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Civil conflict remains by far the most common form of armed conflict. During a seminar held in connection with PRIO’s 50th anniversary celebrations in 2009, Peter Wallenstein released the updated data gathered by the Uppsala University Armed Conflict Data Program. In addition, this update on conflict in the world was reported in the 2009 annual data feature in *Journal of Peace Research*, ‘Armed Conflicts, 1946–2008’ by Lotta Harbom & Peter Wallensteen. Wars and conflicts in 2009 are still being assessed and verified. At the end of 2008, for the entire world there were 36 armed conflicts (involving at least 25 battle-related casualties) being fought in 26 different countries. Five of these conflicts exceeded 1,000 battle deaths, a threshold that is often used to distinguish a war from other forms of armed conflict. In 2008, for the first time since 2004, an armed conflict broke out between two states, Eritrea and Djibouti. This constitutes the first interstate conflict in four years. All other conflicts are classified as intra-state or internationalized intra-state conflict.

Among the new grants awarded to the Centre during 2009, most noteworthy were those for the following projects: ‘Advanced Conflict Data Catalogue’ (Research Council of Norway); ‘Armed Conflict in the Mideast North Africa Region’ (World Bank); ‘Con-
Children tend to be recruited in brutal, long-running civil wars – the kind that simmer for years, or even decades.

To coincide with the book’s launch, an op-ed piece by the two editors appeared in Foreign Policy and Dagbladet. Below is an abridged version.

**Child soldiering is a human rights issue.** It’s much more than that. It is also a geostrategic and a development issue. Child soldiers are usually depicted as victims. That’s accurate: child soldiers are truly casualties of war. But, they’re also assailants. Child soldiers are cheap and efficient weapons in asymmetric warfare. Trained and educated in the ways of guerrilla warfare, many child combatants grow up in a world in which brutality is the norm. The result is a violent gift that goes on giving. In addition to inducing psychological trauma, a violent childhood as a young soldier reduces healthy educational opportunities, leaving militancy the only viable career path in later years. War becomes a way of life.

**There are 300,000 child soldiers in the world.** Who knows? No one has ever made a serious attempt to survey the world’s child-soldier population. This commonly cited figure was touted by members of several different child advocacy groups in the mid-1990s as a way of attracting attention to the plight of child soldiers. What would be more useful than a global figure, however, would be an assessment on a country-by-country basis. Having 300,000 child soldiers in a world of 6 billion matters far less than having 5% of a particular country’s adolescent population engaged in soldiering.

**Most child soldiers are African boys.** Not even close. You can forget about the popular image that the phrase ‘child soldier’ evokes, that of a pre-adolescent African boy, perhaps doped, wielding an AK-47, with anger burning in his eyes. Many child soldiers are not armed combatants. So great is the diversity of tasks in which children are involved that many advocates now prefer the less punchy but more accurate term ‘children associated with fighting forces’. Nor does the gender distinction hold water. Recent studies estimate that girls make up as much as 40% of the fighters in some armed groups.

More than 70 military organizations in 19 countries around the world recruited and used children in armed hostilities between 2004 and 2007. Burma/Myanmar is among the largest users of child soldiers in the world, with the government and rebel groups recruiting tens of thousands of children between them.

**Globalization created child soldiering.** Wrong. Child soldiering is often portrayed as something new, a product of the post-Cold War flow of cheap guns and money to the world’s most failed states. In fact, child soldiers have been around for millennia. What has changed is our awareness of child soldiers, boosted by monitoring, reporting and even Hollywood spectacle. And this has coincided with a dramatic change in perceptions of childhood, at least in the industrialized West, where early years are now seen as a sacred time reserved for innocence, learning and play.

**Child soldiers are no match for Western military forces.** Only in conventional combat. Asymmetric conflicts, however, are another story. Take, for instance, suicide bombing, which child soldiers have carried out in Iraq, Sri Lanka and Chechnya. Face-to-face with child soldiers in battle, Western military forces are often also befuddled as to what to do. Should they engage, retreat, surrender or attempt to disarm?

**Our current approach to ending child soldiering is working.** You wish. The international community primarily deals with child soldiers through ‘naming and shaming’, deterrence (prosecuting adult recruiters) and demobilization (taking away the children’s guns and sending them home). None of these approaches goes far enough. In the first case, prosecutors hope to set an example for future would-be offenders. Unfortunately, however, most recruiters believe they will not get caught. Others, knowing that only those who lose the fight get hauled before international courts, desperately employ child soldiers to avoid defeat. Still others assume they will be granted amnesty after a ceasefire.

Sending children home, via disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes, is another favourite method of post-conflict planners. These programmes are meant to get children out of armies and back where they belong – in schools or in jobs. But, results are mixed. Many organizers make the mistake of excluding girls from their programmes and often fail to understand local economies, with the result that they train children for the wrong professions. And many programmes fail to target the roots of intergenerational violence that will long outlast the active fighting. Furthermore, DDR initiatives are often too short-term to do much more than provide superficial training.

The biggest challenge of all in ending child soldiering lies in the types of conflicts that employ the young. Children tend to be recruited in brutal, long-running civil wars – the kind that simmer for years, or even decades. Unfortunately, such wars constitute the main form of armed conflict today. Until they stop, the recruitment of children will continue.

Think Again!

In 2009, the book *Child Soldiers in the Age of Fractured States* – co-edited by Scott Gates, CSCW director, and Simon Reich, director of the Division of Global Affairs at Rutgers University – was published by the University of Pittsburgh Press.
India is in a state of civil war!
Yes, well, it’s complicated. Civil war and related concepts such as state failure have traditionally been studied at the level of the nation-state, where states at large are either ‘at war’ or not.

Merely a cursory glance at actual civil wars, however, reveals that violence rarely engulfs entire states, but typically occurs in confined areas (e.g. Kashmir in India and Chechnya in Russia), with other areas within a state, such as capital cities, often at relative peace. Likewise, ‘failing’ states do not go from being fully effective over their entire territories to completely ineffective: state capacity can be a matter of degree, with states being more or less effective in certain areas or domains of their territories. In spite of this, most existing studies treat civil war as an aggregate outcome at the level of the state, ignoring all variation within states, actors and regions experiencing conflict. Comparative studies at the country level can be misleading, while in-depth case studies are unsuited to identifying and ranking general patterns.

A special issue of the Journal of Conflict Resolution on ‘Disaggregating Civil Wars’ (vol. 53, no. 4, August 2009), guest-edited by CSCW associates Lars-Érik Cederman and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, attempts to overcome the prevalent aggregation problem. The issue includes six empirical papers – five of them co-authored by CSCW researchers and associates – and is a product of a three-year European Science Foundation-sponsored project involving ETH Zurich, the University of Essex and CSCW. The various contributions show how advances in data collection and analytical methods, in particular the use of geographic information systems (GIS), permit the transformation of geographical information into formats amenable for disaggregated statistical analysis. Three forms of disaggregation are demonstrated: Two articles focus on ethnic groups, identifying specific demographic and ethno-political constellations that may lead to outbreaks of armed conflict, as well as instances where relations are less likely to become violent (Cederman, Buhaug & Rød; Weidmann). Another two articles study features specific to conflict cases. Disaggregation at the level of conflicts allows for more detailed analyses of actor constellations and conflict characteristics, enabling evaluation of how these influence prospects for settlements, the duration of violence and the likelihood of specific outcomes (Buhaug, Gates & Lujala; Cunningham, Gleditsch & Salehyan). The final articles explore spatial units within country cases, acknowledging that countries typically display large variation within their territories. Geo-referenced data at the level of e.g. provinces vastly improve our ability to identify and understand underlying processes that could be attributed to particular geographic, demographic, ethnographic and economic attributes at the local level (Hegre, Østby & Raleigh; Beardsley & McQuinn).

What substantive lessons can be learnt from this? First, the most important theme relates to the importance of geography. Without assuming a deterministic impact, the contributions document different ways in which the locations of groups and actors matter for patterns of political violence, especially by influencing the relative fighting capacities of governmental and non-state organizations and the prospects for an early conflict resolution. Second, our findings indicate that claims about the alleged irrelevance of ethnic configurations for the outbreak of civil war are mistaken, and that many empirical findings held to establish their irrelevance can be attributed to over-aggregation. When e.g. political status is measured for ethnic groups, empirical analyses show that both exclusion and mobilization have a significant influence on conflict behaviour. Third, the specific organizational form and characteristics of rebel groups matter. Larger excluded groups tend to have more resources to extract concessions from governments and may thus resort to violence if not given acceptable offers. But large demographic size does not always translate into effective power if several competing organizations claim to represent a constituency and groups are undermined by factional infighting. Small but cohesive organizations may be disproportionately likely to fight, although they tend to fight shorter conflicts and are more likely to be offered some concessions relatively quickly. In contrast, groups that mount tenacious resistance in the periphery, but have only limited ability to inflict damage on a central government, tend to get involved in long, intractable conflicts.
A Research Council of Norway-supported project entitled ‘State Failure and Regional Insecurity’ was completed last year. The aim of the project was to explore the linkages between state failure and regional security issues. The main outcome is the publication of a volume of Comparative Social Research in 2010, in which one of the articles takes a particular look at Afghanistan. More specifically, the article explores how the country is situated at the interface of three regional security complexes, each with strong security dynamics of its own. One implication is that neighbouring states that are engaged in Afghanistan may be primarily motivated by security concerns within their own regions. This has serious implications for the possibility of fostering a concerted regional effort to secure Afghanistan’s future.

Another Research Council-supported project, ‘Going Home To Fight? Explaining Refugee Return and Violence’, deals with why some returning refugees come to destabilize the peace process in their home country upon return, whereas others do not – a research question that seeks to transcend the clear-cut distinction between refugees (as victims) and fighters (as malevolent fighters) that is commonly found in academic analysis and policy documents. The project compares the cases of Afghanistan and Rwanda, and extensive fieldwork was conducted in 2009.

Kristian Berg Harpviken’s Social Networks and Migration in Wartime Afghanistan (Palgrave Macmillan) was published in 2009. Based on the author’s doctoral thesis and subsequent work carried out both at PRIO and abroad, the book presents a framework for understanding how individuals’ networks play an essential role in their responses to war and disaster. People’s network resources are crucial for mobilizing or maintaining physical resources, for the security of the individuals concerned, and for the gathering of information. Applying this framework to the analysis of wartime migration, the book challenges one-dimensional portrayals of wartime migrants as victims, emphasizing the importance of agency and network resources in individuals’ responses to unpredictable social environments. The book’s systematic application of a network analytical perspective, building on mechanisms developed through studies in other areas (particularly economic and organizational sociology), is unique. This analytical bridge-building brings new insights to the study of responses to armed conflict, where there has previously only been loose debate on whether social networks fragment or gain strength in the face of war. Discussing migration throughout three decades of war in Afghanistan, the book is based on original fieldwork conducted during the period of the Taliban’s domination of the country, focusing on two villages in one of Afghanistan’s most severely war-stricken areas.

Rebellion, insurgency, civil war – conflict within a society is customarily treated as a matter of domestic politics, while analysts generally focus their attention on local causes. Yet fighting between governments and opposition groups is rarely confined to the domestic arena. ‘Internal’ wars often spill across national boundaries, rebel organizations frequently find sanctuaries in neighbouring countries, and insurgencies give rise to disputes between states. In Rebels Without Borders: Transnational Insurgencies in World Politics (published in 2009 by Cornell University Press), Idean Salehyan...
examines transnational rebel organizations in civil conflicts, utilizing both cross-national datasets and in-depth case studies. He shows how external Contra bases in Honduras and Costa Rica facilitated the Nicaraguan civil war, and how the Rwandan civil war spilled over into the Democratic Republic of the Congo, fostering a regional war. Salehyan also looks at other cross-border insurgencies, such as those of the Kurdish PKK and Taliban fighters in Pakistan. He reveals that external sanctuaries feature in the political history of more than half of the world’s armed insurgencies since 1945, and are also important in fostering state-to-state conflicts.

Rebels who are unable to challenge the state on its own turf look for mobilization opportunities abroad. Neighbouring states that are too weak to prevent rebel access, states that wish to foster instability in their rivals, and large refugee diasporas provide important opportunities for insurgent groups to establish external bases. Such sanctuaries complicate intelligence-gathering, counterinsurgency operations and efforts at peacemaking. States that host rebels intrude into negotiations between governments and opposition movements, and can block progress toward peace when they pursue their own agendas.

Iedan Salehyan is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas and an associate of CSCW. Much of the work carried out for this book took place during his stay at PRIO during 2005. The book was the winner of the 2010 ENMISA Distinguished Book Award, presented by the International Studies Association organized section for Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Migration.
Gleditsch publicly expressed his regret that, unlike the US president, he could not expect to earn the prize through future work.
Important dynamics of civil wars transgress national boundaries. External factors can be international, such as the 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 theory development, addressing insights and limitations in the literatures on civil war, transnationalism and international relations. We do not favour one particular theory or approach, seeking instead to develop synthetic, plural arguments that better capture the complex dynamics of civil conflict. This stance of theoretical pluralism informs our choice of methods, which range from case studies, to large-n quantitative work, to ethnography, to agent-based modelling. Ultimately, we aim to understand and explain the myriad interactions between the international/transnational and the local/internal in civil war.

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 shown by 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.

This working group aims at integrating the effect of conflicts on 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 analysing the processes of conflict resolution in terms of 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).

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 postwar societies, we study values to assess the strength of latent conflict.
This dissertation project drew 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.

The project examined 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 used time-series data on political corruption, bureaucratic quality and public spending, as well as case studies of particular countries. It was defended in December 2009.

Based on an extensive amount of freshly unearthed written sources and nearly a year’s worth of fieldwork in Sudan, the articles in the dissertation present a new explanation for the beginning of the first civil war in Southern Sudan and explain the difference in intensity between the first and second civil wars. The investigation of these two cases suggests that comparisons of civil wars should focus on the dissemination and local adaptation of irregular warfare in its local context, and that the period encapsulating the process of escalation from peace to war needs further scrutiny.

The dissertation improves our understanding of the origins and dynamics of intra-state conflict by exploring the role of religion. A growing share of contemporary conflicts seem to involve a religious dimension. Despite this, research on the religion–conflict nexus is underdeveloped in terms of exactly how and when religion matters, and existing systematic studies have produced inconsistent results. Accordingly, the dissertation presents an improved conceptualization and theoretical framework for understanding whether, how, when and why religion matters for conflict, and conducts new empirical tests. Three main conclusions emerge from the research. First, religious diversity does not necessarily translate into conflict, but contexts of religious repression can increase the salience of religious cleavages and spur rebellion that may escalate to civil war. Second, religious conflicts can be disaggregated to different types and differentiated from other conflicts, but the common presumption that religious conflicts are no more severe than other conflicts is not supported. Third, the findings indicate that no particular religion is inherently more violent than others. The dissertation consists of five articles and an introductory chapter, and was submitted on 30 October 2009 and defended on 19 March 2010.

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 the context of 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 positively or negatively. It also investigates the effect of signed water treaties on subsequent water-specific interaction. Through issue-coding of claims over the use of a river raised by one state towards another, it looks at specific water disagreements and whether or not they become militarized.

This project investigates the role played by power-sharing in countries ravaged by civil war. It emphasizes the importance of inclusion and representative institutions in reducing rebel support and thus hindering resurgence of violence. In addition, the project highlights implementation as a crucial aspect of power-sharing’s ability to contribute to post-conflict peace. To study the effect of representation and implementation in relation to peace, the project systematically analyses political and economic power-sharing in all post-conflict societies between 1946 and 2006. To dig deeper into the critical role of implementation, it looks more closely at developments in post-conflict Sierra Leone. The project examines the follow-up of political power-sharing provisions in the 1999 Lomé Peace Accord, as well as the economic power-sharing scheme ‘Diamond Area Community Development Fund’, which was initiated in the country after the civil war to facilitate a more fair distribution of diamond revenues.

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 civilization and conflict, both inter- and intra-state. Data are drawn from World Value Survey, the Penn World Tables, UN General Assembly records (voting data), and the Correlates of War and Uppsala/PRIO conflict datasets.

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?
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 to investigate 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, as well as fieldwork.

Contemporary just war theorizing has focused 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 (jus 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.

How do political institutions affect economic outcomes? This project focuses in particular on how democracy and dictatorship affect economic growth, as well as their effects on property rights protection, physical and human capital, and technological change. The project also explores how different contextual factors affect economic policy in dictatorships. It examines specific channels through which political institutions affect different economic outcomes, but also investigates the interrelations between different mechanisms through construction of formal models. The empirical work consists mainly of statistical analysis, but also includes structured comparative studies of selected countries. In addition, the project discusses the conceptualization and measurement of democracy.

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 analyses systematic inequalities between ethnic/religious/regional groups (horizontal inequalities) as a potential cause of domestic armed conflict and other forms of political violence. On the basis of national household surveys in developing countries, the project develops a comprehensive dataset on horizontal inequalities along economic and social dimensions. The analysis involves large-n statistical event history models, along with quantitative case studies of particular countries.

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.

While much scholarly attention has been devoted to the causes of war, relatively less is known about how conflict affects individuals who live in a war-torn country, and how these effects develop over time. Focusing on the Yugoslav successor states, the aim of this project is to analyse the extent to which individual attitudes like tolerance and political trust are affected by conflict, and what implications this may have for society. The project is based on individual survey data as well as context variables on both regional and national levels.

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.

The cross-national conflict literature has found that less developed countries have a higher risk of civil war than more developed countries. Several different explanations have been suggested, but little has yet been done to assess these empirically. This project uses various types of data and methods to investigate the underlying causal mechanisms of these explanations and test their quantitative implications. The first is done through a case study of rebel control and mobilization in Nepal, the second through a time-series cross-national analysis, as well as a global geographically disaggregated analysis.

The cross-national conflict literature has failed to converge on robust associations that could link resource scarcities with civil war. It has been suggested that droughts increase the risk of violent conflict and that this is most pronounced with smaller-scale local conflicts. This project uses both single-case and cross-national statistical investigations to analyse the possible relationships between climatic factors, resource scarcities and violent conflict. It includes a quantitative case study of Kenya, a global analysis and a disaggregated analysis of Africa in general.
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Østby, Gudrun; Ragnhild Nordås & Jan Ketil Rød. ‘Regional Inequalities and Civil Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa’, International Studies Quarterly 53(2): 301–324.


CSCW Projects in 2009

Transnational and International
Facets of Civil War 1
State Failure and Regional Insecurity 2, 12
Microfoundations of Civil War 1
Environmental Factors in Civil War 1
Political Demography 1, 2
Human Rights, Governance and Conflict 1
Conflict and Economic Performance 1
Values and Violence 1
Civic and Uncivic Values among the Yugoslav Successor States 1, 4
Religion and Civil War 1
Civil Peace 1
CSCW Centre office 1
Training and Internship 1
Cross cutting activities 1
Military History 1
Disaggregating the Study of Civil Wars 1, 2
Geographic Representations of War 1, 6

Battle Deaths dataset 1
Data projects management 1
Political Institutions, Development and a Domestic Civil Peace (OYI) 1, 2
Conflict Prediction 1
Youth Exclusion 1, 7, 12
Natural Hazards and Civil Conflicts in Asian Countries 1, 9
Dynamics of Institutional Change and Conflict 1
A New Agenda for European Security Economics 1, 5
Armed Conflict Location and Event Data 7
Resources and Peace: Power Sharing and Wealth Sharing in Post-Conflict Situations 3
The Payoff of Promises - Articulating, Negotiating and Implementing Wealth Sharing 1, 2, 12
Going Home to Fight? Explaining Refugee Return and Violence 2
Power Sharing, Agency and Civil Conflict 1, 10
Why does Peace Remain Elusive in Burundi? 8
Mobilization and Modus Operandi of Rebel Groups 4
Women’s Political Participation and SCR1325 in Burundi and Nepal 4
Writing up thesis articles for publication 3
Article on armed conflict and female mortality 3
Security Implications of Climate Change 2
World Development Report 2011 7
MNA Regional Flagship Report 7

Project Funders:

1 Research Council of Norway – CSCW CoE grant
2 Research Council of Norway
3 Research Council of Norway – PRIO Core Grant
4 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
5 European Union funding schemes
6 European Science Foundation
7 World Bank
8 Norwegian Peace Building Centre
9 OCHA/Norwegian Geotechnical Institute NGI
10 National Science Foundation
11 The Energy and Resources Institute TERI
12 Other Sources

Total project income in 2009 was 23,868,694 NOK. The CoE grant counts for 46% of this, and the chart represents the remaining 54%. Total person-year effort in 2009 was 23.8.
PRIO

PRIO was founded in 1959. It was one of the first centers of peace research in the world. 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 Exellence

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 CoEs. CSCW secured a second 5 year period of funding after the evaluation, again receiving top scores from the referees.
‘The Centre has become the leading international research environment in research on civil war... [the] level of quality of the research is exceptionally good’

Anonymous expert’s appraisal for the midway evaluation of CSCW as a CoE in 2006