

Architecture of Peace: OEF's Theories of War & Peace

Last Updated September 9th, 2020

Executive Summary

One Earth Future works to promote sustainable solutions to problems at the root cause of armed conflict. In order to do this, we believe that we need a theory of what causes war and what supports peace. This document is our attempt to lay out our analysis of what the global system needs to achieve in order to deliver sustainable peace. Based on our review of the existing research, we find the following:

- The drivers of interstate war, intrastate war, and internationalized war are distinct and should be considered as three separate, if often related, domains. There are generic claims that can be made about the drivers of all three types of conflict, however.
- Generically, conflict tends to emerge from a combination of structural pressures creating the pre-conditions for violence intersecting with specific crises or moments of opportunity in which violence begins.
- The decision to engage in violence is a decision made by individuals, both elites who choose the timing and strategy of violent actors and line members who support violent groups. The causes of war can be analyzed from this perspective.
- Generically, pressures towards war include a perception that something of value can be achieved through violence, low levels of satisfaction with the existing state of affairs, confidence that the violence is likely to be successful, and a lack of confidence that the same end goal can be achieved through nonviolent means.
 - The specific elements which go into the calculation above vary from elite to line members, as well as when considering inter-, intra-, and internationalized conflict.
- There are cross-cutting elements which promote peace. Structural interdependence (through trade or other systems), economic development, democracy, and women's inclusion appear to affect multiple elements driving conflict.
- Overall, a global system which supports peace must address structural drivers of conflict (through promoting human development and good governance), prevent crises and flashpoint issues from erupting, and provide legitimate systems for international engagement and dispute resolution.
- OEF is not alone in reaching this conclusion: major international governmental organizations and national development and security institutions internationally are developing similar

understandings of what needs to be accomplished. The major challenge right now is understanding how this end goal can best be supported.

Introduction

One Earth Future (OEF) is an operating foundation created with the intent of eliminating armed conflict through the use of evidence-based analysis and practice. Achieving this goal requires a clear, accurate, and evidence-based analysis of the causes of violent conflict and the conditions which support peace. This document is intended to represent OEF's theory of peace: driving from the large body of research that exists on the causes of armed violence and the conditions that peace requires. This report attempts to lay out an analytical framework of the causes of violence and of peace. It also identifies in-principle approaches to intervening and reviews the existing research on what works, and what doesn't, to promote peace. In doing this, this report joins an active and emerging discussion in which academics and international organizations are developing a consensus on what conditions are needed for world peace.

This report is primarily developed to guide OEF's strategy and operations, and as a result it is attached directly to OEF's mandate and mission. Operationalizations of questions of war and peace are debatable and this report does not attempt to engage directly with philosophical or definitional questions except to the extent that it's necessary to clearly identify OEF's orientation to these questions. Despite these limitations, this report may be useful to non-OEF stakeholders as one example of how an organization interested in the elimination of war approaches operationalizing what this task means and how to address it.

The challenges of drafting a document like this go beyond the definitional. The empirical research is rapidly developing, and theories of what drives conflict evolve with it. To take one example, there was a rough consensus in the empirical literature in the last decade that rebel groups were often relatively unmotivated by historical or present grievances.¹ This conclusion is being challenged by emerging work showing how exclusion and inequality at the group level can breed resentment driving mobilization² and the modern understanding is more nuanced and leaves room for both "greed" and "grievance" to drive conflict.³ A document like this captures the literature at a certain point in time, and while it's to be hoped that this is more accurate than one written in the past would have been, it's likely that there are errors and omissions in the current research that future work will illuminate. Separately, research conducted at a global comparative level will generate insights about large-scale trends that may or may not directly apply at the country level, challenging the applicability of lessons that may be generally true to a specific context. Finally the state of the research and practice is, on aggregate, that the field can say with some degree of specificity what resilience looks like - but examples of successfully established consolidated peace caused by external actors are fairly infrequent and the ability to generate solid, replicable, evidence-based strategies is limited. Despite these challenges, however, organizations such

¹ Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler, "Greed and Grievance in Civil War," *Oxford Economic Papers* 56, no. 4 (October 1, 2004): 563–95, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oep/gpf064>.

² Lars-Erik Cederman, Nils B. Weidmann, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, "Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison," *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 03 (August 2011): 478–495, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000207>; Lars-Erik Cederman, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and Halvard Buhaug, *Inequality, Grievances, and Civil War* (Cambridge University Press, 2013); Andreas Wimmer, Lars-Erik Cederman, and Brian Min, "Ethnic Politics and Armed Conflict: A Configurational Analysis of a New Global Data Set," *American Sociological Review* 74, no. 2 (April 1, 2009): 316–37, <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400208>.

³ Anke Hoeffler, "'Greed' versus 'Grievance': A Useful Conceptual Distinction in the Study of Civil War?," *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 11, no. 2 (2011): 274–84, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-6576.2011.01111.x>.

as OEF interested in supporting peace must necessarily have a framework that establishes how they think about peace and resilience, in order to guide strategic decisions. Because of these limitations, though, this document and other work like it should be read as an initial map for generating specific strategies and points of engagement, but the impact of these engagements needs to be assessed for success on their own terms.

OEF's Definition of Peace

Conceptually, peace is more complicated than many may expect. While the basic concept is straightforward, specific operationalizations of peace must engage with questions about what constitutes violence and how much violence is necessary to constitute a breach of peace. One stream of both research and policy in the last fifty years has been a recognition of the fact that violence takes many forms, and conceptions of either war or violence more broadly that focus on the formal clash of arms between states or the direct infliction of harm through intentional physical injury are not always accurate in the modern world. In the first case, security studies has recognized that in the modern era “war,” if defined as large-scale violent contestation between groups, is rarely reducible to formal violence between militaries as traditional definitions would have it⁴. Instead, modern conflicts are characterized by a complexity of actors often including state actors but also including non-state actors such as rebel movements, armed militias, and extremist groups operating under varying degrees of control.⁵ Similarly, if violence is understood solely as the intentional and direct infliction of physical harm, it misses tools of oppression and harm such as the intentional infliction of starvation.⁶ To address this, in 1969 Johan Galtung proposed a distinction between “negative” peace focused on the absence of physical violence and “positive peace” defined as the elimination of all systems and structures which cause a gap between human potential and human performance⁷. A similar approach was taken by the 1994 Human Development Report, which proposed that a broader framing of “human security” as a way of thinking about the goals of the international system that would address multiple drivers of death and poor wellbeing⁸.

The challenge of positive peace or broad definitions of human security is that they are so broad that they pose difficulties in operationalizing them. Organizations with fixed budgets face the need to generate clear mission statements that allow a strategic discussion which draws a distinction between activities which are within the mission from those which are without. This is particularly true for relatively small organizations, where part of their impact is often derived from their ability to focus on narrow and specific questions⁹. Positive peace definitions, due to their expansiveness, make it difficult to

⁴ Stathis N. Kalyvas, “The Ontology of ‘Political Violence’: Action and Identity in Civil Wars,” *Perspectives on Politics* 1, no. 3 (September 2003): 475–94, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592703000355>.

⁵ Mary Kaldor, *New & Old Wars* (Stanford University Press, 2007).

⁶ Omelian Rudnytskyi et al., “Demography of a Man-Made Human Catastrophe: The Case of Massive Famine in Ukraine 1932-1933,” *Canadian Studies in Population* 42, no. 1–2 (2015): 53–80.

⁷ Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 167–191.

⁸ United Nations Development Programme, “Human Development Report 1994” (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁹ Jean-Marc Rickli, “European Small States’ Military Policies after the Cold War: From Territorial to Niche Strategies,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 21, no. 3 (September 1, 2008): 307–25, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557570802253435>; PhD Candidate Christopher Allen Stachowski, “The Niche Marketing Strategy in Internationally-Oriented Small and Medium Enterprises: A Literature Review and Lessons for New Zealand,” *Small Enterprise Research* 19, no. 2 (December 1, 2012): 96–112, <https://doi.org/10.5172/ser.2012.19.2.96>.

identify narrow scope. Because of this concern, OEF's analysis of the definitions of security has started with the goal of maintaining a narrow enough focus to develop a (relatively) scope-limited theory of change to drive OEF's work. OEF was founded with the goal of eliminating war, so accordingly OEF takes this as the starting point for our mission. However, the elimination of war is not a one-time event: it will take ongoing efforts to prevent backsliding into violence. Because of this, it can only be accomplished by the establishment of ongoing, sustainable systems which continue to create the conditions that allowed the elimination of war.

Based on these conditions, OEF defines our mission as the elimination of war but acknowledges that achieving this will require the establishment of institutions or systems which create the conditions for sustainable peace.

In practice this means that OEF must develop a strategy that will eliminate war through the creation of conditions which promote sustainable peace. This means that we must develop a way for understanding those conditions and in our work in the field develop tools and approaches which address the drivers of violence in the areas where we work. In principle, this means that the scope of our work may expand to include all issues or problems driving war whether those include issues of human rights violations, criminality, poor development, or other structural issues. However, unlike a pure positive peace approach we do not see these issues as within our strategic scope unless there is a specific and direct link to the risk of war in the areas where we operate.

Causes of War

Our approach to developing our theory of peace was to formalize our understanding of the causes of war, and to identify in principle the points of intervention that such causes imply. This is a task that requires integrating a significant body of existing research, but it's not a particularly novel challenge: the research on the causes of armed conflict is well-developed, and several institutions and academics have executed similar analyses.¹⁰ To the extent that we all have done our jobs, there shouldn't be too much difference between these different analyses: while there are existing debates in the empirical literature about the relative strength of different influences or the relative effect of emerging challenges, in general researchers interested in synthesizing the current empirical research are necessarily working from the same research base and the basic conclusions are likely to be similar.

However, the differing analyses are being developed for different strategic purposes, which in turn can influence where the authors focus their attention and also how they choose to organize the existing research. Our goal with this analysis is to develop a theory of peace that will allow us to develop a generic approach to supporting peace, and also give us a formal analytical framework that will help us map the individual conflict dynamics of specific conflicts we intend to engage in. In the service of this goal, we look at the drivers of conflict through a rationalistic lens. We examine what influences individuals' choice to use political violence. This framing engages with institutions, but treats the individual as the ultimate subject of analysis. This is because war is ultimately driven by the decision of both the leaders of groups and the members of groups to choose violence as a political tool or to join

¹⁰ United Nations and World Bank, "Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict" (Washington, D.C: World Bank, 2018); Alex J. Bellamy, *World Peace (And How We Can Achieve It)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Joshua S. Goldstein, *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide* (Dutton Adult, 2011).

groups which do. Such a rationalistic model is limited: people are not always the strategic expectation-maximizers that it assumes¹¹, and violence can be the result of escalating cycles that are not desired by any actor. However, it does allow for a way for organizations such as OEF to think in terms of the individuals our programs are designed to influence. Moreover, there is good evidence that in general violent groups do use rational decision making in pursuing their goals - even in the case of seemingly irrational behavior.¹² It's also true that while the inputs to decision making are frequently psychological or sociological pressures that don't fit neatly into an expectation-maximization framework, this doesn't mean that they are unstructured or unpredictable. Social scientific research is developing a better understanding of patterns of human irrationality in ways that mean we can assess them as inputs into the system.

Separately, we also consider the causes of war from the frame of whether the drivers of conflict are long-running or structural issues or more specific flashpoint issues. Typically political violence arises from a combination of structural concerns or grievances, some of which can be ancient such as cultural grievances about historic abuses or more current issues of exclusion, combined with specific flashpoint moments that spark a cycle of violence. Thinking about systemic peace means creating systems which can address the full spectrum of drivers of conflict, including preventing flashpoint triggers of violence while reducing structural pressures towards conflict.

These two ways of thinking about the drivers of conflict interact: the structural pressures towards conflict provide the drivers for crises moments to flash into violence. In addition, crises are moments in which potentially violent actors' perceptions of what is possible and what the threats and costs to violence are may change rapidly. For example, one common kind of crisis leading to war is a political movement being repressed by the government, triggering escalatory violence. In this moment, both the elites and general public's perceptions of the risks and relative success of nonviolence versus violence change quickly due to the changing situation, leading to new calculations about whether to endorse violence or not.

Drivers of Conflict and How They Interact

Organized political violence is relatively rare, considering the scope of issues that could generate violence. One reason for this is that violence is costly (in terms of resources and time) and risky (in terms of the significant risk to both the status quo and personal risk), and people tend to prefer to use nonviolent means of achieving their goal unless there are clear reasons why violent means are necessary or otherwise less risky than typical¹³.

One way to think about this is as an algorithm: there are pressures towards violence and pressures away from violence, and the decision to endorse political conflict comes when the pressures towards violence outweigh those against. While this framing is very rationalist, casting the decision to use violence as a rational calculation, it's important to note that as discussed below some of the pressures towards violence are predicated on values or identity issues which can weigh strongly on people's psychology¹⁴.

¹¹ Brian C. Rathbun, Joshua D. Kertzer, and Mark Paradis, "Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality," *International Organization* 71, no. S1 (April 2017): S33–60, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818316000412>.

¹² Robert Pape, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*, Reprint edition (New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006).

¹³ James D. Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization* 49, no. 3 (1995): 379–414.

¹⁴ William B. Swann Jr et al., "Contemplating the Ultimate Sacrifice: Identity Fusion Channels pro-Group Affect, Cognition, and Moral Decision Making.," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 106, no. 5 (2014): 713.

Moreover, the risks attached to violence are such that the initiation of violence is likely to be a considered decision.

Broadly, our analysis of the existing research suggests that major political violence can be seen as a function of the following elements: the value of the current situation (what is risked by engaging in violence) the value of what is perceived as violence can bring (what they can gain by violence), the cost (how hard it would be to achieve) and the likelihood of achieving the same goal by nonviolent means. This is to say that the likelihood of organized political violence goes up when the perceived gains of violence are high, the value of the current situation is low for the group, the perceived costs of OPV are low, and the likelihood of achieving the same end goal through nonviolent means is seen as low.

Expressed formally as an algorithm, this might look like this:

$$\text{Risk of violence} = \frac{[(\text{perceived value of end goal} - \text{perceived value of the current situation}) - (\text{perceived cost of violence} * \text{perceived risk of failure})]}{(1 - \text{perceived chance of achieving same goals nonviolently})}$$

In principle this basic analysis applies to any decision making process around the use of conflict carried out by individuals with the freedom to choose their response. In practice, violence may develop so quickly or be so heavily influenced by situations that the process of decision making may not be visible. If a country is attacked by an invader, for example, there may not be much consideration of the rational options available and military defense may be quickly mobilized. This doesn't mean that the decision can't be understood through the lens above, though: it just means that the pressures are so clear that the process itself is less visible.

It's also the case that the context of the decision, and in particular the questions of whether interstate, intrastate, or internationalized conflict is the subject of discussion and whether the person being considered is an elite decision maker or a lower-level member of the group also heavily influences how this decision may take place. In the first case, there is reason to believe that this generic rationalist approach operates across levels of conflict but the context heavily changes the process for decision making. As will be discussed below, at both inter and intrastate levels, the decision to engage in violence is affected by the elements captured in the algorithm above but the level of analysis varies. Intrastate conflict is predicted by drivers at the level of individuals and ethnic or identity groups, while interstate conflict more frequently reflects major national strategic interests such as disputed geographic areas or resources. Internationalized conflict, wherein external actors drive conflict by funding or supporting conflict actors, also has its own dynamics: while the basic elements of the desired end goals and perceived costs of actors remain the same, the ability for internationalized conflict actors to externalize the costs by supporting violence instead of engaging in it directly can complicate attempts to resolve conflict. In the second case, the relative influence of different variables changes from the elite to the public level: elites are more likely to both get the direct benefit from successful use of violence and are more directly likely to experience targeted consequences from failure, and as such the relative influence of those elements may be higher than considering the general public.

This algorithm is not intended to be an actual formal model of decisions: while it is a useful general way of thinking about competing pressures towards peace and violence and how they interact, it's likely not the case that this algorithm could be formally fit to predict a specific conflict. However, for the purpose of this paper we adopt this algorithm because this framing allows for an analysis of the different

pressures towards conflict in ways that can generate effective strategies for intervention. This memo will review each of the specific pressures below.

The Perceived Value of End Goal

Groups that are fighting are universally fighting for something, and what that goal is, and how it's interpreted by group members, can be a driver towards conflict. When a goal is deeply held or when it is a maximalist goal - when there is no room for compromise for moral or other reasons - then the motivation to use every tool to achieve the goal can be significant.

Considering intrastate conflict, there are a number of reasons why individuals may choose to support groups that use violence. One primary consideration is the group or perspective that a violent group represents. Groups that fight on behalf of ethnic or religious groups are claiming to represent groups that are very important to how many people see themselves. Group membership can be an important part of how people understand who they are and their social environment¹⁵. For people who are strongly associated with a specific social identity and see that identity as central to who they are, it's relatively easy to motivate them to put their lives at risk for the group.¹⁶ This is both because a strong incorporation of the group into the personal identity can lead both to a willingness to sacrifice the individual for the group and also a heightened awareness and concern about issues facing the group as a whole.

Even for people not extremely aligned with specific social groups, group-based concerns can motivate violence. Exclusion, whether from the formal political systems of a region or from the economic and social goods of a system, can drive group-based violence. Social narratives about exclusion and in particular a perception of maltreatment or humiliation can also drive conflict. Considering exclusion, as discussed above there is a link between ethnic or identity-based inequality and conflict and in particular that kind of exclusion appears to be an important tool for mobilizing people to join violent groups.¹⁷ Moreover, a perception that a group's concerns are represented in the collective decision making of a system is an important driver of the perceived legitimacy of the system,¹⁸ and a collapse of legitimacy can lead to the decision to use violence. Considering humiliation, a perception of unfair or unjust treatment is a major driver of individual membership in violent groups.¹⁹ A perceived threat is also a major driver of radicalization or the willingness to use violence: when people feel that their group is under threat it is significantly easier to mobilize for the use of violence.²⁰

¹⁵ Michael A. Hogg, "From Uncertainty to Extremism: Social Categorization and Identity Processes," *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 23, no. 5 (2014): 338–342.

¹⁶ William B. Swann Jr., Ángel Gómez, D. Conor, et al., "Identity Fusion: The Interplay of Personal and Social Identities in Extreme Group Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, no. 5 (2009): 995–1011, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013668>; Harvey Whitehouse et al., "Brothers in Arms: Libyan Revolutionaries Bond like Family," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 50 (December 16, 2014): 17783–85, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1416284111>; Swann Jr et al., "Contemplating the Ultimate Sacrifice."

¹⁷ Gudrun Østby et al., "Population Pressure, Horizontal Inequality and Political Violence: A Disaggregated Study of Indonesian Provinces, 1990–2003," *The Journal of Development Studies* 47, no. 3 (March 1, 2011): 377–98, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2010.506911>; Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch, "Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War"; Patrick M. Regan and Daniel Norton, "Greed, Grievance, and Mobilization in Civil Wars," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (June 1, 2005): 319–36.

¹⁸ Tom R. Tyler, Kenneth A. Rasinski, and Nancy Spodick, "Influence of Voice on Satisfaction with Leaders: Exploring the Meaning of Process Control," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 48, no. 1 (1985): 72–81, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.1.72>.

¹⁹ Bertjan Doosje, Annemarie Loseman, and Kees van den Bos, "Determinants of Radicalization of Islamic Youth in the Netherlands: Personal Uncertainty, Perceived Injustice, and Perceived Group Threat," *Journal of Social Issues* 69, no. 3 (2013): 586–604, <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12030>.

²⁰ Doosje, Loseman, and Bos.

These motivations are not always universal within violent groups. In particular, the motivations of elite group leaders and the calculations they make about profit and risk may be different from the motivations of general group members. Research on “greed” as a motivator, including research on the influence of lootable resources, shows that economic self-interest can be an important motivator for groups and particularly when considering the elite decisions about launching conflicts; while complementary work on grievances show how these can be important for mobilizing front-line member participation.²¹ Similarly, the timing of flashpoint crises such as coups are closely related to elite perceptions of success, which can be influenced by but are distinct from the perceptions of the general population²²

Considering interstate war, the presence of clear national self-interest in war is obvious. Territorial disputes, where states disagree about who controls specific geographic regions, are a major predictor of interstate war.²³ Similarly, a demand for resource wealth, especially when those resources are seen as easily capturable, can predict interstate war²⁴

Perceived Value of Current Situation

The decision to use violence places in jeopardy the benefits of whatever an actor’s current quality of life is. War is characterized by deprivation and austerity, and there’s both personal and structural risk - personal in the risk of individual harm or death and structural in the risk to the existing institutions and systems in place. For that reason, it’s perhaps unsurprising to find that there are fairly strong associations between human development and human security, considered broadly, and a reduced risk of both inter- and intra-state conflict.

At the intrastate level, there is strong evidence that direct improvements in quality of life and human security significantly reduce the risk of organized political violence. GDP per capita is a consistent and significant predictor of lowered risk of violence²⁵, and social spending including education²⁶ and health care²⁷ are both significant predictors of reduced risk of violence. Considering the idea of “value” more broadly in the context of the deeply-held motivations described above, it’s also true that systems which successfully deliver a perception of inclusion in the benefits of the system²⁸ and in the process of decisions²⁹ are more peaceful. Humans want to belong to systems in which our interests and voices are

²¹ Collier and Hoeffler, “Greed and Grievance in Civil War”; Regan and Norton, “Greed, Grievance, and Mobilization in Civil Wars.”

²² Brett Allen Casper and Scott A. Tyson, “Popular Protest and Elite Coordination in a Coup d’état,” *The Journal of Politics* 76, no. 2 (April 1, 2014): 548–64, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613001485>.

²³ Stephen A. Kocs, “Territorial Disputes and Interstate War, 1945–1987,” *The Journal of Politics* 57, no. 1 (February 1, 1995): 159–75, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2960275>.

²⁴ Francesco Caselli, Massimo Morelli, and Dominic Rohner, “The Geography of Interstate Resource Wars,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130, no. 1 (February 1, 2015): 267–315, <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju038>.

²⁵ Edward Miguel, “Economic Shocks, Weather, and Civil War,” *NBER Reporter Online*, no. 3 (2011): 8–10.

²⁶ Gudrun Østby and Henrik Urdal, “Education and Civil Conflict: A Review of the Quantitative, Empirical Literature” (Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011, The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education, 2010).

²⁷ Zeynep Taydas and Dursun Peksen, “Can States Buy Peace? Social Welfare Spending and Civil Conflicts,” *Journal of Peace Research* 49, no. 2 (March 1, 2012): 273–87, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343311431286>; Clayton L. Thyne, “ABC’s, 123’s, and the Golden Rule: The Pacifying Effect of Education on Civil War, 1980–1999,” *International Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 733–54.

²⁸ Lars-Erik Cederman, Nils B. Weidmann, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, “Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison,” *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 03 (August 2011): 478–495, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000207>; Gudrun Østby et al., “Population Pressure, Horizontal Inequality and Political Violence: A Disaggregated Study of Indonesian Provinces, 1990–2003,” *The Journal of Development Studies* 47, no. 3 (March 1, 2011): 377–98, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2010.506911>.

²⁹ Ted Robert Gurr, *Why Men Rebel*, 1 edition (Boulder: Routledge, 2010).

appreciated, and to the extent that religious, ethnic, or other identity groups see themselves as excluded from the system violence is more likely.³⁰ These same mechanisms also reflect, in part, why rising powers often seek to disrupt the status quo (occasionally through violence).³¹ The international system is often ordered around the interests of systemic (and regional) hegemon. These major powers set the terms on trade regimes and the rules around international cooperation. Rising powers, unhappy with the inherent advantages offered to the hegemon, seek to contest these rules.

The mechanisms that link human security to peace can operate through both individual and structural pathways. At the individual level, in general, people who live in more deprivation are more likely to take risks including more use of violence.³² At the structural level, as discussed above inclusion and voice are central aspects of perceived legitimacy of institutions. At the same time, some research suggests that when people don't have direct information about inclusion they use social goods as a proxy, and research on performance legitimacy suggests it is one pathway driving support for governments³³.

At the interstate level, the parallel comparison is the value that the current system is providing to national goals or development. Considered pairwise, economic engagement makes conflict much less likely³⁴, and more broadly there's an association between openness to both trade and foreign investment and reduced risk of civil war.³⁵ It's also possible that participation in other multilateral systems can establish deeper ties of interdependence and more effective rules-based approaches to international cooperation,³⁶ although to some extent this may be an argument for more effective tools for achieving end goals rather than the value.

It's important to note in this analysis that perceptions of "value" in this framing are not objective. Many different people will disagree over what they value and how much emphasis they put on it. Someone strongly identified with a particular ethnic group or identity may see the collective recognition of that group as a goal they value so much that they will die for it,³⁷ while someone else from the same group may not see that group as significant to their identity and hence see much less value in its representation. Because of this, there will be significant variation in how different people in any context see the value of their current situation. In general, it appears to be the case that objective indicators of human development such as education rates, health care, and other elements do predict less willingness to engage in conflict. This general truth, however, will vary at the individual level and specific assessments of conflict contexts should include a specific assessment of how violent or potentially violent actors perceive their current situation.

³⁰ Jean-Paul Azam, "The Redistributive State and Conflicts in Africa," *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 4 (July 1, 2001): 429–44, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343301038004002>.

³¹ Lemke (2002)

³² Margo Wilson and Martin Daly, "Life Expectancy, Economic Inequality, Homicide, and Reproductive Timing in Chicago Neighbourhoods," *BMJ* 314, no. 7089 (April 26, 1997): 1271, <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7089.1271>.

³³ Bruce Gilley, "The Meaning and Measure of State Legitimacy: Results for 72 Countries," *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (2006): 499–525; Mark C. Suchman, "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches," *Academy of Management Review* 20 (1995): 571–610.

³⁴ Edward Deering Mansfield and Brian M. Pollins, eds., *Economic Interdependence and International Conflict: New Perspectives on an Enduring Debate* (University of Michigan Press, 2009).

³⁵ Katherine Barbieri and Rafael Reuveny, "Economic Globalization and Civil War," *The Journal of Politics* 67, no. 4 (2005): 1228–1247.

³⁶ John R. Oneal and Bruce Russett, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000).

³⁷ William B. Swann Jr., Ángel Gómez, D. Conor Seyle, et al., "Identity Fusion: The Interplay of Personal and Social Identities in Extreme Group Behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, no. 5 (2009): 995–1011, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013668>.

Perceived Cost of Violence and Perceived Risk of Failure

Related to the question of the risk to current status quo is the question of the cost of violence and the risk of failure, with its attendant risks of extremely high costs. There is some evidence that organizations weigh these risks in deciding whether to engage in violence or not: considering authoritarian states, violence and repression in the lead-up to elections shifts away from ordinary citizens (most likely due to electoral costs), a trend reversed in times other than elections.³⁸ More directly, states with higher levels of security spending in terms of funding directed to both military and police tend to be more peaceful,³⁹ and there are clear case studies where failures or incapacity of security forces led to a perception that they could be directly confronted on the battlefield in ways that led to destructive cycles of conflict such as what happened with ISIS. This is not universally positive: there are opportunity costs to military spending, and authoritarian states can use a heavy emphasis on military spending to force compliance with abuses and exclusions that create the conditions for violence and it is the case that heavy military spending is associated with repression⁴⁰ and repression with violence as described above.⁴¹ However, it is clearly the case that security spending to some degree factors into civil war, with countries that have a greater degree of capacity for identifying potential militants and preventing strongmen from simply taking over having a correspondingly lower likelihood of seeing outbreaks of armed conflict.

At the interstate level there is likewise evidence for costs. Considered pairwise, violence is less likely when one actor has a clear military superiority over the other.⁴² In this situation, the weaker country is motivated to seek a political resolution because the military outcome is foregone. Violence is more likely when two countries are more equally matched, although there is also evidence for violence being more likely when one country is making advances or gains in military resources.⁴³ Similarly, there is some evidence that economic sanctions as a tool of power politics may prevent armed conflict,⁴⁴ although the mechanism for this may be less a question of costs relating to conflict and more directly relating to capacity for conflict.

Likelihood of Achieving Goals Through Peaceful Means

The final element to consider is the question of whether nonviolent means can achieve the same goals. To the extent that the choice to use violence is the result of a calculation about how to achieve a desired end goal, one thing that must be considered is whether there are other ways to achieve the end goal without the costs and challenges of violence.

³⁸ Tavishi Bhasin and Jennifer Gandhi, "Timing and Targeting of State Repression in Authoritarian Elections," *Electoral Studies* 32, no. 4 (2013): 620–631.

³⁹ James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 01 (2003): 75–90, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000534>; Håvard Hegre and Nicholas Sambanis, "Sensitivity Analysis of Empirical Results on Civil War Onset," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50, no. 4 (August 1, 2006): 508–35, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002706289303>.

⁴⁰ Christian Davenport, "Multi-Dimensional Threat Perception and State Repression: An Inquiry into Why States Apply Negative Sanctions," *American Journal of Political Science* 39, no. 3 (1995): 683–713.

⁴¹ Patrick M. Regan and Daniel Norton, "Greed, Grievance, and Mobilization in Civil Wars," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (June 1, 2005): 319–36.

⁴² Håvard Hegre, "Gravitating toward War Preponderance May Pacify, but Power Kills," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52, no. 4 (August 1, 2008): 566–89, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002708316738>.

⁴³ Hegre; Graham Allison, "The Thucydides Trap – Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy* (blog), June 9, 2017, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/06/09/the-thucydides-trap/>.

⁴⁴ Daniel McCormack and Henry Pascoe, "Sanctions and Preventive War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61, no. 8 (September 1, 2017): 1711–39, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002715620471>.

One way that this can be assessed is the degree to which people trust that the formal governance system takes into account their perspectives and needs. If people feel that they're taken into consideration in how decisions are made, then they are much more likely to trust the institutions which make those decisions.⁴⁵ This trust, in turn, can mitigate arguments for the use of violence: if people see their governments or institutions as just and legitimate then they are likely to assume that they don't need to take up arms to change the system and can accept decisions that they personally disagree with.

An alternate aspect of achieving goals has little to do with the existing government and more to do with the strategic choices of resistance movements. Resistance movements advocating for change or even the complete transformation of a social system or government aren't necessarily violent. A wide variety of nonviolent strategies, from strikes and protests to public art, are available to resistance movements. A developing body of literature suggests that nonviolent strategies are often more effective than violent strategies.⁴⁶ This is through a variety of mechanisms, from encouraging more broad-based buy-in to the group to increasing security sector defections as state repression backfires. Because of this, it's possible that every other pressure towards violence may be pointing in a direction that would lead to violence but the group would deliberately choose nonviolent strategies because they felt that they would more effectively deliver their group goals.

Finally, a third element affecting this is the perception of whether the use of violence is legitimate or not. The decision to use violent or nonviolent means to pursue some goal is both a strategic decision and a decision about whether the use of violence is appropriate or not. Some circumstances make it easier for large groups of people to consider using violence. One of the most potent is dehumanization, or the perception that the opposing groups are somehow fundamentally different from the person considering using violence. In particular, dehumanization refers to language which presents other people as fundamentally not human. Dehumanization leads to significantly more willingness to endorse violence.⁴⁷ Such dehumanization becomes easier when societies are polarized and fragmented such that group memberships become stacked (e.g. membership in one category, such as religious belief, is strongly associated with other categories such as race or political ideology).⁴⁸ In contrast, societies with strongly overlapping identity categories, or one strong superordinate identity that subsumes the others, can be more cohesive. Polarization is particularly dangerous in the context of "factionalized" democracies, or situations where political power is overtly used to advance the goals of some subset of society rather than the society as a whole. Factionalized democracies are particularly susceptible to violence.⁴⁹

Considering interstate war, as described above there is some evidence that engaged multilateralism decreases the risk of conflict by establishing other ways of achieving national goals. For all of the

⁴⁵ E. Allan Lind, Ruth Kanfer, and P. Christopher Earley, "Voice, Control, and Procedural Justice: Instrumental and Noninstrumental Concerns in Fairness Judgments," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59, no. 5 (1990): 952; Tom R. Tyler, "Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation," *Annual Review of Psychology* 57, no. 1 (2006): 375–400, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190038>.

⁴⁶ Erica Chenoweth and Maria J. Stephan, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (Columbia University Press, 2011).

⁴⁷ Albert Bandura, Bill Underwood, and Michael E. Fromson, "Disinhibition of Aggression through Diffusion of Responsibility and Dehumanization of Victims," *Journal of Research in Personality* 9, no. 4 (December 1, 1975): 253–69, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566\(75\)90001-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(75)90001-X).

⁴⁸ D. Conor Seyle and Matthew L. Newman, "A House Divided? The Psychology of Red and Blue America," *American Psychologist* 61, no. 6 (2006): 571–80, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.6.571>.

⁴⁹ Jack A. Goldstone et al., "A Global Model for Forecasting Political Instability," *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2010): 190–208.

criticism of the Security Council veto, it has arguably contributed to the lack of great power wars since World War II by providing a nonviolent way for (some) powers to block actions they may otherwise resist militarily. In addition, the proliferation of venues like the G7 and the many UN-focused systems allows states to interact more regularly in venues that allow for soft diplomatic engagement.

Unifying This Approach

This approach to thinking about the drivers of conflict provides a rough framework for analyzing specific conflict dynamics. However, this approach is somewhat abstracted from the specific issues which create the structural conditions for conflict.

The below image presents another way of framing the above thinking. At the end of the day, the pressures above that relate to violence are most affected by three key aspects: the perceived value of the group's goal (which is not represented below, as it's largely outside of what can be influenced by external intervention), the perceived quality of life, and the perceived legitimacy of the existing governance system. These latter two elements are themselves influenced by a number of different issues and drivers such as economic development or faith in the accountable, inclusive nature of governance. These elements are in turn themselves influenced by a number of different factors



A Structural/Flashpoint Lens on Armed Conflict

Considering the elements of violence described above, there are significant differences between the enduring structural pressures and the moments in which these pressures suddenly erupt into violence. An appropriate model for conflict is that of a forest fire. Wildfires are the combination of a dangerous situation in which a lot of combustible fuel meets a specific spark. Absent either the structural causes or the specific inciting moment, wildfires don't happen. In the long term, fire management is a question of preventing the sparks, responding quickly to brief outbreaks before they expand, and managing the underlying fuel. Conflict dynamics are similar. Considering the development of armed conflict, there are often elements of long-standing concern. As discussed above, the perception (or the reality) of inequality, exclusion, and a lack of territorial autonomy can be critical drivers of violent movements. These issues usually develop over time, and can be generational narratives passed on for centuries.⁵⁰ These represent the fuel in the wildfire narratives: conditions that by themselves don't inevitably lead to conflict, but can be used to mobilize people to violence.

Considering the spark, violence can erupt from strategic timing decisions of group leaders who feel that their moment has come⁵¹ or it can emerge from an escalation of cycles of violence.⁵² In the latter case, repression by state governments and global or regional violence against people who share ethnic or religious identities with potentially violent groups can be significant triggers of violence. In the former, periods of political instability - particularly around elections or coup attempts - can encourage potentially violent groups to act.

For interstate war a similar distinction can be drawn between structural and crisis drivers of conflict. The structural conditions that drive war are often tied to the relative power of international states,⁵³ the establishment (and strength) of international organizations,⁵⁴ as well as the establishment and recognition of international borders.⁵⁵ The internal conditions of states are also structural drivers of war. While past explanations often assumed that interstate disputes were driven by pursuits of power by international actors,⁵⁶ many contemporary theories often cite specific issues surrounding foreign policy or control of territory as critical drivers of militarized interstate disputes. More recent work on the drivers of interstate conflict note that these foreign policy decisions are tied to more complicated decision making processes. For instance, international leaders that are unconstrained by broad-based

⁵⁰ Toft, Monica Duffy, "Indivisible territory, geographic concentration, and ethnic war." *Security Studies* 12 12, no 2 (March 2002): 82-119.

⁵¹ Deniz Aksoy, "Elections and the Timing of Terrorist Attacks," *The Journal of Politics* 76, no. 4 (2014): 899-913; Carlos Pestana Barros, José Passos, and Luis A. Gil-Alana, "The Timing of ETA Terrorist Attacks," *Journal of Policy Modeling* 28, no. 3 (2006): 335-346; Bhasin and Gandhi, "Timing and Targeting of State Repression in Authoritarian Elections.;" Lake, David A. and Donald Rothchild, "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21, no. 2 (Fall 1996): 41-75.

⁵² Matt Motyl, Zach Rothschild, and Tom Pyszczynski, "The Cycle of Violence and Pathways to Peace," *Journal of Organisational Transformation & Social Change* 6, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 153-70, https://doi.org/10.1386/jots.6.2.153_1; Nauro F. Campos and Martin Gassebner, "International Terrorism, Domestic Political Instability, and the Escalation Effect," *Economics & Politics* 25, no. 1 (2013): 27-47, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecpo.12002>; Philip G. Roeder, "Clash of Civilizations and Escalation of Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflicts," *Comparative Political Studies* 36, no. 5 (June 1, 2003): 509-40, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414003036005002>.

⁵³ Lemke, Douglas and Suzanne Werner, "Power Parity, Commitment to Change, and War." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (June 1996): 235-260.

⁵⁴ Shannon, Meghan, "Preventing War and Providing the Peace?: International Organizations and the Management of Territorial Disputes." 26, no. 2 (April 2009): 144-163.

⁵⁵ Gibling, Douglas, *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. (2012) Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

⁵⁶ Waltz, Kenneth, *Theory of International Politics* (1979) Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, INC.

winning coalitions and are more *risk acceptant* are more likely to use war as a foreign policy tool.⁵⁷ This is one reason why democratic governments are often less willing to engage in armed conflict (particularly against other democracies).⁵⁸ High audience costs, democratic norms, and the likelihood that elites will be removed from office given foreign policy mistakes make war a costly strategy for more democratic governments.⁵⁹ While a more democratic regime may help stymie the use of violence as a foreign policy tool, governments are often pushed to engage in war by nationalistic elements within their own borders.⁶⁰ Governments are particularly vulnerable to these demands when salient territory is under dispute between rivalrous governments.⁶¹ While international rivalries are often difficult to end, the presence of disputed territory makes such enmities more intractable. In more recent analyses of armed conflict, the presence of contentious issues surrounding territory are some of the most likely to spur interstate armed conflict.⁶²

International institutions often alleviate these problems by providing binding forums where parties can resolve contentious issues.⁶³ As more international institutions arise, contentious disputes surrounding territory or trade policies are adjudicated by third parties.⁶⁴ This has helped to ease the need for war as a foreign policy tool to reshape the status quo.

Considering less structural and more crises conditions, there is evidence that interstate war can be triggered by crises as well. For example, the power-transition model of conflict assumes that rising powers (unhappy with the status quo) will violently contest the international order as a way to rewrite global agreements to better serve their interests.⁶⁵ The rising trend in internationalized conflict, is tied to the rise in intrastate armed conflicts. Foreign governments often intervene into civil wars for a number of reasons. As civil wars grow in intensity, refugees flee to neighboring countries, putting pressure on those states.⁶⁶ Contiguous states may also host rebel groups (providing them sanctuary from incumbent governments).⁶⁷ The use of foreign support for rebel groups is a common foreign policy tool employed by strategic rivals as a way to advance their foreign policy interests within a region. As conflicts escalate, foreign governments may intervene into civil wars to balance against international involvement by their

⁵⁷ Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, "Risk, Power Distributions, and the Likelihood of War." *International Studies Quarterly* 25, no 4. (December 1981): 541-568.; Bueno de Mequita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph Siverson, and Alastair Smith, "Testing Novel Implications from the Selectorate Theory of War." *World Politics* 56, no. 3 (April 2004): 363-388.

⁵⁸ Maoz, Zeev and Bruce Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 87, no. 3 (Sept. 1993): 624-638.

⁵⁹ Maoz and Russett (1993); Fearon, James D., "Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (June 1998): 289-313.

⁶⁰ Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder, "Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War." *International Organization* 56, no.2 (Spring 2002): 297-332.

⁶¹ Rider, Toby and Andrew Owsiak, "Border settlement, commitment problems, and the causes of contiguous rivalry." *Journal of Peace Research* 52, no. 4 (July 2015): 508-521.

⁶² Hensel, Paul, "Charting A Course To Conflict: Territorial Issues and Interstate Conflict, 1816-199." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15, no. 1 (February 1996): 43-73.

⁶³ Owsiak, Andrew, "Signing Up for Peace: International Boundary Agreements, Democracy, and Militarized Interstate Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (March 2012): 51-66.; Gent, Stephen and Megan Shannon, "The Effectiveness of International Arbitration and Adjudication: Getting Into a Bind." *Journal of Politics* 72, no. 2 (April 2010): 366-380.

⁶⁴ Sara M. Mitchell, "A Kantian System? Democracy and Third-Party Conflict Resolution." *American Journal of Political Science* 46, no. 2 (Oct. 2002): 749-759.

⁶⁵ Lemke, Douglas *Regions of War and Peace*. (2002) Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

⁶⁶ Salehyan, Idean and Kristian S. Gleditsch, "Refugees and the Spread of Civil War." *International Organization* 60, no. 2 (2006): 335-366.

⁶⁷ Salehyan, Idean, *Rebels Without Borders: Transnational Insurgencies in World Politics*. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.

strategic rivals.⁶⁸ Rebel groups therefore become vessels for international actors to pursue their own foreign policy interests. By reducing the number of active rebel groups, the international community may reduce the ability of states to use foreign sponsorship as a way to destabilize strategic rivals.

Collectively, a chronological lens on peacebuilding then suggests that the scope of peacebuilding can include the following potential elements or activities, depending on the intent of the program and the timeframe of the conflict:

- **Structural Prevention:** Work designed to address root cause/structural predictors of violence in countries not currently experiencing large-scale conflict
- **Crisis Prevention:** Work designed to prevent “flashpoint” problems or issues which might lead to large-scale conflict
- **Crisis Response:** Work designed to address crises once they occur in order to prevent the outbreak of large-scale conflict.
- **Peace Interventions:** Work designed to directly disrupt ongoing large-scale conflict
- **Peacebuilding:** Work designed to address stabilization and reconstruction in areas that are post-conflict or where active conflict is ongoing.

A Structural Theory of Peace

To the extent that the above analysis is correct, then the creation of a peaceful world requires a system which prevents the eruption of violence during “flashpoint” moments, responds quickly and positively to outbreaks of violence before they expand to large-scale war, and works to address the underlying drivers of conflict. Ultimately this system needs to operate globally and in ways that support rather than undermine the legitimacy of local institutions. This section will describe in principal what the global system will need to provide, in terms of functions and how success can be assessed. It will not attempt to prescribe exactly how the system should deliver these systems.

Cross-cutting Issues

The framing of this paper can suggest that the different elements that support peace are independent of each other and can be engaged with discretely. In reality this is not the case: societies are complex and interconnected systems, and feedback loops between development, social services, inclusion, and the other issues discussed above mean that “all good things tend to go together”⁶⁹. As a result, while organizations like OEF can develop analyses which treat the different elements as discrete elements, in practice they need to be understood as mutually interrelated parts of a complex system operating dynamically.

This suggests two things. The first is that no single intervention is sufficient for peace. Instead, delivering sustainable peace requires an effective coordinated effort that addresses issues of economic

⁶⁸ Salehyan, Idean, “The Externalities of Civil Strife: Refugees as a Source of International Conflict.” *American Journal of Political Science* 52. No. 4 (Oct. 2008): 787-801.; Findley, Michael and Tze Kwang Teo, “Rethinking Third-Party Interventions into Civil Wars: An Actor-Centric Approach.” *Journal of Politics* 68, no. 4 (Nov. 2006): 828-837.

⁶⁹ James D. Fearon, “Governance and Civil War Onset,” *World Development Report 2011 Background Paper* (The World Bank, 2010).

development, trust and inclusion in government, and security issues simultaneously⁷⁰. The second is that because these issues are connected, it's likely that there are some issues or elements which operate across multiple different elements of peace or war. In particular, these include global economic interdependence, inclusive economic development, women's inclusion in economic and political life, and democratic institutions on the positive side and great powers on the negative. This section briefly reviews why each of these have these impacts.

Interdependence

Global economic interdependence, in the form of increased international trade and a corresponding increase in international movement, appears to have directly impacted peace through multiple pathways. Global trade, in the form of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) contributes to economic development which as described above contributes to peace. This is not universally positive, perhaps, as it may also contribute to inequality in ways that may drive perceptions of exclusion. Global trade and global engagement has also contributed to a rising number and quality of international civil society movements, promoting more multistakeholder engagement.⁷¹ Trade also appears to directly reduce the risk of war,⁷² as it increases the economic interdependence of countries and also provides for multiple pathways of communication that may facilitate dispute resolution.

Development

Economic development is one of the most consistently identified predictors of peace. At the intrastate level, Edward Miguel described the relationship between national income and the risk of violence as "one of the most robust empirical relationships in the economic literature."⁷³ The relationship is so strong that some conflict scholars have argued that the ultimate root cause of war is fundamentally the failure of economic development.⁷⁴ The mechanisms of this, seen through the lens of the analysis above, are straightforward. First, economic development materially improves the lives of people. People who are better off are less likely to join violent groups: there is a direct association at the household level between poverty and participation in violence.⁷⁵ In part this can reflect the fact that people who are better off have more to lose, and in part it can reflect the fact that people treat the distribution of resources in part as a proxy for state legitimacy. Relatedly, at the aggregate level economic development provides funds (through taxation) to central governments who can use those funds to develop the social services and security institutions associated with peace.

⁷⁰ NATO, "Comprehensive Approach," NATO, June 26, 2018, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_51633.htm; Jasmin H. Cheung-Gertler, "A Model Power for a Troubled World? Canadian National Interests and Human Security in the 21st Century," *International Journal* 62, no. 3 (2007): 589–607; Beth Cole and Emily Hsu, "Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction" (Washington, D.C: US Institute of Peace, 2009).

⁷¹ Thomas G. Weiss, D. Conor Seyle, and Kelsey Coolidge, "The Rise of Non-State Actors in Global Governance: Opportunities and Limitations" (Broomfield, CO: One Earth Future Foundation, September 17, 2013), <http://oneearthfuture.org/research/publications/rise-non-state-actors-global-governance-opportunities-and-limitations>.

⁷² Havard Hegre, John R. Oneal, and Bruce Russett, "Trade Does Promote Peace: New Simultaneous Estimates of the Reciprocal Effects of Trade and Conflict," *Journal of Peace Research* 47, no. 6 (2010): 763–774.

⁷³ Edward Miguel, "Economic Shocks, Weather, and Civil War," *NBER Reporter Online*, no. 3 (2011): 8–10.

⁷⁴ Paul Collier et al., "Breaking the Conflict Trap" (Washington, D.C: World Bank, 2003).

⁷⁵ Patricia Justino, "Poverty and Violent Conflict: A Micro-Level Perspective on the Causes and Duration of Warfare," *Journal of Peace Research* 46, no. 3 (2009): 315–333.

Women's Inclusion

Women's inclusion in economic and political life is another major cross-cutting issue that affects multiple drivers of peace. When women are excluded from engaging fully in employment, in political life either as voters or candidates, or in control over family planning and reproductive health, a number of interrelated issues can emerge. There is a strong relationship between these different aspects of women's inclusion: indicators of intentional family planning, women's education, political ability, and employment all tend to move together and appear to be mutually reinforcing.⁷⁶ Considering the larger social environment of these statistics, the same elements are linked to several different elements that overall support peace. Considering electoral participation, women are more likely to endorse peaceful solutions to political problems⁷⁷ and when more women are elected to legislature countries are less likely to use violence both internally and in interstate contexts.⁷⁸ Increased education for women has a direct impact on economic activity,⁷⁹ and also appears to reduce infant mortality rates.⁸⁰ These manifold impacts suggest that one basic change, reducing inequality in the lived experiences of men and women internationally, can impact multiple elements that drive towards peace.

Democracy

The elements which support peace include several key aspects relating to how local governance systems operate. Peace is more likely when governments (or governance systems more broadly) deliver social services, operate transparently, and when citizens feel that their voice is incorporated into the system's decisions. These elements are distinct from the form that governments take - there's nothing inherent to a particular type of government that prevents it from delivering these elements. However, it's also the case that some forms of government are by the nature of their processes and systems more easily able to deliver these peace-supporting elements. An absolute monarch may choose to use his or her power to incorporate citizens' voices into decisions but there's no structural necessity that they do so. In contrast, democratic systems that formally empower citizens to choose representatives or vote on issues require voice as a tool for decision making. Given the structural pressures that such voice creates, it's not surprising that democratic systems seem to promote peace across multiple pathways. As mentioned, democracies formally empower citizens with voice in collective decisions, decreasing feelings of exclusion (if applied universally) and increasing alternate possible pathways for achieving political change without violence. Considering mature democracies (those with relatively strong institutions and a history of peaceful democratic transitions of power), democracies are significantly

⁷⁶ World Bank, "World Development Report 2012 : Gender Equality and Development" (Washington, D.C: World Bank, 2012).

⁷⁷ Richard C. Eichenberg, "Gender Differences in Public Attitudes toward the Use of Force by the United States, 1990–2003," *International Security* 28, no. 1 (2003): 110–141.

⁷⁸ Mary Caprioli, "Gendered Conflict," *Journal of Peace Research* 37, no. 1 (January 1, 2000): 51–68, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343300037001003>; Mary Caprioli and Mark A. Boyer, "Gender, Violence, and International Crisis," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45, no. 4 (August 1, 2001): 503–18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002701045004005>.

⁷⁹ David Dollar and Roberta Gatti, *Gender Inequality, Income, and Growth: Are Good Times Good for Women?* (Washington, D.C: The World Bank, 1999).

⁸⁰ Elizabeth N. Appiah and Walter W. McMahon, "The Social Outcomes of Education and Feedbacks on Growth in Africa," *Journal of Development Studies* 38, no. 4 (2002): 27–68.

less likely to wage war on each other,⁸¹ less likely to experience internal conflict,⁸² and less likely to experience genocide or political mass murder.⁸³ Democratic systems are structurally more prone to providing public goods than autocratic systems, and the opportunity for removing politicians that democracies offer allows for more pressure for transparency and inclusion. This effect is not evident in countries with developing or immature democracies, where factionalism can lead to more conflict.⁸⁴

Great Powers

“Great powers,” in political science, are traditionally defined at least in part by their ability to force the international system to accept their desires through the projection of force of some kind.⁸⁵ Through the lens of the analysis above, this reflects the fact that they possess enough military, economic, or institutional influence that realistically they expect to face little or no cost for their behavior. In the framing above, the decision to use force for a great power is affected at least in part by the perception that the costs of violence are relatively little. This is particularly true when considering internationalized conflict, as discussed below, where many of the externalities associated with violence can be placed on the states in which the violence is taking place. The ability of great powers to escape the negative outcomes of war means that they may be more likely to use force, and indeed that is empirically the case. The United States, for example, is significantly more bellicose than the structural predictors would suggest. There is some evidence that this is directly related to the extensive size of the US military rather than vice-versa.⁸⁶

Preventing Intrastate War

As discussed above, the necessary criteria for sustainable peace at the intrastate level are economic development, strong social service delivery across multiple domains, an inclusive political system that leads no group or identity to feel that they are excluded from the decisions of the system, and some degree of security institutions as a backstop against spoilers. Consistent with the chronological frame, there would also need to be some system in place for crisis response to prevent it becoming a serious violent conflict.

Assuming a global system that is contributed to but distinct from the aggregate of national governments, in practice delivering these elements is a question first of monitoring the situation on the ground, second of identifying where additional resources are needed and predicting where flashpoint issues might emerge, and then providing the additional resources necessary.

In case of economic development, the global system needs to support sustainable economic development, with sustainable meaning both development that does not contribute to environmental

⁸¹ John R. Oneal and Bruce Russett, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000).

⁸² Håvard Hegre, “Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816–1992,” *American Political Science Association Review* 95, no. 1 (2001): 33–48.

⁸³ Barbara Harff, “No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955,” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 01 (2003): 57–73, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000522>.

⁸⁴ Bruce Bueno De Mesquita et al., “Thinking inside the Box: A Closer Look at Democracy and Human Rights,” *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (September 1, 2005): 439–57.

⁸⁵ Iver B Neumann, “Russia as a great power, 1815–2007,” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 11 (2008): 128–151.

⁸⁶ Benjamin O. Fordham “A Very Sharp Sword: The Influence of Military Capabilities on American Decisions to Use Force” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48, no.5 (2004)

damage⁸⁷ but also development that becomes self-perpetuating and avoids traps of “Dutch Disease” and a lack of institutional development⁸⁸ and also development which does not contribute to inequality and exclusion in damaging ways. Conceptually, this has been referred to as a “triple bottom line” approach, in which firms and development aid are assessed on their environmental, financial, and social impact.⁸⁹ In the current system, international development is a major part of the global system with most major countries having a formal department or bureau of international assistance focused on international development, a number of international institutions including the World Bank and the UN developing systems for economic growth, and a large body of NGOs and humanitarian organizations providing economic and humanitarian assistance to least-developed countries. Although criticisms of this work abounds⁹⁰, there is a large and developing body of literature that lays out how aid supports economic development⁹¹.

Considering issues of equality, transparency, and other aspects of good governance, the international system for peace will need to clearly identify the criteria that define peace-supporting systems of governance, develop ways of measuring these elements, and tools for promoting good governance. Specific approaches to promoting good governance have been somewhat problematic, with approaches often emphasizing the forms of government (such as democracy) instead of the public goods that governance should achieve. Similarly, while there is consensus that corruption is acidic for legitimacy and other aspects of good governance, there is a relatively less developed understanding of how specifically to promote anticorruption practices. Transparency in institutional functioning is currently the emphasis of civil society engagement, with formal aid often emphasizing formal legal institutions and reform.

The global system for peace must also have tools in place for identifying areas and countries at particular risk of conflict either structurally or in specific “flashpoint” moments,” and directing effective resources to them in order to reduce the risk of conflict outbreak. Such interventions may include peacekeeping forces, which on balance have been effective⁹² but more effective approaches may be mediation support or other political tools.⁹³ International crises have been exacerbated by major civil wars. While the international community has a number of tools to manage armed conflicts, diplomatic interventions are generally the least costly and have been highly effective at bringing conflicts to a close.⁹⁴ In conjunction with other international conflict management strategies (such as peacekeeping and

⁸⁷ Jim MacNeill, “Strategies for Sustainable Economic Development,” *Scientific American* 261, no. 3 (n.d.): 154–65.

⁸⁸ Tony Addison, Oliver Morrissey, and Finn Tarp, “The Macroeconomics of Aid: Overview,” *Journal of Development Studies* 53, no. 7 (n.d.): 987–97.

⁸⁹ Janet Hammer and Gary Pivo, “The Triple Bottom Line and Sustainable Economic Development Theory and Practice -,” *Economic Development Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (2017): 25–36; Wayne Norman and Chris MacDonald, “Getting to the Bottom of ‘Triple Bottom Line,’” *Business Ethics Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (April 2004): 243–62, <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq200414211>.

⁹⁰ Emma Mawdsley et al., “Exporting Stimulus and ‘Shared Prosperity’: Reinventing Foreign Aid for a Retroliberal Era,” *Development Policy Review* 36, no. S1 (n.d.): O25–43.

⁹¹ E.g. Channing Arndt, Sam Jones, and Finn Tarp, “What Is the Aggregate Economic Rate of Return to Foreign Aid?,” *The World Bank Economic Review*, 30, no 3 (October 2016): 446–474, <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhv033>

⁹² Virginia Page Fortna, “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace after Civil War,” *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2004): 269–92.

⁹³ Regan, Patrick and Aysegul Aydin, “Diplomacy and Other Forms of Intervention in Civil Wars.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50, no. 5 (Oct. 2006): 736–756.; Greig, J. Michael, “Stepping Into the Fray: When Do Mediators Mediate?” *American Journal of Political Science* 49, no. 2 (April 2005): 249–266.

⁹⁴ Regan, Patrick. Richard Frank, and Aysegul Aydin, “Diplomatic Interventions and Civil War: A New Dataset.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, no. 1 (January 2009): 135–146.

targeted sanctions), the international community has the capacity to play a critical role in promoting peace. Considering prevention and identification of prevention countries, this can include both a structural assessment of institutional gaps and weaknesses or a specific prediction of conflict risk associated with predictive modeling around potential flashpoint issues.

Collectively, this vision for the global peace system is one in which the system as a whole needs to provide structural support for effective development and institutional growth coupled with targeted intervention and crisis prevention in response. In the current global system, these functions are mostly provided with varying degrees of effectiveness by a large body of IGOs, state actors, and civil society. The primary challenge in the current system is less a question of identifying new strategic priorities for these institutions and more a question of improving their capacity, effectiveness, and coordination.

Preventing Interstate War

As disputes over territorial boundaries and regional rivalries represent the greatest threat for interstate conflicts, the international community should focus on developing mechanisms for international actors to resolve their differences through peaceful avenues. Fortunately, the general trend in state behavior has been the utilization of international institutions and third-party assistance to resolve contentious issues (as compared to ending the dispute through violence). This explains in part why interstate conflicts are much rarer as compared to intrastate conflicts. To help prevent future armed conflicts, the international community should strengthen these institutions and mechanisms. Furthermore, more inclusive (democratic) governments within the international system will help to dissuade armed conflict as a foreign policy tool.

Preventing Internationalized War

Internationalized war is an increasing aspect of modern conflict, both in terms of wars, such as in Syria, and also “grey zone” conflict characterized by deniable operations and low-level violence and provocation.⁹⁵ From the rationalist analysis that this paper takes as its framing, internationalized conflict may be increasingly common because the costs to the supporters of violence are relatively low. If a country leader feels that he or she will achieve something - some gain in national goals or political prominence - from supporting violence in another state then the costs are relatively low in the current environment and the likelihood of moving ahead is correspondingly higher. This is particularly true in internationalized conflict where support comes in the form of financial support or equipment rather than direct troop support.

A global system that reduces internationalized conflict would need to address multiple issues simultaneously. On the factors relating to the value and costs of conflict, the same prevention elements that prevent inter and intra state war might prevent internationalized conflict. A reduction in intrastate war severity or frequency will reduce the pressures coming from the movement of refugees or the need to protect civilians, while stronger systems for dispute resolution on the interstate side will reduce the strategic need to engage in support. In addition to these elements, though, there are specific pieces that could be developed to address internationalized war. On the structural costs side, the global system needs some way of identifying in a credible way where international actors are engaged in intrastate conflict, who those actors are, and publicly holding them accountable for their contributions to ongoing

⁹⁵ Lyle Morris et al., “Gaining Competitive Advantage in the Gray Zone: Response Options for Coercive Aggression Below the Threshold of Major War” (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2019), https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2942.html.

violence. The only tools available for this in the current system are diplomacy and sanctions, whether bi- or multilateral, and in a limited way the UN Security Council and arguably the International Criminal Court under the narrow circumstances of direct engagement in crimes violating the Rome Statute.

Conceptually, this all means that peacebuilding entails both a wide spectrum of work on a number of different issues ranging from government capacity building to the establishment of international institutions, across structural and crisis elements, and requires a heavy degree of coordination. This runs the risk that “peacebuilding” as a concept can become so broad as to be unwieldy. Appendix II represents one conceptual map of the peacebuilding field that attempts to break down this complexity into specific components.

Where the World is Now

The overall issues identified above have not been ignored by the global system. Current trends in predictors, as well as issues of overall coordination, have been a focus of attention by many different researchers and organizations.

Performance Against the General Goals

After several decades of a steady move towards peace, the early part of the 21st century showed a significant shift to violence. This was driven by the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and later in the 2000s by the conflicts in Libya, Syria, and Ukraine with Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan being the largest conflicts. As of 2018, conflict-related deaths have fallen compared to their mid-decade peak, but the number of active conflicts is at the highest point since the early 1990s.⁹⁶

Considering the four pillars of peace above, economic development has remained strong internationally, continuing ongoing trends of widespread improvement. However, in 2018 these trends began to fragment with some developing countries showing declines in per capita income and significant concerns heading into 2019 that there is a risk of global economic downturns.⁹⁷

Human development has paralleled economic development, with increasing access to education and health care in many developing countries leading to significant global increases in life expectancy.⁹⁸ This is not equally shared, with high income countries actually showing a decline in life expectancy that in most cases was associated with an aging population but in some cases was tied to other aspects of human security such as drug overdoses and violence.⁹⁹

Considering good governance the global trends are not positive. There has been a decrease in the movement towards more inclusive and accountable governments,¹⁰⁰ and increasing economic inequality

⁹⁶ Therése Pettersson, Stina Högladh, and Magnus Öberg, “Organized Violence, 1989–2018 and Peace Agreements,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 2019, 0022343319856046.

⁹⁷ United Nations, “World Economic Situation & Prospects for 2019” (New York, N.Y.: United Nations, 2019), <https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/publication/world-economic-situation-and-prospects-2019/>.

⁹⁸ “WHO | Life Expectancy,” WHO, accessed June 10, 2019, http://www.who.int/gho/mortality_burden_disease/life_tables/situation_trends_text/en/.

⁹⁹ Jessica Y. Ho and Arun S. Hendi, “Recent Trends in Life Expectancy across High Income Countries: Retrospective Observational Study,” *BMJ* 362 (August 15, 2018): k2562, <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k2562>.

¹⁰⁰ Mathew Burrows, *Is Authoritarianism Staging a Comeback?*, ed. Maria J. Stephan (Atlantic Council, 2015).

has led to increasing perceptions that groups are being excluded from the benefits of systems internationally.¹⁰¹

Considering the security pillar, including the nuances of the need for civilian control and the need to avoid excessive spending, security institutions at the national level are largely sufficient with only some areas of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, and some other fragile and conflict-affected countries facing an inability for the state to push back against armed actors. At the international level there has been a retreat from formal international institutions, with increasing criticism and withdrawal from the ICC and increasing use of the veto at the UN to block attempts to pressure combatants or intervene to prevent violence.

Internationally, dangerous trends include the rise of nationalist movements criticising or supporting the undermining of multilateral institutions and asserting the rights of states to act without interference from the international system. In parallel, several events over the last two decades have undermined the belief that the international system will impose costs or punishment on states which act violently. Syria used chemical weapons with (initially) no response from the international system, and military actions by the US and Russia have suggested they see no serious costs. To the extent that this provides a clear demonstration that there are no costs associated with violence these actions undermine the international system supporting peace.

Processes and Groups Working on This

Our conclusions are not unique to OEF. While the specific framing approach we've taken is novel, the basic research we're driving from is the same research that other organizations are looking at when making their own strategic calculations. As a result, it's not a surprise that several other organizations have developed approaches to peace that are in line with our analysis.

International Governmental Organizations and National Governments

Perhaps the most comprehensive approach to an integrated system for sustainable peace is appropriately the comprehensive institution of the United Nations. Formally, the UN charter places the maintenance of international peace and security as its first mission¹⁰² and in its current form has made several significant steps towards delivering a global peace system. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development represents a comprehensive approach to the measurement and reporting of a staggering number of indicators of development, security, and good governance for every country everywhere. The Agenda is the successor to the Millennium Development Goals, whose success continues to be debated. The 2030 Agenda increases the scope and complexity of the MDGs, and the impact of the Agenda and the SDGs are correspondingly more challenging. More directly on the crisis prevention side, the UN peacebuilding and peacekeeping architecture includes both mediation support and a mechanism for delivering coordinated multidimensional peace interventions. The Secretary-General's Sustaining Peace Agenda is an initiative launched in 2016 with the goal of improving coordination among multiple UN agencies to deliver multidimensional and effective peace support.

The World Bank works closely with the UN on issues of stability, and over 2018-2019 have been renewing their "Fragility, Conflict, and Violence" strategy. Their draft FCV strategy draws direct

¹⁰¹ Facundo Alvaredo et al., "World Inequality Report 2018" (World Inequality Lab, 2019).

¹⁰² United Nations, "Charter of the United Nations" (1945).

associations between state government performance (fragility), political violence (conflict) and interpersonal violence (violence) and is intended to develop coordinated tools for addressing each of these elements through the World Bank's work. As of 2019 this strategy is in draft with an open review process, and it is expected to be finalized shortly.

The African Union has committed to developing peace in Africa with the "Silencing the Guns" initiative. Launched in 2014 after the Fifth High-Level Retreat on the Promotion of Peace, Security and Stability in Africa, the Silencing the Guns initiative is a commitment by the African Union to deliver peace in Africa as part of the long-term vision for economic development on the continent¹⁰³. The initiative sets out 2020 as the target year for peace in Africa, and emphasizes the need for preventive mediation and more rapid deployment of peacekeepers in Africa as parts of the strategy. Since the establishment of the initiative, there has been some progress made but the goal of peace by 2020 does not currently appear likely.

Considering the domain of international civil society, a number of groups are likewise working on consolidated peace at the level of individual countries. Many major international organizations which operate in conflict environments as well as post-disaster environments, particularly MercyCorps, International Alert, and Catholic Relief Services, have evolved towards an approach to conflict management that incorporates a multidimensional model of conflict analysis and conflict work.¹⁰⁴ Peace-focused organizations, including Search for Common Ground and PeaceDirect, have followed a similar trajectory of moving from a specific focus on singular approaches to peacebuilding to a multidimensional approach to peace. Collectively, these organizations tend to operate at the country or regional level and while they have had significant impact in the domains that they have operated in, their work is limited by the funding and support they can achieve. As a result they fall short of constituting a truly global system by themselves, although as a part of the global system for addressing peace they are making excellent strides.

Conclusion

Collectively this research suggests that the idea of a world without war is not an absurd goal for the global system and in many ways the current system is delivering steps toward that goal. There are significant gaps and omissions in the focus and capacity of the global system as it is currently constituted, but the work of international organizations and civil society is becoming increasingly evidence-based and effective.

Just because this has been a trend, though, does not mean that it will continue to be so. The fact that war has been declining is still not so long-established that it can be proven to be something other than random statistical variation.¹⁰⁵ The conditions that have contributed to peace - economic development, positive trends in governance and reducing inequality, and growing international trade - are fragile and in some cases reversing the positive trends of the 20th century. While a world without war is not

¹⁰³ ACCORD, "Silencing the Guns, Owning the Future: Realising a Conflict-Free Africa" (Durban, South Africa: African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ Maria Lange, "Building Institutional Capacity for Conflict-Sensitive Practice: The Case of International NGOs" (London, UK: International Alert, 2004); Aaron Chassy et al., "Engaging Government: A CRS Guide for Working for Social Change" (Baltimore, MD: Catholic Relief Services, 2018).

¹⁰⁵ Aaron Clauset, "The Enduring Threat of a Large Interstate War" (Broomfield, CO: One Earth Future Foundation, 2017).

impossible or unattainable, the world will need to take conscious and deliberate steps to counter the existing trends and develop a global system to promote peace. OEF as an organization is committed to promoting this path, and Appendix I below lays out our specific plans for how to execute this.

Appendix I: OEF Strategy for the Elimination of War

Overview

This memo provides an overview of a proposed operationalization of OEF strategy for the “path to peace.” Based on the framing included in the “path to peace” memo, it lays out how OEF can develop our work to move from narrow implementation projects through coordinated national peacebuilding up to transnational or global coordination (if needed). It proposes two areas of strategy that OEF needs to consider. The first is the question of whether our mandate includes the full range of peace interventions from structural prevention through crisis response to post-conflict peacebuilding, or whether OEF will focus on only one of those elements. The second is the question of how OEF strategy will evolve from a focus on issue-specific interventions to coordinated peacebuilding.

OEF’s understanding of drivers of conflict and peacebuilding work.

- OEF maps drivers of conflict across two domains: chronological and thematic. In the first case, OEF understands war to be the result of structural pressures toward conflict, meeting a crisis “flashpoint” which triggers escalating violence. This violence eventually resolves through either a negotiated solution or a military victory by one side.
- In the second case, OEF understands the war to be the result of a decision (whether deliberate or not) that the use of violence is the best way for a group or individual to achieve their goal. This decision is influenced by several factors, including the value of the perceived goal, the value of the current situation, the perceived risk and likelihood of failure of violence, and the perceived likelihood of achieving the same goal nonviolently. While this generic analysis is true across conflict contexts, the specific needs and pressures that feed into this analysis are notably different when considering elite decisions versus front-line participants’ decisions and when considering interstate, intrastate, and internationalized conflict.
- These two axes of analysis demonstrate the complexity of potential peacebuilding interventions: delivering sustained peace means working to prevent flashpoint crises, reduce structural pressures for peace, and deliver systems which address both elite and front-line pressures towards violence at the interstate and intrastate level. Complicating this further is the fact that all of these issues are interconnected, and while peace in the short term may be achieved through a heavy focus on only one aspect of the peace system, sustainable peace requires delivering all of these elements in a coordinated fashion.

Strategy of coordinated peacebuilding

OEF has demonstrated the ability to work effectively in narrow and targeted interventions, and in doing so has built legitimacy as a trusted actor in the areas where we operate. Based on this experience, the proposed strategy for moving the world to peace is the following:

1. OEF projects will continue to emphasize narrow, targeted, and measurable interventions focused on specific and narrow problems in the areas where we operate. These should be consciously defined according to their chronological sequence in the peacebuilding sequence as follows:

- a. Structural prevention: Work designed to address root cause/structural predictors of violence in countries not currently experiencing large-scale conflict
 - b. Crisis prevention: Work designed to prevent “flashpoint” problems or issues which might lead to large-scale conflict
 - c. Crisis response: Work designed to address crises once they occur in order to prevent the outbreak of large-scale conflict.
 - d. Peace interventions: Work designed to directly disrupt ongoing large-scale conflict
 - e. Peacebuilding: Work designed to address stabilization and reconstruction in areas that are post-conflict or where active conflict is ongoing.
2. In 2020 and 2021, OEF will identify a target country (Somalia) and use the legitimacy developed through our work there to partner with another organization (Search for Common Ground) with the goal of exploring multidimensional peacebuilding coordination. This project will have the following goals:
 - a. Exploring methods for deconfliction and coordination among peacebuilding organizations, including the larger community of peacebuilders within Somalia.
 - b. Exploring the effectiveness of coordinated multidimensional work between OEF and SFCG and any other organizations who demonstrate enthusiasm to partner.
 - c. Demonstrating to external peacebuilding communities OEF’s effectiveness as a partner in this.
 3. Depending on the developing success of this model, when OEF feels that it is ready it will develop a similar approach to another geographic area of interest (most likely Colombia), with the goal of further refining our skills and abilities in coordinated multidimensional peacebuilding.
 4. When OEF feels ready, most likely not fewer than 2025, the organization will assess its performance and determine if it justifies a move to a larger transnational coordination effort focused on a specific region rather than a country, or if it should continue to focus on different limited conflict countries.
 5. Throughout this work, OEF will engage directly with the ongoing discussion about coordinated peacebuilding coming from national institutions (including the US government, and the UK government) and international institutions (including the World Bank and the UN) with the goal of sharing lessons-learned and best practices in both directions.

Appendix 2: Map of Potential Peacebuilding Activities

Structural Peacebuilding	Crisis Prevention	Crisis Response	Peace Interventions	Post-conflict Recovery
Inclusive development	Crisis Forecasting	Public Pressure	Humanitarian Aid	DDR
Anti Corruption	Elite Negotiation	Elite Negotiation	Peacekeeping Interventions	Truth & Reconciliation
Security Sector Reform	Public Pressure	Nonviolent Strategy Training	Public Pressure	Post-trauma Recovery
Transparency	Nonviolent Strategy Training	Violent Message Filtering	Elite Negotiation	Inclusive Development
Civil Society Development	Violent Message Filtering	Peaceful Messaging		Security Sector Reform
Reduction in Intergroup Prejudice	Peaceful Messaging	Peacekeeping Interventions		Peace Agreement Monitoring
Inclusion in Government	Media Awareness Training	Humanitarian Aid		Deradicalization
Counterradicalization/ PVE		CVE		Reduction in Intergroup Prejudice
Media Awareness Training				Peacekeeping
Healthcare				State Capacity Building
Education				
State Capacity Building				

Appendix 3: What Doesn't Work

The memo below was prepared as an internal memo addressing the question of what peace science would suggest does not work to prevent peace.

Introduction

While exhaustive studies have attempted to isolate the mechanisms that do promote durable peace in fragile and conflict affected countries, few studies attempt to identify *what does not work*. This information may be of critical importance as it should underscore avenues to avoid so as to prevent peacebuilding efforts from falling into operational pitfalls. Unfortunately, there are clear structural barriers in attempting to assess a body of work on ineffective (or even counterproductive) strategies for promoting peace. Within the world of rigorous academic studies, there is a clear bias towards publishing significant results. This leads to a dramatic undercounting of analyses that have shown little net-benefit for peacebuilding strategies. Similarly, scholars engaged in peacebuilding are committed to identifying *what does work* in promoting stability and are therefore likely to focus their efforts on publishing work that highlights effective mechanisms (as opposed to counterproductive efforts).

With that in mind, there is still some work that has identified ineffective peacebuilding strategies. This is particularly true for popular policy options promoted by the global community such as democratization, power-sharing, international aid projects, and imposed regimes. The following discussion examines what can be learned from these approaches. Broadly, such approaches can be defined as international strategies for fostering peace as well as domestic/ institutional approaches for resolving conflicts and ensuring stability. The scope of this memo is directed specifically at identifying what is known to clearly not work in promoting peace. There are several policies that may work but have a mixed history of success (such as disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration or DDR). Including them in this document may muddy the conceptual waters, as more research is needed to flesh out the beneficial (and deleterious) aspects of these policies. We therefore focus more specifically on policies that have been shown to have a negative effect on promoting peace.

From this review, two general trends emerge:

- 1) Ineffective international approaches to fostering peace (such as foreign aid or economic sanctions) often have the unintended consequence of exacerbating ongoing armed conflicts.
- 2) Ineffective domestic/ institutional level approaches to fostering peace are generally designed to *initiate* a peace process, but they're poorly designed to *consolidate* long-term stability. These policies are exceedingly vulnerable to exploitation by leaders within the government and the opposition.

Context for Producing Peace

Broadly, there are often few options available to the international community to resolve armed conflicts (primarily intrastate conflicts). The strongest predictors of peace are, generally, tied to domestic-level

factors such as economic development,¹⁰⁶ political inclusion,¹⁰⁷ weak governance,¹⁰⁸ and the presence of natural resources.¹⁰⁹ Once armed conflict emerges, the absence (or unequal distribution) of these domestic-level factors tends to be a key barrier to settling armed conflicts.¹¹⁰ For instance, elites that benefit from exclusionary policies often have little immediate incentive to acquiesce to dissident demands to hand over power.¹¹¹ Similarly, there tends to be a reason for why public goods are only directed to areas dominated by key ethnic groups or that natural resource wealth is pilfered by government officials: it maintains the political order.¹¹² When armed conflict emerges, it is an attempt (or an alleged attempt) to disrupt the status quo, thereby threatening the interests of those who benefit from the established order.

International efforts to prevent, reduce, and/ or end armed conflicts are often tied directly to these features. Imposed regimes, power-sharing arrangements, and democratization are designed specifically to deal with the institutional features that started the conflict in the first place. International aid projects are used, generally, to supplement state capacity and alleviate the deleterious effects of poverty (such as the unequal distribution of goods). Finally, armed interventions and the deployment of military aid are used to quickly end fighting and foster security in fragile countries. Unfortunately, these specific policy options often prove counterproductive.

I. International Dimensions to Promote Peace

The first step in this process will review counterproductive international efforts to promote peace. The international community has often experimented with a number of options to push parties to the negotiating table (or unilaterally impose peace to end armed conflicts).¹¹³ The last two decades have presented a significant body of research on how some of these actions are often exceedingly counterproductive. There are, as always, caveats to these claims. Generally, successful interventions (economic, military, diplomatic, etc.) must be part of a more comprehensive plan in order to be effective. As underscored by the research below, though, these unilateral actions (in isolation from a broader approach) often significantly undermine the prospects for durable peace.

- **International Aid**

Broadly, international aid has been seen as a tool to prevent (and end) armed conflicts. The threat of cutting off aid can be used to force parties to come to the negotiating table or comply

¹⁰⁶ Fearon, James D. and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90.

¹⁰⁷ Cederman, Lars-Erik. Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and Halvard Buhaug. 2013. *Inequality, Grievances, and Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁰⁸ Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede and Andrea Ruggeri. 2010. "Political Opportunity Structures, Democracy, and Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(3): 299-310.

¹⁰⁹ Fearon and Laitin (2003); Lujala, Päivi. 2010. "The Spoils of Nature: Armed Civil Conflict and Rebel Access to Natural Resources." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(1): 15-28.

¹¹⁰ Wucherpfennig, Julian. Nils W. Metternich, Lars-Erik Cederman, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2012. "Ethnicity, the State, and the Duration of Civil War." *World Politics* 64(1): 79-115.

¹¹¹ Ibid

¹¹² Wiegand, Krista and Eric Keels. 2019. "Oil Wealth, Winning Coalitions, and Duration of Civil Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(4): 1077-1105.

¹¹³ Regan, Patrick M. and Aysegul Aydin (2006) Diplomacy and Other Forms of Intervention in Civil Wars. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(5): 736-756.

with the terms of a tenuous settlement.¹¹⁴ While the research has pointed to the efficacy of international aid at preventing the onset of organized political violence,¹¹⁵ the continued provision of aid following the onset of conflict can quickly become counter-productive. International aid provision during armed conflicts inadvertently prolongs disputes by allowing aid to be misappropriated by governments and armed groups.¹¹⁶ Similarly, aid can increase the degree of uncertainty in armed conflicts, as humanitarian aid may reduce the direct costs of the armed conflict. This reduces the proverbial “hurting stalemate” that would normally force groups to seek a political settlement.¹¹⁷ It therefore becomes difficult to determine whether groups can continue to wage war. In short, while aid generally can be effective early on to prevent violence from emerging, once fighting is underway, aid may inadvertently prolong conflicts (allowing wars to become intractable). It should also be stated that international aid may be required despite the risk of misappropriation by armed groups. In order to prevent immediate human suffering within the civilian population, international actors may accept that some aid will be misappropriated, and wars will prolong given this issue.

- **Sanctions**

While international aid may exacerbate conflicts because it reduces the costs of fighting, sanctions are designed to increase those specific costs. The logic behind this strategy is relatively straightforward. If wars persist because the cost of fighting is perceived to be lower than the cost of settling, then sanctions may spur a peaceful settlement by raising the costs of war.¹¹⁸ To that end, some of the initial work on this subject indeed found that sanctions could reduce the duration of armed conflicts.¹¹⁹ Unfortunately, further research into the effects of sanctions has underscored that, in general, sanctions (in and of themselves) play little or no role in promoting peace.¹²⁰ This is largely because when actors accept the costs of engaging in armed conflict, additional costs may be insufficient to make them run the risk of settling the conflict (as there are often audience costs associated with compromising). Rather, sanctions may have the inadvertent effect of exacerbating violence in intrastate conflicts.¹²¹ Similarly, sanctions have been found to increase human rights violations in targeted countries.¹²²

There is a caveat, though, in assessing the role of sanctions in promoting peace. While sanctions, in and of themselves, may be ineffective (or counterproductive) in fostering peace, they can be useful as part of a more comprehensive conflict management strategy. For instance, sanctions

¹¹⁴ Michael G. Findley. 2018. “Does Foreign Aid Build Peace?” *Annual Review of Political Science* 21: 359–384.

¹¹⁵ Joseph K. Young and Michael G. Findley. 2011. “Can Peace Be Purchased? A Sector Level Analysis of Aid’s Influence on Transnational Terrorism,” *Public Choice* 149.

¹¹⁶ Narang, Neil. 2014. “Assisting Uncertainty: How Humanitarian Aid can Inadvertently Prolong Civil War.” *International Studies Quarterly*: 1-12.

¹¹⁷ Ibid

¹¹⁸ Mattes, Michaela and Burcu Savun. 2009. “Fostering Peace After Civil War: Commitment Problems and Agreement Design.” *International Studies Quarterly* 53(3): 737-759.

¹¹⁹ Escribà-Folch, Abel. 2010. “Economic Sanctions and the Duration of Civil Conflict.” *Journal of Peace Research* 47(2): 129-141.

¹²⁰ Lektzian, David and Patrick Regan. 2016. “Economic Sanctions, Military Interventions, and Civil Conflict Outcomes.” *Journal of Peace Research* 53(4): 554-568.

¹²¹ Hultman, Lisa and Dursun Peksen. 2017. “Successful or Counterproductive Coercion? The Effect of International Sanctions on Conflict Intensity.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(6) 1315-1339.

¹²² Wood, Reed M. “‘A Hand Upon the Throat of the Nation’: Economic Sanctions and State Repression, 1976-2001.” *International Studies Quarterly* 52(3): 489-513.

employed in conjunction with an arms embargo may significantly reduce the intensity of armed conflicts.¹²³ Similarly, though sanctions may not shorten the duration of civil wars, they do increase the likelihood that parties will enter into mediated talks.¹²⁴ Once in mediation, sanctions will only be effective if the mediator can credibly guarantee that the sanctions will be lifted as part of the peace process. Beyond incorporating sanctions into a broader conflict management strategy, though, sanctions are largely ineffective in promoting peace.

- **Foreign Military Support**

Another strategy designed to increase the costs of fighting is the use of foreign support for government and non-state actors in armed conflicts. Though there is little large-N quantitative research on the long-term effects of providing military support to government officials, a significant amount of research has pointed to the adverse effects for sponsoring violent non-state actors.¹²⁵ The provision of weapons, funding, and training (the most common forms of support) may increase the lifespan of insurgencies, but they do little to ensure success on the battlefield.¹²⁶ Rather, there is an increased opportunity for misappropriation of funds as well as an increase in the relative uncertainty associated with these forms of support.¹²⁷ As the flow of weapons and monetary support into armed conflicts increases, the duration of those disputes also increases (promoting more intractable wars). Equally, the training of rebel groups, by and large, does little to better equip them with the skills to succeed on the battlefield.¹²⁸

- **Foreign Intervention/ Imposed Regimes**

While the provision of military support in the form of fungible goods (e.g. financial assistance) does little to quickly end armed conflicts, there is some evidence to suggest that direct military support in the form of troops significantly shortens the duration of intrastate conflicts.¹²⁹ Similarly, biased interventions on behalf of rebel groups significantly increases the likelihood that the rebels will either defeat the government or fight them to a negotiated settlement. On the other hand, interventions that occur on behalf of the incumbent government tends to occur too late in armed conflicts, doing little to keep the regime in power.¹³⁰

Foreign interventions also lead to significant barriers in settling armed conflicts, though.¹³¹ For each additional intervener, a new veto player is added to any negotiation. Foreign governments may reject possible settlements, particularly if it threatens their geopolitical interests. This often prolongs armed conflicts and stymies efforts to identify a peaceful resolution. Another critical

¹²³ Hultman and Peksen (2017)

¹²⁴ Wiegand, Krista. Eric Keels, and Aaron Gold. 2019. "Leverage and Success in Mediation." *Working Paper*.

¹²⁵ Sawyer, Katherine. Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, and William Reed. 2017. "The Role of External Support in Civil War Termination," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 61 (6) 1174-1202.; Connable, Ben and Martin Libicki. 2010. "How Insurgencies End." *RAND National Defense Research Institute*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

¹²⁶ Sawyer et al. (2017); Keels, Eric. Jay Benson, Michael Widmeier. 2019. "Teaching from Experience: Foreign Training and Rebel Success in Civil War." *Working Paper*

¹²⁷ Sawyer et al. (2017); Keels et al. (2019)

¹²⁸ Keels et al. (2019)

¹²⁹ Sawyer et al. (2017); Keels et al. (2019)

¹³⁰ Stephen E. Gent, "Going in When It Counts: Military Intervention and the Outcome of Civil Conflicts," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 52, No. 4, (Dec., 2008) pp. 713-735.

¹³¹ Cunningham, David E. 2010. "Blocking Resolution: How External States can Extend Civil Wars." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(2): 115-127.

issue that emerges from foreign interventions is what to do after a regime has been toppled. As noted earlier, rebels tend to benefit the most from foreign interventions. Unfortunately, the country as a whole tends to suffer significantly from foreign imposed regimes.¹³² Such regimes typically lack the same credibility as more indigenous governments.¹³³ This is particularly true for societies marked by significant ethnic fractionalization. More diverse societies are much more likely to react violently to the imposition of a foreign regime. In short, while foreign military interventions are likely more successful in ending wars when they are launched on behalf of rebel groups, these interventions often generate profound downstream consequences. Specifically, the subsequent regimes are viewed with hostility and distrust, particularly when the war-torn society is ethnically diverse.

There is some evidence, though, that unbiased militarized humanitarian interventions may assist with settling armed conflicts.¹³⁴ These are militarized interventions where the stated goal is the protection of civilians. Such interventions increase the likelihood of international mediation. Once mediation is underway, though, these interventions are only successful if mediators can credibly claim to increase or decrease military force as part of the negotiations. There are also other risks to this strategy. Interventions significantly increase the likelihood that civilians will be targeted by government and rebel forces.¹³⁵ Similarly, interventions designed to stop mass killings often increase the intensity of such killings before they can effectively stop the agents of atrocity.

II. Domestic Dimensions to Promote Peace

Outside of international engagement that may be counterproductive to fostering peace, there are domestic level policy decisions that also may undermine peace processes. Specifically, ‘what does not work’ in promoting peace often relates to the types of agreements that are designed in the aftermath of armed conflicts.

- **Political Power-Sharing Agreements**

Power-sharing arrangements offer a complicated tool for resolving armed conflicts. Broadly power-sharing institutions are designed to provide greater transparency and (when effective) some degree of mutual veto over the political process.¹³⁶ In short, power-sharing institutions are designed to foster more ‘consensus’ style institutions.¹³⁷ While most power-sharing institutions globally often reflect legislative representation, within many peace agreements power-sharing

¹³² Enterline, Andrew J. and J. Michael Greig. 2007. “Surge, Escalate, Withdraw and Shinseki: Forecasting and Retro-Casting American Force Strategies and Insurgency in Iraq.” *International Studies Perspective* 8: 245-252

¹³³ Greig, J. Michael and Andrew Enterline. 2014. “The Durability of Imposed Democracy.” *International Interactions* 40: 166-190.

¹³⁴ Wiegand et al. (2019)

¹³⁵ Wood, Reed M. Jacob Kathman, and Stephen Gent. 2012. “Armed intervention and civilian victimization in intrastate conflicts.” *Journal of Peace Research* 49(5): 647-660.

¹³⁶ Hartzell, Caroline A. and Matthew Hoddie. 2007. *Crafting Peace: Power-Sharing Institutions and the Negotiated Settlements of Civil Wars*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. Hoddie, Matthew and Caroline Hartzell. 2005. “Power-Sharing in Peace Settlements: Initiating the Transition from Civil War.” *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy after Civil Wars*. eds. Roeder, Philip G. and Ronald Rothchild. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

¹³⁷ Ibid

tends to focus on representation within the executive (though there is some legislative power-sharing).¹³⁸

Even most opponents of power-sharing recognize its efficacy in spurring the initiation of peace.¹³⁹ The guarantee of power-sharing within the government may help reticent members of the government or opposition agree to lay down their arms. Therefore, power-sharing (particularly with stronger rebel groups) is a common feature of peace processes.¹⁴⁰ Unfortunately, while political power-sharing may be effective at initiating peace, it tends to be ineffective at *consolidating* the peace process. The distribution of power essentially *freezes* wartime cleavages, where military rivals negotiate over the tenuous process of implementing peace agreement provisions.¹⁴¹ If elites are uninterested in promoting broader, sociotropic change, then there is little that civil society organizations or international organizations can do to resolve the underlying issues that spurred the conflict in the first place.¹⁴² This often leads to new rebel factions emerging to contest state control.

Power-sharing may be more effective when implemented in conjunction with other, more substantive changes to the country. A transitional power-sharing government may be effective if it oversees the integration of the armed forces, substantive electoral reforms, or an equitable distribution of state resources.¹⁴³ In isolation, though, such institutions may do little to resolve the deep, social grievances that often fuel armed conflicts.

- **Territorial Power-Sharing Agreements**

Territorial power-sharing mitigates some of these challenges by offering autonomy to restive portions of the country.¹⁴⁴ It is not uncommon for peace agreements to include a mix of territorial (with a decentralization of political power) and national power-sharing to reduce participant concerns that the national government will marginalize formerly restive regions.¹⁴⁵ Recent scholarship has pointed to the efficacy of territorial power-sharing in reducing the emergence of rebellions seeking autonomy or independence.¹⁴⁶ Unfortunately, the provision of territorial power-sharing as part of a settlement appears to be less effective at actually reducing the emergence of armed conflict.¹⁴⁷ This is likely the product of disagreements over the management of resources within the restive regions as well as the wellbeing of co-ethnic or

¹³⁸ Högladh, Stina, 2011. "Peace agreements 1975-2011 - Updating the UCDP Peace Agreement dataset", in Pettersson Therése & Lotta Themnér (eds.), 2012, *States in Armed Conflict 2011*, Uppsala University: Department of Peace and Conflict Research Report 99

¹³⁹ Jarstad, Anna K. and Timothy D. Sisk. 2008. *From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.;

Rothchild, Donald and Philip Roeder. 2005. "Power-sharing as an Impediment to Peace and Democracy." *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy after Civil Wars*. eds. Roeder, Philip G. and Ronald Rothchild. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

¹⁴⁰ Högladh (2011)

¹⁴¹ Rothchild and Roeder (2005)

¹⁴² Keels, Eric. 2018. "Electoral Reforms and Peace Duration Following Negotiated Settlements." *International Interactions* 44(1): 33-58.

¹⁴³ Joshi, Madhav, Erik Melander, and Jason Michael Quinn. 2015. "Sequencing the Peace: How the Order of Peace Agreement Implementation Can Reduce the Destabilizing Effects of Post-accord Elections." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* DOI: 10.1177/0022002715576573

¹⁴⁴ Brancati, Dawn. 2006. "Decentralization: Fueling the Fire or Dampening the Flames of Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism?" *International Organization* 60(3): 651-685.

¹⁴⁵ Högladh (2011)

¹⁴⁶ Cederman, Lars-Erik, Simon Hug, Andreas Schadel, and Julian Wucherpfennig. 2015. "Territorial Autonomy in the Shadow of Conflict: Too Little, Too Late?" *American Political Science Review* 109(2): 354-370.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid

co-sectarians associated with the national government living within the new autonomous state.¹⁴⁸

- **Post-War Elections**

One of the great puzzles of post-war peacebuilding is the troubling role that elections play in fostering peace. Broadly, more inclusive political institutions are far less likely to promote armed conflict as compared to exclusionary practices.¹⁴⁹ More democratic reforms are therefore often touted as a necessary reform to promote peace. To that end, elections represent the most common provision in peace agreements.¹⁵⁰ The international community also views elections as a way to *cement* the peace process, signaling an end to transitional governments and the emergence of a new political status quo.¹⁵¹

Unfortunately, elections often have the inadvertent effect of dramatically increasing the risk of renewed fighting between armed groups.¹⁵² This occurs for a number of reasons. First, elections have a way of polarizing societies along wartime cleavages. Shortly after the end of civil wars, rebel factions and supporters of the government tend to be the most organized groups in the post-war environment.¹⁵³ This is particularly true when armed actors specifically target civil society organizations during the conflict so as to claim a monopoly on representing disaffected portions of the population. Furthermore, former combatants often maintain the capacity to violently protest the results of elections.¹⁵⁴ So, faced with the loss of an election, former rebels or members of the government may simply ignore the results and return to the proverbial bush. Elections, while a necessary component of promoting a more inclusive society, run the risk of pushing societies back into armed conflict.

There are some measures that can be taken to reduce the risks posed by elections. First, elections that are postponed to well over a year after the end of the conflict reduce the risk of renewed fighting.¹⁵⁵ During that time, a number of accommodative reforms may be taken to reduce the perceived risk surrounding elections.¹⁵⁶ Rebels may also form official political parties, allowing the international community to monitor the progress of the peace process.¹⁵⁷ Finally, the international community may push to have both the rebels and the government jointly implement electoral reforms so that the incumbent government can signal its commitment to

¹⁴⁸ Cunningham, Kathleen Gallagher and Nils B. Weidmann. 2010. "Shared Space: Ethnic Groups, State Accommodation, and Localized Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(4): 1035-1054.

¹⁴⁹ Cederman et al. (2013)

¹⁵⁰ Sisk, Timothy D. 2008. "Peacebuilding as Democratization: Findings and Recommendations." *From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. Eds. Jarstad, Anna K. and Timothy D. Sisk. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁵¹ Joshi et al. (2015)

¹⁵² Jarstad, Anna K. and Timothy D. Sisk. 2008. *From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁵³ Ibid

¹⁵⁴ Brancati, Dawn, and Jack L. Snyder. 2013. "Time to Kill: The Impact of Election Timing on Postconflict Stability." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57 (5): 822-53.

¹⁵⁵ Flores, Thomas Edward, and Irfan Nooruddin. 2012. "The Effect of Elections on Post Conflict Peace and Reconstruction." *The Journal of Politics* 74 (2): 558-70.

¹⁵⁶ Joshi et al. (2015)

¹⁵⁷ Matanock, Aila. 2017. "Bullets for Ballots: Electoral Participation Provisions and Enduring Peace After Civil Conflict." *International Security* 41(4): 93-132.

abide by the terms of the electoral results.¹⁵⁸ In the absence of these measures, elections pose a significant risk to post-war peace processes.

- **Transitional Justice**

While transitional justice mechanisms (such as tribunals, truth and reconciliation, etc.) do not necessarily *increase* the risk of renewed fighting, they often play little or no role in reducing the risk that renewed fighting will emerge.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, they tend to be concerning because the process is easily co-opted by ruling factions as a way to castigate or sanction wartime opponents.¹⁶⁰ Often, transitional justice mechanisms are offered as a way to address crimes committed during the course of the war. The hope is that they allow for reconciliation within a divided society as well as hold perpetrators of war crimes accountable. In practice, though, these processes do not always play out as intended. Rather, post-war rulers often place a proverbial thumb on the scale, ignoring their own wartime abuses and highlighting the faults of their opponents.¹⁶¹

III. Summary of Findings

As underscored at the start of this internal document, there are key limitations in assessing the literature on “what does not work” in promoting peace. This is because there are disciplinary biases in trying to put forward research on what *does* produce peace. Equally, there are also limitations in evaluating research that include null findings, as such work often fails to be published. Given these limitations, there are key lessons on ineffective and counterproductive approaches to fostering peace. Broadly:

Foreign Interventions- International efforts that attempt to address the costs of armed conflict - either alleviating them through the provision of aid or increasing the costs through sanctions or force – generally inadvertently exacerbate ongoing conflicts. These issues can be mitigated by including a more comprehensive approach to managing the conflict, but isolated uses of force or economic interventions increase the risks of more intractable conflicts.

Domestic Reforms- As part of the peace process, there may be a number of solutions offered by international mediators or segments of civil society. These aspirational reforms, though, may increase the risk that parties will resume. These reforms often fail because they do not anticipate the willingness of militants to abuse the process for their own gain. Power-sharing may initiate peace, but it provides an opportunity for militant leaders (within the government and the rebel group) to ignore broader societal needs in favor of their own personal agenda. Similarly, early calls for an election may quickly reignite wartime tensions and allow highly organized militant factions to abuse the process to gain more leverage. As with foreign interventions to end armed conflicts, these reforms may not be necessarily poor policies if they are coupled with a more comprehensive strategy for promoting peace. But absent a

¹⁵⁸ Keels (2018)

¹⁵⁹ Meernik, James D. Angela Nichols, and Kimi L. King. 2010. “The Impact of International Tribunals and Domestic Trials on Peace and Human Rights After Civil War.” *International Studies Perspectives* 11(4): 309-334.

¹⁶⁰ Loyle, C.E. and Davenport, C., 2016. Transitional injustice: Subverting justice in transition and postconflict societies. *Journal of Human Rights*, 15(1), pp.126-149.

¹⁶¹ Ibid

more comprehensive solution, these efforts often generate exceedingly fragile systems that are easily exploited by armed actors.

Appendix 4: Mapping

This mapping is intended to identify major groups and organizations who operate with a focus on coherent, multidimensional approaches to peacemaking and peacebuilding in their work. It is not comprehensive, because there is no hard and fast distinction between organizations using multidimensional approaches and those participating in peacebuilding systems as a whole, but it does attempt to identify the major groups and organizations promoting this approach.

International Organizations

African Union

The Silencing the Guns by 2020 initiative is an African Union plan to end “all wars, civil conflicts, gender-based violence, violent conflicts and ... genocide in the continent by 2020.” Launched in 2014, it focuses on a composite plan to address conflict through prioritizing combatting small arms and light weapons and illicit resource use while building social cohesion. It also emphasizes good governance.

NATO

The “Comprehensive Approach” to crisis response emphasizes civilian-military coordination and working with states and civil society to deliver coordinated response to crises.

United Nations

The Secretary-General’s “Sustaining Peace” agenda emphasizes closer coordination between different UN entities operating in the peace pillar, and has reformed the peace pillar with a focus on delivering better coordination between the peacekeeping and peacebuilding work done by the UN. This is an evolution of more than 25 years of UN learning and experience in peacebuilding with an emphasis on coordinated work across the political/security/development triad.

The 2030 Agenda for Global Development emphasizes the links between economic development, human development, and peace. It also emphasizes the need for coordinated multi stakeholder partnerships in order to deliver this approach.

World Bank

The World Bank’s “Fragility, Conflict, and Violence” cluster focuses on the interconnections between state fragility, political conflict, and interpersonal violence. In 2019 the World Bank Group released a draft FCV strategy building on the conclusion of their “Pathways to Peace” report and emphasizing multidimensional peacebuilding.

Civil Society

PeaceDirect

PeaceDirect's model for peace explicitly incorporates a full spectrum of approaches to systemic peace including economic development, justice and human rights promotion, reintegration of former combatants and promotion of women's engagement.

At the coordination level, part of their work is mapping different peace activities taking place within a conflict context through their "PeaceInsight" project. This project is intended to highlight both where activity is taking place (or not taking place) in a conflict context and also drive funding to under-funded peacebuilding work.

International Alert

International Alert's model for peace defines peace along five axes including equitable distribution of power, equal opportunity to making a living, fair and effective laws, personal safety, and equal access to basic needs. Their work on peacebuilding stretches across all of these different axes, with a particular emphasis on the root causes of conflict. They do not engage in formal coordination between actors other than those directly engaged in their specific projects, however.

MercyCorps

MercyCorps is a humanitarian aid organization that delivers specific aid around basic human needs including emergency response and crisis management. It also works on systemic issues driving violence and disruption, including a focus on sustainable agriculture, education, water and sanitation, and other elements. Through this work, MercyCorps works on the full spectrum of conflict from resilience and structural peacebuilding through crisis prevention and response to reintegration and rebuilding. At the coordination level, MercyCorps is directly engaged in advocacy around the need for coordinated multidimensional peace engagements.

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects

CDA is a research and consulting organization that works, among other issues, on peacebuilding effectiveness. Their model for assessing peacebuilding is based on the idea of conflict as a complex system and must be analyzed from that perspective.

Humanity United

Humanity United's approach to peacebuilding understands conflict as the result of a complex system of interactions, and assumes that sustainable peace will only come from long-term bottom-up multidimensional peacebuilding activities. They see their role as facilitating long-term coordination between multiple entities and actors