

ANALYTICAL ESSAY

Peace with Adjectives: Conceptual Fragmentation or Conceptual Innovation?

SIMON PIERRE BOULANGER MARTEL 
Stockholm University, Sweden

ANNA JARSTAD 
Uppsala University, Sweden

ELISABETH OLIVIVUS 
Umeå University, Sweden

JOHANNA SÖDERSTRÖM 
Uppsala University, Sweden

MARIE-JOËLLE ZAHAR 
Université de Montréal, Canada

AND

MALIN ÅKEBO
Umeå University, Sweden

What strategies can be employed to conceptualize peace? In recent years, scholars have introduced an impressive array of “peace with adjectives” in order to make sense of some of the normative and empirical underpinnings of peace. *Negative, positive, everyday, virtual, illiberal, partial, insecure, relational, emancipatory, agonistic, and feminist* are some of the qualifiers that have been associated with the concept. While the growing attention to conceptualization is a welcomed development, we argue that the proliferation of new terms has led to increased fragmentation in the field of peace studies. Conceptual fragmentation impedes cumulative knowledge production and generates missed opportunities for fruitful discussions across theoretical and conceptual divides. In this article, we aim to provide more clarity to our field by mapping existing peace conceptualizations and identifying the strategies employed by scholars to construct innovative new terms. In our review, we identify 61 concepts and suggest that these conceptual innovations in peace research belong to one of three analytical strategies: developing diminished subtypes, conceptual narrowing, and conceptual expansion. Building on this categorization, we make recommendations

for how peace researchers can enhance clarity and deepen constructive discussions between different conceptual approaches.

¿Qué estrategias se pueden utilizar para conceptualizar la paz? En los últimos años, los académicos han presentado una impresionante variedad de «paz acompañada de adjetivos» con el fin de dar sentido a algunos de los fundamentos normativos y empíricos de la paz. Algunos de los calificativos que se han asociado al concepto han sido: negativa, positiva, cotidiana, virtual, iliberal, parcial, insegura, relacional, emancipatoria, agonística y feminista. Si bien la creciente atención que se está prestando a la conceptualización es un desarrollo bienvenido, argumentamos que la proliferación de nuevos términos ha provocado una mayor fragmentación en el campo de los estudios de la paz. La fragmentación conceptual impide la producción acumulativa de conocimiento y provoca que se pierdan oportunidades para generar debates fructíferos a través de las divisiones teóricas y conceptuales. En este artículo pretendemos aportar más claridad a nuestro campo mediante el mapeo de las conceptualizaciones de paz existentes y la identificación de las estrategias que utilizan los académicos para construir nuevos términos innovadores. En nuestra revisión, identificamos 61 conceptos y sugerimos que estas innovaciones conceptuales dentro de la investigación en materia de la paz pertenecen a una de entre tres posibles estrategias analíticas: desarrollo de subtipos disminuidos, contracción conceptual y expansión conceptual. Partiendo de esta categorización, hacemos recomendaciones sobre cómo los investigadores en el campo de la paz pueden lograr una mejora con relación a la claridad y profundizar en los debates constructivos que se generan entre los diferentes enfoques conceptuales.

Quelles stratégies employer pour conceptualiser la paix ? Ces dernières années, les chercheurs ont introduit un éventail impressionnant de « paix avec adjectifs » afin de faire sens de certains fondements normatifs et empiriques de la paix. Négative, positive, quotidienne, virtuelle, illibérale, partielle, précaire, relationnelle, émancipatrice, agnostique, féministe... Tous ces mots ont été employés pour qualifier ce concept. Bien que l'attention croissante à la conceptualisation soit une évolution bienvenue, nous affirmons que la prolifération de nouveaux termes a engendré une fragmentation croissante du domaine des études sur la paix. La fragmentation conceptuelle entrave la production de connaissances cumulatives et crée des occasions manquées de discussions productives par delà les divisions théoriques et conceptuelles. Dans cet article, nous cherchons à contribuer à plus de clarté dans notre domaine en retraçant les conceptualisations existantes de la paix et en identifiant les stratégies employées par les chercheurs pour créer de nouveaux termes innovants. Notre revue de la littérature identifie 61 concepts et suggère que ces innovations conceptuelles dans la recherche sur la paix appartiennent à l'une des trois stratégies analytiques suivantes : le développement de sous-types 'diminués', le rétrécissement conceptuel et l'expansion conceptuelle. En nous appuyant sur cette catégorisation, nous émettons des recommandations pour aider les chercheurs à être plus clairs et à approfondir les discussions constructives entre différentes approches conceptuelles.

Keywords: peace concepts, conceptualization, typology

Palabras clave: conceptos de paz, conceptualización, tipología

Mots clés: concepts de paix, conceptualisation, typologie

Introduction

The lack of established definitions of peace beyond the absence of war has left many peace scholars wanting, which in turn has prompted a burgeoning debate on peace conceptualizations (see, e.g., Diehl 2016; Davenport et al. 2018; Jarstad et al. 2019). Current peace research is expanding in numerous directions, and we have seen a range of exciting new theoretical developments within the field. Notably, since Galtung (1969) made the distinction between negative and positive peace, researchers have introduced an impressive array of “peace with adjectives.” Some of these conceptual innovations have allowed us to better grasp the empirical realities of peace (see, e.g., Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010, 368; Caplan 2019, 29; Davenport et al. 2018) but also deepen our reflections on important normative and epistemological questions in peace and conflict studies (see, e.g., Krause 2019; Cruz 2021; Richmond et al. 2021). While conceptual development in relation to the concept of peace is in many ways welcome and a positive sign of a vibrant research community, the proliferation of “peace with adjectives” concepts has left the field fragmented, as the relationship between the many new concepts is seldom articulated or clear. For example, how does a case of insecure peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010) differ from a case of precarious peace (Maher and Thomson 2018)? And is feminist peace (Paarlberg-Kvam 2019) the same as gender-just peace (Björkdahl 2012), or do these concepts denote different understandings of the meaning of peace?

Our review of the literature underlines both the vitality of the field, but also shows that there are considerable tensions and ambiguities in the field. This mushrooming of peace concepts thereby risks impeding cumulative knowledge production as constructive engagement and dialogue across new theoretical efforts get more and more difficult in an increasingly vast and complex conceptual terrain. In addition, various peace concepts are developed for different analytical purposes. Returning to the examples above, insecure peace and precarious peace are both concepts that are developed to describe “what is,” i.e., empirical cases of peace with certain characteristics. In contrast, the literature on feminist peace and gender-just peace often seeks to define “what should be,” i.e., peace as a normative ideal. However, such differences between types of peace concepts and between the analytical work they can do are rarely acknowledged, and this further contributes to confusing debates within the field.

To better understand the rationale for, and content of different concepts, in this article we investigate what strategies are employed to conceptualize peace. In their classical *World Politics* article, Collier and Levitsky (1997) underlined that, in the wake of the waves of democratization in the 1990s, scholars were confronted with the two potentially contradictory goals of analytical differentiation and conceptual validity when defining the concept of democracy. Collier and Levitsky’s assessment is also relevant for the current debates in the field of peace and conflict studies, as we observe that there is little consensus on the basic characteristics of peace beyond the absence of war. In a similar vein, this article aims to chart the variety of “peace with adjectives,” identify strategies of conceptual innovation, and provide recommendations on how peace scholars can better build on each other’s work and encourage fruitful, collective conceptual dialogue in the future. Against this backdrop, we conduct a comprehensive review of existing peace concepts and identify different strategies that have been used to conceptualize peace in previous work. In line with Collier and Levitsky, we are interested in what specific strategy the authors have chosen and what the effects of those choices are. Have various inventors of new peace concepts moved up or down the ladder of generality to enlarge the scope of the concept or to specify a context where peace exists? Has their strategy been to specify what is missing from a conventional understanding of peace, or do they want to propose an entirely different conceptualization of peace that either lowers

or raises the standard of peace? Our work started out with a working paper where we identified numerous different concepts and discussed patterns in how they approach peace (Jarstad et al. 2019). To date, we have identified 61 such concepts (see the list at the end of the text). Hybrid, partial, everyday, democratic, virtual, illiberal, regional, relational, emancipatory, agonistic, decolonial, and feminist are some of the qualifiers that have been associated with peace. The meaning of peace hence remains the source of important debates within the discipline.

This article contributes to peace research by bringing some order into the fragmented landscape of peace concepts. Our review focusing on some 180 scholarly works and covering the time period 1969–2022 demonstrates that the 61 peace concepts identified thus far fit within one out of three strategies for conceptual development. We argue that peace scholars have (explicitly or implicitly) primarily employed the following strategies: (1) developing diminished subtypes; (2) conceptual narrowing; and (3) conceptual expansion. We first outline our methodology for collecting and sorting different peace concepts and briefly discuss some of the challenges encountered in this process. We then describe the three strategies that we have identified and provide examples of concepts that make use of each strategy. Thirdly, we discuss possible ways forward. If we want to better understand peace, both conceptually and empirically, we suggest that scholars need to be more careful, specific, and clear about how they define it, how new concepts build on previous ones, and what new concepts are meant to be used for, for instance, outlining a normative vision or studying empirical real-world cases.

Literature Review and Methodology

For the purposes of this article, we conducted a literature review of current peace research. In the text below, we explain how we think about concept development and how we proceeded with our literature review. Concepts are a keystone of the analytical enterprise. Indeed, Collier and Mahon argue that “stable concepts and a shared understanding of categories are routinely viewed as a foundation of any research community” (1993, 845). Gerring likewise highlights the importance of language, and thus of concept formation, in the functioning and evolution of social science. As authors “make lexical and semantic choices,” he says, “they participate, wittingly or unwittingly, in an ongoing interpretive battle” (Gerring 1999, 359).

Concepts are commonly understood as abstractions representing an object, a property of an object, or a behavioral phenomenon (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2008, 24). According to Adcock, a “classical model” of concept formation “treats concepts as cognitive entities that represent classes of objects in the world via their common and necessary features” (2005, 1). Researchers have focused on concept development, addressing issues of concept goodness (Gerring 1999), formation and misformation (Sartori 1970), and conceptual stretching (Sartori 1970; Collier and Mahon 1993; Collier and Levitsky 1997). Because concepts are essential to comparison and measurement (Sartori 1970), researchers have also been concerned about the relationship between concepts and observations, leading to varied efforts to improve measurement validity (Przeworski and Sprague 1971; Adcock and Collier 2001).

Our research is inspired by Collier and Levitsky’s (1997) analysis of the concept of democracy. Indeed, we find that one of the strategies that they identify in connection with the definition of democracy is also used in peace research (developing diminished subtypes). The other two strategies we include in our typology (conceptual narrowing and conceptual expansion) were inductively identified from the material. We agree with Goertz that peace is an “elusive dependent variable” (20210, 200); even though the field of democracy is fragmented and complicated, peace research seems to be in a worse state. This is partly due to the fact that peace studies is a newer field, but mostly due to the focus on conflict, war, and violence within

peace research, which has hampered our understanding of what peace is in its own right (see, e.g., Diehl 2016). The legacy of the dichotomous negative and positive peace distinction has also, as Klem argues, left the field with “definitions of the term [that] are either so narrow that they miss the point or so expansive that they become utopian” (Klem 2018, 235). There is also perhaps more variation in terms of what unit of analysis is considered when concepts of peace are used than is the case for democracy. While they both can be applied at various levels of analysis, there is more disagreement in the peace literature at large over these questions.

Our Method of Charting Peace Concepts in the Literature

We first conducted a wide-ranging review of the literature to identify as many concepts associated with peace as possible. Our literature review was carried out in the following way: We searched for articles and books that conceptualized peace concepts, covering the time period of 1969 (when Galtung’s article on the peace concept was published in the *Journal of Peace Research*) to 2022. We searched for keywords like “peace,” “peace research,” and “peacebuilding” in the search engines of the Uppsala University and University of Montréal libraries, as well as Google Scholar. After a particular concept was identified, we conducted a more targeted search for each specific peace concept to find texts that defined or developed the concept. We then made a closer reading of texts that we deemed tried to make a concerted effort of using and defining a peace concept. Concepts were excluded from our list if they did not meet these criteria. This meant that some familiar terms, like the democratic peace (see, e.g., Doyle, 1983, 1986; Maoz and Russett 1993), were removed as they do not attempt to conceptualize peace but to capture causal patterns, often where the dependent variable is negative peace. They do not attempt to refine the conceptualization of peace itself.¹ We then inductively identified key characteristics that allowed us to compare the different concepts. Three distinctions stood out. Existing peace concepts in the literature (1) are either primarily descriptive or normative, (2) lean towards a minimalist or maximalist conception of peace (absence of war versus emancipation), and (3) are developed to be universally applicable (defining peace generally) or context-specific (describing a particular instance of peace). This initial qualitative coding allowed us to differentiate between three types of conceptual strategies. All in all, in the process of identifying key conceptual strategies, we ended up distinguishing some 180 articles, books, and book chapters that addressed a distinct “peace with adjective” concept. A key limitation of our work, however, has been that this has meant a focus on English-language texts.

Charting the different peace concepts, we quickly realized that some of our initial ideas for mapping the field proved quite challenging. This was in part because authors often did not explicitly state their dimensions of interest. We also struggled with separating terms that indicated measurement rather than conceptual innovation. We also identified cases of *peace on a scale*, where several concepts are included in a system spanning from a low degree of peace to a high degree. Such peace systems aim to chart variation between opposite poles, e.g., the peace scale (Goertz et al. 2016), the peace continuum (Davenport et al. 2018), as well as the “no war, no peace” approach (Richards 2005). Some of the separate concepts at each point within a peace as a scale system are defined such that they could fit into one of the three strategies of conceptual innovation that we discuss below, often the idea of peace on a scale is to make peace empirically observable rather than engaging in conceptual development, but overall, peace concepts on a scale are too diverse to be considered one stringent conceptual strategy.

¹This also meant that the following concepts were removed: socialist peace (McGovern 2017), commercial peace (Gartzke and Westerwinter 2016), capitalist peace (Gartzke 2007; Gartzke and Hewitt 2010), democratic civil peace (Hegre et al. 2001), domestic democratic peace (Davenport, 2004, 2007a, 2007b; Davenport and Armstrong II 2004).

We also note that many concepts are not comparable. Some concepts address a limited number of dimensions of the peace concept (eg. victors' peace, inclusive peace, autonomous peace); others are narrowly defined but integrated into a broader typology (e.g., Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs's (2010) concepts); and others are fully fledged definitions on the basis of distinct frameworks (quality peace, stable peace, emancipatory peace, feminist peace). While we recognize such differences, for the purpose of our paper, we have focused on the analytical strategy underpinning each concept and thus treated concepts in the same way, even though this might mean that concepts that are integrated into a broader typology fall into different categories of analytical strategies. Sometimes, concepts are also mentioned in the title or the body of the text with no proper conceptualization (see, e.g., routine peace in Mac Ginty 2012; unproductive peace in Lindemann 2011). Concepts that were only mentioned in titles were excluded if they were employed as stylistic devices rather than analytical concepts. While we understand that this may have stylistic advantages, we do think this practice is somewhat unproductive.

We wanted to be as encompassing as possible in our literature review, yet also proceed in a manner that was manageable. We do not claim to have captured all peace concepts out there in our review. However, since our main purpose is to identify key strategies that scholars use when constructing peace concepts, we strived for saturation in terms of strategies. For our overall understanding of the field, all concepts encountered were included in our scrutiny, but in the article, we focus on more developed concepts, concepts used widely (unless otherwise mentioned), and concepts that we found to be illustrative examples of a particular strategy. In conducting this work, it was clear that there is a difference between different subfields (history, sociology, political science, etc.) in how concepts are constructed and what phenomenon they build on (absence of war vs. presence of factors associated with a good society, such as economic prosperity, democracy, and health). Another important distinction noted in the field is based on whether the peace definitions put forward try to formulate a normative vision of what peace should be or if they are trying to define peace with the purpose of measuring the phenomenon empirically.

Conceptualizing Peace: Three Strategies

We suggest that conceptual innovation in peace studies can be categorized into three analytical strategies: *developing diminished subtypes*, *conceptual narrowing*, and *conceptual expansion*. Largely, each strategy, respectively, aims to build descriptive, analytical, and normative definitions of peace. Peace scholars have developed *diminished subtypes* to describe how certain types of peace exist amid the persistence of different forms of violence or the absence of societal characteristics associated with positive peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010). *Conceptual narrowing* has been used to develop more limited definitions of positive peace that are measurable and meant to enable analytical comparisons (Bellamy 2020; Wallensteen 2015) and to emphasize, for example, the relational (Söderström et al. 2021) and everyday (Mac Ginty 2021) dimensions of peace. Practicing *conceptual expansion*, peace scholars have linked the root concept of peace to other normative overarching terms such as emancipation (Richmond 2021), feminism (Martin de Almagro 2022), and decolonialism (Cruz 2021). We also note that the concepts of *negative peace* and *positive peace* (Galtung 1969) are core concepts that have largely structured debates in conceptual innovations within the field. While both have a special foundational status in the literature, we contend that they were also developed employing different conceptual innovation strategies. After all, negative peace, understood as the “absence of violence” is framed by Galtung as a narrower definition of peace, while positive peace, understood as “social justice” (Galtung 1969, 183), is a conceptual expansion of the peace concept. Table 1, below, highlights each strategy's main characteristics, advantages, and limitations and lists some illustrative examples taken from the literature (for

Table 1: *Conceptual Strategies*

Strategy	Characteristics	Advantages	Limitations	Examples
Developing diminished subtypes	Specify the definition of peace by adding an adjective underscoring the absence of an attribute from the root concept	Allows researchers to delimit a population of cases where the concept applies Increases differentiation between empirical cases	Can produce stand-alone concepts Concepts are not always developed in relation to one another	<i>Illiberal peace</i> (Lewis, Heathershaw, and Megoran 2018); <i>Partial peace</i> (Nilsson 2008); <i>Unjust peace</i> (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010); <i>Victor's peace</i> (Piccolino 2015)
Conceptual narrowing	Narrow the definition of peace by focussing on a finite number of attributes or dimensions	Highlights clear conditions under which peace is attainable Focuses on specific dimensions, attributes and levels of analysis Useful for cross-case comparisons	Choice of certain dimensions or attributes over others can be difficult to justify Concepts can have unacknowledged normative underpinnings	<i>Agonistic peace</i> (Shinko 2008; Strömbom and Bramsen 2022); <i>Everyday peace</i> (Mac Ginty 2021; Fritchow 2018; Mac Ginty 2014); <i>Quality peace</i> ; (Wallensteen 2015; Joshi and Wallensteen 2018); <i>Relational Peace</i> (Söderström et al. 2021)
Conceptual expansion	Expand the normative definition of peace by linking the concept to different forms of structural violence	Allows to imagine peace beyond dominant power relations Provides calls for action that can guide policies	Peace concepts may not be attainable Analytical utility for empirical analysis and comparisons can be limited	<i>Decolonial peace</i> (Cruz 2021); <i>Emancipatory peace</i> (Richmond 2021; Richmond et al. 2021; Visoka 2021; Visoka and Richmond 2017); <i>Feminist peace</i> (Martin de Almagro 2022; Olivius et al. 2022); <i>Positive peace</i> (Galtung 1969)

a complete list of peace concepts and which conceptual strategy they belong to, see *List of Concepts* at the end of the article). Each strategy is further discussed in separate sections hereunder.

Developing Diminished Subtypes

Developing diminished subtypes is an important strategy used in the conceptualization of peace. According to Collier and Levitsky, diminished subtypes entail adding an attribute to a concept in order to “specify” its definition, thereby explaining how the concept is limited in relation to the ideal of the general concept studied (1997, 431). While diminished subtypes may have a negative connotation (Goertz 2020, 192), we do not use the term in a pejorative sense; rather, we adopt it because we think it is important to connect to other conceptual debates where the same strategy has been used and named (see Collier and Levitsky 1997). For our purposes, we identify two types of diminished subtypes of peace: (a) subtypes of peace that do not even fulfill the criterion of absence of organized violence and thereby denote imperfect negative peace; and (b) subtypes of peace that meet the negative peace criterion but denote imperfect positive peace. The first subtype thus anchors concepts in a conflict perspective. Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs’ (2010) peace triangle typology is the most illustrative example of such conceptual innovation. Their concepts of *partial peace* (see also Nilsson 2008), *regional peace*, and *insecure peace* express instances where violence continues in different forms in the post-war context. The type of peace that prevails depends on whether certain actors are excluded from a peace deal (partial peace), the geographical patterns in the distribution of violence (regional peace), or the criminal character of post-war violence (insecure peace). While Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs’s typology strives for parsimony, other scholars have also developed diminished subtypes anchored in specific contexts. The term *bellicose peace*, introduced by Forster (2020), describes the foreign and domestic policies of the People’s Republic of China during the early 1950s (another example of the first subtype, i.e., imperfect negative peace). At that time, the World Peace Council (a Soviet-sponsored international organization established in 1954) praised the People’s Republic of China for being a “fortress for the protection of world peace” (Forster 2020, 251) due to its war effort in the Korean War. In this context, *bellicose peace* means the absence of war amongst friendly nations, the safeguarding of the integrity of the Eastern bloc, and war-making against the “right” enemies.

Diminished subtypes are also employed to describe peace concepts that come closer to the positive peace ideal type (subtype b). Again, Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs’ (2010) typology provides interesting examples of this strategy, formulating concepts such as *polarized peace*, *restored peace*, *unresolved peace*, *contested peace*, *unjust peace*, and *fearful peace*. All those concepts imply the absence of large-scale violence but a failure to meet societal characteristics of positive peace since conflict issues and attitudes persist. Polarized peace, for instance, “captures societies where prevailing conflict attitudes have remained polarized since the signing of the peace settlement and where more extreme political views may even have appeared in the post-war period” (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010, 382). In the same vein, restored peace refers to contexts where a peace agreement may have addressed major conflict issues, but the causes and grievances that led to war remain in place and society is simply restored to pre-war conditions (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010, 377). Implicitly, this concept could be seen as a diminished subtype of positive peace, as the authors discuss restored peace as falling short of societal characteristics often associated with positive peace.

Other scholars have developed diminished subtypes that are positioned in relation to the liberal peace concept, itself a subtype of positive peace. The concept of *illiberal peace*, for instance, encapsulates cases of state-centric, authoritarian ap-

proaches to internal conflict management where the state “seeks to achieve a hegemonic discourse that delegitimises opponents, control of space – physically, politically and symbolically – and a form of political economy that approximates as far as possible to a hierarchical, single-patron order” (Lewis et al. 2018, 499–500). Richmond also introduces the concept of *virtual peace*, which describes how the imposition of liberal peacebuilding policies by external actors overshadows different forms of post-war structural violence. According to Richmond, “the liberal peace may only result in a “virtual peace” in which the methods and objectives associated with it are mainly visible to those observing from the outside of the conflict zone in the liberal international community rather than those upon whom this peace is being visited” (2005, 185). While illiberal peace and virtual peace were not developed directly in relation to Galtung’s core concepts, one can find the imprint of such notions on those concepts. Richmond points out, for instance, that liberal peace may also incorporate dimensions of social justice (2005, 219). Virtual peace can thus be understood as a diminished subtype of liberal peace, which is, in turn, a narrower interpretation of positive peace. This highlights that the field of peace studies has expanded well beyond its foundational peace concepts but also that some conceptualizations are closer to the root concepts of positive and negative peace than others.

Diminished subtype concepts (both diminished negative peace and diminished positive peace) are also used to describe empirical instances or types of peace observed in a specific context or type of context. For example, the concept of *victor’s peace* (Piccolino 2015) is developed to describe the character of peace in a situation where a military victory has ended armed conflict. Rather than aiming to construct an ideal and general definition of what peace means or should mean, these concepts are developed to make sense of what empirical cases of peace actually look like. As such, developing diminished subtype concepts can help us map and distinguish between empirically observed manifestations of peace and theorize their variation. Such concepts, therefore, can have the advantage of helping us delimit a population of cases where the concepts apply. Using diminished subtypes also allows for a greater differentiation between empirical cases where peace is not fully attained. However, the proliferation of concepts created to describe particular cases of peace has meant that there are numerous stand-alone concepts that do not relate to each other (see, also Johansson and Saati 2020). This makes comparison, theoretical engagement across cases, and conceptual efforts more difficult. Here, Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs’ (2010) typology is an important exception, as it constructs a scheme where nine diminished subtype concepts are related to one another. However, this typology exemplifies another aspect of confusion within this conceptual strategy, as it includes some diminished subtypes that stem from negative peace as the root concept and some diminished subtypes that start from positive peace as the root concept. At the same time, the root concept that provides the basis for the construction of other diminished subtypes is not always clear. Without explicit discussion, the lack of root concept clarity also complicates comparisons across concepts.

Conceptual Narrowing

To make the peace concept more researchable and enable analytical comparisons, scholars have also narrowed their focus on a finite number of attributes or dimensions. Thus, this strategy aims to construct a narrower scope for the definition of peace, rather than adding attributes to suggest the phenomenon fails to reach some more ideal conceptualization of peace. To be clear, narrowing the peace concept is distinct from the strategy of developing diminished subtypes since it implies a focus on a specific aspect of the concept rather than a diminished version of it. While diminished subtype concepts aim to describe particular types of peace, the strategy of conceptual narrowing is about constructing a measurable general definition of

the meaning of peace. Scholars have notably narrowed down the concept based on institutional (Richmond 2005; Svensson 2009), relational (Jarstad et al. 2023; Söderström et al. 2021), everyday (Firchow and Ginty 2017; Firchow 2018; Mac Ginty 2021; 2014), territorial (Gibler 2012; Gibler and Tir 2014; Owsiak et al. 2017), as well as cognitive and temporal (see e.g., discussions on *stable peace* in Kacowicz and Bar-Siman-Tov 2000, 12–13)² dimensions of peace. Below, we highlight key features and illustrative examples of conceptual narrowing.

Many of the authors who argue for conceptual narrowing, often do this with reference to analytical clarity and easier methodological applicability. Bellamy argues, for instance, that a narrow definition of peace is preferable since broader definitions tend to conflate what peace is with its causes and erode crucial distinctions between war and peace (2020, 48–49). Bellamy contends that “peace should be understood as the absence and prevention of war—that is, of organized group-level violence—and the management of conflict through peaceful means, implying some form of legitimate civic order” (2020, 49). Bellamy’s definition is narrower than positive peace since it excludes some key dimensions often associated with it (social justice, human rights, etc.). The concept of *quality peace* developed by Wallensteen and Joshi (Wallensteen 2015; Joshi and Wallensteen 2018) also falls within this category, as the authors aim to break with the negative/positive peace dichotomy prevalent in the literature. Quality peace is “the creation of postwar conditions that make the inhabitants of a society (be it an area, a country, a region, a continent, or a planet) secure in life and dignity now and for the foreseeable future” (Wallensteen 2015, 6). The central traits of quality peace—security, dignity, and durability—although still broad are narrower than Galtung’s (1969) conception of positive peace, defined as the absence of structural violence.

Narrowing the definition of peace, other scholars have also focused on specific dimensions of the concept, which limit the scope of what is investigated when we study peace. This includes concepts such as *everyday peace* and *relational peace*. Authors using this strategy typically narrow down the idea of peace by encapsulating the concept within, for example, a particular level of analysis, dimension, or scale. Scholars have also emphasized the concrete actions and relationships at the microlevel that make peace possible on a larger scale. The term everyday peace, for instance, focuses on the everyday acts that “ordinary people” carry out to disrupt conflict in societies characterized by armed conflict and intergroup tensions (Mac Ginty 2021; Firchow 2018; Mac Ginty 2014). Thus, the everyday peace concept has a narrow focus, in that it focuses on practices and interactions at the micro-level rather than the macro-level. Accordingly, the concept is not a diminished subtype since the term “everyday” does not imply the absence of a specific attribute of the positive peace root concept.

The meaning of peace can also be narrowed down by approaching peace as an inherently relational phenomena. Söderström et al. and Jarstad et al. advance the concept of relational peace that provides an actor-centric perspective of peace (Söderström et al. 2021; Jarstad et al. 2023). To them, peace is something that happens between actors, and thus they try to define peace in ways that apply to these relationships. The authors argue, in part, that actors are at peace when their behavioral interactions are characterized by deliberation, non-domination, and cooperation (Söderström et al. 2021, 489). This narrows down the definition of peace,

²For Kacowicz and Bar-Siman-Tov’s (2000, 12–13), *stable peace* includes cognitive and temporal dimensions. Boulding (1978) first defined stable peace as a particular “situation in which the probability of war is so small that it does not really enter into the calculations of any of the people involved” (Boulding 1978, 13). The term is often conceptualized as the positive pole of scales capturing various phases between war and peace (Boulding 1978, 8; Kacowicz and Bar-Siman-Tov 2000, 18–23). Stable peace is narrower than Galtung’s positive peace concept as it focuses on certain characteristics of interstate relationships, but is more expansive than negative peace since it includes conditions under which relations can be considered more peaceful than the mere absence of war (see Kacowicz and Bar-Siman-Tov 2000, 19).

which is conceptualized as ontologically located in the nature of relationships between actors and not, for example, in structural conditions within a particular territory. This concept, however, explicitly crosses different levels of analysis and does not limit itself in this manner. Similarly, the concept of *agonistic peace*, developed based on Chantal Mouffe's notion of agonistic democracy, also views peace as a feature of relational interactions. Agonistic peace is about transforming relationships of (violent) antagonism between enemies into agonistic encounters between adversaries. This does not imply the elimination of conflict, but that conflict is channeled in less destructive ways (Shinko 2008; Strömbom and Bramsen 2022). Another example of conceptual narrowing is *territorial peace*, where multiple authors have used this concept to narrow down on what happens at the border and whether territorial conflicts are settled or not (Gibler 2012; Gibler and Tir 2014; Owsiak et al. 2017).³ This type of narrowing down is geographically and contextually focused instead.

The strategy of conceptual narrowing hence aims to construct general definitions of peace that are narrow enough to be measurable and useful for empirical observation. In contrast to developing diminished subtype concepts, these concepts are not developed to describe a particular type of peace but to identify when peace exists across multiple cases. For example, concepts such as quality peace, everyday peace, and relational peace provide different answers to the questions of what peace is and where it should be empirically studied. Notably, these concepts all stem from positive peace (or an implicit, expansive understanding of peace) as the root concept: in relation to a broader understanding of peace, these concepts narrow down its definition so as to make it empirically relevant and analytically clear. Such an approach has important advantages for cross-case comparisons since it allows researchers to assess the extent to which a certain case can be considered as more peaceful than others based on empirically identifiable attributes. Conceptual narrowing often provides researchers with tools to assess peace at different levels of analysis and to query how different levels and dimensions of peace relate to one another. Nevertheless, scholars are often confronted with the challenge of justifying their choice of dimensions and attributes of peace, as this always entails prioritizing certain elements, dimensions, or levels of analysis over others; selecting specific features or dimensions of peace is in itself a normative position. This selection ultimately translates into disagreement on the basic characteristics that make up peace. Thus, while the focus is clearly on making peace empirically researchable, conceptual narrowing therefore often has a normative underpinning as well, suggesting what peace should look like if realized. This illustrates that while we can distinguish patterns with regards to the main analytical aims (descriptive, analytical, or normative) of different types of peace concepts, the different strategies all touch on questions of normative and analytical character.

Conceptual Expansion

Conceptual expansion is prevalent amongst critical scholars who aim to deepen some of the normative dimensions of peace. Thus, this strategy is used to construct peace concepts focused on what peace ought to be rather than describing observable empirical instances of peace. Concepts such as *emancipatory peace*, *decolonial peace*, *feminist peace*, *climate resilient peace*, and *intersectional positive peace* expand the peace concept by integrating the absence of a broad range of structural forms of violence in its definition. Several scholars, for instance, put forward the idea of an emancipatory peace (Richmond 2021; Richmond et al. 2021; Visoka 2021; Visoka and Richmond 2017). The concept is understood as “a project for freeing subjects from constraints and removing the barriers and blockages to peace, development,

³Note, however, that other authors have used the same concept as a diminished subtype, denoting an imperfect positive peace (Cairo et al. 2018).

and justice that were either embedded socially and politically prior to the violent episodes of the conflict or that have emerged as a result of international intervention and postconflict peacebuilding and statebuilding efforts” (Visoka 2021, 642). Emancipatory peace thus entails normative commitments that criticize both prevalent peacebuilding praxis as well as the epistemological foundation of the discipline of peace and conflict studies (see also Cruz 2021 regarding decolonial peace).

Other scholars have followed a similar approach by expanding the focus of positive peace to integrate the gendered dimensions of structural violence (see Confortini 2006 for a discussion on Galtung’s peace concepts and feminism). The concept of feminist peace underlines how patriarchy, militarized masculinities, and gender hierarchies constitute and reproduce different forms of violence (Martin de Almagro 2022; Olivius et al. 2022). Accordingly, Olivius et al. define feminist peace as the “political conditions that empower conflict-affected women to articulate and pursue visions of societal transformation grounded in their experiences of conflict and insecurity, and that allow these visions to shape post-war change” (2022, 4). In an analysis that compares the provisions of the 2016 peace agreement with the visions of peace articulated by women’s organizations in Colombia, Paarlberg-Kvam finds that “the antimilitarist, antineoliberal and antipatriarchal peace envisioned by feminist activists is more comprehensive, more transformative and more stable than that contained in the accords” (2019, 194). As exemplified here, the concept of feminist peace denotes a vision of peace: a normative ideal or aspiration, not an empirically observed reality. However, this normative, expansive concept is used as a theoretical basis for assessing the quality and normative desirability of the empirically existing form of peace that is experienced by the study participants.

Thus, in contrast to diminished subtype concepts, concepts developed using the strategy of conceptual expansion do not aim to describe empirical observations or specific types of peace but to construct general, ideal definitions of the meaning of peace. In doing so, this strategy is more concerned with the normative dimensions of peace—what a just and desirable peace should look like. Here, the strategy of conceptual expansion clearly differs from the strategy of conceptual narrowing, which is concerned with limiting the meaning of peace as to make it measurable and analytically workable. The strategy of conceptual expansion has the main advantage of deepening our understanding of different forms of structural violence and relations of dominance that impede the construction of peace. Those concepts also provide calls for action that can guide policy agendas aiming to address power inequalities that persist in post-war societies. However, the utopian, expansive features of peace concepts such as emancipatory peace or feminist peace also make them subject to the same critique as positive peace: as being “forever out of our reach, illusive by definition, a dream too flatteringly sweet to be substantial” (Shinko 2008, 489). In this way, an expansive concept of peace is of limited analytical and practical utility for empirical and comparative analysis. On the other hand, as critical scholars working in these traditions would argue, such conceptions of peace, characterized by “utopian imagining” (Wibben et al. 2019, 100), are normatively and politically important for peace research to challenge the status quo and rethink peace beyond the dominant relations of power and hierarchy that shape the world.

Challenges and Steps Ahead

This article started with the observation that the peace research field is booming, but with this a proliferation of concepts has followed. We are not alone in noting this mushrooming of peace concepts and the challenges this creates for the field as a whole (see e.g., Davenport et al. 2018; Goertz 2020). In order to systematize and detect patterns in some of the recent conceptual developments in the field, we drew on Collier and Levitsky’s discussion of the conceptualization of democracy (1997) and conducted a literature review to identify various strategies employed

for conceptualization. Focusing on research where peace concepts played a central role in the publication, and especially research that has been picked up by others, we have categorized these various conceptualizations. Overall, we noted 61 peace concepts in this literature. While not exhaustive and recognizing that the field is moving forward fast, our review has been comprehensive, and it lends itself to some final remarks and observations.

We identified three main strategies for concept development. The first, *developing diminished subtypes* of peace, specifies the peace concept in terms of the differences between specific types or empirical observations and ideal forms of peace. The second, *conceptual narrowing*, focuses on a finite number of attributes or dimensions. This strategy narrows the scope of the peace definition. Thirdly, some authors use *conceptual expansion*, often in an effort to add new normative content. Overall, there is limited recognition across this literature that the three strategies are trying to address different conceptual and analytical problems; authors also display limited interest in positioning their concepts vis-à-vis one another. The resulting impression is of a lively yet fragmented field. This echoes Collier and Levitsky's assessment of the multiple uses of democracy with adjectives. It also highlights the potential tensions between analytic differentiation—to capture the various forms of peace that have emerged—and conceptual validity—or the risk that, without minimal agreement over what constitutes peace, we may not be able to agree on what constitutes conceptual stretching (see [Collier and Levitsky 1997](#), 430). Because of the lack of minimal agreement on the core features of peace, this issue may be more pronounced in our field than in research on democracy. With this in mind, we make a few observations about the state of the field.

A first observation is that, while all three strategies produce concepts that can be useful in exploring peace, they are useful for different analytical purposes. Diminished subtypes are particularly useful for characterizing empirical cases of peace that we observe, whereas conceptual narrowing is particularly useful for, though not limited to, studies where we set out to analyze or compare several cases. Concepts constructed using conceptual expansion are more apt when we want to engage in a critical analysis, to critically evaluate empirical cases of peace or peacebuilding efforts, or draw attention to the politics and power relations involved in constructing post-war order. The lack of clarity around the analytical purpose of, and differences between, different types of peace concepts can lead to conceptual debates where scholars misunderstand or speak past each other, ultimately making it more difficult for new scholars to select appropriate tools for addressing their particular research question. Our argument is thus not that one conceptual strategy is generally superior or preferable. Like others, we also recognize that peace is “a complex, multifaceted phenomenon” ([Söderström and Olivius 2022](#), 412) and that pluralism in how we study peace is important, not the least because different conceptual strategies are likely to only give us “partial truths” ([Söderström and Olivius 2022](#), 416). Combining different peace concepts, then, may help us obtain a more complete, full understanding of peace ([Söderström and Olivius 2022](#), 412–414, 416; see also [Davenport et al. 2018](#), 3–11, [Möller and Shim 2019](#), [Firchow and Mac Ginty 2017](#)). However, we argue that increased clarity on how and why we use various peace concepts and increased dialogue between conceptual innovations are prerequisites for this.

Indeed, increased dialogue between conceptual innovations would move the field forward in several ways. It would contribute, first and foremost, to clarifying linkages between different concepts. In the same way that our work has identified three strategies for conceptual innovation, it is possible (and highly likely) that further investigation can establish additional linkages between various concepts within and across the three strategies. What, for instance, are the similarities, differences, or intersections between adversarial, bellicose, militarized, and violent peace, all of which fall under the diminished subtype category? What differentiates the use of

territorial peace as a diminished subtype from its use as conceptual narrowing? Without attempting to “discipline” the field, such dialogues may uncover ways in which the current fragmentation could be partially reduced.

Useful dialogue could also happen between and across the subtypes to query the association between specific concepts and different levels of analysis, as well as the way in which various concepts shed light on specific thematic issues. Some concepts tell us about micro-level processes (everyday peace, agonistic peace), while others focus on higher-level outcomes and processes (regional peace, hybrid peace). A structural approach would ask how the higher-level processes affect micro-level ones, whereas an approach focusing on agency would turn the question around and ask under what conditions does a type of peace at the local/interpersonal level shape higher-level peace outcomes? In so doing, dialogues provide not only an opportunity to link debates within the field of peacebuilding to broader debates in political science, international relations, sociology, and more, they also encourage researchers to think about multicausality and about the possibility of developing multi-level analyses. For their part, while serving to clarify linkages, thematic dialogues could also provide the opportunity for researchers to compare notes and ask whether the different concepts they use affect the way in which they approach a given thematic issue. For instance, researchers particularly interested in a justice lens may benefit from a systematic comparison between and engagement with illegal peace (diminished subtype), constitutional, institutional, and just peace (conceptual narrowing), and gender-just or decolonial peace (conceptual expansion). Conducting such dialogues would contribute, among others, to breaking the silos that tend to exist between problem-solving and critical theories.

A final consideration as regards the usefulness of dialogues is that they may provide an opportunity to refine our understanding of the necessary and sufficient conditions for different kinds of peace. As they contribute to ordering our thinking about peace, concepts may come to define necessary conditions for, or in-between steps within, broader processes. In the same way that negative peace is broadly understood as a prerequisite for more positive types of peace to happen, dialogues may help us answer the question of whether certain types of peace constitute necessary conditions for other types of peace (whether relational peace is necessary for quality peace, for instance). In a similar way to authors who develop a scalar approach to peace (Goertz et al. 2016; Davenport et al. 2018), we may think about different peace concepts as belonging on a scale. We could identify those intermediary steps necessary to move from one end of the scale to the other, for instance, from fearful to emancipatory peace. To uncover these connections and answer such questions, scholars have to take each other’s concepts seriously and engage in fruitful conceptual conversations.

We thus conclude our review of peace concepts with a set of practical recommendations for students and scholars of peace. Given the current fragmentation of the field, we suggest a couple of guidelines to consider when theorizing and developing peace concepts.

- (1) Be clear and explicit about our choices.

The development of new peace concepts must proceed with clarity of purpose. We encourage proponents of new concepts to be explicit about the conceptual strategy they have employed and the purposes for which they have used it. Are they motivated by how to empirically capture and understand an empirical observation, or is theirs a normative endeavor? This also means that we encourage authors to be explicit in their definitions, for instance, if there are necessary or sufficient criteria that need to be met in order to see their definitions fulfilled or what root concept(s) anchor the newly proposed concept. With specific respect to developing diminished subtypes, i.e., when trying to study cases of peace that fall short of some ideal form

of peace, a clear and crisp description is important (to enable others to identify if other cases also belong to this particular type of peace), as is an effort to relate the diminished subtype to existing literature. Ask yourself critically is this really a new subtype, or does it belong to or connect to already identified subtypes? Subtypes that only describe one case do not promise to be that fruitful for cumulative research.

(2) Situate concepts in the broader literature.

As researchers, we can situate our new concepts in relation to previous research more explicitly. Acknowledging kin concepts and clarifying the degree to which the proposed new concept relates to or departs from others can help answer the question as to whether the proposed concept is really a new addition, or a refinement of an existing concept. Do they, for instance, relate to conflict/war in the same way? How deeply embedded are they in other literatures (for example, decolonial or feminist literatures)? While many connect to root concepts such as negative and positive peace, the depths and entanglements of these roots also vary a great deal. Thinking about the linkages between concepts will help in limiting the fragmentation of the field, and provide new avenues for synthesizing knowledge. While this article proposes one way of systematically synthesizing the field, there definitely are other ways to proceed.

(3) Engage in dialogues.

While there are some examples of conceptual discussions that actively engage in positioning vis-à-vis other peace concepts (Jarstad et al. 2023, 14–15 compare relational peace and agonistic peace; see also Davenport et al. 2018 and Goertz et al. 2016), we believe there is room for more. As mentioned above, dialogues could prove useful to establish further linkages between various concepts within and across the three strategies. They could also happen between and across the subtypes to query the association between specific concepts and different levels of analysis, as well as the way in which various concepts shed light on specific thematic issues. Not only is this important, in our opinion, to help in building cumulative knowledge and to address the danger of conceptual stretching, dialogues can also contribute to limiting the current fragmentation of the field. This is essential to facilitate the transfer of academic knowledge to the world of policy, a world to which the academic field of peacebuilding research is intimately connected (Lemay-Hébert 2013; Bush and Duggan 2014).

(4) Be aware of the political economy of academia.

Finally, we also want to note that while the conceptual developments we have seen within peace research are in part driven by enriching and important intellectual debates, the political economy of academia is also driving the proliferation of new concepts. There are structural incentives for scholars to coin new terms to improve their publication and citation rates, and less incentives to allocate time for thorough reading and engagement with existing scholarly work. This tendency has also been discussed elsewhere, for example, in relation to the proliferation of “turns” in peace and conflict scholarship (Hunt 2023). We hope that this article can contribute to and encourage continuous scholarly debate about the implications of these incentive structures for the advancement of our field. While it is not easy, especially for early-career scholars, to challenge the dominant structures of academic career-making, we would nevertheless like to end with a small call for resistance to the logic of individualized output optimization in favor of more collective, dialogical, and cumulative knowledge production.

Overall, we hope that this review and discussion have helped increase conceptual clarity within the field of peace concepts and thereby encourage not only isolated

innovations but fruitful collective conceptual dialogue within the field. Ultimately, we hope that this article will deepen constructive discussions between different conceptual approaches.

List of concepts

Developing Diminished Subtypes

1. Adversarial peace (Shamir 1992; Bengtsson 2000; Diehl 2016)
2. Autonomous peace (Söderberg Kovacs, Höglund, and Jiménez 2021)
3. Bellicose peace (Forster 2020)
4. Cold peace (Aran and Ginat 2014; Ditych 2014; Miller 2000; 2001; Sakwa 2013; Schraeder 2000)
5. Conditional peace (Diehl 2016; George 2000)
6. Contested peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
7. Cooperative peace (Shamir 1992)
8. Dictatorial peace (Peceny et al. 2002)
9. Elusive peace (Zartman 1995)
10. Fearful peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
11. Hybrid peace (Mac Ginty 2010; Richmond 2009; 2014; 2015; 2021; Visoka and Richmond 2017)
12. Illiberal peace (Lewis et al. 2018; Smith et al. 2020)
13. Illegal peace (Levitt 2012)
14. Insecure peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
15. Militarized peace (Meger and Sachseder 2020)
16. Normal peace (Miller 2000; 2001)
17. Partial peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010; D. Nilsson 2008)
18. Polarized peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
19. Precarious peace (George 2000; Maher and Thomson 2018; Nerlich 1985; Thomson 2018; Werner 1999)
20. Regional peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010; Miller 2000; 2001; Oelsner 2007)
21. Restored peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
22. Restricted peace (Shamir 1992)
23. Territorial peace (Cairo et al. 2018)
24. Tyrannical peace (Davenport 2007b)
25. Unjust peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
26. Unresolved peace (Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010)
27. Unstable peace (Boulding 1978)
28. Victor's peace (Goodhand 2010; Höglund and Söderberg Kovacs 2010; Piccolino 2015; 2019; Richmond 2005; 2014; Rupiya and Njeri 2004)
29. Violent peace (Berwouts 2017; Hume 2008; Nilsson and González Marín 2020; Salazar et al. 2019; Schirmer 1999; Mares 2001)
30. Warm peace (Miller 2000; 2001)

Conceptual Narrowing

31. Agonistic peace (Aggestam et al. 2015; Shinko 2022; Björkdahl and Mannergren Selimovic 2016; Strömbom 2020; Strömbom and Bramsen 2022; Çelik 2021)

32. Civil peace (Richmond 2014)
33. Consolidated peace (Caplan 2019; 2020)
34. Constitutional peace (Pospieszna and Schneider 2013; Richmond 2005)
35. Everyday peace (Conrad 2019; Firchow and Ginty 2017; Firchow 2018; Mac Ginty 2021; 2014)
36. Inclusive peace (Dressler 2018; Koopman 2020; Luckham 2018; Paffenholz and Ross 2015; Paffenholz and Zartman 2019; Phelan and True 2022; Tamang 2017; True and Riveros-Morales 2019)
37. Institutional peace (Richmond 2005; Svensson 2009)
38. Just peace (Allan and Keller 2008; Aggestam and Björkdahl 2012; Chesterman 2003; Fixdal 2012; Williams and Caldwell 2006)
39. Legitimate peace (Themnér and Ohlson 2014)
40. Liberal peace (Fanthorpe 2006)
41. Local peace (Leonardsson and Rudd 2015)
42. Maximal peace (Owen IV 2000)
43. Negative peace (Galtung 1969)
44. Participatory peace (Edwards and Bloomer 2011; Doyle and Sambanis 2000; 2006)
45. Quality peace (Joshi and Wallensteen 2018; Wallensteen 2015; Davenport, Melander, and Regan 2018)
46. Relational peace (Jarstad et al. 2023; Söderström et al. 2021)
47. Republican peace (Barnett 2006; Hölzing 2009)
48. Sovereign peace (Doyle and Sambanis 2000; 2006)
49. Stable peace (Boulding 1978; Caplan 2019; 2020; Kacowicz et al. 2000)
50. Strong peace (Ohlson 2008; Ohlsson and Söderberg Kovacs 2013)
51. Sustainable peace (Roeder and Rothchild 2005)
52. Territorial peace (Gibler 2012; Gibler and Tir 2014; Owsiak et al. 2017)
53. World peace (Bellamy 2019; 2020; Kwon 2020)

Conceptual Expansion

54. Climate resilient peace/Intersectional positive peace (Nicoson 2021)
55. Decolonial peace (Cruz 2021)
56. Emancipatory peace (Richmond 2021; Richmond et al. 2021; Visoka 2021; Visoka and Richmond 2017)
57. Feminist peace (Martin de Almagro 2022; Olivius et al. 2022; Paarlberg-Kvam 2019; Wibben et al. 2019; Väyrynen et al. 2021; Manchanda 2020)
58. Gender-just peace (Björkdahl 2012; Björkdahl and Mannergren Selimovic 2014; Björkdahl and Mannergren Selimovic 2015a; 2015b; O'Reilly 2016)
59. Positive peace (Galtung 1969)
60. Post-liberal peace (Jackson 2018; Richmond 2009; 2010; 2012)
61. Transrational peace (Dietrich 2014)

Acknowledgments

We would like to extend our great appreciation to Madhav Joshi and Timothy D. Sisk for comments on an earlier version of the article, and for constructive comments received on the paper when presented to the peace and conflict

studies research group at Umeå University, and at the Conflict Research Society conference in London 2023. We would also like to acknowledge the central contribution of our colleagues in the former core group of the Varieties of Peace Program to our thinking about peace concepts and conceptualizations: Niklas Eklund, Malin Eklund Wimelius, Patrik Johansson, Abrak Saati, Dzenan Sahovic, and Veronica Strandh. We are also grateful to the various funders that have enabled this work: *Riksbankens Jubileumsfond* (grant numbers M160297:1 and P19-1494:1) and *Réseau de recherche sur les opérations de paix*. We would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers at ISR for their help in improving the manuscript.

References

- ADCOCK, ROBERT. 2005. "What is a Concept?" *Committee on Concepts and Methods Working Paper Series*, no 1. <https://www.concepts-methods.org/Files/WorkingPaper/PC%201%20Adcock.pdf>, accessed 16 November 2023.
- ADCOCK, ROBERT, AND DAVID COLLIER. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529–46.
- AGGESTAM, KARIN, AND ANNIKA BJÖRKDAHL, eds. 2012. *Rethinking Peacebuilding: The Quest for Just Peace in the Middle East and the Western Balkans*. London: Routledge.
- AGGESTAM, KARIN, FABIO CRISTIANO, AND LISA STRÖMBOM. 2015. "Towards Agonistic Peacebuilding? Exploring the Antagonism–Agonism Nexus in the Middle East Peace Process." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (9): 1736–53.
- ALLAN, PIERRE, AND ALEXIS KELLER, eds. 2008. *What Is a Just Peace?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ARAN, AMNON, AND RAMI GINAT. 2014. "Revisiting Egyptian Foreign Policy towards Israel under Mubarak: From Cold Peace to Strategic Peace." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37 (4): 556–83.
- BARNETT, MICHAEL. 2006. "Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States after War." *International Security* 30 (4): 87–112.
- BELLAMY, ALEX J. 2019. *World Peace: And How We Can Achieve It*. First edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2020. "Thinking about World Peace." *Ethics & International Affairs* 34 (1): 47–56.
- BENGTSSON, RICHARD. 2000. "The Cognitive Dimension of Stable Peace." In *Stable Peace Among Nations*, edited by Arie M Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Ole Elgström and Magnus Jernek, 92–107. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- BERWOUTS, KRIS. 2017. *Congo's Violent Peace: Conflict and Struggle Since the Great African War*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- BJÖRKDAHL, ANNIKA. 2012. "A Gender-Just Peace? Exploring the Post-Dayton Peace Process in Bosnia." *Peace & Change* 37 (2): 286–317.
- BJÖRKDAHL, ANNIKA, AND JOHANNA MANNERGREN SELIMOVIC. 2014. "Gendered Justice Gaps in Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Human Rights Review* 15 (2): 201–18.
- . 2015a. "Translating UNSCR 1325 from the Global to the National: Protection, Representation and Participation in the National Action Plans of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda." *Conflict, Security & Development* 15 (4): 311–35.
- . 2015b. "Gendering Agency in Transitional Justice." *Security Dialogue* 46 (2): 165–82.
- . 2016. "A Tale of Three Bridges: Agency and Agonism in Peace Building." *Third World Quarterly* 37 (2): 321–35.
- BOULDING, KENNETH EWART. 1978. *Stable Peace*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- BUSH, KENNETH, AND COLLEEN DUGGAN. 2014. "How can research contribute to peacebuilding?" *Peacebuilding* 2 (3): 303–21.
- CAIRO, HERIBERTO, ULRICH OSLENDER, CARLO EMILIO PIAZZINI SUÁREZ, JERÓNIMO RÍOS, SARA KOOPMAN, VLADIMIR MONTÓYA ARANGO, FLAVIO BLADIMIR RODRÍGUEZ MUÑOZ, AND LILIANA ZAMBRANO QUINTERO. 2018. "Territorial Peace': The Emergence of a Concept in Colombia's Peace Negotiations." *Geopolitics* 23 (2): 464–88.
- CAPLAN, RICHARD. 2019. *Measuring Peace: Principles, Practices, and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2020. "Measuring Peace: Principles, Practices, and Politics." *Ethnopolitics* 19 (3): 311–15.
- ÇELİK, AYŞE BETÜL. 2021. "Agonistic Peace and Confronting the Past: An Analysis of a Failed Peace Process and the Role of Narratives." *Cooperation and Conflict* 56 (1): 26–43.

- CHESTERMAN, SIMON. 2003. *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- COLLIER, DAVID, AND STEVEN LEVITSKY. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49 (3): 430–51.
- COLLIER, DAVID, AND JAMES MAHON. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87 (4): 845–855.
- CONFORTINI, CATIA C. 2006. "Galtung, Violence, and Gender: The Case for a Peace Studies/Feminism Alliance." *Peace & Change* 31 (3): 333–67.
- CONRAD, KEZIAH. 2019. "Achieving the Ordinary: Everyday Peace and the Other in Bosnian Mixed-Ethnicity Families." *Conflict and Society* 5 (1): 1–18.
- CRUZ, JUAN DANIEL. 2021. "Colonial Power and Decolonial Peace." *Peacebuilding* 9 (3): 274–88.
- DAVENPORT, CHRISTIAN. 2004. "The Promise of Democratic Pacification: An Empirical Assessment." *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (3): 539–60.
- . 2007a. *State Repression and the Domestic Democratic Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2007b. "State Repression and the Tyrannical Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 44 (4): 485–504.
- DAVENPORT, CHRISTIAN, AND DAVID A. ARMSTRONG II. 2004. "Democracy and the Violation of Human Rights: A Statistical Analysis from 1976 to 1996." *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (3): 538–54.
- DAVENPORT, CHRISTIAN, ERIK MELANDER, AND PATRICK M. REGAN. 2018. *The Peace Continuum: What It Is and How to Study It*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- DIEHL, PAUL F. 2016. "Exploring Peace: Looking Beyond War and Negative Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (1): 1–10.
- DIETRICH, WOLFGANG. 2014. "A Brief Introduction to Transnational Peace Research and Elicitive Conflict Transformation." *Journal of Conflictology* 5 (2): 48–57.
- DITRYCH, ONDREJ. 2014. "Bracing for Cold Peace. US-Russia Relations after Ukraine." *The International Spectator* 49 (4): 76–96.
- DOYLE, MICHAEL W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12 (3): 205–35.
- . 1986. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80 (4): 1151–69.
- DOYLE, MICHAEL W., AND NICHOLAS SAMBANIS. 2000. "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 94 (4): 779–801.
- . 2006. *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- DRESSLER, MATTEO. 2018. "Decentralising Power: Building Inclusive Peace? The European Union's Support to Governance Reform in Eastern Ukraine." *Peacebuilding* 6 (3): 201–17.
- EDWARDS, AARON, AND STEPHEN BLOOMER. 2011. "Transforming Loyalist Communities: A Participatory Peace Research Approach." In *Ulster Loyalism after the Good Friday Agreement: History, Identity and Change*, edited by James W. McAuley and Graham Spencer, 104–15. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- FANTHORPE, RICHARD. 2006. "On the Limits of Liberal Peace: Chiefs and Democratic Decentralization in Post-War Sierra Leone." *African Affairs* 105 (418): 27–49.
- FIRCHOW, PAMINA. 2018. *Reclaiming Everyday Peace: Local Voices in Measurement and Evaluation After War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FIRCHOW, PAMINA, AND ROGER MAC GINTY. 2017. "Measuring Peace: Comparability, Commensurability, and Complementarity Using Bottom-Up Indicators." *International Studies Review* 19 (1): 6–27.
- FIXDAL, MONA. 2012. *Just Peace: How Wars Should End*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- FORSTER, ELISABETH. 2020. "Bellicose Peace: China's Peace Signature Campaign and Discourses about 'Peace' in the Early 1950 s." *Modern China* 46 (3): 250–80.
- FRANKFORT-NACHMIAS, CHAVA, AND DAVID NACHMIAS. 2008. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. 7th Edition. New York: Worth Publishers.
- GALTUNG, JOHAN. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3): 167–91.
- GARTZKE, ERIK. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 166–91.
- GARTZKE, ERIK, AND JOSEPH HEWITT. 2010. "International Crises and the Capitalist Peace." *International Interactions* 36 (2): 115–45.
- GARTZKE, ERIK, AND OLIVER WESTERWINTER. 2016. "The Complex Structure of Commercial Peace Contrasting Trade Interdependence, Asymmetry, and Multipolarity." *Journal of Peace Research* 53 (3): 325–43.
- GEORGE, ALEXANDER L. 2000. "Foreword." In *Stable Peace Among Nations*, edited by Arie M Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Ole Elgström and Magnus Jernek, xi–xviii. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- GERRING, JOHN. 1999. "What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity* 31 (3): 357–93.
- GIBLER, DOUGLAS M. 2012. *The Territorial Peace: Borders, State Development, and International Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- GIBLER, DOUGLAS M., AND JAROSLAV TIR. 2014. "Territorial Peace and Democratic Clustering." *The Journal of Politics* 76 (1): 27–40.
- GOERTZ, GARY. 2020. *Social Science Concepts and Measurement: New and Completely Revised Edition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GOERTZ, GARY, PAUL F. DIEHL, AND ALEXANDRU BALAS. 2016. *The Puzzle of Peace: The Evolution of Peace in the International System*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- GOODHAND, JONATHAN. 2010. "Stabilising a Victor's Peace? Humanitarian Action and Reconstruction in Eastern Sri Lanka." *Disasters* 34 (s3): S342–67.
- HEGRE, HÅVARD, TANJA ELLINGSEN, SCOTT GATES, AND NILS PETER GLEDITSCH. 2001. "Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816–1992." *American Political Science Review* 95 (1): 33–48.
- HUME, MO. 2008. "El Salvador: The Limits of a Violent Peace." In *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*, edited by Michael Pugh, Neil Cooper and Mandy Turner, 318–33. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- HÖGLUND, KRISTINE, AND MIMMI SÖDERBERG KOVACS. 2010. "Beyond the Absence of War: The Diversity of Peace in Post-Settlement Societies." *Review of International Studies* 36 (2): 367–90.
- HÖLZING, PHILIPP. 2009. "Kants Theorie Des Republikanischen Friedens Und Die Republikanische Tradition." *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 116 (1): 4–21.
- HUNT, CHARLES T. 2023. "How Many Turns Make a Revolution? Whither the 'Dialogue of the Deaf' Between Peacebuilding Scholars and Practitioners." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 17 (4): 333–350.
- JACKSON, RICHARD. 2018. "Post-Liberal Peacebuilding and the Pacifist State." *Peacebuilding* 6 (1): 1–16.
- JARSTAD, ANNA, JOHANNA SÖDERSTRÖM, AND MALIN ÅKEBO. 2023. *Relational Peace Practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- JARSTAD, ANNA, NIKLAS EKLUND, PATRIK JOHANSSON, ELISABETH OLIVIUS, ABRAK SAATI, DZENAN SAHOVIC, VERONICA STRANDH, JOHANNA SÖDERSTRÖM, MALIN E WIMELIUS, AND MALIN ÅKEBO. 2019. "Three Approaches to Peace: A Framework for Describing and Exploring Varieties of Peace." *Umeå: Umeå Working Papers in Peace and Conflict Studies* no 12.
- JOHANSSON, PATRIK, AND ABRAK SAATI. 2020. "Different Methods for Analyzing Varieties of Peace." *Umeå: Umeå Working Papers in Peace and Conflict Studies*, no. 13.
- JOSHI, MADHAV, AND PETER WALLENSTEEN. 2018. *Understanding Quality Peace*. New York: Routledge
- KACOWICZ, ARIE M, AND YAACOV BAR-SIMAN-TOV. 2000. "Stable Peace: A Conceptual Framework." In *Stable Peace Among Nations*, edited by Arie M Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Ole Elgström and Magnus Jernek, 11–35. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- KACOWICZ, ARIE M, BAR-SIMAN-TOV YAACOV, OLE ELGSTRÖM, AND MAGNUS JERNEK, eds. 2000. *Stable Peace Among Nations*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- KLEM, BART. 2018. "The Problem of Peace and the Meaning of 'Post-War'." *Conflict, Security & Development* 18 (3): 233–55.
- KOOPMAN, SARA. 2020. "Building an Inclusive Peace Is an Uneven Socio-Spatial Process: Colombia's Differential Approach." *Political Geography* 83 (4): 102252.
- KRAUSE, KEITH. 2019. "Emancipation and Critique in Peace and Conflict Research." *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4 (2): 292–98.
- KWON, HEONIK. 2020. "Anthropology and World Peace." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 10 (2): 279–88.
- LEMAY-HÉBERT, NICOLAS. 2013. "Critical Debates on Liberal Peacebuilding." *Civil Wars* 15 (2): 242–52.
- LEONARDSSON, HANNA, AND GUSTAV RUDD. 2015. "The 'Local Turn' in Peacebuilding: A Literature Review of Effective and Emancipatory Local Peacebuilding." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5): 825–39.
- LEVITT, JEREMY I. 2012. *Illegal Peace in Africa: An Inquiry Into the Legality of Power Sharing with Warlords, Rebels, and Junta*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LEWIS, DAVID, JOHN HEATHERSHAW, AND NICK MEGORAN. 2018. "Illiberal Peace? Authoritarian Modes of Conflict Management." *Cooperation and Conflict* 53 (4): 486–506.
- LINDEMANN, STEFAN. 2011. "Inclusive Elite Bargains and the Dilemma of Unproductive Peace: A Zambian Case Study." *Third World Quarterly* 32 (10): 1843–69.
- LUCKHAM, ROBIN. 2018. "Building Inclusive Peace and Security in Times of Unequal Development and Rising Violence." *Peacebuilding* 6 (2): 87–110.
- MAC GINTY, ROGER. 2010. "Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace." *Security Dialogue* 41 (4): 391–412.
- . 2012. "Routine Peace: Technocracy and Peacebuilding." *Cooperation and Conflict* 47 (3): 287–308.
- . 2014. "Everyday Peace: Bottom-up and Local Agency in Conflict-Affected Societies." *Security Dialogue* 45 (6): 548–64.

- . 2021. *Everyday Peace: How So-Called Ordinary People Can Disrupt Violent Conflict*. *Studies in Strategic Peacebuilding*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- MAOZ, ZEEV, AND BRUCE RUSSETT. 1993. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946–1986." *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 624–38.
- MARTIN DE ALMAGRO, MARIA. 2022. "Building Feminist Peace: Gender, Legal Reforms and Social Reproduction after the United Nations Mission in Liberia." *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 5 (1): 45–62.
- MAHER, DAVID, AND ANDREW THOMSON. 2018. "A Precarious Peace? The Threat of Paramilitary Violence to the Peace Process in Colombia." *Third World Quarterly* 39 (11): 2142–72.
- MANCHANDA, RITA. 2020. "Difficult Encounters with the WPS Agenda in South Asia: Re-Scripting Globalized Norms and Policy Frameworks for a Feminist Peace." In *New Directions in Women, Peace and Security*, edited by Laura Shepherd, Paul Kirby and Soumita Basu, 61–82. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- MARES, DAVID R. 2001. *Violent Peace: Militarized Interstate Bargaining in Latin America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McGOVERN, MIKE. 2017. *A Socialist Peace? Explaining the Absence of War in an African Country*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- MEGER, SARA, AND JULIA SACHSEDER. 2020. "Militarized Peace: Understanding Post-Conflict Violence in the Wake of the Peace Deal in Colombia." *Globalizations* 17 (6): 953–73.
- MILLER, BENJAMIN. 2000. "The International, Regional, and Domestic Sources of Regional Peace." In *Stable Peace Among Nations*, edited by Arie M Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Ole Elgström and Magnus Jernek, 55–73. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- MILLER, BENJAMIN. 2001. "The Global Sources of Regional Transitions from War to Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 38 (2): 199–225.
- MÖLLER, FRANK, AND DAVID SHIM. 2019. "Visions of Peace in International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 20 (3): 246–264.
- NERLICH, UWE. 1985. "The Precarious Peace in Europe: The West in Search of a Political Strategy." In *European Peace Movements and the Future of the Western Alliance*, edited by Walter Laqueur and Robert Hunter. New York: Routledge.
- NICOSON, CHRISTIE. 2021. "Towards Climate Resilient Peace: An Intersectional and Degrowth Approach." *Sustainability Science* 16 (4): 1147–58.
- NILSSON, DESIRÉE. 2008. "Partial Peace: Rebel Groups Inside and Outside of Civil War Settlements." *Journal of Peace Research* 45 (4): 479–95.
- NILSSON, MANUELA, AND LUCÍA GONZÁLEZ MARÍN. 2020. "Violent Peace: Local Perceptions of Threat and Insecurity in Post-Conflict Colombia." *International Peacekeeping* 27 (2): 238–62.
- OELSNER, ANDREA. 2007. "Friendship, Mutual Trust and the Evolution of Regional Peace in the International System." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (2): 257–79.
- OHLSON, THOMAS. 2008. "Understanding Causes of War and Peace." *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (1): 133–60.
- OHLSSON, JOHANNA, AND MIMMI SÖDERBERG KOVACS. 2013. *From Civil War to Strong Peace in Africa: The Thomas Ohlson Memorial Conference*. Uppsala University: Department of Peace and Conflict Research. <https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:651132/FULLTEXT01.pdf>, accessed 16 November 2023.
- OLIVIU, ELISABETH, JENNY HEDSTRÖM, AND ZIN MAR PHYU. 2022. "Feminist Peace or State Co-Optation? The Women, Peace and Security Agenda in Myanmar." *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 5 (1): 25–43.
- O'REILLY, MARIA. 2016. "Peace and Justice through a Feminist Lens: Gender Justice and the Women's Court for the Former Yugoslavia." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 10 (3): 419–45.
- OWEN IV, JOHN M. 2000. "Pieces of Maximal Peace: Common Identities, Common Enemies." In *Stable Peace Among Nations*, edited by Arie M Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov, Ole Elgström and Magnus Jernek, 74–91. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- OWSIK, ANDREW P., PAUL F. DIEHL, AND GARY GOERTZ. 2017. "Border Settlement and the Movement toward and from Negative Peace." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34 (2): 176–93.
- PAARLBERG-KVAM, KATE. 2019. "What's to Come is More Complicated: Feminist Visions of Peace in Colombia." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21 (2): 194–223.
- PAFFENHOLZ, THANIA, AND NICHOLAS ROSS. 2015. "Inclusive Peace Processes – An Introduction." In *Inclusive Peacebuilding: Recognised but not Realised*, edited by Sigrid Gruener and Matilda Hald, 28–37. Development Dialogue 63, Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- PAFFENHOLZ, THANIA, AND I. WILLIAM ZARTMAN. 2019. "Inclusive Peace Negotiations— From a Neglected Topic to New Hype." *International Negotiation* 24 (1): 1–6.
- PECENY, MARK, CAROLINE C. BEER, AND SHANNON SANCHEZ-TERRY. 2002. "Dictatorial Peace?" *American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 15–26.

- PHELAN, ALEXANDRA, AND JACQUI TRUE. 2022. "Navigating Gender in Elite Bargains: Women's Movements and the Quest for Inclusive Peace in Colombia." *Review of International Studies* 48 (1): 171–94.
- PICCOLINO, GIULIA. 2015. "Winning wars, Building (illiberal) Peace? The Rise (and Possible fall) of a Victor's Peace in Rwanda and Sri Lanka." *Third World Quarterly* 36 (9): 1770–1785.
- . 2019. "Local Peacebuilding in a Victor's Peace. Why Local Peace Fails Without National Reconciliation." *International Peacekeeping* 26 (3): 354–79.
- POSPIESZNA, PAULINA, AND GERALD SCHNEIDER. 2013. "The Illusion of 'Peace Through Power-Sharing': Constitutional Choice in the Shadow of Civil War." *Civil Wars* 15 (sup1): 44–70.
- PRZEWORSKI, ADAM, AND JOHN SPRAGUE. 1971. "Concepts in Search of Explicit Formulation: A Study in Measurement." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 15 (2): 183–218.
- RICHARDS, PAUL. 2005. *No Peace, No War an Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflicts*. Athen: Ohio University Press.
- RICHMOND, OLIVER P. 2005. *The Transformation of Peace*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- . 2009. "A Post-Liberal Peace: Eirenisism and the Everyday." *Review of International Studies* 35 (3): 557–80.
- . 2010. "Resistance and the Post-Liberal Peace." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 38 (3): 665–92.
- . 2012. "A Pedagogy of Peacebuilding: Infrapolitics, Resistance, and Liberation: A Pedagogy of Peacebuilding." *International Political Sociology* 6 (2): 115–31.
- . 2014. *Failed Statebuilding: Intervention, the State, and the Dynamics of Peace Formation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2015. "The Dilemmas of a Hybrid Peace: Negative or Positive?" *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (1): 50–68.
- . 2021. "What Is an Emancipatory Peace?" *Journal of International Political Theory* 18 (2): 124–47.
- RICHMOND, OLIVER P, ROGER MAC GINTY, SANDRA POGODDA, AND GĚZIM VISOKA. 2021. "Power or Peace? Restoration or Emancipation through Peace Processes." *Peacebuilding* 9 (3): 243–57.
- ROEDER, PHILIP G., AND DONALD ROTHCHILD. 2005. *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy After Civil Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- RUPIYA, MARTIN, AND JEMIMA NJERI. 2004. "An Evaluation of the Post-Savimbi Peace Process in Angola since February 2002: The Victor's Peace Treaty." *Institute for Security Studies*, 95–108. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1448004/an-evaluation-of-the-post-savimbi-peace-process-in-angola-since-february-2002/2079783/>, accessed 16 November 2023.
- SAKWA, RICHARD. 2013. "The Cold Peace: Russo-Western Relations as a Mimetic Cold War." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26 (1): 203–24.
- SALAZAR, LUIS GABRIEL SALAS, JONAS WOLFF, AND FABIÁN EDUARDO CAMELO. 2019. "Towards Violent Peace? Territorial Dynamics of Violence in Tumaco (Colombia) Before and After the Demobilisation of the FARC-EP." *Conflict, Security & Development* 19 (5): 497–520.
- SARTORI, GIOVANNI. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1033–53.
- SCHIRMER, JENNIFER. 1999. "The Guatemalan Politico-Military Project: Legacies for a Violent Peace?" *Latin American Perspectives* 26 (2): 92–107.
- SCHRAEDER, PETER J. 2000. "Cold War to Cold Peace: Explaining US-French Competition in Francophone Africa." *Political Science Quarterly* 115 (3): 395–419.
- SHAMIR, SHIMON. 1992. "From Conflict to Peace: Stages along the Road." *United States Institute of Peace Journal* 5 (6): 579.
- SHINKO, ROSEMARY E. 2022. "A Critical (Re)Reading of the Analytical Significance of Agonistic Peace." *Third World Quarterly* 43 (6): 1399–407.
- SMITH, CLAIRE Q, LARS WALDOR, RAJESH VENUGOPAL, AND GERARD MCCARTHY. 2020. "Illiberal Peace-Building in Asia: A Comparative Overview." *Conflict, Security & Development* 20 (1): 1–14.
- SHINKO, ROSEMARY E. 2008. "Agonistic Peace: A Postmodern Reading." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 36 (3): 473–91.
- STRÖMBOM, LISA. 2020. "Exploring Analytical Avenues for Agonistic Peace." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 23 (4): 1–23.
- STRÖMBOM, LISA, AND ISABEL BRAMSEN. 2022. "Agonistic Peace: Advancing Knowledge on Institutional Dynamics and Relational Transformation." *Third World Quarterly* 43 (6): 1237–50.
- SVENSSON, ISAK. 2009. "Who Brings Which Peace? Neutral versus Biased Mediation and Institutional Peace Arrangements in Civil Wars." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (3): 446–69.
- SÖDERBERG KOVACS, MIMMI, KRISTINE HÖGLUND, AND MÉLIDA JIMÉNEZ. 2021. "Autonomous Peace? The Bangsamoro Region in the Philippines Beyond the 2014 Agreement." *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development* 16 (1): 55–69.

- SÖDERSTRÖM, JOHANNA, MALIN ÅKEBO, AND ANNA K JARSTAD. 2021. "Friends, Fellows, and Foes: A New Framework for Studying Relational Peace." *International Studies Review* 23 (3): 484–508.
- SÖDERSTRÖM, JOHANNA, AND ELISABETH OLIVIUS. 2022. "Pluralism, Temporality and Affect – Methodological Challenges of Making Peace Researchable." *Conflict, Security & Development* 22 (5): 411–433.
- TAMANG, MUKTA S. 2017. "Social Movements and Inclusive Peace in Nepal." *Accord*, 26 (November): 97–106.
- THEMNÉR, ANDERS, AND THOMAS OHLSON. 2014. "Legitimate Peace in Post-Civil War States: Towards Attaining the Unattainable." *Conflict, Security & Development* 14 (1): 61–87.
- THOMSON, SUSAN. 2018. *Rwanda: From Genocide to Precarious Peace*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- TRUE, JACQUI, AND YOLANDA RIVEROS-MORALES. 2019. "Towards Inclusive Peace: Analysing Gender-Sensitive Peace Agreements 2000–2016." *International Political Science Review* 40 (1): 23–40.
- VÄYRYNEN, TARJA, SWATI PARASHAR, ÉLISE FÉRON, AND CATIA CECILIA CONFORTINI, eds. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- VISOKA, GĒZIM. 2021. "Emancipatory Peace." In *The Oxford Handbook of Peacebuilding, Statebuilding, and Peace Formation*, edited by Oliver P. Richmond and Gëzim Visoka, 641–660. New York: Oxford University Press.
- VISOKA, GĒZIM, AND OLIVER RICHMOND. 2017. "After Liberal Peace? From Failed State-Building to an Emancipatory Peace in Kosovo." *International Studies Perspectives* 18 (1): 110–29.
- WALLENSTEEN, PETER. 2015. *Quality Peace: Peacebuilding, Victory, and World Order*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- WERNER, SUZANNE. 1999. "The Precarious Nature of Peace: Resolving the Issues, Enforcing the Settlement, and Renegotiating the Terms." *American Journal of Political Science* 43 (3): 912–34.
- WIBBEN, ANNICK TR, CATIA CECILIA CONFORTINI, SANAM ROOHI, SARAI B AHARONI, LEENA VASTAPUU, AND TIINA VAITTINEN. 2019. "Collective Discussion: Piecing-up Feminist Peace Research." *International Political Sociology* 13 (1): 86–107.
- WILLIAMS, ROBERT E., JR., AND DAN CALDWELL. 2006. "Jus Post Bellum: Just War Theory and the Principles of Just Peace." *International Studies Perspectives* 7 (4): 309–20.
- ZARTMAN, I. WILLIAM, ed. 1995. *Evasive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution.