INTERNATIONAL LAW AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Edited by **Beth A. Simmons**
and **Richard H. Steinberg**

[Consider first the control variables that shape the baseline prospects for peace.] Wars that end in a tie are much *** more likely to be repeated than those that end with a decisive victory for one side. More costly wars are followed by substantially more durable peace, all else being equal. Peace is significantly more fragile between belligerents with more acrimonious shared histories, and is almost six times more precarious when one side's existence is threatened by the conflict.[27] *** Neighboring states are [more likely] to fight again, but [note that] this finding is not always statistically significant.[28]

As Werner's argument would predict, changes in relative capabilities over time do seem to be associated with the resumption of war.[29] ***

* * *

These findings suggest that it will be much harder to maintain peace in a case like the 1948 cease-fire in the Arab-Israeli War – which took place without a clear victor, between states whose entire history was marked by violence, and with the very existence of one side at stake – than in a case such as the Falklands War, fought by states a long distance from each other with little previous history of militarized conflict, ending in a very lopsided victory for Britain, with a relatively low death toll.

* * *

Agreement Strength

[Turn now to our primary variables of interest, the measures of agreement strength at the top of Table 20.1.] *** The subjective coding of agreement strength is a categorical variable (none, very weak, weak, moderate, strong). Model 1 shows the comparison to the omitted middle category (weak). As expected, the strongest agreements yield the most durable peace, and moderately strong agreements perform better than

---

[27] The latter finding is driven largely, but not entirely, by the Arab-Israeli cases.

[28] While neighbors are more likely to fight in the first place, all of the states in these data have proven themselves to have both reason to fight and the ability to reach each other militarily. It is thus not surprising that the effects of contiguity are weaker for the resumption of war than for propensity to fight in the first place.

[29] [But it is not entirely clear from this finding which way the arrows run. Do changes in relative capabilities lead to war, or does war lead to changes in relative capability? For example, was the India-Pakistan war over Bangladesh caused by Pakistan's falling capabilities, or did the war, which severed Pakistan in two, cause our measures of capability to drop? A lagged measure of the change in relative capabilities has no positive effect on the risk of war, casting significant doubt on the finding that changes in relative capabilities cause peace to break down.]

weak ones. Compared to the median agreement (weak), moderate agreements reduce the risk of another war by an estimated 57 percent (as indicated by the hazard ratio of 0.43), and strong agreements reduce the hazard of failure by more than 80 percent. Very weak agreements are associated with the least durable peace, faring perhaps even worse than no agreement at all. But compared to the middle category, peace falls apart more quickly with both very weak and no agreements. These effects are jointly significant.[30]

The findings are even clearer if one uses the objective index of agreement strength (Model 2). The negative and statistically significant coefficient indicates that the stronger the agreement, the longer peace lasts, all else being equal. A unit increase in agreement strength is associated with about a 20 percent reduction in the risk of another war. Overall, I find fairly strong support for the hypothesis that the content of agreements matter. Even when one takes the baseline prospect for peace into account, stronger agreements lead to more durable peace.

* * *

Assessing Individual Peace Mechanisms

Although mechanisms to alter incentives, reduce uncertainty, and control accidents are effective in the aggregate, examining the effects of each peace mechanism individually is important to know how best to maintain peace. Tables 20.2 to 20.4 show the results of each mechanism in turn, controlling for the baseline prospects for peace. Unfortunately, the small data set and problems of multicolinearity mean it is not possible to test all of these measures simultaneously. Because many aspects of agreements are correlated, it is difficult to reach strong conclusions about which measures are most effective relative to each other. For each mechanism, I checked the results controlling for the other aspects of agreements that were highly correlated with the measure under consideration.[31] Including correlated aspects of agreements solves the omitted variable bias but introduces multicolinearity, which reduces the efficiency of the estimates. Note that while the trade-off between multicolinearity and omitted variable bias makes it difficult to assess precisely the relative merits of each aspect of agreements, it does not call into

---

[30] Joint significance is determined with F-tests using STATA's "test" command.
[31] Where findings are not robust to these changes in model specification, I note this in the discussion below.

TABLE 20.2. *Individual Peace Mechanisms (Weibull Estimates)*

Variables	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio
WITHDRAWAL	−0.33 (0.75)	0.72		
DEMILITARIZED ZONES				
Partial	−0.83* (0.47)	0.43		
Full	−2.38** (1.03)	0.09		
ARMS CONTROL	0.45 (0.48)	1.57		
INTERNAL CONTROL				
Responsible			0.70 (0.78)	2.01
Concrete			0.28 (1.21)	1.32
THIRD-PARTY				
Mediation			1.33 (1.02)	3.79
Guarantee			−15.54*** (0.97)	0.000
TIE	3.47*** (0.32)	32.10	3.26*** (0.36)	26.04
COST OF WAR	−0.45** (0.19)	0.64	−0.85*** (0.21)	0.43
HISTORY OF CONFLICT	1.16*** (0.16)	3.20	0.56* (0.31)	1.75
EXISTENCE AT STAKE	1.85*** (0.65)	6.35	2.22*** (0.84)	9.16
CONTIGUOUS	0.76 (0.48)	2.13	1.68*** (0.45)	5.35
CHANGE IN RELATIVE CAPABILITIES	1.13*** (0.22)	3.09	0.66*** (0.18)	1.93
Constant	−7.49*** (2.64)		−6.07*** (2.32)	
Shape parameter p	0.76** (0.10)		0.83 (0.11)	
N	770		770	

Variables	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio
Subjects	48		48	
Log likelihood	−46.07		−44.33	

Note: Negative coefficients and hazard ratios <1 indicate decrease in risk of another war (increase in duration of peace). Positive coefficients and hazard ratios >1 indicate increase in risk of another war (decrease in duration of peace).

RSE = robust standard errors.

*** $p \leq .01$.

** $p \leq .05$.

* $p \leq .10$.

Two-tailed tests used.

doubt the general finding that agreements matter in the construction of durable peace. The bias arises because the omitted agreement mechanisms also affect the durability of peace, contradicting the null hypothesis that agreements do not matter.

As Table 20.3 indicates, withdrawing forces from the cease-fire line may reduce the risk of another war, but not significantly so. Troops withdraw to the status quo ante in about one-third of the cases examined here, suggesting that the norm against taking (and keeping) territory by force is fairly strong. Failure to withdraw from land captured during war has often laid the seeds for another round of fighting (the continuing strife over territories occupied by Israel in 1967 being the best example). But returning to the prewar lines does not ensure peace. Israel and Egypt fought again after Israel withdrew from the Sinai in 1956, for example.

Demilitarized zones (DMZs) to separate troops help foster durable peace. Even partial or very limited zones can help reduce the danger of accidents and skirmishes (for example, the number of incidents between India and Pakistan dropped markedly when narrow DMZs were established after the first and second Kashmir wars), but this effect is only marginally significant. However, full DMZs (defined as those 2 km wide or more, running the full length of the cease-fire line) have a clear stabilizing effect, reducing the hazard of another war by about 90 percent. DMZs have contributed to peace between El Salvador and Honduras after the Football War, in Korea, and between Israel and Syria in the Golan Heights. Arms control measures have not reduced the likelihood of recurrent war.[32]

---

[32] The sign of the coefficient for arms control flip-flops depending on model specification.

TABLE 20.3. *Individual Peace Mechanisms (Weibull Estimates)*

Variables	All peacekeeping		New peacekeeping only	
	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio
PEACEKEEPING				
Monitors	−1.10*	0.33	−6.87***	0.001
	(0.59)		(2.62)	
Armed forces	−0.21	0.81	−7.29*	0.001
	(0.80)		(4.05)	
TIE	3.79***	44.24	11.17**	70898.3
	(0.47)		(4.50)	
COST OF WAR	−0.70***	0.50	−1.84*	0.16
	(0.18)		(1.10)	
HISTORY OF CONFLICT	1.27***	3.56	7.38**	1605.81
	(0.29)		(3.77)	
EXISTENCE AT STAKE	2.35***	10.50	7.66*	2124.89
	(0.23)		(4.27)	
CONTIGUOUS	0.97**	2.63	1.43**	4.17
	(0.40)		(0.69)	
CHANGE IN RELATIVE CAPABILITIES	0.80***	2.23	−0.16	0.85
	(0.23)		(0.37)	
Constant	−5.78***		−15.18**	
	(1.88)		(7.34)	
Shape parameter p	0.76*		1.82	
	(0.11)		(1.18)	
N	770		593	
Subjects	48		37	
Log likelihood	−46.78		−16.67	

Note: Negative coefficients and hazard ratios <1 indicate decrease in risk of another war (increase in duration of peace). Positive coefficients and hazard ratios >1 indicate increase in risk of another war (decrease in duration of peace).

RSE = robust standard errors.

*** $p \leq .01$.

** $p \leq .05$.

* $p \leq .10$. Two-tailed tests used.

Nor have measures to establish internal control over potential rogue groups made peace more stable. A number of cease-fire agreements specify that each side is responsible for any hostile action coming from its territory. Such statements are not effective at making states rein in

irregular forces; in fact these statements are more likely an indicator of a serious problem with rogue groups. In some cases (such as the Football War), there is evidence that concrete measures to disarm irregular forces can help cement peace. But in many cases, the problem has not been one of "involuntary defection" by rogue groups, but of the voluntary use of irregular forces to carry out covert aggression. This problem, especially prominent in India and Pakistan and in the Middle East, has not been effectively dealt with.

The effect of third parties on peace depends on their level of involvement. Outsiders often help mediate a cease-fire, as the United States did for Israel and Egypt in 1970 to end the War of Attrition, or as Iran did in Armenia and Azerbaijan in 1992. Third parties may also pressure client states to stop fighting, as in the Sinai War and the Iran-Iraq War. This level of involvement may help warring states reach a cease-fire to begin with, but it does not help them keep it. If anything, cease-fires reached with outside mediation appear to be more likely to break down quickly (the coefficient is positive but not significant). Explicit guarantees, though not terribly frequent, are much more successful. There are no cases of peace failing when an outside state has explicitly underwritten the cease-fire. Unlike in civil wars, such guarantees are not necessary[33] (there are many cases of durable peace without them), but they clearly help reduce the risk of another war.

Table 20.4 shows the effect of peacekeeping. The international community has sent monitors or armed peacekeepers to about two-thirds of the interstate cease-fires in the post–World War II era. These efforts have helped keep the peace, but the effectiveness of peacekeeping can be easily undermined. The presence of monitors appears to lengthen the duration of peace.[34] However, the presence of armed peacekeepers does not have a statistically significant effect. A look at peacekeeping's record suggests an important difference between missions deployed at the time of the cease-fire, and those already in place before the war broke out. More than half of peacekeeping's failures (that is, cases where peacekeepers were present and war resumed) were those of missions deployed long before the cease-fire. In many cases these missions were largely inactive and had been discredited by their earlier failures. The

---

[33] Walter 2001.
[34] This finding is not as strong when the Arab-Israeli conflict is controlled for. Deploying a larger number of peacekeepers seems to reduce the risk of another war, but this effect is not statistically significant (results not shown).

TABLE 20.4. *Individual Peace Mechanisms (Weibull Estimates)*

Variables	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio
CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES	−0.18 (2.11)	0.83		
SPECIFICITY	−0.04*** (0.01)	0.96		
DISPUTE RESOLUTION				
Ongoing mediation			1.84*** (0.49)	6.27
Joint commission			−16.69*** (0.81)	0.000
FORMAL AGREEMENT			−0.69 (0.57)	0.50
TIE	3.57*** (0.33)	35.36	2.24*** (0.28)	9.35
COST OF WAR	−0.25 (0.28)	0.78	−0.31* (0.16)	0.73
HISTORY OF CONFLICT	0.52*** (0.13)	1.69	0.68*** (0.18)	1.97
EXISTENCE AT STAKE	3.24*** (0.57)	25.49	1.98*** (0.47)	7.21
CONTIGUOUS	1.93*** 0.28	6.89	1.16*** (0.27)	3.20
CHANGE IN RELATIVE CAPABILITIES	1.53*** (0.09)	4.63	1.08*** (0.18)	2.94
Constant	−12.18*** (2.73)		−10.49*** (2.95)	
Shape parameter p	1.08 (0.17)		1.07 (0.27)	
N	757		770	
Subjects	47		48	
Log likelihood	−37.64		−37.36	

Note: Negative coefficients and hazard ratios <1 indicate decrease in risk of another war (increase in duration of peace). Positive coefficients and hazard ratios >1 indicate increase in risk of another war (decrease in duration of peace).

RSE = robust standard errors.

*** $p \leq .01$.

** $p \leq .05$.

* $p \leq .10$. Two-tailed tests used.

UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) had been deployed in 1964 to help keep peace between Turkish and Greek Cypriots in an internal conflict. It could do nothing to prevent military action by Turkey in 1974, nor was its presence effective in maintaining a cease-fire in the midst of the Turco-Cypriot War. Both the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in the Middle East and the UN Military Observer Group (UNMOGIP) in Kashmir were effective in the early years of their deployments, but after more bouts of fighting – in 1956 and especially 1967 in the Middle East, and in 1965 in Kashmir – these missions were rendered useless. Both missions remain in place today, but are inactive.

If one drops cases in which peacekeeping contingents were already deployed before the war (for example, keeping the first Arab-Israeli cease-fire when UNTSO was first established but dropping subsequent cases in which UNTSO is the only peacekeeping mission), one can see that new peacekeeping missions have been quite effective.[35] Of course, new peacekeeping missions are not foolproof, or there would never be old missions discredited by their failure to keep peace. But there is a large and statistically significant difference between cease-fires overseen by a fresh set of international peacekeepers and those without the benefit of peacekeeping.[36]

The jury is still out on the effectiveness of confidence-building measures, because they are relatively rare. The risk of another war appears to be lower in cases where measures such as notification of troop rotations or hotlines between military commanders have been implemented (see Table 20.4). But these measures have been employed in only a few cases, making it is possible that this finding is merely an artifact of the data.

I examined two types of dispute resolution between belligerents: that provided by ongoing third-party mediation after a cease-fire has been reached;[37] and joint commissions made up of representatives from both states in the war. The former is not an effective dispute resolution tool; in fact it is associated with peace that is significantly more likely to break down quickly. But joint commissions such as those set up after the

---

[35] Note that because almost all of the omitted cases are wars that ended with a decisive victory but were repeated, the hazard ratio for the variable tie is highly exaggerated.

[36] This finding contradicts the conclusions of Diehl, Reifschneider, and Hensel 1996; however, the results they report in Table 20.4 suggest that both active and operational involvement by the UN reduce the risk of another dispute.

[37] As opposed to mediation to reach a cease-fire, which was examined above.

Korean War, between Ethiopia and Somalia in 1988, or between El Salvador and Honduras in 1980, have been much more successful. The history of the armistice commissions between Israel and its Arab neighbors suggests that willingness to work within such a forum can provide an important signal of intentions. These commissions worked well in their early years to settle disputes over land use and fishing and farming rights, as well as to handle small incidents between soldiers. Conversely the breakdown of these regimes both signaled and contributed to increasing hostility on both sides.[38]

All else being equal, the more specific the cease-fire agreement, the longer peace tends to last. More specific agreements also tend to implement other measures to keep peace, but the finding that specificity reduces the hazard of another war holds up even when these other measures are controlled for. The most detailed agreements, such as the Korean Armistice and the Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement, have been followed by lasting peace. Cases of medium detail (China-India, the Gulf War, and the two Kashmir Wars, for example) have had mixed success, and the much less detailed agreements (for example, the Six Day War and the first Turco-Cypriot cease-fire) have tended to fail quickly. Demarcating the exact location of the cease-fire line put a halt to efforts on both sides to push for slight advantages in the early days of each cease-fire between India and Pakistan.[39] Of course, deliberate attacks cannot be stopped by specifying the location of the cease-fire line, but defining compliance can clearly help prevent skirmishing as both sides try to improve their positions.

Peace tends to last longer after formal agreements than after tacit or unilaterally declared cease-fires, all else being equal, but the difference is not significant statistically, nor terribly robust to different model specifications. Concern about international audience costs often plays a role in states' decisions about whether, when, and how to fight each other. India and Pakistan, for example, have both tried hard not to appear as the aggressor in their repeated wars, using proxy forces rather than regular troops to initiate hostilities.[40] These two states have also fought in

---

[38] For the history of these Military Armistice Commissions, see Azcárate 1966; Khouri 1963; and Kinsolving 1967.

[39] See UN document S/6710 and addenda, various dates 1965–66.

[40] Pakistan sent Azad Kashmir forces across the cease-fire line in 1965, successfully laying the blame for the war on India's retaliation. India learned the lesson and sponsored the Mukti Bahini insurgency in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) in 1971.

places where their formal agreement left loopholes, as on the Siachen Glacier in the early 1980s.[41]

However, formalizing a cease-fire may not be crucial for invoking international audience costs. The general norm against aggression means that costs may be paid even for breaking an informal cease-fire. The international reaction has often been muted, either by great powers turning a blind eye for strategic reasons (especially during the Cold War), or by a UN reluctant to threaten its impartiality by naming an aggressor.[42] Formalism may, therefore, not be the best way to test for the role of international audience costs.

In sum, arms control, third-party mediation, and attempts to control irregular forces have not helped maintain peace, and may in fact be associated with especially fragile peace. Confidence-building measures, formalizing an agreement, and withdrawal of forces may help, but the evidence to support their role is unclear. The most effective tools for maintaining peace in the aftermath of war are demilitarized zones, explicit third-party guarantees, peacekeeping, joint commissions for dispute resolution, and making the cease-fire specific.

Political Settlement

Not surprisingly, political agreement on the issues over which the war was fought leads to very durable peace (see Table 20.5). In fact, there are no cases in the wars examined here in which both sides agreed explicitly to a political settlement and war later resumed. But, as mentioned earlier, such settlement is quite rare in the post–World War II period. Only three wars led to an explicit agreement on the basic dispute over which the war was fought: the Yom Kippur War between Israel and Egypt; the Iran-Iraq War, in which Iraq conceded the Shatt al'-Arab waterway to secure its flank with the outbreak of the Gulf War; and the Gulf War itself, in which Iraq formally renounced its claim to Kuwait when it surrendered.[43] Wars that end leaving the basic issues unsettled, as in

---

[41] Lamb 1991, 325–26. The cease-fire line is not marked on the glacier, both because the territory is so inhospitable, and because specifying a terminus would require agreement on the disputed border with China.

[42] A blatant example of this was the UN's decision not to blame Pakistan for its role in starting the 1965 war with India. For Secretary General U Thant's rationale, see UN document S/6651 (3 September 1965), 7.

[43] In a few other cases, belligerents eventually settled their political conflict many years after the war ended, as Israel and Jordan did in 1994.

TABLE 20.5. *Political Settlement (Weibull Estimates)*

Variables	Coefficient (RSE)	Hazard ratio
POLITICAL SETTLEMENT	-15.34^{***}	0.000
	(1.02)	
Imposed	-15.57^{***}	
	(0.99)	
Agreed	2.94^{***}	0.000
	(0.47)	
TIE	-0.66^{***}	18.89
	(0.18)	
COST OF WAR	0.91^{***}	0.52
	(0.23)	
HISTORY OF CONFLICT	1.55^{***}	2.49
	(0.45)	
EXISTENCE AT STAKE	0.68^{*}	4.73
	(0.36)	
CONTIGUOUS	0.81^{***}	1.97
	(0.24)	
CHANGES IN RELATIVE	-4.96^{**}	2.25
CAPABILITIES	(2.50)	
Constant	0.72^{*}	
	(0.14)	
Shape parameter p	770	
N	48	
Subjects	-46.39	
Log likelihood		

Note: Negative coefficients and hazard ratios <1 indicate decrease in risk of another war (increase in duration of peace). Positive coefficients and hazard ratios >1 indicate increase in risk of another war (decrease in duration of peace).

RSE = robust standard errors.

*** $p \leq .01$.

** $p \leq .05$.

* $p \leq .10$. Two-tailed tests used.

the Korean Armistice, have been the norm rather than the exception. Even if one includes settlements imposed unilaterally by a decisive victor (but without official acceptance by the defeated side, as in the Falklands), settlement is rather rare.[44] This de facto category also appears to be quite

[44] The basic issue of the war has been settled unilaterally in eight wars (nine dyads) in these data: Russia-Hungary, China-India, Vietnam (North versus South), India and Pakistan in 1971, the second round of the Turco-Cypriot War, Uganda-Tanzania, the Falklands War, and the second part of the Azeri-Armenian War.