

4

ANALYSING CONFLICT RESOLUTION

4.1 Basic and Complex Levels of Analysis

In the preceding chapters, we developed a general understanding of the concept of conflict. This is a necessary initial step in conflict analysis. Here, our task is to approach conflicts where arms are used and the role this gives to conflict resolution. Armed conflict is one category of the general phenomenon of social conflict. It has some distinct features. It normally grows out of non-armed conflict, in the sequences illustrated in Figure 3.3, but involves not just a shift in behaviour. It has other aspects associated with the three concepts of parties, incompatibility and action. First, there is a particular role for the state as soon as a conflict becomes armed. The reasons for this are explained in Section 4.2. There are also armed, as well as unarmed, non-state actors in many armed conflicts, and for a fuller analysis it is necessary to include these. The conflict analyst faces not only the traditional conflict material of states fighting wars among themselves, but also the analytically less well-developed circumstances of intra-state conflicts. This will also be pursued in the chapter. Second, an additional building block is the incompatibility, where the analysis concentrates on two types that are particularly frequently associated with armed conflict. These are incompatibilities dealing with political power (here termed 'incompatibility over government') and those dealing with control over land (here described as 'incompatibility over territory'). Third, when a conflict shifts from non-armed to predominantly armed conflict behaviour, this may involve a shift of parties and of issues. This makes the task of conflict resolution more cumbersome. It becomes not only a matter of ending violence. It also means affecting relationships between the parties as well as their incompatibilities. Together, these distinctions result in three types of conflict, a **trichotomy of conflict**. They are the basic units

ANALYSING CONFLICT RESOLUTION

of conflict analysis. Part Two of this book, i.e. Chapters 5, 6 and 7, is devoted entirely to an analysis of the resolution of such conflicts. There is also a more complex level. Conflicts are often connected to one another, where parties may have alliances or, in fact, be the same across borders or social divides. Incompatibilities may form components in regional or global confrontations. This has to be taken into account. In addition, there is frequent involvement from outside actors, which has to be considered in a complex, comprehensive analysis. The complex level is pursued in Part Three where the four chapters provide tools for an understanding of the full reality in which conflicts arise. Part Four looks at several developments which will have an impact on the conflict patterns in the coming years, again with the help of the tools that have been presented here.

4.2 The Role of the State

Actors in Conflict

The definitions of conflict and conflict resolution have so far not offered much about who the parties are. In Chapter 3 we only specified them as 'actors' or 'parties', giving them some general characteristics. However, the definitions used for collecting war statistics in the Michigan and Uppsala programmes described in Chapter 2 limit armed conflict to a considerably smaller cluster of social interactions (although there is also now an increasing interest in non-state violence). They concentrate on conflicts that have a state as one of the parties. The examples used in much of the theorizing on conflict resolution indicate similar restrictions for the selection of cases. The practice of researchers is more restrained than their theories would necessarily require.

In fact, the study of conflict resolution is a merger of two different strands of thought. Conflict theory has the objective of creating a general understanding of conflict, e.g. it takes note of the apparent parallels between person-to-person conflicts and state-to-state relations. Thus, it is tempting to search for general understandings. No doubt interesting lessons can be drawn, building on an intimate knowledge of particular cases and their specific dynamics. The other strand is the causes of war studies, which aim to find general patterns for wars throughout history, ideally by including all wars and empirically discovering similarities. Thus, it requires general definitions across time and space in order to arrive at data consisting of comparable phenomena. The value increases with larger numbers and longer time-spans. The state is such a 'stable' actor, providing for comparability, e.g. after the end of the Napoleonic Wars (i.e. since 1816) or following the Westphalian Peace (i.e. since 1648). The merger of these two strands into studies of general conflict resolution theory runs into empirical difficulties. For instance, the cases analysed may be insightful, but how typical are they for the general phenomenon? Can a state be compared to a person, a social group or a social institution? Similarly, the

data collected for causes of war studies are often not necessarily well designed for conflict theory purposes. Ending of conflicts has seldom been part of the understanding, except when searching for a termination date for instance. Merging these two strands requires particular efforts.

The Uppsala Conflict Data Program is specifically devoted to conflict resolution. Even so, it initially restricted itself to the types of conflict that the causes of war studies include. The agenda has now been enlarged to also make possible the study of conflicts between non-state actors, and actions of one-sided violence. The solution to such conflicts will gradually enter the agenda and enlarge our understanding of conflict resolution in the coming years.

The study of person-to-person relations in state-to-state conflicts, notably the personal relationships between leaders, would be a valuable point of convergence. For example, the rapport between the very conservative Republican US President Ronald Reagan and the Soviet Secretary-General of the Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, from their first meeting in 1985, appears to have had a profound impact on world developments. A similar understanding between US President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin in the early 2000s, however, did not last. Similarly, by 2014, the relations between US President Barack Obama and Putin were cold, in contrast to the closer relationship between Obama and Putin's immediate predecessor Dmitry Medvedev, when the number of summit meetings peaked. In 2017 the personal relations between Donald Trump and Putin became a major issue in US domestic affairs, of concern both to legal authorities and members of Congress. However, in general the evidence points to a limited significance for personal relations on inter-state relations (Druckman and Wallenstein 2017). From whatever angle we would like to approach the question of conflict resolution in armed conflict, an analysis of the state is unavoidable.

The Special Roles of the State

There are theoretically valid reasons for having the state as a main actor in the analysis of armed conflict and its resolution. The state is, according to most political science definitions, the only legitimate user of physical violence in a society (Weber 1964: 154–6). Thus, it is almost by definition involved whenever there is an armed conflict in society. The control of violence is not the only distinguishing feature however. There are also fiscal, territorial and ideological monopolies. The concurrent exercise of these four monopolies provides the state with coherence internally and independence internationally. This requires some further elaboration.

The state has a fiscal monopoly, being the only unit that can collect taxes and tariffs, where the inhabitants have to pay a certain sum of money in return for services whose delivery and quality they cannot immediately inspect and where choice is limited. The fiscal monopoly is unique and distinct from the monopoly that can be exercised by a corporation on a market or a trade union in recruiting members in a company for instance. A central state may hand over its rights and obligations to others, e.g. to states in a federation, to local communities or even to other units.

But this authority derives from the right of the state to collect tax revenue. In the writings of economic historians, the state's fiscal monopoly is seen as particularly important for the state's emergence and growth, compared to other organizational units (Tilly 1990).

The state is the sole legitimate authority within its territory, and is expected by other actors, notably neighbouring states, to maintain that authority. The border is not only a line of territorial separation, but also the geographical space where one legitimate authority is replaced by another. A central governmental task is to uphold authority all the way to the border. However, in an increasingly interdependent world of cross-border transactions, it is in the interest of governments on either side of the border that there also be control on the other side. Otherwise border areas may become bases for non-legitimate actors, such as criminal gangs, drug traders or guerrilla groups directed against one or both governments. The border is no longer only the exposed first line of defence against an unknown or hostile actor on the other side. Borders are increasingly matters of shared interest. In another interesting development, humanitarian concerns change the agenda of the state inside its area of authority, as the state is seen as the guarantor of exposed groups or even as a guardian of human rights. One state's failure to pursue this may expose it to international sanctions from other states. Indeed, the 2005 World Summit meeting in New York endorsed the principle that in such cases there is even an international responsibility to protect exposed populations. Protection of civilians has become a reason for international involvement affecting the actions of the United Nations, although this became increasingly controversial in view of the developments in Libya in 2011 and the major powers' action (and inaction) in the Syrian civil war.

In addition to these elements, it is also evident that the state, notably through its control over the educational system, is the originator of an official view of what the state is all about. There is an ideological function. For each state, the government's interpretation of what the role is of a particular state is likely to be highly influential. It determines the range of debate that is acceptable within the state, but it may at the same time restrict the options available to the political leadership. It cannot act easily beyond the established parameters of customary conduct. Hence, the state determines and expresses the way in which a society describes its history, pursues its values and reproduces the myths that exist for legitimizing its existence. This is an ideological leadership, which is a monopoly in non-democratic states and a more subtle hegemony in many open societies.

All these roles may make the state an actor in conflict as well as an object of conflict. That the state is an actor is obvious. This is the way policy is made, and the instruments available to the state are used (administration, police, military forces, tax collection, etc.). That the state is an object of conflict is also clear. For example, the access to tax revenue makes it valuable to control the state. It makes the state a resource-rich actor, and is probably perceived to be more so, the poorer a country is. The state may sometimes be the sole provider of wealth in a society. The control over violence indicates that there is a powerful military and police apparatus, with its own interests but also attractive to control. This invites group competition for entry into power. The ideological function means that the state machinery can be

used to transmit perspectives and legitimize values directing the society at large. This can be an instrument that groups may value to control. One by one, or taken together, the four functions of a state's monopoly or near-monopoly on force, fiscal resources, territorial control and ideological leadership, make the state an asset for those pursuing particular perspectives, be they of left, right, religious, secular, democratic, nationalistic or other orientations.

The one who controls the state acts in its name, and can use the state's legal systems for its own purposes. The state, as a consequence, is a unique actor and cannot be compared to a political party, a guerrilla movement or a business corporation. These may all have resources of different sorts, but will not have the legitimacy that follows with the state. There is a limit however. If the state is not capable of performing some of these functions, its strength as an actor diminishes, and so does its value as an object. This is the essence of the phenomenon of warlord politics that can be observed in different parts of the world (Duffield 1998; Reno 1998). The phenomenon of state failure – known throughout the history of the state – has received particular attention since the 1990s. This is a matter that affects conflict dynamics and conflict resolution. Thus, we will have to return to it in Parts Two, Three and Four. However, it raises important theoretical and normative issues that we will need to consider immediately.

Clearly, the state as an institution is caught in a dilemma. If it is too powerful it is likely to be resented; if it is too weak it is likely to be dismissed. The former is illustrated by the Soviet Union during its entire existence (1917–1991); the latter is exemplified by Somalia since the 1990s. Both ends of the continuum require some thought. When the state is too strong, it governs through the fear it can instill in the population. Totalitarian systems may survive for considerable periods of time, but do so at a high price of repression, and eventually facing a strong counter-reaction. If central control can be combined with economic growth, the pressure may be deflected, but it may also result in new demands from entrepreneurial groups and other resource-rich constellations. In addition, totalitarian regimes inject fear into neighbouring countries, not only among its own citizens. Even global relations can be affected. Major power relations changed dramatically when the Communist Party under Mao took control of China in 1949. The same happened when a totalitarian regime under Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933. This shows that working inter-state relationships are dependent not only on direct interactions between states, but also on the domestic conditions of the parties. The relationship between totalitarian regimes and democratic powers is particularly contentious. This was a feature during the twentieth century and remains so for the new century, epitomized by the West's relations in past decades with China, Vietnam, North Korea, Burma/Myanmar, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and an increasingly authoritarian Russia.

When the state is too weak a different dynamic can be observed. This means a state cannot maintain law and order within its assigned area, control the flow of arms and pursue the collection of taxes. These functions of the state are, in fact, highly interrelated. To collect revenue, the state needs to have credible legal means and a reliable police system. In order to maintain an efficient police and legal

system, it needs revenue. Revenue is collected from citizens, their economic transactions and from border crossings. To be able to do that it needs to have effective control over its territory. This requires police and military resources. It is an interplay that in industrialized, resource-rich countries is robust and entrenched in the minds of the people. In a resource-scarce country, other loyalties are stronger. The provider of security and welfare can be a clan leader who, in addition, may want to enlarge the resources at the clan's disposal. Thus, the state faces challenges. Somalia may, to some extent, represent the case of clans in conflict. This is not the full story however, as there are examples of clan cooperation and resorting to local forms of conflict resolution (Fox 2015). The competing forces may be other actors, notably companies interested in the extraction of minerals (as seen in other African states, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo). State leaders may play religious groups wanting to institute their own order against one other (which can be witnessed in Afghanistan and Iraq). There can also be ethnically based groups searching for control of strategic assets, such as nodes in pipeline systems (a factor in Chechnya, Nigeria and Iraq). Thus, too weak a state invites intra-state wars; too strong a state may do the same. Both, furthermore, may lead to international repercussions. To find the 'ideal' state for peace is not easy. Democracy has been identified as one element (Russett 1993), but it may not be sufficient for handling all the world's conflict material.

A Global System

The interactions among sovereign states are described as the international system. According to some writers, it is a self-contained system that can be understood through the lens of the security dilemma. Even a state with defensive purposes may be seen as a threat to other states, whose defensive actions in turn are perceived as threatening. This is a security dilemma to which we have already alluded (Waltz 1979). Although strong theoretically, the notion of the security dilemma builds on some assumptions, most importantly that state survival is the prime motive for states, that states are strong and coherent, and that war between states is of basic concern for security policy. A number of these assumptions are not valid when we look at the entire picture of armed conflicts in the world. It is more common to see war inside states than between them (see Table 4.1), that states do collapse (as just described) and that there are numerous other actors. Thus the *inter-state system*, as instituted in international law and in the UN Charter, is but one subsystem, albeit an important one, in a larger framework – the *global system*. This is a messier, less structured, set of relationships that includes a gamut of other actors and interests. In this perspective the inter-state system, often described as anarchic, appears rather structured and based on predictable rules. Let us explore this a little further.

First, the *inter-state system* assumes that states can be *easily defined*. The number of states in the world is limited; UN membership (at the end of 2017) stands at 193. There are some ten additional entities, which are not recognized by the UN majority

and are thereby not seated (the Republic of China, Taipei, also known as Taiwan, is one case; Kosovo is another, more successful case, now recognized by more than half of all UN member states).¹ There is, in addition, a category of non-recognized states, which exist *de facto*, but have not been recognized by the central government, and thus normally not by other states either: Somaliland, Northern Cyprus, Abkhazia, South Ossetia all belong to this category of state-like non-states. In particular Somaliland, which corresponds to the former British Somali colony and was independent for a week in 1960 before it merged with Somalia, the former Italian colony, clearly has managed to keep its state authorities functioning and maintain the country's independence, in spite of the collapse of the rest of Somalia (Fox 2015). No country has yet recognized this entity however. Partly, this is based on the fear that it would stimulate or legitimize secessionism in Africa. In the case of Eritrea, other states did not recognize the new state until after an arrangement had been made with Ethiopia on a procedure for independence, leading to mutually agreed statehood in 1993. The declaration of Northern Cyprus as an independent state in 1983 led to diplomatic recognition by Turkey, whereas the UN defined the declaration as illegal. The Republic of Cyprus does not recognize this entity. There is a tendency to give the former central, sometimes colonial, power a veto over the recognition of new states emerging from territory nominally under the control of the previous centre. In 1990, several states in the Soviet Union declared themselves independent. At that time, Lithuania was only recognized by Iceland. The major powers did not want to risk undermining Gorbachev's leadership of the Soviet Union as a whole. An agreement on the final status of Kosovo would therefore normally require the consent of Serbia (the successor to Yugoslavia), but Kosovo nevertheless declared itself independent in 2008. Later the same year Abkhazia and South Ossetia took the same step, immediately being recognized by Russia and a few other states. However, the central authority, Georgia, has not agreed. Most states have refused recognition of these two entities, while Kosovo has widespread international backing.

As a result the attitude among existing states is less than inviting with regard to the formation of new states. Granted this reluctance, it is still likely that a set of new states will be formed in the coming years, eventually to be seated in the UN. The non-recognized states aspire to receive recognition as a way of protecting their security. On many counts they operate as recognized states, and often model themselves on such states. The process of fragmentation of larger ethnically diverse states, which began during the First World War, is likely to proceed. There are today some 200 state-like entities. The number may grow during the coming years with the addition of one or two states per year. A more dramatic rise is only likely if a major, colonial-type empire is dissolved. The record since 1945 shows that there is at least one such event per decade. The dissolution of the British Empire in South Asia took place in the 1940s. The ending of French control in Indochina and Africa occurred in the 1950s and 1960s. The end of British colonial possessions in Africa can be dated to a decade after 1957 when Ghana became independent.

The crumbling of the Portuguese Empire in Africa in the mid-1970s was achieved through liberation wars. The granting of independence to Pacific islands was a process of the 1980s and the breakdown of the communist empires in Europe was a

feature of the early 1990s. The process of formation of new states is not at its end, but it is not an unlimited process either. There are countervailing forces, including the possibility of existing states learning to handle minorities in a more respectful way (Gurr 2000a, 2000b, Cederman et al. 2017).

Second, we can observe that in the 171 armed conflicts since 1989 recorded by the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, the state was only one of the actors in most of the conflicts. Thus, it is not entirely an inter-state system and more of a global system with considerable messiness. In the UCDP they are defined as opposition organizations, or *armed non-state actors*. The Uppsala Conflict Data Program lists more than 1,000 such actors. Few of these are recognized by states, and certainly not by the states against which they are fighting. They are instead defined variously as terrorists, gangs, bandits, criminal groups, etc. Most of these entities challenge a particular government and thus operate in one location. However, the past two decades have seen a new phenomenon of transnational non-state actors. Al-Qaeda was a first example, and lately ISIS has followed by enlarging the concept by claiming particular territories and having affiliates or coalition partners in the Middle East, in parts of Asia and in areas of Africa. Governments have not been willing to enter into formal discussions, beyond local cease-fires (Karkus and Svensson 2017). Sometimes, however, successful negotiations have taken place, making leaders appear as reasonable or even enlightened statespersons despite the labels that have been put on them previously (e.g. Nelson Mandela in South Africa, Xanana Gusmão of Timor-Leste, Menachem Begin in Israel).

It may be that these organizations turn into political parties or legitimate armed structures (the former liberation army UCK/KLA in Kosovo was, by the international community, converted into a civilian protection corps after the 1999 war). Al-Fatah and Hamas have both been running as political parties in Palestinian elections. Other organizations have instead been recorded in history as uncivilized, cruel and even illogical. To these belongs the al-Qaida network that was led by Osama bin Laden and generally seen to be the instigator of the attack on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, DC, on September 11, 2001. The Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) claimed to be a 'state' but did little to obtain any form of diplomatic recognition. It gained notoriety through its brutality, persecution and eviction, particularly against non-believers in areas under its control (a type of 'religious cleansing', parallel to the ethnic version observed in other conflicts). There are historical precedents. For instance, the First World War followed on from the assassination of the heir to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. This was carried out by a terrorist organization harboured by neighbouring Serbia. Indeed, words such as 'assassins' and 'anarchists' refer to terrorists in European history. How have such organizations emerged, what were their goals, how did they garner resources to finance protracted wars? These are pertinent and legitimate questions. They will not be answered in this work, but it points to the confusion that marks a global system. We will return to this issue in Chapter 12, when dealing with one-sided violence.

The large number of non-state actors illustrates the shortcomings of focusing only on the inter-state system, as if states were in exclusive control even of their own

territories. As we have seen in the 2010s they may be strong enough to coerce regimes, terrorize populations far from their original zone of operation and appeal to supporters to take up their own actions. This record now includes Paris, Brussels, Copenhagen and Stockholm just to include events in Europe since 2015, but such events are even more numerous in other parts of the world. Terrorism as a global concern is what we deal with in Chapter 12.

In addition, we should note that in the 1990s there emerged a market for mercenaries and private security companies, which have played a role in wars in Africa, South America and the Middle East. There are militias or para-military formations, i.e. informally or formally organized groups. These are locally recruited, operate with unclear mandates and obscure finances and are often directed by a determined leadership, motivated by political and/or economic gains. Such groups are reported from Colombia, Central Africa, in the Bosnian War, in pre-independent East Timor, in Chechnya, and in Middle Eastern conflicts. Their semi-autonomous status makes them worrying actors that can disrupt peace processes. Therefore we see that insecurity and security dilemmas abound, and that they are created also by actors other than states.

The global system also includes actors who do not have arms but still have a role in conflict. In the emerging global civil society, *non-governmental organizations* (NGOs), increasingly called civil society organizations (CSOs), have gained in significance since the end of the Cold War. They have an ability to act legitimately in a transnational way that few other actors can. This is typically true of humanitarian organizations, such as Doctors Without Borders, or *Médecins Sans Frontières* (MSF), which at the same time delivers humanitarian support and brings global attention to atrocities and disasters. With skilful access to conventional media, use of Internet connections and social media, NGOs are able, in a short period of time, to mobilize support globally for particular actions and causes in the humanitarian field. In the Syrian war there has also emerged independent bodies monitoring the war atrocities and collecting information on war crimes.

There are also actors who profit from the disorder of the global system and operate across borders without any fear of interdiction. This is a category of *trans-state actors*. There are, of course, multinational corporations operating all over the globe. They may be involved in the early phases of conflict, as the exploitation of resources may be at the heart of social dynamics leading to armed conflict (as seen in the protracted conflict over Bougainville, Papua New Guinea). The supply of major weapons involves such trans-state organizations, and some of these transactions may be concealed in obscurity, evading laws, with or without the consent of governments. These actors seldom appear in the armed stages of the conflict, and rarely participate openly in negotiations to end the conflict. Other actors, however, may represent their interests, be they states, non-state actors, NGOs or law firms. In addition, there are informal networks: arms dealers trading in small arms; merchants dealing in valuable minerals controlled by governments or non-state actors; drug traders engaged in international cartels and coalitions; or monetary transfers and money laundering to support war efforts. There are reports of entire ships loaded with weapons that have been captured by factions and used in their armed struggles. Support

groups may extort 'revolutionary taxes' from compatriots living far from the war scene to demonstrate their professed 'solidarity' with particular causes. Often, such pressures have a mafia-like quality. Support groups for different sides may even fight each other, thousands of kilometres away from the battlegrounds. Thus, linkages may extend globally, in what might be termed ethnic internationals or global 'tribes' (Kotkin 1992). In addition, conditions of lawlessness give rise to human trafficking and an enhanced drug trade, not least across borders.

Hence, there are good reasons for using the term 'global system' for these connecting webs with numerous different types of actor. On the basic level of conflict analysis, the focus is on warring parties. This is the relationship that has to be settled for the conflict to be resolved. It is a necessary element and is dealt with in Part Two. It may not be sufficient however. That is why the global system, with all its actors and its disorder, enters into the complex level of analysis (Parts Three and Four).

4.3 Introducing the Trichotomy of Conflict

Our concern is the resolution of conflict. Although the origin and dynamics may be similar for many conflicts, for each party its conflict is unique. In many important respects this is also the reality. There are no conflicts which are entirely similar, and special features always have to be kept in mind. Still, there are rules, norms and understandings that try to equalize conflicts so that they can be treated in similar ways. This is true for violence in any society. One murder is not likely to be identical to another; there are still norms which treat them in similar ways. When society wants to contain violence and inflict punishment, it strives to do so in a fair way. Equal punishment for equal crime is a basic rule. These are general rules created for handling unique events. In the process, similarities are emphasized so as to make events comparable. The argument for dealing with conflicts in the global system is parallel. There are large-scale conflicts that are sufficiently similar to allow them to be handled in comparable fashions. Through international law, such a differentiation has already been introduced and has gained considerable acceptance in the international community.

Traditionally, a firm distinction has been drawn between international and internal conflicts. The first can be handled by, for instance, international institutions, such as the UN, the International Court of Justice and regional organizations. Internal conflicts are, in this thinking, left to the domain of the states themselves, and placed outside the purview of the international bodies. Internal affairs may only become the affairs of the international community if the legitimate authority in the country, i.e. its government, asks for such an intervention. This is a basic tenet of the UN Charter and was seen as an untouchable principle during the Cold War. It does not deny, however, the possibility of making rules for internal conflicts. The distinctions drawn have been ones of expediency rather than matters of principle. If inter-state conflicts can be compared, this should also be true for internal conflicts. Indeed, otherwise it would not be possible to draw a

general distinction between internal and inter-state conflicts. Furthermore, the political climate has changed. The lively debate on humanitarian intervention since the Cold War has questioned the validity of the distinction, both normatively and in practice. By the end of the 1990s, humanitarian arguments resulted in large international support for NATO bombings of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo crisis in 1999 as well as for the international involvement in East Timor formally a part of Indonesia. The UN extended general support for actions as part of its new responsibility to protect exposed populations, as agreed by the General Assembly in 2005. This document gave authority to the Security Council and it was used in the Libya conflict in 2011, but has not repeated since then, e.g. in the case of the Syrian civil war. By limiting international action to the Council, the inter-state system was upheld, even if it could lead to involvement in internal conflicts. The question of international terrorism has also led the Security Council to make decisions that transcend traditional sovereignty, e.g. in the commanding decisions on financial sanctions in 2001. Even so, implementation rests with the member states individually.

This means that the separation of inter-state conflicts from other conflicts is deeply entrenched. It will be maintained here because it is a simple differentiation, which reflects realities of importance for conflict resolution. It needs to be seen, however, together with other conflicts, as well as within a larger framework to provide a complete picture. Thus, Chapter 5 is devoted to the inter-state conflicts, whereas Chapters 8 through 11 present that larger picture, as does Part Four.

This leaves us with a group of conflicts which are 'internal'. It is a broad category. Much of what goes on in 'normal' political affairs are interactions among individuals, groups and peoples inside the same borders. The disagreements can be many, as can the conflicts. Internal conflicts, argues Zartman, 'begin with the breakdown of normal politics' (Zartman 1995a: 5). Thus, there are a large number of issues that can be combined in such a way as to make conflict serious and escalatory. There are probably more such concerns inside a particular country than between a given pair of states. It would therefore be logical to expect more conflict inside states than between them. Decisive for how situations will develop are prevailing and historical social and economic conditions, the governance system for accommodating changes of such conditions, etc. These are matters that will be of concern to the ordinary citizen, for whom international affairs are often separate and distant. With increasing globalization, their importance may become stronger and more obvious, particularly for small and dependent countries. However, for most inhabitants, what goes on in their own country is likely to be primary as it immediately affects their income, wellbeing and freedom. It is noteworthy that all countries seem to have an internal conflict, which at times is the dominant one. It is also readily identifiable by the citizens of that country. Conflict is a common experience in any society and not necessarily something that is outside 'normal' affairs. Almost to the contrary, as observed by Coser, conflict may contribute to keeping society together (see Chapter 3 and Coser 1956). What is not 'normal' is the resort to arms. There is universal preference for peaceful politics, within as well as between states.

Thus, for the population of this planet, internal conflict is as important a category as international conflict. It needs to attract as much attention and to be treated in an equally thorough way. It may be true that international law instruments have been restricted from dealing with internal issues, but legal rules are becoming more numerous and more intrusive. It is sufficient to think of the human rights issues, the convention on war crimes tribunals, the many democracy-promoting agencies, as well as the general integration through the global market. Internal affairs are a legitimate object of study and are amenable to conflict resolution that also involves outside parties.

Let us now complement the dichotomy of inter-state and intra-state conflict. So far we have presented a dimension which deals with the actors in conflicts whether they are states or other parties. In Chapter 3 we introduced an equally important notion, i.e. incompatibility. This has theoretical and practical implications, particularly for intra-state conflicts. This distinction has turned out to be a fruitful dimension in the Uppsala Conflict Data Program. It separates incompatibilities that concern control over territory from those dealing with government. As we have also seen, the Correlates of War project now applies this distinction for intra-state conflicts (Sarkees and Wayman 2010). Territorial conflicts have always been central in inter-state conflicts. Military authorities are important for the control of territory. State security often depends on control over particular areas. Such areas are defined as strategic or vital and thus come to justify military action. The same, of course, is true for internal conflicts. If particular groups claim control over certain areas and want to change their status, this affects the inhabitants of the state as a whole. It might mean drawing new borders and altering established rights of all citizens. It impacts on access to particular areas. It has implications for control over resources. The interest in maintaining the existing territorial arrangements is strong in inter-state relations. International consensus is highly resistant to territorial changes which do not have the consent of the parties. The government of a state is likely to be highly conservative with respect to the territory it is set to administer. Challenges are likely to be taken very seriously. Thus, territorial issues acquire a particular meaning in internal affairs. Studies point to the significance of territory in explanations of inter-state war (Vasquez 1993, 1995; Gibler 2012) and we suggest that the same is true for internal conflict. The incompatibility over territory cuts across the distinction between inter-state and intra-state conflict.

This also applies to the second incompatibility, control over government, referring to the command over the existing central government authority and the composition of the government. The most serious disputes in this category are those where an opposition challenges the existing authority and wants to have it removed, rather than just achieve a change in a particular policy. Repression by governments aims at keeping a particular group in power. Criticism of government policy may be interpreted as a challenge to its authority. Repression can set in at an early stage. In fact, a larger number of incumbent governments have come to power through non-democratic means. Coups, revolutions, civil wars and dynastic arrangements are still routes to power, and they are as frequent as are democratic procedures. The struggle over governmental control is classic in politics and continues to be an

important aspect of conflict. The state, as we have just seen, contains such attractive resources that many will find it worthwhile to fight to stay in power or take over power. Hence, it draws on a different dynamic from territorial issues, which focus on particular areas or regions, not on the state as a whole. In internal affairs this incompatibility makes sense.

Is this incompatibility also of value for the analysis of international conflicts? Yes, the Cold War demonstrated this convincingly. The interventions by the Soviet Union and the United States were not motivated in terms of territorial gains but with regard to government control. The ambitions of both sides were to promote particular types of regime, not to change borders after the territorial realignments of the Second World War. The return of Soviet authority in Ukraine, Belarus and the Baltic states actually met strong armed resistance that went on until the early 1950s, and explains why these countries were the first to opt out of the Soviet Union in 1990–91. It goes without saying that the events in Ukraine since 2013 have actualized these historical experiences. During the Cold War, Soviet policy aimed at the installation of Soviet-style governments. There were, no doubt, military and strategic considerations, but the conflicts placed local communists loyal to the Soviet Union against non-communist members of the same society. The USA and the West were supporting or establishing particular governments in Iran and other places in the Middle East, as well as in South America and Indochina, but without the idea of changing borders. The hot wars that were part of the Cold War focused on control over government: which type of regime should there be in a particular country? Some countries may have had a more crucial, geographical position in these global strategies (e.g. Cuba and Turkey). Nevertheless, it was the allegiance of the country as such that was disputed, not the idea of breaking up existing units.² The Cold War dualism is no longer present on the global level, but the issue of regime types remains important, both regionally (there are still communist regimes in East Asia) and in particular situations (exemplified by the West-led intervention of Iraq in 2003 and Libya in 2011, or the massive Russian support for the Assad regime, particularly since 2015). The West has long committed itself to promoting democracy. Some leading Western countries have been prepared to do this with military means, while opposing actors pledge to resist this, or argue for the right to make counteractions (even justifying terrorism). Thus, we can observe that both intra-state and inter-state conflicts have similar incompatibilities when conflicts are armed and serious. The distinction of territory and government as two separate incompatibilities is fruitful.

This gives us four categories of conflict to consider, but we will merge two into one, making three categories. This creates the trichotomy for conflict analysis. The first category consists of *the inter-state conflicts around territory and government*. It is treated as one category, as this is an established group of conflicts, identified with criteria used in international law. Then there are *intra-state conflicts over government* and a third category containing *the intra-state conflict over territory*. It can be said that this trichotomy follows the distinction of international law, but develops it with respect to the intra-state conflicts. Inter-state negotiations between sovereign states are similar no matter what the incompatibility concerns, but this, we will

show, is not the case for intra-state conflicts. The trichotomy also makes sense as the number of inter-state conflicts is limited, and much of today's conflict materials are of an intra-state nature. Furthermore, in the case of intra-state conflict resolution, there are likely to be different arrangements depending on the incompatibility.

It is interesting to note that this distinction for internal conflicts applied here is parallel to the one made by Zartman (1995a) between 'regional' and 'central' conflicts. However, there is no understanding here that conflict resolution, in Zartman's words, necessarily leads to the 'restoration of normal politics' (1995a: 24). The political realities after a serious conflict are likely to be dramatically different, depending on the incompatibility. The solution to a conflict over government may aim at achieving integration and thus some form of restoration and 'normalcy'. A negotiated settlement of a conflict over territory is not likely to have such an outcome. It is not going to be a return to the conditions that prevailed before 'the troubles', rather it will involve different forms of separation, even to the point where new states are created. Relationships are changed in a fundamental way. There are, consequently, strong arguments for making the distinction between government and territory particularly important for internal conflicts.

Locating Conflicts in the Trichotomy

It is not necessarily simple to separate one category from another. Thus, the following questions can help to sort out the categorization of the conflicts. For finding a conflict of the first type, it is helpful to ask the following:

Does a particular conflict have a significant inter-state component? This can be decided primarily by observing if there are troops from different states involved, meaning that the direct command goes to a particular decision centre. If there are two regular armies fighting each other from two different states, the conflict is a classic inter-state confrontation. Most important is whether the troops of one or the other party are there as part of an alliance or have an internationally legitimate authorization (e.g. by the United Nations or an international regional organization). This shows an additional component of the inter-state character of the conflict. The issue becomes more complicated if the 'foreign' troops are fighting on the territory of a country with the consent of the government. The problem is to decide whether this is a collective defence arrangement, and thus a case of legitimate assistance, or whether it is a case of intervention, to which a particular government cannot but agree. An even more complex situation is if the external actor is supporting a non-state actor in the other country. Is this then to be regarded as intervention into an internal conflict between a non-state actor (the rebels) and the government? Or is this, in fact, an inter-state conflict, where the external actor is only using the non-state actor as a Trojan horse, or an excuse for expansionism? Determining the true state of affairs is often easier than it may first appear, if one applies strict criteria. By observing where the non-state actor gets training for its forces, how its finances are raised, how logistics are set up, how weapons reach the rebels and where political

support is expressed, a picture emerges. Key questions are: who can stop the fighting, and who will sign an agreement that will be implemented? Two states in direct or indirect conflict are likely to prefer to settle the conflict between themselves and not allow space for others. Armed conflicts which meet these criteria are inter-state conflicts, and their solution is discussed in Chapter 5.

The second type of conflict can be identified by asking: *Does a particular intra-state conflict have a significant component of being an incompatibility over government?* In this case, we are considering a conflict between a government and a non-state actor, and the conclusion is based not only on the military actions of the parties, but also on the stated purposes of the parties. If the goal is keeping or taking power within the same country to which both sides claim allegiance, it is clear that we are talking about a conflict that traditionally has been identified as *civil war*. It is a struggle for power within a particular state, not only a fight for a change in the policies pursued by a government.

Recent developments indicate that non-state actors may not be primarily interested in taking state power as such, but may settle for control over particular areas or want to make external supporters withdraw so that internal change can be achieved. For example, the peace agreement in Sierra Leone in July 1999 gave the non-state actor, RUF/SL, access to the mining resources in the country. The war was, however, fought on more general grounds and there were no stated intentions of breaking away a particular piece of territory from the country. On the contrary, the peace agreement reaffirmed the unity of the state. This conflict, therefore, is a part of new wars, where public welfare questions are no longer the primary driving force. These are cases of 'warlordism' (Duffield 1998; Reno 1998). A closer look will demonstrate, however, than a number of rebel groups have been deeply involved in a clandestine economy, notably the coca trade as with FARC in Colombia. The purpose, however, still has been to forcibly remove the incumbent government from attractive areas. They challenge government control.

A second case in this category is *internationalized terrorism*, where the ultimate goal is change in particular societies but where the armed attacks are directed primarily against international supporters of the incumbent regimes. A typical case is the al-Qaida grouping attacking the USA on September 11, 2001, with the hope of achieving US withdrawal from the Middle East. This was in turn expected to lead to regime change in the region. Interestingly, ISIS began as a challenge to the government in Iraq wanting to replace the Shi'ite regime with Sunni dominance, that means pursuing a government issue. In Chapter 6, the conflicts over state power will be analysed in more detail.

The third type of conflict can be found by asking: *Does a particular intra-state conflict have a significant territorial component?* In this case, the conflict posits a government versus a non-state actor, where the former demands the upholding of the integrity of the state. Its opponent, however, wants to break away a particular piece of territory from the existing state. This may come in different forms. It can include either demanding significant constitutional changes, achieving full sovereignty or attaining integration with the neighbouring state. These aspirations are here subsumed under one: the question of territorial control. More refined labels can

be given, such as separatism, secessionism, liberation, irredentism, reunification, restoration, but all these labels have strong value connotations. Discussing them under the heading of territory as incompatibility makes possible a less charged analysis. These conflicts are labelled *conflicts over state formation*. From the government's point of view, it is a matter of keeping the present state form intact. To the non-state actor, it is a question of changing this very set-up in a profound way. ISIS claimed to be a 'caliphate' and thereby challenged existing territorial arrangements in the Middle East. It appealed to other, Islamic-based groups to join in, creating a coalition with other such groups in Western Africa and other places. These are the conflicts to which considerable attention will be devoted in Chapter 7.

4.4 Applying the Trichotomy of Conflict and Peace

Armed Conflict Since the Cold War

The three types of conflict identified in Section 4.3 are applied to the armed conflicts reported in the Uppsala Conflict Data Program since 1989. The result is seen in Table 4.1. It shows the empirical validity of merging inter-state conflicts into one category. There are few such conflicts in the period, in all only eleven. This has been observed before and has often been regarded as a prime hallmark of the post-Cold War period. In fact, there have probably been few inter-state conflicts for a long time. During the Cold War however, internal conflicts were internationalized in such a way as to make the local issues subordinate to the global confrontation. It appeared that there were more inter-state conflicts. Furthermore, in those days, government issues were probably more important. Although the distinction government-territory is not systematically applied in Table 4.1, it does have a strong impact on the data. We can note that most inter-state conflicts dealt with territorial issues, notably changes of borders (Ecuador-Peru, Eritrea-Ethiopia), more complex relationships focusing on particular territories (India-Pakistan) and the resurrection of an occupied state (the Gulf War over Kuwait in 1991). There were two inter-state conflicts over government, both of them involving the United States. One was its intervention in Panama in 1989. The other case was the 2003 Iraq War to remove the regime of Saddam Hussein. The Panama case may, in fact, have been the last of a typical Cold War pattern. The Cold War saw many inter-state interventions to remove or support incumbent regimes (Hungary 1956, Dominican Republic 1965, Czechoslovakia 1968, and Afghanistan and Nicaragua in the 1980s are but a few examples). It has been argued that such unilateral interventionism by a major power may be something of the past. There was an international operation to remove the military regime in Haiti in 1994 in order to bring back the democratically elected government. It was a US-led activity, but under a mandate of the United Nations. The 2003 Iraq War was an exceptional event. The issue initially concerned the removal of any potential Iraqi capacity for weapons of mass destruction, but in the final round came to concern the regime itself. The war was not sanctioned by the UN, although it had a limited collective ring

to it, being supported, for example, by troops from the United Kingdom and Australia. As the formal occupation ended in 2004, the war in Iraq continued, but then it is recorded as an internationalized intra-state conflict over government.

Table 4.1 presents the armed conflicts during the twenty-five years since 1989 in four seven-year periods. We can see that the total number of armed conflicts did decline during the 1990s, and then there is a marked upward trend for the most recent period. It can partly be attributed to the aftermath of the Arab Spring. All the categories are affected in a similar way; the upturn of state formation conflicts has a close connection to ISIS but also includes the Ukraine situation. The table also shows that the bulk of the conflicts deal with incompatibilities that are internal. At no moment in time did the inter-state conflicts constitute more than around 5 per cent of the total number of conflicts. Even among the wars of the period (i.e. conflicts with more than 1,000 casualties in one year), only four were inter-state (the 1991 Gulf War, the Ethiopia-Eritrea border war 1998–2000, India-Pakistan in 1999 and the 2003 Iraq War). Nevertheless, the inter-state category is important. Such wars may have a stronger potential for escalation and diffusion. They may become more destructive and more unsettling for entire regions, in a shorter period of time, than intra-state conflicts.

Table 4.1 Basic types of armed conflicts, 1989–2016

Type	1989–1995	1996–2002	2003–2009	2010–2016	Total 1989–2016*
Intra-state conflict over government	45	36	30	34	63
Intra-state conflict over territory	51	34	32	46	97
Inter-state conflict	4	4	3	4	11
Total	100	74	65	84	171

Source: UCDP, Downloaded December 12, 2017. I am grateful for the assistance from Audrey Faber to produce this and following tables on armed conflict. Also, Stina Höglblad has helped with the identification of peace agreements.

*Note that the total is not the addition of the previous columns, but refers to the whole period.

Source: Uppsala Conflict Data Program. Armed Conflict Dataset, downloaded December 12, 2017.

The other two categories include the largest number of all conflicts and wars in the period. Many have become very protracted and the accumulated destruction is immense. It is likely that Afghanistan is the most serious case, with more than 1 million deaths. The war in Bosnia, as horrible as it was, still does not compare. The genocide in Rwanda stands out as the humanly most destructive of the events of the decade. The killings were directed at defenceless individuals. Shelters and churches were not spared. The genocide took place in a short period of time. In this case, the killings were not even part of the armed conflict, nor did they serve a strategic, military purpose. It was an attempt to wipe out an entire population (Prunier 1995). In the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, this is treated as a case of one-sided violence, in

addition to the armed conflict. Thus we will return to this in Chapter 12. The protracted war in Sudan ceased with the peace agreement in 2005, and the long war in Sri Lanka ended with a government victory in 2009. Both cases saw considerable cruelty against civilian populations. The peace agreement in Sudan did not settle all the issues. In 2011 South Sudan seceded, becoming the 193rd member state of the United Nations. However, armed conflict soon broke out within both state entities, and has proved particularly destructive in South Sudan since 2013.

Table 4.1 shows that the two categories of internal conflict that we have identified in Section 4.3 have been of about equal size for the three first periods, but the fourth one saw a numerical advantage for the territorial conflicts. Many of the latter are protracted and localized conflicts, e.g. in India and Myanmar, but in the fourth period has also involved ISIS and its affiliates. Conflicts that have drawn heavy casualties in the most recent period concern struggles over government. Syria is clearly the most devastating one, but in this category are also located the conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. Table 4.1 reinforces the importance of separating the two groups for purposes of analysis. As is the case with all three basic conflicts, there are likely to be interconnections, and to them we shall return in Part Three.

There are some distinct regional differences. Conflicts over territory are now almost non-existent in South America. The conflict between Ecuador and Peru indicates that there are a number of unsettled inter-state borders on the continent. Indeed, the Falklands/Malvinas conflict of the 1980s was an important reminder of that and there are minor episodes reported around this dispute throughout the period. There is, however, limited resort to the separatism in South America that is common in other parts of the world.

On the other end of the spectrum is Europe, where almost all conflicts concerned territorial issues. This is most marked for the wars, that have all been about territorial issues. This includes Northern Ireland. For most of the period the conflicts were concentrated in the Balkan and Caucasus regions. The conflicts over Ukraine's eastern provinces belong to this group, as does Crimea (which, however, was taken over by Russia in an almost bloodless operation in 2014). During the Cold War, conflicts around government were central; hence, the promotion of democracy was focal in political and academic thinking, apart from the standard defence considerations. The European integration project stemmed from a desire to denationalize European affairs, something which has been relatively successfully achieved in Western Europe. However, East, Central and Southeast Europe came out of the Cold War with a strong nationalistic fervour, as part of the popular mobilization against the communist regimes (an example is Croatia), and where such regimes quickly took on a nationalistic rhetoric (notably Serbia). The EU enlargement process has been a check on such tendencies. By emphasizing democracy and human rights, countries aspiring to become members have had to adjust their policies accordingly. However, the financial crisis since 2008 affected the EU's ability to act and the proposal of an extension of the union into an Eastern partnership with, among many, Ukraine, led to serious conflicts within the country and with Russia. Thus, in 2014, Europe saw a new war, where the territorial issues around Crimea and Eastern Ukraine strongly upset regional and major power relations.

There is now a cease-fire in place, with observers from the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), but no solution.

Other regions find themselves between the South American and European patterns. The Middle East and Asia have somewhat more conflicts dealing with territory. Africa, surprisingly, largely exhibits conflicts framed in terms of government. There has been a political taboo against breaking up states in Africa, a shared policy that has been pursued on the continent by the African Union (the AU, until 2003 the Organization for African Unity, the OAU) since 1964. The two exceptions have been Eritrea and South Sudan, but this may have sparked others to ask for the same. Thus, new territorial conflicts erupted in Mali, Niger and Nigeria, with regional as well as religious ingredients. The advancement of ISIS led to the forging of alliances among Islamic groups that also questioned the existing borders.

The trichotomy used in this book is based on the incompatibility in the conflict and this is drawn from the parties' own descriptions of the conflicts. This means it does not treat 'ethnic', 'religious' or 'ideological' as separate categories. Such labels are analytically difficult to compare from one situation to another and not necessarily useful from the viewpoint of conflict resolution. It is political demands for change that are crucial for the outcome of a conflict. 'Ethnic', 'religious' or other identity variables may cut across the categories and perhaps help to understand the intensity of demands, the mobilization of social groups, or interconnections. The resolution of the conflicts, however, has to depart from the specific demands made by the parties. These are captured by the trichotomy.

Peace Agreements Since the Cold War

The Uppsala Conflict Data Program contains systematic information on the outcomes of conflicts and on peace agreements. In Chapter 2, different outcomes were presented (Table 2.1), and an overview was given of the relative frequency of peace agreements. The trend data in Table 4.1 show a gradual reduction in the total number of active armed conflicts, from 100 in the first period after the Cold War to 65 in the third one. One explanation given for this is an increased international commitment to peacemaking (*Human Security Report 2005*). However, the fourth period is a strong reversal of this trend, and suggests that the international instruments have not been sufficient to handle the new challenges.

The peace agreements can now be related to the trichotomy of conflict. A first observation is that such an agreement may be concluded long after a particular conflict was active. The almost simultaneous ending of the war and the signing of a peace agreement in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the last months of 1995 is not typical. There were peace agreements concluded in the 1990s for conflicts that had not been armed for many years. There was a peace treaty in 1994 between Israel and Jordan. The most recent, severe military encounters between these parties were in 1967. Also, a peace agreement may be concluded one year, while the armed conflict is still not ended nor the agreements implemented until the following year, or even later. Thus, there is a discrepancy between peace agreements and war termination. This

makes it more reasonable to deal with longer periods rather than focusing on the annual shifts. Table 4.2 lists the peace agreements concluded for armed conflicts that have been active in the post-Cold War period.

Table 4.2 Peace agreements in armed conflicts, 1989–2016

<i>Peace agreements in intra-state conflicts over government:</i>	<i>Peace agreements in intra-state conflicts over territory:</i>
Afghanistan (4) 2016	Angola (Cabinda) (1) 2006
Angola (4) 2002	Bangladesh (Chittagong Hill Tracts) (1) 1997
Burundi (8) 2008	Bosnia and Herzegovina (Croat) (1) 1994
Cambodia (1) 1991	Bosnia and Herzegovina (Serb) (1) 1995
Central African Republic (5) 2015	Comoros (Anjouan) (3) 2003
Chad (11) 2006	Croatia (Serb) (1) 1995
Colombia (7) 2016	Georgia (Abkhazia) (1) 1994
Congo (1) 1999	India (Bodoloand) (1) 1993
Côte d'Ivoire (9) 2008	India (Tripura) (1) 1993
Democratic Republic of Congo (7) 2013	Indonesia (Aech) (2) 2005
Djibouti (3) 2001	Israel (Palestine) (8) 2007
El Salvador (9) 1992	Mali (Azawad) (3) 2015
Guatemala (16) 1996	Moldova (Dniestr) (1) 1997
Guinea Bissau (1) 1998	Myanmar (Karen) (1) 2015
Haiti (1) 1993	Niger (Air and Azawad) (2) 1995
Liberia (11) 2003	Papua New Guinea (Bougainville) (3) 2001
Macedonia (1) 2001	Philippines (Mindanao) (11) (2014)
Mexico (1) 1996	Senegal (Casamance) (1) 2004
Mozambique (5) 1992	Sudan (Abyei) (1) 2011
Nepal (1) 2006	UK (Northern Ireland) (1) 1998
Niger (1) 1993	Yugoslavia (Slovenia) (1) 1991
Philippines (1) 1995	Yugoslavia (Kosovo) (1) 1999
Rwanda (6) 1993 ^a	
Sierra Leone (3) 2000	<i>Peace agreements in inter-state conflicts:</i>
Somalia (5) 2008	Cameroon–Nigeria (1) 2006
South Africa (5) 1993	Djibouti–Eritrea (1) 2010
South Sudan (7) 2015	Ecuador–Peru (1) 1998
Sudan (11) 2014 ^b	Eritrea–Ethiopia (1) 2000
Tajikistan (5) 1997	Sudan–South Sudan (1) 2012
Uganda (8) 2008	
Yemen (1) (2014)	

^aThe two agreements on August 3, 1993, are treated as one.

^bThe three agreements on May 26, 2004, are treated as one.

Note: Peace agreements are defined as signed treaties which regulate (resolve or find a process for) the incompatibility, which are concluded between the warring parties and put an end to conflict behaviour. Ceasefire agreements are not included.

Source: Uppsala Conflict Data Program, downloaded on December 12, 2017.

Table 4.2 shows the tangible outcomes of considerable international, national and local efforts to deal with armed conflict. Many of the agreements are part of peace processes with mediators, facilitators, experts, civil society representation and public debate, as well as the politically responsible actors. These 201 agreements were often signed under solemn conditions and generated high hopes. Many actually fulfilled the expectations; others became part of further learning on the requirements for a durable peace.

There are many difficulties in defining a peace agreement. The war between Iran and Iraq ended with the two sides accepting a resolution by the Security Council in 1987. There was no treaty signed between the two heads of state. Their support for the arrangement was the result of a decision by the Security Council. Still, it regulated important aspects of the contentious issues, adhered to by the two parties, and there was no further fighting between them. Neither side could be said to have won the war, but both could claim that they prevented the other from winning. The Security Council resolution was the main modality through which war termination was expressed.

The case of Kosovo is similar. It ended with official negotiations between the Western powers and the government in Yugoslavia through intermediaries. It was a document that both NATO and Yugoslavia could accept. It led to the cessation of air warfare and a withdrawal of Yugoslav forces from Kosovo. It left central issues unresolved. Most notable was the absence of a solution for the status of Kosovo, which was the focus of the conflict. It was agreed that the forces of Yugoslavia were to be replaced with an international force (KFOR), and that the opposite side, Kosovo Albanian forces (UCK/KLA), were to be disbanded. It outlined a process for settlement. Thus, it is comparable to other peace agreements which also have this element and it is included as a peace agreement. In 2008, Kosovo declared itself unilaterally independent and, by 2018, more than half the world's countries had accepted Kosovo as a new state. It remains for it to get a sufficient majority in the UN General Assembly, however, to gain the final mark on sovereignty, including avoiding a negative vote from two veto powers (Russia and China). The most noteworthy peace process has been the one between Israel and the PLO in 1993. In this case, a number of interim agreements had been concluded during the 1990s, seven of which are included here as peace agreements. A restart of negotiations took place in November 2007 resulting in a new agreement on a peace process, and a new attempt was initiated by the Obama administration in September 2010. However, by early 2014, the US Secretary of State, John Kerry, gave up on his attempts to broker an agreement between the two sides. Thus, there has been no substantial accord in this conflict for more than a decade.

Another noteworthy case, which is not included in Table 4.2, is the termination of the Gulf War. It ended through UN Security Council Resolution 687 (1991). This was an asymmetrical document. It specified the conditions to which Iraq had to adhere for international forces to withdraw and the economic sanctions to be lifted. Iraq had virtually no input into the document, and was not expected to influence the process that followed. This included the

disarmament of particular weapons systems, acceptance of a procedure for drawing the boundary between Iraq and Kuwait, and the payment of compensation. It is a document written by the victorious coalition. Thus, it cannot be regarded as a peace agreement. It makes clear who won the war. There was little ambiguity. The outcome of the Gulf War in 1991 was more of a victory than the Kosovo conflict in 1999.

A further complication is that there may be many agreements in the same conflict. Agreements are overturned, reworked or extended. This is why notions such as spoilers and spoiler management became valid for the international community (Stedman 1997, 1998). In Table 4.2 there are 201 agreements for 58 armed conflicts, an average of more than three per conflict with a treaty. The highest number is found in the conflicts in Burundi, Uganda and Israel (Palestine) with eight each, El Salvador and Côte d'Ivoire both with nine, Chad, Liberia, Philippines (Mindanao) and Sudan with 11 each and Guatemala's 16 testifying to considerable complexities, failures, mistrust and renewed efforts for a solution. In fact, these ten conflicts have a total of 118 peace agreements, that is more than half of all agreements. By 2016, three of them had an ongoing minor armed conflict.

If we concentrate our attention on the conflicts with agreements and relate this to the trichotomy, Table 4.3 emerges. It compares the frequencies of conflict resolution in the three categories of conflict.

Table 4.3 Armed conflicts and peace agreements, 1989–2016

	No. of conflicts with peace agreements	No. of armed conflicts	Proportion of peace agreements to armed conflicts (%)
Intra-state conflict over government	31	63	49
Intra-state conflict over territory	22	97	23
Inter-state conflict	5	11	46
Total	58	171	34

Note: Armed conflicts with at least one peace agreement.

Source: Uppsala Conflict Data Program, downloaded December 12, 2017.

Table 4.3 shows that there is considerable similarity in the ability to conclude peace agreements no matter what type of conflict. More than one third of all conflicts appear likely, sooner or later, to find a negotiated settlement, for some categories even more. There is a consistent pattern of such settlements being somewhat more common for intra-state conflicts over government. It is reasonably 'normal' that agreements will be reached to make such accords a most serious aspect in any analysis of war and peace. Also, the fact that there are some differences – although not very strong – among the categories in the trichotomy suggests that it is valid as a guide for conflict resolution.

Further Readings

Go to the *Understanding Conflict Resolution* web page at <https://study.sagepub.com/wallensteen5e> for free access to the journal articles listed.

Peace Agreements: General Understanding

There is considerable work on peace agreement with respect to individual conflicts. General treatments are rarer. However, the Peace Accord Matrix at the Kroc Institute, University of Notre Dame, is a particular resource for the implementation of such agreements. It can be reached on <https://peaceaccords.nd.edu>

For an overview as well as definitions of peace agreements, see Harbom, L., Högladh, S. and Wallensteen, P. (2006) Armed conflict and peace agreements, *Journal of Peace Research*, 43 (5): 617–31.

Bell, C. (2008) *On the Law of Peace: Peace Agreements and Lex Pacificatoria*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

In this work Bell presents the legal aspects of peace agreements, which are often absent in the more political treatments of such arrangements. There is now also a database on peace agreements, called PA-X and available on www.kaggle.com/university-of-edinburgh/peace-agreements-dataset

Stedman, S.J., Rothchild, D. and Cousens, E.M. (eds) (2002) *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Here a number of researchers study peace agreements in political terms and in particular conflicts.

Notes

- 1 The State of Palestine has been recognized by 136 UN member states and is seated as a 'non-member observer state' in the UN General Assembly. It is not recognized by Israel, however. The so-called Islamic State (IS, ISIS, ISIL) seemingly never strived for diplomatic recognition or a seat in the UN.

- 2 This is a broad generalization. The four most glaring exceptions are Germany, China, Korea and Vietnam. It is noteworthy that none of these cases was seen by the Cold War superpowers as a question of separatism. The Western support for West Germany was built on the idea of a reunification in the future under a democratic, federal system; the East's support for East Germany emphasized a new legitimacy, not the separation of an 'East German' identity. Similarly, the divisions of China, Korea and Vietnam follow such Cold War lines of legitimacy, not a separation of identities. This can be seen also in the attitude to reunification. In Germany, it was the West that pressed for unification. In Vietnam, it was instead the communist side that favoured this option, as has also been the case for China in its relation to Taiwan.