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Abstract
The focus of this study is the assumption that the return of refugees is a necessary condition for the establishment of sustainable peace after armed conflict. This assumption is often made in the peacebuilding literature as well as by policy makers, but it has rarely been the object of systematic analysis. The purpose of the study, therefore, is to test this assumption, which I label the “peace-by-repatriation thesis.”

I adopt a two-step approach to analyzing the peace-by-repatriation thesis. The first step is to formulate an analytical framework. The second step is to use the framework to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis on a medium number of cases. The formulation of the analytical framework starts with an examination of previous research. I trace the theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis in research on peacebuilding, forced migration, and partition. The analytical framework is further informed by case studies of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh, two cases that represent opposing perceptions of repatriation as a condition for peace.

I adopt a set-theoretic approach to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis. I describe in some detail how the key concepts of the analytical framework are operationalized. I select and code forty-three cases—terminated conflicts that caused large-scale displacement—and use fuzzy-set analysis to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis. The analysis shows that repatriation is not a necessary condition for sustainable peace. Instead, ending displacement—irrespective of how this is done—turns out to be an important condition for peace. This result is consistent across tests of different combinations of cases and tests using alternative operationalizations of key concepts.

Taken together, the fuzzy-set analysis and the case studies suggest that the relationship between repatriation and peace will vary from case to case and that pre-war interethnic relations is one of the circumstances that affect that relationship.
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Preface
The idea to this dissertation originally developed in reaction to the international community’s different approaches to addressing displacement in the Balkans and the Middle East. In the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina the right of every displaced person to return home was a central feature of the Dayton Peace Agreement of 1995, not because this is what the parties to the negotiations necessarily wanted, but because of the insistence on such a right by the international community. Only two years earlier, in the Oslo Accords of 1993, the question of the Palestinian refugees was one of the so called final status issues, explicitly left for Israel and the PLO to negotiate and reach agreement on, with the international community neither then nor later expressing a firm position on what such an agreement should entail, other than repeating that it should be “just.”

Why these different approaches, I wondered. Because those displaced from Bosnia ended up in Europe rather than in Arab countries? Because of the special relationship between Israel and the United States? Because the passage of time since the creation of the Palestinian refugee problem sixty years ago has rendered return impracticable? These answers appeared either cynical, biased, or likely to inspire those opposed to return to remain recalcitrant, as time is on their side (none of which qualities necessarily makes them wrong). Or could the different approaches to displacement be adequately explained by other differences between the two cases?
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I am alone responsible for any remaining flaws and mistakes.

In relation to the field work I want to thank Stina Magnusson and Vida Korén Holm at Kvinna till kvinna for sharing useful contacts, Nara Galstyan for being my personal tour leader in Nagorno-Karabakh, and Suzana Močević for emergency interpretation in Sarajevo. I am deeply indebted to all interviewees—especially those of you who shared personal experiences with me. I am also grateful to those of your assistants who aided with interpretation.

Thank you as well Nadine Walicki for the cover photo, Daniel Karlsson for improving my figures, and Christina Boström for assistance with layout and for keeping track of practical details during the final months.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the Wallenberg Foundation and Ambassador Lyndon Olson through the “Scandinavian Policy and Politics Project,” as well as by the J. C. Kempe Memorial Fund, the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, and Forskraftstiftelsen Theodor Adelswärds Minne.

Three groups of people who had nothing to do with the dissertation also deserve mentioning, because in different ways they helped me to regularly put work aside and focus on something else entirely: the choir Kammarkören Sångkraft, the floorball squad, and my five brothers from back in high school. These breaks, I dare say, have helped me remain sane throughout most of the process.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, Elisabeth, for ceaseless encouragement and support and for keeping our home up and running when my focus has been elsewhere, and my son, Henning, for always expecting my full attention.
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Emperors and kings, dukes and marquises, counts, knights, and townsfolk, and all people who wish to know the various races of men and the peculiarities of the various regions of the world, take this book and have it read to you. Here you will find all the great wonders and curiosities of Greater Armenia and Persia, of the Tartars and of India, and of many other territories. Our book will relate them to you plainly in due order, as they were related by Messer Marco Polo, a wise and noble citizen of Venice, who has seen them with his own eyes. There is also much here that he has not seen but has heard from men of credit and veracity. We will set down things seen as seen, things heard as heard, so that our book may be an accurate record, free from any sort of fabrication. And all who read the book or hear it may do so with full confidence, because it contains nothing but the truth.

Marco Polo, The Travels
Introduction

The conventional wisdom of most refugee experts holds that there is a necessary connection between forging and implementing a peace agreement and ensuring the successful return of refugees. Peace depends on refugee repatriation, and every peace agreement must provide for it, or so it is widely believed.

Howard Adelman

1.1 The Peace-by-Repatriation Thesis

The sun was barely visible through the cold and hazy air as Dr. van Heuven Goedhart made his way to the Nobel Institute in Oslo on 12 December, 1955. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) had been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, and High Commissioner Dr. van Heuven Goedhart was in Oslo to accept the prize and deliver his Nobel Lecture.

This was neither the first nor the last time that the link between refugee protection and peace has been highlighted through the Peace Prize. In 1922, Norwegian explorer/diplomat Fridtjof Nansen received the prize after, among other things, as High Commissioner for Refugees of the League of Nations, having taken on the tasks of finding solutions for some 1.5 million Russian refugees around Europe, and of handling the displacement situation resulting from the Greco-Turkish War. Shortly after Nansen’s death in 1930, the League of Nations established the Nansen International Office for Refugees to continue his work in the field of refugee protection, and the organization was awarded the Peace Prize in 1938.

Also, after the UNHCR was awarded the Peace Prize in 1955, in 1958 it was given to Father Georges Pire for his work with assisting old and unhealthy refugees to leave refugee camps around Europe ten years after the end of World War II. In 1981 the UNHCR was awarded the Peace Prize a second time, for its continued work on the issue of refugee protection, including its adhesence to “the fundamental principle that no refugee must be repatriated against his or her will, or under any form of coercion whatever.”

In his Nobel lecture in 1955 Dr. van Heuven Goedhart explained that

Refugee problems can only be solved in three different ways—through voluntary repatriation, through resettlement overseas, and through integration either in the country of present residence or in combination with intra-European migration. Of

2 Oslo weather observations for 12 December, 1955, kindly provided by the Climate Division of the Norwegian Meteorological Institute.
3 The UNHCR received the 1954 Peace Prize, which was “reserved” in 1954, and awarded in 1955.
In fact, he went on to predict that “voluntary repatriation will in the years to come account for not more than one percent of the solutions to refugee problems still to be solved” (UNHCR 1955).

At this time the UNHCR’s mandate was limited to caring for persons who had become refugees (a concept discussed further below) as a result of “events occurring in Europe before 1 January 1951.” More specifically, the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (the Refugee Convention) left it up to each Contracting State to choose whether the geographic restriction would apply to its particular obligations or not; the Statute of the UNHCR, on the other hand, contained no geographic reference (Barnett & Finnemore 2004, 84–86; Orchard 2008, 278–282). Both documents were limited to displacement occurring before 1951. In 1967 a Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees was adopted, which removed the time and geographic restrictions, thereby also eliminating the inconsistency between the Statute and the Convention. Earlier, the Statute had made the High Commissioner competent to deal with an increasing number of refugees who nevertheless were not covered by the Convention (cf. Orchard 2008, 301).

In 1955 Dr. van Heuven Goedhart’s remarks on repatriation no longer being of great importance concerned some one million refugees still displaced as a result of events occurring in Europe before 1951. Sixty years later, the number of refugees around the world is ten million, with another more than twenty million being internally displaced, and the international approach to solutions has shifted 180 degrees to a strong emphasis on repatriation as the solution in today’s refugee discourse. Chimni (2003, 195), concludes that in the early twenty-first century local integration and third country resettlement are applicable to around one percent of the world’s refugees.

According to Barnett and Finnemore this shift began in the late 1970s and developed into a “repatriation culture [. . .] a bureaucratic structure and discourse coupled with formal and informal rules that made repatriation UNHCR’s preferred solution and, in fact, nearly synonymous with protection” (Barnett & Finnemore 2004, 93–105). In time, repatriation has evolved from a solution to the refugee’s problem of being displaced to a solution to the problem of the fact that people are displaced, and to some extent even further into being instrumental in resolving other problems than those related to displacement. For example, in 1990, then High Commissioner Stoltenberg stated his ambition that the
UNHCR should be prepared to seize all the possibilities for voluntary repatriation, which is the best solution for refugees, the most productive use of resources, and a concrete contribution to peace and stability (quoted in Barnett & Finnemore 2004, 97–98).

Voluntary repatriation is a concrete contribution to peace and stability. High Commissioner Stoltenberg is not alone in making that claim, which I will refer to in this study as the peace-by-repatriation thesis. Indeed, this is the conventional wisdom of most refugee experts, as noted by Adelman in the epigraph to this chapter. Obviously, this conventional wisdom has implications for policy making. Since the late 1980s most major peace agreements have contained specific provisions regarding the return of displaced persons (UNHCR 1997, 159–160; cf. Harbom, Högladh & Wallensteen 2006; UCDP 2009b). Similarly, about half of all post–Cold War multidimensional peacekeeping operations have had refugee repatriation as part of their mandates (Howard 2008, 347–352). According to Black (2006, 26), the 1997 issue of the UNHCR’s State of the World’s Refugees “stressed how return is symbiotically related to peace-building in conflict-torn countries.”

However, the Adelman quote sensibly ends with the words “or so it is widely believed” rather than “and this has been confirmed by social scientists.” In fact, despite the popularity of the peace-by-repatriation thesis, very little research has been done on the assumption that refugee repatriation is crucial to achieving and maintaining peace. Consequently, in its most rudimentary form, the problem addressed in the present study is whether this assumption holds true.

Obviously, the peace-by-repatriation thesis needs to be both specified and clarified before it can be tested. It should be noted at the outset that refining the peace-by-repatriation thesis and making it testable is an important facet of this enquiry, and one which goes beyond the definition of key theoretical concepts. Rather, it is continually done throughout most of the study.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study
In one of the few academic studies expressly addressing the peace-by-repatriation thesis, Adelman (2002) sets out to analyze the relationship between peace and repatriation. He does this on the basis of his own previous research as well as several case studies of peace implementation in the same edited volume, of which his chapter is a part (Stedman, Rothchild & Cousens 2002).

4 Throughout this study, “the thesis” will refer to the peace-by-repatriation thesis; the dissertation will be referred to as “the study.”
Briefly, he questions “any causal, necessary, signifying, or even inherent type of relationship of refugee repatriation to peace agreements” (Adelman 2002, 274). Importantly, his argument is not that refugee repatriation and peace are totally unrelated phenomena, but rather that no one relationship is valid across all cases; depending on the circumstances, repatriation may contribute to peace, it may be irrelevant to peace, or it may be unfavorable to peace. He concludes, inter alia, that factors such as the type of war and who wins affect the link between repatriation and peace (Adelman 2002, 295).

What makes Adelman’s study unusual is that it draws on a number of cases, and initiates a systematic discussion of why the role of repatriation in the establishment of peace differs between cases. Most other studies that consider the relationship between repatriation and peace do not have that relationship as their main focus, and, unsurprisingly, they often reach different conclusions regarding the role of repatriation in achieving and maintaining peace. Hence, there is clearly a need for further systematic analysis of the common assumption that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace—the peace-by-repatriation thesis—but there is also a need to develop the theoretical foundations of that assumption.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to refine and analyze the peace-by-repatriation thesis. An important rationale for this study is that the assertion that repatriation is necessary for peace is more common than explicit accounts of the theoretical arguments on which the assumption rests. Such accounts, in turn, are more common than even rough descriptions of key concepts (for example, how much repatriation is required for what kind of peace?).

This study therefore begins by turning to previous research in an attempt to identify the theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. This results in a preliminary theoretical framework comprising a few concepts relevant to an analysis of peace by repatriation. This framework is further refined through an initial application of it in two empirical cases of large-scale conflict-induced displacement. Finally, the peace-by-repatriation thesis is tested through a fuzzy-set analysis of around forty cases. A more detailed outline of the study follows at the end of this chapter. Before that, however, I will discuss a number of key concepts and briefly describe the context in which repatriation has become the default solution to displacement.

1.3 Context and Relevance

Overview of Key Concepts
While concepts such as peace and repatriation are discussed further below, the presentation will benefit from a brief account of a few other important concepts already at this stage.
The term *refugee* is frequently used to describe anyone who has left his or her home for any one of a number of reasons and seeks protection in another country. “Development refugees” are forced from their homes by major dam projects and the like, “climate refugees” flee from the effects of climate change, such as rising sea levels, “economic refugees” connotes people who leave their homes voluntarily to seek a better life in a rich country, et cetera. People who are displaced within their own country are occasionally referred to as “internal refugees,” though the term internally displaced person (IDP) is far more common (see below).

However, the term refugee is also a legal term with a very specific meaning. A refugee is defined by the Refugee Convention, in Article 1. A (2), as a person who

owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.

To emphasize that a displaced person is a refugee according to this definition, terms such as “Convention refugee” or “statutory refugee” are used. Clearly, IDPs are not statutory refugees. The Convention definition also limits the legitimate reasons for flight to violations of civil and political rights (see below). This means that under the Refugee Convention climate refugees, development refugees, and others are not refugees.

In displacement statistics an overall number is often provided for “refugees and asylum seekers.” The term refugees refers to those who have been recognized by the UNHCR or a host state as refugees according to the Refugee Convention definition; asylum seekers are those who seek protection from persecution, but who have not yet been granted such protection, or *asylum*. There is no right to asylum in international law, only a right to seek asylum (see e.g. Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 358–365). It remains a discretionary act of the host state to grant it. The most important right awarded a refugee is the right not to be returned to a country where he or she is likely to face persecution or torture; this is known as the principle of *non-refoulement* (see e.g. Chimni 2000, 85; Clark 2004, 587; Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 201–284).

Like all basic international refugee instruments, the Refugee Convention contains a “cessation clause” (Art. 1.C), which specifies when protection ends. This can be the case for a number of reasons. Most important in the present context is the so-called “ceased circumstances clause” of Art. 1.C (5), which specifies that the Convention shall cease to apply to a person if
he can no longer, because the circumstances in connexion with which he has been recognised as a refugee have ceased to exist, continue to refuse to avail himself of the protection of the country of his nationality.

Examples of ceased circumstances are the end of civil conflict, or regime change from authoritarian to democratic government (see Bonoan 2001).

The peace-by-repatriation thesis most often calls for “refugee” repatriation, but the theoretical arguments that inspire the thesis make clear that it does not exclusively concern persons who meet the definition of the Refugee Convention. Rather, the peace-by-repatriation thesis refers more generally to conflict-induced displacement, or, in practice, to persons who fall within the mandate of the UNHCR. These include

not only those who can, on a case-by-case basis, be determined to have a well-founded fear of persecution on certain grounds (so-called “statutory refugees”); but also other often large groups of persons who can be determined or presumed to be without the protection of the government of their State of origin (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 49).

Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2007, 49) go on to argue that in order for people in the second group, those who are not statutory refugees, to fall under the protection mandate of the UNHCR the reasons for flight need to be “traceable to conflicts, human rights violations, breaches of international humanitarian law, or other serious harm resulting from radical political, social, or economic changes” in the state of origin. They should also have crossed an international border. This broader meaning of the term refugee is the one used in this study.

Displaced persons who do not cross an international border become internally displaced persons (IDPs). IDPs enjoy significantly weaker international protection than refugees, but their situation has been given increased attention during the past decade. IDPs do not constitute a legal category in the same way that refugees do. The standard definition of IDPs is as persons or groups of persons

who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular, as a result of, or in order to avoid the effects of, armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border (Cohen & Deng 1998a, 18).

Since 1998 a set of Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement identify the rights and guarantees relevant to the protection of IDPs (reproduced in e.g. Chimni 2000, 423–433; Cohen & Deng 1998a, 305–316). The Guiding Principles are not legally binding like the Refugee Convention. However, they reflect and restate many existing norms of international human rights law and international humanitarian law that are legally binding, but not
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specifically concerned with displaced persons (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 484–485; Mooney 2003, 161). While the problem of internal displacement is well recognized today, the rationale for treating IDPs as a separate category of people in need is a matter of some dispute (see e.g., Hathaway 2007, and responses); the UNHCR’s role in assisting them is also a matter of controversy (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 485–488).

There are three so-called durable solutions to displacement, and they are the same as in 1955 when Dr. van Heuven Goedhart gave his lecture in Oslo: (1) return/repatriation and reintegration in the home society, (2) local integration in the host country, and (3) resettlement to a third country (Chimni 2000, 330–389; Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 489–501). These solutions are a product of Cold War thinking, which interpreted everything including displacement as a result of ideological differences. Earlier, however, during the interwar years, refugee flows were primarily attributed to ethnic conflict, and the three durable solutions proposed at the time were (1) redrawing borders, (2) exchanging populations, and (3) securing international guarantees for minority rights (Adelman 1992, 6).

For more on the general development of the international protection regime, see for example Orchard (2008) and UNHCR (2000, Chapter 1).

The Making of a Default Solution

The 1951 Refugee Convention is a child of its time, and highly influenced by the emerging post–World War II ideological conflict between East and West. Due to the voting strength of the Western alliance at the United Nations at the time (Hathaway, quoted by Chimni 2000, 13), the Refugee Convention sets out to protect “those whose (Western inspired) civil and political rights are jeopardised, without at the same time protecting persons whose (socialist inspired) socio-economic rights are at risk” (Hathaway, quoted by Chimni 2000, 14). Accordingly, during most of the Cold War, “from the point of view of the Western governments which received them, refugees from the Eastern Bloc were viewed as welcome evidence of the failure of the socialist system” (Harrell-Bond 1989, 46). Repatriation was seen as an ideal solution, which could not be implemented in practice. As expressed by Goodwin-Gill, the Refugee Convention “was drafted at a time when voluntary repatriation was effectively obsolete” (quoted by Chimni 2004, 61).

---

6 In fact, a population exchange was Nansen’s solution to the refugee problem created by the Greco-Turkish war. The problem consisted of more than 1 million Greeks fleeing from Turkey to Greece, which was unable to provide for them. Nansen believed that “to unmix the populations of the Near East will ... secure the true pacification of the Near East” (quoted by Huntford 1997, 529), and this was indeed agreed in the 1923 Convention of Lausanne. The population exchange was completed by the end of 1924. This, according to Nansen’s biographer (Huntford 1997, 530), “was arguably his greatest achievement as an international statesman.”
By the mid 1980s, however, repatriation started to gain acceptance as the ideal solution also in practice, for example through the adoption of a Conclusion on Voluntary Repatriation by the UNHCR Executive Committee (1985). The Conclusion stated that from the outset of a refugee situation, the High Commissioner should at all times keep the possibility of voluntary repatriation for all or for part of a group under active review and the High Commissioner, whenever he deems that the prevailing circumstances are appropriate, should actively pursue the promotion of this solution.

Scholars pointed out that return is a poorly understood social phenomenon, and regretted that the desire of all refugees to go home was presented as a statement of fact rather than as a hypothesis to be tested (Chimni 2004, 58–59). A few years later High Commissioner Ogata declared the 1990s the “decade of repatriation.” “Needless to add,” comments Chimni, “it was not the sudden availability of scholarly studies which emboldened the organization to make such an announcement” (Chimni 2004, 59).

A milestone in the establishment of repatriation as the default solution to displacement situations is the concept of temporary protection. In response to the refugee flows from the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, the UNHCR in 1992 requested host governments to give temporary protection to displaced persons instead of going through the time-consuming process of evaluating individual asylum applications (Bell 2000, 238).

However, in addition to not requiring individual refugee determinations, temporary protection also allowed return “before conditions which would safely satisfy the cessation clause are met” (Bayefsky & Doyle 1999, 8). The Refugee Convention does not specify how or to what extent circumstances need to change to be considered “ceased,” but Chimni argues that such decisions have over time come to rely more on “objective” circumstances as determined by the host state, and less on the “subjective” circumstances as perceived by displaced persons themselves (Chimni 2004, 61). In light of the strong preference for repatriation in today’s refugee discourse, such shifts are significant.

One illustration of host state preferences for repatriation begins with an August 2004 UNHCR position paper (in fact, one of a series of papers with a similar content presented over several years), which explicitly argued against the return to Kosovo of rejected asylum seekers, because the situation in Kosovo was considered unsafe. In paragraph 6 the UNHCR (2004) maintains its position that members of the Serb, Roma, Ashkaelia and Egyptian communities should continue to benefit from international protection in countries of asylum. Return of these minorities should take place on a strictly voluntary basis, deriving from fully informed individual decisions. Along with Kosovo Albanians originating from areas where they now are in a minority situation, they should not be forced or compelled to return to Kosovo.
Responding to UNHCR’s recommendation, the Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish governments, in a letter to the UNHCR and the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), claimed that

this ban sets aside the principle of individual status determination of the 1951 Convention, and we are concerned that it has the unintended effect of cleansing Kosovo of ethnic minorities. […]

The UNHCR position paper furthermore bases itself on an interpretation of the term “homes in Kosovo” in Security Council Resolution 1244 of 1999 which in our view does not appropriately take into account the generally accepted concept of internal flight alternative (Foreign Ministry 2005).

As further discussed in later chapters, the need to reverse ethnic cleansing is one of the main arguments underlying the peace-by-repatriation thesis, and one made in relation to the former Yugoslavia more than anywhere else. In effect, then, the Scandinavian governments used the peace-by-repatriation thesis to argue in favor of returning displaced persons to areas considered by the UNHCR to be unsafe for returnees. If the assumption that repatriation is necessary for peace is used in this way by host state governments, then there is every reason to refine and analyze that thesis and to find out whether it is indeed more than just an assumption.

**Fortress Europe and the Securitization of Migration**

In early June 2006, seventeen members of a purported Islamist terrorist cell were arrested in a series of counter-terrorism raids in the greater Toronto area in Canada.7 Two weeks later, the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) gathered in Toronto for its tenth Biennial Conference. During one of the plenary sessions it was noted that

no self-respecting terrorist would try to enter a country as an asylum seeker, considering all the interviews, finger printing, and often humiliation, which that entails—not to mention how time consuming it is. He would arrive with a phony Swedish passport as a business man. Yet, as soon as the seventeen were arrested, calls were made for stricter asylum policies.8

This is a reference to an ever more common view of refugees and asylum seekers as security threats—migration has become “securitized” (Abiri 2000; Huysmans 2002). In order to deal with these threats states have employed various devices “to keep asylum seekers from the procedural door” (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007, 390), in effect, preventing them from seeking asylum in a country of their choice. Among these so-called “non-

---

7 See “2006 Toronto Terrorism Case” on Wikipedia for more details.
8 Donald Galloway; adapted from the present author’s conference notations.
admission policies” are the concepts of first country of asylum (FCA), safe third country (STC), and safe country of origin (SCO) which are part of the 2005 EU Council Directive on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status, aka the Asylum Procedures Directive (Council of the European Union 2005; see also Costello 2005, 396–403; Goodwin-Gill & McAdam 2007).

In the EU context, the first country of asylum concept means that Member States do not need to consider asylum applications if an asylum seeker has already been granted “refugee status or otherwise sufficient protection” in another country—the first country of asylum—to which the asylum seeker can then be returned. The safe third country concept means that the same principle can be applied if the asylum seeker could have found protection in another country en route to the Member State in question, but did not do so; he or she may still be returned to that third country. According to Costello (2005, 40) “the practice of returning asylum-seekers to STCs is a European invention, with scant foundation in international law.”

If an asylum seeker comes from a country which has been designated a safe country of origin, Member States can presume that the asylum application is unfounded because the country of origin is safe for the applicant. While these rules are not absolute, they are clearly indicative of the proliferation of non-admission policies in the Global North, as are the proposals for establishing “transit processing centers,” or reception camps, on the major transit routes into the EU (see e.g., Crawley 2005; cf. Fekete 2005; HRW 2009). As part of this development roadblocks to asylum have become the rule rather than the exception in developed countries beginning in the 1980s. Visa requirements, carrier sanctions, safe country of origin and safe third country rules, expedited processing and removal, filing deadlines, detention, and pre-inspection discourage or bar asylum seekers from receiving protection in developed countries (Martin & Schoenholtz 2006, 422–423).

As a final example, it is symptomatic that the European Commission places the issue of asylum under the Home Affairs portfolio, along with crime prevention and law enforcement, rather than under International Co-operation, Humanitarian Aid, and Crisis Response, or under Employment, Social Affairs, and Inclusion.

This study is not about the securitization of migration or stricter asylum policies. However, to some extent at least, the peace-by-repatriation thesis is a part of the same context. This, by itself, does not mean that the peace-by-repatriation thesis is necessarily unfounded, but it does mean that there is an apparent risk that states will be tempted to refer to the peace-by-repatriation thesis in their pursuit of other goals—such as those reflected in the Asylum
Procedures Directive. Seen from this perspective, there is an urgent need to start treating the peace-by-repatriation thesis as a hypothesis to be tested rather than as an assumption. Therefore, it is my hope that this study can make a small contribution to clarifying the relationship between repatriation and peace, whatever it may be.

1.4 Outline of the Study
Having now introduced the purpose and the context of the study, I continue to argue in chapter 2 that explicit theoretical arguments for the peace-by-repatriation thesis are rarely made in the literature. Like the assumption mentioned above, that all refugees wish to return, the peace-by-repatriation thesis is usually presented as an assumption rather than as a hypothesis to be tested. In order to identify the theoretical foundations for the peace-by-repatriation thesis, I turn primarily to the peacebuilding literature, but also to research on forced migration and on the ethnic security dilemma. The chapter results in a preliminary theoretical framework, or pre-theory, based on five key concepts: sustainable peace, repatriation, ended displacement situation, partition, and ethnic structure.

Next, in chapters 3–6, I develop this framework with the help of two case studies. First, the case studies are described in chapter 3 as being “instrumental,” meaning that the cases were selected because they are particularly useful for the purpose of developing the peace-by-repatriation framework. Case studies on Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh are presented in chapters 4 and 5. Bosnia is the case where the argument about the necessity of repatriation has been most consistently made, whereas in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh repatriation has played a marginal role in negotiations. On the basis of the case studies chapter 6 summarizes the peace-by-repatriation framework used in the chapters that follow.

A systematic analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis is conducted in chapters 7–10. Chapter 7 presents the methodological approach of this analysis, namely set theory and necessary conditions. I stress that the peace-by-repatriation thesis is not a correlational argument about a dependent and an independent variable, but a set-theoretic argument about an outcome and a condition. Consequently, it should be tested as a set-theoretic argument. I introduce the concept of fuzzy sets, and argue that fuzzy-set analysis is suitable for a test of the peace-by-repatriation thesis.

Next, in chapter 8, the various concepts of the framework developed in chapters 2–6 are operationalized as fuzzy sets. The operationalization of...
theoretical concepts is always a delicate matter, irrespective of the choice of method. It is not necessarily more difficult to operationalize a concept as a fuzzy set than as a continuous variable, but the difficulties inherent in the process are often made more explicit. The operationalizations used in this study will be open to debate, as would any alternative operationalizations. Therefore, in addition to describing how the concepts are operationalized, I make an effort to explain why I believe these operationalizations make sense.¹⁰

In chapter 9 I select the cases for the fuzzy-set analysis. The cases are conflict terminations and the question asked in the analysis is whether the conflicts remained terminated or restarted. From the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) I select forty-three conflict terminations in thirty-seven different conflicts. Each case (conflict termination) is then coded—given a membership score in each of the five fuzzy sets.

The fuzzy-set analysis conducted in chapter 10 clearly shows that repatriation is not necessary for peace. There is some support for the alternative thesis that displacement situations have to be resolved in order for sustainable peace to be achieved, but not that repatriation is preferable to any other durable solution.

The study is summarized in chapter 11, which also draws some conclusions and proposes important areas of further research.

¹⁰ This effort is also related to one of the premises of this study, namely that the observation of social phenomena is not as straightforward an exercise as implied by the Marco Polo quotation in the beginning of the study; describing “things seen as seen, things heard as heard,” however sincerely, does not make a statement “true.”
2 | Theorizing Peace by Repatriation

Everything was simple, and direct. Cause and effect were good friends back then; thesis and reality hugged each other as if it were the most natural thing in the world. And my guess is that the sixties were the last time that'll ever happen.

Haruki Murakami

2.1 Introduction

So far few attempts have been made to systematize the assumed relationship between repatriation and peace. Usually, it is simply one of a number of activities described variously as important tasks of peacebuilding or as conditions for peacebuilding success, without further specification either how it supports peacebuilding or whether it does so only under certain circumstances. As a rule, the positive effects of repatriation for peacebuilding are taken for granted, and, at least implicitly, assumed to hold across all cases of peacebuilding. In order to analyze the claim that repatriation is important for peace the relationship needs to be more explicitly specified. Hence, the purpose of this chapter is to elicit and concretize the theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. I rely most heavily, although not exclusively, on the peacebuilding literature.

Two earlier attempts to describe the relationship between repatriation and peace, or perceptions of it, constitute the starting point for the development of the theoretical framework presented in this chapter. These are Adelman’s four positions regarding the nature of the relationship between repatriation and peace, as extracted from peacebuilding research (Adelman 2002), and UNHCR’s four explanations of how repatriation contributes to peace (UNHCR 1997). After introducing them I take a brief look at previous research on displacement and peacebuilding to try to establish what theoretical concepts should be part of the peace-by-repatriation framework.

I want to stress that the word “framework” is used loosely to refer to a set of factors, or concepts, that would appear to be relevant to an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. The present chapter identifies an initial set of factors by looking at previous research on repatriation and peace. The following chapters develop this framework through an initial application of it to two empirical cases. While the case studies enhance understanding of the cases, more importantly they contribute to evaluating and refining the peace-
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12 For lack of a better term to refer collectively to the four “ways” in which repatriation can contribute to peace, as described by the UNHCR, I use “explanations.”
by-repatriation framework. In other words, the development of the framework in chapters 2–6 is reminiscent of Rosenau’s (1966) “pre-theory” of foreign policy, with theory and observation being mutually reinforcing, as well as of Brecher’s (1999) description of “theory from the bottom up,” according to which “theory is the end-point of an intellectual process, not the starting-point.”

From literature on refugee repatriation and peacebuilding, specifically several case studies in Stedman, Rothchild and Cousens (2002), Adelman (2002, 274–275) extracts four positions, representing different views of the relationship between refugee repatriation and peace implementation. First, he identifies two soft positions, one (Soft I) that considers any resolution of a refugee problem as a sign that peace is in place, and one (Soft II) that specifically sees repatriation as such a sign. Common to the two soft positions is that they perceive the resolution of the refugee issue as “a manifestation of peace.”

Adelman’s soft positions come dangerously close to using repatriation as an indicator of peace, as Ali and Matthews (2004, 405–6) do:

Even in Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe, where the international community can fairly claim some responsibility for a successful transition from war to peace, measured by such criteria as effective economic recovery, free and fair elections, the repatriation of refugees, the decommissioning of former combatants and their integration into society, external intervention has also had a negative impact [emphasis added].

Using repatriation as an indicator of peace means that repatriation cannot be fruitfully analyzed as an empirically necessary condition for peace; it means determining a priori that it is a logically necessary condition (or a “constitutive” condition, cf. chapter 7). Adelman’s soft positions are not necessarily of this character, but the distinction between “being a sign of” and “being an indicator of” is not made explicit in his study.

Adelman also presents two hard positions, one (Hard I) that considers peace and refugee repatriation as necessary conditions of one another, and one (Hard II) that claims mutual causation between peace and refugee repatriation. Additional versions of the hard positions may be conceived of in the form of unidirectional conditionality and causation (in either direction). While there are several examples of the soft positions in the

---

13 Peace implementation, “the process of carrying out a specific peace agreement” (Stedman 2002, 2).
14 To argue that refugee repatriation and peace are necessary conditions of one another is methodologically problematic. As explained in greater detail in chapter 7, a relation of necessity means that the outcome constitutes a subset of the necessary condition. A relation of mutual necessity would mean that the two relevant sets (here “cases of peace” and “cases of refugee repatriation”) are subsets of each another, or, expressed more succinctly, that the two sets completely overlap. However, this means that they are also supersets of each another, making them not only mutually necessary but mutually sufficient, which I think is not what Adelman intends to imply with his Hard I position (cf. Johansson 2007, 97). It makes more sense to see refugee repatriation and peace as mutually reinforcing.
literature, according to Adelman (2002, 274) “the hard view remains the overwhelming conviction and presupposition of those who connect refugee repatriation to the implementation of peace agreements.”

The most common and, in my opinion the most crucial position is the one claiming unidirectional conditionality—that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace. This is the one referred to in the epigraph to chapter 1 above. This position is common, and often explicitly articulated by the policy community (cf. chapter 4).

But, “how exactly can repatriation and reintegration contribute to the peacebuilding process in war-torn societies?” asks the UNHCR in the 1997 issue of *The State of the World’s Refugees* (UNHCR 1997, 160). Four answers (“explanations”) are given.15

The first corresponds to Adelman’s Soft II position—repatriation can be seen as a sign that peace is in place. Quoting a World Bank discussion paper, the UNHCR argues that “as long as significant portions of a society’s population are displaced, the conflict has not ended” (UNHCR 1997, 161). Refugee movements and other forms of forced displacement are the result of the state’s inability to protect its own citizens. Consequently, voluntary repatriation and reintegration is “an important manifestation of the process whereby national protection is restored and human security reinforced.” In this way, voluntary return has “an important impact on public confidence in the peacebuilding process” (UNHCR 1997, 162).

A second and related way in which repatriation contributes to peace is by validating the post-conflict political order, not least in the form of refugees returning to participate in elections. “When they choose voluntarily to go back to their homeland, refugees are, quite literally, voting with their feet and expressing confidence in the future of their country” (UNHCR 1997, 162). Clearly, voluntariness is the *sine qua non* of this logic.

The third way in which repatriation is said to contribute to peace is that “the return and reintegrations of an exiled population may be a precondition for peace in situations where refugees are politically and militarily active.” Examples include Cambodia, Namibia, Nicaragua, and Rwanda. In each of these cases, it is argued, “the return of the refugees and their separation from the military represented an important step in the transition from war to peace” (UNHCR 1997, 162–163).

Finally, returning populations can make important contributions to the economic recovery of war-torn states. “Indeed, repatriation may even be a prerequisite for that objective to be achieved” (UNHCR 1997, 163). People with education and other resources may have a greater chance of escaping generalized violence, and their return is then likely to be important for
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15 More or less the same arguments have been repeated by such prominent authorities as Walter Kälin (2008), Representative of the Secretary General on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, and Erika Feller (2009), Assistant High Commissioner (Protection) at the UNHCR.
rebuilding war-torn societies. Refugees can also get various forms of training during displacement, which may prove valuable to the peacebuilding process once they return.

Refugees voting with their feet and the economic contribution of returnees are clearly related to the particular solution of repatriation. The question of restoring protection, however, is addressed as well by the solutions of local integration and third-country resettlement, and does not necessarily require repatriation. And to a great extent, the issue of refugee warriors is a question of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) rather than a question of repatriation.

This suggests that not only the Soft II position can have hard versions, which it does in Adelman’s presentation. The Soft I position, too, can be turned into a hard version, namely that any resolution of a refugee problem (that is, repatriation, local integration, or third-country resettlement) is a necessary condition for peace.

### 2.2 Previous Research

The theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis can be traced in several fields of research, though thesis and reality do not exactly hug each other in any of them. In this section I discuss three fields of research—on peacebuilding, forced migration, and partition. The idea is to keep a clear focus on the peace-by-repatriation thesis, and I make no claim to giving a comprehensive presentation of any of these fields of research.

I want to point out that the starting point of my interest in these issues, and the field of research where I primarily aim to make a contribution, is peacebuilding. Although I have had to acquaint myself with several other fields of research (certainly one of many rewarding aspects of working with this project), their use in this study is limited to what they can contribute to the understanding of the relationship between repatriation and peace.

**Peacebuilding**

Until 1989 peacekeeping missions were deployed with the express consent of the (state) parties to the conflict in question, their mandates were usually limited to supervising truces or disengagement agreements with minimum involvement in the internal affairs of states, and they were almost exclusively carried out by the United Nations. The end of the Cold War opened new possibilities for the international community to engage in conflict resolution around the world, and post-1989 peacebuilding missions differ in all these respects. They are frequently deployed under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, thus not requiring the consent of the (now often non-state) parties, they cover a broad range of activities (civil as well as military), often issues at the heart of national sovereignty, and they are carried out by numerous actors of different character (see e.g., Paris 2004, 13–39).
The concept of peacebuilding is most often related sequentially to other concepts such as preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peacekeeping. Peacebuilding is then seen as a post-agreement phenomenon, simultaneous with implementation and reconstruction, and referred to as post-conflict peacebuilding. *An Agenda for Peace* (UN 1992) takes this approach, and consistently refers to “post-conflict peace-building.” For example, paragraph 21 reads,

The present report in addition will address the critically related concept of post-conflict peace-building—action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict. Preventive diplomacy seeks to resolve disputes before violence breaks out; peacemaking and peace-keeping are required to halt conflicts and preserve peace once it is attained. If successful, they strengthen the opportunity for post-conflict peace-building, which can prevent the recurrence of violence among nations and peoples.

The Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations—the so-called “Brahimi Report” (UN 2000)—defines peacebuilding as “activities undertaken on the far side of conflict to reassemble the foundations of peace and provide the tools for building on those foundations something that is more than just the absence of war.” Similarly, Paris (2004, 38) defines peacebuilding as “action undertaken at the end of a civil conflict to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of fighting.” Jarstad and Sisk (2008, 17, note 1) define peacebuilding as “efforts to implement and consolidate peace agreements,” which presupposes the existence of such agreements. The aim of peacebuilding is to prevent a recurrence of fighting, a conceptualization that presupposes that fighting has occurred and largely ended.

An alternative approach to peacebuilding is to identify it with reference to its objectives rather than by its sequencing in a peace process. Cockell (1998, 207; cf. Darby & Mac Ginty 2003, 195) argues that

While the transition phase from a peace accord to stable peace is perhaps the conflict situation most commonly associated with a broad range of peacebuilding activities, and may be the most frequent type of operational environment for such applied peacebuilding, the unique requirements of this transitional environment should not be confused with the conceptualisation of peacebuilding itself.

In *An Agenda for Peace* (under the heading “Post-conflict peace-building”) UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali described a number of activities that would “consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people,” explaining that

these may include disarming the previously warring parties and the restoration of order, the custody and possible destruction of weapons, repatriating refugees, advisory and training support for security personnel, monitoring elections, advancing efforts to
protect human rights, reforming or strengthening governmental institutions and promoting formal and informal processes of political participation (UN 1992, paragraph 55).

Obviously, many such activities can be initiated before a formal peace agreement has been reached. The point of the alternative approach is that it is not the timing of a certain activity that determines whether it constitutes peacebuilding or not.

Research on peacebuilding, like the trade itself, covers a broad range of activities. Examples include (re)building democratic institutions, including arrangements for power-sharing, as well as decentralization and post-war elections (Hartzell & Hoddie 2003; Jarstad 2009; Lyons 2002; Paris 2004; Roeder & Rothchild 2005); economic reconstruction (del Castillo 2008; Woodward 2002); transitional justice, including questions of human rights, reconciliation, and the rule of law (Brounéus 2008; Fletcher & Weinstein 2002; Hannum 2006; Kaufman 2006; Kostić 2007; Kritz 2001; Lederach 1997; Meernik 2005; Mertus & Helsing 2006; Putnam 2002; Roht-Arriaza & Mariezcurrena 2006; Sannerholm 2007); security issues, such as disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) and security sector reform (SSR) (Knight & Özerdem 2004; Peterson 2010; Schnabel & Ehrhart 2005; Spear 2002); and the return of displaced persons (Adelman 2002; Chimni 2003; Johansson 2007).

However, it should be noted that not everyone agrees that the concept of peacebuilding should be so all-encompassing, or that all of these activities are always supportive of peace. For example, Cousens (2001, 13) argues that peacebuilding should not be equated to the entire basket of postwar needs, as multiple and complex as they are. Rather, it should be seen as a strategic focus on conflict resolution and opening of political space, to which these other needs may or may not contribute. What are frequently conceived as peacebuilding activities, then—demobilization, economic reconstruction, refugee repatriation, human rights monitoring, elections, community reconciliation—are not inherently equivalent to peacebuilding unless they design themselves to be [emphasis in original].

In effect, the various activities that peacebuilders engage in, “however commendable,” risk diverting attention from the original focus of peacebuilding, which remains “consolidating whatever degree of peace has been achieved in the short term and, in the longer term, increasing the likelihood that future conflict can be managed without resort to violence” (Cousens 2001, 4). This is a crucial point. Many of the activities that the international community deals with in the aftermath of conflict are positive values in their own right, but whether (and when) they contribute to consolidating peace and avoiding future conflict depends on the circumstances, which vary from case to case.
Consider, for example, democratization. As Jarstad and Sisk (cf. Baker 2008; cf. 2001) point out, international efforts to promote democracy may undermine efforts to consolidate peace, and vice versa. Jarstad and Sisk and the various authors in their edited volume demonstrate convincingly that efforts to promote sustainable peace and efforts to promote democracy do not necessarily reinforce, but instead often undermine each other. They argue that peacebuilders face four dilemmas. Briefly, the horizontal dilemma refers to what parties should be included in negotiations and in the post-war political order; it is a dilemma between inclusion and exclusion at elite level. Next, the vertical dilemma concerns the trade-off between efficacy and legitimacy, in terms of elite processes versus public openness and involvement. Third, the tension between international and local ownership of the processes of peacebuilding and democracy are represented by the systemic dilemma. Finally, the temporal dilemma involves the question of short-term versus long-term priorities and effects of various activities. For a more elaborate description of the dilemmas, and what causes them, see Jarstad (2008).

A related dilemma is presented by Sahovic (2007), in his analysis of the Office of the High Representative (OHR) in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1996–2006. Describing what he labels the socio-cultural viability dilemma he finds that the OHR during its first ten years was continually torn between, on the one hand, its own cultural bias in favor of implementing peace and democracy by peaceful and democratic means and, on the other hand, the Bosnian socio-cultural reality which required authoritarian decision making in order to be effective—including, for example, the dismissal of dozens of elected politicians who did not agree with the vision outlined in Dayton. Assisting the development of democracy is, to echo Cousens, a commendable exercise, which might contribute to peacebuilding, but there is no guarantee that it will, particularly in the short term.

The premise of the present study is that the same thing is true for refugee repatriation. Refugee repatriation is often one of the many activities included in the theory and practice of peacebuilding. It is quite likely that in most instances people displaced by violent conflict will want to return home once the conflict is over, and the international community clearly has an important role to play in assisting such return. Often, or occasionally, the return of displaced persons can contribute to peacebuilding, but in this study I question the assumption that that this is always and necessarily the case.

A few examples can illustrate how the peace-by-repatriation thesis is articulated in the peacebuilding literature. They show that the perception of the relationship between repatriation and peace is not straightforward. Consider first del Castillo (2008, 40), who argues that “critical activities” in war-to-peace transitions include
the delivery of emergency aid to former conflict zones (many of which may not yet be under government control); the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) of former combatants; the return of refugees and internally displaced groups; the reform of the armed forces and the creation of a national civilian police.

In a similar vein she goes on to suggest that “refugee repatriation and the relocation of displaced populations are critical in peace consolidation. Any strategy for post-conflict reconstruction needs to include plans and sources of finance for this process” (del Castillo 2008, 257). Referring to refugee return as a critical activity of war-to-peace transitions and in peace consolidation can reasonably be interpreted as examples of the (unidirectional) Hard position I—repatriation is a necessary condition for peace.

However, in the case study of economic reconstruction in Afghanistan in the same volume, del Castillo (2008, 169) notes that “an estimated two million refugees had returned to the country in 2002—a sign of confidence and hope in the political transition,” a conclusion clearly more reminiscent of the Soft II position, which makes no claim of necessity but instead sees repatriation as a sign that peace is in place.

Another example of the Soft II position is Wallensteen’s (2007, 150), argument that the “issue of the return of refugees is important as it signifies, more than many other actions, that the extreme conditions which gave rise to their flight have been remedied to some extent.” Similarly, according to Stein (1997, 160), “repatriation of refugees to their homeland is a sign that safety and control over one’s own life has the possibility of being restored, but it does not necessarily mean that the bond of trust and loyalty has been restored.”

An example of the Hard I position is Kumar’s claim that the “return and resettlement of the refugees and IDPs are necessary for social peace and economic growth” (Kumar 1997, 15). Less deterministic is Cohen and Deng’s claim that “peace and reconstruction in war-torn societies depend in part on the effective reintegration of displaced persons” (Cohen & Deng 1998a, 5). The Hard I position can be found within the policy community as well. For example, UN Secretary-General Annan, in an address to the UNHCR Executive Committee, argued that

the return of refugees and internally displaced persons is a major part of any post-conflict scenario. And it is far more than just a logistical operation. Indeed, it is often a critical factor in sustaining a peace process and in revitalizing economic activity (UN 2005).

16 Kumar uses the term “resettlement” to refer to the reintegration of returnees into their societies of origin, not as the alternative durable solution of third-country resettlement (cf. p 17 where he discusses “the resettlement of returnees”).
As noted above, one can also conceive of a hard version of Adelman’s Soft I position, which would claim that solving the displacement situation is a necessary condition for achieving sustainable peace, but without requiring a particular solution to the displacement situation. For example, High Commissioner Ogata (1997, vii) has argued that “peace-building requires just solutions for refugees and displaced persons. In UNHCR’s experience, such solutions are indispensable for lasting peace and true stability.” Similarly, the Esquipulas II Declaration of 1987 proclaims that “there can be no lasting peace without initiatives to resolve the problem of refugees, returnees and displaced persons” (Stein 1997, 158).

While these examples can rather easily be related to Adelman’s positions regarding the character of the relationship between repatriation and peace, it is more difficult to link them to one or more of UNHCR’s explanations of how repatriation contributes to peace—or, importantly, to find alternative explanations. This is true for most of the peacebuilding literature. A rare exception is Adelman (2002, 276–277), who notes that in some cases repatriation may not be a goal in itself, but intimately tied to the success of an election or a referendum (which, however, as argued above, does not necessarily contribute to peace); examples are Cambodia, Namibia, and Western Sahara.

In addition, it is possible to find examples of UNHCR’s explanations in peace agreements, such as the Agreement on a Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Cambodia Conflict (Paris Agreement 1991), which states that

The task of rebuilding the Cambodian nation will require the harnessing of all its human and natural resources. To this end, the return to the place of their choice of Cambodians from their temporary refuge and elsewhere outside their country of origin will make a major contribution.

A variant of this involves emphasizing the contribution to rebuilding that can be made by people with special education and training, such as engineers, teachers, physicians, et cetera, and to focus particularly on the return of such individuals.17 The International Organization for Migration (IOM), for example, carried out such a program in Bosnia-Herzegovina (cf. chapter 4).

**Forced Migration**

Another body of research is forced migration research, which like peacebuilding is a field that comprises several sub-fields, including refugee studies (Haddad 2008; Hathaway 2007; Milner 2009) as well as research on various other forms of displacement, such as development induced

---

17 This is related to what Naudé (2009, 258) refers to as “entrepreneurial migration,” the fact that people who emigrate are often relatively skilled individuals.
displacement, climate or environmental refugees, and internal displacement (Biermann & Boas 2010; Cohen & Deng 1998a; 1998b; Global IDP Project & Norwegian Refugee Council 2002; McNamara 2007; Mooney 2003; Weiss & Korn 2006). There is also research on UNHCR and asylum, including the securitization of migration and the development of “fortress Europe” (Abiri 2000; Alexseev 2006; Byrne, Noll & Vedsted-Hansen 2004; Koser, Walsh & Black 1998; Loescher, Betts & Milner 2008; Noll 2003; Thielemann 2004; van Selm 2003), protracted refugee situations, warehousing, and trafficking (Koser 2003; Loescher & Milner 2005; Smith 2004), exile and diasporas, land and property rights, and the search for durable solutions (Black & Koser 1999; Chimni 2004; Harrell-Bond 1989; Leckie 2007; Swain 2007). Further, various social science themes are applied to the specific situation of forced migrants, for example, gender studies, health issues, and sustainable livelihoods (Hyndman 2000; 2010; Mertus 2003).

By way of simplicity one could perhaps say that if peacebuilding is about consolidating peace in the short term and avoiding a recurrence of violence in the long term, forced migration studies are about protection during displacement in the short term (which is not always so short), and durable solutions for displaced persons in the long term. In the peacebuilding literature, the sustainability of return is usually not an issue. The important thing is that displaced persons return, but the need for sustainable return is at best implicit. Occasionally (as for example in the case of the Scandinavian letter to UNMIK and UNHCR), it is explicitly made clear that the peace-by-repatriation thesis does not require return to be sustainable—the internal flight alternative is good enough (cf. the discussion of minority return versus relocation in chapter 4).

Conversely, in forced migration research the sustainability of return is essential, but only rarely is it explicitly related to peace. When it is, the argument is often that return should not be used as a means to achieve another end, even if that other end is peace. Sustainable return is an end in itself and the fate of displaced persons should not be reduced to being an instrument for other purposes—not primarily because this might undermine the peace process, but because it might put returnees in danger (see Bhatia 2003; Black 2006; Chimni 2003; Naqvi 2004; Petrin 2002; Phuong 2000; Zolberg, Suhrke & Aguayo 1989). For example, Bhatia (2003, 797) asks how the voluntariness of return is affected by a broader peace settlement that puts repatriation on a list of tasks to be completed according to a timetable. Focusing specifically on the situation of the Sahrawi refugees, he emphasizes that repatriation is related to cessation [of refugee status] by the fact that the end-point of return is an individual’s renewed acquisition of national protection. Yet, what of repatriation prior to cessation, as will be the case in the Western Sahara? (Bhatia 2003, 794)
If repatriation is to coincide with the renewed acquisition of national protection, then a more comprehensive peace than the mere absence of armed conflict needs to be in place prior to return. From this perspective it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of repatriation as a condition for peace. A similar argument is presented by Naqvi (2004, 83):

Given the link between massive human rights violations and refugee status, it would seem logical that repatriation of refugees should only be promoted and encouraged after an objective assessment of the human rights situation in the country of origin has been carried out and where it has been ascertained that repatriates will be guaranteed these rights if they choose to or are required to return [emphasis in original].

Lischer (2005) focuses on the issue of refugee related violence (the third of UNHCR’s explanations). She finds four socioeconomic explanations for refugee-related violence in the literature: (1) that large refugee camps become breeding grounds for militant and criminal organizations because they are harder to control, (2) that camps located near the border of the sending state facilitate attacks either by refugee militias or by the sending state itself, (3) that large numbers of young men among the refugees will lead to greater violence, and (4) that poor living conditions encourage discontent, which leads to militancy (Lischer 2005, 9). Finding these explanations wanting, Lischer proposes that refugee-related violence can be better understood by considering the political context of the crisis, specifically three attributes of this context, namely (1) the origin of the refugee crisis, (2) the policy of the receiving state, and (3) the influence of external state and non-state actors (Lischer 2005, 18–43). Most importantly, the origins of the refugee crisis are often disregarded in the routine socioeconomic explanations of refugee-related violence.

Lischer categorizes refugees into three groups according to the cause of their flight: First, there are situational refugees, who flee the general conditions of civil war; they usually wish to return as soon as hostilities end and are unlikely to engage in military activity. Second, persecuted refugees escape ethnic cleansing or oppressive policies targeting them on the basis of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or political identity; they are likely to organize and be involved in cross-border violence, and they will not return home unless the can be protected from further persecution. Third, state-in-exile refugees include political and military leaders; these groups will only return home in victory. They are very likely to organize and have a high propensity for political violence.

In sum, the militarization of refugees—however likely or unlikely it was in the individual case—can make the need for a solution to the displacement situation more acute. However, peace is arguably more dependent on disarming and demobilizing the militarized refugees and finding durable solutions for them, than on resolving the displacement situation particularly
through repatriation. The advantage of considering the origin of the refugee crisis is that specific characteristics of the outcome of the conflict can be used to assess the likelihood of voluntary repatriation among different groups of refugees once the conflict has ended and a certain level of national protection has been restored. Again, peace comes before repatriation.

In this context, I should point out that the role of diasporas in peacebuilding is not addressed in this study, even though the broad concept of diaspora can comprise conflict induced displacement. Research on the role of diasporas in sustaining or mitigating conflict in their countries of origin focuses on established diaspora communities that display some form of permanency of relocation, such as the Irish-American diaspora, the Sri Lankan diaspora in the West, and the Ethiopian diaspora in North America (see various contributions in Swain 2007). Conversely, the peace-by-repatriation thesis relates to asylum seekers, refugees, IDPs, et cetera—people displaced by armed conflict and awaiting durable solutions.

**Ethnicity and Partition**

Widening the scope of potentially relevant literature reveals that, in addition to the UNHCR's four explanations of how repatriation contributes to peace, a fifth explanation is related to ethnicity. The role of ethnicity in an analysis of repatriation and peace is stressed by proponents as well as opponents of repatriation.

Ethnicity is an inherently contested concept. Discussions about what ethnicity “is” were more common in the 1980s and early 1990s than they are today. Various authors have asked whether ethnicity is primordial or acquired, static or contextual. They have compared and contrasted ethnicity to related concepts such as race, nationality, and minority, and debated alternative bases for membership in an ethnic group ranging from kinship and shared history to religion and language (Hettne 1993; Horowitz 1985; Lindholm 1993; Riggs 1991a; 1991b). Analyzing the link between ethnicity and conflict, Gurr, one of the world’s leading authorities on ethnic conflict, describes “groups whose ethnic identity is the basis for either differential treatment or collective political action, or both” as “ethnopolitical groups” (Gurr 2000, 6). Ethnopolitical groups are divided into several subgroups, most importantly “national peoples,” who seek separation from or autonomy within states, and “minority peoples,” who seek rights, access, and control (Gurr 2000, 16).

In the context of repatriation and peacebuilding the concept of ethnicity is not well explored or defined. It is basically accepted that people belong to various ethnic groups and assumed that there is a need to remix them after ethnic cleansing—or, according to the opponents of repatriation, to keep them apart. This study does not discuss the concept of ethnicity at any length, but considers the question of mixing or unmixing.
A brief overview of the academic debate about ethnic mixing and unmixing has a natural starting point in the work of Kaufmann, who argues that “the international community must abandon attempts to restore war-torn multi-ethnic states. Instead it must facilitate and protect population movements to create true national homelands” (Kaufmann 1996b, 137).

Kaufmann’s argument is premised on the notion of the security dilemma. The security dilemma was originally devised as a description of a predicament states face under international anarchy, namely (1) that it is difficult to determine whether other states have defensive or offensive intentions, and (2) that offensive action is often (perceived as) superior to defensive action. A state that feels just a little bit threatened will increase its defensive capabilities. This is seen as an offensive move by another state, which in turn increases its defensive capabilities, thus confirming to the first state that it is indeed under threat. When both states believe that the key to prevailing in a conflict is to strike first, a worst-case scenario is very likely (cf. Herz 1950).

The security dilemma as an analytical tool was introduced to the study of ethnic conflict by Posen (1993). He argued that the security dilemma was well suited to explain the breakup of, for example, Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union, where various ethnic, religious, and cultural groups were left to their own devices as the “sovereign” faded and disappeared. There was “anarchy within,” as Melander (1999) aptly described it.

Ethnic heterogeneity is central to Kaufmann’s perception of the security dilemma in intrastate conflict:

The severity of ethnic security dilemmas is greatest when demography is most intermixed, weakest when community settlements are most separate. The more mixed the opposing groups, the stronger the offense in relation to the defense; the more separated they are, the stronger the defense in relation to offense (Kaufmann 1996b, 148).

Because ethnic heterogeneity is seen as reinforcing the security dilemma, Kaufmann calls for the separation of opposing groups into defensible enclaves.

Another central feature of his argument is that ethnic fears and hatreds are hardened by war. This, in turn, makes the security dilemma dynamic even more compelling the next time a group feels threatened. Even after ethnic wars, where the security dilemma was not initially an important contributing cause, it will be the second time around if attempts are made to rebuild a multi-ethnic state, for the simple reason that there has been a war. Therefore, “solutions to ethnic wars do not depend on their causes” (Kaufmann 1996b, 137, cf. 154).

Testing his argument that separation is a necessary (but not sufficient; Kaufmann 1996b, 150) condition for the resolution of ethnic civil wars,
Kaufmann uses Minorities at Risk (MAR) data to analyzes the twenty-seven ethnic civil wars that were resolved between 1944 and 1994 (1996b, 160).18 Twelve cases ended by victory, five by partition (de facto or de jure), and two were suppressed by third party military occupation; these are in line with Kaufmann’s argument. The remaining eight cases ended by agreement that did not partition the country, which at first sight contradicts his argument. However,

every case in which the state was preserved by agreement involved a regionally concentrated minority, and in every case the solution reinforced the ethnic role in politics by allowing the regional minority group to control its own destiny through regional autonomy for the areas where it forms a majority of the population. There is not a single case where non-ethnic civil politics were created or restored by reconstruction of ethnic identities, power-sharing coalitions, or state-building (Kaufmann 1996b, 161).

This convinces Kaufmann that it is the regionally concentrated minority that is the decisive factor in preventing a recurrence of war: “The critical variable is demography, not sovereignty” (Kaufmann 1996b, 161). However, all eight cases in which the state was preserved by agreement were characterized by both a regionally concentrated minority and regional autonomy. It is not clear on what basis Kaufmann concludes that the regionally concentrated minority is more important than the regional autonomy for preventing a recurrence of war.

Ten years on Licklider and Bloom collected some of the responses to Kaufmann’s ideas in an edited volume (Licklider & Bloom 2006). For example, Laitin (2006)19 finds Kaufmann’s argument wanting in precision in several respects, and sets out to refine it in order to allow for more elaborate analysis of its viability. In particular, he focuses on the aspect of territorial concentration of ethnic groups. Using MAR data like Kaufmann, Laitin concludes, in contradiction to Kaufmann’s argument, that “the concentration of groups within a region of a country, other things being equal, makes these groups better candidates for insurgencies leveled against states” (Laitin 2006, 212).

Laitin also points out that Kaufmann does not specify whether his theory requires a minimum level of regional autonomy or ethnic separation, or whether what is required is greater autonomy and more unmixing than before the war. This is problematic since many situations are characterized by group concentration and regional autonomy already before the war. 20

---

18 Kaufmann considers these cases to constitute all ended conflicts 1944–1994, a claim, which is open to question (cf. Kuperman 2004).
20 On a similar note, but without making explicit inferences about ethnic mixing or unmixing, Cornell (2002, 247) argues that rather than bringing peace and stability, the introduction of territorial autonomy “may foster ethnic mobilization, increased secessionism, and even armed conflict.” He compares nine compactly settled
The fact that “Kaufmann at times combines partition and unmixing as having the same properties, but at times separates them analytically” complicates things even further (Laitin 2006, 217).

In another chapter in the same volume, Sambanis (2006, 74) finds that “nonethnic partitions are more stable and peaceful than ethnic partitions (although these results are driven by the very few cases of nonethnic partition).” This is noteworthy since partition theorists tend to focus on ethnic wars (cf. Kaufmann 1996a). Sambanis concludes (2006, 86) that “if border redefinition is a viable option [. . . ] then ethnic integration rather than ethnic partition may be a winning strategy.”

 Partition theory does not usually explicitly address the question of refugee repatriation. However, because the question of ethnic mixing and unmixing plays an important role for proponents as well as critics of partition as a solution to ethnic civil war, their conclusions have implications for how displacement ought to be handled. Kaufmann is explicit about how to deal with displacement:

After an ethnic war, repatriating any substantial number of refugees back to territory held by the other group risks making control of that territory once again uncertain, thus re-creating the same security dilemma that helped escalate the conflict in the first place (Kaufmann 1998, 156).

And when Sambanis argues that ethnic integration rather than ethnic partition may be a winning strategy, this implies that repatriation is preferable to local integration and third country resettlement as a durable solution for displaced persons.

To sum up, the partition literature presents several concepts—ethnic heterogeneity versus homogeneity, mixing and unmixing of ethnic groups, and political and/or territorial autonomy and partition—that are all potentially relevant to an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis.

2.3 An Analytical Framework of Peace by Repatriation
In this chapter, I have traced the theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis in three broad fields of research, namely the fields of peacebuilding, forced migration, and partition. The final task of the chapter is to extract the relevant factors from the discussion and bring them together

---

minorities in the South Caucasian republics, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, at the end of the Soviet era. Four of these minorities enjoyed regional autonomy (the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan, and the Abkhaz, the Ajars, and the South Ossetians in Georgia), and five did not (the Azeris of Armenia, the Azeris and the Armenians of Georgia, and the Lezgins and the Talysh of Azerbaijan). Cornell finds that none of the five non-autonomous minorities formed any broad-based, well-organized, or credible separatist movements. Conversely, “all four autonomous minorities displayed high levels of separatism, with all but one case (Ajaria) ending in armed conflict” (Cornell 2002, 236).

into a preliminary analytical framework, or pre-theory, which will be further refined in chapters 3–6 with the help of two case studies.

Obviously, the relationship of principal interest is the one between repatriation and peace. These two concepts are central to the analysis, but they need to be made more precise. As discussed, the relationship between these concepts can be perceived in different ways, but the focus of attention in the present study is repatriation as a necessary condition for peace—the assumption that there will not be peace unless there is repatriation. A few sources of this assumption are found in the literature: displaced persons vote with their feet to express confidence in the post-conflict political order, they participate in the physical rebuilding and the economic recovery of their societies, and their return reverses what can be reversed of ethnic cleansing.

Clearly, the peace-by-repatriation thesis refers to the post-conflict period (a concept which is, admittedly, not as straightforward as it might first appear). What this means is that proponents of the peace-by-repatriation thesis do not suggest that displaced persons be returned to areas of ongoing armed conflict in order to bring about an end to the shooting; the idea is that once the active armed conflict has come to an end—that is, once there is negative peace—22—the return of displaced persons is required, either in order to prevent armed conflict from recurring, or in order to add some positive qualities to that negative peace—this latter distinction is not always clear.23

A few additional assumptions underlying the peace-by-repatriation thesis require an end to displacement, but not necessarily repatriation. They correspond to the hard version of Adelman’s Soft I position (see p 16), where any solution to a displacement situation is perceived as a necessary condition for peace. For example, the suggestion that “as long as significant portions of a society’s population are displaced, the conflict has not ended” means that durable solutions have to be found for the displaced persons. This does not privilege repatriation over local integration or third-country resettlement in principle (though, in official rhetoric, it does).

Similarly, the need to address refugee-related violence is often essential, but as a condition for peace it does not require the specific solution of repatriation. The key is that refugee-related violence is brought to an end, but whether displacement ends through repatriation, local integration, or third-country resettlement is in principle a secondary issue. A new government or a military victory may be necessary requirements for the voluntary return of state-in-exile refugees, but this should not be confused with the necessary requirements for peace in the country of origin. In other words, an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis should not focus on

---

22 Negative peace is peace defined as the absence of war, cf. chapter 8.
23 Reversing ethnic cleansing—thereby sending the message that it will not be accepted—could have the additional effect of discouraging potential ethnic cleansers in different locations from initiating conflict in the first place. However, this dimension of the thesis is not analyzed in the present study.
exclusively on the relationship between repatriation and peace, but on the somewhat broader relationship between ended displacement situations and peace.

Further, *ethnicity* and *partition* need to be considered. These and related concepts—such as heterogeneity and homogeneity, mixing and unmixing, and various forms of autonomy—are used both by proponents and opponents of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. Kaufmann is one of the few who explicate the causal connection between repatriation and peace—or, in his view, between repatriation and the risk of renewed conflict. In contrast, the policy community often stresses the need for power-sharing within pre-conflict borders as part of the overall vision of peace, to which repatriation also belongs. An example would be the Framework Agreement in Macedonia, 2001,\(^4\) negotiated under the intense auspices of the international community, and which states that “there are no territorial solutions to ethnic problems.”

As far as these opposing theories go, there is an assumed negative relationship of sorts between repatriation and partition; the pro-repatriation camp is anti-partition, and vice versa. However, any combination of the absence or presence of repatriation and partition is possible.

In conclusion, then, a preliminary analytical framework for studying the peace-by-repatriation thesis would inquire how *peace* after armed conflict is related to (1) the *repatriation* of displaced persons, (2) the *end of the displacement situation*, irrespective of how this is achieved, (3) the *ethnic structure* of the post-conflict society, and/or (4) the *partition* of the country. In the following chapters, I attempt to refine this theoretically derived framework with the help of two real-world post-conflict situations—Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh.

The previous chapter presented a preliminary framework based on previous research. This and the following chapters develop this framework further with the help of case studies of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh. The purpose of the case studies is not to conduct an empirical test of the thesis, but to gain better insights into how the relationship between repatriation and peace is understood in real-world cases.

This chapter begins by defining the purpose of the case studies, discussing what type of case study is most suitable to fulfill that purpose, and motivating the selection of cases. Next, the method of structured, focused comparison is described. The chapter concludes with an overview of how the field research was conducted.

Case Studies of Peace by Repatriation

Without an adequate understanding of the ways in which we apply concepts, appreciation of the reasons for our conceptual choices, and recognition of the strengths and weaknesses that our use of key concepts entail, we run the risk of conducting empirical studies that we cannot justify or that amount to nothing more than aimless fact-finding.

Milja Kurki25

3.1 The Purpose of the Case Studies
As Gerring (2007, 17) observes, “researchers have many things in mind when they talk about case study research.” He suggests that many of the terms used to describe case studies, such as qualitative, ethnographic, holistic, naturalistic research, process-tracing, and triangulation, are “better understood as describing certain kinds of case studies, not the topic at large” (Gerring 2007, 18).

Similar arguments have been made regarding comparative research. Moses and Knudsen state that “one of the most confusing aspects of the comparative method is the many names given to it,” such as different systems/similar systems, comparable case strategies, focused comparison, case-oriented comparisons, or the method of systematic comparative illustration (Moses & Knutsen 2007, 96). This is not surprising, since comparisons are used in all scientific methods, but it is makes the conception of comparative research ambiguous.

These variations are mentioned in order to illustrate that conducting case studies or comparative research—or, indeed, comparative case-study research—requires further precision than these general labels entail. I would argue that the starting point for achieving that precision should be the purpose of the study.

In this regard, Stake (1995) distinguishes between intrinsic and instrumental case studies. In the intrinsic study, the case is given. “We are interested in it, not because by studying it we learn about other cases or about some general problem, but because we need to learn about that particular case” (Stake 1995, 3). Conversely, in instrumental case studies, “we have a research question, a puzzlement, a need for general understanding, and feel that we may get insight into the question by studying a particular case,” and the first criterion for case selection is “to maximize what we can learn” (Stake 1995, 3–4). It is worth noting that selecting cases that maximize what we can learn means that case selection

25 Kurki (2008, 8–9).
for case study research does not chiefly aim at representativeness; “case study research is not sampling research” (Stake 1995, 4).

The case studies in the following chapters are instrumental, and the two cases are selected because they are believed to be particularly fruitful for a further refinement of the analytical framework. While chapter 2 traced the theoretical underpinnings of the peace-by-repatriation thesis in previous research, the case studies aim at a better understanding of how that thesis is perceived in relation to particular empirical situations rather than as a general assumption. To be clear, the purpose of the case studies is not to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis, or to explain a particular outcome; instead, it is to further develop and synthesize the peace-by-repatriation framework. Is the framework a useful tool for analyzing peace by repatriation? How can it be improved?

**Selecting the Cases**

Two cases of large-scale, conflict-induced displacement are analyzed in the following chapters, namely Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh. There are many similarities between the cases: both conflicts occurred in the first half of the 1990s, both played out in relation to the dissolution of multi-ethnic states—Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, respectively—both pitted ethnic groups against each other, and both resulted in massive ethnic cleansing in the form of deaths and displacement.

The most important difference between the cases—in the context of the present study—concerns the perceived importance of repatriation for the establishment of sustainable peace. In Bosnia, the international community has consistently emphasized repatriation as the only acceptable solution to displacement, explicitly arguing that repatriation is necessary for peace. In Armenia and Azerbaijan, the accepted view is that repatriation is impossible in the absence of a peace agreement, and the international community consequently argues that the best solution for displaced persons is local integration. In this way, Bosnia and Nagorno-Karabakh represent what Seawright and Gerring (2008) refer to as “diverse cases.”

A related difference between the cases is that there is a peace agreement in Bosnia-Herzegovina (the Dayton Peace Agreement, DPA, of 1995), but not in Nagorno-Karabakh. This is undoubtedly part of the explanation for the different views on how to resolve displacement in the two cases, but it is not the whole explanation. And, more to the point, it does not explain the different views on repatriation as a necessary condition for peace. As illustrated below, repatriation was the agreed solution to displacement from and within Bosnia-Herzegovina several years before the signing of the DPA, and in Armenia and Azerbaijan both official and unofficial peace efforts aim at resolving the political-territorial conflict with the issue of displacement playing a rather marginal role in negotiations.
The focus of the case studies is the perception of the relationship between repatriation and peace, and the analysis covers the period from the early 1990s until the time of writing (2010). Developments over time inform the overall analysis, but the idea is not to explain the most recent positions with the help of these developments.

3.2 The Structure and Focus of the Case Studies

Yin presents a twofold, technical definition of case studies (2009, 18):

A case study is an empirical inquiry that

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.

The case study inquiry

- copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result
- relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result
- benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis.

I believe the case studies of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh in the following chapters fit this definition well. Both cases are contemporary; the conflicts and the displacement situations are comparatively recent, and the implementation and negotiation of peace, respectively, are still on the international agenda. Also, refining the peace-by-repatriation framework—the purpose of the case studies— involves trying to clarify what factors are best seen as the causal (or, rather, permitting) conditions that make up the peace-by-repatriation thesis, and what factors constitute the context, or scope conditions, “the circumstances under which a pattern or relationship holds” (Ragin 2000, 61). In order to address several questions in the two cases I use data from previous research and other documents as well as interviews (see below). The case studies are guided by the analytical framework outlined in chapter 2.

More specifically, I employ the method of structured, focused comparison (George & Bennett 2004, 67–72). Outlining the method, George and Bennett stress the importance of identifying the universe of cases, of which the cases to be studied are instances—each case must be an instance of the same phenomenon, otherwise the comparative component of the analysis will be severely undermined. In the present study, the universe of cases consists of “armed conflicts that have caused substantial displacement,
and that have ended at one time or other, and may or may not have restarted.”

Further, the selection of cases from within the universe of cases should be made on the basis of the research objective and an appropriate strategy to achieve that objective. “Cases should not be chosen simply because they are ‘interesting’ or because ample data exist for studying them” (George & Bennett 2004, 69). In other words, to make the most of structured, focused comparison, case studies should be instrumental, not intrinsic; as argued, the present case studies meet that requirement.

George and Bennett (2004, 69) also stipulate that case studies should be conducted with the purpose of explaining, and to provide policy makers with leverage to influence outcomes. As observed above, the purpose of the case-study analysis in the present study is not to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis, or to explain a particular outcome. They are not, in themselves, concerned with explanation. However, the case studies are intended to contribute to a better understanding of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. Together with added insights from the fuzzy-set analysis in chapters 7–10, the study as a whole can increase awareness of how repatriation is linked to sustainable peace. This has at least the potential to enhance policymakers’ appreciation of what “effects” various policies in the area of conflict-induced displacement are likely to have in different circumstances.

According to George and Bennett, once these preliminaries are accomplished, the first step in conducting the actual structured, focused comparison involves devising a set of standardized, general questions, which are asked of each case covered by the analysis. The objective with this set of questions is to ensure that comparable data are collected from each case. This is what makes the method structured. Second, the analysis should not attempt to provide a comprehensive picture of all interesting aspects of an event. Instead, it should concentrate on those aspects that are relevant to the research objective at hand. This is what makes the method focused.

The problem addressed in the case studies is the same as in chapter 2, namely how the link between repatriation and peace is perceived. However, while chapter 2 answered that question with the help of previous research, the following chapters use two empirical cases. Three broad research questions asked in the case studies are:

---

26 The definition of this universe of cases is discussed in further detail in chapter 9 in relation to the selection of cases for the fuzzy-set analysis. There would have been no methodological problems with selecting cases for the case-study analysis from a different—broader or narrower—universe of cases than the one used for the fuzzy-set analysis. However, neither are there any methodological problems with using the same universe of cases.

27 George and Bennett go on to describe in further detail how to employ the method of structured, focused comparison in three stages: designing case-study research, carrying out the case studies, and drawing implications for theory (2004, 73–124). I will not repeat those instructions here, as they are rather closely related to the purpose of explanation, which, as already noted, is not the purpose of the case studies in the chapters that follow.
1. Is repatriation perceived by various actors as contributing to peace, and, if so, how?
2. How well does the analytical framework developed in chapter 2 capture the relationship between repatriation and peace as perceived in the two cases?
3. What other factors are important in the context of peace by repatriation in the two cases?

Data Collection
The case studies are based on primary and secondary written material, as well as interviews. In the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina there is an abundance of written material about displacement and return and their relationship to sustainable peace. Consequently, the case study of Bosnia-Herzegovina is heavily influenced by such material, particularly policy documents and various analyses, among them reports by the International Crisis Group (ICG).28

In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh there is considerably less written material, both primary and secondary, regarding displacement and return, and particularly regarding the relationship between repatriation and peace. Consequently, there was a comparatively greater need to supplement the written material with interviews in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh than in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The different availability of written material in the two cases mirrors the uneven attention paid to them by the international community. This imbalance is perhaps even more obvious in terms of the number of UN Security Council Resolutions adopted regarding the two conflicts. Since 1991, the Security Council has adopted more than eighty Chapter VII-resolutions dealing with the situation in the Former Yugoslavia (including Kosovo).29


Field research was carried out in the fall of 2008. I spent four weeks in Armenia and Azerbaijan, including Nagorno-Karabakh, during August and September, and two weeks in Bosnia-Herzegovina in October. Interviewees

28 The International Crisis Group (ICG) was established in 1995, largely as a reaction to the inability of the international community to respond effectively to the war in Bosnia. Fifteen years later the organization has become a leading and well-respected independent source of analysis of conflict and of international efforts to resolve conflict, and has produced hundreds of reports on dozens of conflicts worldwide. The return of displaced persons to and within Bosnia-Herzegovina has been a recurring feature of numerous reports. The ICG has also produced several reports on Nagorno-Karabakh, though far fewer than on Bosnia-Herzegovina, and with less focus on displacement.

29 In a 2004 study, Wallensteen and Johansson point out that more than 50 percent of all Chapter VII resolutions adopted from 1946 to 2002 concerned the post-Cold War conflicts in Iraq and Yugoslavia. “Whether this is a reasonable proportion of Council attention or not, it is testimony to the international significance of these two situations for the post-Cold War order” (Wallensteen & Johansson 2004, 19).
CASES

were selected from three types of actors. My first priority was to speak to representatives of the international community (IC), most importantly the UNHCR, but also other organizations. Second, I wanted to meet representatives of local civil society, first and foremost non-governmental organizations (NGOs) dealing explicitly with displaced persons. Third, I wanted comments from government representatives.

In distinguishing these three types of actors, I agree with Pouligny (2005, 501) that there is much more proximity between northern or international NGOs (which are often the same, as there are very few actual transnational NGOs) and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), than between the northern and southern NGOs.

Consequently, organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) or the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) would be considered part of the international community. The term NGO is reserved for local NGOs (including local branches of international umbrella organizations).

With a few exceptions, I succeeded in meeting the people I wanted to talk to. In the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the OHR turned down my requests for an interview, arguing that formal responsibility for the return process has been handed over to local authorities and that the OHR is no longer involved, and that the turnover of OHR staff means that there is no institutional memory regarding the return process. In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, I was informed that the representatives of the Minsk Group of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE, cf. chapter 5) are not authorized to discuss the peace negotiations with researchers. In addition, with reference to the Minsk Group being the forum for negotiations, the regular OSCE office in Baku declined to meet me.

A majority of the interviews were conducted in English, but in a few instances I had to rely on interpreters. With one exception, interpreters were provided by the interviewees. Most interviews were recorded and transcribed, but a few interviewees did not want to be recorded, and on a few occasions my recording turned out to be inaudible. In those cases I have relied on my interview notes. The duration of the interviews varied from 30 to 90 minutes.

The interviews were semi-structured: They combined “a sequence of themes to be covered, as well as some suggested questions” with an “openness to changes of sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up the specific answers given and the stories told by the subjects” (Kvale 2007, 51). I usually began by briefly introducing the subject I was interested in and then letting the interviewee develop his or her views on this, if possible initially without much input on my part. In this way, I hoped to avoid getting the answers the interviewee thought I wanted. As the interview
progressed I relied more and more on the set of standardized questions that I wanted to address, and tried to steer the conversation towards those questions that had not yet been covered. The interview guide is reproduced in Appendix 1.

Most interviewees agreed to being identified by both name and organization. However, there were exceptions, and since I believe it is enough for my purposes to identify which of the three types of actors an interviewee belongs to—the international community, a local NGO, or the government—I decided not to reveal the identity of any interviewee, nor the particular organization they represent (because in several cases this would de facto have revealed their identity).

The case studies are presented in chapters 4 (Bosnia-Herzegovina) and 5 (Nagorno-Karabakh). They focus on the link between repatriation and peace, but also discuss other solutions to displacement situations, as well as the issues of partition and ethnic relations. Chapter 6 compares and analyzes the cases, and concludes with a refined framework of peace by repatriation, which is then applied to a larger number of cases in the fuzzy-set analysis in chapters 7–10.
4 Bosnia-Herzegovina and the
Primacy of Minority Return

One of the mantras of the international engagement in BiH since Dayton has been that
the return of refugees and displaced persons to their pre-war homes is a necessary
precondition for the establishment of a sustainable (and self-sustaining) peace.

International Crisis Group

Nowhere has the argument about repatriation as a necessary condition for
peace been more explicitly and emphatically pronounced than in the case of
Bosnia-Herzegovina (Bosnia). Further, not only return to Bosnia but also return within Bosnia has been strongly emphasized by the international
community. The recreation of a multiethnic country has been a central
principle of the peacebuilding process, accompanied by numerous plans and
supported with large resources.

4.1 Introduction

While the underlying causes of World War I were abundant, the triggering
event was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in the Bosnian
capital, Sarajevo, in June, 1914. As a result of the war, the Austro-Hungarian
Empire crumbled, leaving Bosnia and some of its other Balkan domains free
to join formerly independent Serbia to form the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats
and Slovenes in 1918—in essence, the first Yugoslav state.31

The interwar years were characterized by pan-Yugoslav ambitions losing
ground to de facto centralization under Serb domination. During World War
II, Croat Ustaša fought with the Nazis against Serb Četniks, who, in turn,
later joined the Germans against the Communist Partisans. “Muslims” writes
Malcolm (2002, 192) “had fought on all sides—Ustaša, German, Četnik,
Partisan—and had been killed by all sides.”

The pan-Yugoslav, but above all Communist, Partisans emerged
victorious, and in 1943 proclaimed the second country called Yugoslavia—
more specifically (after a few name changes) the Socialist Federal Republic
of Yugoslavia (SFRY), consisting of six republics: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia,
Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia. This country survived for
almost fifty years, until June 1991, when Slovenia and Croatia declared their
independence. Macedonia followed suit in September, and Bosnia in April
1992. The last country to bear the name Yugoslavia was the Federal Republic

30 ICG (2002, 40). The Bosnian name of Bosnia-Herzegovina is Bosna i Hercegovina, and the abbreviation
BiH is often used in English as well.
31 In 1929, the Kingdom’s name was changed to Yugoslavia. Jug means "south" and slavija means "land of the
Slavs"; thus, Yugoslavia means the "land of the south Slavs." The name Bosnia means either "running water"
or "border"; Herzegovina refers to the "land of the Herzog" (duke in German).
of Yugoslavia (FRY) established in 1992 by the two remaining republics, Montenegro and Serbia. In 2003, it abolished the name Yugoslavia and became the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro, and in 2006 both Montenegro and Serbia declared independence, thereby definitively ending the Yugoslav era. Most recently, in 2008, the province of Kosovo, having been under international administration since 1999, seceded from Serbia, and soon received widespread recognition.
Conflict
While the case of Kosovo is beyond the scope of the present study, it provides a convenient bridge to a brief summation of the Bosnian war of 1992–1995, because Kosovo is often considered the place where the break-up of Yugoslavia started. It was there that Slobodan Milošević, in April 1987, exclaimed to a Serb crowd that “no one should dare to beat you” (Silber & Little 1996, 37). Two years later, as part of a Serbian “pounce for control of all of Yugoslavia” (Rogel 2003, 172), he managed to revoke the provincial autonomy that Kosovo (and Vojvodina) had received in 1974. The result was nationalist protest among Kosovo’s Albanian majority, and all over Yugoslavia ethnicity began gaining lost ground as a basis for organization and loyalty.

When Croatia and Slovenia declared their independence in June 1991, Belgrade responded with war. Slovenia secured its independence in a brief conflict with relatively few casualties. The Croatian conflict was decidedly more serious, but was, in turn, overshadowed by the war in Bosnia. The republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina had the most complex ethnic structure of the six republics with 44 percent Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks), 31 percent Serbs, and 17 percent Croats. That is, no ethnic group constituted a majority of the population. In each of the other five republics, the principal ethnic group represented at least 60 percent of the population.32

In February 1992, after the European Community (EC) had extended recognition to Croatia and Slovenia, a referendum on independence was arranged in Bosnia. Bosniaks and Croats came out overwhelmingly in favor of independence, and Bosnia-Herzegovina declared its independence in early March, and gained international recognition in April. However, the Bosnian Serbs, who had largely boycotted the referendum, were adamantly opposed to Bosnian independence, and ready to prevent it by force.

The ensuing war was fought primarily between the Bosniaks and the Bosnian Croats on the one side, and the Bosnian Serbs, backed by Belgrade, on the other. But nothing was holy. Already in 1991, Belgrade and Zagreb conspired to divide Bosnia between them; by 1992, similar talks were held between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Serbs. In 1993, the Croat-Bosniak alliance broke down and conflict intensified in central Bosnia between government forces and the self-proclaimed Croatian Republic of Herzeg-Bosna. One is reminded of Vladimir Gligorov’s dictum about the ethnic issue in the Balkans: “Why should we be a minority in your state, when you can be a minority in our state?” (cited in ICG 2004, 4). Whether or not there is any truth to such a statement, it should not lend credit to attempts to explain the Bosnian war with reference to stereotypical ancient hatreds among different

32 There were 62 percent Montenegrins in Montenegro, 66 percent Serbs in Serbia, 67 percent Macedonians in Macedonia, 78 percent Croats in Croatia, and 91 percent Slovenes in Slovenia.
ethnic groups. As Kaufman (2001, 166) concludes, “Yugoslavia’s ethnic conflicts were particularly intractable, but mostly because its leaders were determined to make them so.” As discussed below, several interviewees argued that ethnicity is still used by Bosnian leaders for political purposes, and that this severely undermines the return process, and, therefore, the peace process.

The international community was unprepared for and repulsed by the brutality of the war and the massive ethnic cleansing that took place in the form of mass murder and large-scale displacement. Civilians were directly targeted by the warring parties, whose aim was to create and control ethnically homogeneous territories.

The international community did not recognize the nature of the conflict. At a European Community Conference in Geneva in the summer of 1992, the British Minister of Overseas Development, Baroness Chalker, emphasized that “the world had a humanitarian, not a political, crisis on its hands, and it called for a humanitarian, not a political response” (Silber & Little 1996, 247). In a similar vein, Malcolm (2002, 242) describes how the Western governments only saw the symptoms of the war, but not its causes. As a result, the world used “humanitarian assistance as a substitute for protection” in Bosnia (Frelick 1997, 25).

The war ended with the Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA) in November 1995, one of the most ambitious peace agreements to date. The DPA divided Bosnia into two entities under the federal government level, the Bosniak-Croat Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Federation), which was itself further divided into ten cantons, and the Serb-dominated Republika Srpska.33 The DPA also confirmed the right of all displaced persons to return home.

**Displacement**

The war in Bosnia resulted in the largest displacement crisis in Europe since World War II. More than half of Bosnia’s 4.4 million pre-war population was uprooted by the war. More than nine hundred thousand fled the country, one-half ending up in other countries of the former Yugoslavia, the other half mainly in the rest of Europe. An additional 1.3 million became internally displaced (USCRI 1996, 6–7, 129).

As will be further developed below, it was decided very early that the displacement situation resulting from the war in Bosnia should be resolved through repatriation. This focus on repatriation had effects on the protection regime. At a 1992 emergency conference, the UNHCR called on governments to provide “temporary protection” to displaced persons from the former

---

33 I follow conventional practice and refer to the entities as Republika Srpska in Bosnian and to the Federation in English.
Yugoslavia (UNHCR 1992). The concept existed earlier. “It is in the context of former Yugoslavia, however, that the notion of temporary protection has been developed most systematically as a means of resolving refugee problems” (UNHCR 1995b, 85).

In 1996, in one of the most in-depth accounts of the collapse of the former Yugoslavia, Silber and Little (1996, 247) argued that “to assume that the refugees would be able to return after the fighting had ended was to miss the whole point of the war, which was being waged deliberately to ensure that they would never return.” Pape explicitly brings Kaufmann’s thesis to bear on the case of Bosnia when he argues that partition is in Bosnia’s future and no Western policy can avoid it. Rather than allow ethnic boundaries to be written in blood after SFOR [the NATO-led Stabilization Force] leaves, the West should help to manage a peaceful partition while it still has troops on the ground (Pape 1997, 27).

However, the international community began working for an end to temporary protection very soon after the end of the war (USCRI 1996, 134). Under pressure from host governments, the UNHCR drafted a very ambitious plan for return, initially aiming for most return to happen during 1996 (USCRI 1996, 134). In the end, it took several years before return became substantial, and another few years before minority return (see below) really took off.

While hundreds of thousands of Bosnians have returned from displacement since 1995, it is not yet possible to fully account for the demographic changes that resulted from the war, or to what extent they have been reversed. The most recent census was conducted in 1991, prior to the war. It is estimated that Bosnia’s present population is around 4.5 million, with Bosniaks constituting 48 percent, Serbs 37 percent, and Croats 14 percent (CIA 2010). However, it is difficult to find reliable information on the ethnic composition of the two entities—the Federation and Republika Srpska.34

A new census, the first since 1991, is being prepared for 2011, but is politically sensitive. According to the Bosnian constitution (Art. IX. 3),

Officials appointed to positions in the institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be generally representative of the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

---

34 However see Marko (2000). Using figures from the International Monitoring Group (IMG) on the basis of the 1991 census and UNHCR estimates for 1997, he compares the post-war ethnic structures of the entities with the demographics of the corresponding territories before the war. He finds that the share of Bosniaks and Croats in the territory of the Federation increased from 74 percent in 1991 to 95 percent by 1997, and that the share of Serbs decreased from 18 percent to 2 percent. In the territory of Republika Srpska, the share of Serbs increased from 54 percent in 1991 to 97 percent by 1997, while the number of Bosniaks and Croats decreased from 38 percent to 3 percent. Substantial return has taken place since 1997, but this has taken the form of both majority and minority return (cf. below) and it is not known to what extent these returns have affected the ethnic structure of the two entities.
This means that the (non-elected) staff of public institutions should broadly represent the ethnic structure of the state, entity, canton, or municipality they serve. Until now, such representation has been based on the 1991 census, first, because those have been the only available figures, but second, and equally important, in order to avoid legitimizing the demographic effects of ethnic cleansing. A new census would produce reliable up-to-date figures, effectively negating the first motive for relying on the 1991 census. Despite significant return, the new figures would largely reflect the effects of ethnic cleansing, and this has already led to disagreement about which census to use henceforth as the basis for representation in public institutions. To circumvent this problem, it has been suggested that the 2011 census disregard ethnicity and religion, as those should not be relevant for planning purposes anyway. At the time of writing much remains unclear about the 2011 census.

4.2 Implementing Peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Several peace proposals were presented during the conflict. Already in September 1991, as conflict broke out after Croatia’s and Slovenia’s declarations of independence from Yugoslavia, the international community initiated peace talks (Keesing’s September 1991, 38420). These talks, though chaired by then NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington, became known as the European Community Conference on Yugoslavia.

The first peace plan for Bosnia was presented in March 1992, the Carrington-Cutileiro Plan (or the Lisbon Agreement), but it did not prevent the conflict from escalating. In August 1992, several months after the war had spread to Bosnia, the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) was established at a meeting in London, building on the work done by the European Community Conference. Under the framework of the ICFY several additional peace plans were presented over the following years: the Vance-Owen Plan of January 1993, the Stoltenberg-Owen Plan (or the Invincible Package) of August 1993, the European Union Action Plan of December 1993 and the Contact Group Plan developed during 1994 (see Ramcharan 1997, 24–28, 249–341).

Finally, in November 1995, the so called proximity peace talks held at Wright-Patterson air force base in Dayton, Ohio (famously described by Holbrooke 1998), resulted in the General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP), more commonly known as the Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA), or simply the Dayton Agreement. The DPA was signed in Paris on December 14, and since then the international community has devoted much effort to support its implementation.

After agreement was reached in Dayton, but before it was signed in Paris, a conference aimed at mobilizing support for the peace process was arranged in London on December 8–9, 1995. One important result of the
conference was the establishment of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC), consisting of 55 countries and agencies that support the peacebuilding process in Bosnia in various ways. The PIC defines the goals of the peace implementation in Bosnia and still meets on a regular basis. The High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina is, strictly speaking, a representative of the PIC.

**The Right to Return**

The division of Bosnia into two entities is one defining feature of the DPA. The entities are a manifestation of the de facto division of the country which resulted from the war. Despite this, another defining feature of the agreement reflects the international community’s unwavering determination not to accept the consequences of ethnic cleansing. This is the right of all displaced persons to return to their pre-war homes. Annex 7 deals with the issue of return, and its first Article reads:

All refugees and displaced persons have the right freely to return to their homes of origin. They shall have the right to have restored to them property of which they were deprived in the course of hostilities since 1991 and to be compensated for any property that cannot be restored to them. The early return of refugees and displaced persons is an important objective of the settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Parties confirm that they will accept the return of such persons who have left their territory, including those who have been accorded temporary protection by third countries.

The return of displaced persons is arguably the most important element of the DPA. As expressed by the ICG (2000, 1):

The key to DPA implementation is refugee return, which is guaranteed in Annex 7 of DPA and the Bosnian Constitution. All other DPA annexes either depend on refugee return, or were created to assist in implementing refugee return.

The strong emphasis on return led Paddy Ashdown, High Representative 2002–2005, to proclaim that “we’ve invented a new human right here, the right to return after a war” (quoted in ICG 2002, 39). The perception of return as being a right of displaced persons is highly significant, for two reasons. First, in the particular context of the return process in Bosnia, several political agreements initially failed to produce any substantial return. Prettitore (2006, 201) argues that only when the international community encouraged a system for return and repossession grounded in the rule of law, and not subject to political agreements, did serious progress ensue. The DPA does provide individual rights, and the rule of law approach is the best to ensure they are enforced.
Insofar as the return process in Bosnia is a success, then, this can largely be attributed to the approach of treating return as a non-negotiable right, one not subject to political agreements, but strictly a question of the rule of law. In this way, it was possible to defuse demands by local politicians for “reciprocal return,” that is, the idea of people more or less switching places and moving into “each other’s” apartments. Theoretically, reciprocal return is perceived as a way to break the logjam and set in motion a chain reaction of return. In practice it meant that the entire return process became hostage to the weakest link in the chain and that nothing happened. In the words of the ICG (1999, 19), “the principle of reciprocity in negotiating returns ought to be unacceptable, since it implies that individual human rights are tradeable.” The rule-of-law approach was also important in the Property Law Implementation Plan (PLIP) discussed below. The basic idea is that the right to return should apply equally to every displaced person, irrespective of ethnicity, place of origin, or place of displacement.

The second reason why treating return as a right is highly significant becomes obvious when this principle is considered in a broader context than Bosnia. The clearest example of the opposite approach is the Palestinian refugee problem. Within the framework of the Oslo peace process, the question of refugees was one of the so-called “final status issues” that was to be negotiated during the five-year interim period (which formally ended in May 1999). During the past fifteen years, while return to Bosnia has been a non-negotiable right and a prerequisite for peace, the international community has largely limited its efforts to address the Palestinian refugee problem to calling for a just and comprehensive solution. For all practical purposes that solution is decidedly and exclusively subject to political agreement between the parties to the conflict.

**Minority Return**

During the first several years after the end of the war returning refugees tended to settle in areas where their own ethnic group was in the numerical majority, irrespective of whether they actually came from that area or not. This was not considered enough to secure sustainable peace in Bosnia. Instead, a central feature of the return process has been the need for “minority return,” that is, return to areas now demographically dominated by another ethnic group than one’s own.35

Minority return was a clear objective very early in the peace process. In November 1995, even before the official signing of the DPA, a pilot project

---

35 According to the Bosnian Constitution (=Annex 4 of the DPA), Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs are the “constituent peoples” of Bosnia-Herzegovina. In Bosnian law, the term “minorities” refers to people who are not constituent or state-forming peoples, and is unrelated to the demographic situation in any given area. Nevertheless, in the context of return to and within Bosnia, “minority return” is the accepted term used to signify return to an area where one’s own ethnic group is now in the numerical minority (cf. ICG 2002, 4).
was planned for central Bosnia involving Croat return to Bugojno and Travnik and Bosniak return to Jajce and Stolac (USCRI 1996, 130). By the end of 1997, these pilot returns were completed in Bugojno, Travnik and Jajce, but not Stolac, with just over sixty returning Bosniak families (ICG 1998c, 8; USCRI 1998, 166). Also, in the beginning of the return process, people who ran for office in their pre-war municipality were prioritized in the property repossession process in order to encourage minority populations to engage in politics (Interview 28 IC BiH)\(^{36}\).

Two years after Dayton around two hundred thousand refugees and two hundred twenty-three thousand IDPs had returned. Most of these were “easy” cases who returned home to majority areas. Most of the others originated from areas where they would now be in the minority if they returned (USCRI 1998, 163). During 1996 and 1997 some forty-five thousand minority returns took place, but they were offset by some eighty-thousand newly displaced minorities as displacement continued after the end of open warfare. This mainly involved ethnic Serbs leaving Sarajevo suburbs as these were transferred to Federation control in 1996 (USCRI 1998, 164; cf. USCRI 1997, 174).

The year 1998 was declared the year of minority returns (ICG 1998b, i), but it took until 2000 before minority returns became substantial. More than sixty-five thousand minority returns (refugees and IDPs together) took place during 2000, a 64 percent increase from 1999 (USCRI 2001, 207). In 2001, there were more than ninety thousand minority returns, seventeen thousand refugees and seventy-five thousand IDPs. This was more than 90 percent of all returns—refugee as well as IDP returns—during 2001 (USCRI 2002, 197–198).

The need to achieve minority return is discussed in some detail in the ICG report *Minority Return or Mass Relocation* (ICG 1998b). As indicated by the title, the report emphasizes the difference between minority return, that is, return to pre-war homes that happen to be situated in an area where one’s own ethnic group is in the minority and relocation to another area within Bosnia. Relocation refers to refugees returning to parts of the country other than their places of origin as well as IDPs finding solutions through local integration in majority areas.

A common problem in the first few years after the end of the war was the return of refugees from abroad to other parts of Bosnia than where they originally came from—that is, relocation. A 1997 report by the Commission for Real Property Claims of Displaced Persons and Refugees (CRPC) and the UNHCR argued that such refugee return “contributed significantly to the

\(^{36}\) I refer to interviews by their number in the list on pp 208–209, specifying (i) whether the interviewee is a representative of the international community (IC), of a local NGO, or of the government, and (2) in which country or area the interview was conducted (the latter being relevant for the case study on Nagorno-Karabakh).
displaced persons problem within Bosnia” in 1997 (quoted in ICG 1998b, 8). The UNHCR accepted relocation as a durable solution, but underlined that it had to be voluntary (which under the prevailing circumstances at the time would have been difficult to ascertain). Bell (2000, 256; cf. Prettitore 2006, 198) argues that the “early enforced return by host states of refugees to parts of the country which are safe, even though original home areas are not, in effect consolidates the ethnic carve-up of BiH rather than reversing it.” The ICG notes that the main proponents of relocation were Croat and Serb hardliners, who preferred the ethnic divisions created by the war (ICG 1998b, 9). Overall, the strong emphasis on ethnic remixing through minority return shows how skeptical the international community was at the time to relocation, seeing it as increasing the risk of cementing the consequences of ethnic cleansing.

Parenthetically, in light of these sentiments, which were clearly expressed by the international community in the late 1990s and later, the Scandinavian position regarding return to Kosovo (mentioned in chapter 1) is all the more surprising. On the one hand, the Scandinavian governments argue that they want to send minority populations back to Kosovo in order to reverse ethnic cleansing. On the other hand, they argue that if return to actual pre-war homes is not possible, the “internal flight alternative”—that is, relocation—should be tried. In terms of the need to reverse ethnic cleansing, therefore, the two arguments are plainly contradictory (and possibly motivated by other concerns).

A similar stand was taken by other countries regarding Bosnia:

Germany actively promoted repatriation for minorities originating in Republika Srpska who would not be able to return to their places of origin. An estimated 90,000 of the 1998 repatriates from Germany were minorities originating in Republika Srpska who relocated to areas of the Federation (USCRI 1999, 178–179).

Even today (or in 2008, when I conducted the field research), a Bosnian Government Ministry pointed out that simply returning is not enough, we have to make sure that return does not turn into local integration, that is, into de facto relocation (Interview 25 Gov’t BiH).

During the late 1990s the international community employed a number of different strategies to promote minority return in Bosnia (ICG 1998b, 15–34). For a few years, the Open Cities Initiative was the backbone of UNHCR policy on minority returns (ICG 1998b, ii). It was launched in March 1997 (USCRI 1998, 167), and it was premised on linking increased international assistance to local communities showing a “genuine commitment” to minority return. Seven open cities were recognized during 1997: Bihać, Busovača, Goražde, Kakanj, Konjic, Vogošća, and Mrkonjić Grad (USCRI 1998, 167). By the end of 1999 there were fifteen open cities (USCRI 2000, 221). The initiative was not very successful, mostly because there was not
enough monitoring of the Open Cities (Prettitore 2006, 186). The initiative was also undermined by poor coordination among the international community. Many donors had their own funding priorities, which meant that municipalities that were declared Open Cities did not necessarily receive the extra funding promised. Additionally, “some European countries preferred to allocate funding to areas that were the pre-war homes of refugees they were currently hosting” (Prettitore 2006, 186). The top priority of several host governments was obviously to assist or encourage people to leave the host country, but what happened to them or to the country of origin once they returned was often of secondary importance as best.

During spring of 1998, following the 1997 PIC meeting in Bonn, a number of cantonal and municipal return plans were drafted and new mechanisms put in place to promote minority return. The Central Bosnia Cantonal return plan of November 1997 served as a model in this process. It outlined three phases of return: first to unoccupied homes, second to occupied private homes, and third to occupied socially-owned housing (ICG 1998b, 21–24). However, donor response was slow, and some municipalities soon used the plans to oppose returns outside their particular frameworks.

In order to support a grass-roots movement for return, in October 1996 the OHR initiated the Coalition of Return, which soon developed into an umbrella organization for more than one hundred refugee and IDP associations. A central figure in the Coalition was Mile Marčeta, a Bosnian Serb displaced from Drvar and head of the association of displaced persons from Western Bosanska Krajina. Among other things, as described by the ICG (1998a), he was instrumental in the return of displaced Bosnian Serbs to Drvar, Bosansko Grahovo and Glamoč. When I conducted my field research in Bosnia ten years later, international community representatives still referred to Mr. Marčeta as an example of the important role displaced persons themselves can play in the return process (Interview 30 IC BiH). However, while their role may be important in specific instances, such instances were too few and too limited to have a significant impact on the overall process.

In 1998, hopes were high that the Sarajevo Declaration and the Banja Luka Regional Return Conference would be important starting points for minority return. Sarajevo, being the capital of Bosnia and of the Federation, and Banja Luka, being the capital of Republika Srpska, should serve as models for the rest of the country, making early minority return particularly important there. In the end not much came out of either project. Commenting on these initiatives, Prettitore argues that

it became apparent that political agreements on their own would not lead to considerable returns. Such agreements made the ability to return subject to political whims and objectives. Not only was this an inefficient way to support returns, but it
was also contrary to the guarantee of individual rights of refugees and displaced persons enshrined in the DPA and the B&H Constitution (Prettitore 2006, 187).

Finally, internationally regulated and monitored return was most relevant to the case of Brčko, a town and surrounding district in northeastern Bosnia. The dispute over Brčko was not settled by the DPA. Instead, the parties agreed to refer the issue to binding arbitration (DPA, Annex 2, Art. 5). In the final award, delivered in March 1999, the Arbitral Tribunal decided on the establishment of a self-governing “neutral” district to be part of both entities, the Federation and Republika Srpska, but under the sovereignty of the state, meaning that neither entity would exercise any authority in the new district (for more on the Brčko arbitration, see ICG 2003; Schreuer 1998a; 1998b; 1999). The imperative of the return of displaced persons—described in the Final Award as “the most important of all of Dayton’s objectives”—is a central and recurring explanation for this decision (see Arbitral Tribunal for Dispute Over Inter-Entity Boundary in Brčko Area 1999).

The success of these strategies varied (as did their aims), but none of them had a major effect on the overall return to and within Bosnia. However, a strategy that did have an impact was one that addressed the related problem of property.

**Property Repossession**

By the end of the war there were considerably fewer empty houses than displaced persons (Interview 25 Gov’t BiH). In part this was because many houses had been destroyed, but also because attempts to create ethnically homogeneous areas had been largely successful. A lot of the internal displacement that took place was in the form of exchange migration; Bosniaks displaced from a Serb to a Bosniak area took over the houses of the Serbs displaced from the Bosniak area, et cetera. However, as noted above, the idea of reversing exchange migration according to the principle of reciprocal return was not acceptable to the international community—and it was also not very efficient. But something had to be done, and the approach chosen was to treat property repossession, like the issue of return, as a matter of the rule of law to be implemented as an individual right. In addition, the physical reconstruction of houses required a massive effort. According to the International Monitoring Group (IMG), during the period 1996–1999 housing represented the largest single category of international expenditure, several times larger than, for example, education, landmine clearance, peace implementation activities or government institution building (Black 2001, 183–184).

For several years after Dayton the various Bosnian property laws—one on the state level and two on the entity level—were major impediments to minority return. Laws on the use of abandoned property were employed by
the wartime regimes trying to make the separation of the populations irreversible. However, sustained efforts by the international community to make return and property restitution part of entity law changed that, thus making return possible (OHR 2000, 2; cf. Leckie 2007). The Federation adopted new property legislation in April 1998, and Republika Srpska followed suit in December. Over the next several years the High Representative introduced additional amendments to these laws (Prettitore 2006, 189–190).

A milestone of these efforts was the Property Law Implementation Plan (PLIP, referred to here as OHR 2000), launched in October 2000 by the lead organizations in property and return issues, OHR, UNHCR, OSCE, UNMIBH, and CRPC. The working approach of the PLIP was standardization—that the same pressures, demands and expectations should apply to all officials and municipalities in Bosnia (OHR 2000). Until 2000, the focus of return efforts had been on selected return locations or certain modalities of return. This had been necessary at the time, to initiate the return process. Conversely, the PLIP was premised on neutral application of the law. This had two concrete benefits: de-politicization of the property issue, and institutionalization of the property return process.

The objective of the PLIP is to ensure that all outstanding claims by refugees and displaced persons to repossess their properties are resolved. It aims to do this by building domestic legal processes which apply the laws neutrally, processing property claims as efficiently as possible until all claimants are able to exercise their rights under Annex 7. By treating repossession of property as a question of rule of law, the PLIP promotes respect for civil rights over political interests and opens enormous possibilities for the overall return of DPs and refugees (OHR 2000).

The document confidently states that “the full and complete resolution of property claims will prove to be the cornerstone of a sustainable and lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” (OHR 2000)

The introduction of the PLIP was followed by a marked increase in minority returns already during 2000, with 67,445 minority returns (refugees and IDPs) that year—a 64 percent increase from 1999 (USCRI 2001, 207). During the years 1996–1999, there was an average of 31,000 minority returns; in 2000–2003 the average increased to 26,000 (Ambroso 2006, 3).

In 2003 the Bosnian (state-level) Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees (MHRR) took over responsibility for implementation of Annex 7. By the end of 2006 the OSCE, along with UNHCR and OHR, declared that property law implementation had been accomplished throughout Bosnia (OSCE Undated). The PLIP had been completed in 129 municipalities across the country, and nearly 95 percent of over two hundred thousand claims for property repossession had been successfully resolved. Some interviewees
echoed the common criticism that many displaced persons reclaimed their property only to rent or sell it instead of actually returning, and that property repossession statistics and return statistics are two quite different things (Interviews 27 NGO BiH, 30 IC BiH). If so, successful property law implementation would not necessarily reflect a successful return process. However, a 2006 survey carried out by the Nadel Institute in Sarajevo showed that “only 5% of returnees have actually sold their houses and 10% are considering doing so in the future” (see Ambroso 2006, 4). This illustrates the overall success of the PLIP process also as a means of furthering the return of displaced persons.

International organizations agree that while the overall return process is not completed, what clearly have been successful are the property repossessions (Interview 30 IC BiH). This promotes peace because it addresses grievances—people get back what they lost (Interview 30 IC BiH). Similarly, Prettitore (2006, 199) argues that

regardless of whether refugees or displaced persons actually did return in the end, an extremely important factor in the post-conflict reconciliation in B&H is that they had the right to choose whether or not to return and repossess property.

Even if many reclaimed their property only in order to sell it, rather than actually returning, they usually used that money to settle somewhere else. Thus irrespective of whether they actually returned or not, those who got their property back are generally no longer displaced, no longer IDPs (Interview 30 IC BiH). It is also worth noting that rural properties were more often destroyed, while urban properties were more often occupied. This means that people were often able to repossess their urban properties (and possibly sell them at a good price), but that rural ones no longer existed and could not be reclaimed (Interview 30 IC BiH). On the one hand, it is positive that for those who reclaimed their property and sold, this process probably provided them with a durable solution. On the other hand, in these cases the solution has not contributed to minority return, which was one of the main motivations for the PLIP.

Despite significant successes, there are more than one hundred fifteen thousand IDPs still in Bosnia (UNHCR 2010, Europe section, 22). As late as November 2009, the United Nations Security Council, in resolution 1895 (2009) on the situation in Bosnia, reiterated that “a comprehensive and coordinated return of refugees and displaced persons throughout the region continues to be crucial to lasting peace.”

**A Revised Strategy for Annex 7 Implementation**

Substantial return is completed in Bosnia (Interview 30 IC BiH). Security incidents occur, but lack of security is no longer the main reason why people
do not return. Instead, the decision to return or not depends on access to employment, education, health services, and other such factors (Interviews 28 IC BiH, 30 IC BiH). For example, there is better health care in Sarajevo than in Zenica or Foča. Therefore, many displaced persons in Sarajevo do not want to give up their status as “displaced person” and the social benefits linked to it. Thus they do not deregister, even if they actually return (Interview 28 IC BiH). Also, many are reluctant to return if it means their children will have to go to school in a “minority area.” Some do return, but leave their children behind in a majority area or send their children to school in a majority area even if this means they must go by bus a long way every day (Interview 30 IC BiH). There is also a lot of peer pressure among displaced persons and returnees in this regard (Interview 30 IC BiH).

In light of this, discussions about declaring Annex 7 concluded have been going on for several years. Already in 2002 the ICG warned against “the urge to redefine the continuing challenge out of existence” (ICG 2002, 40). According to interviewees, there have always been two attitudes to return: the Republika Srpska wants everybody to stay where they are, while the Federation would prefer that everybody returns (Interview 28 IC BiH). This is reflected in views on the idea of closing Annex 7. The Serb side will say that Annex 7 is already closed, and the Bosniak side will say that it will never close (Interview 30 IC BiH).

Discussing the possibility of closing Annex 7, one international community representative emphasizes that

the rights that are set out in Annex 7 exist independently of Annex 7. So the right to return and, theoretically, the right to compensation, those rights exist regardless of Annex 7. And people... Even if somebody, say the High Representative, came out and said, Annex 7 is now officially implemented and closed, that doesn’t mean people don’t still have the rights that exist within Annex 7, meaning the right to return, and to be facilitated in that (Interview 30 IC BiH).

Another international community representative argued that there is a need to define a limit to at least some of the rights associated with Annex 7, namely those related to the status of “displaced person.” The time has come for people to decide whether they are going to return or not. Those who decide to return need to do so, and those who decide not to return should no longer be considered potential returnees (Interview 29 IC BiH).

At this time it is not clear whether there is ever going to be an official declaration regarding the completion of Annex 7 (Interview 30 IC BiH). Such a declaration was made regarding the property repossession process, but that was a process involving a smaller—and very specific—number of claims, which could be clearly determined as settled or not. The sustainable return of displaced persons (or compensation or other durable solutions) is not as easy to measure.
A representative of a local NGO explains that Bosnian organizations working with displaced persons do not want to close Annex 7. Apart from the process not being completed, an important reason for this position is that international assistance for the work that remains to be done would most likely decrease if there was an official declaration that the job was already done (Interview 26 NGO BiH).

Presently, a revised strategy for Annex 7 implementation is in the process of being adopted. The revised strategy, while still emphasizing return,

recognises the need to compensate people for lost property (instead of a sole focus on restitution) and to assist the most vulnerable who cannot or do not want to return, thereby providing de facto support to local integration (IDMC 2008).

UNHCR (2009, 2) describes the new strategy as follows:

A reinvigorated approach to the durable solutions is thus now required on behalf of competent authorities, supported by the international community, primarily in the following areas:

1. Continuing to support the right to voluntary return, but with increased emphasis on creating conditions for sustainable return and reintegration (primarily in terms of access to rights and economic sustainability);
2. Promoting and supporting durable solutions in the place of displacement for extremely vulnerable IDPs who are not in a position to return.

The UNHCR expressly advocates “that solutions in the place of displacement be made available, as an urgent priority for extremely vulnerable IDPs” (UNHCR 2009, 3). In the same document, the UNHCR repeatedly calls for “pragmatic durable solutions” for vulnerable IDPs who are still not able to return after more than fifteen years in displacement.

The revised strategy will place less emphasis on return (Interview 25 Gov’t BiH), but at the same time it will not explicitly change its focus to another durable solution (Interviews 28 IC BiH, 30 IC BiH). Rather, according to the new strategy local integration will be accepted as a durable solution for the most vulnerable (Interview 30 IC BiH). Also, the question of compensation for destroyed property is getting attention for the first time in many years (Interview 30 IC BiH).

The revised strategy addresses issues such as health, education, the closure of collective centers—actually the whole social protection system. Unfortunately, while all this is badly needed, the political will to actually implement it is lacking (Interview 28 IC BiH). Others agree. According to one representative of an international organization, when it comes to addressing the social protection systems in general, it is largely just wishful thinking (Interview 30 IC BiH).
Several interviewees described the revised strategy as involving a shift of focus (or perhaps, part of a shift of focus), from finding solutions for displaced persons in particular to addressing the needs of the Bosnian population at large, including displaced persons. Improvements in education, health, and social security are badly needed and would benefit displaced persons and returnees as well as the rest of the population.

Before, it was return, return, return, reconstruction, return, reconstruction, return. Now after all these years, people have come to the conclusion that you can’t resolve everything that way, that you need to give the people the freedom to choose (Interview 28 IC BiH).

The revised strategy does not impose a deadline for the implementation of Annex 7. The strategy is supposed to cover four years, but, as pointed out by a representative of an international organization, the important thing is not to have a deadline. The timing of implementation can always be adjusted. What is important is the content of the strategy (Interview 28 IC BiH).

The revised strategy has been adopted by the Council of Ministers and the lower house of the Parliamentary Assembly, but its adoption by the upper house has been blocked. On several occasions the PIC Steering Board has expressed its dissatisfaction with the failure of the upper house to adopt the revised strategy and reiterated the importance of doing so (see UNHCR 2009, 4).

4.3 Peace by Repatriation in Bosnia-Herzegovina

The general perception of the relationship between peace and repatriation in the case of Bosnia is that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace. The focus on return has been strong throughout the process, to the extent that support for alternative solutions actually provided for in the DPA has not materialized. As cited above, according to Annex 7 of the DPA, all refugees and displaced persons “shall have the right to have restored to them property of which they were deprived in the course of hostilities since 1991 and to be compensated for any property that cannot be restored to them.” Article 14 of Annex 7 provides for the establishment of a Refugees and Displaced Persons Fund, to be used in cases of compensation, but as Prettitore (2006, 196–197) notes, the right of claimants to express a preference for compensation has been used only for statistical purposes. No compensation has ever been paid; the Fund was not even established.

There are also those who do not want to return, for example many Serbs who left Sarajevo in the immediate aftermath of Dayton, which has implications for the reintegration of Sarajevo (Interview 30 IC BiH). Displaced persons who do not want to return are organized and work, among other things, for the right to compensation (Interview 26 NGO BiH). So far this has been very difficult to achieve.
In terms of how repatriation contributes to peacebuilding in Bosnia, the most important aspect has been to undo as far as possible the effects of the war. More specifically, the goal has been to reverse ethnic cleansing, both in terms of assisting and encouraging displaced persons to return to their places of origin, and in terms of strongly promoting their right to reclaim property lost during the conflict.

An exception to this picture is the Return of Qualified Nationals (RQN) program37 led by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Under this program, “skilled medical, academic and technical experts in sectors relevant to the reconstruction of the country” (IOM Undated) received assistance for return to Bosnia. By mid-2000, more than eight hundred qualified nationals and one thousand eight hundred dependants had returned under the program. This represents a quarter of a percent of the total returns, but it has generally been perceived as positive (USCRI 2000, 219; cf. however Black 2001, 187–188).

Any discussion of how return to and within Bosnia contributes to peace must take into consideration the fact that Bosnia constitutes “an extreme instance of the politicization of displacement” (Weiss & Pasic 1998, 208). This means that any decision to return or not to return has political implications, even when the displaced person making the decision has no political motives. On the one hand, according to one NGO representative, Bosnians have not returned in order to express their support for the post-conflict political order. They have returned when they feel safe enough to return, because they have a house, employment et cetera (Interview 26 NGO BiH). On the other hand, displaced persons are being used for political purposes. One international community representative describes how displaced persons from Srebrenica were convinced in 2007 to set up a protest camp in Sarajevo and demand that the district of Srebrenica be transferred to the Federation. This was promoted not because it is in the interest of the displaced persons, but because it is what some politicians want. In this particular instance, “there’s a political interest on the Bosniak side to keep those people as displaced people” (Interview 30 IC BiH).

These problems not only stem from the Bosniak side, and not only from politicians. There is also a problem of peer pressure among people who have not yet returned, particularly in Republika Srpska. When people have been displaced to and remain in an area where they are in the majority, they are often pressured to stay there in order to help retaining that majority (Interview 26 NGO BiH). At the same time there are examples of unfortunate pressure on vulnerable people to return, not least on female heads of

---

37 It is an exception in the sense that it had another primary rationale than reversing ethnic cleansing; it was obviously not based on acceptance of ethnic cleansing.
household who, like everybody else, are expected to return to their places of origin when objective conditions for safe and dignified return are satisfied, despite the risk of additional trauma, such as the likelihood of meeting perpetrators of rape and torture (Dzumhur 2010).

Overall, the central argument for return has been the need to reverse ethnic cleansing and to protect the right of return, which, as noted, was not among the explanations presented by the UNHCR in 1997 (cf. p 13). However, there is possibly more to this argument than what is found in the numerous policy documents on return to Bosnia. Several interviewees argued in various ways that the return of displaced persons and the remixing of ethnic groups is important for peace because it contributes to confidence building and reconciliation. One NGO representative argues that multi-ethnicity is stabilizing. For example, the recreation of a multiethnic Sarajevo is the most important argument for return (to Sarajevo)—sharing a city makes people learn from each other and respect each other (Interview 27 NGO BiH). Similarly, according to an international community representative, as people return neighbors begin to help neighbors, people begin to feel safer, and eventually it becomes irrelevant whether you are part of the majority or not (Interviews 28 IC BiH).

In this context, it is interesting to recall Kaufmann’s theory. He argues that ethnic conflict makes it more difficult for different ethnic groups to live together irrespective of whether relations were good or bad prior to the conflict. Therefore, in order to avoid repeating the security dilemma logic, different ethnic groups need to be kept apart. One international community representative argued that while this may be true in some parts of Bosnia it cannot be generalized to the whole country (Interview 30 IC BiH). Similarly, another international community representative commented:

Yes, but now they are kept apart. [. . .] You have various areas that are predominantly Bosniak, predominantly Croat, predominantly Serb, but people are still afraid of each other! (Interview 28 IC BiH)

Keeping ethnic groups apart after ethnic conflict is possibly a way to avoid repeating the security dilemma, but it also preserves the fear and suspicion that the various ethnic groups have developed towards each other, fears that are in turn nurtured and exploited by nationalist politicians. A politician in a predominantly Bosniak area can gain support from continually reminding people about what the Serbs did during the war, and what they would do again if they had the chance (Interview 28 IC BiH). Return of displaced persons and ethnic remixing is the most reasonable way to overcome this, because
if you let people to live as they used to live before, you know, the fear will disappear. You know, because you live together, you build relationships, you start after certain time to trust each other. And then the politicians..., this whole rhetoric would be defeated (Interview 28 IC BiH).

The final corollary of this line of reasoning is that the idea of temporary protection makes good sense—although it was supposed to be accompanied by open borders, which was not always the case (UNHCR 1995b, 89). Displaced persons will look for durable solutions. If return is out of the question for the foreseeable future, alternative durable solutions will be chosen if available. The implication is that if durable solutions had been available in various host countries in the mid 1990s many refugees would probably have opted for such solutions. As a result, fewer displaced persons would have been interested in returning once return became a real possibility around the year 2000. This would have contributed to cementing the separation of the ethnic groups in Bosnia, and made mutual suspicion and fear all the more difficult to overcome. According to this line of reasoning, the insistence that alternative solutions were temporary, in anticipation of the day when return would be possible, probably meant that many more displaced persons returned than would otherwise have been the case.
Nagorno-Karabakh and the Search for Pragmatic Solutions

Although 2004 marked the 10th anniversary of the cease-fire agreement still holding today, prospects in the future to achieve a peaceful solution to the conflict are considered slight. Against this background, local integration remains the best and most realistic durable solution available to refugees from Azerbaijan.

UNHCR

The war in Nagorno-Karabakh in the early 1990s resulted in large-scale displacement both within and across the borders of Armenia and Azerbaijan. In fact, Azerbaijan has the largest per capita IDP population in the world, with nearly 10 percent of its entire population being internally displaced. In terms of durable solutions to displacement, the international community argues that because peace is a necessary condition for return, and because there is no peace, local integration is the most realistic solution to displacement.

5.1 Introduction

Nagorno-Karabakh, the mountainous black garden of the South Caucasus, is an old issue of contention between Armenia and Azerbaijan, though not as ancient as is sometimes believed. After a brief interlude of independence following the fall of the Russian Empire, the three countries of the South Caucasus (or Transcaucasus, as viewed from Russia)—Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia—were conquered by the Red Army during 1920 and 1921, and became part of the Soviet Union (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, USSR) at its establishment in 1922.

Already at this time there was disagreement about where certain Caucasian regions should belong, most importantly Nakhchivan and Karabakh. After a few years of contradictory messages and decisions from Moscow both regions became part of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR). Nakhchivan was made an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR), the second highest status after the Union Republics, the SSRs, and Nagorno-Karabakh became an Autonomous Region—the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO)—with lower status than the ASSRs.

Armenian SSR and the Armenian majority population of Nagorno-Karabakh never accepted the incorporation of Karabakh into Azerbaijan.

---

38 UNHCR (2006).
39 Karabakh means “black garden” and Nagorno means “mountainous.” With reference to the introduction to this study, it might be noted that there is a Nansen Street in Yerevan (in honor of his devotion to the plight of the Armenian people) and a Nobel Avenue in Baku (named after Alfred’s brothers, who were instrumental in developing the Caspian oil industry at the turn of the nineteenth century).
SSR, but the dispute remained largely dormant during most of the Soviet era. However, as the political climate became more open toward the end of the 1980s, tensions grew, and in 1988 they escalated into violence.

Most of the Soviet republics declared independence in the fall of 1991. In September, in response to Azerbaijan’s declaration of independence August 30, authorities in the NKAO and Shaumian proclaimed the independence of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic (NKR). In December a referendum was held, and 99 percent of those who voted supported independence. The Karabakh Azerbaijanis boycotted the referendum (Cornell 1999, 27). Independence was re-declared in January 1992. No state, including Armenia, has recognized the independence of the NKR.

Conflict
Following a week of mass demonstrations in Yerevan, on February 20, 1988, the Regional Soviet of the NKAO appealed to the Supreme Soviets of Armenian SSR, Azerbaijan SSR and the USSR to be transferred to Armenian SSR (de Waal 2003, 10). This appeal was followed by a series of decisions,

40 The conflict is usually considered as having begun in February 1988. However, de Waal (2003, 18–19) relates how low scale violence and displacement occurred already in the fall of 1987, a prelude to what was about to unfold, “as if both sides were picking up a high-frequency radio signal.” See also Kaufman (2001).
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votes, and statements by the political bodies mentioned. The NKAO and Armenian SSR spoke in favor of unification with Armenia, and Azerbaijan SSR and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR rejected it. For a more detailed description of these developments, see Cornell (1999, 13–30). Only a week after the original appeal by the Regional Soviet of the NKAO that it be allowed to join with Armenia, there were riots in Sumgait, an industrial town just north of Baku on the Abseron peninsula. More than thirty people were killed, including twenty-six Armenians and six Azerbaijanis.

In early 1989 Soviet troops were deployed to Nagorno-Karabakh, and the region was placed under the direct rule of Moscow. From 1988 through 1991 the main protagonists were the central Soviet Authorities and the Armenian SSR. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in late December 1991 the primary parties became instead the Republic of Azerbaijan and the self-declared NKR, backed by Armenia.

The war ended with a ceasefire, the Bishkek protocol, brokered by Russia and signed on May 5, 1994. The ceasefire line is referred to as “the line of contact.” By the end of the war and until today, Nagorno-Karabakh is de facto connected to Armenia, but remains de jure part of Azerbaijan.

The territorial consequences of the war have been succinctly summarized by the ICG (2005a, 1–2) (cf. map p 58). The NKAO covered 4,388 sq. km (5 percent of the territory of Azerbaijan). Since 1994 the de facto NKR controls 4,061 sq. km (92 percent) of the former NKAO, or Nagorno-Karabakh proper. In addition, the NKR occupies more than 7,400 sq. km outside Nagorno-Karabakh proper, including the entire districts of Kelbajar, Lachin, Kubatly, Jebrail and Zangelan, as well as parts of Agdam and Fizuli. In total, the NKR, supported by Armenia, occupies 11,722 sq. km, or 13 percent, of Azerbaijan’s territory. Below, the term “district” will be used to refer to individual districts, and the term “occupied territories” will be used when all seven are considered.

In addition, the NKR claims another 1,000 sq. km of territory still under Azerbaijani control (or, according to the NKR, under Azerbaijani “occupation”). This includes 327 sq. km of the districts of Martuni and Mardakert, both of which were part of the NKAO, plus 701 sq. km outside the NKAO, namely the district of Shaumian, which also declared independence from Azerbaijan in 1991, but remains under Azerbaijani control.

**Displacement**

The conflict resulted in large-scale displacement, both within and between the two countries. During the first phase of the conflict, between Armenia and the Soviet Union, some two hundred thousand ethnic Azerbaijanis left Armenian SSR mainly for Azerbaijan SSR, and at least three hundred thousand ethnic Armenians left Azerbaijan SSR primarily for Armenian SSR and Russian SSR. Strictly speaking, with the USSR still in place at this time,
these people were internally displaced. However, since the dissolution of the USSR in 1991 they have been considered refugees. 41

By the end of the conflict there were some two hundred ninety thousand Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan residing in Armenia (including eighteen thousand from Nagorno-Karabakh), and another hundred thousand in Russia. There were also seventy thousand Armenian IDPs. In Azerbaijan there were around one hundred eighty-five thousand Azerbaijani refugees from Armenia, and six hundred seventy thousand IDPs (USCRI 1995; 1996). 42 The vast majority of the Azerbaijani IDPs originated in the occupied territories; some 10 percent came from Nagorno-Karabakh proper (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 12 NGO Azerbaijan).

Because the de facto authorities in Stepanakert, the capital of Nagorno-Karabakh, considers the NKR to be an independent state, ethnic Armenians displaced to Nagorno-Karabakh from other areas of Azerbaijan are considered refugees, and only those displaced within the territory claimed by the NKR are seen as IDPs. The international community, however, does not recognize the NKR, and considers all those displaced within the borders of Azerbaijan—including Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories, and irrespective of ethnicity—as IDPs. The number of Armenian IDPs in Azerbaijan—that is, ethnic Armenians displaced within the borders of Azerbaijan, and de facto residing in Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories—is estimated at between fifty and sixty thousand. These are more or less equally divided between what the de facto authorities refer to as refugees and IDPs (Interview 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh).

One result of the displacement is that Armenia and Azerbaijan, as well as Nagorno-Karabakh, have all become more homogeneous than they were before the conflict. According to the last Soviet census, conducted in 1989, Armenia had a total population of just under 3.3 million, which was 93 percent Armenian, and Azerbaijan’s 6.8 million population was 85 percent Azerbaijani (Library of Congress 2009). By contrast, in the early twenty-first century, Armenia is 98 percent Armenian, and Azerbaijan is 91 percent Azerbaijani (ICG 2005a, 2). In the pre-war NKAO, 77 percent of the one hundred eighty-eight thousand population was Armenian, and in the post-war de facto NKR, the one hundred twenty-five thousand population is 99 percent Armenian (Rowland 2008, 104, 108). One NGO representative in

41 Displacement statistics for Armenia and Azerbaijan in the 1990s also contain large groups of displaced persons not related to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, and not considered in the present analysis. Most importantly, Azerbaijan is the host of some fifty thousand Meskhetian Turks (deported from Georgia to Central Asia in the 1940s) who fled ethnic violence in the Fergana Valley region of Uzbekistan in 1988. There were also some ten thousand Chechens, who arrived after the conflict in Chechnya resumed in 1999. In Armenia, several hundred thousand people remained displaced after an earthquake in December 1988.

42 Fifteen years on, the number of IDPs in Azerbaijan varies, and numbers from the same source do not always add up. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre sets the number at 573,000–603,000 (IDMC Undated).
Nagorno-Karabakh could think of no more than five mixed (Armenian-Azerbaijani) couples in Stepanakert at this time (Interview 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh).

The population of Nagorno-Karabakh is markedly smaller today than twenty years ago. In the area of the former NKAO, the population has decreased by 35 percent from around one hundred ninety thousand to one hundred twenty-five thousand, and in the total area of the NKR, the population has decreased by 60 percent, from three hundred forty thousand to one hundred thirty-five thousand (Rowland 2008, 104). These numbers show that the occupied territories are very sparsely populated (cf. ICG 2005b, 25).

Azerbaijanis who left Armenia were primarily rural, as were most of the IDPs, with the exception of people from Agdam (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan). Today, most of them live in Baku, Sumgait, or other cities. Armenians who left Azerbaijan, however, were largely urban and many used to work in the oil industry. Today they live in rural areas in Armenia (Interviews 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 16 Gov’t Armenia). One NGO representative, a displaced person from Baku, guided me around Shusha, and as we passed a small puddle of oil outside the entrance to his garden he inhaled and said that the smell made him nostalgic.

Most people displaced by the conflict have been unable to return home. The exception is the Armenian IDPs and some of the Karabakh Armenians. The ICG explains that some Azerbaijani IDPs returned in the late 1990s (ICG 2005b, 26), but according to a well-positioned interviewee in Azerbaijan there has been no return to Nagorno-Karabakh since the cease-fire. During the conflict control of certain territories went back and forth, and people went with it; some refer to that as return. Further, in the last couple of years, many Azerbaijani IDPs have moved to new settlements near the occupied territories (cf. below), but this does not mean that they have returned home (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan).

5.2 Negotiating Peace in Nagorno-Karabakh

The OSCE Minsk Process

Since 1992, peace negotiations between Armenia and Azerbaijan have been conducted under the auspices of the OSCE.43 The original plan to arrange a peace conference in Minsk, the Belarusian capital, has not yet materialized but lives on in the “Minsk Group,” which has responsibility for the negotiation process. Since 1997 the Minsk Group has been co-chaired by France, Russia and the USA. Also since 1997, Ambassador Andrzej Kasprzyk

---

43 Until 1995 called the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, CSCE.
has been the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office on the Conflict Dealt with by the OSCE Minsk Conference.

The de facto authorities in the NKR are not party to the negotiations, only Armenia and Azerbaijan are. However, relations between Armenia and the NKR are very intimate. For example, the first de facto president of the NKR, Robert Kocharyan, 1994–1997, went on to become prime minister of Armenia in 1997 and then president from 1998 to 2008. The current president of Armenia, Serzh Sargsyan (who also served as prime minister for a short period), served as chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh “Self-Defense Forces Committee” during most of the war. Both of them were born in Stepanakert. According to Cornell (1999, 27) “Karabakh can be said to control Armenia to a much higher extent than the opposite.”

Armenia and Azerbaijan have been members of the OSCE since 1992. Both pledge their support for the organization’s ten fundamental “principles guiding relations between participating states,” but each has its own favorite principle. Armenia emphasizes the equal rights and self-determination of peoples outlined in principle VIII, while Azerbaijan hails the territorial integrity of states guaranteed by principle IV. This was also noted by some of the interviewees (Interviews 7 IC Azerbaijan, 18 IC Armenia).

Progress has been slow, though from 2004 negotiations have been more intensive within the framework of the Prague Process (still within the Minsk framework), involving direct meetings between the Armenian and Azerbaijani presidents and foreign ministers. For example, Armenian President Kocharyan and Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev met three times during 2006. Still, no agreement was reached.

Parallel to these negotiations both governments present hard-line positions for public consumption at home. An important consequence of this is that there is very little public support for a peace agreement. In addition, those who try to work for reconciliation and coexistence are often considered traitors and risk harassment. The need to prepare the populations for necessary compromises, and the complete failure to do so up to today, was noted by several interviewees (Interviews 7 IC Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 17 NGO Armenia, 18 IC Armenia); see also Dehdashti (1997, 478), ICG (2005a, 24), and Kaldor (2007, 165) for similar points.

44 The international community has not come out clearly in favor of either principle (which are obviously relevant beyond the OSCE). An illustrative example of this vacillation is the European Neighborhood Policy Action Plans for Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia (which has its own breakaway regions, most importantly Abkhazia and South Ossetia). These plans were all adopted in November 2006, but they emphasize different principles. The EU/Azerbaijan and the EU/Georgia Action Plans both stress respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, and neither contains the term self-determination. Conversely, the EU/Armenia Action Plan makes no mention of territorial integrity, but instead maintains that the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict should be resolved “on the basis of international norms and principles, including the principle of self-determination of peoples” (Johansson 2009b, 126).
In the summer of 2006 the co-chairs of the Minsk Group presented a number of basic principles for a settlement of the conflict: withdrawal of Armenian forces from and demilitarization of the occupied territories, deployment of international peacekeepers, demining, reconstruction, resettlement of IDPs, and some interim status for Nagorno-Karabakh, with final status to be determined in a popular referendum (OSCE 2006; cf. de Waal 2009, 3; ICG 2007, i). The plan thus revealed was not a big surprise (see e.g., ICG 2005b, 18–29; Lynch 2004, 116–119), but the decision to make it official was highly significant in light of the hard-line positions presented by both governments at home. Going public with what was on the agenda was intended to prevent the two governments from misleading their publics about what they were discussing.

Armenia has long favored a package approach to avoid making any commitments until satisfied with the question of the final status of Nagorno-Karabakh, while Azerbaijan has preferred a more gradual approach. The Prague process has been described as an attempt to combine agreement on a package with step-by-step implementation of it (ICG 2005b, 11). For example, on the particular issue of the future status of Nagorno-Karabakh, the aim of the negotiations has shifted from reaching agreement on status to reaching agreement on how to determine status.

The future status of Nagorno-Karabakh is the most contentious issue for both sides. Both Armenians and Azerbaijanis are adamant that ultimate sovereignty over Nagorno-Karabakh must rest with them. Some form of far-reaching autonomy for Nagorno-Karabakh within Azerbaijan is a likely arrangement, though presently not acceptable to the Armenian side. Several Azerbaijani interviewees referred to President Aliyev’s proclaimed readiness to offer “the highest degree of autonomy that exists in the world” (cf. ICG 2005b, 13) to Nagorno-Karabakh. Tatarstan and the Åland islands45 were mentioned as models (Interviews 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 11 NGO Azerbaijan).

Various options for permanent status have been discussed over the years, such as some confederal arrangement between Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh (see e.g., ICG 2005b). There have been talks (at least by observers) about a land swap, possibly involving the creation of a land link between Nakhchivan and Azerbaijan proper. However, as noted, the present strategy seems to be to postpone the status issue and eventually settle it through an internationally sanctioned referendum. Many obstacles remain to be overcome if a referendum is to be successful, or even possible. Interviewees did not place a lot of hope in that solution. Importantly, the Constitution of Azerbaijan requires a nation-wide referendum for any

45 Tatarstan is an autonomous republic within the Russian Federation. The Åland islands are an autonomous, Swedish-speaking region of Finland.
change in the borders of the country. This precludes any regional referendum limited to Nagorno-Karabakh. Additionally, the Constitution can only be amended by way of a nation-wide referendum.

In the unlikely case that the Azerbaijani constitution is indeed amended to make a regional referendum possible, the outcome will depend on who is eligible to vote as well as on what territory the referendum would actually concern. According to one Azerbaijani NGO representative there was a clear 65 percent Armenian majority in the former NKAO before the conflict, but in the territory now controlled by the NKR (that is, the NKAO plus the occupied territories) there were 70–80 percent Azerbaijanis before the war (Interview 11 NGO Azerbaijan). While the accuracy of these figures may be questioned (cf. above), it is clear that the pre-war Armenian population in the area was concentrated to Nagorno-Karabakh proper, and was markedly smaller in the surrounding districts.

It is not known how far negotiations have progressed on such issues as eligibility to vote and what geographic area the referendum would actually concern, but the issues are clearly problematic (cf. Johansson 2009b). Most Karabakh Armenians are against a referendum. They note that there have already been two referenda on the issue, both confirming the independence of the NKR, and argue that there is no need for a third one (Interviews 21 de facto Gov’t Nagorno-Karabakh, 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh).

The security aspects of a solution are clearer. The general consensus seems to be an Armenian withdrawal from five to six-and-a-half of the occupied districts, with some special arrangements for Lachin, which provides the land corridor between Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, and probably for Kelbajar, which is also situated between NKAO and Armenia. One option is to handle Lachin and Kelbajar in the same way that Brčko was handled in Bosnia-Herzegovina (cf. chapter 4), that is, through international arbitration (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan).

In Azerbaijan the distinction between the former NKAO and the occupied territories is very clear. Both local actors and the international community in Azerbaijan basically take it for granted that the occupied territories will be returned to Azerbaijani control in any resolution of the conflict. They maintain that the real conflict is about Nagorno-Karabakh proper (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan, 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan). Conversely, the distinction is not very relevant to Armenians—and it is becoming less so (Interview 18 IC Armenia). In Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh I saw several maps—including in the offices of international organizations in Yerevan—that did not distinguish between different parts of the NKR. A representative of the de facto NKR authorities argued that while compromise will be needed to reach a solution to the conflict, the NKR cannot make compromises about territories that are either strategically important or “that were historically ours” (Interview 21 de facto Gov’t Nagorno-Karabakh).
Deployment of a peacekeeping force has also been on the agenda during the entire Minsk process. Dehdashti (2000, 263–268) describes a number of plans presented in the mid 1990s, proposals for stationing from several hundred up to five thousand peacekeepers and military observers in the occupied territories. de Waal (2009, 3) describes plans to deploy up to ten thousand peacekeepers, primarily in the Kelbajar region. So far, however, the ceasefire has been basically self-regulated, merely overseen by Ambassador Kasprzyk’s field assistants. They regularly visit the line of contact, but are required to announce their intention to do so in advance. Incidents do occur, and in 2005 the UCDP coded the conflict as active at minor level. A few years later, the UCDP noted that according to some accounts clashes in the spring of 2008 were the most serious since the 1994 ceasefire (UCDP 2009a).

The Minsk process is one of the most closed and confidential peace processes in the world. Very few people are involved, and there is no spokesperson or press secretary of the Minsk Group co-chairs (de Waal 2009, 3). The elite character of the Minsk Group negotiations is one of the problems of the peace processes, because any peace initiatives must be approved by either Baku or Yerevan, and everybody is extremely suspicious (Interview 7 IC Azerbaijan).

At the same time, there seems to be a consensus that reaching a solution to the conflict is the responsibility of the governments. NGO activists in both countries explained that civil society organizations do important work on humanitarian issues and reconciliation initiatives, but that it is up to the governments and the presidents to resolve the political conflict (Interviews 6 NGO Azerbaijan, 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 12 NGO Azerbaijan, 20 NGO Armenia). Even a high level ministry official in Yerevan, when asked about the repercussions of the conflict in Georgia on the Minsk Group and Russia’s role in the negotiations, declined to comment on the issue, because “our department does not deal with problems of peace. [ . . . ] Only the minister of the exterior is authorized to deal with these issues” (Interview 16 Gov’t Armenia). While several interviewees regretted the closed character of the Minsk process, some noted that the problem is not whether the Minsk Group is open or closed, public or confidential—the problem is that they do not produce any results (Interviews 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 11 NGO Azerbaijan).

Leaving conflict resolution to the governments, civil society concentrates on the task of preparing their respective populations for compromise, reconciliation, and once again living together in peace. The governments make no efforts whatever in that regard, rather the opposite. Since there are no official relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, there can be no official initiatives for reconciliation (Interview 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan). NGOs working with these issues are often ridiculed or even accused of treason (Interviews 6 NGO Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 15 NGO Armenia, 17 NGO Armenia).
Nevertheless, a few organizations are able to engage Karabakh Armenians in dialogue (Interviews 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 20 NGO Armenia, 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh). However, as the head of an Armenian NGO points out, the international community, which wants dialogue, does not fund projects in Nagorno-Karabakh, and the Armenian diaspora, which funds projects in Nagorno-Karabakh, is not interested in promoting dialogue (Interview 17 NGO Armenia).

In light of this, it is hard to see that NGO communication will make any real difference (Interviews 8 IC Azerbaijan, 17 NGO Armenia).

A few interviewees noted, in the context of a possible future referendum, that the Azerbaijani government claims it wants to convince Karabakh Armenians that they are better off as part of Azerbaijan than as independent, particularly in economic terms. However, interviewees also noted that it is difficult to present a convincing argument to someone you refuse to talk to (Interviews 12 NGO Azerbaijan, 14 NGO Azerbaijan). Azerbaijan also considers Karabakh Armenians as Azerbaijani citizens. For example, they were encouraged to participate in the 2005 elections in Azerbaijan, though for obvious reasons there were no polling stations in Karabakh (Interview 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan).

The Regional Context
During my visit to the Caucasus in August and September 2008, the South Ossetia conflict was high on the agenda. A ceasefire agreement was reached only a week before I arrived in Baku, and Russian withdrawal continued for another several weeks. A number of interviewees argued that the Minsk formula would have to be reconsidered after the conflict, which had demonstrated how strong Russia’s strategic interests in the South Caucasus are (Interviews 6 NGO Azerbaijan, 7 IC Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 14 NGO Azerbaijan, 15 NGO Armenia, 17 NGO Armenia, 18 IC Armenia). On the other hand, the difference between Russia’s role as party to the conflict in South Ossetia and intermediary in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict was also noted (Interview 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan).

Some interpreted the South Ossetia conflict as a Russian message to all three South Caucasian republics not to get too friendly with the West, or alternatively as a message particularly directed at Azerbaijan that Russia would react strongly to any Azerbaijani attempt to retake Nagorno-Karabakh by force (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 6 NGO Azerbaijan). Several interviewees contended that the three South Caucasian republics need to agree on a common path, east or west, Russia or NATO, and that regional integration is the key to long-term peace and development (Interviews 6 NGO Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan, 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan, 15 NGO Armenia).
One interviewee explained that after Russia entered South Ossetia many Armenians greeted Russians in Nagorno-Karabakh and thanked them (Interview 23 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh). Another expressed his hopes that Russian recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia would “strengthen the precedent of Kosovo” (Interview 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh). However, the decision by the de facto authorities of the NKR to recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia will not make it easier to use Georgia as a neutral venue for NGO meetings (Interview 17 NGO Armenia). As far as recognition is concerned, one Karabaghian NGO representative hoped that the de facto NKR government’s strategy was to be recognized by both sides, not only by Armenia. In fact, he said, “I want to believe that the first country that recognizes us is Azerbaijan” (Interview 24 NGO Nagorno-Karabakh).

Conversely, Armenian recognition of Nagorno-Karabakh is the one thing that could lead to renewed conflict, according to one interviewee. It would simply be too much for the Azerbaijani government (Interview 12 NGO Azerbaijan).

Some interviewees argued that it is largely up to Russia to decide when the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict can be settled (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 6 NGO Azerbaijan), while others believed that if Armenia and Azerbaijan were to reach a peace agreement, outside powers could not prevent it (Interviews 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan, 14 NGO Azerbaijan). An Armenian NGO representative noted that Russia has tried to handle the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict on its own from the beginning, side-tracking the Minsk Group (Interview 15 NGO Armenia). The Bishkek protocol (that is, the 1994 ceasefire agreement) was mentioned as an example of that.

In recent years there have been warnings that Azerbaijan might attempt to re-establish control over Nagorno-Karabakh by force. This perceived threat is largely a result of Baku’s being emboldened by its oil wealth (ICG 2005b). Having been the world’s second largest producer of oil in the early 1900s, Azerbaijan saw its oil production decline toward the end of the century. However, since 1998 it is once again advancing (Kaldor 2007, 167)—and fast. Increasing production in combination with rising oil prices made Azerbaijan the fastest growing economy in the world in 2006, with GDP up 34.5 percent (ICG 2007, 8). Substantial amounts of money have gone into military spending, which increased by 51 percent from 2004 to 2005, and again by 82 percent in 2006. In 2007, President Aliyev pledged to make the Azerbaijani military budget as large as Armenia’s entire state budget (ICG 2007, 12).

Some argue that as the oil revenues begin to decline—as they will by 2012 according to most forecasts—the Azerbaijani authorities might want to divert attention from declining wealth by pursuing renewed efforts at retaking Nagorno-Karabakh (ICG 2007, 8). However, interviewees did not believe that the threat is real, with several arguing that any resort to force is
bound to fail miserably and that the Azerbaijani government is fully aware of this (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 7 IC Azerbaijan, 12 NGO Azerbaijan) In addition, if oil revenues are bound to start declining sooner or later, a new war would be instantly devastating to them (Interview 14 NGO Azerbaijan). Azerbaijani IDPs are generally more positive to the military option than the rest of the population. The ICG cites a survey showing that 13 percent of all Azerbaijanis favored a military solution; the corresponding figure for IDPs was 84 percent (ICG 2005a, 28). According to one Azerbaijani NGO representative, most IDPs favor a peaceful solution to the conflict, but as time passes there is increasing support for the military option (Interview 10 NGO Azerbaijan).

Oil and gas from the Caspian Sea are central to political developments in the region. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, which takes Azerbaijani oil to the Mediterranean through Georgia and Turkey, painstakingly avoids both Russian and Armenian territory and competes with pipelines through Russia. Suggesting that Russia is the key to resolving the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, one interviewee suspected that Russian inaction regarding the conflict is a way of punishing Azerbaijan for the BTC pipeline (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan).

Addressing Displacement
As described above, Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan and Azerbaijani refugees from Armenia are not expected to return when the conflict is resolved (Interviews 7 IC Azerbaijan, 15 NGO Armenia, 16 Gov’t Armenia, 21 de facto Gov’t Nagorno-Karabakh). The solution to their displacement is overwhelmingly local integration. According to an Armenian government representative, of the three durable solutions to displacement return is impossible and third country resettlement is improbable. Therefore, local integration is the only reasonable solution for the Armenian refugees (Interview 16 Gov’t Armenia). The final stage of local integration is citizenship, and some eighty-five thousand Armenian refugees have already received citizenship. Another two hundred fifty to three hundred thousand still have refugee status (Interview 16 Gov’t Armenia). Local integration is also believed to be in line with the wishes of the refugees—both Armenian and Azerbaijani. While many are hoping for some kind of compensation for lost property, very few would be interested in actually returning (Interviews 7 IC Azerbaijan, 15 NGO Armenia, 17 NGO Armenia).

However, the promotion of local integration as a durable solution is not entirely uncontroversial. One NGO representative argues that, on the one hand, the UNHCR puts pressure on Armenia to provide citizenship for refugees from Azerbaijan, while promising to continue to assist those in need of assistance. On the other hand, when new citizens are no longer considered displaced, the UNHCR decreases its budget for Armenia (Interview 20 NGO...
Armenia). Further, out of seventy thousand Armenian IDPs from the districts close to the border with Azerbaijan, around sixty thousand have been able to return or settle elsewhere. Between eight thousand and ten thousand are still in need of durable solutions (IDMC 2010, 53).

The category of displaced persons for which repatriation remains an issue, therefore, is the Azerbaijani IDPs, numbering more than half a million, and they are most often seen as firmly committed to return (ICG 2005a, 16). This picture was partly confirmed by several interviewees. As far as first generation IDPs are concerned, return is decidedly perceived as the only possible durable solution. Second generation IDPs do not necessarily consider themselves Karabaghians but would nevertheless want to establish ties with their ancestral homes, to be able to visit the areas, and to bring their children there during holidays (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 11 NGO Azerbaijan, 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan). One interviewee pointed out that many IDPs compare their poor living conditions in displacement with their normal and good living conditions before displacement and argue that they want to return as soon as possible to get away from the poor living conditions of displacement (Interview 10 NGO Azerbaijan). The fact that the situation in the places of origin are not the same as before the conflict is easily overlooked.

There is no alternative, no alternative to returning to Nagorno-Karabakh, because the conditions here are bad, but conditions were okay in Karabakh. IDPs are now living in dormitories, in awful conditions; they don’t see any alternative to returning (Interview 10 NGO Azerbaijan).

Similar sentiments have been expressed in relation to other conflicts, for example among Georgian IDPs from Abkhazia (cf. Kabachnik, Regulska & Mitchneck 2010).

The international community has been unequivocal about protecting the right of return of Azerbaijani IDPs (ICG 2007, 5) as well as the other groups of displaced Armenians and Azerbaijanis. However, return has to happen within the framework of a broader political process, not least because there is an enormous need for reconstruction in the occupied territories (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 7 IC Azerbaijan).

The displacement situation is clearly not only a humanitarian issue. It is part of the highly political demographic dimension of the conflict. An example of this dimension is Azerbaijan’s 2004 complaint to the UN General Assembly about non-Azerbaijani citizens moving from Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories in order to change the demographic composition of the area (ICG 2005a). An OSCE Fact Finding Mission (FFM) was subsequently deployed for the purpose of establishing whether such migration was the result of a deliberate policy on the part of Armenia. The FFM concluded that this was not the case.
When it comes to the return of displaced persons, most plans presented during the peace process are weak on IDP return to Nagorno-Karabakh (ICG 2005b, 24–25). Regarding return, however, there is, again, an important difference between the occupied territories and Nagorno-Karabakh proper. As Lynch (2004, 118, 129) observes, while the great majority of Azerbaijani IDPs could return to their former homes in the occupied territories as soon as these were returned to Azerbaijani control, return of IDPs to their former homes inside Nagorno-Karabakh “would not be immediate, nor would it be pressed by the international community in order to avoid the security dilemmas that may arise from the mingling of the two populations.”

Several interviewees agreed, emphasizing the fundamental distinction between the former NKAO and the occupied territories also regarding the prospects for return (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 8 IC Azerbaijan, 12 NGO Azerbaijan). As noted, the share of Azerbaijani IDPs from NKAO is believed to be around 10 percent, meaning that the vast majority of IDPs would be able to return if the occupied territories, or even just five districts, were returned to Azerbaijani control (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan). Not everyone believes that the Azerbaijani IDPs can return to Nagorno-Karabakh, however, because the Karabakh Armenians do not trust them. “[The Karabakh Armenians] argue that they were lucky to survive the first time, but that they may not be so lucky the second time” (Interview 17 NGO Armenia).

Another aspect of the politicization of demography is the claim that Azerbaijan has a non-integration policy for IDPs, supposedly to demonstrate that the conflict is unresolved and that displacement is temporary (see e.g. ICG 2007, 16). Throughout the 1990s the Azerbaijani authorities concentrated on resettling refugees from Armenia. The IDPs, on the other hand, have always been expected to return, which means that any arrangements to care for them during displacement are by their very nature temporary. Summarizing these sentiments, one international community representative in Baku observed that “the IDPs are the physical indicator of Azerbaijan’s claim to Nagorno-Karabakh” (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan).

Since the early 2000s, partly as a result of increasing oil revenues, the IDPs have received better care, but the notion of temporality remains central (ICG 2005a, 16). The same international community interviewee explains that

while the government finally wants to give the IDPs better living conditions it is not ready to accept local integration as a de facto durable solution. The conception is that accepting local integration as a durable solution for the IDP is equivalent to giving up Azerbaijan’s claims to Nagorno-Karabakh. In practice, however, local integration is taking place on a large scale—we just can’t refer to it as a durable solution (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan).
Despite the Azerbaijani unwillingness to accept local integration as a durable solution, most interviewees (Azerbaijanis as well as international community representatives) did not subscribe to the notion that the government is deliberately trying to keep the IDP population isolated from the general population as a reminder to the world of its claims to Nagorno-Karabakh (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 7 IC Azerbaijan, 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 11 NGO Azerbaijan). On the contrary, the international community is generally positive to how the Azerbaijani government handles the displacement situation (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan). Interviewees emphasized that there is no discrimination of IDPs; in some respects they are actually favored. For example, IDPs cannot be evicted from their housing (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 9 NGO Azerbaijan). Some, however, expressed doubt that the government actually wants the IDPs to return; “if they did, we would already be back” (Interview 11 NGO Azerbaijan).

Since 2004 the Azerbaijani government is pursuing a “Framework Plan on the Return of Displaced Persons” (or Great Return Plan) in cooperation with several international organizations (ICG 2005a, 16–17). It contains three points: (1) to institutionalize a common view of what constitutes voluntary repatriation, (2) to agree on necessary conditions for voluntary repatriation, and (3) to define the government’s sectoral responsibilities. The third point has thus far been the least successful (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan). Part of this plan is the construction of new settlements\(^{46}\) for IDPs near the occupied territories, to which around ninety thousand IDPs had moved by early 2008 (NRC 2008, 4).

5.3 Peace by Repatriation in Nagorno-Karabakh
While the return of displaced persons is not a high priority issue in the various proposals—official and unofficial—produced by the Minsk Group over the years, it is nevertheless included. However, what cannot be found in the proposals is a perception of return as being important for peace. In contrast to the Bosnian case, where peace cannot be achieved without return, in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, security and stability must come first—peace is a necessary condition for return.

There are different views on the relationship between repatriation and peace in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh. Refugees are not expected to return at all for a long time, whether a political solution to the conflict is found or not. This includes Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan as well as Azerbaijani refugees from Armenia. As noted, the de facto authorities (as well as the inhabitants) of the NKR also consider Armenians who fled to the NKR from other parts of Azerbaijan as refugees; they are also not likely to return. The group of displaced persons for whom return is an issue is the Azerbaijani

\(^{46}\) Such as the one depicted on the cover of this study.
IDPs, and as far as they are concerned the general consensus seems to be that they may be able to return once a political settlement of the conflict has been reached. With reference to Adelman’s positions, their eventual return will be a sign that peace is in place.

An Armenian government representative argued that peace and return are certainly linked, but emphasized that the order must be peace first and return second (Interview 16 Gov’t Armenia). Others agree, and outline the sequence of a settlement as first a political agreement that resolves the conflict, then withdrawal of all military forces, then return. Because displacement was a result of war, return will be the result of peace (Interview 11 NGO Azerbaijan).

Different actors draw different conclusions from this, and would complete the following sentence in different ways:

- Azerbaijani: Return of Azerbaijani IDPs to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories will be a sign that peace is in place, and that is why we need a political solution to the conflict soon, so return—the only conceivable durable solution to displacement—can begin.
- Armenians: Return of Azerbaijani IDPs to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories will be a sign that peace is in place, because only with peace in place can we possibly accept the return of Azerbaijani.
- International community: Return of Azerbaijani IDPs to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories will be a sign that peace is in place, but because peace is not in place we must look to other durable solutions to displacement.

Not surprisingly, then, the return of Azerbaijani IDPs to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories is not expected to make an important contribution to peace. Peace will make return possible, and return will help resolving the problem of displacement, but return is not perceived as something that will make peace any more likely or sustainable. In terms of how return would contribute to peace, a few interviewees admitted that returnees would contribute to the physical reconstruction of the war-torn areas and to the development of the post-conflict economy. These comments came only after I had suggested how return and returnees can contribute to peace (Interviews 10 NGO Azerbaijan, 11 NGO Azerbaijan). Alternatively, returnees can contribute to validating the post-conflict political order, in this case not primarily through the act of returning, but by participating in an eventual referendum, should it become possible to arrange one (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 7 IC Azerbaijan).

Regarding pre-war inter-ethnic relations, there was limited interaction between Armenians and Azerbaijanis before the conflict (Interview 3 IC
Azerbaijan). One international community representative with previous working experience from the Balkans compared relations between Armenians and Azerbaijanis to those between Serbs and Albanians. These latter groups displayed stronger feelings of hatred towards each other than any of the other ethnic groups in the former Yugoslavia (Interview 1 IC Azerbaijan, cf. Interview 29 IC BiH). Such lack of positive pre-war relations means that there is less confidence to rebuild once the conflict is over. Thus, even if the conflict is not the result of age old hatreds, the enmity created during the conflict cannot easily be overcome with reference to the good relations that existed before the conflict. For some, this means that young people are more skeptical to reconciliation than older generations who have still memories of coexistence (Interview 22 de facto Gov’t Nagorno-Karabakh). Others believe that it would be easier for young people to reconcile since they do not remember the conflict as vividly as their parents (Interview 3 IC Azerbaijan).47

An interesting experience was a meeting I arranged at the State Committee for Refugees and IDPs.48 I had asked for the opportunity to conduct an interview about the problem of displacement in Azerbaijan and how the resolution of that problem would be related to the resolution of the political conflict regarding Nagorno-Karabakh. What I got was a history lesson, the main point of which was that the Armenians are latecomers to the South Caucasus and therefore have less right to be there (Interview 5 Gov’t Azerbaijan).49 While it is not surprising to find such sentiments among people in conflict areas, it is disheartening that a high level representative of the State Committee for Refugees and IDPs—in a meeting with a researcher interested in the issue of displacement—chooses to engage in political demagoguery rather than take the opportunity to discuss the situation of displaced persons in Azerbaijan.

Still, the issue of territorial control turned out to be critically important not only to this particular government representative, but—somewhat surprising to me—also to civil society activists. As described briefly above, there are NGOs that work for dialogue and cooperation, arrange workshops about conflict resolution, and visit each other in Armenia and Azerbaijan. Often these activities have a regional development perspective and include Georgian NGOs and use Georgia as a neutral venue. Some of my

47 My personal impression is that the former view is more probable. Older generations may have both good and bad memories, but young people have little else than stereotypes and nationalist rhetoric.
48 Also known as the Department for Problems of Refugees, IDPs, Migration and Affairs with International Organizations.
49 Incidentally, the view that who was here first has the better right, which was the basis for this entire speech, stands in sharp contrast to the argument that “even an unambiguous answer to the question of who first entered the now disputed territory could not seriously affect its legal status,” which was the basis for the Azerbaijani motion to the UN regarding Armenian attempts to change the demographic composition of the territories, referred to above (UN 2004).
interviewees told me about friends on the other side and expressed sincere appreciation and respect for them. They favored return of displaced persons and coexistence among Armenians and Azerbaijanis, and they were more than willing to offer far-reaching autonomy to the other group. Despite all this, their view was that ultimate sovereignty over Nagorno-Karabakh must rest with “us,” this is absolutely critical.

One Azerbaijani NGO representative expressed what appears to be a common opinion in Azerbaijan when she explained that Azerbaijani IDPs do not have a problem with even the highest possible level of autonomy for Nagorno-Karabakh. They would still be ready to return and live in peace with the Armenians. But autonomy means autonomy and not independence. It is absolutely essential that Nagorno-Karabakh remain Azerbaijani territory in any solution (Interview 10 NGO Azerbaijan). Azerbaijan is ready to offer the Karabakh Armenians their own money, president, whatever, but Nagorno-Karabakh is Azerbaijani territory. It belongs to Azerbaijan (Interview 6 NGO Azerbaijan). An Armenian and an Azerbaijani NGO representative among my interviewees work closely and have a close and respectful relation in their work on reconciliation and coexistence—but as far as the future status of Nagorno-Karabakh is concerned, neither is willing to compromise.

According to Lynch, the importance of the status issue is a legacy of the Soviet era, where “group rights had to be territorialized to mean anything.”

De jure, the republics/regions/areas had autonomy, but real power resided elsewhere, with the union republics and Moscow. The legacy from this was paradoxical. Structures of autonomy supported the territorialization of ethnicity. However, the experience of autonomy was often negative for members of the titular nationality in the autonomous structure, who were well aware that power lay elsewhere. It was also negative for the titular nationality in the union republic in which the autonomy was embedded, who saw it as a means of Soviet/Russian “divide and rule” (Lynch 2004, 23–24).

These sentiments are stronger on the Azerbaijani side, largely because Armenia won the war. It is easier to defend the prevailing situation, as Armenians and particularly Karabakh Armenians do, than to try to change it, as Azerbaijanis do (Interview 17 NGO Armenia). Several interviewees explained that the Karabakh issue is not very high on the political agenda in Armenia today (Interviews 18 IC Armenia, 19 IC Armenia, 20 NGO Armenia). Particularly after the 2008 elections the dispute between the government and the opposition are the focus of attention for Armenians (Interview 15 NGO Armenia). Also, the Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan are being integrated into Armenian society, their situation is being resolved, but the Azerbaijani IDPs remain displaced (Interview 15 NGO Armenia). “In Armenia,” explained one interviewee, “the question of Karabakh is not in your face” (Interview 17 NGO Armenia). This might be an indication that to a certain extent
peace depends on the displacement situation being resolved, though not necessarily through repatriation—what I referred to as the hard version of Adelman’s Soft I position (p 16). As far as the refugees and the Armenian IDPs are concerned, this seems to be the case.

Representatives of civil society, in both Armenia and Azerbaijan, made it clear that civil society performs important work in preparing for compromise, reconciliation and coexistence, but that peacemaking—negotiating a solution to the political conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh—is the prerogative of the government, of the president or of the foreign minister. Somewhat ironically, however, those same interviewees made it very clear that as far as the final status of Nagorno-Karabakh is concerned there is no possibility for compromise—“it is our territory.”

Perceptions of peace and displacement in relation to the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh differ markedly from those regarding the conflict in Bosnia. Local integration is considered the best solution for the five hundred thousand refugees in Armenia and Azerbaijan. How their displacement situation is addressed is not perceived as having an impact on the prospects for peace, or on the sustainability of any future peace. Resolving the situation of Armenian IDPs is also seen as unconnected to the peace efforts. The perception of the Azerbaijani IDPs is basically the same—how and whether their situation is resolved does not constitute a condition for a resolution of the political conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

What sets the Azerbaijani IDPs apart from the other categories of displaced persons is that, far more than for the other displaced persons, the solution to their situation depends on peace. The Azerbaijani government has always emphasized that return is the only possible durable solution for the IDPs from Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories. According to this view, accepting local integration as a durable solution means giving up the claim to the territories.

The international community also supports the right of return for Azerbaijani IDPs, but because return is impossible in the absence of a peace agreement the international community is more open to alternative durable solutions, including local integration. Several interviewees confirmed this. On the one hand, while local integration is clearly seen as a durable solution by many in the international community, this cannot be stated officially. The sensitivity of the issue means that any talk of durable solutions at this time is impossible. On the other hand, return remains the ideal solution also to the international community (Interviews 1 IC Azerbaijan, 2 IC Azerbaijan).

On the possibility of living together, the time perspective is probably important. It is a bit more common on the Armenian side to say that reconciliation and coexistence is impossible at this time and for the foreseeable future, while Azerbaijanis more often argue that once we find a solution to the political conflict we will be able to coexist once again. The de
facto authorities in the NKR explained that Azerbaijanis are welcome to return to the NKR. They will become citizens, with the same rights and obligations as other citizens; they have nothing to fear. However, they can live in areas where there were many Azerbaijanis before the war, such as Fizuli and Agdam, “but we don’t want them in Stepanakert or Shoushi” (Interview 21 de facto Gov’t Nagorno-Karabakh).
Case Study Analysis

True, sustainable peace and recovery are necessary to allow refugee returns, but refugee returns are every bit as essential to sustained peace and recovery.

Antonio Guterres\textsuperscript{50}

6.1 Summary Results of the Case Studies
Most policy documents on refugee repatriation to and within Bosnia-Herzegovina are based on the assumption that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace (as reflected in the epigraph to chapter 4). Further, the main motive for emphasizing return is the perceived need to reverse what can be reversed of the ethnic cleansing perpetrated during the war. Interviewees qualified this general impression in some ways. One government employee claimed that “return is not the key to peace; it is a part of peace” (Interview 25 Gov’t BiH). An NGO representative argued that the relationship between peace and return is reciprocal, that they affect each other (Interview 26 NGO BiH), and a representative of the international community suggested that the theory about repatriation as a condition for peace be reformulated into a claim that durable solutions are important for peace: “It’s hard to imagine how peace can happen without durable solutions for the people, but not necessarily return so long after” (Interview 30 IC BiH). Nevertheless, the predominant view has been—for more than fifteen years—that without the return of displaced persons there cannot be peace in Bosnia, because peace depends on the reversal of ethnic cleansing and the recreation of a multiethnic society.

In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, in principle the international community supports the right of return for all Azerbaijani IDPs (as well as for all other groups of displaced persons in Armenia and Azerbaijan). In practice other solutions are encouraged because return is not a realistic option at this time. More to the point, return is not considered a factor that would contribute to peace even in the sense of improving the “quality” of peace once it is achieved. The general perception is that return to Nagorno-Karabakh and the occupied territories will be a sign that peace is in place, and it will put an end to displacement for many people.

6.2 Implications for the Peace-by-Repatriation Framework
As mentioned in chapter 3, there are both differences and similarities between the two cases, which may affect the perceptions of repatriation as a condition for peace. One important difference already noted is that a peace

\textsuperscript{50} UN (2006, 4).
agreement ended the conflict in Bosnia only a few years after people were displaced, whereas there is still only a ceasefire between Armenia and Azerbaijan more than fifteen years after displacement occurred. Clearly, the Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA)—and the international presence backing it up—has created conditions in Bosnia that support perceptions of repatriation, peace, and the relationship between them, that remain inconceivable in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh. In light of this dissimilarity, it is not surprising that the peace-by-repatriation thesis has been more explicitly pronounced in Bosnia than in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

I want to repeat that the purpose of the case studies was not to explain the outcome of the conflicts, how the two displacement situations have been addressed, or even to explain different perceptions of the relationship between repatriation and peace in Bosnia and Nagorno-Karabakh. The purpose was to refine the preliminary analytical framework developed in chapter 2, the “peace-by-repatriation framework.” Accordingly, the rest of this chapter asks whether and how that framework can be informed by the case studies.

**Sustainable Peace**

Chapter 2 concluded that the peace-by-repatriation thesis refers to the post-conflict period. Repatriation is not seen as a condition for the warring parties to stop shooting at each other, but rather as a condition for successful peacebuilding (primarily) in the aftermath of conflict. The case studies present no reason to alter that conclusion. Indeed, a government representative in Azerbaijan argued that if return was to take place before a political settlement was at least agreed, IDPs would become a force for conflict, because they would be unprepared and confronted with underdevelopment; “you have to finish one process before you start the next” (Interview 13 Gov’t Azerbaijan).

The implication of this is that an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis should not be concerned primarily with peace as the absence of war. Instead, the concept of peace should be sensitive to various ambitions of peacebuilding, still without deviating too much from how the concept has been used in previous research. This is discussed in further detail in chapter 8.

**Repatriation**

In terms of Adelman’s positions on the relationship between repatriation and peace, Bosnia is the epitome of the unidirectional Hard I position, which portrays repatriation as a necessary condition for peace. In Nagorno-Karabakh, on the other hand, the general perception is that the repatriation of Azerbaijani IDPs will be a sign that peace is in place. This is the Soft II position.
Regarding the explanations for how repatriation contributes to peace, the need to reverse ethnic cleansing tops the list in Bosnia, while in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh repatriation will more likely be a manifestation and a legitimization of the post-conflict political order, once there is such an order.

Some of the literature surveyed in chapter 2 is clear about the need to remix ethnic groups separated by conflict (cf. below), but it mostly refers only to refugee repatriation without further specification. The case study of Bosnia highlighted the difference between minority return and relocation, the former referring to the return of displaced persons to their former homes in areas where they are now in the numerical minority, the latter signifying displaced persons—including refugees returning from abroad—finding solutions not in their places of origin, but more often in areas where they belong to the ethnic majority. The significance of this difference is contingent on what motivates the need for repatriation. If the main reason for promoting return is that the conflict will not be seen as ended as long as a significant portion of a society’s population is displaced, durable solutions need to be found, whether in the place of origin or elsewhere. In such cases, relocation is quite sufficient. Conversely, if peace is seen as being dependent on the recreation of a multiethnic society with an intermixed population, minority return is required.

It is also worth underlining that the literature surveyed in chapter 2 nowhere implies that the importance of repatriation for peace diminishes over time. Nor do the opponents of repatriation argue that the dangers of repatriation are only temporary. Neither, however, does the literature explicitly preclude that peace can eventually be possible after a long time even in the absence of repatriation. Previous research simply does not specify whether there is an expiration date on the claims made by the peace-by-repatriation thesis. Nevertheless, the fact that repatriation is still considered essential to peace in Bosnia fifteen years after the end of armed conflict means that the claims are supposed to hold at least that long. While this does not imply that the peace-by-repatriation thesis should be presumed to be valid indefinitely, it shows that the duration of the Azerbaijani IDP situation does not by itself undermine the applicability of the thesis to the case of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Equally important, the peace-by-repatriation thesis is not limited to the post-agreement phase of a conflict. Consider again the case of Bosnia. Repatriation was more or less explicitly declared the solution to displacement from and within Bosnia before the end of active warfare, as indicated inter alia by the UNHCR’s 1992 call for temporary protection and the 1995 pilot project on minority return, which was initiated prior to the signing of the DPA. In fact, at the London Conference in August 1992, where the ICFY was established, acting U.S. Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger made the following statement:
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Let me say, parenthetically, that we are aware of the risk that humanitarian assistance could, if we are not careful, help consolidate the land-grab in Bosnia and the political cantonization which the United States categorically opposes. Therefore, we believe it is not too soon for the international community to begin addressing the issue of how we will assist refugees to return to—and to rebuild—what is left of their homes and villages. This is an issue which will have to be part of any political settlement of the present crisis which obtains the support of the United States, and it will require another substantial infusion of the international assistance (Ramcharan 1997, 118).

The (at least informal) decision that the displacement situation resulting from the war in Bosnia should be resolved as far as possible through repatriation was clearly taken long before the proximity talks in Ohio.

**Ended Displacement Situation**

In the case of Bosnia, ending displacement was not sufficient. Displacement should end through repatriation. Fifteen years after the DPA, a revised strategy for Annex 7 implementation calls for de facto support to local integration as a solution for the most vulnerable, but this is an exception to the time-honored rule.

In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, most refugees have found, or are in the process of finding, durable solutions in the form of local integration. For the Azerbaijani IDPs, repatriation is the preferred solution in theory, but in the absence of a peace agreement local integration is becoming a de facto durable solution, a process encouraged off the record by the international community in Azerbaijan. However, as argued above, finding durable solutions for the Azerbaijani IDPs may end their displacement, but it is not seen as contributing to peace between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

**Partition**

Neither of the two cases resulted in de jure partition and the establishment of a new, independent state (barring the establishment of Bosnia itself as part of the dissolution of SFRY). However, there are degrees of de facto partition in both cases—and of de jure partition in the case of the Bosnian entities. (The idea of degrees of partition is discussed further in chapter 8.) The case studies are relevant to the partition component in the peace-by-repatriation framework as it relates to the component of ethnic structure (rather than in terms of its relationship to peace).

In Bosnia, the establishment by the DPA of the entities—the Federation and Republika Srpska—confirmed in principle the territorial division of Bosnia generated by the war-time efforts to create and control ethnically homogeneous areas. Those same war-time efforts were categorically rejected by Annex 7 and the prominence given to return of displaced persons since the end of armed conflict. In this way, the Bosnian case undermines, at least in theory, the possibility of combining partition and unmixing as having the
same properties (which Laitin rightly criticizes Kaufmann for doing, cf. chapter 2). Rather, the two concepts should be analyzed separately.

The lessons from the case of Nagorno-Karabakh are more equivocal. On the one hand, the present situation of de facto partition manifestly prevents the return of Azerbaijani IDPs, meaning that territorial partition equals ethnic unmixing. On the other hand, Armenians and Azerbaijanis were not intermixed before the war in what is today the de facto NKR, and even a reintegration of the NKAO and the occupied territories into Azerbaijan followed by large-scale return of displaced persons is unlikely to result in any substantial degree of ethnic intermixing. Territorial unity, in other words, does not equal ethnic mixing. In the end, both case studies caution against using partition as a proxy for ethnic unmixing, and vice versa.

**Ethnic Structure**

The principal argument for peace by repatriation in Bosnia concerns the need to undo the effects of the war, most importantly to reverse ethnic cleansing. To a great extent this argument is backward-looking, focusing on a need to redress past wrongs, which is clearly an important part of the establishment of sustainable peace (the term backward-looking is not intended to diminish the importance of redressing past wrongs). What is usually not part of this argument in policy documents, but which was emphasized by several interlocutors, is how repatriation is a prerequisite for encounters, and hence for reconciliation. Reconciliation requires that people meet. In Lederach’s words,

> reconciliation must be proactive in seeking to create an encounter where people can focus on their relationship and share their perceptions, feelings, and experiences with one another, with the goal of creating new perceptions and a new shared experience (Lederach 1997, 30).

Kaufmann’s argument that ethnic groups be kept apart after ethnic conflict in order to avoid a repetition of the ethnic security dilemma was challenged by interviewees. They argued that after ethnic conflict and ethnic cleansing people are afraid and suspicious of each other irrespective of whether they are kept apart or not. While separation can conceivably reduce the risk of pre-emptive action initiating a new spiral of violence, it also effectively prevents reconciliation.

Such observations were more common in Bosnia than in Armenia and Azerbaijan, and this adds to the equation a factor which is not part of the theoretical underpinnings of the peace-by-repatriation thesis, namely pre-war interethnic relations. In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, there was limited interaction between Armenians and Azerbaijanis before the war. There was a firm Armenian majority in the NKAO, and an overwhelming Azerbaijani dominance in what are now the occupied territories. Armenians
and Azerbaijanis lived side by side rather than together. In Bosnia, on the other hand, there was a lot of interaction among the ethnic groups (as far as ethnicity was even relevant before the war), many identified themselves as Yugoslavs rather than Bosniaks, Croats, or Serbs and some still do. Intermarriages were common. The point is that where pre-war interethnic relations were good, such as in Bosnia, there is something to build on, a starting point for reconciliation. Conversely, where pre-war relations were bad, or perhaps, rather, weak, as in Nagorno-Karabakh, there is less of a foundation for post-conflict reconciliation between ethnic groups.

According to the Kaufmann thesis, the experience of ethnic war should by itself be enough to render future coexistence next to impossible irrespective of the quality of pre-war interethnic relations. However, though Bosnians have far from overcome the experience of the war, they have demonstrated that coexistence is possible. Importantly, according to several interlocutors this has been possible because people remember what things were like before the war. This line of reasoning suggests that pre-war interethnic relations are not at all irrelevant, as Kaufmann would have it; on the contrary, they could be decisive.

Obviously, this has implications for the peace-by-repatriation framework. If repatriation is necessary for reconciliation through encounters, and if the prospects for successful reconciliation depends in part on pre-war interethnic relations, then pre-war interethnic relations will affect the usefulness of repatriation for the purposes of reconciliation. Neither the strong focus on repatriation in the Bosnian case nor the absence of such a focus in Nagorno-Karabakh has been motivated with reference to this argument, but the difference between the cases is in line with it. Assuming that pre-war interethnic relations are relevant, return has a far more important role to play in the establishment of sustainable peace in Bosnia than it does in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Importantly, there are at least two dimensions to the concept of ethnic structure. One concerns the heterogeneity or fractionalization of a country. It usually reflects the number and relative size of different ethnic groups in a country, but is insensitive to the geographical dispersion of these groups. The other is the particular distribution of ethnic groups, the extent to which they live separately or intermixed. While the second one is more to the point in relation to the peace-by-repatriation thesis, the first one is the more common in social research. Both will be employed in the systematic comparative analysis in chapter 10, and they are discussed in further detail in relation to the operationalization of key concepts in chapter 8.
6.3 Conclusions

We are now halfway through the study, and a preliminary analytical framework has been developed on the basis of previous research and refined through case studies of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh.

The framework suggests that an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis should examine how peace after armed conflict is related to (1) the repatriation of displaced persons, (2) the end of the displacement situation, irrespective of how this is achieved, (3) the ethnic fractionalization of the country concerned, (4) the geographic concentration of the ethnic group concerned, and/or (5) the partition of the country. This is the framework applied in the test of the of the peace-by-repatriation thesis presented in the following chapters.

In chapter 7 I describe the methodological approach. I emphasize that the peace-by-repatriation thesis makes a set-theoretic claim and that this has important implications for how the thesis can be tested. In chapter 8 I operationalize the concepts of the analytical framework (the outcome and the five conditions) as fuzzy sets. I describe in some detail how I approached this task. Cases are selected and coded in chapter 9. The actual fuzzy-set analysis is conducted in chapter 10. Chapter 11 summarizes the study and presents some conclusions.
A Comparative Methodology

Perhaps every science must start with metaphor and end with algebra; and perhaps without the metaphor there would never have been any algebra.

Max Black

7.1 A Set-Theoretic Argument
An important premise of the analysis presented in the next few chapters, and a rationale for the current chapter, is that the claim made by the peace-by-repatriation thesis is a set-theoretic argument, and therefore should be tested as such. More specifically, I use fuzzy-set analysis to conduct this test. Because most readers are probably not very familiar with fuzzy-set analysis, this chapter presents a few basic features of set theory, necessary conditions, and fuzzy sets.

The first part of the chapter describes a few relevant differences between qualitative, comparative, and quantitative approaches to social science. The purpose of this description is to argue that the different approaches should not be construed as competing ways of answering the same type of questions; rather, they often have different aims, and they pose (and answer) different questions about social phenomena. Next, the comparative, or diversity-oriented, approach is outlined in some detail, including the dichotomous analysis of necessary conditions and Boolean algebra as used in Quantitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). In the final part of the chapter, I provide a brief introduction to fuzzy sets and how to conduct fuzzy-set analysis.

There is obviously a lot more to these themes than could possibly fit into this chapter, and I do not claim to offer a comprehensive introduction to any of them. Indeed, several concepts that are important to fully grasping fuzzy-set analysis are not mentioned in this overview. My ambition is limited to providing the reader with enough insight into these issues to be able to understand what I do in chapters 8–10 and why I do so.

My view on set theory and necessary conditions is strongly inspired by Ragin, (such as Ragin 1987; 2000; 2003; 2006b; 2008a; Rihoux & Ragin 2009) and Goertz (such as Goertz 2006a; Goertz 2006b; Goertz & Levy 2007b; Goertz & Starr 2003). They argue that a large number of the questions that contemporary social scientists try to answer are, in fact, questions about set relations and necessary (or sufficient) conditions (see e.g. Goertz 2003, 76–94). Despite this fact, these questions are rarely analyzed as questions about set relations or necessary conditions. Instead,
they are habitually reformulated as questions about correlations and probabilities. According to Ragin (2008a, 15) this is one of the most common mistakes in contemporary social science.

**The Comparative Approach**

A distinction is often made between qualitative and quantitative research. Most commonly, this distinction is based on the number of cases studied, as illustrated by the labels *small-N* and *large-N* research. Almost as common a marker is the number of variables, with qualitative studies being described as embracing many variables in the few cases they contain, and quantitative studies focusing on a limited number of variables in a large number of cases. Much social science research can be fit into either of these categories, although there are significant intra-category variations.

While most research is comparative in one way or other, there is also what is referred to as the comparative approach, or the comparative method. As regards numbers of cases and variables, the comparative approach falls somewhere between the qualitative and the quantitative traditions, analyzing a medium number of variables in a medium number of cases. More important, however, than the number of cases and variables, are the goals of the different approaches. According to Ragin (1994), we use qualitative methods to study commonalities, comparative methods to study diversity, and quantitative methods to study covariation.

Discussions of what characterizes the comparative approach often devote more attention to how it differs from quantitative research than they do to what sets it apart from qualitative research. This is probably because the methodological standards for good quantitative research are regularly presented by their proponents in the quantitative camp as being equally valid for qualitative and comparative research, an argument most famously made by King, Keohane and Verba in *Designing Social Inquiry* (1994). To a significant extent, however, qualitative and comparative research adhere to a common set of standards that sets them apart from quantitative analysis—but there are differences between qualitative and comparative research, too.

Looking first at how the comparative approach differs from quantitative research, it is important to realize the difference between a set-theoretic argument and a correlational argument. As an illustration, consider the relationship between democracy and freedom. Using a correlational approach we could pursue the argument that the more democratic a country, the freer it will be. In order to test that argument we would give each country a value on the variable “democracy” and a value on the variable “freedom,” and then analyze our data to see whether the variables correlate, that is, whether cases with a high value on “democracy” also have a high value on “freedom” and vice versa.
Conversely, a set-theoretic approach involves a reformulation of the argument into, for example, a claim that democracy is a necessary condition for freedom. To test that argument we would classify each country as either belonging or not belonging to the set of “democratic countries” and as either belonging or not belonging to the set of “free countries.” We would then see whether all free countries are in fact also democratic.

A few points need to be stressed. First, a set-theoretic approach does not mean that a correlational argument is tested by unorthodox means. Rather, it means that a substantially different argument is made. A correlational argument should be tested as a correlational argument, and a set-theoretic argument should be tested as a set-theoretic argument. In order to approach a scientific problem from different angles, we can obviously reformulate a correlational argument as a set-theoretic one or vice versa—as long as we are aware that this entails testing a different argument than the one originally made.

Second, not all cases are equally relevant to both types of arguments. Regarding the arguments about democracy and freedom, all countries are relevant to the test of the correlational argument, because the correlational argument is an argument about all countries. Countries with a high value on one variable should have a high value on the other, and countries with a low value on one variable should have a low value on the other. A country with a high value on democracy and a low value on freedom is problematic to the correlational argument that the more democratic a country, the freer it will be.

However, in the set-theoretic approach, such a country (being a member of the set of “democratic countries” but not of the set of “free countries”) does not undermine the argument that democracy is a necessary condition for freedom. The set-theoretic argument is not an argument about all countries. It is an argument about the members of the set of “free countries,” and the claim it makes is that all these countries are also members of the set of “democratic countries.” It does not make the opposite claim, that all members of the set of “democratic countries” are also members of the set of “free countries.”

In other words, necessary causation is not a claim about the frequency of the cause, the frequency of the outcome, or even the frequency of the outcome given the cause. It is only a claim that the outcome does not occur without the cause (Seawright 2002, 183).

The differences between comparative and qualitative research are less striking; a method like structured, focused comparison illustrates the overlap between the two approaches. There are differences however. To continue with the example of democracy and freedom, qualitative research would
probably be more interested in clarifying the relationship between democracy and freedom with the help of one or a few particularly relevant cases. A qualitative study would ask, for example, what is it about democracy that makes freedom possible or more likely?

This cursory look at qualitative, comparative, and quantitative research is not intended to imply that one approach is inherently better than the other; they are good at different things. The purpose of making these points very explicit is simply to avoid confusion about the nature and aim of the analysis conducted in the following chapters. For more on the different approaches see, for example, Ragin (1994, 77–153; 2000, 311–316; 2004b).

7.2 The Methodology of Necessary Conditions

The most elementary test of necessity involves one dichotomous condition and one dichotomous outcome, each coded as either present (1) or absent (0). To test for necessity we gather all instances of the outcome—that is, all cases where the outcome is present—and check whether the condition is also present in each of these cases. If the condition is present in every instance of the outcome, the condition can be seen as necessary. In set-theoretic terms, a condition is necessary for the outcome if the outcome constitutes a subset of the condition. Note that cases where the outcome is absent are irrelevant to a basic test of necessity (cf. below).

Several points should be stressed. First of all, a necessary condition can be either constitutive or causal. A constitutive necessary condition is part of the definition of a concept. Free and fair elections are a constitutive necessary condition of most definitions of democracy. In principle, we could use the basic test of necessity to see whether we could find any democracies that did not have free and fair elections (although this would not make much theoretical sense). Conversely, a minimum level of economic development may or may not be a causal necessary condition for democracy, and it would make theoretical sense to conduct a test of that set relation. The point is that the test of necessity does not in itself tell us the difference between constitutive and causal conditions; that is a task for the researcher. Also, even though the term “causal necessary condition” is often used, necessary conditions are best seen as permitting or enabling the outcome rather than as actually bringing it about. In this study, I avoid the term causal condition.

Second, and related, the importance of conditions can vary. A necessary condition (as well as a sufficient condition) can be more or less relevant and more or less trivial. These concepts refer to the importance of the condition for explaining the outcome. Explaining this notion, Goertz and Levy (2007a,

---

52 This corresponds to the distinction between “analytic” and “synthetic” statements, as described by Hollis & Smith (1991, 57). See also the discussion of concept structure in chapter 8.

53 As seen in chapter 2, some researchers use repatriation as a constitutive condition for peace. This, of course, must be avoided in the present study (cf. the operationalization of sustainable peace in chapter 8).
40) argue that if 2’s were rarer than 3’s, then 2 would be a more important cause of 6 in the expression $2 \times 3 = 6$. They go on to illustrate the intuition of this argument:

A smoker lights up and there is a gas leak in his house; the result is the explosion of his house. Lighting a match and the presence of gas due to the leak (like 2 and 3 in the production of 6) are both causes of the explosion. Yet when asked for the cause of the explosion people will say it was the gas leak. Gas leaks are relatively rare while the smoker has lit thousands of matches. On an oil rig, where gas is often present, the cause of an explosion will be the careless worker who lights a cigarette (Goertz & Levy 2007a, 40).

Third, studying cases where the outcome is present and ignoring cases where the outcome is absent means “selecting on the dependent variable,” a mortal sin in correlational research. However, in tests of necessity it usually makes sense (see e.g. Dion 2003). This is so because, as noted above, all cases are not equally relevant to a set-theoretic argument. Cases where both outcome and condition are present support an argument about necessity, and cases where the outcome is present but the condition is absent contradict the argument. Cases where the outcome is absent cannot tell us anything about the necessity of the condition (cf. table 7.1).

The fact that not all cases are equally relevant to a set-theoretic argument is central to fuzzy-set analysis and the concepts of consistency and coverage (explained further below). It is worth taking a closer look at this notion.

An illustrative example is provided by Hempel (1945a), namely the set-theoretic argument that “twins always resemble each other.” Stated differently: the set of “twins” is assumed to constitute a subset of the set of “people who resemble each other.” This means that “resembling each other” is the necessary condition and “being twins” is the positive outcome—two people cannot be twins unless they resemble each other. In order to test this argument, we would gather all pairs of twins and investigate whether the respective pairs of twins in fact do resemble each other. In this example it is quite obvious that we would not be interested in comparing married couples, colleagues, neighbors, or other people who are not twins, because, in Hempel’s (1945a, 10) words, “any two persons not twins—no matter whether

### Table 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition absent</th>
<th>Condition present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome present</td>
<td>cases contradict necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome absent</td>
<td>cases are irrelevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they resemble each other or not—would constitute irrelevant evidence.” This is illustrated in table 7.2.

This means that we have to distinguish not only between positive and negative cases, but between negative and irrelevant cases, where negative cases are “nonpositive cases that are relevant” and irrelevant cases are “nonpositive cases that are irrelevant” (cf. Mahoney & Goertz 2004). The distinction is important to this study because fuzzy-set analysis does not exclude negative cases, but it should exclude irrelevant ones.

Making the distinction between negative and irrelevant cases is complicated by the fact that a necessary condition argument can be reformulated in a few logically equivalent ways. First, if the presence of X is necessary for the presence of Y, then the absence of X is sufficient for the absence of Y. For example, if being a citizen (X) is a necessary condition for being allowed to vote in parliamentary elections (Y), then being a non-citizen (non-X) is sufficient for not being allowed to vote (non-Y).

Further, if the presence of X is necessary for the presence of Y, then the absence of Y is necessary for the absence of X; if being a citizen (X) is necessary for being allowed to vote (Y), then not being allowed to vote (non-Y) is necessary for not being a citizen (non-X). This latter phrasing is rather cryptic, and it is clearly not the way we would choose to express the relationship, but it remains valid. Since we cannot find a non-citizen who is allowed to vote, we must look among persons not allowed to vote if we are to find a non-citizen. (The fact that some citizens are also not allowed to vote is not contradicted by any of these statements.)

To illustrate how different ways of expressing the same set relation can complicate the distinction between negative and irrelevant cases, consider the so called raven paradox, also introduced by Hempel, in a series of articles in Mind (Hempel 1945a; 1945b; 1946). The paradox begins with the claim that all ravens are black, or more formally that “being black is a necessary condition for being a raven.” In order to confirm this hypothesis, we need to consider all ravens (all cases where the outcome is present) and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome present</th>
<th>Condition absent</th>
<th>Condition present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twins</td>
<td>Twins who do not resemble each other</td>
<td>Twins who do resemble each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome absent</td>
<td>Non-twins who do not resemble each other</td>
<td>Non-twins who do resemble each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
establish that they are all black (that the necessary condition is present in each case).

At first glance it does not seem to make any sense to study parrots, fish, or pieces of clothing if our aim is to verify that all ravens are black—clearly, only ravens are relevant. However, if being black is a necessary condition for being a raven, it follows logically that being a non-raven is necessary for being non-black—that is, in order for any object to be of another color than black, that object must be something else than a raven. Thus,

- being black is a necessary condition for being a raven, and
- being a non-raven is a necessary condition for being non-black.

Because these two statements are logically equivalent, evidence of one of them constitutes evidence of the other. Consequently, because a green parrot supports the second hypothesis, it also supports the first. The only thing that can disconfirm either hypothesis remains a non-black raven; any other object of whatever color supports both hypotheses.54

To distinguish between positive and negative cases, on the one hand, and irrelevant cases, on the other, Mahoney and Goertz (2004) propose the possibility principle, which states that “negative cases should be those where the outcome has a real possibility of occurring.” To exemplify, they argue that a researcher interested in the causes of industrialization need not bother to study such cases as the pre-colonial Americas or contemporary Antarctica. Because industrialization is impossible in these cases they cannot tell us anything about the causes of industrialization. Similarly, because a parrot cannot be a black raven, or a raven of whatever color, it cannot tell us anything about ravens, and the parrot is therefore an irrelevant case. However, the brown-necked raven is a negative case—it is definitely a raven, but it can be more brown than black.

In chapter 9 I argue, with reference to this discussion, that not all conflicts are relevant to an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis, but only those that have resulted in substantial displacement.

**Set Theory and Boolean Algebra**

The method of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) has been developed to allow the systematic analysis of set-theoretic relations. Fuzzy-set analysis, which is used in chapter 10, is based on QCA, and a brief overview of QCA will therefore provide a good basis for the introduction of fuzzy-set analysis in the next section. I use the conventional abbreviations cs/QCA and fs/QCA to refer to crisp-set, or dichotomous, QCA (where cases are either in or out of

54 This discussion has inspired a lot of writing, including the article “A Green Parrot Is Just as Much a Red Herring as a White Shoe” (French 1988).
sets) and fuzzy-set QCA (which allows for partial membership). QCA refers to both.

The above discussion of necessary conditions was limited to one outcome and one condition. QCA makes it possible to study more than one condition at a time, and to analyze how several conditions can combine in various ways to produce an outcome.

In order to do this, cs/QCA uses Boolean algebra (and fs/QCA uses fuzzy algebra, cf. below). Two important Boolean operators are addition and multiplication. Boolean addition, represented by a + sign, is equivalent to the logical operator OR. The expression $A + B \rightarrow Y$ means that the outcome $Y$ is the result of the presence of either condition $A$ or condition $B$. The presence of either $A$ or $B$ is also referred to as the intersection of conditions $A$ and $B$. This is different from Boolean multiplication, represented by a * sign, which is equivalent to the logical operator AND. Thus, $A*B \rightarrow Y$ means that the outcome $Y$ is the result of the combined presence of conditions $A$ and $B$, which is also referred to as the union of $A$ and $B$.

Two things should be noted. First, strictly speaking $A+B$ means $A$ and/or $B$. The logical OR means that the presence of one condition is enough, but the presence of both is okay, while the logical AND requires the presence of both conditions. Second, the * sign is usually implied by conditions being placed next to each other; thus the expression $A*B \rightarrow Y$ will most often be written as $AB \rightarrow Y$.

A third Boolean operator is negation, which changes presence to absence and vice versa. The negation of the crisp set of “democracies” is the crisp set of “non-democracies”; a case which is a member (1) of the set of “democracies” is a non-member (0) of the set of “non-democracies.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
notation of negation varies; in this study I use upper case letters for presence and lower case letters for absence.

To illustrate the logic of cs/QCA, I have constructed a hypothetical dataset, which is reproduced in table 7.3. Let us assume that the example concerns the “onset of severe ethnic rebellion” (outcome Y), and that the three conditions are “discrimination against an ethnic group” (condition A), “a militarily strong central power” (B), and “the ethnic group having strong ties to a particular territorial unit” (C).

The first step of cs/QCA analysis is to create a truth table, as the one in table 7.4. A truth table is an overview of all logical combinations of the presence and absence of the conditions. These combinations are referred to as configurations. Each logical configuration is represented by one row in the table. The number of rows in a truth table is therefore always 2^k, where k is the number of conditions. In the example there are three conditions, A, B, and C, which makes 2^3 = 8 rows. An output value is added to each row, namely the value on the outcome (Y) for the respective configuration according to the dataset in table 7.3. Often, a final column is added indicating the number of cases displaying the particular configuration. This illustrates the key to configurational thinking: an analysis based on this truth table is not an analysis of three independent variables, but of eight configurations conceived as different types of cases (Ragin 2000, 73).

Table 7.4
Hypothetical truth table based on dichotomous data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 Obviously, the same configuration of conditions is often found in several cases, and it is not uncommon for these cases to display different values on the outcome. This is referred to as the problem of contradictions and means that these particular configurations cannot easily be given a value on the outcome in the truth table. There are ways to address contradictions (see e.g. Ragin 1987, 113–118). However, the problem of contradictions is only relevant in cs/QCA. In fs/QCA the values in the outcome column in the truth table are determined in a different way, as illustrated in section 7.3 below. Therefore, I do not go into detail regarding the problem of contradictions in this overview.
The truth table gives a better overview than the data matrix of which configurations lead to the outcome and which do not. In the example, there are two configurations that lead to the outcome, namely 1-0-1 and 1-0-0, or, expressed differently, AbC and Abc (with upper case letters indicating presence, and lower case letters indicating absence). All other configurations are associated with the absence of the outcome (except the two configurations aBC and aBc, for which there are no empirical examples; cf. below).

In the example, the outcome Y is associated with configurations AbC and Abc; thus AbC → Y and Abc → Y. However, there is a simpler way to express this, namely Ab → Y. Whenever a case displays the configuration Ab—the presence of condition A and the absence of condition B—it also displays the presence of the outcome. In these cases it does not matter whether condition C is present or absent, and, therefore, condition C can be taken out of the expression. The process of reducing the solution to as short an expression as possible is called minimization.56

As noted, the truth table also shows that there are two configurations for which empirical examples have not been found, 0-1-1 and 0-1-0, or aBC and aBc. This is a result of limited diversity; the real world simply does not contain empirical examples of all logically possible configurations. Limited diversity means that we need to be careful when making generalizations, because generalizations often cover configurations that lack empirical cases. In the name of parsimony we make “simplifying assumptions” about the likely outcome of such cases, were they to exist. Without simplifying assumptions, we cannot generalize.

Because of limited diversity, statements about causation (in the absence of simplifying assumptions) are necessarily restricted to the combinations of causally relevant conditions that actually exist (Ragin 1987, 105).

Limited diversity is a quality of the empirical world that social scientists study, not of set-theoretic analysis. The problem as such is equally relevant to case studies or correlational research, though it obviously becomes more important when ambitions to generalize are high (cf. Ragin 1987, 104–113; 2000, 76–87, 198–202).

In QCA, configurations that lack empirical referents are referred to as “logical remainders.” Cases displaying these configurations could logically exist, but in reality they do not—at least not within the population covered by our investigation. However, they might exist outside that population. For example, they might exist outside the geographical area covered by the study, or they might have existed during a time period before the one

---

56 Minimization is done automatically by the fs/QCA software, but it is useful to know what the concept entails. For more on minimization, see Ragin (1987, 93–98).
covered by the study, or they could come into existence at a later stage. A study conducted in 1995 would not have found any empirical examples of the configuration “member of the European Union AND former member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.” Today, there are several.

There are a few options for the treatment of logical remainders in the minimization process. The researcher can either (manually) assign these configurations a value on the outcome, 1 or 0, or let the software assign them the value which yields the simplest solution. This choice of strategy is made by the researcher on the basis of theoretical and substantive knowledge. The researcher must ask: if such cases were to exist, would they most likely be associated with the presence of the outcome or with the absence of the outcome, or is it impossible to tell? When the researcher decides not to assign a particular value to logical remainders, but leaves it up to the software, this is referred to in QCA lingo as “setting logical remainders to ‘don’t care’.” Setting logical remainders to “don’t care” yields the most “parsimonious solution.” Assigning a particular value to them—on the basis of theoretical and substantive knowledge—yields a “complex solution.”

**Causal Complexity**

Few if any social phenomena can be attributed to a single cause. The diversity-oriented approach therefore emphasizes the possibility of causal complexity, where there might be more than one causal path to the outcome, and where several conditions can jointly lead to the outcome. This means that, in contrast to much correlational research, the diversity-oriented approach is not looking for the net effect of different independent variables (cf. Ragin 2006a).

For illustration, let us assume that one of the logical remainders in the example above, aBC, had also been associated with the presence of the outcome (even though this does not make theoretical sense). That would give us two alternative paths to the outcome, Ab and aBC; thus Ab + aBC → Y, an expression that cannot be minimized further. The two different paths to the outcome, Ab and aBC, is an example of multiple causation. Further, the expression Ab—the presence of ethnic discrimination and the absence of a militarily strong central power—is an example of two conditions jointly leading to the outcome. This is referred to as conjunctural causation (which obviously applies the expression aBC as well). In conclusion, the expression Ab + aBC → Y is an example of multiple, conjunctural causation.

---

57 In the example with ethnic rebellion, it would make most theoretical sense to assume that ethnic rebellion would not result from the two configurations aBC and aBc, minimized to aB (the absence of ethnic discrimination combined with a militarily strong central power).

58 In the fuzzy-set analysis in chapter 10, different paths to the outcome are referred to as “solution terms.”

59 In the expression “multiple, conjunctural causation,” “multiple” obviously refers to the multiple paths to the outcome and “conjunctural” refers to the fact that several conditions operate in conjunction, but even experts sometimes confuse them (cf. Berg-Schlosser & De Meur 2002, 272).
7.3 Fuzzy Sets
QCA has improved the systematic analysis of set-theoretic relations. However, many social science concepts do not easily lend themselves to the “either-or division” required by conventional set theory using crisp sets. For example, while Sweden and the United States are both clearly members of the set of “democratic states,” and Burma and North Korea are not, many states are usually considered less democratic than Sweden but could still be considered members of the crisp set of “democratic countries”: India, Argentina, Kenya, Estonia, and Haiti, to mention a few. For 2007, India has a Polity score of +9, Argentina +8, Kenya +7, Estonia +6, and Haiti has a score of +5. Are they members or non-members of the set of “democratic states”?

The use of crisp sets requires that each state is coded as being either a member or a non-member of the set of “democratic states”—there is no in-between. Once all states are divided into members and non-members of the set of “democratic states,” no distinction is made between the members of the set. In other words, crisp sets are insensitive to differences in degree of democracy among states coded as being members of the set of “democratic states” (and they are of course equally insensitive to differences among non-members). Assuming that the five states mentioned above are all coded as members of the set of “democratic states,” any claim about democratic states is expected to apply equally to Sweden, Argentina, and Haiti. If an argument about democratic states does not hold for Haiti, this is just as damaging to the argument as if it does not hold for Sweden. Clearly, much information about cases is lost in dichotomization.

Enter fuzzy sets. Fuzzy sets combine the need to make a qualitative distinction between members and non-members of sets with a sensitivity to varying degrees of membership in these sets. They make it possible to argue that Sweden, India, Argentina, Kenya, Estonia and Haiti all belong to the set of “democratic states” and still conduct an analysis that is sensitive to the varying degrees of democracy in these countries. This is because fuzzy sets allow partial membership in sets. Claims about, in this case, democracy should then apply with full force to states that are full members of the set of “democratic states,” but they apply to a lesser extent to states that are weak members of the set. As in the crisp-set situation, states that are full non-members of the set of “democratic states” are irrelevant to an assessment of a claim made about democratic states (see e.g. Ragin 2003, 181–182).

In fuzzy set analysis this commonsense thinking—that cases with strong membership in a set constitute the most relevant cases for analyzing

---

60 The 2008 version of the Polity IV dataset (Marshall 2008) contains worldwide data on political regime characteristics and transitions from 1800–2008. A state’s “Polity score” is a combination of its autocratic and democratic characteristics (see Marshall & Jaggers 2009).
Table 7.5
Crisp versus Fuzzy Sets (from Ragin 2000, 156).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crisp set</th>
<th>Three-value fuzzy set</th>
<th>Five-value fuzzy set</th>
<th>Seven-value fuzzy set</th>
<th>“Continuous” fuzzy set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 = fully in</td>
<td>1.00 = fully in</td>
<td>1.00 = fully in</td>
<td>1.00 = fully in</td>
<td>1.00 = fully in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 = more in than out</td>
<td>0.83 = mostly but not fully in</td>
<td>0.67 = more or less in</td>
<td>Numerical scores indicating that degree of membership is more “in” than “out” (0.50&lt;xi&lt;1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 = not fully out or fully in</td>
<td>0.50 = crossover; neither in nor out</td>
<td>0.33 = more or less out</td>
<td>0.50 =crossover; neither in nor out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 = more out than in</td>
<td>0.17 = mostly but not fully out</td>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td>0.00 = fully out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

arguments about that set—can be incorporated into the analysis through the concepts of consistency and coverage, to which I return below (cf. Ragin 2006b, 295).

Fuzzy membership values vary from 0.0 (full non-membership) to 1.0 (full membership). The most basic type of fuzzy sets is three-value fuzzy sets. They allow full membership (1.0), full non-membership (0.0), and the point of maximum ambiguity (0.5), also referred to as the crossover point. Next is a five-value fuzzy set, where one value (0.75) is inserted between full membership and the crossover point for cases that are more in than out of the set but not full members, and another value (0.25) is inserted between full non-membership and the crossover point for cases that are more out than in the set but not full non-members. In a seven-value fuzzy set, two values are inserted between full membership and the crossover point, as well as between full non-membership and the crossover point, et cetera. A fuzzy set can also be continuous (cf. table 7.5).

61 It is also possible to construct four-value and six-value fuzzy sets, et cetera, which do not employ the membership value 0.5. This has become more common in the last few years. I discuss this option further at the end of this chapter, and argue in favor of the membership value 0.5.
important for researchers to view the measurement of fuzzy membership as a fundamentally interpretive act, not as a mechanical exercise (Ragin 2000, 165–166).

As opposed to most correlational analyses, fuzzy-set analysis embraces the notion of irrelevant variation. As noted above, states that are fully out of the set of “democratic states” are irrelevant to an assessment of an argument about democratic states. For example, Saudi Arabia, Belarus, Fiji and Rwanda would in most accounts be fully out of the set of “democratic states,” despite significant variations in Polity scores (-10, -7, -4, and -3 respectively). This variation is irrelevant to their membership scores in the fuzzy set of “democratic states”; they are all fully out of the set.

Similarly, there can be irrelevant variation among cases with full membership in a set. For example, despite significant differences in GDP/c, up to fifty countries could reasonably be considered full members of the fuzzy set of “rich countries.” Conversely, in variable-oriented research, which usually considers all variation as being relevant, the country with the highest GDP/c will have a higher value on the variable “rich” than the country with the second highest GDP/c, which in turn will have a higher value that the country with the third highest GDP/c, et cetera.

A related point is that the fuzzy membership value 0.5, the crossover point, is a conceptual midpoint of each fuzzy set, and should not be confused with the mean of a conventional variable. In a fuzzy set it does not matter if all cases have membership scores greater (or lower) than 0.5 (Ragin 2000, 168–169). For example, the vast majority of countries would have membership scores lower than 0.5 in the fuzzy set of “environmentally sustainable societies.” Conversely, an a priori requirement that a minimum share of empirical cases have membership scores higher than 0.5 in that set would be a serious misrepresentation of the concept of environmental sustainability.62 In short, “variables are calibrated according to sample means and standard deviations; fuzzy sets are calibrated according to theoretical and substantive knowledge” (Ragin 2000, 169).

To illustrate the basic features of fuzzy set analysis (but ignoring for the moment any theoretical and substantive knowledge), the hypothetical crisp data from table 7.3 have been translated into fuzzy membership scores in table 7.6. Again, the outcome (Y) is the onset of severe ethnic rebellion, condition A is ethnic discrimination, condition B is a militarily strong central power, and condition C is the ethnic group having strong ties to a particular territorial unit.

---

62 Cf. Ragin (2003, 188–193) who assesses membership in “the set with severe IMF protest, thus ensuring that only the clearest instances of IMF protest receive high membership scores.” As intended, only five of thirty-five cases (14 percent) get membership scores higher than 0.5 in the fuzzy set of “severe IMF protest.” One of the six conditions is even more asymmetric; only four of thirty-five cases (11 percent) get membership scores higher than 0.5 in the fuzzy set of “countries that experienced political liberalization (1978–1988).”
Table 7.6
Hypothetical dataset on ethnic rebellion: fuzzy data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a first example of a fuzzy set analysis, consider a test of whether “discrimination against a certain ethnic group” (condition A) is a necessary condition for “severe ethnic rebellion” (outcome Y). The set-theoretic relationship between the condition and the outcome can be illustrated in an XY plot, as illustrated in figure 7.1.

Testing necessity with the use of fuzzy sets means testing whether the outcome constitutes a subset of the condition, or expressed differently, whether each case has an equal or higher membership score in the condition than in the outcome. If this is the case, then all cases will end up on or below the diagonal X=Y in the XY plot. When testing sufficient conditions, we want...
cases to end up on or above the diagonal X=Y. With a single exception, the result of the analysis in the example fits this pattern, which means that, hypothetically, ethnic discrimination is almost always a necessary condition of severe ethnic rebellion.

The conclusion that a condition is “almost always necessary” might sound strange. Intuitively, a necessary condition is always necessary—otherwise it is not necessary. However, the way the result appears in the XY plot in figure 7.1 is not uncommon in actual analyses of necessary conditions: with a few exceptions cases are located on or below the diagonal. This means that only in rare instances will the outcome appear without the condition being present. In such cases, referring to the condition as “almost always necessary” is a better description of the result of the analysis than claiming that there is no relationship at all between the condition and the outcome.

One thing that is not directly observable from the XY plot is the number of cases that end up at particular intersections in the plot. In the example, the ten cases end up at eight different intersections; cases 1 and 4 have the same membership scores in condition A and outcome Y, as do cases 2 and 8.

Where cs/QCA uses Boolean algebra, fs/QCA uses fuzzy algebra, and employs (among others) the same three operators described above (cf. table 8.1 below). Fuzzy addition (intersection), the equivalent of the logical OR, is computed using the maximum membership score. Consider case 1 in table 7.6. It has a membership score of 1.00 in set A (ethnic discrimination) and a membership score of 0.25 in set B (a militarily strong central power). Its membership score in the fuzzy set of “ethnic discrimination OR a strong central power” is therefore 1.00. The weak membership in condition B is compensated by the strong membership in condition A, and yields a strong membership in the intersection of conditions A and B.

Conversely, fuzzy multiplication (union) corresponds to the logical AND and uses the minimum, which means that a weak membership in one set cannot be compensated by a strong membership in the other. Consequently, case 1 has a membership score of 0.25 in the union of conditions A and B, that is, in the fuzzy set of “ethnic discrimination AND a strong central power.”

Negation of fuzzy membership scores is simply 1 minus the original membership score. A membership score of 0.75 in the set of “rich countries” (to enhance illustration of a few points) gives a membership score of 0.25 in the set of “non-rich countries.” Note that the fuzzy set of “non-rich countries” is not necessarily the same as the fuzzy set of “poor countries,” for several reasons. First, fuzzy sets are often constructed on the basis of more than one variable or component, and the components of the fuzzy set of “rich countries” need not be the same as the components of the fuzzy set of “poor countries.”

---

63 The same applies to crisp sets.
countries.” Second, fuzzy sets are based more on the theoretical concept than on case distribution along a continuous variable, such as GDP/c (cf. Ragin 2000, 163–165). Third, while the concept of “rich” has a natural opposite in the concept of “poor,” many fuzzy sets will not have similar opposites. For example, negating the fuzzy set of “Protestant countries” gives the fuzzy set of “non-Protestant countries,” but this is clearly not the same as “Catholic countries,” “Buddhist countries,” or “atheist countries.”

**Consistency and Coverage**

The concepts of consistency and coverage are used to measure the extent to which a condition is necessary or sufficient for an outcome, alone or in combination with other conditions. Consistency can be said to measure the existence of subsets, while coverage measures their relevance. The most straightforward measure of consistency is the proportion of cases that confirm the hypothesized subset relation. In a test of necessity, this corresponds to the proportion of cases where the outcome constitutes a subset of the condition—and vice versa for a test of sufficiency.64

For illustration, consider the Venn diagrams in figure 7.2. The black circle represents the hypothesized superset, and the white circle represents the hypothesized subset. Consistency corresponds to the share of the subset that actually constitutes a subset of the superset, that is the share of the white circle that is grey. Coverage, in turn, is the share of the superset that is covered by the subset, that is the share of the black circle that is grey. Consistency must be high enough (cf. below) for coverage to be a relevant measure. In other words, it is “pointless to compute the coverage of a cause or combination of causes that is not a consistent subset of the outcome” (Ragin 2006b, 299).

To make the four examples in figure 7.2 more concrete, let us consider them as being tests of four hypothetical sufficient conditions for getting a high salary. The outcome, “getting a high salary,” is then the superset, the black circle, and the various conditions are the white circle subsets. In the first example the sufficient condition tested is “having a high education.”

![Figure 7.2 Consistency and coverage, Venn diagrams.](image)

---

64 This is sometimes referred to as the “inclusion algorithm.”
Most (but not all) people who have a high salary have a high education (most of the white circle is inside the black circle). This means that consistency is high; there is a consistent subset relation. Also, most (but not all) people with high education have high salaries (most of the black circle is covered by the white circle). This means that coverage is high; the subset relation is relevant.

In the second example, the sufficient condition is “having a degree from the top five European universities.” Again, most of the white circle subset is inside the black circle superset, meaning that consistency is high; most people with degrees from the top five European universities have high salaries. However, the white circle subset only covers a small part of the black circle superset, which means that coverage is low; this particular condition applies only to a very small minority of all those who have high salaries. In general, this condition is rather irrelevant as a condition for having a high salary.

The sufficient condition in the third example is “having a first name beginning with the letter P.” Here, consistency is low: most people whose names begin with the letter P do not have high salaries (only a small part of the white circle is inside the black circle). This means that there is no subset relation, and that coverage, the part of the black circle covered by the white circle, does not really matter. Evaluating the relevance of a subset relation is irrelevant when there is no subset relation. The same is true in the fourth example, where “being male” is the hypothesized sufficient condition for having a high salary. Again, most of the white circle is outside the black circle—a majority of men do not have high salaries: consistency is low, “being male” is not a consistent subset of “having a high salary”; coverage is, therefore, uninteresting.

An important weakness of measuring consistency and coverage as the proportion of cases that confirms the hypothesized subset relation is that it treats all cases (both consistent and inconsistent cases) as equally important to the consistency and coverage scores, even though, as argued, their relevance to the set-theoretic argument can vary substantially (cf. above, and Ragin 2006b, 295). To incorporate the argument that cases with strong membership in a set constitute the most relevant cases, the consistency measure used by the fs/QCA software is sensitive to the extent to which consistent cases are consistent, and to the margin by which inconsistent cases are inconsistent; and likewise for the measure of coverage. These measures are presented in table 7.7.

The formulas in the table illustrate the close similarity between the computing of consistency and coverage. Consistency is computed by dividing the sum of minimum scores (fuzzy multiplication of several fuzzy conditions) by the sum of scores in the subset; coverage is computed by dividing the same sum of minimum scores by the sum of scores in the superset. In a test
Table 7.7
Formulas for computing consistency and coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Subset relation</th>
<th>Computation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of a necessary condition</td>
<td>$Y_i \leq X_i = \frac{\sum (\min (X_i, Y_i))}{\sum (Y_i)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of a necessary condition</td>
<td>$Y_i \leq X_i = \frac{\sum (\min (X_i, Y_i))}{\sum (X_i)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of a sufficient condition</td>
<td>$X_i \leq Y_i = \frac{\sum (\min (X_i, Y_i))}{\sum (X_i)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of a sufficient condition</td>
<td>$X_i \leq Y_i = \frac{\sum (\min (X_i, Y_i))}{\sum (Y_i)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of necessity the outcome ($Y$) is the subset, and the condition ($X$) is the superset. In a test of sufficiency the condition ($X$) is the subset, and the outcome ($Y$) is the superset.

Table 7.7 shows that the consistency score of a necessary condition is computed in exactly the same way as the coverage score of a sufficient condition, and that the consistency score of a sufficient condition is the same as the coverage of a necessary condition. This means, again, that the analysis itself does not tell us whether a condition is sufficient or necessary. Instead, the researcher decides on theoretical grounds whether to conduct a test of necessity or a test of sufficiency.

Figure 7.3 illustrates consistency and coverage in a test of sufficiency, where we want cases to end up on or above the diagonal. The left part of the figure measures the consistency of the sufficient condition. Cases on or above the diagonal are consistent with a claim of sufficiency, and cases below the diagonal are inconsistent. For purposes of illustration, the two cases that are inconsistent with sufficiency have the same value on the outcome. The distance between the x-axis and the case (the unbroken line) shows the extent to which the cases are consistent, and the distance between the diagonal and the case (the broken line) corresponds to the extent to which they are inconsistent. This illustrates the notion that cases with strong...
memberships are more important, because the longer the distance between
the x-axis and the diagonal, the more a case contributes to the consistency
score—irrespective of whether the case is consistent or not. The right part of
figure 7.3 measures the coverage of the same sufficient condition. Here, the
consistent cases (above the diagonal) contribute to coverage to the extent
that the horizontal lines are unbroken, and they weaken coverage to the
extent that lines are broken.

In a test of necessity, where cases should end up on or below the
diagonal, consistency would be based on the horizontal position of cases
above the diagonal, and coverage would be based on the vertical position of
cases below it.

Figure 7.3 illustrates that all cases not situated on the actual diagonal
will always undermine either consistency or coverage. The consistency score
of a subset relation decreases as cases end up further from the diagonal on
the wrong side of it, and coverage decreases as cases end up further from the
diagonal on the right side of it. Conversely, the closer to the diagonal cases
end up, the better the consistency and coverage (cf. Goertz 2006a).

As noted, a subset relation exists when large enough a part of the subset
in fact constitutes a subset of the superset. How large is large enough? There
is no definite rule. According to Ragin (2006b, 293), “with observed
consistency scores below 0.75, it becomes increasingly difficult on
substantive grounds to maintain that a subset relation exists, even a very
rough one.” Elsewhere, he recommends using a cutoff point of 0.85, arguing
that scores of 0.00–0.75 indicate substantial inconsistency (Ragin 2004a, 11).
In a more recent publication (Ragin 2009, 112–115), he compares the
results of using consistency scores of 0.70 and 0.80, arguing that 0.70 is
“relatively low,” or even “very low.” In this study I use a consistency cutoff of
0.80, the default option of the fs/QCA software.

**Conducting Fuzzy-Set Analysis**

Finally, I will briefly discuss the use of the fs/QCA software. This will be done
using the example of severe ethnic rebellion introduced above. A fuzzy-set
analysis of all three conditions proceeds via a crisp truth table. The
hypothetical fuzzy data in table 7.6 yield the truth table shown in table 7.8.
The truth table again consists of $2^k$ rows. In the table they are sorted
according to the number of cases (N) that display each particular
configuration. The researcher then selects a “frequency cutoff” and a
“consistency cutoff.” Selecting the frequency cutoff means deciding the
minimum number of cases that should be associated with a particular
configuration in order for that configuration to be considered relevant for the
analysis. A frequency cutoff of 1 means that all configurations that have no
cases are excluded (these are the logical remainders, italicized in the table).
Table 7.8
Hypothetical truth table based on fuzzy data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>raw consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.937500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.727373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.500000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.714286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.800000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the analysis contains a large number of cases, a higher frequency cutoff can be selected.

The researcher also needs to select a consistency cutoff, such as 0.75, 0.80, or 0.85—a minimum consistency score required for a subset relation to be considered consistent; the default option in the software is 0.80. When the consistency cutoff is selected, the outcome value for each configuration is entered into the truth table, “1” for consistent subset relations and “0” for non-consistent subset relations, as illustrated with bold figures in the (Y) column of table 7.8. 65

Next, the researcher decides (as in cs/QCA) whether to assign a specific value, 0 or 1, to the logical remainders, or to set them to “don’t care.” Once this is done, the final step of the analysis yields the solution, in this case the parsimonious solution $A_b \rightarrow Y$, with a consistency of 0.9412 and a coverage of 0.8421. Table 7.9 shows what the output looks like in the software. In

Table 7.9
Truth table solution on ethnic rebellion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_b$</td>
<td>0.842105</td>
<td>0.842105</td>
<td>0.941176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 Often, several configurations have consistency scores above the consistency cutoff, and then they are all given the value “1” in the outcome column. It also happens that no consistency score in the truth table is high enough to meet the selected consistency cutoff. In such cases, there is no consistent subset relation, and it does not make sense to go on to the final step of the analysis.
chapter 10 where a large number of tests are conducted I opt for a simpler way of presenting the results in the text itself. (Detailed results are given in Appendix 5.) For example, the information in table 7.9 will be summarized thus (Formula 7.1):

\[ A \times b \rightarrow Y \]

consistency 0.9412, coverage 0.8421

In other words, “severe ethnic rebellion” (Y) is a highly consistent and very relevant subset of “discrimination against a certain ethnic group” (A) combined with “the absence of a militarily strong central power” (b). This is the same solution that was found in the crisp set analysis above.

A few things remain to be mentioned about fuzzy-set analysis. Note that the number of cases represented in the truth table is \( 4 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 8 \), but there were ten cases in the dataset. Also, with three five-value fuzzy sets, there are obviously more than eight possible configurations, yet the truth table contains only eight rows. Both discrepancies are consequences of the procedure for creating a crisp truth table from fuzzy data.

In order to create the truth table, the membership score of each case in each configuration is computed through fuzzy multiplication, as the minimum of each case’s membership score in each condition. The membership scores of case 1 (see table 7.6) was 1.00 in condition A, 0.25 in condition B, and 0.75 in condition C. Thus membership in ABC is \( \min(A, B, C) = 0.25 \), membership in ABc is \( \min(A, B, 1-C) = 0.25 \), membership in AbC is \( \min(A, 1-B, C) = 0.75 \), et cetera. Each empirical case can have partial membership in several configurations, but it can have a membership > 0.50 in only one configuration. This is illustrated in table 7.10.

When the membership scores of all cases in all configurations have been computed the truth table is constructed on the basis of the number of cases with memberships > 0.50 in the various configurations. Thus, the top row in the truth table (table 7.8) corresponds to the four cases with memberships > 0.50 in the configuration AbC (table 7.9), the second row of the truth table corresponds to the two cases with memberships > 0.50 in abC, et cetera.

A final point concerns the two cases that do not have memberships > 0.50 in any configuration (cases 3 and 7). This is because they have membership scores of exactly 0.50 in at least one of the conditions. A membership score of 0.50 remains a membership score of 0.50 even after negation, and, consequently, a case with a membership score of exactly 0.50 in at least one condition cannot have a minimum score higher than 0.50 in any configuration. Therefore, such cases are not taken into account when membership scores in configurations are translated into a truth table—though in the final step of the analysis the consistent configurations are tested on all cases.
Table 7.10
Membership in configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>ABc</th>
<th>AbC</th>
<th>Abc</th>
<th>aBC</th>
<th>aBc</th>
<th>abC</th>
<th>abc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because a membership score of exactly 0.50 in a single condition is enough for such temporary exclusion, increasing the number of conditions will likely increase the number of cases with membership scores of exactly 0.50 in at least one condition, and consequently decrease the number of cases actually considered in the creation of the truth table. There is some concern about this issue in the QCA community. Skeptics ask what conclusions we can draw on the basis of cases that we know so little about that we cannot say whether they are more in or more out of a particular fuzzy set. However, explicit discussions of the issue are rare. While the use of the fuzzy membership value 0.50 appears to be decreasing in practical use, I am aware of only one example of an explicit proposal to actually stop using it (Schneider & Wagemann 2007, 183). This could be accomplished, for example, by using six- instead of five-value fuzzy sets, thus employing the membership values 0.00, 0.20, 0.40, 0.60, 0.80, and 1.00. Alternatively, the most ambiguous cases could be assigned values close to 0.50, such as 0.55 if slightly more in and 0.45 if slightly more out.

However, excluding the 0.50 value is not without consequences. Both alternatives described above involve force-fitting the most ambiguous cases as either more in or more out of the set. The truth table would then be constructed on the basis of a larger number of cases, but at the price of altering the operationalizations of central concepts in the analysis. According to Ragin (2000, 259),

rescalings have important substantive and theoretical consequences in fuzzy-set analysis, in effect changing the theoretical and substantive status of cases. For example, a case that was only “partially in” a set might become “fully in” a set, after rescaling membership scores. As noted previously, such rescalings often call for reconceptualizing the set that is rescaled.
Further, as observed by Cioffi-Revilla (cf. epigraph to chapter 9), “the problem of intrinsic fuzziness in IR cannot be solved by any arbitrarily large increase in the accuracy of our measurements.” More to the point, if we do not actually have enough knowledge to decide whether a case is more in or out of a set, it seems prudent to leave it out of the truth table. That way, only cases about which we have such knowledge are used to identify configurations that are consistent subsets of the outcome. A principal argument against excluding the 0.50 value is that force-fitting the most ambiguous cases into being more in or more out of a particular fuzzy set does not improve our knowledge about these cases, it merely reduces our ability to be explicit about their ambiguity in the analysis. Surely, this is not to be taken lightly.

In this study I retain the fuzzy membership value 0.50.
8 | From Theoretical Concepts to Fuzzy Sets

One cannot neatly separate the ontology of a concept from the role it plays in causal theories and explanations.

Gary Goertz

8.1 Concept Structures

Having described the methodology of necessary conditions and fuzzy sets in chapter 7, in this chapter I construct the fuzzy sets that will be used in the analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis in chapter 10. More precisely, I operationalize the outcome and conditions developed in chapters 2–6 as fuzzy sets. Before proceeding to that particular exercise, however, I devote a few pages to a discussion of what such an operationalization entails.

Basically, operationalizing a social science concept means making it observable, often also measurable. According to Goertz (2006b) social science concepts can be fruitfully analyzed as consisting of three levels. The first level, the basic level in Goertz’s terminology, is the concept itself—such as peace, war, democracy, or power. This level is used in theoretical propositions such as “democratic states do not fight wars against each other.” At the secondary level are the components of the concept. For example, explains Goertz, democracy may be seen as consisting of civil rights, competitive elections and so on. These “secondary-level dimensions remain part of the theoretical edifice, but they are concrete enough to be operationalized by the indicator/data level” (Goertz 2006b, 6–7). The third level, then, is the indicator/data level, or operationalization level. This is where we find the actual data, specific enough to observe and measure the original concept.

As an illustration, consider the concept of democracy as used in the Polity IV Project—which I use in the construction of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.” The Polity IV Project assigns each country a democracy score ranging from 0 to 10 and an autocracy score ranging from 0 to 10. A combined “Polity score” is then computed by subtracting the autocracy score from the democracy score. The Polity score can thus vary from -10 (strongly autocratic) to +10 (strongly democratic).

The secondary level of the concept of democracy/autocracy has five components: competitiveness of executive recruitment, openness of executive recruitment, constraints on chief executive, regulation of participation, and competitiveness of political participation (Marshall & Jaggers 2009, 14–15). These components show what dimensions of

---

66 Goertz (2006b, 28).
democracy are important in the Polity IV Project. Other aspects of plural democracy, such as freedom of the press or the rule of law, are not part of the Polity IV conceptualization of democracy.

On the indicator/data level the competitiveness of executive recruitment is operationalized into a variable consisting of eight forms, or degrees, that such competitiveness can take, ranging from “succession by birthright” via “informal competition within an elite” to “formal competition among publicly supported candidates” (Marshall & Jaggers 2009, 22). Corresponding operationalizations are made for the other secondary-level components, allowing researchers to pin-point the level of democracy/autocracy in the states of the world.

The relationship between the secondary-level components is an important, but occasionally overlooked aspect of concept formation and operationalization. Goertz (2006b) describes two principles for constructing this kind of multidimensional concept, one based on necessary and sufficient conditions and one based on family resemblance.

In the necessary and sufficient conditions structure, secondary-level components are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for the presence of the concept. An example is the definition of “armed conflict” used by the UCDP (2010):

An armed conflict is a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year.

The definition contains several components, each of which must be present for a conflict to fit the definition. For example, if an armed conflict does not result in at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year, or if none of the parties to the conflict is the government of a state, then the conflict does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the UCDP dataset. (This definition is used in the selection of cases in chapter 9).

Another example is Walter’s (2002, 51) conceptualization of a formal attempt to negotiate:

A war was coded as having experienced negotiations if three criteria were met: (1) the leaders or representatives of each of the main fighting factions met in face-to-face talks, (2) these individuals were willing to discuss both a cease-fire and a political solution to the war, and (3) their respective factions had the capabilities to continue the war if talks broke down [emphasis in original].

A situation that fails to meet even one of these criteria is coded as having experienced “no negotiation,” and cases where all three were met constitute cases of “active negotiations.” Each criterion is individually necessary, and they are jointly sufficient.
As an example of the family resemblance structure Goertz refers to Hicks (1999), who defines a welfare state circa 1930 as one that provides at least three of the four following services: (1) unemployment compensation, (2) old age pensions, (3) health insurance, or (4) workman’s compensation (Goertz 2006b, 38; cf. Hicks 1999, 67).

Here, no secondary level component of the concept is individually necessary, but the combination of a minimum number of components is sufficient. In the family resemblance structure, failing to meet one criterion may be compensated by meeting a sufficient number of other criteria; this is not possible in the necessary and sufficient condition structure.67

The Polity IV concept of democracy/autocracy is another example of the family resemblance structure. In the Polity IV Project, “there is no ‘necessary condition’ for characterising a political system as democratic, rather democracy is treated as a variable” (Marshall & Jaggers 2009, 14). This means that a low value on, for example, competitiveness of executive recruitment can be compensated by a high value on constraints on chief executive.

The different logics of the two concept structures can be illustrated more formally. The necessary and sufficient condition structure operates according to the logical AND in classic Aristotelian logic. The family resemblance structure works according to the logical OR. The difference can be expressed in terms of fuzzy logic and set theory as well, as in table 8.1.

The crux of the matter is the need for consistency. If the secondary-level components are described and organized according to the family resemblance structure, then the concept should be operationalized and measured according to the family resemblance structure; if the concept is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Necessary and Sufficient Condition</th>
<th>Family Resemblance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classic logic</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy logic</td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set theory</td>
<td>intersection</td>
<td>union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 The necessary and sufficient condition structure of concept construction should not be confused with the analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions. While the analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions asks whether certain conditions are necessary or sufficient for a certain outcome, the necessary and sufficient condition structure of concept construction rather defines certain conditions as necessary or sufficient components of the presence of a phenomenon. It is important to note that when a concept is constructed according to the necessary and sufficient condition structure, the particular conditions that are part of that concept cannot be made part of an analysis of necessary and sufficient conditions for the presence of that same concept; as argued below, in order to be able to analyze whether repatriation is a necessary condition for sustainable peace, refugee repatriation cannot be a necessary component of the concept of sustainable peace.
constructed according to the necessary and sufficient conditions structure, then it should be operationalized and measured in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions. We should aim for “concept-measure consistency.” However,

in general most concepts of democracy use the necessary and sufficient condition theoretical structure, while most measures use the family resemblance strategy, which as we have seen is typified by addition or the logical OR. Thus in terms of concept-measure consistency they do poorly (Goertz 2006b, 98).

Developing his argument further in collaboration with Mahoney, Goertz demonstrates the usefulness of fuzzy set analysis in the testing of two-level theories using different concept structures for different concepts. This is done by conducting a fuzzy set analysis of Skocpol’s theory of social revolutions, parts of which are briefly recounted here. For the full exercise see Goertz and Mahoney (2006, 257–266).

Skocpol’s theory is succinctly summarized as: “State breakdown and peasant revolt are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for social revolution.” The theory contains three basic-level concepts: the outcome social revolution and the causes state breakdown and peasant revolt. These, in turn, consist of several secondary-level components: social revolution consists of (1) class-based revolts from below, (2) rapid and basic transformation of state structures, and (3) rapid and basic transformation of class structures; state breakdown consists of (1) international pressure, (2) dominant class leverage within the state, and (3) agrarian backwardness; and peasant revolt consists of (1) peasant autonomy and solidarity, and (2) landlord vulnerability (Goertz & Mahoney 2006, 249).

Goertz and Mahoney operationalize each secondary-level component as a five-value fuzzy set and assign membership scores to the various cases in the analysis. They then demonstrate how the fuzzy membership scores in the secondary-level components can be aggregated into fuzzy membership scores in the basic-level components in two different ways, depending on concept structure.

One option is to argue that each secondary-level component is individually necessary for the basic-level concept. If so, all three components must be present in order for the concept to be present. This requires the use of the logical AND, which in fuzzy logic is calculated as the minimum (cf. table 8.1). Alternatively, each secondary-level component can be considered individually sufficient for the basic-level concept, in which case the concept can be present even when one or more components are absent—as long as at least one sufficient component is present. This procedure works according to the logical OR, calculated as the maximum in fuzzy logic.

Usually, the family resemblance structure does not mean that each secondary-level component is individually sufficient. More often m of n
components must be present, as in Hicks’s definition of a welfare state cited above. To handle such concepts, Goertz & Mahoney (2006, 243–244) present a third aggregation procedure using the min($\sum X_i$, 1), which calibrates the fuzzy membership scores in the secondary-level components to reflect the number of components that must be present for a case to be a member of the basic-level concept.

The details of this procedure need not concern us here. The point is that strict applications of the minimum and maximum are not the only options; there are “in-betweens.” And as Goertz and Dixon explain, the same applies to concept structures. The necessary and sufficient conditions structure and the family resemblance structure are not the only choices available. Instead, they are situated “at opposite poles of the concept structure continuum. This continuum consists of the degree of substitutability between secondary-level factors” (Goertz & Dixon 2006, 154).

Goertz first constructs a fuzzy set of each secondary-level component, then assesses the membership score of each case in these components. Finally, he uses these membership scores to calculate the membership in the basic-level concept, using minimum, maximum, or some alternative procedure. In this study, the secondary-level components largely consist of indicator/data-level measures, which means that fuzzy sets are constructed of the basic-level concepts rather than of the secondary-level components. The fuzzy sets are constructed not by aggregating memberships in secondary-level components, but by formulating explicit minimum criteria for each fuzzy membership value in each fuzzy set. In some instances, the concept structure changes between different membership values of a single fuzzy set.

The rationale behind this procedure is that all secondary-level components are not equally important to the basic-level concept. In some instances (such as the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace”), a minimum level of one secondary-level component is necessary for any non-zero membership in a fuzzy set, whereas higher membership scores are assessed on the basis of additional components that are not relevant to low membership values. In other instances (such as the fuzzy set of “repatriation”), membership values are based almost entirely on a single component, but in its absence another component can warrant a low, but not high, membership. In one instance (the fuzzy set of “partition”) the necessary condition for full membership and the respective necessary conditions for each lower membership value are mutually exclusive. While this may seem confusing at first, things will become clearer as the fuzzy sets are constructed in the rest of this chapter. Each section ends with a table summarizing the respective fuzzy set.

To the best of my knowledge, these concepts have not been operationalized as fuzzy sets before, so in this regard I am breaking new ground. This is a challenge that needs to be taken seriously. Further, fuzzy
sets should be the result of dialogue between theory and data, and many judgment calls are required when the fuzzy sets are constructed. For these reasons I find it particularly important to explicate the reasoning that underlies each fuzzy set and I do this in significantly greater detail than what is common in studies using fuzzy sets. Alternative operationalizations are conceivable, but to seriously question the ones I use in this study they need to be accounted for in corresponding detail.

Six sets are constructed: the fuzzy-set outcome “sustainable peace,” and the five fuzzy-set conditions “repatriation,” “ended displacement situation,” “partition,” “fractionalization,” and “group concentration.” All six are constructed as five-value fuzzy sets. There are a few studies that use sets with different numbers of membership values. While this might be motivated in special circumstances, I believe that the consequences it has for the analysis outweigh the benefits, and that the same number of membership values across all fuzzy sets should be the default option. Anyway, I intend to stick to that option in the present study. Also, I agree with Ragin that five-value fuzzy sets are especially useful in situations where researchers have a substantial amount of information about cases, but the evidence is not systematic or strictly comparable from case to case (Ragin 2000, 157).

Finally, and related to Goertz’s statement in the epigraph to this chapter, the operationalizations here should not deviate too much from previous operationalizations. In one respect they will, namely that they are fuzzy sets. However, “content-wise” they should be comparatively close to current research in order to contribute to the accumulation of knowledge. The concept of sustainable peace is probably the best example. It would be quite possible to elaborate on various complex definitions of the concept, including the meaning of democracy in different cultural settings. However, an operationalization of that kind would not measure the same phenomenon being measured in other research in the field (see also George & Bennett 2004, 70–71; Yin 2009, 32–33). It would therefore contribute less to our accumulated understanding of sustainable peace.

8.2 Sustainable Peace
The most elementary way to define peace is probably as the absence of war. Peace as the absence of war is often referred to as negative peace. It is also possible to talk about positive peace. Where negative peace is usually defined as the absence of direct violence, positive peace may be defined as the absence of structural violence (see e.g. Galtung 1969; Wallensteen 2007; Wiberg 1990). Both are examples of peace defined negatively, that is, as the
absence of something. Peace can also be defined positively as the presence of something, although this is less common.

While there is been peace between Sweden and Norway for more than a century, this is not the kind of peace that is of interest in this study. Here, focus is on peace after armed conflict, which in the field of peace and conflict research implicitly means peace after recent armed conflict.

The conventional way of conceptualizing peace after armed conflict is as the absence of war, that is, negatively defined negative peace. From World War II until the end of the Cold War, the ambition of mediators and peacemakers was to put an end to the use of armed force, and if that succeeded then peace was achieved. The common way to measure this success was to evaluate whether the absence of armed force became durable, that is, if it lasted for at least a minimum amount of time. According to Walter (2002, 53) a “five-year time frame is the standard measure of success in the literature” (cf. Hartzell, Hoddie & Rothchild 2001; Licklider 1995; Walter 1997).

While a focus on the initial five years after a peace settlement (whether in the form of agreement, victory or otherwise) has been a common practice in the literature, both shorter and longer periods have also been used. Nordquist (1992) employs three measures of durability, one of which is whether agreements remain operational for at least 15 years. Ohlson (1998) requires the absence of war for at least 30 months in order to call an agreement successful. Also, some researchers use several cutoff points. For example, Doyle and Sambanis (2000; cf. Sambanis 2000) measure peacebuilding success two, five, and ten years after a war. In recent years, it has become more common not to use specific cut-off points, but simply to measure how long a peace agreement holds (Fortna 2003; Gurses, Rost & McLeod 2008; Hartzell & Hoddie 2003; Jarstad & Nilsson 2008; Werner 1999), though some such studies, such as Druckman & Albin (2010), limit the continuous measure to the first five years.

The recurrence of war is the most common indicator of failure. A peace settlement fails if war restarts within a period of five years when such a fixed measure is used, or when war restarts if a continuous measure is used. Some studies do not require the use of force in order to code a peace settlement as failed. For Nordquist (1992) it is enough for the agreement to be formally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.2 Definitions of peace.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatively defined</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
invalidated by either party, for Werner (1999) the mere threat of force suffices. However, such measures are unusual. Also, when the measure used is the recurrence of armed force it can be adjusted to a lower level than the conventional definition of war. Walter (2002, 53, note 15) uses the conventional measure and finds that violence has ended “if fewer than one thousand war deaths occurred each year for a period of five consecutive years.” This can be compared to the UCDP definition of armed conflict cited above: at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year. The UCDP distinguishes between “wars” that cause at least 1,000 battle-related deaths in one calendar year—a definition that corresponds to the convention in the literature—and “minor armed conflicts” conflicts that cause 25–999 battle-related deaths.

It would be possible to construct a fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” on the basis of settlement duration. However, while it would be fairly simple to assign fuzzy membership scores in such a set, conceptually it would be off target in important respects. This is because, in addition to different thresholds being used for coding if and when peace settlements fail, a broad range of criteria can be added to the “absence of violence” standard in the measure of success.

Fortna acknowledges that her definition of peace as merely the absence of war has its limitations, because “not all varieties of peace are equally desirable, nor does stability necessarily coincide with social justice” (Fortna 2003, 339). Ohlson voices similar concerns when he argues that the idea of negative peace “suggests that highly unacceptable social orders and peace could be compatible. This is problematic, even unsatisfactory” (Ohlson 1998, 31).

Similarly, while negative peace was often the reasonable aim of peacekeeping during the Cold War, over the past twenty years the international community has developed higher ambitions in areas such as post-conflict reconstruction, transitional justice, democratization, et cetera. There is little consensus regarding the precise meaning of and differences between these various labels, but if any single one of them can be used as an overarching concept it is peacebuilding.

To some researchers peacebuilding involves a whole new range of means at the disposal of the international community, but the aim is more or less the same as before. Cousens’s emphasis on the original purpose of peacebuilding was referred to in chapter 2. In a similar manner, Jarstad and Sisk (2008) question the common perception that peacebuilding and democratization are mutually reinforcing, and argue that when these two aims collide the fortification of peace should take priority over democratization.

While most researchers would agree that the durable absence of war is the most important objective of peacebuilding (if only because a return to
warfare will undo achievements in other areas), democracy, respect for human rights, the rule of law, gender equality, et cetera are often placed on the output side of the equation. Rather than being means to an end (durability), they are goals in their own right in peacebuilding processes.

In this way the ambitions of peacebuilding have expanded beyond the mere cessation of armed violence. This has effects on how the success and failure of peacebuilding operations are conceptualized. A recurring theme is that peace must be made sustainable, a term which, within this field of research, has different connotations than durable. Paris has expressed this in the following way:

If the test of ‘successful’ peacebuilding is simply whether large-scale conflict resumed in the aftermath of a peacebuilding mission, then most of the operations conducted in the 1990s were successful, because in all but three cases (Angola, Rwanda, and Liberia), large-scale hostilities have not resumed. But if we use instead the standard of success articulated by Kofi Annan and Boutros Boutros-Ghali—namely, the establishment of a ‘sustainable’ peace, or a peace that will endure long after the peacebuilders depart from the country—then the picture becomes less favorable (Paris 2004, 6).

But what is really the difference between the traditional measure of success and failure, “whether large-scale conflict resumed in the aftermath of a peacebuilding mission,” and the more ambitious aim of establishing “a ‘sustainable’ peace, or a peace that will endure long after the peacebuilders depart from the country”? Instead of asking whether armed conflict resumed within five years of the end of active hostilities, should we simply ask whether armed conflict resumed within five years of the departure of the peacebuilders?

Yes and no. Yes, in much of the peacebuilding literature the fundamental criterion of success remains the durable absence of war. What is new is that peacebuilding theory considers a broader range of activities in and aspects of the post-conflict civil society as instrumental for that durability, although few such activities and aspects make it through the operationalization phase into indicators and measurements. But no, some studies have employed measures of sustainable peace that require more than the absence of armed conflict for a peace settlement to be deemed fully successful—as opposed to partially successful processes, where armed conflict does not resume, but the “quality” of the peace is nevertheless not entirely satisfactory.

Grading Peace
One implication of the discussion thus far is that the success and failure of peacebuilding is not necessarily a question of either/or; it can also be a matter of more or less, of varying degrees of success. Hampson, for one, argues that “the ending of civil violence and armed conflict” should be seen as only partial success.
The ultimate success of the peace-building process in situations of civil conflict is thus directly related to a society’s ability to make an effective transition from a state of war to a state of peace marked by the restoration of civil order, the reemergence of civil society, and the establishment of participatory political institutions (Hampson 1996, 10).

Such an understanding of peacebuilding success is key in the construction of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” and it is not entirely new.

Downs and Stedman use three degrees of success in their study of the implementation of peace settlements (Downs & Stedman 2002, 50–51). They operationalize “mission success” on the basis of two dichotomous variables, or rather, conditions,

1) whether large-scale violence is brought to an end while the implementers are present; and 2) whether the war is terminated on a self-enforcing basis so that the implementers can go home without fear of the war rekindling.

If neither condition is fulfilled a case is coded as a failure; if condition one is fulfilled, but not condition two, a case is coded as a partial success; and if both conditions are fulfilled, and the war did not restart within two years, a case is coded as a success.

In important respects, the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” used in this study builds on work by Doyle and Sambanis, who argue that “sustainable peace’ is the measure of successful peacebuilding” (Doyle & Sambanis 2006, 4). They introduce two concepts of peace: sovereign peace and participatory peace (2006, 73). First, sovereign peace (also referred to as lenient peace, cf. Doyle & Sambanis 2000) is “a negative standard of peace, and refers to the absence of large-scale violence.” Second, participatory peace (or strict peace) “requires sovereign peace plus a minimum level of political openness,” coded on the basis of the Polity IV index.

The concept of participatory peace is constructed according to the necessary and sufficient condition structure. Participatory peace requires sovereign peace plus a minimum level of political openness. A high level of political openness cannot compensate for a failure to fulfill the “negative standard of peace” for at least two years, the cutoff point used by Doyle and Sambanis. This means that the same case can be coded as a success according to the sovereign peace standard and a failure according to the participatory peace standard, but not vice versa (cf. Doyle & Sambanis 2006, table 3.1, pp 76–81).

An important conclusion from their earlier study is that higher order, or democratic, peacebuilding is more successful after nonidentity wars, after long and not very costly wars, in countries with relatively high development levels, and when UN peace operations and substantial financial assistance are available. Lower order peacebuilding – an end to the violence – is more dependent on
This shows that the lenient and strict types of peacebuilding are dependent on different factors. In other words, to achieve democracy and justice after a civil war, what is required is not simply more of whatever is associated with an end to violence, but something qualitatively different.

Clearly, many options are open for the operationalization of sustainable peace as a fuzzy set. Two concerns have influenced the process in this study. First, the post-conflict context of the study should be reflected in the construction of the fuzzy set; all degrees of membership, including full membership, refer to situations in countries that relatively recently experienced armed conflict. Second, the assumption under scrutiny in this study comes from a field of research where peace is measured according to variations on a common standard, as described above. The fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” while original in some ways, should not deviate too much from these conventional measures.

As noted above, Doyle and Sambanis use a cutoff point of two years. While it seems far-fetched to talk about sustainable peace in a situation where large-scale conflict resumes after three years, the absence of war for at least two years is a measure that has been used in the literature; here, it will be referred to as “sovereign peace for at least two years” and yield a membership score of 0.25 in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace”—such situations have some features of sustainable peace, but they are more out of the set than in. Conflicts that restart within two years are considered fully out of the set. Next, the membership value 0.50, or the cross-over point, will be what has been described as “the standard measure of success in the literature,” namely the absence of armed force for at least five years—here “sovereign peace for at least five years.”

For the remaining membership values, 0.75 and 1.00, certain qualities will be added to the five year measure, but a longer time-period will not be employed, for two reasons. First, as Downs and Stedman (2002, 48) aptly point out, “the passage of time is the enemy of inference.” The longer the time period studied, the more difficult to relate the outcome to the conditions. Secondly, Hartzell, Hoddie and Rothchild (2001, 187–188) argue that instances of civil wars resuming after more than five years are rare. And in fact, of the 138 conflict terminations in the UCDP termination dataset, seventy-nine were durable according to the five year measure, and only six of these restarted at a later date.68 This means that, although there are exceptions, if a terminated conflict has not restarted within five years it will usually remain terminated. Adding, say, another five years for higher

---

Table 8.3
The fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>participatory peace for at least five years, and respect for human rights, and no peace operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>participatory peace for at least five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>sovereign peace for at least five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>sovereign peace for at least two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>conflict recurrence within two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership values would therefore change little in terms of results (but, since all terminations should theoretically be given the chance to hold for ten years, it would reduce the number of cases that could be included in the study).

Instead of using a longer period than five years for the higher degrees of membership, I will employ Doyle and Sambanis’s concept of participatory peace, that is, sovereign peace plus a certain level of democracy. Doyle and Sambanis use two alternative levels of democracy: a combined Polity score of at least +3, and a combined Polity score of at least +6. For the membership value 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” I will require five years of sovereign peace plus a combined Polity score of at least +6.69

For full membership in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” a case should experience participatory peace—that is, sovereign peace for at least five years and a Polity score of at least +6 by the end of that period—plus there should be no ongoing peace operation at the end of the five year period (also based on Doyle & Sambanis 2006, 74) and a minimum level of respect for human rights. To measure respect for human rights, I use the Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) index (Cingranelli & Richards 2004; 2007) and require at least 5 on a combined measure standardized to vary between 0 and 10 (see Appendix 3 for details on the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace”).

Like the examples of graded peace above, this fuzzy set is based on the necessary and sufficient condition structure. For example, a high Polity score cannot compensate for short durability of the absence of conflict.

8.3 Repatriation
At first glance the operationalization of repatriation seems obvious: repatriation takes place when people repatriate. People who repatriate can be observed, even counted if necessary (though precise figures are often

69 Using the lower threshold, a Polity score of +3, changes the membership scores of no more than three cases compared to the threshold +6. It should also be noted that the threshold +6 is not arbitrary; the Polity IV web page (http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm) proposes a three-part categorization of states as autocracies (-10 to -6), anocracies (-5 to +5 and the three special values: -66, -77, and -88), and democracies (+6 to +10), that is, a threshold of +6 for democracies. Further, with a threshold of +6 it does not matter if I use the old Polity score or the new Polity2 score, so I will simply refer to “Polity scores.”
difficult to estimate). However, the challenge in this section is that repatriation needs to be operationalized as a condition. It must be possible to code cases as being cases of repatriation or cases of non-repatriation—or more specifically, since fuzzy sets are used, we must be able to determine the extent to which cases are cases of repatriation. The original assumption investigated in this study is formulated in terms of conditionality and not as a correlation, and in order to analyze whether repatriation is a necessary condition for peace, I must be able to determine whether that condition is present or absent in each case analyzed.

When it is assumed that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace, what is meant by “repatriation”? As soon as the first refugee has repatriated, repatriation has taken place to some extent, but this is clearly not what is intended. Likewise, the assumption does not require the return of every single displaced person to their original homes. As is so often the case, the answer lies somewhere in between, but the literature is not very enlightening in this regard.

While the construction of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” could draw on earlier operationalizations of peace, a somewhat different approach is needed in the construction of the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” A useful starting point is to consider a few cases where successful repatriation processes are often cited as having been important for peace. Cambodia, Guatemala, and Mozambique are prominent examples. While case studies of repatriation during peace processes do not often use the language of necessary conditions, given the way these three cases are considered in the peacebuilding literature they would clearly qualify as cases of repatriation. So, what did repatriation look like in these cases?

In the case of Cambodia “the repatriation in safety and dignity of Cambodian refugees and displaced persons [was] an integral part of the comprehensive political settlement” of the conflict (Article 20 of the Paris Agreement). Repatriation was explicitly related to the ability of refugees and displaced persons to participate in elections, as provided for in the peace agreement. “The effectiveness of the [Cambodian] repatriation operation has been widely recognized and it has been hailed as a model of its kind” (Eastmond & Öjendal 1999, 38–39). In 1991, the Cambodian refugee population consisted of more than three hundred and ninety thousand refugees. During 1992 and 1993 the UNHCR assisted more than three hundred and sixty thousand of them to repatriate, 95 percent in time to vote in the May 1993 elections. Several thousand more repatriated spontaneously (that is, without UNHCR assistance), bringing the total number of returnees to three hundred and sixty-seven thousand by the end of 1993 (USCRI 1994, 78). While generally considered very successful, the repatriation process was tainted by Thailand’s forcible return of the few hundred Cambodians who did not repatriate voluntarily, and it has been criticized for failing to
reintegrate the returning refugees properly (see e.g. Eastmond & Öjendal 1999).

In the case of Guatemala the active participation of refugees in planning and implementing repatriation has contributed to the assessment of it as a success. After a 1992 agreement between the Guatemalan government and representatives of the Guatemalan refugee community in Mexico, organized repatriation began, despite the fact that the conflict was not brought to an end until 1996. In 1989, the number of refugees was fifty-nine thousand. By 1999, the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants argued that those Guatemalans still remaining in Mexico in 1998 should no longer be considered refugees, despite the fact that both the Mexican government and the UNHCR still considered them as such. The USCRI argued that nothing prevented repatriation, and that those who had not repatriated by 1998 should be considered to have voluntarily decided to resettle elsewhere. Thus, they should no longer be considered displaced. The same was said about IDPs (USCRI 1999, 266–267). By this time, more than thirty-one thousand refugees had repatriated.

The Mozambican repatriation process is one of the most massive to date. Out of a total refugee population of 1.7 million in 1992, some 1.4 million returned between the signing of the peace agreement in 1992 and the end of 1995, in a process regarded as very successful. 3 million IDPs returned home during the same period. In 1996 the UNHCR invoked the cessation clause for refugees from Mozambique. The UNHCR cited the “uninterrupted peace and stability” in Mozambique since the signing of the peace agreement, and the successful return and reintegration of refugees, and concluded that these developments, as well as their broad international recognition and appreciation, are indicative of the fundamental nature and durability of the changes which have taken place in Mozambique, and call therefore for the application of the cessation clause to Mozambican refugees (UNHCR 1996).

The USCRI applies the same argument to remaining IDPs (USCRI 1997, 82).

Two secondary-level components of the concept “repatriation” can be extracted from this very brief overview. First, the extent of repatriation that has taken place is obviously important, and second, the successful completion of an organized repatriation program should also be taken into account.

---

70 In Guatemala the terms “return” and “repatriation” took on different connotations with return implying an active subject deciding to return home as opposed to the passive object being repatriated. This study adheres to the conventional use of the terms as synonymous.

71 The World Refugee Survey, a yearly publication by the USCRI, has been the primary source of displacement data in this study (cf. chapter 9).

72 Additionally, a decision by the UNHCR to invoke the cessation clause is seemingly critical in that it reveals a belief that the problem is solved. However, that is exactly the crux of the cessation clause in the present context: problem solved. It does not presuppose that the problem was solved through repatriation; any
The absolute number of refugees who have repatriated is not irrelevant, but the share that has done so is more pertinent. If thirty thousand out of a displaced population of forty thousand have repatriated, this is more to the point than if fifty thousand out of two hundred thousand have repatriated. Still, although a 75 percent repatriation rate is a better indicator of the condition “repatriation” than a 25 percent repatriation rate, it is not obvious what rate to require for full or partial membership in the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” Previous research offers no guidance since repatriation has not been operationalized as a condition in this way before. However, the three repatriation successes can serve as a starting point.

In the Cambodian case the repatriation rate was almost 95 percent, in the Guatemalan case the rate was 54 percent; and Mozambique achieved a repatriation rate of 81 percent. There is a considerable difference between slightly over 50 percent of refugees returning home to Guatemala and more than 80 percent returning home to Mozambique and Cambodia. Nevertheless, all three cases are usually considered successful, and should definitely be (at least) more in than out of the fuzzy set of “repatriation.”

Therefore, in this study, full membership in the fuzzy set of “repatriation” will require a repatriation rate of at least 80 percent. This means that the membership scores of Cambodia and Mozambique are 1.00. Guatemala receives a membership score of 0.75 ending up between full membership and the crossover point, at a level which will require a repatriation rate of at least 50 percent. With repatriation rates of less than 50 percent it becomes increasingly difficult to categorize cases as “cases of repatriation,” and in cases where less than one-third of displaced persons return repatriation is clearly not the most common solution. Therefore, cases with repatriation rates between 30 and 50 percent will receive a membership score of 0.50—the crossover point.

The other secondary-level component of the concept of repatriation, the successful completion of an organized repatriation program, is arguably less important than the displacement rate, most obviously because the ambitions of organized repatriation processes may vary substantially. As an illustration, consider the case Bosnia and Herzegovina (Croat), 1994 (part of the fuzzy-set analysis in chapter 10). In this case a few thousand Bosnian Croats repatriated from Croatia to Republika Srpska (RS) under a June 1998 agreement between Croatia and RS (USCRI 2000, 225; 2001, 211). This program was not aiming at returning several hundred thousand Bosnian Croats from Croatia to Bosnia, and in terms of finding durable solutions for the entire Bosnian Croat refugee population in Croatia the impact of the program was practically negligible. The overall repatriation rate from Croatia durable solution will do. Consequently, the cessation clause, critical as it is, will be part of the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” operationalized in the next section, but not of the fuzzy set of “repatriation.”
to Bosnia was 10–15 percent, and this particular program probably contributed less than one-tenth of that. Yet, in the context of the situation in former Yugoslavia (to which assessments of fuzzy membership scores should be sensitive), an exchange program of this kind should count for something.

On the basis of such considerations the successful completion of an organized repatriation program is used as a basis for membership scores of 0.25 in the fuzzy set of “repatriation” for cases where the repatriation rate is lower than 30 percent. What, more precisely, constitutes a successful completion of an organized repatriation program will have to be determined on a case by case basis. Similarly, the three thresholds based on the repatriation rate are not set in stone, but can be employed flexibly depending on such factors as the size of the total displaced population, the pace of repatriation, or whether repatriating refugees are unable to return to their areas of origin and instead become internally displaced—which raises a final concern before the fuzzy set of “repatriation” can be presented:

What about the distinction between refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs)? Should only refugees count, or both refugees and IDPs? The assessment of cases can differ substantially depending on whether one or both categories of displaced persons are included in the analysis. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), 2001 (also part of the fuzzy-set analysis in chapter 10) is a case in point. The vast majority of displaced persons in/from DRC were IDPs (more than 3 million, or 85 percent of the total displaced population in 2003), and while more than 2 million IDPs returned home, only a handful (relatively speaking) refugees returned. Also, there are important differences (as well as similarities) between refugees and IDPs regarding return and protection in relation to peace processes (Fagen 2009).

On the one hand, general statements about repatriation as a necessary condition for peace typically allude to refugee repatriation, and do not mention IDPs. This suggests that the analysis be limited to refugees. On the other hand, in the case where the argument about peace being dependent on repatriation has been pronounced more forcefully than anywhere else, namely Bosnia-Herzegovina, a strong emphasis has been placed on minority

Table 8.4
The fuzzy set of “repatriation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>repatriation rate at least 80 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>repatriation rate at least 50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>repatriation rate at least 30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>repatriation rate less than 30 percent, and successful repatriation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>repatriation rate less than 30 percent, and no successful repatriation program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
return and the remixing of ethnic groups; a mere returning of refugees to their country of origin has clearly not been considered good enough. This calls for including both refugees and IDPs.

In keeping with Goertz’s proposition in the epigraph to this chapter, I believe that the decision should depend on the role the concept repatriation plays in causal theories and explanations. Unfortunately, the causal theories and explanations at hand do not provide a decisive answer either way. The argument about refugee warriors is more relevant to refugee populations than internally displaced populations, not in principle, but because displaced persons are more likely to be able to arm themselves when outside their country of origin. This is in line with Lischer’s argument that governments-in-exile are the most likely to use force—governments-in-exile are also more likely to be abroad, whereas people fleeing generalized violence may or may not cross an international border (cf. chapter 2). Conversely, the argument about expressing confidence in the future of one’s country applies at least as much to IDPs as to refugees. This is particularly evident in cases where refugees return to their country of origin, but end up in internal displacement because they are unable or unwilling to return to their actual homes. Consequently, I will employ two alternative codings for the fuzzy set of “repatriation,” one based on all displaced persons, and one based on refugees and asylum seekers only, excluding IDPs.

In this set, a very low rate of return can be compensated by a successful repatriation program. However, such a program cannot by itself yield a high membership score in the set. This means that while successful repatriation programs are not entirely irrelevant to membership scores in the fuzzy set of “repatriation” those membership scores are nevertheless primarily assessed on the basis of repatriation rates.

8.4 Ended Displacement Situation

The fuzzy set of “repatriation” is obviously based particularly on the durable solution repatriation. Conversely, the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is equally compatible with the two other durable solutions, local integration and resettlement. What matters is that the displacement situation has ended, not how it ended.

The share of displaced persons who find a solution—any solution—is a significant secondary-level component of the concept ended displacement situation. However, the “any-solution-rate” is less central to the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” than the repatriation rate is to the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” This is so because theoretically, the focus of repatriation as a condition for peace is primarily on how those who do return can contribute to sustainable peace, but the focus of ended displacement situation as a condition for peace is rather on how those who do not find durable solutions
(or how the fact that not all displaced persons have found durable solutions) can hamper peace efforts.

A more important secondary-level component is therefore the absolute number of people who have not found durable solutions by the time the outcome is assessed. As in the case of repatriation, there is little guidance in previous research regarding what numbers would be relevant to different fuzzy membership values in the set of “ended displacement situation” (and, again, a fair amount of flexibility is called for in the coding process, as the assessment of fuzzy membership scores should reflect case knowledge).

In 2004 the UNHCR introduced the measure of “25,000 persons or more who have been in exile for five or more years in developing countries” as a way to identify what was termed “major protracted refugee situations” (Loescher & Milner 2005; UNHCR Executive Committee 2004). The number twenty-five thousand is the basis for the designation “major,” and the five year duration makes a situation “protracted.” The rationale behind the figure twenty-five thousand is not explicated, but the UNHCR’s use of it makes it less arbitrary than most other figures as a starting point for an operationalization of the concept ended displacement situation into a fuzzy set. Crude as the measure of twenty-five thousand may be, a major displacement situation is hardly an ended displacement situation.

In view of the many refugee populations that number several hundred thousand, even millions, the measure of twenty-five thousand appears relatively low and sets a high standard for membership in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation.” If millions of displaced persons succeed in finding durable solutions it might seem less important whether ten thousand, twenty-five thousand or fifty thousand fail to do so. However, once again the role the concept plays in causal theories and explanations needs to be kept in mind, and then the absolute number of people who remain displaced is more important than the relative number who find durable solutions. In addition it is quite likely that the last remaining displaced persons are the most politically contentious, and in such circumstances their number does not have to be high for the issue to be very salient.

Low membership values in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” are based on a combination of these two secondary-level components. As argued above, a major displacement situation is hardly an ended displacement situation. Therefore, cases where the remaining displaced population is substantially larger than twenty-five thousand persons will be considered full non-members of the set—unless at least 50 percent of the total displaced population have managed to find durable

---

73 An unconfirmed rumor has it that the figure twenty-five thousand was chosen because at the time it resulted in a list of protracted refugee situations that neatly fit a standard page U.S. letter. The UNHCR admits, in the original document, that the measure is “crude.”
conditions, in which case membership will be 0.25. If the remaining displaced population is around twenty-five thousand, and at least 50 percent have found solutions, it is difficult to determine whether a case should be considered more in or out of the set, and, consequently, membership will be 0.50. For higher membership values, the size of the remaining displaced population is key, and the any-solution-rate is disregarded. For full membership in the set, the remaining displaced population should not exceed ten thousand persons. Again, the figure ten thousand is not based on any established convention in the literature, because there is none. However, reporting on displacement becomes increasingly scant as numbers decrease, and many summaries of displacement situations do not contain displaced populations smaller than ten thousand.

In addition to the size of the remaining displaced population and the any-solution-rate, the case of Mozambique in the previous section suggested a third secondary-level component of the concept ended displacement situation, namely “the cessation clause.” Article 1.C of the Refugee Convention lists the circumstances under which the Convention shall cease to apply to a person. This shall be the case, inter alia, if he has voluntarily re-availed himself of the protection of the country of his nationality, or if he has acquired a new nationality and is protected by the country of that new nationality. Most important in the present context, Article 1.C (5) states that the Convention shall cease to apply to a person if

he can no longer, because the circumstances in connexion with which he has been recognised as a refugee have ceased to exist, continue to refuse to avail himself of the protection of the country of his nationality.

Until 2001, the cessation clause had twice been invoked by the UNHCR with reference to the settlement of civil conflict: in 1973 concerning Sudan and in 1996 concerning Mozambique and Malawi. It had also been invoked seven times with reference to “independence” and twelve times with reference to “regime change/democratization” (Bonoan 2001, 22).

Article 1.C (5) is obviously more closely related to changed circumstances in the country of origin than to a solution to the displacement situation. The basis for invoking the cessation clause in the cases of Sudan and Mozambique/Malawi was not the large number of displaced persons that had repatriated, but the “fundamental nature and durability of the changes” that had taken place (UNHCR 1996). Before invoking the cessation clause, however, the UNHCR tries to find durable solutions for the displaced; the cessation clause is not invoked at the initiation of, say, a repatriation program, but in relation to the completion of it. By invoking the cessation clause, the UNHCR sends the message that any circumstances related to the creation of the displacement situation have ceased to exist, and that anyone
who still resides outside his or her country of nationality does so by choice, not because of well-founded fear. In essence, it means that the UNHCR considers the problem solved.

More specifically, it means that the displacement situation is solved, not necessarily that the refugees’ problems are solved. In the present context, the UNHCR invoking the cessation clause is important enough an act to warrant full membership in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation,” irrespective of the size of the remaining displaced population and the any-solution-rate. Similarly, although the USCRI cannot invoke the cessation clause, they occasionally make explicit assertions that certain groups of people should no longer be considered displaced, as in the case of refugees from Guatemala and, as discussed in the previous section, IDPs in both Guatemala and Mozambique. Such assertions are made on the same basis used by the UNHCR to invoke the cessation clause, and will equally merit full membership.

The fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is summarized in table 8.5. In the same way as for “repatriation,” the assessment of membership in the fuzzy set “ended displacement situation” is based on developments up to five years after the conflict termination, corresponding to the five-year measure of the outcome, sustainable peace (with the obvious exception of cases where the termination fails within five years). Also, as in the case of repatriation, two alternative codings are used, one including all displaced persons, and one based on refugees and asylum seekers only, excluding IDPs.

8.5 Partition
When it comes to partition there is more previous research to draw on than was the case with repatriation and ended displacement situation. As a starting point for the operationalization of the fuzzy set of “partition,” I use Kaufmann’s list of terminated conflicts 1944–1994, in table 8.6.74

---

74 In addition to the thirteen cases presented in here, Kaufmann counts twelve cases that ended by complete military victory by one side, and two that were suppressed by military occupation by a third party. However, those latter types of conflict terminations are not relevant to a discussion of different degrees of partition.
Table 8.6
Outcomes of ethnic civil wars (adapted from Kaufmann 1996b, 160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De jure partition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians vs. USSR</td>
<td>independent 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanians vs. USSR</td>
<td>independent 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritreans vs. Ethiopia</td>
<td>independent 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De facto partition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenians vs. Azerbaijan</td>
<td>de facto partition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali clans</td>
<td>de facto partition in the north</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nagas vs. India</td>
<td>autonomy 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basques vs. Spain</td>
<td>autonomy 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripuras vs. India</td>
<td>autonomy 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinians vs. Israel</td>
<td>autonomy 1993, partly implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskitos vs. Nicaragua</td>
<td>autonomy 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abkhazians vs. Georgia</td>
<td>autonomy 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited autonomy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moros vs. Philippines</td>
<td>limited autonomy 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong Hill peoples vs. Bangladesh</td>
<td>limited autonomy 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the creation of a new independent state constitutes full membership in the fuzzy set of “partition,” and various forms of autonomy can be used to define partial membership in the set. Because the role of partition as a condition for peace is related to the security dilemma, two aspects of autonomy should be considered in the operationalization process: territoriality and power.

As discussed in chapter 2 political/territorial partition and ethnic separation are different phenomena. I address partition in this section before turning to fractionalization and group concentration in the following two sections. The reason for this order is that partition, like repatriation and ended displacement situation, can be directly related to the termination of the conflict in question. However, as discussed further below, available data on fractionalization and group concentration cannot be related to the individual conflict terminations, but rather refer to certain aspects of the conflict. This difference is important, and I therefore treat repatriation, ended displacement situation, and partition as one set of conditions, and fractionalization and group concentration as another set.

75 Autonomy as part of the operationalization of the fuzzy set of “partition” should not be confused with the autonomy of municipal government, or states in a federation. While the latter refers to how centralized versus decentralized a country is, what is relevant to the concept of partition is whether autonomy arrangements are related to a specific territorial unit within the state, which sets that unit apart from other units in the state (or to a specific group, setting that group apart).
Table 8.7
The fuzzy set of “partition.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>de jure partition (new state created and recognized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>de facto partition, or autonomous region responsible for external security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>autonomy arrangements related to territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>autonomy arrangements related to ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>no autonomy arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, while most autonomy arrangements are territorially bound there are alternatives, such as cultural autonomy which is awarded a certain group in a society without geographic specifications (see e.g. Cornell 2001; Hannum 1990; Lapidoth 1997). Though not irrelevant in this context, cultural autonomy clearly warrants a lower membership in the fuzzy set of “partition” than territorial autonomy. Second, the powers delegated to or otherwise assumed by the autonomous entity can include anything from the responsibility for basic social services, language and education, taxation, to internal (police) and external (military) security and the right or ability to enter into agreements with other states or international organizations. As a basis for assessing membership scores in the fuzzy set of “partition,” responsibility for external security, including control of border crossings, is more pertinent than responsibility for education. Obviously, full membership in the set is also based on territoriality and power.

8.6 Fractionalization
As mentioned in chapter 6, one dimension of ethnic structure concerns the heterogeneity or fractionalization of a country and another concerns the geographic distribution of ethnic groups. Fractionalization, operationalized in the present section, is based only on the number and relative size of ethnic groups in a country. In the next section, the concept of group concentration, developed within the framework of the Minorities at Risk (MAR) Project precisely to enable consideration of ethnic separation or intermixing, is described and operationalized.

The traditional measure of ethnic fractionalization is calculated as 1 minus the standardized Herfindahl-Hirschman index\(^{76}\) of ethnolinguistic group shares, and reflects the probability that two random individuals from the population of a country belong to two different ethnic groups; the higher the value, the more heterogeneous a country (see Alesina et al. 2003, 156–158). This formula for calculating ethnic fractionalization is often referred to as the ELF index (for ethnolinguistic fractionalization). The ELF index has usually been based on data from the *Atlas Narodov Mira*, published by the

\[ ELF = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_j^2 \]

\(^{76}\) ELF = 1 - \( \sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j^2 \) where \( s_j \) is the share of group \( i = 1, ..., n \).

However, the traditional measure, most importantly the data from the Atlas, have been criticized, and alternative measures are continuously being developed.\(^{77}\) They are different in at least three important and partly related respects. First, the types of cleavages used to identify various groups differ. In addition to ethnicity, language is often taken into account and occasionally also religion—which is not uncomplicated, since language and religion are often part of the concept of ethnicity. The ethnolinguistic index in the Atlas, for example, is based on “the common Eastern European assumption that native language marks ethnicity” (Fearon 2003, 210). Second, different data sources are used, often global ones such as the Atlas, the CIA World Factbook, Encyclopedia Britannica, Barrett (1982), Levinson (1998), or Vanhanen (1999), but also country studies and census data. Third, various additional considerations are made when the actual indices are constructed. For example, Rae and Taylor (1970, 26–33) propose different formulae for large and small populations, Fearon (2003; cf. 2000) uses the structural distance between languages to sensitize his measure to the cultural distances between groups in a country, and Posner (2004) constructs an index of “politically relevant groups,” which by implication classifies some culturally or linguistically distinct groups as irrelevant (depending on the issue at hand).

In this study I use data from Alesina et al. (2003), who present three separate indices for ethnic, linguistic and religious fractionalization. These indices are computed in the same way as the ELF index, described above, but are not based on Atlas data. Instead, the Encyclopedia Britannica constitutes the primary source, supplemented by various other sources as needed (see Alesina et al. 2003, 158–160). I consider both the average score of all three indices combined, and the ethnicity score on its own. The fuzzy membership values are based on the distribution of the cases across the ethnic fractionalization index.\(^{78}\)

\(^{77}\) See, for example, Posner (2004, 856) who presents the fractionalization scores for 42 African countries according to seven different indices. For many countries the scores vary substantially from one index to the other.

\(^{78}\) The thresholds are based on the distribution of the thirty-seven countries included in the present study (cf. chapter 9), not on all two hundred fifteen states in Alesina’s dataset. This is because the distribution of all states across the ethnic fractionalization index basically covers the entire range from zero to one, without interruption, but when only the thirty-seven cases are analyzed it is possible to discern a few thresholds that can be used to define the different fuzzy membership values in the set of “fractionalization.” It should be noted, that the distribution of the cases is not very different from the distribution of all states, although the average ethnic fractionalization score is higher, 0.54 compared to 0.44 for all states. Standard deviations are 0.24 and 0.25 respectively. The same is true for the average combined ethnic-linguistic-religious fractionalization index, where cases score 0.50 compared to 0.42 for all states, and standard deviations are 0.21 and 0.19.
Table 8.8
The fuzzy set of “fractionalization.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&gt;0.85 on ethnic fractionalization or &gt; 0.85 on combined fractionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>&gt;0.60 on ethnic fractionalization or &gt; 0.60 on combined fractionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>&gt;0.35 on ethnic fractionalization or &gt; 0.35 on combined fractionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&gt;0.20 on ethnic fractionalization or &gt; 0.20 on combined fractionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.20 on ethnic fractionalization and &lt; 0.20 on combined fractionalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, available datasets on fractionalization are not based on yearly fluctuations—which, for the purposes of this study, would have been preferable. On the contrary, fractionalization is measured at intervals of a decade or more. (Alesina uses the most recent data for two hundred fifteen states, and time of data collection varies from 1979 to 2001.) As illustrated by the case study on Bosnia-Herzegovina and the plans for a census in 2011, it is particularly difficult to trace changes in fractionalization in the aftermath of conflict. Hence, it was not practical within the framework of this study to assemble yearly data on fractionalization for thirty-seven countries over a period of several years (as was done for repatriation and ended displacement situation). Therefore, rather than tracing how fractionalization changed during the first several years after conflict termination, the condition fractionalization in this study serves to describe the various countries where the conflicts took place. I return to this caveat in chapter 10.

8.7 Group Concentration
As seen above, fractionalization is insensitive to the geographic distribution of ethnic groups within a country. However, as Kaufmann argues: “The severity of the ethnic security dilemma is greatest when demography is most intermixed, weakest when community settlements are most separate.” (Kaufmann 1996b, 148) Therefore, the concept of group concentration comes closer to the essence of the security dilemma. As in the case of fractionalization, the measure of group concentration refers to a specific point in time and does not permit the analysis of change from one year to the next. Thus, the condition group concentration will be used in the same way as fractionalization to describe the context of the respective conflicts.

For data on group concentration I turn to the MAR project, which is the only reasonable option. In a recent study, Melander measures regional ethnic diversity and argues that “by relying on the MAR codings as the basis for the operationalization of the key independent variable [of regional ethnic diversity], the present study follows the state of the art in the field” (Melander 2009, 103). The latest version of the MAR dataset has seen the introduction of new group concentration indicators, the foundation of which
is the “regional base,” originally devised by Laitin. According to Laitin (2006, 213), the existence of a regional base requires that

(1) at least 25% of the minority population should live in a certain spacially contiguous region, and (2) the percentage of the country's minority population living in that region should be significantly higher than the percentage of the country's dominant group living in that region.

The fuzzy set of “group concentration” used in this study is based on the regional base and other group concentration indicators from the MAR dataset. The minority populations referred to in the definition of a regional base are ethnopolitical groups. The UCDP (used for case selection in chapter 9) distinguishes between conflicts over government and conflicts over territory. In conflicts over government there are no ethnopolitical groups and such conflicts are therefore, by definition, fully out of the fuzzy set of “group concentration.” In (intrastate) conflicts over territory there are ethnopolitical groups, and such conflicts will therefore have at least partial membership in the fuzzy set of “group concentration.”

The most difficult type of case to assess is that in which there is a regional base, but the ethnopolitical group is only weakly concentrated in it. Such cases will therefore receive membership scores of 0.50 in the fuzzy set of “group concentration.” Two MAR indicators are use to measure the concentration of groups in the regional base. One concerns the ethnopolitical group’s share of the total population in the region: <50 percent, 50–75 percent, or 75–100 percent (MAR indicator gc6b, cf. Davenport 2003, 18–21). The other indicator concerns the proportion of the group that lives outside the regional base: <25 percent, 25–50 percent, or 50–75 percent (MAR indicator gc7). An ethnopolitical group is considered to be weakly concentrated to the regional base if the group constitutes less than 50 percent of the population in the region and 50–75 percent of the group lives outside the region (that is, the weakest concentration scores, respectively). The membership scores of such cases will be 0.50.

Full membership, that is 1.00, will require the strongest group concentration on both indicators—the group should constitute 75–100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>regional base and strong concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>regional base and medium concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>regional base and weak concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>no regional base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>no group (conflicts over government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9
The fuzzy set of “group concentration.”
percent of the region’s population and less than 25 percent of the group should live outside the region. Other combinations of scores than the two weakest or the two strongest on the two MAR indicators will result in membership scores of 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “group concentration.” Finally, conflicts over territory where there is no regional base—that is, where Laitin’s two criteria are not fulfilled—will receive membership scores of 0.25.

This concludes the operationalization of concepts into fuzzy sets. The next chapter goes on to select the cases for the fuzzy-set analysis and to assess their membership scores in each of the fuzzy sets constructed in this chapter.
9 \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Case Selection and Coding}

The problem of intrinsic fuzziness in IR cannot be solved by any arbitrarily large increase in the accuracy of our measurements. This fuzziness is embedded in the very nature of foreign policy and international politics; from this perspective, it is “empirical” in a very real sense.

Claudio A. Cioffi-Revilla\textsuperscript{79}

9.1 Selection of Cases

As explained in Chapter 7, not all cases are equally relevant to a set-theoretic argument. In an analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis relevant cases should be armed conflicts that have both caused substantial displacement and ended at one time or other, and which may or may not have restarted (cf. Gerring 2007, 19). In this way, it will be possible to analyze both to what extent each case is a case of repatriation and to what extent it is a case of sustainable peace. Conflicts that either have not ended or did not cause substantial displacement would be irrelevant (cf. the possibility principle, chapter 7).

In order to identify cases for the fuzzy set analysis, I turned to the UCDP, a collection of datasets about armed conflicts since the World War II. The UCDP website,\textsuperscript{80} as well as each issue of \textit{States in Armed Conflict}, an annual publication by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University, lists a number of definitions used by the UCDP. Since the case selection procedure is partly based on these definitions, two are presented here:

An \textbf{armed conflict} is a contested incompatibility that concerns \textit{government} and/or \textit{territory} where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the \textit{government} of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year.

The \textbf{intensity} variable is coded in two categories: \textit{Minor}: At least 25 but less than 1,000 battle-related deaths in a year. \textit{War}: at least 1,000 battle-related deaths in a year.

Until 2006 the UCDP used three levels of intensity: minor, intermediate, and war. The \textit{intermediate} level introduced a temporal dimension to the coding of conflict intensity, defined as “more than 1,000 battle-related deaths recorded during the course of the conflict, but fewer than 1,000 in any given year (Sollenberg 2001, 9–11). However, because the intensity variable was often misconceived as ordinal (as three levels of increasing intensity), the

\textsuperscript{79} Cioffi-Revilla (1981, 131); IR means International Relations.
\textsuperscript{80} http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/index.htm.
intermediate level was dropped, and is now instead represented by a separate dummy denoting cumulative intensity (UCDP 2009c, 7, footnote 8). This dummy variable has been employed in the selection of cases for the present analysis.

I used the Armed Conflict Termination Dataset, version 1.0, published in 2005, and employed several criteria to select cases. From the comprehensive “conflict year” data, I first excluded all non-terminated conflicts (coded 0 on “Term”). This resulted in a list of all conflict terminations 1946–2004, as identified by the UCDP.

Next, though the claim about repatriation and peace is not made with explicit reference to any specific period in time, the analysis needs to focus on a limited number of years in order to be feasible. I decided to focus on the period 1989–2001 (excluding cases coded <1989 or >2001 on “Year”). This period was selected for two reasons. First, comprehensive peacebuilding efforts aimed at “sustainable peace” rather than merely ending the use of force are largely a post-Cold War phenomenon (see e.g. Doyle & Sambanis 2006, 22), and as argued in chapter 1, repatriation became the default solution to refugee problems in the late 1980s. Hence, limiting the study to 1989 and later means that the analysis will focus on the time period during which the argument about repatriation and peace has been most emphatically pronounced and employed. The latter cutoff point, 2001, is motivated by the operationalization of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace”; it must be possible to determine whether the conflict termination lasted for at least five years.

The second reason for limiting the analysis to the period 1989–2001 has to do with the main source used for information on displacement and return (or other durable solutions) in this study, namely the World Refugee Survey (WRS). This is an annual publication by the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants. The WRS has been particularly useful during the period of interest in this study. Each issue consists of three parts: (1) a statistical overview of world refugee data covering both refugees and asylum seekers worldwide by country of origin and country of asylum, main sources of refugees and IDPs, major return movements, et cetera, (2) several thematic articles about various aspects of displacement, and (3) detailed country reports with information about displacement within and from a large number of countries worldwide, based on critical assessments of a number of different sources as well as field visits by USCRI staff. The WRS is particularly suitable for the purposes of this study because it focuses on conflict-induced displacement and attempts to relate displacement to particular conflicts, even in countries with several simultaneous conflicts.

Unfortunately, its usefulness (for these purposes) is largely limited to the period 1989–2001. Having consisted of around one hundred pages of less detailed information in the late 1980s, the WRS became ever more extensive
and detailed during the 1990s, not least in terms of describing the development of conflicts with consequences for displacement, following various groups of displaced persons from year to year, and back-dating displacement figures as estimates became more reliable over time. The 2000 issue is more than three hundred pages long. A few years after the turn of the century, however, the publication became less extensive, and its focus shifted to the asylum policies of host countries.

Finally, the resolution of intrastate and interstate conflicts works differently (Wallensteen 2007, 81–189), and comprehensive peacebuilding efforts are usually made after intrastate, or civil, conflicts rather than after interstate ones. Therefore the latter type (coded 2 on “Type”) was also excluded. Remaining conflicts are either internal conflicts or internationalized internal conflicts.81 In order to further limit the number of cases I decided to also exclude cases that had not resulted in at least one thousand battle-related deaths during the entire course of the conflict (coded 0 on “CumInt”), based on the dummy variable on cumulative intensity.82

This process left me with a list of sixty-five conflict terminations in fifty-two different conflicts, all of which had resulted in at least one thousand battle-related deaths (see table 9.1). While several theoretical arguments about the importance of return (or of avoiding it) are primarily related to ethnic (territorial) conflicts, some are equally valid for ideological (governmental) conflicts. In chapter 10 tests are conducted on the two types of conflict both separately and together.

Further Reduction of Cases

The list of cases in table 9.1 was the result of limitations made on the basis of the conflict termination dataset. However, in order for a conflict termination to be relevant to a test of the peace-by-repatriation thesis the conflict should have caused substantial displacement. In this study I use the threshold twenty-five thousand displaced persons to identify substantial displacement. As discussed in relation to the operationalization of the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation,” a “major, protracted refugee situation” consists of at least twenty-five thousand displaced persons. Again, the figure twenty-five thousand is arbitrary, but less so than any other conceivable figure.

On the basis of the substantial displacement criterion, fifteen conflict terminations in nine conflicts were excluded from the list above, namely Ethiopia (Ogaden), 1996; Senegal (Casamance), 2001; UK (Northern

---

81 Extraterritorial (or anti-colonial) conflicts (coded 1 on “Type”) were excluded indirectly by the exclusion of pre-1989 conflict terminations.
82 The UCDP threshold of twenty-five battle-related deaths per year is low in comparison with other datasets. Otherwise one thousand deaths per year has often been used. By excluding most minor armed conflicts, but including those with a history of high intensity, the present study will analyze wars as well as less intensive but protracted conflicts.
Table 9.1
A preliminary list of cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, 2001</td>
<td>Laos, 1990*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, 1995</td>
<td>Lebanon, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (Chittagong Hill Tracts), 1992</td>
<td>Morocco (Western Sahara), 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina ( Croat), 1994</td>
<td>Mozambique, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin), 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad, 1994</td>
<td>Myanmar, 1992*, 1994*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, 1999</td>
<td>Nicaragua, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo, 2001</td>
<td>Paraguay, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, 1991</td>
<td>Peru, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea), 1991</td>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao), 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, 1991</td>
<td>Philippines, 1995*, 1997*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Ogaden), 1996*</td>
<td>Russia (Chechnya), 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia), 1993</td>
<td>Rwanda, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1995</td>
<td>Senegal (Casamance), 2001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau, 1993</td>
<td>Sierra Leone, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, 1994*</td>
<td>Somalia, 1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Nagaland), 1997*, 2000*</td>
<td>Sri Lanka (Eelam), 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Punjab/Khalistan), 1993*</td>
<td>Sri Lanka, 1990*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, 1993*, 1997*, 2001*</td>
<td>Yemen (South Yemen), 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1993, 1996</td>
<td>Yugoslavia (Croatia), 1991**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq, 1996</td>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo), 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cases were excluded as the coding process continued, each is briefly explained below.
** Yugoslavia (Croatia) is a special case discussed further below.

Throughout, I use the original UCDP "name" of each conflict. This means that conflicts over territory are those where a territory (or, in a few cases, an ethnic group) is added in parenthesis, and conflicts over government are referred to simply by the name of the country, and that the various conflicts in Burma/Myanmar are referred to by the name Myanmar.


In several of these cases it was difficult to find information about displacement. It was particularly difficult to find information that allowed displacement to be attributed to the conflict in question. The conflicts over government in Iran and Myanmar can be used to illustrate this problem. In both countries there were territorial conflicts going on at the same time. These were of a greater magnitude and caused large-scale displacement. The armed opposition in the conflict over government in Iran, the Mujahedin-e-Khalq (MEK), was not so much involved in warfare as in targeted attacks, the two most important of which were carried out in 1981 (Keesing's Record of
World Events May 1982). There are also reports that the MEK carried out a few military operations in Iran during the final year of the Iran-Iraq war (Keesing’s Record of World Events September 1988), but nowhere have I been able to find information about substantial displacement related to the conflict over government in Iran. In Myanmar, in addition to the conflict between the government and the All Burma Students Democratic Front, the UCDP identifies seven conflicts over territory (Arakan, Kachin, Karen, Karenni, Mon, Shan, and Wa), two of which meet the criteria for inclusion in the present analysis, namely Myanmar (Kachin) and Myanmar (Karen).

Regarding the conflict over government there are occasional reports of displaced dissidents, students, and democracy activists, but any figures provided are usually well below ten thousand. These figures are obviously highly uncertain, but since I have no basis for making higher estimates the case is excluded from the analysis.

Further, the case of Indonesia (East Timor), 1998 had produced some displacement by 1998, although perhaps not as much as twenty-five thousand displaced persons. However, the main reason for excluding the case was the drastic change in the situation in 1999 in the aftermath of the referendum on independence; out of a total population of eight hundred thousand, up to seven hundred ninety thousand people were displaced by anti-independence militia riots. Under those circumstances it would not make sense to try to track the fate of those who were displaced prior to 1999 by the conflict between the Government of Indonesia and Fretilin.

Another four cases were excluded because they reached a high level of intensity only after the conflicts had been terminated (and, obviously, restarted), namely India, 1994, India (Nagaland), 1997 and 2000, and Indonesia (Aceh)1991. In other words: at the time of the coded conflict terminations these cases did not meet the substantial displacement criterion.

When remaining cases were cross-checked with the main conflict dataset from the UCDP, Paraguay, 1989 and Laos, 1990 turned out not to meet the cumulative intensity criterion. For example, in the case of Laos there was a history of high intensity conflict (war between the government and the Pathet Lao in the 1960s and early 1970s). However, the conflict that was terminated in 1990 began only in 1976 and total battle-related deaths for that conflict are given as 25–999.

The case of Somalia, 1996 was excluded because the conflict was not actually terminated; it merely ceased to meet one of the criteria for inclusion in the UCDP dataset, namely that one of the parties to the conflict is the government of a state. The general anarchy in Somalia in the late 1990s made it impossible to identify any party as a government. However, according to Wallensteen and Sollenberg (2001, 642), “if the government criterion is disregarded, Somalia would be included for the years 1997–2000 as an intermediate armed conflict, since it meets the other criteria.”
In addition to these exclusions, one of the conflicts in table 9.1 was replaced by a previously excluded case. The conflict Yugoslavia (Croatia), between the Yugoslav National Army and Croat irregulars over the secession of Croatia from Yugoslavia, was active at war level during 1991 and coded as terminated by the end of 1991. In 1992 Croatia gained international recognition, with Serb irregulars in the Krajina region breaking away from the new state of Croatia. This latter conflict, labeled Croatia (Serb) was active in the years 1992, 1993, and 1995—but at minor level only, and hence excluded from the present analysis according to the cumulative intensity criterion. The question is whether, for the present purposes, it is reasonable to treat these two cases as different conflicts. Is the conflict Yugoslavia (Croatia) best seen as terminated in 1991—and a durable termination at that, giving the case a membership score of 0.5 in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace”? And is the conflict Croatia (Serb) best seen as having started in 1992 and as having resulted in a cumulative total of less than one thousand battle-related deaths? On termination type the 1991 termination is coded as “other,” indicating that the termination is a consequence of changes in criteria rather than a cessation of violence.

My overall aim in the coding process is to avoid second-guessing individual cases from the UCDP dataset, because if I make my own evaluation of one case I ought to do the same for all cases. Nevertheless, I believe the least arbitrary way of handling this issue is to treat the two conflicts as one, even though the formal status of the parties and the particular issue of contention changed in 1992. Further, I believe it makes most sense to argue that the 1991 termination of the Yugoslavia (Croatia) conflict not be counted as a conflict termination in the present context, but instead that the two terminations of the conflict Croatia (Serb), in 1993 and 1995, are included in the analysis; they are treated as terminations of a conflict which in 1991 was active at war level and should therefore be included in the analysis. The most difficult consequence of merging these two cases concerns the fuzzy set of “partition” (see below).

Finally, note that conflict termination for Cambodia is 1998, several years after the major repatriation subsequent to the Paris agreement in the early 1990s. The case still gets a high membership score in the fuzzy set of “repatriation,” but the assessment is based on figures from 1997–2000.

9.2 The Coding Procedure
After the further reduction of cases just described, forty-three conflict terminations in thirty-seven different conflicts remain and need to be given membership scores in the fuzzy sets operationalized in chapter 8. The result
of the coding procedure is summarized in table 9.3, with “repatriation” and “ended displacement situation” referring to both refugees and IDPs.**

Even with explicit criteria for what constitutes different degrees of membership in the various fuzzy sets, the coding process was often anything but straightforward. The most common problem is that data on displacement are inherently uncertain and imprecise. Therefore, assessing membership scores in the fuzzy sets of “repatriation” and “ended displacement situation” was the most complicated, but in a few cases difficulties were also related to the other fuzzy sets, including “sustainable peace.”

It is very difficult to determine yearly figures of displacement and repatriation during and after a conflict, especially when that conflict went on for several years and perhaps overlapped with several other conflicts. Displacement is not static. People move back and forth; they may or may not choose to register with the UNHCR or other agencies when they flee and when they return, and various factors related to personal security, political conviction, economic situation et cetera, simultaneously affect their decisions. The figures used for coding the cases in this study vary considerably in precision and reliability. They are sometimes authoritative, but often merely indicative.

As far as possible I have tried to rely on the information provided by the USCRI in the World Refugee Survey mentioned above. This is because I believe the coding will be more reliable if based on similar data, compiled and evaluated according to the same method. Nevertheless, in many cases I have had to look elsewhere for additional information. In fact, this is particularly true for the cases that were excluded on the basis of not having caused substantial enough displacement, such as the conflicts over government in Iran and Myanmar, but it was necessary in several other cases as well.

While it would take up too much space to discuss each case in detail and explain how I chose to address the various difficulties I encountered, this section describes the coding of six cases—three of the most complicated and three of the easiest ones. This illustrates the kinds of problems I was confronted with during the coding process and how I handled them.

**Complicated Cases**

The case of Iraq (Kurdistan) was first coded as terminated in 1993. It then restarted briefly in 1996 and was terminated again during that same year; it has not restarted since. During the period in question, Iraq consistently had a Polity score of -9. The two terminations therefore receive membership

---

**Appendix 2 presents all cases’ membership scores in all fuzzy sets, including those based on alternative operationalizations discussed in chapter 10.**
scores in of 0.25 and 0.50, respectively, in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

Concerning the two fuzzy sets related to displacement, the case was more complicated. The two Iraqi conflicts included in this analysis—the one between the government and the Shiite Supreme Assembly/Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (ASIRI/SCIRI) over government, and the one between the government and the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP), and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK)—are both characterized by a peak in 1991.

After the allies of Kuwait had used all means necessary to ensure Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait in 1991, both the Shiites and the Kurds seized the opportunity to revolt against the government of Saddam Hussein, expecting the support of the international community (cf. Malanczuk 1991; Strauss 2002). The international community, however, was not forthcoming, and the government brutally crushed both uprisings, causing displacement of immense proportions. However, most of those displaced during late spring of 1991 had returned by the end of the year (USCRI 1992, 96–100).

The displacement related to the 1991 Kurdish uprising was exceptionally large. At the peak of displacement in mid May 1991, more than 1.3 million Iraqis had fled to Iran, and some four hundred fifty thousand to Turkey. The situation was further complicated by the fact that this took place in a context already characterized by large-scale conflict-induced displacement, some of it related to the conflict Iraq (Kurdistan), and relevant to the present analysis, and some not so related. Most importantly, some three hundred fifty thousand Iraqis, mostly Kurds, were expelled to Iran during the 1980–1988 Iran-Iraq war on suspicion of being of Iranian origin. For most of the 1990s these “expellees” continued to constitute the bulk of Iraqi refugees or Iraqis living in refugee-like situations in Iran (USCRI 1998, 142), but they are not counted in this study.

Detailed figures show that three Iranian provinces—West Azerbaijan, Kordestan, and Bakhtaran—together hosted 1,342,000 Iraqis at the peak of displacement in 1991 (USCRI 1992, 97). These three provinces more or less coincide geographically with Iranian Kurdistan and are just across the border from Iraqi Kurdistan. It therefore seems reasonable to estimate that most of the 1,300,000 refugees were Iraqi Kurds, even though this is not expressly stated in the displacement data. By the end of the year there were no more than 69,929 Iraqis left in the three provinces, a majority of whom had arrived prior to 1991 (USCRI 1992, 97). By the beginning of 1992, some 44,000 Iraqis from the 1991 influx remained in Iran—30,000 Shiites and 14,000 Kurds (USCRI 1993, 98). While figures are uncertain, this means that

---

84 From 1979 to the early 1990s, Bakhtaran was the name used for the province otherwise known as Kermanshah.
nearly all of the Iraqi Kurds who fled to Iran during 1991 repatriated within the year—an extraordinary record, indeed. “The speed of the repatriation was a source of wonder,” according to the USCRI (1992, 97). In addition to those fleeing to Iran some 450,000 Iraqis, mainly Kurds, sought refuge in Turkey in 1991. Here, too, almost all repatriated very soon; by the end of the year only 4,079 of them remained in Turkey (USCRI 1992, 82–83).

However, Iraqi Kurds had been displaced by the conflict Iraq (Kurdistan) also before the 1991 uprisings, primarily to Iran, making the total number of displaced Iraqi Kurds close to 2 million in late spring 1991. However, even when they are counted, the repatriation rate remains over 90 percent.

It could be argued that the repatriation that took place in 1991 and 1992 is of limited relevance to the establishment of peace several years later, and particularly after the 1996 termination. However, I have argued that without the massive repatriation that took place in 1991 and 1992 the situations in 1993 and 1996 would have been quite different, and that events in 1991 and 1992 should be considered when the membership scores of these terminations are assessed. Therefore, despite continued new displacement and repatriation during the rest of the 1990s, both terminations are given a membership scores of 1.00 in the fuzzy set of “repatriation,” when only refugees are considered.

There was also large-scale internal displacement related to the conflict Iraq (Kurdistan). Internally displaced Iraqi Kurds can clearly be counted in the hundreds of thousands, but any figures are rough approximations at best. By the end of 1992, there were an estimated four hundred thousand IDPs in Iraq (USCRI 1993, 52), at least half of which were Shiites in the south (USCRI 1994, 105; cf. 1995, 116). The reported number of IDPs in northern Iraq increased during the 1990s. By the turn of the century the UN Center for Human Settlements estimated that more than 1 million had been displaced at one time or other (see USCRI 2000, 187; cf. King 2007, 408). The number of displaced at any one time may have been as high as eight hundred thousand, many of which were uprooted not as a result of the conflict between the Kurds and the Iraqi government, but by Kurdish in-fighting or by incursions and shelling of Kurdish-controlled areas from Iran and Turkey (USCRI 2000, 187; cf. King 2007, 408).

This means that when IDPs are included, the repatriation rate decreases and becomes more difficult to determine, but in light of the large numbers of refugees that were displaced and repatriated during 1991, I have not found enough evidence to suggest that adding IDPs to the equation should reduce the membership score in the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” Again, this goes for both terminations.

Then there is the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation.” As noted, Iraqi Kurds had been displaced before the 1991 wave of displacement and
repatriation, and they continued to be displaced in the following years. By the end of 1995, there were still more than one hundred fifty thousand Iraqi Kurds in Iran, not counting the “expellees” (USCRI 1996, 111; 1999, 149). Substantial repatriation took place over the following years, but the number remained above twenty-five thousand. Adding IDPs increases that number. With more than twenty-five thousand people still displaced, but with more than 50 percent having found solutions (though the durability of those solutions may be questioned) the case gets a membership score of 0.25 in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation,” for all displaced persons as well as for refugees only and for both terminations.

Turning to partition, assessing the fuzzy membership scores is easier. After the failed uprisings by Iraqi Kurds and Shiites and the massive displacement that resulted, no-fly zones were created in the north and south of Iraq. The northern one soon developed into a de facto Kurdish state (Carpenter 2009, 23; Gunter 1993; 2003, 156) controlling, among other things, strategic border crossings to Iran and Turkey (Dahlman 2002, 285–292). Both terminations are given membership scores of 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “partition.”

Iraq is a 0.50 member in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization,” and, in the case of the Kurds, it is a full member of the fuzzy set of “group concentration.”

Lebanon is one of several cases where data on democracy/autocracy and respect for human rights are missing. Such missing data are unproblematic in cases where the conflict restarts within five years, but when the conflict termination is durable such data are needed in order to qualify the case’s membership in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.” In the case of Lebanon, the conflict was terminated in 1990, and Polity scores are missing for the entire period 1975–2004. The first fifteen years, 1975–1989, are coded -77, “interregnum, or anarchy,” and the next fifteen years, 1990–2004, are coded -66, “foreign interruption.”

A case coded (-66) or (-77) is not necessarily highly authoritarian, but it is definitely not strongly democratic (cf. Marshall & Jaggers 2009, 17–18). In the case of Lebanon this fits Zahar’s (2002, 567–568) description of the Syrian presence in Lebanon in the aftermath of the civil war, and Syria’s stake in the stability of Lebanon: “In the short term, this stability has come at the expense of human rights, democracy, and national reconciliation.”

85 Some seventy-five thousand Iraqi Kurds fled to Iran in 1996 as both the Iraqi government and Kurdish troops entered the safe zone established through Operation Provide Comfort in 1991 (USCRI 1997, 151–152). This displacement—and the internal displacement of perhaps one hundred fifty thousand people—was largely the result of Kurdish in-fighting, and not related to the conflict Iraq (Kurdistan). However, it mentioned because repatriation figures for 1996 and the following years relate both to the more than one hundred fifty thousand Iraqi Kurds in Iran before 1996 and to the seventy-five thousand newly displaced.
Lebanon is given a membership score of 0.50 in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

Regarding displacement caused by the conflict in Lebanon, figures are highly uncertain. More than half the country’s population is estimated to have been displaced at some point during the war (USCRI 1990, 84–85), and the total population reportedly decreased by one-third, from 4 million to 2.7 million, during the 1980s (see USCRI 1993, 107).

Most of those who left Lebanon simply emigrated, that is, they did not seek asylum and therefore did not become part of refugee statistics. However, in 1994, the Social Affairs Ministry reported that around half of the originally nine hundred thousand persons then estimated to have fled abroad during the war had been able to return. It was not clear whether these four hundred fifty thousand returnees had been able to return to their pre-war homes (USCRI 1995, 120). There are no reports of further significant return to Lebanon over the next few years.

Internal displacement was also massive, but figures are imprecise. By the end of 1989, some five hundred thousand to 1 million Lebanese are believed to have been internally displaced (USCRI 1990, 32), and the average number of IDPs at any one time during most of the war is estimated at eight hundred thousand (USCRI 1993, 106). According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), by the end of 1996 some four hundred fifty thousand remained internally displaced since the civil war (see USCRI 1997, 161). Again, it is unclear whether those no longer considered displaced had returned home or found other solutions.

On the basis of these uncertain figures, I estimate that more than half of all displaced persons had found durable solutions five years after conflict termination. However, with several hundred thousand remaining displaced, the case’s membership score in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is no higher than 0.25. Further, not all of those who found durable solutions did so through repatriation, though many probably did. I believe it is reasonable, therefore, to assume a repatriation rate at somewhere between 30 and 50 percent, for both cross-border and internal displacement. This translates to a membership score in the fuzzy set of “repatriation” of 0.50.

Regarding partition, the 1989 Ta’if Agreement, which ended the conflict, did not result in the partition of Lebanon. Rather, an intricate system of power-sharing was introduced. The various religious communities in Lebanon each has its own jurisdiction regarding several civil matters, and the country has been referred to as “an example of a consociational system with cultural autonomy based on the personality principle” (Hanf 1991, 46). However, this cultural autonomy was a general facet of the Lebanese political order, and not related to one particular ethnopolitical group. Therefore, the case is given a membership score of 0.00 in the fuzzy set of “partition.”
Lebanon’s membership score in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization” is 0.50, and as in other conflicts over government, the membership score in the fuzzy set of “group concentration” is 0.00.

The conflict in Tajikistan is coded in the UCDP as terminated twice, in 1996 and in 1998. Assessing membership scores in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” is simple. The 1996 termination lasted for one year and gets a membership score of 0.00; the 1998 termination was durable, but the Polity score for Tajikistan was, and remains, negative, and the case gets a membership score of 0.50 in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

The case of Tajikistan presents a striking example of discrepancies between different sources of displacement data. For 1994, the USCRI reports 145,000 Tajik refugees and asylum seekers in Russia (1995, 42), while the corresponding figure from UNHCR is zero (1995a, 54; 2005, 337). I have handled this and similar instances by relating figures for several consecutive years, trying to discern trends in total numbers of displaced, new displacement, repatriation, and other durable solutions. In several cases, more or less explicit corrections have been published a few years after a complex crisis, and this also helps to reduce the margin of error. The 1994 discrepancy between the USCRI and the UNHCR can then likely be ascribed to disagreement over who should count as refugees and asylum seekers, rather than disagreement over how many people had left Tajikistan for Russia because of the conflict in Tajikistan.

The number of refugees and asylum seekers from Tajikistan appears to have peaked at nearly, or possibly above, 250,000 in 1995/1996 (USCRI 1997, 4–6, 140–141). By 2001, five years after the 1996 termination, that figure was roughly halved; and during the next two years it was halved again. This development is not immediately visible from the statistics sections of the WRS, but it is a reasonable conclusion based on comparing country reports of several issues of the publication. In the statistics section of the WRS 2000 (covering the year 1999), Tajikistan is presented as the source of 63,000 refugees and asylum seekers, and Russia is said to host 104,300 refugees and asylum seekers, 89,400 from the former USSR (with no further specifications) and 14,900 from other places (USCRI 2000, 2–5). However, the country report for Russia sets the number of Tajik refugees and asylum seekers in Russia at 107,355. Of these, 12,299 were recognized refugees and 95,056 were so called forced migrants86 (USCRI 2000, 265).

According to the statistics section of the WRS 2001 (covering 2000), there were 60,000 refugees and asylum seekers from Tajikistan, 2,100 of

---

86 Despite the distinction in Russian asylum legislation between forced migrants or involuntarily relocated persons (which applies to persons from within the former Soviet Union, or the “near abroad”) and refugees (which applies to persons from countries outside the former Soviet Union, or the “far abroad”), displaced persons from Tajikistan are found in both categories (see e.g., USCRI 1998, 199).
which were in Russia (USCRI 2001, 2–5). However, the country report for Russia refers to 2,061 refugees and 83,039 forced migrants from Tajikistan, a total of 85,100 (USCRI 2001, 247).

The statistics section of WRS 2002 (covering 2001) identifies Tajikistan as the origin of 55,000 refugees and asylum seekers, but does not specify how many of them are in Russia; of a total of 28,200 refugees and asylum seekers in Russia, 14,800 are from Georgia, and 13,400 are “other” (USCRI 2002, 2–5). However, the country report for Russia sets the number of forced migrants from Tajikistan at 59,190 (USCRI 2002, 236). The number of refugees is not specified, but only 236 persons in all were granted refugee status in Russia during 2001 (USCRI 2002, 235).

While the largest number of Tajik refugees and asylum seekers found their way to Russia, significant numbers also went to the neighboring Central Asian states of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and particularly to Uzbekistan. The WRS 1995 sets the number of Tajiks who fled to Uzbekistan at 50,000 (USCRI 1995, 109). The WRS 1996 makes no mention of Tajiks in Uzbekistan. The following two years, there are reports of 30,000 Tajiks living in “refugee-like situations” in Uzbekistan (USCRI 1997, 11; 1998, 11). The WRS 1999 again does not mention them, but from the 2000 issue, they are back and considered refugees, without any explanation of why they are now refugees rather than people in refugee-like situations (e.g., USCRI 2000, 2001, 3, 166).

So, to sum up, to assess the fuzzy membership scores for Tajikistan, I have consulted the statistics sections of the WRS, I have considered the numbers of “refugees” and “forced migrants” from the country reports on Russia, and I have counted 30,000 Tajiks in Uzbekistan each year, irrespective of whether they are listed in the WRS as refugees, people in refugee-like situations, or not listed at all.

Table 9.2 shows the numbers of refugees and asylum seekers from Tajikistan from 1994 through 2002 according to the statistics section (left column) and on the basis of the considerations just mentioned (right column). While the figures in both columns are rough approximations, I believe the right column makes more sense as a realistic development of displacement trends than the left column.

With more than twenty-five thousand remaining displaced persons, and an any-solution-rate of at least 50 percent, the membership score in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is 0.25 for both terminations, 1996 and 1998.

In 1997 a Protocol on Refugees was signed as part of the ongoing peace process, aiming at the voluntary return of all displaced persons to their homes (Bell 2000, 372–373). Nevertheless, repatriation to Tajikistan was very limited. The majority of refugees and asylum seekers from Tajikistan who found durable solutions did so through local integration, largely in
Table 9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Statistics section</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>170,400</td>
<td>243,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>245,600</td>
<td>245,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>68,400</td>
<td>218,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>172,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>167,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>57,650</td>
<td>142,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>102,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>97,342</td>
<td>97,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

countries where they belonged to the ethnic majority; for example, the fifty thousand Tajiks who fled to Uzbekistan were of Uzbek origin, and the twenty thousand Tajiks who went to Turkmenistan were of Turkmen descent, and found solutions in those countries (USCRI 1995, 109). During several years after 1996 (when the conflict was terminated a first time), no more than an estimated thirty thousand displaced persons repatriated to Tajikistan (see e.g., USCRI 1997, 140; 1998, 132; 1999, 139; 2000, 173). This is clearly less than 30 percent of two hundred fifty thousand, and both terminations are given membership scores of 0.00 in the fuzzy set of “repatriation.”

The discussion so far has concerned refugees and asylum seekers. However, the conflict also resulted in large-scale internal displacement, some five hundred thousand Tajiks—10 percent of the country’s total population—became internally displaced. For most of the IDPs the displacement was of relatively short duration. It has been estimated that more than 90 percent of IDPs had returned home by the end of 1994, the vast majority already during 1993 (USCRI 1995, 109). This means that, when both refugees and IDPs are considered, more than 50 percent of displaced persons found durable solutions through return, giving both terminations membership scores of 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” Tajikistan’s membership score in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is the same for all displaced persons as for refugees only: 0.25.

Tajikistan is fully out of the two fuzzy sets of “partition” and “group concentration,” but its membership score is 0.50 in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization.”

---

87 Another estimated thirty thousand refugees and asylum seekers repatriated during 1993–1994, that is before displacement peaked in 1995–1996. This means that a total of up to sixty thousand Tajik refugees and asylum seekers repatriated – still below 30 percent of two hundred fifty thousand.
**Easy Cases**

The 1995 termination of the conflict in Liberia lasted for four years, which makes the case’s membership score in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” 0.25.

Displacement peaked in 1994 with 784,000 refugees and asylum seekers and 1,100,000 IDPs (USCRI 1995, 44). By the end of 1999, “approximately two-thirds of all Liberian refugees and nearly 90 percent of all internally displaced Liberians had returned to their home areas,” leaving 250,000 refugees and 50,000 IDPs (USCRI 2000, 5–6, 100). Consequently, Liberia’s membership score in the fuzzy set of “repatriation” is 1.00 for all displaced persons and 0.75 for refugees only. The membership score in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” is 0.25, both for all displaced persons and for refugees only.

There was no partition or autonomy in the case of Liberia, so the membership score in the fuzzy set of “partition” is 0.00. The case is fully in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization,” but being a political conflict, it is fully out of the fuzzy set of “group concentration.”

The conflict in Mozambique was terminated in 1992 and has not restarted. Further, since 1994 the country has consistently had a Polity score of +6, and the standardized CIRI value for Mozambique is 7.0. Finally, the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) left by the end of 1994. This means that the case of Mozambique is a full member of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

As already mentioned in chapter 8 Mozambique is considered a very successful case of repatriation. Over a few years beginning in 1992 some 80 percent of the 1.7 million refugees and the 3.5 million IDPs returned home. In 1996 the UNHCR invoked the cessation clause for Mozambican refugees worldwide. By then, there were no IDPs in Mozambique, and the UNHCR concluded that the one hundred thousand odd refugees who remained in South Africa, Zambia, and Tanzania were there “for economic rather than security reasons.” This makes the case a full member of the fuzzy sets of “repatriation” and “ended displacement situation,” both when all displaced persons are considered and when only refugees are taken into account.

There was no partition or autonomy, and the case is also fully out of the fuzzy set of “group concentration.” It gets a membership score of 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization.”

Also in 1992, a truce was reached in the conflict Bangladesh (Chittagong Hill Tracts). Over the following years negotiations continued, resulting in a peace agreement in 1997. No peacekeeping operation was ever deployed to Bangladesh and the Polity score and the standardized CIRI value are both
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above the thresholds set for full membership in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace.”

The conflict resulted in the displacement of tens of thousands of the tribal population, primarily Buddhist Chakma. For several years before the conflict ended, some fifty thousand Chakma refugees were living in India. That number increased temporarily to seventy-five thousand during 1991, but by the end of 1992 it was back to fifty thousand (USCRI 1991, 91–92; 1992, 95–96; 1993, 89, 93). The 1997 peace agreement gave new momentum to the repatriation process. Ten thousand Chakma repatriated during 1997, and the remaining forty thousand returned by late February 1998, effectively bringing the displacement situation to an end (USCRI 1998, 122–123; 1999, 125).88

The peace accord contained provisions for regional autonomy (see e.g., Bell 2000, 26; Rashiduzzaman 1998), and the case gets a membership score of 0.50 in the fuzzy set of “partition.” Bangladesh is fully out of the fuzzy set of “fractionalization” and the case has a membership score of 0.75 in the fuzzy set of “group concentration.”

A Few Final Comments

Among the terminated conflicts in the UCDP dataset, several cases are coded as having restarted with new parties. Examples are Chad, Congo, Liberia, and Rwanda. It could be argued in these cases that the conflict terminations remained durable and that they should be given membership scores in the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace” on that basis. However, these renewed conflicts were often fought between a government consisting of the former rebels fighting rebels consisting of the former government and/or its allies—"basically a continuance of the first phase, albeit under new banners” (UCDP 2009a). In this study, I have considered such cases the same conflict.

The “combined” case of Yugoslavia (Croatia) and Croatia (Serb) was the most complicated case to code on partition. The former conflict would be a full member of the fuzzy set partition, and the latter conflict a full non-member. I argued that by 1995 and even 1993—the years of the conflict terminations included in the analysis—Croatian independence was no longer an issue of contention, at least not one that the Serb side realistically fought against. Rather, the conflict that was terminated in 1993 and 1995 concerned the regions of Eastern Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Sirmium. Therefore, the combined case is given a membership score of 0.00 in the fuzzy set “partition.”

88 In January 1996, sixty-five thousand Chakma living in Arunachal state in India became the focus of attention (USCRI 1997, 131). They were generally considered immigrants rather than refugees, but in 1996 a local group in Arunachal Pradesh tried to forcibly repatriate them to Bangladesh. India’s National Human Rights Commission brought the case before the Supreme Court, which ordered a halt to the forced repatriation. These sixty-five thousand are not included in the present analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Peace</th>
<th>Repatriation</th>
<th>Ended displacement situation</th>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>Ethnic-alteration</th>
<th>Group concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, 2001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (N.-Karabakh), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (CHT), 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Croat), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, 1998</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad, 1994</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, 1999</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1993</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo, 2001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, 1991</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, 1991</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea), 1991</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia), 1993</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau, 1999</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq, 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, 1990</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia, 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Western Sahara), 1989</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique, 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin), 1992</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1992</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1995</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua, 1989</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, 1999</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao), 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (Chechnya), 1996</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda, 1994</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone, 2008</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka (Islam), 2001</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1998</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda, 1991</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen (South Yemen), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo), 1999</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding fractionalization, it should be noted that for the case Yugoslavia (Kosovo) I use the figure given at Serbia/Montenegro in Alesina’s data set. Both “Yugoslavia” and “Serbia/Montenegro” are cases in the data set; data for Yugoslavia is from 1995, and data for Serbia/Montenegro is for 1991 (which would suggest that I use the more recent figure, related to “Yugoslavia”). However, more importantly, Yugoslavia corresponds to pre-1991 Yugoslavia, that is, including Slovenia, Croatia, et cetera. Serbia/Montenegro corresponds to the country in which the Kosovo war was fought. Therefore, it makes more sense to use the fractionalization measure for Serbia/Montenegro.

The fuzzy membership scores of all cases are presented in table 9.3.
10 Systematic Comparative Analysis

While it may be a lamentable comment on the human condition, the fact is that population flows that increase ethnic homogeneity are much less likely to be reversed than those that create greater heterogeneity.

USCRI89

10.1 Testing the Peace-by-Repatriation Thesis

The previous three chapters have laid the groundwork for the fuzzy-set analysis conducted in the present chapter. In chapter 7 the methodology of necessary conditions and set theory was introduced, the method of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) was presented, and fuzzy sets and fuzzy-set analysis were described. The concepts of the peace-by-repatriation framework, which I developed in chapters 2–6, were operationalized as five-value fuzzy sets in chapter 8. Finally, in chapter 9 I selected and coded cases for the fuzzy-set analysis.

This chapter begins with a few introductory comments on how the analysis was conducted. The peace-by-repatriation thesis is then tested on the entire set of cases, followed by separate tests for conflicts over territory and conflicts over government. After discussing the findings of the analysis, a few alternative tests are conducted to see whether the results are affected by alternative operationalizations of key concepts.

Preliminaries

Of the forty-three cases—conflict terminations—analyzed in this chapter, twenty-two are terminations of conflicts over territory, and twenty-one are terminations of conflicts over government (cf. chapter 8). Because the role of ethnicity differs in these types of conflict, after I test the peace-by-repatriation thesis on all conflicts, I test it separately on conflicts over territory and conflicts over government. I also conduct tests involving all displaced persons as well as tests limited to refugees. On the one hand, in light of the explanations of how repatriation contributes to peace, it is reasonable to presume that the peace-by-repatriation thesis applies to refugees and IDPs alike. On the other hand, because explicit reference is often made only to refugees there is reason to examine the thesis also without including IDPs. Note that five conflicts—Georgia (Abkhazia), Guinea-Bissau, Myanmar (Kachin), Peru, and Russia (Chechnya)—produced almost no refugees, and therefore do not fulfill the “minimum displacement criterion” for inclusion in the analysis when it is restricted to

89 USCRI (1994, 29).
Table 10.1
Number of cases in different tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All displaced persons</th>
<th>Refugees only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts over territory</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts over government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cases</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

refugees. The number of cases covered by different combinations of cases and types of displaced persons are most easily presented in tabular form. This is done in table 10.1.

An important distinction between some of the conditions should also be reiterated. Three conditions—repatriation, ended displacement situation, and partition—are clearly connected to their respective cases, that is, to the conflict terminations. The two remaining conditions—fractionalization and group concentration—are not so connected, and serve rather to describe part of the context of the cases. The reason for this, as described in chapter 8, is that there are no readily available data that allow changes in fractionalization and group concentration to be traced from one year to the next. Clearly, this is not ideal, but I believe that using the available, albeit less-than-ideal, data on fractionalization and group concentration is the best realistic option under the circumstances. To illustrate the difference between the conditions consider the hypothetical solution REPALL*FRAC → PEACE (cf. table 10.2). This should be interpreted as meaning that post-conflict repatriation is related to peace in cases where fractionalization is high; the measure of fractionalization, however, does not permit the conclusion that post-conflict repatriation should be pursued with the aim of increasing fractionalization.

The software used to conduct the fuzzy-set analysis in this study is fs/QCA, version 2.5.90 All tests are run using the software’s default frequency and consistency cutoffs (frequency cutoff 1; consistency cutoff 0.80). I use the (recommended) “truth table algorithm.”91 However, having selected the frequency and consistency cutoffs (as described in the final section of chapter 7), I use the “specify analysis” option rather than the (recommended) “standard analyses” option. I do this because the latter procedure requires estimations of the plausibility of counterfactuals (Ragin 2008b, 49–53, 81). What this means is that, since there will most often be configurations that are not represented in the empirical data (so called logical remainders), the researcher needs to estimate how likely it is that these configurations would be associated with the positive outcome were they to exist. When the researcher possesses enough theoretical and

90 The fs/QCA software can be downloaded from http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/software.shtml.
91 The alternative “inclusion algorithm” simply calculates the proportions of cases consistent with the claim of necessity or sufficiency, cf. chapter 7.
Table 10.2
Abbreviations of concepts used in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>Sustainable peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE 2</td>
<td>Alternative coding of PEACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPALL</td>
<td>Repatriation (all displaced persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPREF</td>
<td>Repatriation (refugees only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>Ended displacement situation (all displaced persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF</td>
<td>Ended displacement situation (refugees only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL 2</td>
<td>Alternative coding of ENDALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF 2</td>
<td>Alternative coding of ENDREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Partition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAC</td>
<td>Fractionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAC 2</td>
<td>Alternative coding of FRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Group concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because I test numerous different combinations of conditions on several different groups of cases, the chapter is interspersed with formulas and consistency and coverage scores. The results covering a specific group of cases are summarized at the end of each section. The first tests are described in some detail (cf. also Appendix 5) to enhance understanding of how to interpret the solutions.

10.2 All Conflicts
As portrayed above, the aim of diversity-oriented research is not to measure the isolated effect of independent variables. However, “good practices” of fs/QCA prescribe that any necessary conditions be eliminated from the truth table analysis and addressed separately (see Ragin 2009, 118). This requires testing for necessary conditions before conducting the truth table analysis. In the test of necessity a high consistency threshold should be employed.

Testing each of the five conditions for necessity produces consistency scores varying from 0.2949 (partition) to 0.7436 (fractionalization), but none of them is close to the default 0.80 threshold. In addition, 0.90, or even 0.95, is probably more suitable in this test, where a high consistency threshold is explicitly called for. In other words, none of the conditions is by
itself a necessary condition for sustainable peace when tested on all cases, and all five are therefore retained for further analysis.

From a deterministic perspective these results are all we need to refute the peace-by-repatriation thesis in its unidirectional Hard I form, that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace. The analysis demonstrates that there are cases of sustainable peace which are not at the same time cases of repatriation. Peace is therefore possible in the absence of repatriation, and, hence, repatriation is not necessary for peace. This is in line with Adelman’s conclusion that no one relationship between repatriation and peace is valid across all cases. However, the rationale for this study is to go beyond that basic conclusion and perform a more detailed study of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. Before proceeding to the fuzzy-set analysis, however, the “bivariate” relationship between repatriation and peace will be discussed a bit further.

This relationship can be illustrated graphically in an XY plot as in figure 10.1 (similar to the one used to illustrate fuzzy-set analysis of necessity in figure 7.1). In order to support the peace-by-repatriation thesis the analysis would have had to result in all cases ending up on or below the diagonal X=Y. The figure clearly shows that they do not.

However, there are at least two things that the figure does not reveal. First, it does not tell us how many cases end up at each intersection of the XY plot. From the sixteen intersections marked in the figure, we know that ten of the forty-three cases analyzed end up on or below the diagonal, and that six end up above it, but we do not know where (that is, in which of the sixteen marked intersections) the remaining twenty-seven cases end up. Whether they end up primarily on-or-below or above the diagonal

![Figure 10.1 Fuzzy-set analysis of peace by repatriation, XY plot.](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEACE</th>
<th>Croatia (Serb) '95</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>Bangladesh (CHT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Croatia (Serb) '95</td>
<td>BiH (Croat)</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Azerbaijan (N-K)</td>
<td>BiH (Serb)</td>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Italy (Serb) '93</td>
<td>Morocco (W Sahara)</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia (Abkhazia)</td>
<td>Vietnam (Kachin)</td>
<td>Tajikistan '98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia (Serb) '93</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia (Kurd) '90</td>
<td>BiH (Croat)</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia (Kurd) '93</td>
<td>BiH (Serb)</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iran (Kurd) '90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iran (Kurd) '93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mindanao)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia (Chechnya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka (Eelam)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan '96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Croatia (Serb) '93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10.2 XY plot of membership in PEACE / REPALL.
0.5769 and a coverage of 0.5233, which is, as has been noted, far from a consistent subset relation.

The other thing the figure does not tell us is which cases end up where in the XY plot. While this does not affect consistency and coverage, potentially interesting patterns can be revealed by illustrating the position of different cases. This is done in figure 10.2 (which also shows how many cases end up at each intersection).

The figure shows, for example, that half of the conflicts over territory (bold font) are fully out of the fuzzy set of “repatriation,” whereas two-thirds of conflicts over government have a membership score of at least 0.75 in that same set. Further, all Latin American cases are full members of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” but have on average low membership scores in “repatriation.” Of the thirteen African cases, more than half are full members in “repatriation,” but only one has a membership of >0.50 in “sustainable peace.”

Clearly, to repeat, the peace-by-repatriation thesis in its unidirectional Hard I version does not hold across all cases. The more detailed study of the thesis now proceeds with fuzzy-set analysis. First, analyzing all five conditions together yields no consistent solutions. However, testing various combinations of two, three, or four conditions does. For example, a test of REPALL and ENDALL yields a consistent solution (Formula 10.1):

\[
\text{ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE} \\
\text{consistency } 0.8226, \text{ coverage } 0.6538
\]

Five cases have full membership in this solution (1.00 membership in ENDALL and 1.00 membership in PEACE), namely Bangladesh (Chittagong Hill Tracts), El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique, and Peru, and they make a significant contribution to the consistency and coverage scores of the solution.\(^{92}\) Four other cases have >0.50 membership in this solution, namely Guinea-Bissau (1.00 in ENDALL/0.50 in PEACE), Yemen (South Yemen) (1.00/0.50), Cambodia (0.75/0.50), and Ethiopia (0.75/0.50).

The solution ENDALL \(\rightarrow\) PEACE means that ENDALL is a consistent and relevant subset of PEACE, which suggests that ending displacement goes a long way toward bringing sustainable peace. Sustainable peace is obviously a function of many conditions not included in the present analysis. I would not, therefore, conclude that ending displacement is “almost always sufficient” for peace. However, the result suggests a significant empirical relationship between ending displacement and peace.

\(^{92}\) The subset relation ENDALL \(\leq\) PEACE holds for a majority of cases in the analysis, including Nicaragua (0.50 \(\leq\) 1.00), Yugoslavia (Kosovo) (0.25 \(\leq\) 0.75), and Afghanistan (0.00 \(\leq\) 0.00), but cases with stronger membership are more relevant to the argument.
Combining REPALL with any one of the other three conditions does not produce any consistent solutions. However, ENDALL yields consistent solutions in combination with each of them. ENDALL and PART produces the same solution as presented in formula 10.1, as does ENDALL and FRAC. ENDALL and CON yields a more complex solution—though still the parsimonious option in the software (Formula 10.2):

\[
\text{ENDALL*CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE} \\
\text{consistency} \ 0.8750, \text{ coverage} \ 0.1795
\]

_Bangladesh (CHT)_ has strong, though not full membership in this solution (ENDALL 0.75/PEACE 1.00). No other case has >0.50 membership in the solution term ENDALL*CON. The consistency of this solution is somewhat higher than that presented in formula 10.1, but coverage is markedly lower; that is, the subset relation is consistent, but not very relevant. This means that cases where displacement has ended after a conflict involving a regionally concentrated group are most often also cases of sustainable peace. However, this particular combination of conditions is found in only a small percent of all cases of sustainable peace. (Instead, sustainable peace is usually related to other conditions).

As noted above, _Bangladesh (CHT)_ is a full member of both PEACE and ENDALL. However, its membership score in CON is only 0.75, and since membership in a fuzzy union is based on the minimum, _Bangladesh (CHT)_'s membership score in ENDALL*CON is \(\text{MIN}(1.00, \ 0.75) = 0.75\). Again, the subset relation \(\text{ENDALL*CON} \leq \text{PEACE}\) holds for a majority of cases in the analysis,\(^{93}\) but membership in ENDALL*CON is generally very low, which also makes coverage low. One way of illustrating the low coverage is to note that _Bangladesh (CHT)_ is the only case with a membership score of 0.75 in ENDALL*CON, two cases have a membership score of 0.50, nine have a membership score of 0.25, and the remaining thirty-one cases are fully out of that configuration.

Several combinations of three conditions also yield consistent solutions. REPALL, ENDALL, and PART produces the following solution (Formula 10.3):

\[
\text{repall*ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE} \\
\text{consistency} \ 0.8621, \text{ coverage} \ 0.3205
\]

_Peru_ is a full member (repall*ENDALL 1.00/ PEACE 1.00) in this solution, and two other cases have >0.50 membership in the solution term repall*ENDALL, namely _El Salvador_ (0.75/1.00) and _Guatemala_.

---

\(^{93}\) In fact, the _Iran (Kurdistan) 1993_ termination is the only exception.
(0.75/1.00). This particular solution, which is not very relevant, suggests that it is important to end displacement, but that this should not be done through repatriation. As described above, membership in the absence of a fuzzy condition equals 1 minus membership in the (presence of the) condition. El Salvador has a membership score of 0.25 in REPALL and a membership score of 1.00 in ENDALL. Hence El Salvador’s membership score in the configuration repall*ENDALL is MIN(1 – 0.25; 1.00) = 0.75.

Testing REPALL, ENDALL, and FRAC again yields the same solution as in formula 10.1 (and, as long as the same set of cases is tested, consistency and coverage are also the same). Combining REPALL, ENDALL, and CON results in a solution consisting of two solution terms (Formula 10.4):

\[
\text{repall} \times \text{ENDALL} + \text{ENDALL} \times \text{CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}
\]

consistency 0.8824, coverage 0.3846

When an analysis results in a solution containing two or more solution terms, this means that the outcome is associated with either of the solution terms. In this case, PEACE is often the result of either repall*ENDALL or of ENDALL*CON. This means that cases characterized either by displacement having been solved, but through other means than repatriation, or by displacement having been solved after a conflict involving a regionally concentrated minority are often also cases of peace. The first solution term, repall*ENDALL, is the same as in formula 10.3, and the second solution term, ENDALL*CON, is the same as in formula 10.2, again with the same consistency and coverage for the individual solution terms, and obviously with the same cases displaying full/strong membership.

A few other combinations of three conditions again reproduce the solutions presented in formulas 10.1 and 10.2, but no new consistent solutions are found. The same is true for all combinations of four conditions. Overall, ending displacement stands out as the most important condition when all cases and all displaced persons are analyzed.

Shifting our attention to a strict focus on refugees, that is excluding IDPs, it is again important to test for necessary conditions before conducting the truth table analysis. The analysis of all displaced persons above found no necessary conditions. The corresponding tests of only refugees yield lower consistency scores for all conditions (except repatriation, which increases to 0.5769 to 0.6418); there are no necessary conditions here either.

The fuzzy-set analyses of various combinations of conditions produce a few consistent solutions. Of all combinations of any two conditions, two produce consistent solutions. First, the test of ENDREF and FRAC yields the solution (Formula 10.5):
Bangladesh (CHT) has full membership in this solution (1.00/1.00), and three cases have >0.50 membership in the solution term ENDREF*frac, namely Yemen (South Yemen) (1.00/0.50), El Salvador (0.75/1.00) and Cambodia (0.75/0.50). The solution suggests that cases where displacement has ended after a conflict in a country with a low degree of ethnic fractionalization are usually cases of sustainable peace. The coverage of this particular solution is not very high, which means that the solution is not relevant to most cases.

Second, testing ENDREF and CON yields the solution (Formula 10.6):

ENDREF*CON → PEACE
consistency 0.8750, coverage 0.2090

The high consistency means that cases where displacement has ended after conflict involving a regionally concentrated minority tend to be associated with peace, but the low coverage shows that most cases of peace after armed conflict do not fit the description of displacement having ended after a conflict involving a regionally concentrated minority. Indeed, Bangladesh (CHT) is the only case with >0.50 membership in this solution (0.75/1.00). The corresponding solution was found in the analysis involving all displaced persons: cases that combine the ending of conflict-induced displacement with the conflict having involved a regionally concentrated group are most often cases of sustainable peace, but this particular combination of conditions is found in only a small percent of all cases of sustainable peace.

The tests of various combinations of three conditions produce only one consistent solution. ENDREF, FRAC, and CON yields the same solutions as the test of only ENDREF and CON (cf. formula 10.6). Finally, combining the four conditions REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, and CON yields two alternative consistent solutions,94 namely (Formula 10.7):

---

94 Alternative solutions to the same truth table analysis are possible when the minimization process (cf. p 92) leads to more reduced expressions—or "prime implicants"—than are needed to cover all the original "primitive expressions." Ragin (1987, 95–98) illustrates this with the following example. Four of the eight possible configurations of the three conditions A, B, and C are related with the positive outcome Y, like this: AbC + aBc + Abc + ABC → Y. These four configurations are the "primitive expressions" that we want to minimize in order to achieve as simple a solution as possible. Through minimization, ABC combines with AbC to produce AC; ABC combines with AbC to produce AB; and AbC combines with aBc to produce Bc. Hence AC + AB + Bc → Y. AC, AB, and Bc are the "prime implicants." However, two prime implicants, AC and Bc, together cover all four primitive expressions, making AB redundant. When such a situation occurs—as it does in a test of REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, and CON—the software allows the researcher to select which prime implicants to use. As always, this should be done on the basis of theoretical and substantive knowledge, and because I do not feel confident excluding any prime implicants on the basis of such knowledge, I present both alternative consistent solutions.
and (Formula 10.8):

\[
\text{repref} \cdot \text{ENDREF} + \text{REPREF} \cdot \text{frac} \cdot \text{CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}, \\
\text{consistency} 0.8000, \text{coverage} 0.4179
\]

*El Salvador* is the only case with strong membership in the first term of both solutions, \text{repref} \cdot \text{ENDREF} (0.75/1.00). *Bangladesh (CHT)*, in turn, has strong membership in the second terms of both solutions (0.75/1.00). The analysis shows that if a case is either a case of \text{repref} \cdot \text{ENDREF} or a case of \text{ENDREF} \cdot \text{CON} (formula 10.7), it is usually also a case of \text{PEACE} (and the analogous for formula 10.8).

In sum, limiting the analysis to refugees produces the same main findings as the analysis including all displaced persons. Of the conditions analyzed, ending displacement is the most important condition for peace. These findings are summarized in table 10.3. What is interesting so far is that repatriation appears to play a rather marginal role in sustaining peace, and the importance of partition is even smaller. Ending displacement is part of almost every consistent solution; repatriation is part of a few (in both present and absent forms), and partition is not part of a single consistent solution.

Table 10.3
Consistent solutions—all conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>All conflicts, all displaced persons</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>→ PEACE</td>
<td>0.8226</td>
<td>0.6538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repall*ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8621</td>
<td>0.3205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repall<em>ENDALL + ENDALL</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8824</td>
<td>0.3846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>All conflicts, refugees only</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>0.2090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF*frac → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8378</td>
<td>0.4627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repref<em>ENDREF + ENDREF</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8387</td>
<td>0.3881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repref<em>ENDREF + REPREF</em>frac*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.4179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus far, the tests have been conducted on all cases (forty-three cases when all displaced persons are analyzed, and thirty-eight when only refugees are considered). However, a key rationale for the peace-by-repatriation thesis is the need to remix ethnic groups after armed conflict. This makes the thesis particularly pertinent to conflicts over territory. Similarly, partition theory has an explicit focus on conflicts over territory. In the next section, therefore, I repeat the analyses conducted above, but only include the twenty-two cases of conflict over territory.

10.3 Conflicts over Territory
Excluding now conflicts over government and concentrating on conflicts over territory, I begin by testing all conditions for necessity. This yields a consistency score of 0.8919 for group concentration (the other conditions get lower scores). Group concentration is by definition higher in conflicts over territory than in conflicts over government (and for necessary conditions, the outcome should be a subset of the condition). Therefore, it is no surprise that group concentration gets a higher consistency score as a necessary condition when the analysis is limited to conflicts over territory. The consistency of group concentration as a necessary condition for peace is high, but it is not 0.90 or 0.95. I will therefore retain it in the analysis of conflicts over territory.

When all displaced persons are considered, the analysis of conflicts over territory results in two consistent solutions, both of which were also found in the analysis of all cases. The first contains one condition (Formula 10.9):

\[
\text{ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE},
\]
consistency 0.8095, coverage 0.4595

and the other contains two conditions (Formula 10.10):

\[
\text{ENDALL} \ast \text{CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE},
\]
consistency 0.8750, coverage 0.3784

Bangladesh (CHT) is the only case (among conflicts over territory) with strong membership in either solution (1.00/1.00 in ENDALL \rightarrow \text{PEACE} and 0.75/1.00 in ENDALL\ast\text{CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}).

Combining the analysis of conflicts over territory with an exclusive focus on refugees yields four consistent solutions. One singles out the need to end displacement (Formula 10.11):

\[
\text{ENDREF} \rightarrow \text{PEACE},
\]
consistency 0.8095, coverage 0.5313
Table 10.4
Consistent solutions—conflicts over territory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8095</td>
<td>0.4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>0.3784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8095</td>
<td>0.5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFREF<em>frac</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF<em>CON + REPREF</em>frac*CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bangladesh (CHT) has full membership in this solution (1.00/1.00) and Yemen (South Yemen) (1.00/0.50) is the only other case with >0.50 membership in the solution term ENDREF. Another solution was found also in the analysis of all cases (limited to refugees), namely (Formula 10.12):

\[
\text{ENDREF*CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE},\nonumber \\
\text{consistency } 0.8750,\text{ coverage } 0.4375
\]

A third solution constituted one of the solution terms in a solution with two terms (cf. formula 10.8), namely (Formula 10.13):

\[
\text{REPREF*frac*CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE},\nonumber \\
\text{consistency } 0.8000,\text{ coverage } 0.3750
\]

The two solutions in formulas 10.12 and 10.13 also combined to form one consistent solution with two solution terms (Formula 10.14):

\[
\text{ENDREF*CON} + \text{REPREF*frac*CON} \rightarrow \text{PEACE} \\
\text{consistency } 0.8000,\text{ coverage } 0.5000
\]

Bangladesh (CHT) is the only case with strong membership in either of these solutions. Table 10.4 summarizes the analyses of conflicts over territory.

10.4 Conflicts over Government

Finally, to make the analysis complete, the same tests are run exclusively on the twenty-one cases of conflicts over government. No condition is necessary for peace in an analysis restricted to conflicts over government. ENDALL gets the highest consistency, scoring 0.8293.
However, two other conditions are excluded from the analysis, namely partition and group concentration. As these concepts are operationalized in this study (cf. chapter 8), they are irrelevant to an analysis of conflicts over government, and all of them are fully out of the set of “group concentration.”

The analysis of conflicts over government produces three consistent solutions. The first was also found in the analysis of all conflicts as well as in the analysis of conflicts over territory (Formula 10.15):

\[
\text{ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}, \\
\text{consistency 0.8293, coverage 0.8293}
\]

*El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique,* and *Peru* are full members (1.00/1.00) of this solution. Another three have >0.50 membership in ENDALL (cf. formula 10.1), namely *Guinea-Bissau* (1.00/0.50), *Cambodia* (0.75/0.50), and *Ethiopia* (0.75/0.50). The second solution was also found in the analysis of all cases, but not in the analysis of conflicts over territory (Formula 10.16):

\[
\text{repall*ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}, \\
\text{consistency 0.8889, coverage 0.3902}
\]

*Peru* is a full member (1.00/1.00) of this solution, and *El Salvador* and *Guatemala* are strong members (both 0.75/1.00). A third solution, not found in the previous analyses was (Formula 10.17):

\[
\text{repall*frac} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}, \\
\text{consistency 0.8667, coverage 0.3171}
\]

*El Salvador* is the only case with >0.50 membership in this solution (0.75/1.00), and, unsurprisingly, coverage is low. The solution suggests that after conflicts in countries characterized by low fractionalization, displaced persons should not return home.

Finally, limiting the analysis of conflicts over government to refugees yields one consistent solution (Formula 10.18):

\[
\text{REPREF*frac} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}, \\
\text{consistency 0.8235, coverage 0.4000}
\]

One case has >0.50 membership in this solution, namely *Cambodia* (0.75/0.50). It suggests that refugees should return home after conflicts in countries with a low degree of fractionalization. This solution largely contradicts the one found in formula 10.17, which suggested that displaced persons—refugees and IDPs considered together—should not return home.
Table 10.5
Consistent solutions—conflicts over government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicts over government, all displaced persons</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8293</td>
<td>0.8293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repall*ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8889</td>
<td>0.3902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repall*frac → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8667</td>
<td>0.3171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflicts over government, refugees only</th>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPREF*frac → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8235</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

after the end of such conflicts. The results of the analysis of conflicts over government are summarized in table 10.5.

10.5 Findings
The most consistent result of the analyses presented in this chapter is the importance for sustainable peace of ending displacement. This importance can be illustrated in several ways.

First, ENDALL/ENDREF is the only condition that comes out on its own as a consistent subset of PEACE. REPALL/REPREF, FRAC, and CON appear in solution terms only in combination with another condition. Second, either ENDALL or ENDREF are part of eleven of the thirteen different solutions produced by the various analyses, more than any other condition. Third, these eleven solutions all contain ENDALL or ENDREF as present (upper case letters) conditions; the absence of either ENDALL or ENDREF is not part of any solution. REPALL/REPREF is part of eight solutions—REPREF appears variously as present or absent, while REPALL is always absent. The absence of FRAC is part of six solutions, and the presence of CON is part of seven solutions. It is worth noting that PART does not appear in a single consistent solution, including tests restricted to conflicts over territory.

Figure 10.3 illustrates the subset relation ENDALL ≤ PEACE, which (unlike the one in figure 10.2) is a consistent subset relation and an actual solution of several truth table analyses—most cases are clearly on or above the diagonal.

As already mentioned, various combinations of the same nine cases—Bangladesh (CHT), Cambodia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Peru, and Yemen (South Yemen)—have >0.50 membership in the solutions produced in the tests of the peace-by-
The five cases in the upper-right corner of figure 10.3 are full members of both ENDALL and PEACE. Four of them are conflicts over government repatriation thesis conducted above. No other case has >0.50 membership in any consistent solution.95 Incidentally, four of these cases (Cambodia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau and Yemen) belong to the roughly twenty percent of cases for which the subset relation ENDALL ≤ PEACE does not hold. Still, the software highlights them because they have >0.50 membership in some of the consistent solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEACE</th>
<th>ENDALL</th>
<th>Bangladesh (CHT)</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Peru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb) ’95</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (N-K)</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bih)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia)</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (W Sahara)</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin)</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Iran (Kurd) ’96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Myanmar (Karen) ’92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao)</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Russia (Chechnya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Croatia (Serb) ’95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen)</td>
<td>Sri Lanka (Eelam)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’95</td>
<td>Tajikistan ’96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10.3 XY plot of membership in PEACE / ENDALL.
and one is a conflict over territory. This is an important reason for the different coverage scores of the solution ENDALL → PEACE for conflicts over territory and conflicts over government, respectively (tables 10.4 and 10.5). Of all consistent solutions found, ENDALL → PEACE in conflicts over government has by far the greatest coverage. Conversely, the case Croatia (Serb) 1995 is fully in PEACE and fully out of ENDALL, making a significant contribution to the lower coverage of the solution ENDALL → PEACE in conflicts over territory.

The analysis also highlights the difference between fractionalization and group concentration. At the operationalization stage it was argued that they represent different dimensions of ethnic heterogeneity. However, FRAC only appears as absent and CON only as present when they are part of consistent solutions, indicating that fractionalization and group concentration are less related than might have been expected. As noted above, group concentration is not relevant to conflicts over government, at least not as the concept is operationalized in this study—however, fractionalization is. Interestingly, conflicts over government have higher average membership scores in the fuzzy set of “fractionalization” than do conflicts over territory: 0.71 and 0.50, respectively. Indeed, seven conflicts over government are full members of that set, but not a single conflict over territory is. In the end, however, this does not affect the main finding that ending displacement is the most important condition.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the solutions presented in tables 10.3–5 do not reflect to the only combinations of conditions that have been tested. Instead, they are all the consistent solutions. See Appendix 5 for a more extensive summary of these tests.

10.6 Modifying the Analysis
As discussed in chapter 8 the concepts used as conditions and outcome in this study have not been operationalized as fuzzy sets before. For example, I could have focused on other aspects of the first-level concepts, or selected different thresholds to define membership values in the various fuzzy sets. I am the first to admit that alternative operationalizations are conceivable. However, having devoted quite some time to operationalizing the concepts and coding the cases I believe the operationalizations used in this study are reasonable in the context that they are used. Nevertheless, in light of the exploratory character of this study it is worth conducting a few alternative tests. These involve alternative operationalizations of sustainable peace, ended displacement situation, and fractionalization.
**Alternative Operationalization of Sustainable Peace**

The fuzzy membership value 0.50 is considered problematic by some researchers. At the end of chapter 7 I explained that I consider it equally problematic to exclude the 0.50 value even for the most ambiguous cases.

Nevertheless, a look at table 9.3 shows that seventeen of forty-three cases in this study have a membership score of 0.50 in the outcome “sustainable peace.” This is not surprising, considering the elusive nature of the concept of peace. (It is perhaps more surprising that I have dared to code some cases as fully in that set.) Still, almost forty percent of cases undecided on outcome is a lot. This section asks whether reducing that share affects the result of the analysis.96

I retain the fuzzy membership value of 0.50, but reduce the number of cases that are assigned that value. In the original operationalization, the 0.50 value comprised cases where sovereign peace (defined as the absence of armed conflict) had lasted for at least five years, but which had a Polity score of less than +6. Cases with a shorter period of sovereign peace received a lower membership score in the set, and cases with a Polity score of +6 or higher received a higher membership score.

The alternative operationalization separates these cases only on the basis of their Polity score, and employs a lower threshold. As before, cases where conflict recurred within two years are fully out of the set of “sustainable peace”; only cases where sovereign peace lasted for at least two years have nonzero membership. Among these cases, those with a Polity score of 0 or lower are assigned a membership score of 0.25 in the set, and those with a Polity score of +1 or higher are assigned a membership score of 0.75 in the set. The requirements for full membership are the same as with the original operationalization.97

Coding the cases according to this alternative operationalization changes the membership scores of fourteen cases; seven change from 0.50 to 0.25 and seven change from 0.50 to 0.75. This leaves three cases in the 0.50 category, –Bosnia-Herzegovina (Croat), Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), and Lebanon—cases where Polity scores are missing for the relevant years. Fuzzy membership scores according to the alternative coding of sustainable peace are presented in Appendix 2, column “PEACE 2.”

I will not go into detail about these alternative tests. They are simply conducted to see whether alternative operationalizations fundamentally

96 With reference to the discussion at the end of chapter 7, it should be noted that only cases with a membership of 0.50 in one or more conditions are excluded from the creation of the truth table. Cases are not excluded from that procedure on the basis of their membership in the outcome. The exercise in the present section, therefore, is not a response to that particular critique of the 0.50 value.

97 The difference between the Polity score and the Polity2 score, again, does not affect the coding of cases according to the alternative operationalization of sustainable peace.
Table 10.6
Consistent solutions—alternative operationalization of “sustainable peace.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8548</td>
<td>0.6795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL*FRAC → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8667</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL<em>FRAC + ENDALL</em>CON + repall*ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8846</td>
<td>0.5897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL<em>FRAC + repall</em>ENDALL + REPALL<em>FRAC</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8393</td>
<td>0.6026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL<em>FRAC + ENDALL</em>CON + repall<em>frac</em>con → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8095</td>
<td>0.6538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

change the results of the original analysis. In the case of PEACE 2, they do not.

The analysis, summarized in table 10.6, yields a few individual solution terms that do not contain the presence of ENDALL, but these solution terms have rather low coverage—particularly unique coverage (cf. Appendix 5). Also, they are part of consistent solutions where ENDALL appears as the most important solution term. Of the twenty-two combinations of conditions tested, ten analyses yield the parsimonious solution ENDALL → PEACE.

Alternative Operationalization of Ended Displacement Situation

Of the conditions included in this study, “ended displacement situation” stands out as the most important condition for sustainable peace. The subset relation ENDALL ≤ PEACE holds for around eighty percent of all cases. For a condition to constitute a subset of the outcome, membership in the condition should be equal to or lower than membership in the outcome. Does this mean that the lower the average value of memberships in a condition, the more likely it is to constitute a subset of the outcome? A look

Table 10.7
Average membership scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average membership</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPALL</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAC</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10.8
Alternative operationalization of the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&lt; 25,000 remaining displaced persons, or cessation clause invoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>approximately 25,000 remaining displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>25,000–100,000 remaining displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&gt; 100,000 remaining displaced persons, and any-solution-rate ≥50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>&gt; 100,000 remaining displaced persons, and any-solution-rate &lt; 50 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at the average membership scores in the conditions and in the outcome analyzed in this study (table 10.7) reveals that membership in ended displacement situation is comparatively low. However, it is worth noting that the average membership in ENDALL is not as low as that of PART, which does not show up in any consistent solutions. This shows that it is also important in which cases membership scores are high or low.

However, the fact that a very low average membership in PART does not translate into partition being an important condition in the analysis does not preclude the possibility that the comparatively low average membership in ENDALL unduly influences the results. Therefore, the analysis will be repeated with an alternative operationalization of ended displacement situation, which increases average membership.

The original operationalization of ended displacement situation took the concept of “major, protracted refugee situation” as a starting point, arguing that a major refugee situation is clearly not ended. This meant that cases where more than twenty-five thousand people remained displaced after five years were automatically considered more out than in the fuzzy set of ended displacement situation (cf. table 8.5). However, considering the magnitude of many displacement situations this might have been asking too much. A more generous operationalization (which I nevertheless find theoretically less satisfying) would be that a major refugee situation is clearly not fully ended. With the original operationalization, a case with more than twenty-five thousand remaining displaced persons would receive a membership score of no more than 0.25 in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation.” With the alternative operationalization a membership of 0.25 is possible for cases with a remaining displaced population four times larger. The alternative operationalization of “ended displacement situation” is presented in table 10.8.

Coding the cases according to this alternative operationalization increases the membership scores of twenty cases, nearly half of all cases in the analysis—eighteen cases are assigned higher membership scores in ENDALL 2 than they were in ENDALL, and fifteen are stronger members in ENDREF 2 than in ENDREF. Average membership scores in the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” increases to 0.49, similar to that of
Table 10.9  
Consistent solutions—alternative operationalization of “ended displacement situation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL 2*frac → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8085</td>
<td>0.4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPALL<em>ENDALL 2</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>0.1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL 2<em>frac</em>CON → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8947</td>
<td>0.2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repall<em>ENDALL 2</em>frac → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8519</td>
<td>0.2949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

repatriation (std remains 0.35). Fuzzy membership scores are presented in Appendix 2, columns “ENDALL 2/ ENDREF 2.”

The presence of ENDALL 2 appears in every consistent solution. Some consistency scores are unusually high (for this study). The consistency of the subset relation REPALL*ENDALL 2*CON ≤ PEACE is over 0.90. However, the coverage of the various solutions are low or even very low. One case, Bangladesh (CHT), has a membership score of 0.75 in the configuration REPALL*ENDALL 2*CON, nine cases have membership scores of 0.25, and the remaining thirty-three cases are fully out of that particular configuration. Such a solution is far from relevant. In sum, the results show that the alternative operationalization of ended displacement situation does not undermine the results of the original analysis.

**Alternative Operationalization of Fractionalization**

As noted in chapter 8, there are different ways of describing and measuring the ethnic structure of countries. In the original analysis, I used data from Alesina et al (2003), which, while based on more recent sources than the Atlas Narodov Mira, are calculated as the traditional ELF index, which is widely used in the literature.

An interesting alternative to the ELF index is introduced by Fearon (2003). Fearon notes that the traditional measure does not take into account how different various ethnic group are. He illustrates this by comparing Belarus with Cyprus. With seventy-eight percent Belarusians, thirteen percent Russians, four percent Poles, and three percent Ukrainians, Belarus receives a fractionalization score of 0.37. Cyprus’s fractionalization score is

Table 10.10  
Consistent solutions—alternative operationalization of “fractionalization.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL → PEACE</td>
<td>0.8226</td>
<td>0.6538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[98 \ 1 - (0.78^2 + 0.13^2 + 0.04^2 + 0.03^2) = 0.3722\]
practically the same, 0.36, based on seventy-eight percent Greeks and eighteen percent Turks. However,

Belarusians], Ukrainians, and Russians are quite similar in terms of religion, language, and customs, and Poles speak a Slavic language and share many of the same customs. By contrast, Greeks and Turks speak languages that come from completely different families (Indo-European and Altaic), subscribe to two different world religions (Orthodox Christianity and Islam), and have very different customs (Fearon 2003, 211).

Because the traditional measure of ethnic fractionalization fails to capture differences such as those between Belarus and Cyprus, Fearon constructs a measure of “cultural fractionalization,” using the structural divergence between languages as a proxy for the cultural distance between groups in a country. The cultural distance between groups is potentially relevant in a test of the peace-by-repatriation thesis, and it is therefore used as an alternative operationalization of the condition “fractionalization.” Appendix 2, column “FRAC 2” presents the fuzzy membership scores. Six cases received higher membership scores in “FRAC 2” than they did in the original “FRAC,” and thirteen cases received a lower membership score in “FRAC 2.” The analysis results in one consistent solution, which supports the results of the original analysis.

Summary
The main finding of the analysis conducted in this chapter is that the subset relation ENDALL\leq PEACE is consistent and fairly relevant. This means that ending displacement is more important than doing so particularly through repatriation. In a way, this goes back to Adelman’s Soft I position (see p 14), that any solution to the displacement situation is a sign that peace is in place, though the results of this study indicate that “any solution to displacement” is not merely a sign of peace, but more likely an important contributing factor in the establishment of peace—more important than repatriation, anyway.

A total of six cases are full members of the fuzzy set of “sustainable peace,” namely Bangladesh (CTH), El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Peru. Five of these are also full members of the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation,” but only two of them are full members of the fuzzy set of “repatriation.” Similarly, as just seen from another angle, seven cases are full members of the fuzzy set of “ended displacement situation” and

---

99 $1 - (0.78^2 + 0.18^2) = 0.3592$

100 Regarding the case Yugoslavia (Kosovo), discussed at the end of chapter 9, for FRAC 2 I use data for “Yugoslavia” on line 7 under Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union in Fearon’s appendix, which corresponds to “Serbia/Montenegro” in Alesina’s dataset; “Yugoslavia” on line 1 in Fearon corresponds to Alesina’s “Yugoslavia,” which I do not use.
in five of these cases the condition constitutes a subset of the outcome. Twelve cases, nearly twice as many, are full members of the fuzzy set of “repatriation,” but that condition constitutes a subset of the outcome in only two of these cases.

In light of the fact that cases with strong membership in outcome and condition are the most relevant to the theoretical argument in set-theoretic analysis, this goes a long way toward understanding the importance of ending displacement as a result of the present analysis—because clearly, ending displacement has been found to be considerably more important to achieving sustainable peace than is repatriation.

Further, as noted, four of the five cases with full membership in the most general solution, ENDALL ≤ PEACE, are conflicts over government. In light of this finding, it is not surprising that ending displacement comes out as particularly relevant after conflicts over government (the highest coverage score of any solution).

Like ENDALL, PART is a subset of sustainable peace in around seventy-five percent of the cases. There are only a few cases with >0.50 membership in the fuzzy set of “partition” (cf. the low average membership in partition, table 10.8). Even among conflicts over territory, average membership in the fuzzy set of “partition” is no higher than 0.43; only forty percent of conflicts over territory have a membership of >0.50 in partition. However, unlike ended displacement situation, partition is not a relevant subset.

Despite the findings of this analysis, ending displacement cannot be said to constitute a sufficient condition for achieving sustainable peace after armed conflict. Whether peace will be sustainable or not depends on a large number of factors not considered in this study—power sharing arrangements, security guarantees, justice and reconciliation processes, foreign investments and economic recovery to mention a few. The present analysis says nothing about the importance of addressing displacement in different ways relative to the importance of such other variables.

However, in light of the common assumption that repatriation is necessary for peace—the starting point of this study—the crucial finding of the analysis is that ending displacement is more important for sustainable peace than is repatriation. The need to end displacement is the most coherent finding across the various tests conducted in this chapter—whether we analyze conflicts over government or conflicts over territory, whether we include all displaced persons or only refugees, and whether I use my original or alternative operationalizations of peace, fractionalization, and ended displacement situation. As discussed above there are exceptions, but they are few and not very relevant. Additionally, several tests yield solutions consisting of only ended displacement situation. Conversely, the importance of repatriation is not at all constant across the various tests.
This means that at the end of armed conflicts that have caused large-scale displacement, the sustainability of peace will generally depend less on whether displaced persons return home than on whether displaced persons are able to find durable solutions, be it repatriation, local integration, or resettlement.
Summary and Conclusions

Newcomers to the field of international relations may be surprised to learn that efforts to advance human rights are often at odds with attempts to halt violent conflicts. In the experience of practitioners, however, it is unfortunately a commonplace that the promotion of human rights and the practice of conflict resolution, while both admirable endeavors in themselves, are by no means necessarily complementary objectives.

Richard H. Solomon

11.1 Summary

The point of departure for this study was the assumption that the return of displaced persons is necessary for the establishment of sustainable peace after armed conflict. I labeled this assumption the “peace-by-repatriation thesis” and argued that, unfortunately, it is most often presented as a statement of fact rather than as a hypothesis to be tested. I then set out to conduct such a test.

In order to test the peace-by-repatriation thesis, I first needed to make it more precise. I began by tracing the theoretical foundations of the thesis in previous research and discerned several concepts of potential relevance to an analysis of it. I argued that the theoretical foundations of the peace-by-repatriation thesis are weak. However, on the basis of previous research I was able to construct a preliminary framework, or pre-theory, of peace by repatriation. To refine the preliminary framework I applied it to two case studies of conflicts that caused large-scale displacement, namely Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh. While similar in many respects, the cases represent two very different perceptions of the relationship between repatriation and peace, they are, to use Seawright and Gerring’s term, diverse cases. Adding insights from the case studies to the conclusions from previous research, I argued that a theoretical framework suitable for a test of the peace-by-repatriation thesis would entail—in addition to repatriation and sustainable peace—four other potentially relevant conditions, namely ended displacement situation, partition, fractionalization, and group concentration.

Proceeding to a test of the peace-by-repatriation thesis, I began by arguing that the claim made by the thesis was one of necessary conditions, best analyzed in set-theoretic terms. I argued that fuzzy-set analysis would be particularly suitable, and I operationalized the concepts of the theoretical framework as fuzzy sets. Forty-three conflict terminations were selected and coded for the fuzzy-set analysis, which clearly showed that repatriation is not

101 Foreword, Mertus & Helsing (2006, ix).
CONCLUSIONS

necessary for peace. Further, repatriation did not seem to be of general importance in combination with other conditions either. Nor was there any support for the alternative claim that ethnic groups should be kept separated through partition. Instead, the one condition that turned out to be consistently relevant to the establishment of sustainable peace was to end displacement—irrespective of how this was done. Three of the consistent solutions resulting from the fuzzy-set analysis in chapter 10 have consistency scores > 0.50, namely ENDALL → PEACE in the analysis of conflicts over government (0.8292), ENDALL → PEACE in the analysis of all conflicts (0.6538), and ENDREF → PEACE in the analysis of conflicts over territory (0.5313). The various conditions were combined in different ways, separate tests were conducted on conflicts over territory and conflicts over government, respectively, and the analysis was repeated with alternative operationalizations of some of the concepts. None of this changed the main findings, that repatriation is not necessary, but that ending displacement seems to be an important condition for peace.

11.2 Conclusions
This study raises serious doubts about the generality of the peace-by-repatriation thesis. The systematic analysis in chapter 10 found no support for the necessity of repatriation. This supports Adelman’s conclusion that no one relationship between repatriation and peace is valid across all cases. This is not to deny that repatriation can indeed be important for peace in some cases, depending on the circumstances. The case studies suggest that pre-war interethnic relations are critical in this regard.

Expressed in terms of Adelman’s positions, the fuzzy-set analysis does not support the unidirectional Hard I position, which holds that repatriation is a necessary condition for peace. Instead, the hard version of the Soft I position, that ending displacement is important for peace, comes out strong in the analysis. This means that the grand rhetoric of the repatriation culture does not reflect the empirical relationship between displacement and peace.

This conclusion can be developed a bit further with a look back at the case studies. Bosnia is the clearest example of the peace-by-repatriation rhetoric, and the case study suggested that repatriation indeed has an important role to play in the consolidation of peace there. Conversely, repatriation is not likely to be very important for peace in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, where the predominant perception of the relationship between repatriation and peace is Adelman’s Soft II position, that repatriation will be a sign that peace is in place.

However, a few observations in the latter case also hint at the main finding from the fuzzy-set analysis, that any solution to displacement is important for peace. Some of the interviewees noted that the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh is not as high on the political agenda in Armenia as it is
in Azerbaijan. Part of the explanation for this might be the fact that the Armenian IDPs have largely found durable solutions and that the refugees—that is, Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan—are in the process of doing so. In Azerbaijan, the issue of internal displacement is much more salient. At the same time, Armenian control over most of the disputed territory also helps explaining why the issue is more acute to Azerbaijanis.

Regarding UNHCR’s explanations of how repatriation contributes to peace, I argued initially that two are clearly related to the particular solution of repatriation, namely that returning refugees vote with their feet to validate the post-war political order and that they contribute to rebuilding their country. Refugees returning in time to vote in the first post-war elections in Cambodia is an example of the former, and the Return of Qualified Nationals in Bosnia is an example of the latter. The other two explanations—the need to restore protection and the issue of refugee warriors—are not specifically related to repatriation.

Reversing Ethnic Cleansing

In addition to these explanations, the reversal of ethnic cleansing and the remixing of ethnic groups were described as critical for the establishment of sustainable peace, most notably in the case of Bosnia. In this way, repatriation is both an important objective in its own right and a condition for achieving other ends.

The case of Bosnia illustrates how return can represent a right of the individual displaced person. As Lord Ashdown exclaimed: “We’ve invented a new human right here, the right to return after a war.” Similarly, the approach adopted to bring about return to and within Bosnia—as well as to promote property repossession—was to treat the issue as a question of the rule of law. In chapter 4 I quoted Prettitore, who argues that serious progress on return and repossession came about only when these processes were grounded in the rule of law and no longer subject to political agreements. In analyses of the international involvement in Bosnia this is one of the important lessons. Hopefully it has been learned.

There is an element of this line of reasoning in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, too. The international community’s support in principle for the return of displaced persons is based on a perception of such return as a right, once it becomes possible. Further, it is clear from the case study in chapter 5 that in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, this right to return is unrelated to the peace-by-repatriation thesis.

The success of the rule-of-law approach to the Bosnian return process should not hide the fact that the return of displaced persons—and hence, unavoidably, displaced persons themselves—have also been used as means to an end. Nevertheless, the case bears witness to a promising ambition to treat return as a right. The rule-of-law approach to repatriation means that any
person who has been forced from his or her home during armed conflict has an inherent right to reclaim that property and to return voluntarily and in dignity to live there—irrespective of whether this contributes to a particular political goal, including the establishment of sustainable peace.

The case study of Bosnia also highlighted how repatriation can be a condition for successful reconciliation, an aspect that was not equally relevant in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh. The argument was that reconciliation and the rebuilding of trust between the ethnic groups require renewed intermixing. From this perspective, reversing ethnic cleansing is not only a goal in its own right, but also a condition for reconciliation. The high level of social interaction among the ethnic groups in pre-war Bosnia was presented as essential to this line of reasoning. Conversely, if ethnic groups led separate lives before a conflict, even when they happened to inhabit the same parts of a country, there are fewer former social bonds to restore and build peace upon in a reconciliation process. This was the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh. In such cases, the return of displaced persons will play a smaller role for the establishment of sustainable peace. These observations led me to suggest that pre-war interethnic relations are one of the circumstances that determine whether repatriation will contribute to peace or not. Interestingly, this argument has not been an important part of the rhetoric surrounding the need for repatriation to and within Bosnia, nor the discussions about possible return to Nagorno-Karabakh.

In addition, repatriation leading to ethnic remixing can contribute to peace by undermining the power of ethnonationalist elites. Fifteen years after the end of the war Bosnia is still largely characterized by politicians appealing to nationalist sentiments, reinforcing ethnic stereotypes, and keeping mutual fear and suspicion alive. Jenne (2009, 285) studies post-war Bosnia and Kosovo and finds that

\textit{de facto} partition has ensured the electoral success of nationalist parties and policies; impeded property restitution and refugee return; permitted rent-seeking and corruption by nationalist elites; and segregated security and police forces along ethnic lines—creating a climate of extreme insecurity for ethnic minorities residing in the "wrong" territory [emphasis in original].

Interviewees argued that the most reasonable way to overcome this is through remixing the ethnic groups and restoring pre-war relations. The situation in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh is similar, with deep distrust between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, and attempts to overcome these divisions are considered suspect or even treacherous.

In the case study of Bosnia it was argued that temporary protection for displaced persons makes sense where there are positive pre-war interethnic relations to rebuild. If alternative durable solutions had been available to refugees from Bosnia early on, many of them would probably have opted for
them. As a consequence of this, the argument went on, far fewer would have been interested in returning once return became a real possibility. Despite this argument, displaced persons enjoying temporary protection cannot be held in limbo indefinitely. If repatriation does not become a viable option within a reasonable period of time the rationality of temporary protection needs to be reassessed.

**Future Research**

The results of this study show that repatriation as the default solution to displacement cannot be justified with reference to the role of repatriation for building sustainable peace, certainly not to promote the return of displaced persons to dangerous environments in the name of peace. Whether repatriation contributes to peace or not will vary from case to case depending on the circumstances. The case studies indicate that pre-war interethnic relations are important, but this conclusion cannot easily be generalized beyond those two.

Future research should deepen the analysis of the peace-by-repatriation thesis in two ways. First, by developing the theoretical argument about the relationship between repatriation and reconciliation and, second, by adding to the systematic knowledge about interethnic relations in specific cases. A possible starting point for developing the theoretical argument is Lederach’s notions of grass roots peacebuilding and reconciliation through encounters. Lederach (1997, 24) calls for a paradigmatic shift “away from a concern with the resolution of issues and toward a frame of reference that focuses on the restoration and rebuilding of relationships.” Similar concerns have been voiced by Prendergast and Plumb (2002, 327), who argue that

> in order for peace agreements between warring parties to lead to durable peace, there needs to be, alongside the top-down implementation of the peace agreement, concurrent bottom-up processes aimed at constructing a new social contract and healing societal divisions.

The implication for this for the peace-by-repatriation thesis is that in the absence of repatriation, there will be no encounters, and hence relationships cannot be renewed.

An alternative theoretical perspective is feminist peace research. Most important in this context, feminist peace research calls for a focus on other issues than the ones at the center of armed conflict and the involvement of other actors than the primary warring parties. In important respects, the fields of grass roots peacebuilding and feminist peace research make similar recommendations—especially regarding the issues relevant to the findings of this study. Where feminist peace research calls for the participation of women, grass roots peacebuilding emphasize the participation of civil society (Belloni 2001; Orjuela 2003; Richmond 2005).
Jarstad and Sisk (2008, 1) argue that the theory and practice of post-conflict peacebuilding emphasizes, inter alia, “the elite and public negotiation of comprehensive peace agreements.” According to Richmond (2005, 129), non-governmental actors and agencies play an important role in peacebuilding because they often have “unparalleled access to conflict zones, far beyond those actors which form part of the official political, economic and development discourse.” Similar roles for displaced persons are suggested by Fagen (2009) and Newman (2003).

In addition, more empirical research is important, beginning with case studies, structured in a way that allows systematic comparison. The case studies of Bosnia and Nagorno-Karabakh suggest that the relationship between repatriation and peace is influenced by pre-war interethnic relations, but it is difficult to test this in a systematic way. What is needed is information on how ethnic groups interacted before a conflict, and how people intermix in the aftermath of conflict. Global datasets based on census data cannot provide such information, if only because censuses are not conducted even on a decennial basis. Further, existing datasets on ethnic intermixing—whether various forms of data on fractionalization or the MAR data on group concentration—tell us little, if anything, about the quality of relations between ethnic groups. Quantitative studies, or systematic studies of a medium number of cases, will be important once there is enough systematically collected data on relevant variables; presently there is not. I believe, therefore, that the next step in the furtherance of research on the peace-by-repatriation thesis needs to be case studies based on a common format. Such studies will be a first indication of whether and how the findings from the two cases studies of Bosnia and Nagorno-Karabakh apply to a broader empirical domain, thereby further refining the theoretical argument. In addition, such studies will help pinpointing what kinds of data are needed to compile relevant datasets that would allow more quantitative analyses of the peace-by-repatriation thesis.

In this regard, I consider Fearon’s measure of cultural fractionalization to be more to the point than the traditional ELF measure. This can be seen in the cases of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Nagorno-Karabakh. According to the ELF measure Bosnia is more fractionalized than Azerbaijan, with fractionalization scores of, respectively, 0.681 and 0.188. Conversely, the cultural fractionalization scores are 0.146 for Bosnia and 0.187 for Azerbaijan. However, cultural fractionalization is still related to the state, just like the ELF measure, and group size remains important to the fractionalization score. Furthermore, it does not reflect pre-war interethnic relations.

Finally, I want to stress again that while this study seriously questions repatriation as a blanket solution to displacement, it should not be taken as making a case against the return of displaced persons in the aftermath of
armed conflict. The potential contribution of return to the establishment of sustainable peace might vary considerably from one case to the other, but that contribution is only one of many conceivable reasons to promote return. The right of displaced persons to return is possibly an example of what Wallensteen (2007, 11) refers to when he argues that certain standards are being established for internationally accepted peace agreements. Indeed, as has been noted, provisions for return are included in most major peace agreements of late. The rule-of-law approach adopted to promote return and property repossession in Bosnia is an important model, even though it was motivated by the peace-by-repatriation thesis. It is essential, however, that such a right of displaced persons to return is not misrepresented as an obligation to return.
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Appendix 1: Interview Guide

General
What is the relation between the solution of displacement and the resolution of the conflict?

In what ways is the solution of displacement dependent on the resolution of the conflict—and in what ways is the resolution of the conflict dependent on the solution of displacement?

Can the conflict be resolved without the return of DPs? How? Why not?

Would resolution of conflict have been different/easier if there were no DPs? Why?

Is the IDP/refugee/returnee community a political actor?

Do IDPs/refugee/returnees have an agenda that they pursue?

Are they a force for peace or for conflict; compromise, principles, rights...?

In what ways could the resolution of this conflict become a model for other cases?

Nagorno-Karabakh
What do you think will happen to the displaced persons (various groups)?

When and how will displacement end?

In what ways can the return of displaced persons contribute to peace?

In what ways can displaced persons and returnees contribute to peace?

How do you envision future relations between Armenians and Azerbaijanis?

The present plan for peace envisages a future referendum on the status of Nagorno-Karabakh. Why is this /not a good idea?

Bosnia-Herzegovina
In what ways has the return of displaced persons contributed to peace?

In what ways have displaced persons and returnees contributed to peace?

What effects have the strong emphasis on return had on peace implementation?
## Appendix 2: Fuzzy Membership Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>PEACE</th>
<th>PEACE 2</th>
<th>REPALL</th>
<th>REPREF</th>
<th>ENDALL</th>
<th>ENDRIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, 2001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (N.-Karabakh), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (CHT), 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Croat), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, 1998</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad, 1994</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, 1999</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1993</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo, 2001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, 1991</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, 1991</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea), 1991</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia), 1993</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau, 1999</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq, 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, 1990</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia, 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Western Sahara), 1989</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique, 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin), 1992</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1992</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1995</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua, 1989</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, 1999</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao), 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (Chechnya), 1996</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda, 1994</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone, 2000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka (Eelam), 2001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1996</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1998</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda, 1991</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen (South Yemen), 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo), 1999</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>ENALL</td>
<td>ERF2</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>FRAC</td>
<td>FRAC1</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, 2001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, 1995</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (N.-Karabakh), 1994</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (CHT), 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Croat), 1994</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, 1998</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad, 1994</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, 1999</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo, 2001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, 1991</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, 1991</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea), 1991</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia), 1993</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1995</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau, 1999</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1990</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq, 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia, 1995</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Western Sahara), 1989</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique, 1992</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin), 1992</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1992</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1995</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua, 1989</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, 1999</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao), 1990</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (Chechnya), 1996</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda, 1994</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone, 2000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka (Eelam), 2001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1996</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1998</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda, 1991</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen (South Yemen), 1994</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo), 1999</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Coding Sustainable Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Restarted</th>
<th>Govt. Peace 2 Years</th>
<th>Govt. Peace 5 Years</th>
<th>Polity Score</th>
<th>CIRI Value</th>
<th>Internat. Presence</th>
<th>Sustainable Peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, 2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, 1995</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan (N.-Karabakh), 1994</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (CHT), 1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Croat), 1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, 1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad, 1994</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, 1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Serb), 1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo, 2001</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, 1991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, 1991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (Eritrea), 1991</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia (Abkhazia), 1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala, 1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau, 1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1990</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq, 1996</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1993</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq (Kurdistan), 1996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon, 1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia, 1995</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (Western Sahara), 1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique, 1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Kachin), 1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1992</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar (Karen), 1995</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua, 1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, 1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (Mindanao), 1990</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (Chechnya), 1996</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda, 1994</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone, 2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka (Uelam), 2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1996</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan, 1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda, 1991</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen (South Yemen), 1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (Kosovo), 1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanatory note for Appendix 3.

- **RESTARTED**: Year when conflict restarted (if at all) according to the UCDP.
- **SOVEREIGN PEACE 2 YEARS**: Did the conflict termination last for at least two years?
- **SOVEREIGN PEACE 5 YEARS**: Did the conflict termination last for at least five years?
- **POLITY SCORE**: Average Polity score at termination plus 4, 5, and 6 years.
- **CIRI VALUE**: Average CIRI value at termination plus 4, 5, and 6 years; a weighted value max 10, with PHYSINT and EMPINX given equal weight: \( \frac{(\text{PHYSINT} \times 5 + \text{EMPINX} \times 4)}{8} \).\(^{102}\)
- **INTERNATIONAL PRESENCE**: was the international community present at termination plus 5 years?

The concepts are operationalized according to the necessary and sufficient condition structure. If the original termination did not last for five years, then POLITY, CIRI and INTERNATIONAL PRESENCE are irrelevant. If the original termination lasted for five years but POLITY is <6, then CIRI and INTERNATIONAL PRESENCE are irrelevant.

\(^{102}\) The Physical Integrity Index (PHYSINT) is an additive index based on the Torture, Extrajudicial Killing, Political Imprisonment, and Disappearance indicators, and it ranges from 0 (no government respect for these rights) to 8 (full government respect for these rights). For details see Cingranelli and Richards (1999). The Empowerment Rights Index (EMPINX) is an additive index based on the Freedom of Movement, Freedom of Speech, Workers’ Rights, Political Participation, and Freedom of Religion indicators, ranging from 0 (no respect) to 10 (full respect). For details see Richards, Gelleny and Sacko (2001).
Appendix 4: Complex versus Parsimonious Solutions

As explained in chapter 7, a fuzzy set analysis can be designed to produce either a complex or a parsimonious solution, the difference being whether or not the researcher manually assigns a particular value on the outcome for logical remainders, that is, theoretically possible configurations not represented among the empirical cases. To illustrate, consider an analysis of the three conditions repatriation, ended displacement situation and partition. The truth table reproduced in table A4.1 shows that there are two logical remainders, namely 0-1-1 (repall*ENDALL*PART) and 1-1-1 (REPALL* ENDALL*PART).

Table A4.1
Truth table (all cases, all displaced persons, three conditions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repall</th>
<th>Endall</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Peace</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.558140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.612245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.640000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.790698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.625000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.857143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to achieve a complex solution I need to decide whether, if such cases were to exist, they would most likely be associated with sustainable peace or not. For example, assigning them a positive value on the outcome yields the following complex solution (Formula A4.1):

\[
\text{repall} \times \text{ENDALL} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}
\]

consistency 0.8621, coverage 0.3205

Alternatively, giving the logical remainders a negative value on the outcome results in the following complex solution (Formula A4.2):

\[
\text{repall} \times \text{ENDALL} \times \text{part} \rightarrow \text{PEACE}
\]

consistency 0.8571, coverage 0.3077

Finally, not assigning any particular value to these configurations, but instead setting logical remainders to “don’t care,” gives the following parsimonious solution (Formula A4.3):
The solutions in formulas A4.1 and A4.3 are identical. The only difference is that in the complex solution (formula A4.1), I, the researcher, decided that the logical remainders should have a positive value on the outcome, whereas in the parsimonious solution (formula A4.3) this decision was taken by the software. The software makes that decision on the basis of which solution is the most parsimonious. As formula A4.2 shows, giving the logical remainders a negative value on the outcome results in a more complex solution, and therefore, the software prefers to give them a positive value.

For the researcher to make this decision he or she needs to possess enough theoretical and substantive knowledge to be able to assess whether the logical remainders are, in fact, most likely to be associated with the presence of the outcome or with the absence of the outcome. Because I do not possess that kind of knowledge, I set logical remainders to “don’t care” throughout in this study.
Appendix 5: Truth Table Solutions

This appendix presents the truth table solutions that constitute the basis for formulas 10.1–10.18 in chapter 10. In several cases the same solution has resulted from separate tests of different combinations of conditions. Below, I present one table per solution (that is, one table per formula in chapter 10) and specify for each solution which tests—or “models”—yield that particular solution.

The parsimonious solution option is used throughout, as are the default frequency cutoff (1) and consistency cutoff (0.80). Two things should be noted. First, a consistency cutoff of 1 means that a configuration should be represented by at least one empirical case in order to be included in the analysis, while a consistency cutoff of 0.80 means that an individual configuration should have a raw consistency of more than 0.80 to be counted as consistent in the truth table analysis. These cutoffs are used throughout. Once solutions are found, however, I have required a solution consistency of at least 0.80 to count a solution as consistent. (Consistencies of >0.80 in the truth table are no guarantee that the resulting solution will be consistent. Second, the software reports de facto cutoffs, rather than the default ones. For example, if four configurations are represented by, respectively, 0, 0, 3, and 7 cases, then the reported frequency cutoff will be 3. This is what is reproduced in the tables below.

Table A5.1
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.1.

| Data: all conflicts, all displaced persons |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL) |
| frequency cutoff: 3 |
| consistency cutoff: 0.804348 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, PART) |
| frequency cutoff: 8 |
| consistency cutoff: 0.813559 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, FRAC) |
| frequency cutoff: 2 |
| consistency cutoff: 0.822222 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC) |
| frequency cutoff: 1 |
| consistency cutoff: 0.827586 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, PART, FRAC) |
| frequency cutoff: 1 |
| consistency cutoff: 0.818182 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage*</th>
<th>unique coverage*</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>0.653846</td>
<td>0.653846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.653846
solution consistency: 0.822581

* Raw coverage corresponds to the coverage of an individual solution term irrespective of the coverage of other solution terms. Unique coverage refers to the coverage related exclusively to that particular solution term (cf. Ragin 2006b, 304–307).
Table A5.2
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.2.

| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.875000 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.928571 |
| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| ENDALL*CON | 0.179487 | 0.179487 | 0.875000 |

Table A5.3
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.3.

| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, PART) | frequency cutoff: 3 | consistency cutoff: 0.857143 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, PART, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.857143 |
| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| repall*ENDALL | 0.320513 | 0.320513 | 0.862069 |

Table A5.4
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.4.

| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.857143 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.823529 |
| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| repall*ENDALL | 0.320513 | 0.205128 | 0.862069 |
| ENDALL*CON | 0.179487 | 0.064103 | 0.875000 |

solution coverage: 0.384615
solution consistency: 0.882353
Table A5.5
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.5.

Data: all conflicts, refugees only
Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, FRAC)
  frequency cutoff: 1
  consistency cutoff: 0.837838

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENDREF*frac</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.462687</td>
<td>0.462687</td>
<td>0.837838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.462687
solution consistency: 0.837838

Table A5.6
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.6.

Data: all conflicts, refugees only
Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, CON)
  frequency cutoff: 1
  consistency cutoff: 0.875000
Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, FRAC, CON)
  frequency cutoff: 1
  consistency cutoff: 0.928571

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENDREF*CON</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.208955</td>
<td>0.208955</td>
<td>0.875000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.208955
solution consistency: 0.875000

Table A5.7
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.7.

Data: all conflicts, refugees only
Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)
  frequency cutoff: 1
  consistency cutoff: 0.833333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repref*ENDREF</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.283582</td>
<td>0.179104</td>
<td>0.791667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENDREF*CON</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.208955</td>
<td>0.104478</td>
<td>0.875000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.388060
solution consistency: 0.838710

Table A5.8
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.8.

Data: all conflicts, refugees only
Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)
  frequency cutoff: 1
  consistency cutoff: 0.833333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repref*ENDREF</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.283582</td>
<td>0.238806</td>
<td>0.791667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPREF<em>frac</em>CON</th>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.179104</td>
<td>0.134328</td>
<td>0.800000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.417910
solution consistency: 0.800000
## Table A5.9
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.9.

| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL) | frequency cutoff: 2 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 2 | consistency cutoff: 0.842105 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, PART, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |

| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 2 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>0.459459</td>
<td>0.459459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.459459

solution consistency: 0.809524

## Table A5.10
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.10.

| Model: PEACE = (ENDALL, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.875000 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL*CON</td>
<td>0.378378</td>
<td>0.378378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.378378

solution consistency: 0.875000

## Table A5.11
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.11.

| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF) | frequency cutoff: 2 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.842105 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC) | frequency cutoff: 1 | consistency cutoff: 0.812500 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDREF</td>
<td>0.531250</td>
<td>0.531250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.531250

solution consistency: 0.809524
Table A5.12
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.12.

| Data: conflicts over territory, refugees only | Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, CON)  |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, CON)  | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, CON)  | consistency cutoff: 0.875000 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, CON) | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (ENDREF, FRAC, CON) | consistency cutoff: 928571 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON) | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON) | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |

| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| ENDREF*CON | 0.437500 | 0.437500 | 0.875000 |
| solution coverage: 0.437500 |
| solution consistency: 0.875000 |

Table A5.13
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.13.

| Data: conflicts over territory, refugees only | Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |

| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| REPREF*frac*CON | 0.375000 | 0.375000 | 0.800000 |
| solution coverage: 0.375000 |
| solution consistency: 0.800000 |

Table A5.14
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.14.

| Data: conflicts over territory, refugees only | Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  | frequency cutoff: 1 |
| Model: PEACE = (REPREF, ENDREF, FRAC, CON)  | consistency cutoff: 0.909091 |

| raw coverage | unique coverage | consistency |
| ENDREF*CON | 0.437500 | 0.125000 | 0.875000 |
| REPREF*frac*CON | 0.375000 | 0.062500 | 0.800000 |
| solution coverage: 0.500000 |
| solution consistency: 0.800000 |
### Table A5.15
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>frequency cutoff</th>
<th>consistency cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (ENDALL, FRAC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.812500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, FRAC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.814815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL, PART, FRAC, CON)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.814815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENDALL</td>
<td>0.829268</td>
<td>0.829268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution coverage: 0.829268

Solution consistency: 0.829268

### Table A5.16
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>frequency cutoff</th>
<th>consistency cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (REPALL, ENDALL)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.888889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repall*ENDALL</td>
<td>0.390244</td>
<td>0.390244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution coverage: 0.390244

Solution consistency: 0.888889

### Table A5.17
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>frequency cutoff</th>
<th>consistency cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (REPALL, FRAC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.866667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repall*frac</td>
<td>0.317073</td>
<td>0.317073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution coverage: 0.317073

Solution consistency: 0.866667

### Table A5.18
Truth table solution, basis for formula 10.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>frequency cutoff</th>
<th>consistency cutoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEACE = (REPREF, FRAC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.823529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>raw coverage</th>
<th>unique coverage</th>
<th>consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFREF*frac</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
<td>0.400000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution coverage: 0.400000

Solution consistency: 0.823529
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