Liberal Peace Implementation and the Durability of Post-war Peace

Abstract

This article examines the correlation between the implementation of liberal peace provisions in peace accords and the duration of peace by drawing on data from the Peace Accords Matrix that comprises 34 comprehensive peace agreements signed in the post-Cold War period. Our key findings confirm that the duration of peace is improved when the liberal aspects of peace included in peace accords are implemented. In addition, the article examines peace duration in relation to UN peacekeeper deployment and mechanisms for peace accord verification – in an attempt to establish factors that enhance the duration of peace. Peacekeeping is found to have a positive impact, while verification mechanisms do not. The findings highlight the need to unpack and scrutinize more thoroughly the complex roles of liberal peacemaking.

Keywords: peace duration, peace accords, the liberal peace, peacekeeping

Introduction

This article examines some of the key, and heavily debated, issues in contemporary International Relations. It is particularly interested in the duration of peace and thus connects with a series of cognate debates on the meaning(s) of peace and how peace might be measured. Questions that arise from this research agenda touch on the duration versus the quality of peace, and issues of how this is to be captured. The past two decades have seen very considerable academic, policy and public debate on the (dis)advantages of the liberal peace, or the dominant form of peace support intervention favoured by leading states in the international system and its allied international institutions. From its apparently neo-imperialistic nature to its ill-managed exit strategies, a wide range of pitfalls have been discussed from both normative and empirical perspectives. More recent studies have challenged these critiques by questioning the validity of their empirical evidence, and the very existence of the liberal peace. This article seeks to contribute to the discourse on contemporary peacemaking by examining the extent to which the liberal peace can impact on the duration of peace. The introduction of empirical evidence into debates on the utility of the liberal peace is, we believe, a useful and original contribution.

Specifically, our study examines the correlation between (1) the implementation of the contents of peace accords that we identify as being core parts of the liberal peace with (2) the duration of peace in post-war societies. Peace duration is measured in terms of whether or not the signatories to a peace accord returned to armed conflict. Our study is based on an analysis of 34 comprehensive peace accords (CPAs) signed in the post-Cold War period and draws on data from the Peace Accords Matrix (PAM), a detailed database of post-1989 comprehensive peace accords. PAM includes data and analysis on peace accord content and implementation. Other data sources, notably the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) and the *Polity 2* database of political stability, are used

to augment the PAM data. Through this analysis, we are able to empirically confirm that there is a positive correlation between the implementation of the liberal peace provisions of a peace accord and the duration of peace.

The article proceeds by outlining our understanding of the liberal peace and, in particular, how we identify the liberal aspects of contemporary peace accords and how the implementation of those liberal aspects can lead to a more durable peace, at least on the part of signatories. It then introduces the research design before going on to present and analyze the findings on the extent to which a peace that may be identified as 'liberal' influences the duration of that peace. Moreover, the roles played by field deployment (UN peacekeeping and verification mechanisms) in maintaining peace will be discussed in relation to the implementation of liberal peace provisions. This is followed by a note on the robustness tests of the empirical findings, and a concluding discussion. The chief finding of the article is that the implementation of the liberal aspects of a peace accord has a positive correlation with the duration of peace.

The authors are aware that the concept of peace is notoriously contested. Moreover, they recognize that merely reaching an accord and having an accord that lasts cannot automatically be accepted as 'peace'. The concept of 'political unsettlement' (Bell and Pospisil 2017) neatly captures post-peace accord situations in which there is a peace accord, but the parties merely grudgingly accept to co-exist with the other rather than engage in meaningful reconciliation. Gauging peace on the basis of whether or not peace accord signatories return to violence does not take account of spoiler violence from those who were not signatories of the peace accord, nor does it take into account post-peace accord criminal violence. Such violence, as attested by high crime rate societies like El Salvador and South Africa, often dominates life in these contexts. Nevertheless, since peace accords are the most visible, and often internationally recognized,

statements of peacemaking, it is legitimate for this study to use them and their contents in its examination of peace duration.

The Liberal Peace and its Critiques

The liberal peace is taken to mean the dominant form of peace-making and peacebuilding that is supported by leading states, international organizations and international financial institutions (Paris, 2004; Richmond, 2006; Richmond and Franks, 2011). It justifies itself using liberal rhetoric and is associated with practices and institutions that are regarded as liberal such as democracy, free markets, transparency, accountability, individual rights and the rule of law. The extent to which the liberal peace is actually liberal, and whether it sometimes relies on illiberal methods, has been the subject of much debate. The academic literature has examined the philosophical heritage of liberal internationalism (Kant, 1795; Gray, 2000; Richardson, 2001), the link between a state's liberal disposition and its pacific orientation in international affairs (Small and Singer, 1976; Doyle, 1983; Brown, 2002; Ray, 2005), and the normative value of liberal institutions (Fukuyama, 1992; Owen, 1994; Mayall, 1996).

For the purposes of this article, we are interested in liberal peacebuilding in the sense of post-Cold War comprehensive peace accords and consequent peacebuilding. Importantly, while the liberal peace can be conceptualized as a series of peace accords in quite different conflict contexts, it is prudent to regard it systemically. It is a *system* of peace-building, -keeping, enforcement and maintenance that has a sustained, if not always coherent, ideological heritage and is linked to material power in the sense of particular states and institutions and the incentives and coercion that they can offer. So while this article analyses peace accords, it can also be read as an empirically-

4

informed commentary on the dominant internationally-endorsed contemporary system of international peace intervention and support.

The dominance of the liberal peace in contemporary peacemaking and post-war reconstruction has been subject to extensive academic discussions over the last two decades. These discussions have measured rhetoric against practice and pointed to apparent illiberal and dysfunctional aspects of peacemaking. They have highlighted that the liberal peace primarily reflects third-party interveners' perspectives and frequently fails to reflect the political, social and cultural contexts in the war-affected countries. Critical studies contend that many contemporary peacebuilding programmes demonstrate significant limitations in bringing about consolidated post-war peace (Paris, 2004; Richmond, 2005; Futamura, Newman and Tadjbakhsh, 2010; Mac Ginty, 2011), with some studies focusing on practical challenges and others on the normative and Euro-centric associations of the liberal peace (Lyons, 2004; Obi, 2007; Franks and Richmond, 2008; Bellamy and Williams, 2010; Sisk and Reynolds, 1998; Chopra, 2000; Pugh, Cooper and Turner, 2008; Chandler, 2009; Harris, 2012; Shinoda, 2015). The literature has also expanded to include alternative or supplementary mechanisms such as local ownership, hybrid peace, everyday peace, and the like (Mac Ginty 2011).

In more recent debates, the validity of the previous critiques has begun to be questioned. These 'critiques of critiques' have included defences of the liberal peace, by arguing that alternative models may be unpalatable or less reliable (Paris 2010; Quinn and Cox 2009). Some argue that an assumption of the liberal dominance in contemporary peace interventions is itself an exaggeration or a 'myth' that misunderstands the realist nature of the international politics (Selby 2013; Zaum 2012). Theoretical works have also called into question the ability of critics to make valid criticisms as they themselves are implicated in the very liberal peace that they seek to criticize.

However, a lack of systematic and comprehensive examination of the achievements and limitations of liberal peacebuilding remains a significant knowledge gap in the conventional peacebuilding discourse. Many contemporary discussions on the liberal peace are either normative discussions or a qualitative examination of a selected number of case studies. While normative discussions frequently present a distinctly ideological flavour, the case studies based on field research usually rely on a small number of cases and thus often lack a systematic examination of the overall trends. There are a substantial number of quantitative studies that evaluate the roles of some liberal elements of peace accords such as democratic institutions (Doyle and Sambanis 2002, 2006; Hartzell and Hoddie 2007; Joshi and Mason 2011; Joshi 2013; Walter 2002), the demobilization of military groups (Wagner 1993; Licklider 1995; Walter 1997; Joshi and Melander 2017), the reconstruction of the (market) economy (Paris, 2004; Doyle and Sambanis 2000, 2006) and the protection of civilians (Huttman et al. 2013). Nevertheless, these studies tend not to connect directly with debates on the liberal peace, and a comprehensive evaluation of a wider range of peace accord provisions that might be said to constitute the liberal peace is rarely conducted. Hence, we feel justified in offering systematic empirical evidence that can guide judgments on the existence, quality, nature and duration of the liberal peace.

This article aims to help address this knowledge gap by examining the correlation between the liberal peace and peace duration. In addition, it will provide a finer grained analysis of how the liberal peace operates alongside two often-deployed elements of peace support: verification mechanisms and UN peacekeeping.

Previous studies using PAM data have been useful in revealing the character of contemporary peacemaking. A study by Joshi, Lee and Mac Ginty (2014) demonstrated the extent to which contemporary peace accords can be considered 'liberal' through an analysis of peace accord

provisions. This contradicts arguments by Selby (2013) that denied the existence of the liberal peace. The findings showed that it is accurate to label contemporary internationally-sponsored peace accords as 'liberal' on the basis of the contents of peace accord provisions and their promotion of five factors: democracy, human rights, the rule of law, Security Sector Reform (SSR) and governance reform. Taken together, these five factors constitute the liberal peace as manifest in contemporary peace accords. If an accord prominently promotes these factors then it can be called a liberal peace accord.

Most peace accords address issues of participation and place an emphasis on institutionalizing post-conflict elections and electoral reform. These post-conflict elections are often designed with an emphasis on the inclusion of former armed actors and marginalized segments of the population. The aim is to recalibrate the polity so as to allow for the representation of previously excluded constituencies, and thus lessen the possibility of grievances sparking renewed conflict. Rule of law provisions in peace accords may also be said to be a quintessentially liberal intervention that offer protection and certainty to citizens, property and the polity. This may involve (re)constructing constitutional frameworks, or new governance measures to enhance judicial independence. Relatedly, peace accords often place an emphasis on rights. This may be retrospective in the sense of addressing wartime human rights violations, and other transitional justice measures such as amnesty, reparations and truth commission mechanisms. It may also involve provisions for the post-conflict dispensation such as protections for minorities and cultural expression.

There may also be significant reforms in the security sector with an emphasis on civilian oversight of security agencies. Liberal peace provisions have also placed significant emphasis on governance reforms – often mediated through statebuilding interventions that attempt to right-size, regularize and make the state more efficient and transparent. Thus, through liberal peace provisions, and in

an ideal scenario, individual rights are protected and promoted, institutions are reformed, and systems of accountability are put in place. Depending on context, peace agreements may protect and support indigenous and minority rights as well as children's and women's rights, and secure their social, economic and political representation. The philosophy behind such initiatives is that societies with transparent and accountable systems in place to regulate competition over scarce resources, and to regulate relationships between different identity groups, are less likely to experience violent conflict. In a nutshell, the liberal peace is based on the notion that liberalism institutionalized and operationalized in a domestic political setting is likely to result in peace at home and abroad.

Research Design: Data, Dependent and Independent variables

This study measures the extent to which the liberal peace correlates with peace duration. Specifically, it examines whether the duration of peace is *correlated with the extent of liberal peace implementation*. In order to proceed, we need to identify how we operationalize the liberal peace in this study. To identify the core attributes of the liberal peace we analyzed eight major policy documents from international organizations.[1] Taken together, the documents can be regarded as the seminal corpus of contemporary international peacebuilding. The five recurring

---

[1]The documents examined in this article are: UN Secretary General (UNSG) (1992). *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-Keeping*, UN doc., A/47/277–S/24111; The Panel of United Nations Peace Operations (2000). *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Brahimi Report)*, UN doc., A/55/305–S/2000/809; UN (2004). *A More Secured World: Our Shared Responsibility – Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*, UN doc., A/59/565; International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001) *The Responsibility to Protect*, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; UNSG (2005). *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*, UN doc., A/59/2005; UNSG (2009). *Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict*, UN doc., A/63/881–S/2009/304; International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (2011). *A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States.* Declaration issued at the 4thHigh Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, South Korea, 30 Nov. 2011; and UNDP (2012). *Governance for Peace: Securing the Social Contract*, New York: UNDP.

ideas of the liberal peace outlined in the previous section (the promotion of democracy, rule of law, human rights, security sector reform and governance reform) are often manifest in peace accords. We categorise peace accord provisions around these five clusters and take them to be key signifiers of the liberal peace. These issue areas often form the basis of statebuilding, 'stabilization', and reconstruction programmes that follow a peace accord. Peacebuilding programmes and projects often include many other issues, such as nurturing of civil society, promoting social inclusion and facilitating a market economy, although sometimes these go beyond the scope of the peace agreements and take place in later stages of conflict settlements.

Earlier work on the Peace Accords Matrix identified 51 issue areas with which peace accords dealt (Joshi and Darby, 2013). We were then able to match 23 issue areas with the five liberal peace policy categories we identified from the major peacebuilding documents (see Table 1). The primary goal of this study is to examine the impact of all liberal peace provisions in an integrated way, which will address the knowledge gap in the existing liberal peace discourse.

Table 1 About Here.

In the next stage of our research design, we matched the implementation of liberal peace elements in CPAs. This study utilises the implementation rate of all liberal peace provisions included in a peace accord as the primary indicator for measuring the independent variable. Specifically, in examining the implementation of liberal peace provisions, this study refers to the Peace Accords Matrix Implementation Data (PAM-ID), which provides annual implementation data for 51 provisions for 10 years after a CPA was signed (Joshi, Quinn and Regan 2015). For example, the Dayton or General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina

was reached in 1995 and the PAM-ID provides annual implementation data until 2005. The implementation data for these provisions are available until 2012 or when a major armed conflict that produced over 1,000 deaths recurred and the peace accord became obsolete.

Based on the concept of viability – a practical goal for coding full implementation of individual provisions given the current level of implementation – Joshi, Quinn and Regan code implementation of individual provisions in CPA as initiated or not initiated, and if initiated, then whether the status is minimum (coded 1), intermediate (coded 2), or full (coded 3) for the year under observation. If a major reversal takes place in the implementation of particular provisions, such as in Sierra Leone where the agreed-upon amnesty was revoked for the alleged involvement of Foday Sankoh and others in renewed violence, the implementation status is adjusted accordingly (Joshi, Quinn and Regan, 2015).

Based on this implementation information, a variable *Liberal Peace Implementation* is generated that calculates the annual implementation rate by summing the actual implementation value for all liberal peace related provisions. The sum is then divided by the expected value of implementing these provisions. The outcome is then multiplied by 100. For example, there are 22 liberal peace provisions in Sudan's 2005 CPA. The expected value for fully implementing all these provisions is 66 as the full implementation for each provision takes a value of 3. For all 22 provisions, the overall implementation value for the first year of accord is 33 and therefore the *Liberal Peace Implementation* rate is (33/66)*100 = 50 per cent. This rate improved to 56 per cent in 2006.

The implementation rate captures the extent to which the liberal provisions negotiated in CPAs are implemented and therefore does not provide any information on the scope of the liberal peace reforms as negotiated in the accord. While liberal peace reforms outside the CPA remain a

theoretical possibility, the implementation rate variable needs to be contextualized with the scope

of liberal peace reforms negotiated in the accord. For example, when focusing entirely on the

implementation rate, a peace process with three liberal peace provisions (all of which present a

high implementation rate) is considered more liberal than a process with 20 provisions (which

present with moderate implementation). At the same time, a focus only on the number of liberal

peace reforms cannot be a sufficient indicator to identify the liberal nature of a peace process.

The number of liberal peace provisions required in a peace process vary according to the contexts

of conflicts, social conditions and the types of challenges facing peace processes. For instance,

provisions on 'indigenous rights' or 'transitional government' are relevant to some conflict

affected societies but not to others. Hence, to have a more liberal peace provisions does not

necessarily bring about a stronger representation of liberal peace.

In our model, this factor is reflected by adjusting the implementation rate according to the

number of liberal peace provisions using both lenient and strict implementation scores.

Moreover, we include the quantity of liberal peace provisions in our empirical analysis along

with other provisions (see the 'Robustness and Endogeneity Tests' section). According to PAM-

ID, an agreement on average entails 12 provisions related to what we identify as liberal peace

signifiers. Guinea-Bissau's *Abuja Peace Agreement* (1998) contained the least with only 3

provisions that could be associated with the liberal peace. Sudan's 2005 *Comprehensive Peace

Agreement* had the most with 22 provisions.

As specified in the hypotheses, the dependent variable is the recurrence of armed conflict

between the signatories who negotiated the CPA. Based on the Uppsala Conflict Data Program

armed conflict dataset, this variable is coded "1" when armed conflict between signatories

reoccurred, otherwise it is coded "0" (Themnér and Wallensteen, 2013). For the first year of

observation, or the CPA signing year which could still see some violence prior to the signing of the CPA we do not code armed conflict. In the data used in this analysis, signatories returned to either minor or major conflicts in 10 cases (29.41 per cent) within a decade of signing of an accord.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analyses. In our empirical analysis, we control for various factors that are related to armed conflict, factors that are likely to influence the content of the peace accord. Moreover, we control for battle deaths by using the data from UCDP (2014) because conflict intensity and duration are found to influence powersharing provisions and are important factors considered for international intervention, especially when the United Nations must decide whether to send peacekeeping forces (Hartzell and Hoddie, 2007; Gilligan, 2003). As an alternative, we also examine total deaths incurred in specific conflicts by utilizing the PAM data (Joshi and Darby, 2013). The PAM data is also used to control for war duration. The deployment of peacekeeping forces reduces commitment problems and thus the recurrence of conflict by providing a guarantee of security and reducing uncertainty when peace agreements provide for parties to verify the military (Walter, 1997; Doyle and Sambanis, 2000, 2006; Joshi, 2013; Mattes and Savun, 2010). Therefore, in our analysis, we control for the deployment of UN peacekeepers. Using the PAM-ID, this variable is coded "1" when the peacekeeping forces are deployed and "0" if they are not deployed.

Many peace accords provide a verification mechanism to monitor implementation progress and this often involves international monitors, parties to the peace process, and representatives from civil society. This provision is significantly related to the overall implementation of peace agreements (Joshi, Lee, and Mac Ginty 2017). We thus control for the implementation of

verification provisions by using the PAM-ID data. This variable is coded "1" when verification mechanisms are implemented and "0" if otherwise.

<div align="center">**Table 2 About Here.**</div>

Following previous studies on state capacity and peace agreement implementation (DeRouen et al., 2010), we use infant mortality rates and the total number of armed personnel to examine the influence of state capacity in peace implementation. Similarly, we control for annualized GDP growth rate. Data for these variables come from the World Bank's World Development Indicators (World Bank 2013). Because the analysis of policy documents related to the liberal peace suggests that the promotion of democracy is the most integral part of liberal peace (Joshi, Lee, and Mac Ginty, 2014), and emerging democracies are more susceptible to armed conflict, we control for democracy using the executive constraints (XCONST) indicator from the Polity IV data (Marshall, Gurr and Jaggers, 2013). Constraints on the executive as defined in the Polity IV project refer to oversight on the decision-making power of chief executives. In democracies, the oversight function is often carried out by the legislature or the independent judiciary. We derive a dummy variable coded "1" when the XCONST is high (levels 5-7) and "0" when otherwise. This reflects the high levels of constraints that are often seen with democratic regime types.

Additionally, the media can be perceived to be responsible for fomenting violence and/or encouraging peace processes (Mitchell, 2012; Wolfsfeld, 2004). We use data from Joshi and Quinn (2017) to control for media coverage. Data on media coverage is likely to be over-dispersed from case to case because some peace implementation processes receive more media coverage than others. To deal with the data dispersion issue, we take the natural log of this variable.

A final point on research design is a reminder that the PAM data refers to comprehensive peace accords. Thus partial, minor and un-signed accords lie outside of its remit. Comprehensive accords usually seek a definitive end to violent conflict and cover a wide range of issues beyond security and constitutional issues. They will also seek to include a wider range of conflict actors.

Empirical Analysis and Findings

In analyzing the data, our first question was: "To what extent were peace accord provisions related with the liberal peace implemented?" By this we mean provisions of a peace accord that have a demonstrably liberal heritage, as identified by our interrogation of the seminal peacebuilding documents and the post-1989 peace accords that identified five signifiers of a liberal peace: promotion of democracy, rule of law, human rights, security sector reform and governance reform. Figure 1 presents the implementation rates of liberal peace related provisions, either 10 years after their initiation or when the data coding was stopped. Although full implementation has never happened in cases of post-peace accords since the Cold War, the average implementation score of liberal peace related provisions was 70 per cent. This confirms that the CPA provisions associated with the liberal peace themes were prioritized during the implementation processes. Again it is worth reminding ourselves of the rhetorical and declaratory nature of much peacebuilding, and how aspects of the liberal peace may not necessarily result in liberal means and outcomes.

<div align="center">**Figure 1 About Here.**</div>

An examination of PAM-ID data also identified different patterns of implementation. Figure 2 summarizes the overall liberal peace implementation rate for a selection of six peace accords that

experienced UN involvement to various degrees and capacities (the transitional authority in

Cambodia to no role in Bangladesh). As can be seen, all peace accords have their own trajectory

in terms of how implementation starts and proceeds. This is likely to reflect a complex and

context-specific story of international, transnational, national and local politics, and economics

that makes cross-case comparison and generic commentary difficult. Some accords achieved a

high liberal peace implementation within the first five years of accord (e.g. El Salvador and

Mozambique), while others made early progress in implementation before plateauing (e.g. Papua

New Guinea). In Bangladesh, the implementation rate did not improve after an initial surge in the

first two years. The figures suggest that in many cases there is a gradual implementation process

that lasted for a decade or longer. In many studies, the success of a liberal peace is evaluated

within two to five years of a peace accord being reached (Doyle and Sambanis, 2000, 2006).

These figures, however, demonstrate a gradual implementation of provisions related to liberal

peace, and that, in many instances, liberal peace provisions were not fully implemented even after

a decade.

Figure 2 About Here.

Our next goal was to investigate if the implementation of the liberal peace provisions in a CPA

avoids the recurrence of armed conflict between signatories. In other words: does liberal peace

implementation impact on peace duration? We use the event history or the survival statistical

method to determine this (Box-Steffensmeier and Jones, 2004; Cleves, Gould and Gutierrez,

2004). In event history analysis, depending on distribution assumption and tests statistics, various

parametric modeling options are available. Theoretically, we expect liberal provisions in a CPA

to be implemented over time and the risk of armed conflict recurrence to decline as the overall

implementation rate increases. This suggests a typical Weibull or continuous probability

distribution pattern. The AIC and BIC test statistics rule out the use of the Cox proportional hazard model.[2] For all models, but Model 1 and 7, the estimated parameter (p) is higher than 1, which suggests that the Weibull model better fits the data.[3] Because we are interested in analyzing peace duration until an armed conflict recurs between CPA signatories, or time to event, we use the Weibull model with the accelerated failure time (AFT) matric (Cleves, Gould and Gutierrez, 2004). The use of AFT matric reports coefficient (not the proportional hazard), which allows easy interpretation of the coefficient. In the context of survival analysis in this study, positive coefficients suggest an increasing rate of peace duration while negative coefficients suggest a decreasing rate of peace duration (peace failure).

Table 3 presents a series of Weibull regression with recurrence of conflict as the failure event. We began with the first model that has *liberal peace implementation* as the only variable in the model. Model 2 builds on Model 1 by including battle deaths and war duration (measures of costs of conflict), infant mortality rate (a measure of state capacity) and media coverage (a measure for domestic and international influence on peace process). Model 3 includes deployment of UN peacekeeping and implementation of the verification mechanism. In Model 4, we control for executive constraints and conflict type. In Model 5, we add annualized GDP growth rate as a control. In Model 6, we substituted battle deaths from all wars to total deaths related to a specific conflict leading up to the signing of a CPA. We also used the number of armed personnel along with infant mortality as a measure of the state capacity.

---

[2] The Bayesian information criterion (BIC) penalize for additional variables in the model, therefore we rely on *Akaike information criterion (AIC). Test statistics not reported.*
[3] Model 4 and 6 for the lenient implementation rate and 10 and 12 for the strict implementation rate were replicated with the Cox proportional hazard method. Results are in the expected direction, but because of test statistics for model specifications and theoretical expectations regarding the shape of hazard function, results from the Weibull model specification are reported.

Table 3 About Here.

In Model 1, we test direct and unmitigated effects of *liberal peace implementation* as this variable does not include controls for other confounding factors. We find statistically significant support for the implementation of liberal peace related provisions (p<0.001, Model 4). This finding is replicated across all models (2-5). These consistent findings support the theoretical argument that the implementation of liberal peace provisions significantly increases the duration of peace or reduces recurrence of armed conflict between signatories. Based on model 4 in Table 3, we estimated that a one percent increase in liberal peace implementation rate leads to a 9 percent $[100*(1-(\exp(-\hat{p}\hat{\beta}))) = [100*(\text{EXP}(-2.403*0.041)))]$ increase in the duration of peace between signatories who signed the CPA. In other words, in those post-CPA countries where the liberal peace implementation rate was 75 per cent, we see an increase in the chance of durable peace by at least two times compared to those post-CPA countries where the implementation rate was just 25 per cent. These findings are robust and substantial.

In Model 2, we find negative and statistically significant support for the *infant mortality rate* impacting on peace durability (P<0.05, Model 4). This suggests that countries with a higher *infant mortality rate* often see a recurrence of armed conflict. This finding is consistent across all models. On the contrary, and as expected, we find a positive and significant effect of GDP growth rate on the durability of peace (p<0.05). This finding indicates the relationship between economic growth and the durability of post-conflict peace. Many countries also tend to adopt a liberal market economy in the post-CPA period. Therefore, a portion of economic growth might be a function of the adoption of economic reform consistent with the liberal peacebuilding framework.[4] Similarly, *media coverage* has a negative and statistically significant relationship

---

[4] We did not test whether the post-CPA GDP growth could be attributed to the post-CPA economic reform.

with the recurrence of armed conflict across all models. While we expected *media coverage* to bring international attention and possibly hold the government and former rebel leaders responsible for implementing peace agreements, we find instead that media interest foments violence even after CPAs are negotiated and put through the implementation process. The most logical explanation, however, is that the *media coverage* increases in instances of failed peace processes or in environments where implementation has failed.

After adding the *UN peacekeeping* and *verification mechanisms* variables in Model 3, the *battle deaths* variable becomes positive and significant ($p<0.05$), which suggests peace durability after heavy human death tolls. This remains true in Model 4 as well. The *UN peacekeeping* variable has a positive and significant effect in model 3 and 4 ($p<0.10$). Although marginally significant, this finding aligns with the results of earlier studies of the relationship between UN peacekeeping and peacebuilding success (Doyle and Sambanis, 2000, 2006).

The *verification mechanism,* which is instituted by the accord itself and often includes representatives from the government, the rebel group(s), and international and civil society actors, is negative and significant. This finding is surprising because prior studies have emphasized how unbiased verification regarding military strength on both sides can resolve information uncertainty thus giving them the confidence to persist with the peace process/peace deal (Mattes and Savun, 2010). This does not mean, however, that CPAs with a *verification mechanism* in place lack implementation. In fact, Joshi, Lee, and Mac Ginty's (2017) analysis of the same PAM dataset finds that verification mechanisms have a positive and robust influence in the overall implementation of the CPA provisions. In the analysis performed here, there was no evidence of significant support of war duration, executive constraints, conflict type, total deaths and armed personnel.

This finding, instead, reflects the procedural and practical limitations that conventional verification mechanisms possess. For instance, many peace processes with strong verification mechanisms completed the implementation of peace accord provisions within two years of initiation (e.g., Tajikistan, Bougainville, Macedonia, Cambodia, Mozambique, Burundi, Guinea-Bissau). However, external efforts for speedy implementation, although in line with an agreed implementation timetable, may fail to reflect national military factions' security and political concerns. In Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge considered it unexpected and biased that the UN Transitional Authority (UNTAC) demanded strict respect for the Paris Peace Accords with little pre-consultation (Heder, 1999). Moreover, such a verification mechanism may also create obstacles in the implementation process itself. For instance, data provided to or by those charged with verification might differ from perceptions on the frontline, perhaps parking security fears among parties. Despite UNTAC's institutional and procedural arrangements for neutral verification, the Khmer Rouge thought the subsequent demilitarization procedures paid them unfair attention while ignoring their counterparts' 'fake disarmament' (Doyle, Johnstone and Orr, 1997:118-121). The danger in circumstances like this is that verification mechanisms provide evidence not of the implementation of a peace accord, but of the perceived bad faith of the other side and so may prompt a resumption of violence. Hence, feeling betrayed by its previous advocates, such as China and Thailand, the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia declared that it would refuse to collaborate with UNTAC only eight months after it had signed the peace accords (Heder, 1999; Lizée, 1999).

In prior studies, the role of UN peacekeeping operations was often credited with promoting liberal peace or peacebuilding success (Stedman, 2003; Doyle and Sambanis, 2006). Our analyses, to some extent, help us support this link. For example, we found unmitigated effects of liberal peace implementation on peace duration. This is represented in Figure 3. As can be seen in

the first part of the Figure (3a), when liberal peace implementation is significantly higher (75 per cent or more), recurrence of armed conflict is less likely compared to mid-range (50 per cent), lower (25 per cent) or no implementation. This finding suggests that irrespective of UN peacekeeping deployment, a higher liberal peace implementation leads to a more durable peace between signatories. However, the deployment of UN peacekeeping significantly influences peace duration when the liberal peace provisions are either not implemented or do not achieve a high implementation rate. This effect can be seen in the second part of the figure (3b), which replicates the first part accounting for the deployment of the UN peacekeeping forces.

In other words, the roles and influence of peacekeeping is different depending on the progress of the liberal peace implementation. This finding is understandable since a few key provisions of liberal peacebuilding (e.g. military reform, demilitarization, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, repatriation of refugees and IPDs) are closely associated with the objectives of UN peacekeeping. In the cases where more liberal peace provisions are implemented, the urgent security issues with which peacekeeping is primarily concerned are more likely to be addressed. In contrast, when the above security-related provisions are not implemented and the risk of security destabilisation is high, the operation of external military troops makes a stronger contribution as a deterrence force.

From a theoretical perspective, this finding offers more nuanced information on the roles of peacekeeping in maintaining peace in post-conflict societies than many previous studies that examined its overall impact (Doyle and Sambanis 2006; Fortna 2004; Greig and Diehl 2005; Joshi 2013; Joshi and Mason 2011; Walter 1997). Moreover, this finding has significant policy implications. The deployment of UN peacekeeping is costly given the time required to get consensus among permanent members in the Security Council and the financial resources and

logistics involving the deployment, and security of the peacekeeping troops on the ground (Bosco, 2013; UN Peacekeeping, n.d.). Moreover, a recent study based on the PAM dataset also suggests that the deployment of external peacekeeping troops may deter the implementation of peace accords (Joshi, Lee and Mac Ginty 2017). Hence, there is a need for carefully planning the forms and procedures of external peacekeeping involvement. If we know in advance some probability of the extent to which the liberal peace provisions will be implemented once the CPA is signed, the deployment of UN peacekeeping forces may or may not be necessary to sustain the peace.

Moreover, the positive contribution of UN peacekeeping can be further confirmed by examining the liberal peace implementation rate with UN peacekeeping. Considering 12 cases where UN peacekeeping troops were deployed, the average of lenient implementation rate of liberal peace-related provisions is 74.58 per cent, while the average of the cases with no peacekeeping was 65 per cent. This implies that UN peacekeeping positively contributes to the implementation of liberal peacebuilding, and when the liberal peace is not well implemented, to the maintenance of a minimal level of peace.

Figure 3 About Here.

Robustness and Endogeneity Tests

One could argue that the way we have derived the *liberal peace implementation* rate does not distinguish between accords that contain more liberal peace provisions and those that have few such provisions. This is because some accords contain 3 provisions while others contain 23 provisions. When implemented fully, provisions will have the same implementation rate. Models 6-10 replicate models 1-5 with a rescaled liberal peace implementation rate variable in a way that

21

takes all liberal peace provisions into account when calculating the liberal peace implementation rate. For example, a CPA that has 3 liberal peace provisions will get a $[(3*3)/(23*3)]*100 = 13.04$ per cent implementation rate for full implementation compared to 95.65 per cent implementation $[(22*3)/(23*3)]*100$ for an accord that has 22 out of 23 liberal peace provisions. This is a significant change in the way the independent variable was measured in Model 1-6. Results from this change are reported in Model 7-12 in Table 3. After this significant change in the main independent variable, however, the effect of liberal peace implementation on peace duration is still in the expected direction and highly significant ($p<0.001$).

Table 4 presents two additional models (Model 13 and 14) that include two variables to capture a number of liberal peace provisions as well as a number of non-liberal peace provisions. This allows us to contextualize the liberal peacemaking approach as it unfolds in a real setting. When the rate of implementation is the same, can the number of liberal peace provisions negotiated in a CPA influence the durable peace? As can be seen, provisions themselves are not significant when examined alone with the implementation rate both in lenient and strict tests.[5] This lends support to our argument that the liberal peace provisions or the scope of liberal reform as negotiated in the accord are not sufficient if they are not implemented.

Moreover, because we derive a standardized score for implementation of liberal peace provisions in CPAs and do not make a distinction between the importance of individual provisions, one could suggest that some provisions are critically important in a time of transition from war to peace (e.g., powersharing, military reform etc.) than provisions that can be addressed once peace is more durable (e.g., children's rights, indigenous people's rights etc.). It is logical that some peace process actors choose to prioritize the implementation of certain provisions in earlier

---

[5] We also performed bivariate tests both lenient and strict and the provision variable is not significant.

phases to build confidence and trust between former adversaries and then focus on other

provisions in later phases. However, in most cases, provisions in peace agreements are not meant

to be implemented independently. Many of these provisions are implemented concurrently and

the processes are very much sequential and interrelated, which makes it difficult to isolate the

implementation of some provisions from others in empirical analysis. As can be seen in pairwise

correlation tests (Table 4), almost all provisions are statistically correlated with each other.

Table 4 About Here.

One could also argue that liberal peace implementation processes are endogenous to factors that

potentially influence the armed conflict recurrence as well as liberal peace implementation. In

their study, Hartzell and Hoddie (2007: 58) find that protracted conflict determines the

powersharing provisions in peace accords. Work by DeRouen and Sobek (2004) finds state

capacity to influence civil war duration and outcome. Similarly, DeRouen et al (2010) find state

capacity to influence peace implementation. In our analysis, we include war duration, battle

deaths and UN peacekeeping variables which explain civil war settlement itself. Similarly, the

inclusion of the infant mortality rate, GDP growth rate, and the armed personnel variables

enables us to view state capacity in terms of the state's ability to deliver public goods (infant

mortality rate) as well as the state's coercive power and its projection.

The implementation data generating process is also another potential source of endogeneity. This

would be the case here if the implementation rate (independent variable) is influenced by the

post-CPA peaceful environment (dependent variable). In our empirical analysis, we use the PAM

implementation data, which is collected independent of whether the armed protagonists went

back to conflict or not after they signed the CPA (see Joshi and Darby 2013; Joshi, Quinn, and

Regan 2015). Out of 34 CPA cases, signatories went back to armed conflict in 10 cases. This

however does not mean that the implementation did not proceed in those cases. Regardless of violence, in all cases implementation proceeded except for Sierra Leone's 1996 accord and Angola's 1994 accord. The PAM project stopped collecting implementation data for Sudan's 2005 CPA in 2011 after the independence of South Sudan.

It is also possible that implementation of liberal peace provisions and durable peace are both influenced by the willingness of actors to implement liberal peace provisions. As our data suggests, there is significant variation in liberal peace provisions as well as the implementation of those provisions across CPA cases. The willingness of policy makers to implement liberal peace provisions could be affected by the prospect for stable negative peace. Hence, it should be acknowledged that the causal relationship between the liberal peace implementation and the duration of negative peace cannot be substantiated further without information about the willingness of actors. Nevertheless, the statistical robustness of our findings proposes a strong correlation between the liberal peace nature and peace duration, which offers a solid empirical foundation for further studies.

Concluding discussion

The key finding of this article challenges the widely shared notion in normative discussions that the liberal peace has barely done any good. The article suggests that the duration of peace is improved if the liberal aspects of peace are included in peace accords and subsequently implemented. A one per cent increase in the liberal peace implementation rate leads to a nine per cent increase in the duration of peace between the signatories who signed the CPA. Although the articulation of the causal relations between them requires further studies, the clear correlation as well as other research findings suggest that the liberal aspects of peacemaking should be taken

seriously as they are a predictor of the longevity of peace. While the conventional critiques on the various limitations of the liberal peace are still valid, the evaluation of the roles of the liberal peacebuilding should be done in a more nuanced way, observing both the positive and negative dimensions of this approach to peacemaking. Especially during the chaotic periods in the aftermath of armed conflicts, the implementation of liberal elements may have a positive influence in deterring the remobilisation of military movements and stabilising security. To put it another way, this means that coercive and illiberal forms of peace are short-lived and therefore potentially counterproductive.

This finding revisits the validity of previous academic debates on the liberal peace and calls for more nuanced approaches to the roles and functions of the liberal peace elements in post-conflict peacebuilding. To reiterate, the difference between the duration of peace and the quality of peace should be acknowledged. Many critiques of liberal peacebuilding concentrate on the latter rather than the former. By using the term 'no war, no peace', studies argue that a poor quality 'peace', marked bys continuing divisions, poverty, authoritarian rule, and lack of freedom, can persist without a resumption of large-scale violent conflict (Baghdasarian and Yunusov, 2005; Mac Ginty, 2006; Kappler, 2013). Many post-peace accord states (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina) have experienced serious public dissatisfaction with the peace accord and post-accord living standards, yet they have not reverted back into civil war (Magill and Hamber, 2011). Nevertheless, this study suggests that the progress in the liberal peace may play positive roles, at least, in maintaining negative peace in the aftermath of civil war.

We cannot construct an axiomatic causal link between liberal peace implementation and peace duration. Multiple factors may be at work to explain the duration of a 'peace' including the exhaustion of potential combatants and a range of exogenous factors such as regional dynamics or

the state of the global economy. Moreover, when the long durée of a peace is examined in a particular society (for example, Northern Ireland) then we can see that notions of linear time in homogenous units are problematic (Loftus, 2013). Our focus is admittedly short-termist in this sense, but it is worth noting that much of contemporary peacemaking occupies the short-term realm.

In addition, this study examined two types of field deployment (peacekeeping forces and verification mechanisms) and how they interact with peace accords that may be compliant with the liberal peace. Our findings suggest that the deployment of UN peacekeeping alongside a liberal peace accord has a positive impact on the duration of peace. Somewhat counter-intuitively, the institution of peace accord verification mechanisms does not have a positive impact although there may be timing and sequencing issues at play in explaining this finding in that verification mechanisms may be most active at particular periods in a peace process/peace accord lifecycle.

Moreover, while the evaluation of cases included in the analysis suggests overwhelming support for our argument, this study does not examine systemic peace within the country. Violence may occur in some parts of the country or be below a threshold required to be included in databases on conflict. While many security incident databases capture violent incidents, they are less well equipped to capture the tensions and exclusions that amount to structural or indirect violence. Moreover, the implementation of formal aspects of a peace accord is likely to be only one aspect of a post-accord peacebuilding process. Peace accords often concentrate on the public, legal and political realms of peacemaking, which may include constitutional reform, and various state-building, governance and security sector reform tasks. Many other issues may legitimately be regarded as part of a peacebuilding process (e.g., land reform, infrastructure support, programmes focusing on people-to-people behavior) but these are seldom formally included in peace accords.

Having said this, our examination presents the need to scrutinize more thoroughly the content and implementation emphases of peace accords. The extent to which a peace accord is 'liberal' in the sense of covering key liberal peace tropes like human rights and the promotion of democracy, and the extent to which these aspects are implemented, have an impact on the duration of peace. The findings highlight the need to unpack and scrutinize more thoroughly the complex roles of liberal peacemaking. We should not see peace accords as undifferentiated and uniformly positive political phenomena. Hence, finer-grained research to understand the precise relationships between institutions and liberalism is required. For instance, do the liberal aspects of peace accords, such as human rights legislation, require the building of particular types of institutions? There is also a need to disaggregate the various tropes within the liberal peace. It is clear that the liberal peace is best treated in the plural rather than as some sort of monolithic leviathan.

It is a task for future research, in this sense, to measure the different social and political impacts that the areas of the liberal peace reforms have on the development of post-conflict peacebuilding. This notion of disaggregating the contents of the liberal peace, and contextualizing it, also suggests the necessity for a conceptual endeavor to look afresh at the concept of the liberal peace. Among some areas of the literature, it has become a by-word for power politics cloaked in a liberal sounding verbiage. This may suggest that a future intellectual task can rescue liberalism (at least those positive aspects that qualitatively improve peace) from 'the liberal peace' that is often regarded as illiberal.

References

Baghdasarian, L. & Yunusov, A. (2005). *The limits of leadership: Elites and societies in the Nagorny Karabakh.* London: Conciliation Resources.

27

Bell, C. and J. Pospisil (2017) 'Navigating Inclusion in Transitions from conflict: The formalized political unsettlement', Journal of International Development, Online First.

Bellamy, J. A. and Williams, D. P., (2010) *Understanding Peacekeeping,* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Bosco, D. (2013). The Price of Peace: How much is a UN blue helmet actually worth? *Foreign Policy* (30 May 2013).

Box-Steffensmeier, J. M. & Jones. B. (2004). *Event History Modeling: A Guide for Social Scientists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, C. (2002) *Sovereignty, Rights and Justice: International Political Theory Today.* Cambridge: Polity.

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min. 2010. "Why do ethnic groups rebel?: New data and analysis." *World Politics* no. 62 (1):87-119.

Chandler, D. (2010) *International Statebuilding: The rise of post-liberal governance.* London: Routledge.

Chandler, David, (2006) *Empire in Denial: The Politics of Statebuilding*, London: Pluto Press.

Chopra, J. (2000) The UN's Kingdom of East Timor, *Survival* 42 (3): 27-40.

Clapham, Christopher S. 1998. "Introduction " In *African Guerrillas*, ed. Christopher S Clapham. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. 1-18.

Cleves, M., Gould, W., & Gutierrez, R., (2004) *An introduction to survival analysis using Stata.* College Station: Stata Press.

DeRouen, K. & Sobek, D. (2004). The Dynamics of Civil War Duration and Outcome. *Journal of Peace Research* 41(3), 303-320.

DeRouen, K., Ferguson, M., Norton, S., Park, Y., Lea, J., & Streat-Bartlett, A. (2010) Civil War Peace Agreement Implementation and State Capacity. *Journal of Peace Research* 47(3), 333-346.

Doyle, M. (1983) Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12 (3), 205–235.

Doyle, M. & Sambanis, N. (2006) *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Doyle, M. & Sambanis. N. (2000) International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 94 (4), 779-801.

Doyle, M., Johnstone, I., & Orr, R. (1997) *Keeping the Peace: Multidimensional UN operations in Cambodia and El Salvador.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elbadawi, Ibrahim, and Nicholas Sambanis. 2000. "Why are there so many civil wars in Africa? Understanding and preventing violent conflict." *Journal of African Economies* no. 9 (3):244-269.

Fortna, Virgina Page, (2008) Does Peacekeeping Work? Shaping Belligerents' Choices After Civil War, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fortna, Virginia (2004) Does peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After War, *International Studies Quarterly* 48: 269-292.

Franks, J. and Richmond, P. O., "Co-opting Liberal Peace-Building: Untying the Gordian Knot in Kosovo", *Cooperation and Conflict,* Volume 43, No.1, 2008.

Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York: Free Press.

Futamura, M., Newman, E. and Tadjbakhsh, S. (2010) *Towards a Human Security Approach to Peacebuilding - Research Brief* No. 2. Tokyo: United Nations University.

Gilligan, M. (2003) Where Do the Peacekeepers Go? *International Studies Review* 5 (4), 37-54.

Gilligan, Michael J., and Ernest J. Sergenti, 2008, 'Do UN Interventions Cause Peace? Using Matching to Improve Causal Inference,' *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 3: 89-122.

Gray, D. (2000) *Two Faces of Liberalism.* Cambridge: Polity.

Greig, Michael, and Paul Diehl. (2005) The Peacekeeping–Peacemaking Dilemma. International Studies Quarterly 49(4):621–646.

Harris, David (2012) *Civil War and Democracy in West Africa: Conflict Resolution, elections and Justice in Sierra Leone and Liberia*, London: IB Tauris.

Hartzell, C., & Hoddie, M. (2007) *Crafting Peace: Power Sharing and the Negotiated Settlement of Civil Wars.* University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Heder, S. (1999) *Pol Pot at bay: people's war and the breakdown of the 1991 Paris Agreements*. PhD Thesis. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Hultman, L., Kathman, J. and Shannon, M., 2013. United Nations peacekeeping and civilian protection in civil war. *American Journal of Political Science*, *57*(4), pp.875-891.

Joshi, M. & Melander, E. (2017) Explaining demobilization in the wake of civil conflict. *Peacebuilding* 5(3), p. 270-88.

Joshi, M. (2013) United Nations Peacekeeping, Democratic Process, and the Durability of Peace after Civil Wars. *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (3), 362–382.

Joshi, M. & Darby, J. (2013) Introducing the Peace Accords Matrix (PAM): a database of comprehensive peace agreements and their implementation, 1989–2007. *Peacebuilding* 1 (2), p. 256-274.

Joshi, M. & Quinn, JM. (2017) Implementing the peace: The aggregate implementation of comprehensive peace agreements and peace duration after intrastate armed conflict. *British Journal of Political Science* 47 (4), p. 869-892.

Joshi, M., Lee, S. & Mac Ginty, R. (2014) Just how liberal is liberal peace? *International Peacekeeping* 21(3), 364-389.

Joshi, M., Lee, S. & Mac Ginty, R. (2017) Built-in Safeguards and the Implementation of Civil War Peace Accords. *International Interactions* **43(6),** p. 994-1018.

Joshi, M., Quinn, J. M., & Regan, P. (2015) Annualized Implementation Data on Comprehensive Intrastate Peace Accords, 1989-2012, *Journal of Peace Research*. 52 (4), 551-562.

Joshi, Madhav and T. David Mason (2011) Civil War Settlements, Size of Governing Coalition, and Durability of Peace in the Post-Civil War States, *International Interactions* 37, no. 4, pp. 388-413

Kant, I. (1795) *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.*

Kappler, S. (2013) Representations of Peace in the EU's Peacebuilding Approach in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In Aggestam, K. & Björkdahl, A., eds. *Rethinking Peacebuilding: The quest for just peace in the Middle East and Western Balkans,*. London: Routledge, 168-182.

Lee, S., Mac Ginty, R. , & Joshi, M. (2016) Social Peace vs. Security Peace. *Global Governance* 22 (4), 491-512.

Lee, SungYong, 2014, Seeking a new generation of the critical scholarship, Peacebuilding

Lizée, P. (1999) *Peace, power and resistance in Cambodia.* Houndmills: Macmillan.

Loftus, S. (2013) *The Invention of Memory: An Irish Family Scrapbook, 1560-1934.* London: Daunt Books.

Lyons, T. 2004. "Transforming the Institutions of War: Postconflict Elections and the Reconstruction of Failed States." In *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences*, edited by R. I. Rotberg, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 269–301.

Mac Ginty, R. (2006) *No War No Peace: The Rejuvenation of Stalled Peace Processes and Peace Accords.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac Ginty, R. (2008) 'Indigenous peace-making versus the liberal peace', *Cooperation and Conflict* 43 (2), 139-163.

Mac Ginty, R. (2011) *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance: Hybrid Forms of Peace*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Magill, C. & Hamber, B. (2011) If they don't start listening to us, the future is going to look the same as the past. *Youth and Society* 43 (2), 509-527.

Marshall, M., Gurr, T., & Jaggers, K., Polity IV Project, *Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2012.* <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm>

Mattes, M., & Savun, B. (2010) Information, Agreement Design, and the Durability of Civil War Settlement. *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2), 511-524.

Mayall, J. ed. (1996) *The New Interventionism 1991-1994: United Nations experience in Cambodia, former Yugoslavia and Somalia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mehler, Andreas (2009) Peace and Power Sharing in Africa: A Not So Obvious Relationship, *African Affairs* 108 (432), 453-73.

Mitchell, J. P. (2012) *Promoting peace, inciting violence: the role of religion and media.* Oxon: Routledge.

Obi, Cyril (2007). Introduction: Elections and the Challenge of Post-Conflict Democratisation in West Africa. African Journal of International Affairs 10 (1&2): 1-12.

Owen, J. M. (1994) How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security* 19 (2), 87-125.

Paffenholz, Thania, 2013 'Critical Peacebuilding Research, Power and Politics: How Peacebuilding Research is Losing its Original Mandate of a Critical and Policy Oriented Science (the second annual conference of the International Association for Peace and Conflict Studies)

Paris, Roland (2009) Does liberal peacebuilding have a future?, in Edward Newman, Roland Paris and Oliver Richmond (eds), New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding, New York: United Nations University Press, 97-111.

Paris, Roland (2010) 'Saving liberal peacebuilding,' *Review of International Studies* 36 (2): 337-365.

Paris, Roland, (2004) *At war's end: building peace after civil conflicts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pugh, M., N. Cooper, and M. Turner (eds.) (2008) *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quinn, Adam, and Michael Cox (2009) For Better, for Worse: How America's foreign policy became wedded to liberal universalism, in Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver Richmond, (eds), *The Liberal Peace and Post-War Reconstruction*, London: Routledge, pp.9-30

Ray, J. L. (2005) Constructing Multivariate Analyses (of Dangerious Dyads). *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22, 277–292.

Richardson, J. (2001) *Contending Liberalisms in World Politics: Ideology and Power.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Richmond, O. (2005) *Understanding the Liberal Peace: The Transformation of Peace*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richmond, O. (2006) The problem of peace: understanding the "liberal peace". *Conflict, Security & Development* 6 (3), 291-341.

Richmond, O., & Franks, J. (2011) *Liberal peace transitions: between statebuilding and peacebuilding.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Richmond, Oliver P., (2006) "The problem of peace: understanding the 'liberal peace'." *Conflict, Security & Development*, 6 (3): 291-341.

Selby, Jan, 2013, 'The myth of liberal peace-building,' *Conflict, Security and Development* 13 (1): 57-86.

Shinoda, Hideaki, (2015) Local ownership as a strategic guideline for peacebuilding, in Sung Yong Lee and Alpaslan Ozerdem (eds.) *Local Ownership in International Peacebuilding: Key Theoretical and Practical Issues*, London and New York: Routledge: 19-38.

Sisk, T. and Andrew Reynolds (eds.) (1998) E*lections and Conflict Management in Africa*, Washington DC: UNSP Press.

Small, M. & Singer, D. J. (1976) The War Proneness of Democratic Regimes, 1816–1965. *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations* 1, 50–69.

Stedman, S. (2003) Policy Implications. In Stedman, S., Rothchild, D. & Cousens, E. eds. *Ending Civil Wars,* Boulder, C.O.: Lynne Rienner, 663-672.

The Uppsala Conflict Data Program. (2014) UCDP *Conflict Encyclopedia.* <www.ucdp.uu.se/database> (Accessed May 22, 2015).

Themnér, L., & Wallensteen, P. (2013) Armed Conflicts, 1946–2012. *Journal of Peace Research* 50 (4), 509-521.

Tschirgi, N. (2013) Securitization and peacebuilding. In Mac Ginty, R. ed. *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding,* London: Routledge, 197-210.

United Nations Peacekeeping. (n.d.) *Financing Peacekeeping.*
<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml> (Accessed August 12 2014).

UN Security Council (2018) *Report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security* (UN Doc. S/2018/900¸ 9 October 2018).

Wagner, Robert Harrison (1993) The Causes of Peace, in Roy Licklider (ed) Stop the Killing: How Civil Wars End, New York: New York University Press, 235-268.

Walter, B. (1997) The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization* 51 (3), 335-364.

Wolfsfeld, G. (2004) *Media and the Path to Peace.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

World Bank (2013) *World Development Indicators.* Washington, D.C: World Bank.

Zaum Dominik (2012) Beyond the "liberal peace", *Global Governance* 8 (1), 121-132.