure and Regional Insecurity (2)
- The Payoff of Promises - Articulating, Negotiating and Implementing Wealth Sharing (2), (1), (12), (13)
- Youth Exclusion and Political Violence (6)

Project funders:
(1) Research Council of Norway – CSCW Core Grant
(2) Research Council of Norway
(3) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
(4) European Union
(5) European Science Foundation
(6) World Bank
(7) Norwegian Peace Building centre
(8) OCHA/Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI)
(9) Christian Michelsens Institute/NORAD
(10) National Science Foundation (NSF)
(11) Research council of Norway – PRIO Core Grant
(12) Nordiska Afrikainstitutet
(13) Other Sources

CSCW grant profile 2008 excluding CoE Core

Total turnover in 2008 was 25 056 000 NOK. The CoE counts for 42% of this, and the cart represents the remaining 58%. Total person-year effort came to 20.7.
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 distinction 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 CoE’s. CSCW secured a second 5 year period of funding after the evaluation, again receiving top scores from the referees.

A young girl in Haiti. Photo: Wenche Hauge