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Purpose of the Conference

The conference "Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and Its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention" was held in Uppsala, Sweden on 8-9 June 2001. The conference was arranged by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, the Development Research Group/World Bank, and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO).

Being the first conference of its kind, this conference provided an opportunity for different conflict data projects to meet and discuss issues regarding criteria, methodologies, and results.

Purpose
The main purpose of the conference was to serve as a departure point for future dialogue and collaborative work. The conference specifically focused on:

- Comparing definitions and methodology across the data collection projects in the hope of eliminating issues of coding and data as possible explanations for discrepancy in results.
- Exchanging knowledge on data sources and problem-solving in research techniques.
- Identifying gaps in knowledge to be tackled by the next generation of research.
- Improving accessibility of scientific research for policy makers.

Participants
The conference had a total of 89 participants, representing 54 different institutions and 19 different countries throughout the world. Participants were mainly researchers producing quantitative conflict data, researchers who use these data in their work on related phenomena, and practitioners involved in making policy to prevent, manage, and resolve conflicts effectively. A significant proportion of the conference participants consisted of young scholars, which led to extensive interaction and fruitful discussions between junior and senior researchers in this field.

Financing
The conference received financial support from the European Commission, the World Bank, the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Swedish Emergency Management Agency, and the Research Council of Norway.

The Executive Summary
This summary is divided into four different themes: Defining war in armed conflict datasets, Expanding the scope of conflict datasets, Use of datasets in research, and Use of data in policy making. The conference program, a list of conference papers, and a list of participants are included as well.

Theme 1: Defining War in Armed Conflict Datasets

Several important questions relating to conflict data were raised and deliberated upon during the conference. One primary topic of discussion was the question of what constitutes a war or an armed conflict, as well as what variables should be included/excluded in a conflict dataset. The participants also discussed various different methodologies used in creating and maintaining armed conflict datasets.

Margaretta Sollenberg & Peter Wallensteen presented some of the methodological choices that they have made within the Uppsala Conflict Data Project (UCDP). The UCDP records data on three levels of armed conflict - minor armed conflict, intermediate armed conflict, and war. Each of these levels is separated by different thresholds for the number of people killed in a battle-related event. The UCDP also includes data on incompatibility (government/territory) and conflict parties.

Using the UCDP as a starting point, Nils Peter Gleditsch, Edward Strand, Michael Eriksen, Margaretta Sollenberg and Peter Wallensteen presented a joint project to extend the UCDP dataset to include the years of 1946-1999. Information found in 13 different armed conflict datasets was used to create a 'candidate list' of conflicts, which were then closely examined to determine if they fulfilled the Uppsala criteria. This effort resulted in a total of over 200 armed conflicts for the period 1946-99, most of these being intrastate conflicts, and approximately half of the total amount of conflicts reaching the level of war. Gleditsch et al. then compared the revised UCDP dataset with several other major datasets such as COW, KOSIMO, and MID. The results revealed graphically that similar curves emerged over time between UCDP and COW, despite important definitional differences, while KOSIMO's data appear to diverge more from both UCDP and COW. In reference to interstate conflicts, the MID and UCDP curves were reassuringly similar, despite different coding processes. Assuming that empirical differences result from different coding rules, Gleditsch et al. then suggested seven different ways to improve the UCDP dataset: 1) adding start and end dates (which has begun); 2) finding better ways of distinguishing between central and peripheral participants; 3) obtaining better data to study conflict escalation; 4) addressing the difficulty of requiring that all parties be organized, as well as the casualties be battle-related; 5) addressing the difficulty of requiring that at least one party be a government; 6) being more precise when mapping conflict locations; and 7) adding information on how conflicts ended.

Some projects significantly expanded the temporal domain. One such project was presented by Peter Brecke, whose Conflict Catalog is an attempt to create a taxonomy of violent conflicts using data from the 15th century onwards. His ultimate objective is to make the Conflict Catalog comprehensive enough for it to eventually be used in creating a conflict early-warning system, which in his opinion would necessitate identifying variables that could be used in constructing a pattern recognition capability. Brecke identified 22 such variables that are used to classify conflict data, and which taken together could compose a taxonomic character list. Creating the Conflict Catalogue is an on-going project, and his paper served an interim report.

Burkhard Conrad & Klaus Schlichte explained the advantages of using a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches when constructing a dataset on armed conflict, such as
their AKUF project ('Arbeitgemeinschaft Kriegsursachenforschung'). Conrad and Schlichte asserted that quantitative methodology, while useful in explaining conflict trends and patterns, is not sufficient in revealing causes and dynamics of violent conflict. Therefore, they advocated incorporating three types of research methodologies: quantitative methods, comparative analysis of processes, and case studies. They believe that a combination of these methods provides a better comprehension of the conflict phenomenon, and helps to bridge the gap between scientific debate and policy formation.

Whereas these conflict data projects primarily dealt with describing overall patterns of armed conflicts and wars, other papers focused more on specific phases of the conflict process, both prior to armed conflicts and after the outbreak of wars. Paul F. Diehl presented the Militarized Interstate Dispute (MID) dataset, an outgrowth of the Correlates of War (COW) project. The MID dataset focuses on interstate crises and currently covers the period of 1815-1992, and includes incidents of militarized behavior that have not escalated to war. Diehl defined a militarized interstate dispute as 'a unified historical case in which the threat, display or use of military force short of war by one state is explicitly directed towards the government, official representatives, official forces, property, or territory of another state.' These can be broken down into three categories: threats, displays of force, and use of force (short of war). Each militarized dispute is composed of at least one (but usually more) of these militarized incidents. Diehl elaborated on how MID data have been used in a variety of different studies and then detailed the current project to update the MID to cover the period of 1993-2001. These years are deemed to be especially important since they will allow researchers to compare Cold War data with post-Cold War data.

Jonathan Wilkenfeld also focused on international military-security crises within the International Crises Behavior Project (ICB). During the conference, Wilkenfeld presented the ICB dataset, which focuses on the context of crises, as well as the actors' behavior during these crises. The ICB dataset employs both qualitative and quantitative data. The dataset currently covers the period 1918-1994, but is being updated to carry the research forward to 2000. Wilkenfeld described the ICB's new CD-ROM, which makes the full dataset easily available, as well as the future directions for ICB. These include: 1) updating and recording the dataset; 2) addressing negotiation and mediation; 3) addressing international quasi- and near-crisis (those which fall below ICB's threshold); 4) making the dataset accessible at the dyadic level; 5) enhancing information on sanctity in international crises; and 6) addressing the role of third parties in international crises.

While the previous two papers dealt with pre-conflict phases, papers dealing with the ending of conflict were also delivered. Roy Licklider presented a paper on the construction of the Civil War Termination dataset. In the CWT dataset, Licklider classified civil wars as wars with at least 1,000 battle-related deaths during conflict's effectiveness, in a situation where the population of an area obeyed more than one institution (i.e. multiple sovereignty) and where the leaders were concerned with the possibility of having to live in the same political unit with their current enemies. Licklider then coded these wars as either 'negotiated settlements' or 'military victory.' His focus was on how civil wars end rather than how they begin. The aim was to test the hypothesis that negotiated settlements do not hold as long as military victories, a hypothesis which Licklider confirmed, though the relationship was not 'overpowering.' The CWT dataset ends in 1993 and has not been updated to include wars since then.

Apart from papers presenting the methodological decisions that had been made within specific conflict data projects, papers comparing or criticizing of existing datasets were also a major part of the conference. Paul Collier & Anke Hoeffler focused on a few issues of interest in conflict datasets, dividing them into three general areas. First, they discussed the different definitions of civil wars and their measures of severity. They concluded that despite difficulties in obtaining fatality numbers, they preferred definitions of civil war based on the level of violence experienced, stating that such data are more useful in analyzing causes of conflicts than data that categorizes conflicts based on proclaimed goals of the rebels. They also note that most datasets focus on absolute, not relative, numbers of deaths (i.e. deaths in regards to the total population). Second, Collier and Hoeffler assert that there are few datasets that address the human cost of conflicts as well as the geographical spread of conflicts, making total numbers hard to assess. They also noted that there is very little systemic data available on economic and political reform processes after a conflict has ended. Finally, Collier and Hoeffler addressed the topic of military expenditure, noting this is a difficult area to collect data on and there is no complete universal record; they encouraged the development of a comprehensive data set on global military expenditures.

With the purpose of finding out how much the major datasets overlap, Wolf-Dieter Eberwein & Sven Chojnacki compared and evaluated some of the major datasets on domestic and international violent conflict. In doing so, they found striking divergences among the datasets. They argued that the fact that the datasets do not consistently correspond could lead to academic difficulties; particularly the possibility that theoretical propositions tested with different data could produce different results. Yet, they could not conclude than any one dataset was inherently more reliable. Based on this, they drew the conclusion that more conflict datasets are not desirable; instead, agreement should be reached on how to resolve the considerable differences between datasets.

Meredith Reid Sarkees & J. David Singer summarized seventeen datasets, examining the major issues raised by the different armed conflict projects. In their opinion, the proliferation of different coding rules has led to confusion, duplication, and over-emphasis on certain types of conflicts. Interested in how the various datasets classify conflict and war, Sarkees and Singer compared the various coding rules as a basis for their proposal of creating a master typology of armed conflict. They concluded that despite some shortcomings, the methodologies used by COW are most useful for such a typology. Thus, they argue for a typology that rests on the political status of the protagonists (as well as a set casualty threshold of 1,000 per year), though they also provide suggestions for expanding COW's system of categorization.

Another comparison of datasets was made by Dan Smith, in a paper where he focused on inclusiveness versus exclusiveness by comparing the UC3P dataset with his conflict dataset, The State of War and Peace Atlas (SoWaP). Smith compared the casualty thresholds, the concept of a stated incompatibility, the place of the state in the definition, and the issue of continuity between clashes, and found that the differences between the various definitions were small overall. He did note, though, that differences could be quite high when comparing annual variation (as much as
70%), and suggested that this may be due to different methods for handling data. Smith therefore concluded that the preference of one conflict definition over another should be decided as a consequence of what is being studied; specifically, he recommended using the Uppsala dataset when studying conflict escalation or the actions of governments and the SoWaP dataset when making regional or thematic comparisons. For studying large conflicts, he found both datasets to be equally useful.

While most papers included some elements of critique, there were conference papers that concentrated on only one or two specific aspects of a dataset where they found room for improvement. One such example was Kristian S. Gleditsch’s paper, which suggested various possible revisions to COW’s data. While Gleditsch was quick to point out the merits of COW, he also noted that the COW project’s decisions on system membership led to the exclusion of several conflicts usually regarded as interstate wars, as well as the fact that some wars and participants in wars were excluded from the dataset entirely. Gleditsch did not argue that this makes the COW data incorrect, but that it can affect certain types of research. Gleditsch also suggested that COW data would benefit a great deal by additional documentation, namely, a set of case studies that could elaborate on the conflict details.

Turning the spotlight away from conflict datasets but remaining focused on war, John Mueller questioned the very existence of war in today’s society. He asserted that major war—war among developed countries—has become increasingly obsolete due to changing social mores. He also noted that conventional war (conventional and ideological civil war, colonial war, etc.) is in decline. Mueller discussed the concept of “new wars,” which became increasingly prominent in the 1990’s with the war in the former Yugoslavia; these wars are often considered to be driven by ethnicity or nationalism and feature roving militias and renegade bands of soldiers. Mueller dismissed the concept of new wars as being less about war and more about organized criminality in weak states. Labeling these conflicts wars, he asserted, increases the likelihood that the international response will not be adequate; what is needed is to stop criminal bands with effective policing or organized military force.

**Theme 2: Expanding the Scope of Conflict Data**

While the previous papers dealt mainly with armed conflict datasets, many of the other participating data projects sought to expand the scope of armed conflict data to include issue areas related to armed conflicts. Many different areas of interest were highlighted, such as third-party intervention, refugees, terrorism, event data tracking, military expenditure, etc.

Albert J. Houman introduced the World Conflict and Human Rights Map of 2000, which includes not only armed conflicts, but also data on refugees, genocide, use of the death penalty, torture, and other types of human rights violations. The data have been collected within the PICOOM (the Interdisciplinary Research Programme on Causes of Human Rights Violations) data project, which contains a dataset on armed conflict. PICOOM registers three levels of violence (high intensity conflict, low intensity conflict and violent political conflict), with the lowest level having a threshold of 100 conflict-related fatalities in a year. Unlike most other datasets, PICOOM also focuses on inter-communal conflicts and makes an attempt to disaggregate individual violent communal conflicts. PICOOM also attempts to measure conflict de/escalation through a series of indicators. While this conflict escalation index cannot itself serve to predict future violence, it may reveal trends over time and assist in planning crisis management and international relief.

Collecting systematic data on contentious issues between states was the objective of Paul R. Hensel & Sarah McLaughlin Mitchell, with the I Cow (Issue Correlates of War) data project. Most major armed conflict datasets focus on conflicts once they have become militarized. Hensel and Mitchell sought to approach the issue from a different perspective, focusing instead on identifying contentious issues, regardless of whether any action was taken to resolve them. The ICOW project has been active since 1997, and so far data collection has focused on territorial issues, though the project is now expanding to include cross-border river and maritime issues. For a contentious issue to be coded as such, there must be an explicit statement from a government representative supporting a claim. ICOW also addresses issue salience and issue settlement attempts. Hensel and Mitchell suggested that ICOW could be further expanded to include different issue areas and they also demonstrated the utility of the data by presenting a short overview of research projects undertaken based on ICOW data.

Another war-related phenomena - intervention - was discussed by Herbert K. Tillena. Tillena collected data on over military interventions and international conflicts to create the Overt Military Intervention Dataset. By coding an intervention as being a state’s open and direct use of military violence within the territory of another state, Tillena found a total of 690 interventions between 2 September 1945 and 31 December 1991. Work on updating the dataset to carry it through to the end of 2000 is in progress.

Patrick M. Regan also presented a data set on interventions. However, while Tillena’s dataset focused on intervention in international conflicts, Regan’s dataset covered third party intervention in intrastate conflict. Regan’s project consisted of three phases. In the first, he identified all intrastate conflicts 1945-1999, using his own operational definition of civil conflict as being ‘organized military hostilities between groups in conflict in which there were at least 200 (aggregate) fatalities.’ Regan also coded for the existence of an outside intervention. In the second phase, he expanded the temporal range and recorded data at the level of the specific
intervention, distinguishing between military or economic types of interventions. He had so far found more than 1000 interventions made by 74 different actors during the period of 1945-1999. Finally, in the third and ongoing phase, diplomatic interventions are being added to the database.

Another field of traditional war-related data that was covered during the conference was the issue of refugees. Will H. Moore & Stephen M. Shellman presented their research proposal for the study of flows of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). By using both their own data, as well as data from UNHCR and the US Committee for Refugees, they intended to create a useful model of refugee and IDP flows (R-IDP). In their project, they ask four questions: What characteristics make a country more likely to produce refugees and IDPs? How does one distinguish between countries that produce greater numbers of refugees and IDPs to those that produce greater numbers of IDPs? What explains greater flows of refugees to one border country than another? And, finally, how do economic factors influence refugees and IDP flows? Moore and Shellman have created a number of hypotheses that they will test to elicit answers to these questions. In a larger sense, they hoped that a useful flow of R-IDP would eventually contribute to the development of an early warning capacity.

Particularly salient to current world events were the data presented by Jan Oskar Engene & Ketja H-W Skjaerbø in the TWEED (Terrorism in Western Europe: Event Data) dataset. In this dataset, the focus was on internal terrorism, that is, events initiated by actors originating in one of the 18 Western European countries which are coded. Terrorism is understood as a form of violence that uses targets of violence in an indirect way in order to influence third parties. A list of events employed by terrorists (bombings, etc.) supplemented this definition to create a two-level guide for identifying acts of terrorism. The TWEED dataset has been extended by Skjaerbø to include all of the members of the OECD (an additional 12 countries, spread over several continents). Engene suggested that one possible expansion of TWEED could be to extend coverage to new regions. He raised the possibility of creating a new dataset on global terrorism, which would be worldwide in coverage and could include both intrastate and international terrorism.

Several datasets related armed conflict to regime type and political stability. Monte G. Marshall presented a mapping of different types of state regimes and state failure events with the purpose of showing which conditions are most unfavorable in regards to the occurrence of "anti-regime" armed conflicts. Preliminary analyses suggested that the outbreak of armed conflict is strongly associated with sudden regime changes and transitional processes; the weakness of a regime often gives rise to opportunistic violence and challenges to state authority.

J. Craig Jenkins & Augustine Kposowa described their ongoing project on internal war and political crises in the post-Cold War era. The project has two phases. The first, which has been completed, was a multivariate analysis of the root causes of internal wars that identified a set of structural risk factors. The second phase, which is still in progress, involves Jenkins and Kposowa's idea of Conflict Carrying Capacity (CCC), or the ability of political systems to regulate intense conflicts without resort to violence. The concept of CCC had been developed in previous papers, and at the Uppsala Conflict Data Conference, it was revisited and revised in Jenkins and Kposowa's paper. They found that subsequent analysis revealed instability in CCC scores, and so they set about modifying the CCC. The result was the creation of the Country Stability (CS) score (or "Modified CCC"). They found that CS appears to be a useful tool in monitoring violent conflict, and addresses some problems in early warning research.

While these two papers drew a relationship between regime type or political stability and the occurrence or management of conflict, Scott Gates, Edward Heyen, Mark P. Jones and Howard Strand delved more deeply into means for measuring democracy by elaborating on the development of a more differentiated dataset of regimes-MIRPS (Multidimensional Institutional Representation of Political Systems). The MIRPS index is based on a three-dimensional model of political authority in which the dimensions are the regulation of executive recruitment, the extent to which the executive is constrained by other institutions, and the regulation and institutionalization of participation. Rather than collapsing these three aspects onto a single-dimensional scale, Gates et al. attempted to disaggregate the measures to obtain a fuller understanding of regime types. MIRPS is meant as a hybrid of previous measures of democracy datasets, but also as an improvement on shortcomings in those datasets.

Erik Gartzke was interested in exploring state preferences. Because examining motivational factors is extremely difficult and subjective, Gartzke created the U.N. General Assembly Affinity Index. The Affinity Index is based on Gartzke's assumption that the U.N. General Assembly is a forum where the cost for a state of expressing its true preferences is small, and so serves as a good indicator of a state's preferred outcome. The affinity index measures the similarity of nations' voting records over time, and it serves to reveal and compare the interests of different states and thereby group these states together.

William Reed also put forward a rather different way of looking at armed conflicts. In his conference paper, Reed studied the way variations regarding available information of the balance of power affect a state's decision to go to war. By looking at different conflict dyads, Reed found that access to information influences an opponent's ability to respond to a threat. The probability of armed conflict is enhanced when states have roughly equal capabilities (parity) and when their access to information is most asymmetrical. In short, Reed demonstrated that uncertainty is a central cause of conflict emergence.

Some papers focused on areas in which there appeared to be no existing data at all. In his conference paper, Jurgen M. Brauer addressed the need for reliable data on the connection between armed conflict and the environment. Brauer is currently working on a project entitled "War and Nature: The Environmental Effects of War." In discussing progress on this project, Brauer highlighted the difficulties he faced in attempting to obtain reliable environmental data. The connection between the environment and armed conflict, according to Brauer, is an area that is very little studied, and scientific standards for data collection are often inadequate. Brauer suggested that one future avenue for study in this area would be to examine the connection between types of war and environmental damage; however, there is very little information available for a systematic study. In his review of various data collection efforts in this area, Brauer stressed the need for more reliable, accurate studies of the environmental impact of armed conflict.

Another area where data seemed to be lacking was put into focus by Jörg Brömmelhöfner. Within the framework of his International Military Expenditure Project (IMEP), Brömmelhöfner
discussed the need for the inclusion of off-budget military expenditure in national military expenditure estimates. These expenditures are defined as those that describe costs for functions of the military that are not properly budgeted or go beyond the given definition. Because all countries are free to define their military expenditures themselves, accountability and accuracy vary considerably. Despite the efforts of a number of organizations that evaluate military expenditures (UN, IMF, SIPRI, etc.), there are no military expenditure data series that cover all countries. Brüniglöser suggested a number of directions for future research. Among other things, he asserted that more research is needed on off-budget military expenditures, which should use more disaggregated data. Likewise, more evaluation needs to be done on sources used for expenditure estimation. Without making changes to how military expenditures are evaluated, it will remain difficult to get a comprehensive and accurate worldwide assessment.

Turning to a different area within conflict data, several papers focused on events data tracking, a prominent method of conflict data collection. Doug Bond, Joe Bond and Churl Oh presented IDEA, the Integrated Data for Events Analysis protocol that has evolved out of the PANDA project (Protocol for the Assessment of Nonviolent Action). The IDEA framework performs computerized events analysis that allows for coding of a large amount of data. By having events data coded by computer instead of by humans, the project can process a greater amount of data and the reliability has been demonstrated to be comparable or even favorable to human-coded data. Bond et al. noted that the most appropriate use for IDEA technology is to identify and track events reported in high volume source and consistent coverage of a region. This allows the researcher to follow trends at their earliest stages.

Philip A. Schreft, Erin M. Simpson and Deborah J. Gerner also presented a protocol used for automated coding of news reports. The Kansas Event Data System-protocol (KEDS) is an events data system that records the interactions between international actors as reported in the open press. In their paper, Schreft et al. discussed the issues they have faced in developing dictionaries for coding events. They also compared the coverage by various different news sources. KEDS allows researchers to use a valuable resource—the news media—without being bogged down by the sheer quantity of information. Because of computer technology, automatic coding can be done so quickly that it not only allows the researcher to go through a great deal of material, but also to experiment with the coding rules. Automatic coding allows the researcher to focus on maximizing the validity of a coding scheme, since the automatic coding process itself guarantees the reliability. At the end of their paper, Schreft et al. suggested a number of topics that could be addressed to improve events data tracking.

Finally, in a paper that focused on an area related to conflict studies, Christian W. Martin, Thomas Plümper and Gerald Schneider turned to economics and developing countries. In order to evaluate whether liberalization had taken place in the foreign economic policy of developing countries and whether there are regional differences to such liberalization, they created the CACAO (Capital and Current Account Openness) dataset. Based on data from the IMF, Martin et al. concluded that economic openness is a multidimensional phenomenon and should include government regulations rather than just transaction measures. With CACAO, Martin et al. attempted to introduce new measures for studying the economic openness of the developing world.

Theme 3: Use of Datasets in Research

The conference not only included discussions on the production of reliable conflict datasets, but also on the use of these datasets in research. Many of the conference papers used data from at least one of the earlier discussed data projects, but some authors sought to modify these datasets or create their own in order to address their particular research interest.

Several of the papers presented focused on ethnic or cultural aspects of armed conflict. Tanja Ellingsen presented a paper in which she examined the occurrence of cultural armed conflicts in the period of 1946-1999. Ellingsen defined a cultural conflict as an internal armed conflict with a cultural aspect to it, that is, the presence of linguistic, religious and/or ethnic differences. Data from INCORE (International Conflict Research) and the Uppsala Conflict Data Project were used as a basis for Ellingsen to identify armed conflicts with a cultural dimension. After performing her analysis, she concluded that most intrastate conflicts are between cultural groups. Interestingly, she also asserted that cultural conflicts are not a new phenomenon—they have taken place both during and after the Cold War. Moreover, while cultural conflict has been the dominant form of conflict both during and after the Cold War, the amount of cultural conflicts relative to the amount of non-cultural conflicts has increased with the end of the Cold War. Ellingsen also found that cultural conflicts are not distributed equally geographically, nor are they more intense than other types of internal conflicts.

Marta Reynal-Querol also dealt with questions of ethnicity; specifically she examined ethnic intrastate conflicts. Reynal-Querol argued that religious divisions are more important than language divisions and natural resources in explaining ethnic conflicts. In order to investigate whether this statement was true, Reynal-Querol used data from the State Failure dataset, the Freedom House dataset, and the POLITY III dataset. Her analysis confirmed this hypothesis; Reynal-Querol then turned to examining why all ethnically divided societies do not engage in civil war. Her results revealed that consociational democracy is a political system that significantly reduces the incidence of ethnic civil war.

Birger Heldt and Mats Hammarström also examined ethnic conflict, but from a different perspective. Heldt & Hammarström investigated whether nationalism makes democracies less prone to accommodate when facing intra-state ethnic conflicts, and whether this in turn threatens to limit the applicability of the democratic peace proposition. The democratic peace proposition, developed by Immanuel Kant, asserts that democratic countries are less likely to go to war with each other. However, Heldt and Hammarström also deduced from Kant's work the implication that nationalism will make democracies less likely to accommodate. Wanting a spatial and temporal domain which would severely test the democratic peace proposition, they chose to examine Eastern Europe between 1991-1996 because it contained the circumstances in which, according to Kant, peacefulness would be reduced by nationalism. Heldt and Hammarström used several datasets in constructing their research models to ensure that the findings of their study were robust. The result of their analysis was that even a sizable ethnic minority does not challenge dyadic democracy's immunity against nationalism; and thus, the democratic peace proposition’s applicability remains intact.
A couple of papers examined conflict and economics, such as that by James C. Murdoch & Todd Sandler, who used various data resources when trying to construct models on how economic growth is affected by civil war. These data sources included the Penn World Tables Mark 5.6, Barro and Lee’s data on economic growth, and the Correlates of War dataset. The results of their study showed that civil war reduces economic growth in the short-term, both for the target state and for its neighbors. The same is not true, however, for the long-term. Murdoch & Sandler suggested that foreign aid in an armed conflict area should be given to neighboring countries to a civil war, especially those with longer common borders, since they are most prone to civil-war spillovers.

Also addressing economic questions were Gerald Schneider & Günter Schulze, in a paper dealing with the way the structure of the domestic economy, combined with the relative importance of the military-industrial complex, affects the aggressiveness of a state. To address this question, Schneider & Schulze used data from the POLITY III dataset and the Sacles & Wamers on economic reform. Specifically, the authors were interested in testing the peace-through-trade hypothesis, which asserts that states that trade with each other are more likely to avoid conflict. Schneider and Schulze’s analysis suggested that there should be a qualification to the peace-through-trade hypothesis. They found that since an increase in trade can strengthen the military sector, in some situations the hostility-generated income of the military-industrial complex can result in positive incentives for conflict.

Several of the conference papers concentrated on the areas of peace and prevention. Hugh Miall’s paper focused on how to determine that a conflict has been prevented. By identifying conflict that have been managed or resolved without violence, and by identifying the factors that were associated with these cases, Miall suggested that it was possible to identify different preventive factors, so-called preventers. By combining the Minorities at Risk data with data provided by the World Bank, Miall tentatively concluded that good governance might be a structural preventer of internal conflict.

Also addressing the topic of peace was Birger Heldt’s paper. Heldt presented a quantitative study of conditions for successful intrastate peacekeeping missions. By collecting UN-data on all intrastate peacekeeping missions, and by testing hypotheses from available case studies, Heldt found that the success of a peacekeeping mission was more dependent on the context of deployment than on the mission itself. Heldt defined success as the absence of war during the deployment of the peacekeeping mission. While some aspects of the peacekeeping mission had a statistical significance—such as length of deployment and rationality of the chief executive—Heldt found that it is the conflict context rather than peacekeeping mission characteristics that most accounts for success in peacekeeping.

Nicolas Schwank & Christoph Rohloff were concerned with how to create a durable peace agreements. Relying on the KOSIMO dataset, Schwank and Rohloff examined the outcomes of over 600 conflicts. Their hypothesis was that consensually resolved conflicts with fair outcomes tend to last longer than coerced settlements. In addressing this question, Schwank and Rohloff found that while international conflicts are most likely resolved by non-violent negotiations or remain undecided, internal conflicts are most likely resolved by violent means. Applying their hypothesis to post-WWII conflicts, they found some evidence to support their conclusion, though they stressed the need for more research. Finally, in order to study this question better, KOSIMO is working on expanding and improving its treaty database.

Jean-Paul Azum gave a presentation in which he described his research on increasing the chances for peace. Azum created a theoretical model for addressing this question and employed several datasets in examining a sample of African countries. His conclusions were that to increase the chances for peace, one should aim at: 1) improving the credibility of the promises of redistribution by the government and; 2) improving the government’s information about the fighting efficiency of the excluded group relative to the government’s own army.

Finally, in an example of the use of data collected for other purposes Hege Brunborg, Henrik Urdal and Torkild Lyngstad presented a paper that dealt with the question of how to estimate the number of victims of armed conflict. Specifically, Brunborg et al. sought to determine the number of people killed in Srebrenica in July 1995. Brunborg et al. used a combination of several different methods in order to avoid that a person was counted twice (or more), beginning with cross-checking data from two different lists of missing persons - The International Committee of the Red Cross and Physicians for Human Rights. They also used data from the OSCE lists of voters for the 1997 and 1998 elections, and 1991 Census to supplement the list. Their efforts revealed that 7475 people from Srebrenica were missing and presumed dead, almost all of them Muslim men.
Theme 4: Use of data in policy making

During the conference, researchers and policy makers were given a chance to come together and discuss their different points of view. Some of the conference papers were concerned with developing the connection between research and policy development and a number of policy recommendations were made based on current research.

Andrew Mack discussed the concept of human security and the creation of the Human Security Report. Instead of focusing on the state as the security referent—as is done in traditional security studies—human security is an attempt to make the individual the referent object for study. The Human Security Report would allow researchers to examine the connection between armed conflict and development and governance. A human security dataset would be geared towards policy makers, in order to make the concept of human security more accessible and understood. The core of the Human Security Report will be the Human Insecurity Index, based on indicators such as the number of deaths from armed conflict, the incidence of criminal violence and refugee numbers.

Tony Addison & S. Mansoor Mushshed also focused on how to deal with post-conflict reconstruction from an economic perspective. In their paper, Addison & Mushshed pointed out the importance of building new fiscal institutions as a parallel process to political reconstruction after an armed conflict. Addison & Mushshed asserted that this was an essential part of reaching a stable peace.

Turning to another important war-related arena, Raül Romeva put forward a report in which criteria for the authorization or refusal of arms exports had been developed. By collecting data on different factors such as the occurrence of armed conflicts, a state’s human rights record, level of militarization, and the existence of an international binding agreement (for example an embargo), Romeva sought to produce a report that would help governments adopt a more detailed set of criteria to authorize or refuse arms exports applications.

Finally, a paper was presented that clearly demonstrated how researchers and policy makers can work together. Susanne Schmidt described the work of the ‘Prüf-Analyse von Spannungen und Tatsachenemittlung’ (PAS) project. The FAST project is funded by Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), thus demonstrating a tangible link between research and policymaking. With the purpose of identifying burgeoning conflict areas, FAST has developed its own early warning system. The work so far has focused on the development of country profiles, which reflects a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. FAST relies primarily on qualitative analyses to provide both country risk profiles and constant up-dates. Quantitative data is employed in the form of events tracking, using a system based on the automatic coding of Reuters articles. This is supplemented by hand coding from field monitors to allow for better coverage in terms of quantity and diversity of events covered.

Program of the Conference

Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and Its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention

Euroconference, Uppsala
June 8-9, 2001

Location: SAS Radisson Hotel Gillet

Friday 8 June

Opening Session
Room: Gillesalen

Chair: Research Professor Scott Gates, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

Keynote address: Director Paul Collier, Development Research Group, World Bank

Papers:

Paul Collier & Anke Hoeffer
Nils Petter Gleditsch, Harvard Strand, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg & Peter Wallensteen
Peter Wallensteen & Margareta Sollenberg
Roy Licklider
Monty G. Marshall
Nicolas Schank & Christoph Rohloff

Discussant: Professor Paul F. Diehl, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Second session
Room: Gillesalen

Data demonstrations:

Philip A. Schrodt (KEDS, event data)
Doug Bond (PANDA; VRA natural language parsing system for event data)
Susanne Schmidt (FAST early warning)
Third session
Room: Gillesalen

Chair: Professor Peter Wallensteen, Uppsala University

Keynote address: Director Dan Smith, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (1993-2001)

Papers:
Meredith Reid Sarkees & J. David Singer
Paul F. Diehl
Paul R. Hensel & Sara McLaughlin Mitchell
Kristian S. Gleditsch
William Reed
Dan Smith
Jonathan Wilkenfeld

Discussant: Director Paul Collier, Development Research Group, World Bank

Fourth session
Room: Gillesalen

Chair: Associate Professor Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Uppsala University

Papers:
Doug Bond, Joe Bond & Churl Oh
J. Craig Jenkins
Philip A. Schreft, Erin M. Simpson & Deborah Gerner
Susanne Schmeidl

Discussant: Associate Professor Mats Hanmannström, Uppsala University

Saturday 9 June

Fifth session (parallel sessions)
(A) Room: Gillesalen
(B) Room: Florasalen

(A)

Chair: Dr. Ibrahim A. Elbadawi, Development Research Group, World Bank

Papers:
Jean-Paul Azam
Tony Addison & S. Mansoob Murshed
Todd Sandler & James C. Murdoch
Gerald Schneider & Günther Schulze
Jurgen M. Brauer
Christian W. Martin, Thomas Pliimpler & Gerald Schneider

Discussant: Associate Professor Han Dorussen, Norwegian School of Technology and Science, NTNU

(B)

Chair: Dr. Anke Hoeftier, Oxford University

Papers:
Tanja Ellingsen
Marta Reynal-Querol
Jörn Brömmelhöfter
Ratil Romeva
Albert Jongman

Discussant: Professor Roy Licklider, Rutgers University
Sixth session
Room: Gillesalen

Chair: Associate Professor Patrick M. Regan, Binghamton University

Keynote address: Professor Wolf-Dieter Eberwein, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB)

Papers:
Helge Brumborg, Henrik Urdal & Torkild Lyngstad
Burhard Conrad & Klaus Schlichte
Erik Gartzke
John Mueller

Discussant: Research Professor Scott Gates, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

Seventh session (parallel sessions)
(A) Room: Gillesalen
(B) Room: Florasalen

(A)
Chair: University fellow Tanja Ellingsen, University of Oslo

Papers:
Jan Oskar Eugene & Katja H-W Sjøsland
Alex P. Schmid
Patrick M. Regan
Herbert K. Tillma
Peter Brecke

Discussant: Professor Jonathan Wilkenfeld, University of Maryland

(B)
Chair: Assistant Professor Erik Gartzke, Columbia University

Papers:
Scott Gates, Håvard Hegre, Mark P. Jones & Håvard Strand
Will H. Moore & Stephen M. Shellman
Birger Heldt
Birger Heldt & Mats Hammarström

Discussant: Professor Philip A. Schrodt, University of Kansas

Final session
Room: Gillesalen

Chair: Research Professor Nils Petter Gleditsch, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

Papers:
Andrew Mack
Hugh Miall

Oral remarks:
Martha Snodgrass
Paul Collier
Scott Gates
Peter Wallensteen
Conference Papers

Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and Its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention
Euroconference, Uppsala
June 8-9, 2001

Addison, Tony and S. Mansoob Manzur, The Fiscal Dimensions of Conflict and Reconstruction

Azam, Jean-Paul, Contracting for Peace

Bond, Doug, Joe Bond and Churl Oh, Integrated Data for Events Analysis (IDEA): An Automated Approach to Events Data Development

Brauer, Jürgen M., War and Nature: The Problem of Data and Data Collection

Brecke, Peter, The Long-Term Patterns of Violent Conflict in Different Regions of the World

Brunborg, Helge, Henrik Ursdal and Torkild Lyngstad, Accounting for genocide: How many were killed in Srebrenica?

Brömmelhöfer, Jörn, Off-budget military expenditure

Collier, Paul and Anke Hoefler, Data Issues in the Study of Conflict

Conrad, Burkhard and Klaus Schlichte, The Hamburg Experience or Quantitative Research: Four Limits and One Alternative

Diod, Paul P., Updating the Correlates of War Militarized Dispute Data Set: Justifications and Reflections

Eberwein, Wolf Dieter and Sven Chojaacki, Scientific necessity and political utility. Data on violent conflicts

Ellingstien, Tanja, Cultures in Conflict: Old Stories or New Threats? The Pattern of Cultural Armed Conflicts, 1946-99

Eugene, Jan Oskar and Katja H-W Skjalberg, Data on Intrastate Terrorism: The TWEED Project

Gartzke, Erik, The Utility of Utility Indexes: An Introduction to Measures of National Preference


Gleditsch, Kristian S., A User's Guide to Omitted Wars and Participants in the COW War Data

Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Håvard Strand, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg and Peter Wallensteen, Armed Conflicts 1946-99: A New Dataset (Revised version)

Hedt, Birger, Conditions for Successful Intrastate Peacekeeping Missions

Hedt, Birger and Mats Hammarström, Nationalism, Democracy, and Accommodation of Interstate Ethnic Conflicts

Henkel, Paul R. and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Contingent Issues, Early Warning, and Issue Management: The Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project

Jenkins, J. Craig & Augustine Kposowa, Conflict Carrying Capacity and Internal War in the Post-Cold War Era

Jonson, Albert J., The PLOOM Experience with Mapping Dimensions of Contemporary Conflicts and Human Rights Violations

Licklider, Roy, Creating the Civil War Termination Dataset

McK, Andrew, 'Security With a Human Face': A Proposal to Create a Human Security Report

Marshall, Mouty G., Regime Authority, Opportunity, and Outbreaks of State Failure Events

Martin, Christian W., Thomas Plumper, and Gerald Schneider, Economic openness in developing countries: An empirical investigation using CACAO

Miall, Hugh, Data Requirements for Conflict Prevention

Moore, Will H. and Stephen M. Shellman, 40 Years of Refugee Flows: New UNHCR Data — Challenges and Prospects

Mueller, John, The Remnants of War: Thugs as Residual Combatants

Murdock, James C. and Todd Sandler, Economic Growth, Civil Wars, and Spatial Spillovers

Reed, William, Information, Power, & Militarized Conflict

Regan, Patrick M., Data on Third Party Interventions in Intrastate Conflicts

Reynal-Querol, Marta, Ethnicity, Political Systems and Civil Wars

Romeva, Raül, 2001 Report: Criteria to authorise or refuse arms exports

Sarkees, Meredith Reid and J. David Singer, Armed Conflict Past & Future: A Master Typology?
Schmidt, Susanne, *Practical Challenges in Predicting Wars* FAST: An Example of a Comprehensive Early Warning Methodology

Schmid, Alex P., *The Terrorism Prevention Branch's Data-Base on Terrorist*

Schneider, Gerald and Günther Schulze, *The Domestic Roots of Commercial Liberalism: A Sector-Specific Model of the "Peace through Trade"-Hypothesis*

Schoedt, Philip A., Erin M. Simpson, and Deborah J. Germer, *Monitoring conflict using automated coding of newswire reports: a comparison of five geographical regions*

Schwank, Nicolas and Cristoph Rohloff, *War is over - conflict continues? Conditions for stable conflict outcomes*

Smith, Dan, *Counting Wars: The Research Implications of Definitional Decisions*

Tillena, Herbert K., *Overt Military Intervention and International Conflict*

Wallensteen, Peter and Margareta Sollenberg, *Armed Conflict, 1989-2000*

Wilkenfeld, Jonathan, *The International Crises Behavior Project: Origins, Current Status and Future Directions*

---

**List of Participants**

**Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and Its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention**

Euroconference, Uppsala

June 8-9, 2001

Addresses as of 1 December 2001.

Ali Abdel Gadir Ali, Economic Advisor, Arab Planning Institute, Kuwait, P.O. Box 5834, Safat 13059, Kuwait; phone: +965 484 3130 ext. 237; fax: +965 484 2955; e-mail: Aali@api.org.kw, aagali@hotmail.com

Kamarulzaman Askandar, Dr, Regional Coordinator, Southeast Asian Conflict Studies Network, School of Social Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Minden, Penang, Malaysia; phone: +60 04 657 7888 ext. 2658/2123; fax: +60 04 657 0918; e-mail: zami@usm.my

Jean-Paul Azam, Professor, Université Toulouse des Sciences Sociales, Place Anatole France, 31042 Toulouse, France; phone: +33 05 61 12 85 37; fax: +33 05 61 12 85 38; e-mail: azam@univ-tlse1.fr

Robert H. Bates, Professor, Center for International Development, Harvard University, 79 John F. Kennedy Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA; phone: +1 617 496 0919; fax: +1 617 496 6849; e-mail: robert.bates@harvard.edu

Doug Band, Associate Director, Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1737 Cambridge Street, Mailbox 33, Cambridge, MA 02138; phone: +1 617 495 9941; fax: +1 617 496 2254; e-mail: dband@cfia.harvard.edu, doug.band@vranet.com

Jurgen M. Brauer, Professor, College of Business Administration, Augusta State University, 2500 Walton Way, Augusta, GA 30904, USA; phone: +1 706 667 4544; fax: +1 706 667 4064; e-mail: jbrauer@aug.edu

Peter Brecke, Associate Professor, The Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0610, USA; phone: +1 404 894 3195; fax: +1 404 894 1900; e-mail: peter.brecke@inta.gatech.edu

Helge Brunborg, PhD, Senior Research Fellow, Division for Social and Demographic Research, Statistics Norway, Box 8131 Dep., 0033 Oslo, Norway; phone: +47 21 09 48 65; fax: +47 21 09 49 73; e-mail: helge.brunborg@ssb.no
Mikael Eriksson, Research Assistant, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; phone: +46 18 471 63 06; fax: +46 18 69 51 02; e-mail: mikael.ekrkonsson@pcr.uu.se

Erik Gartzke, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, N-170 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA; phone: +1 814 865 1912; fax: +1 814 863 8979; e-mail: gartzke@psu.edu

Scott Gates, Research Professor/Program Leader, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), Fuglehauggata 11, 0260 Oslo, Norway; phone: +47 22 54 77 32; fax: +47 22 54 77 01; Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, 321 S. Kedzie Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA; phone: +1 517 355 2166; fax: +1 517 432 1091; e-mail: gateses@pilot.msu.edu

Theodora-Ismene Gizilis, Research Associate, Research Committee, Academy of Athens, 84 Solonos street, Athens, 10680, Greece; phone: +30 858 453 7174; e-mail: theodora_ismene@hotmail.com

Kristian S. Gleditsch, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92039, USA; phone: +1 858 527 0535; fax: +1 858 534 7130; e-mail: kgleditsch@ucsd.edu

Nils Petter Gleditsch, Research Professor, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), Fuglehauggata 11, 0260 Oslo, Norway; phone: +47 22 54 77 21; fax: +47 22 54 77 01; e-mail: npg@prio.no

Kristina Granberg, Research Assistant, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; e-mail: kristina.granberg@hotmail.com

Helena Grussell, Administrator for PACS & Ph.D Programme, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; phone: +46 18 471 76 52; fax: +46 18 69 51 02; e-mail: helena.grussell@pcr.uu.se

Mats Hammarström, Associate Professor, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; phone: +46 18 471 23 54; fax: +46 18 69 51 02; e-mail: mats.hammarstrom@pcr.uu.se

Håvard Hegre, Economist, World Bank, MSN MC3-301, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20433, USA; phone: +1 202 473 2106; fax: +1 202 522 3518; e-mail: hhegre@worldbank.org

Birger Heldt, Ph. D., Swedish National Defence College, Valhallavägen 117, Box 27805, 115 93 Stockholm, Sweden; phone: +46 8 788 93 54; fax: +46 8 788 94 27; e-mail: birger.heldt@fhs.mil.se
Washington, DC 20523-3100, USA; phone: +1 202 712 4206; fax: +1 202 216 3231; e-mail smorriss@usaid.gov

John Mueller, Woody Hayes Chair of Security Studies and Professor of Political Science, Ohio State University, Marron Center for International Security, 1501 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43201-2602 USA; phone: +1 614 247 6007; fax: +1 614 292 2407; e-mail: jmueller@osu.edu

S. Mansoob Murshed, Associate Professor, Institute of Social Studies, P.O. Box 29776, 2502 LT The Hague, Netherlands; phone: +31 70 42 60 591; fax: +31 70 42 60 746; e-mail: Murshed@iss.nl; Research Fellow, UNU-WIDER, Kajakakanalanturi 6B, 00160, Helsinki, Finland; phone: +358 9 61 59 92 18; fax: +358 9 61 59 93 33; e-mail: Murshed@wider.unu.edu

Desired Nilsson, PhD Candidate, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; phone: +46 18 471 23 55; fax: +46 18 69 51 02; e-mail: desired.nilsson@pcr.uu.se

Janvier Nkurunziza, Research Economist, Centre for the Study of African Economies, University of Oxford, 21 Winchester Road, Oxford OX2 6NA, UK; phone: +44 18 65 274 499; fax: +44 18 65 274 558; e-mail: Janvier.Nkurunziza@Econometrica.oxford.ac.uk

Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Associate Professor, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, P.O. Box 514, 751 20 Uppsala, Sweden; phone: +46 18 471 23 46; fax: +46 18 69 51 02; e-mail: Kjell-Ake.Nordquist@pcr.uu.se

Bertil Öden, Secretary to the Expert Group of Development Initiatives (EGDI), Department of International Cooperation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 103 39 Stockholm, Sweden; phone: +46 8 405 56 15; fax: +46 8 723 11 76; e-mail: Bertil.Oden@foreign.ministry.se

William Reed, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, 303 S. Kedzie Hall, East Lansing, MI 48823, USA; phone: +1 517 432 2047; fax: +1 517 432 1091; e-mail: wreed@msu.edu

Patrick M. Regan, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Binghamton University, P.O. Box 6000, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000, USA; phone: +1 607 777 2167; fax: +1 607 777 2675; e-mail: regan@binghamton.edu

Martí Reynal-Querol, Doctor in Economics, Institute for Economic Analysis (IAE), Campus de la UAB, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain; phone: +34 93 580 66 12; fax: +34 93 580 14 52; e-mail: M.Reynal-Querol@iese.edu

Raul Romeva, Professor, Lecturer, UNESCO Chair on Peace and Human Rights, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Edifici G-6, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain; phone: +34 95 581 24 14; fax: +34 93 581 32 84; e-mail: rromeva@pangea.org

Richard Sadaka, Assistant Professor in Economics, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon; phone: +961 1 350 000 ext. 4071; fax: +961 1 744 484; e-mail: rsl14@aub.edu.lb

Todd Sandler, Robert and Kay Dockson Chair of International Relations and Economics, School of International Relations, University of Southern California, VKC 330, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0043, USA; phone: +1 213 740 9695; fax: +1 213 742 0281; e-mail: tsandler@usc.edu

Meredith Reid Sarkees, Professor, Political Science Department, DePaul University, 990 W. Fullerton Avenue, Suite 2200, Chicago, IL 60614, USA; phone: +1 773 325 7355; fax: +1 773 325 7337; e-mail: mrsarkees@condor.depaul.edu

Susanne Schmedli, Senior Research Analyst, FAST Early Warning Unit, Coordinator for Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Swiss Peace Foundation, Institute for Conflict Resolution, Gerechtigkeitsgasse 12, P.O. Box, 3000 Bern 8, Switzerland; phone: +41 31 310 27 28; fax: +41 31 310 27 28; e-mail: susanne.schmedli@swisspeace.unibe.ch

Alex P. Schmid, Dr, Officer-in-Charge, Terrorism Prevention Branch, P.O. Box 500, 1400 Vienna, Austria; phone: +43 12 60 60 42 78; fax: +43 12 60 60 59 68; e-mail: Alexander.Schmid@iei.pn.or.at

Gerald Schneider, Professor, Dr, Department of Politics and Management, University of Konstanz, Box D 86, 78457 Konstanz, Germany; phone: +49 75 31 882 608/3081; fax: +49 75 31 882 774; e-mail: Gerald.Schneider@uni-konstanz.de

Philip A. Schrott, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Kansas, 1541 Llack Lane, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, USA; phone: +1 785 864 9024; fax: +1 785 864 5700; e-mail: schrott@ku.edu

Nicolas Schwank, MA, Director, Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research, Department of Political Science, University of Heidelberg, Marstallstrasse 6, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany; phone: +49 0622 154 3198; fax: +49 0622 154 2896; e-mail: schwank@hiik.de

Taylor Seybolt, Dr, Project Leader, Conflict and Peace Prevention Project, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Signalvägen 9, 169 70 Solna, Sweden; phone: +46 8 655 97 47; fax: +46 8 655 97 33; e-mail: taylor.seybolt@sipri.se

Stephen Shellman, Doctoral Student, Instructor, Department of Political Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2230, USA; phone: +1 850 942 4685; fax: +1 850 644 1367; e-mail: shellman@mindspring.com

J. David Singer, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan, 611 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, USA; phone: +1 734 763 6590; fax: +1 734 764 3522; e-mail: jsinger@umich.edu

Katja H-W Skipper, PhD Candidate, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI), Division of Systems Analysis, P.O. Box 25, 2027 Kjeller, Norway; phone: +47 63 80 77 22; fax: +47 63 80 77 15; e-mail: katja.skipper@ffi.no