

Knowledge production on peace: actors, hierarchies and policy relevance

SARA HELLMÜLLER, LAURENT GOETSCHÉL AND
KRISTOFFER LIDÉN*

The academic discipline of International Relations (IR) was originally established to understand the causes of wars and thus prevent them. However, the link between research, policy and practice is not always obvious, and ‘much of what we know about the relationship between IR research and policy-making is based on personal anecdotes and untested assumptions’.¹ This is equally true of peace studies, which, although touted as one of the most policy-relevant subfields of IR, does not always make explicit the processes of who produces knowledge on peace and conflict, what knowledge is prioritized, and how it feeds into policy and practice.² In this special section, we invited an exploration of these questions of knowledge production and uptake in the field of peace research, including more specific topics like mediation and transitional justice. By focusing not only on theoretical and methodological approaches but also on social, cultural and political aspects, the contributions include a critical perspective on the actors, dynamics and hierarchies in peace studies and offer insights into how current biases may be addressed.

Contributions: what knowledge, whose knowledge, and what influence?

The special section focuses on three interrelated questions: what knowledge is produced on peace, whose knowledge is prioritized, and what influence it has on policy and practice. The articles are structured around these three questions.³

What knowledge?

The first part examines *what knowledge* peace researchers produce on peace and conflict. Cox famously distinguished between problem-solving and critical

* This is an introduction to the special section in the September 2023 issue of *International Affairs* on ‘Knowledge production on peace: actors, hierarchies and policy relevance’, guest-edited by Sara Hellmüller, Laurent Goetschel and Kristoffer Lidén.

¹ Roland Paris, ‘Ordering the world: academic research and policymaking on fragile states’, *International Studies Review* 13: 1, 2011, pp. 58–71 at p. 59, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2010.00998.x>.

² For an overview of the field of peace research, see Nils Petter Gleditsch, Jonas Nordkvelle and Håvard Strand, ‘Peace research—Just the study of war?’, *Journal of Peace Research* 51: 2, 2014, pp. 145–58, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343313514074>.

³ Some articles cover several aspects, but we clustered them according to their dominant theme.

approaches to research.⁴ While problem-solving research seeks to provide practical solutions to problems without questioning the broader framing, critical research analyses the underlying perspectives and opens the possibility for ‘creating an alternative world’.⁵ In peace research, problem-solving approaches provide recommendations on how to address concrete challenges as policy-makers see them. Critical approaches, in turn, question the predominant views and theoretical assumptions of contemporary policies. As part of the critical research agenda, authors have drawn attention to the gendered and racial hierarchies that influence its production.⁶ While Cox’s distinction downplays the critical potential of problem-solving accounts, the distinction brings out the diversity and complementarity of knowledge production in this field. The special section asks whether, at a time when problem-solving research faces the limitations of its prescriptions and critical approaches are blamed for failing to provide viable alternatives, a more differentiated and empirically grounded approach to the generation of knowledge on peace can further the debate and improve its relevance for the research/policy/practice nexus.

Sara Hellmüller addresses the question of knowledge production in mediation by examining who produces academic knowledge on mediation, how this knowledge is produced and what knowledge is produced.⁷ She finds that western male authors produce most scholarly research on mediation, that these analyses are dominated by positivist approaches employing rationalist conceptual frameworks and quantitative methodologies and that mediation research mostly theorizes about reasons for effectiveness. Through this analysis, she shows that while academic research on mediation is practice-oriented in that most contributions examine how to make it more effective, its practice-relevance could be enhanced by complementing it in three ways: increasing the diversity of perspectives, adding more interpretive and qualitative approaches and producing more critical research.

The article by Ulrike Lühe complements Hellmüller’s argument by analysing underlying biases and normative choices in quantitative literatures on transitional

⁴ Robert W. Cox, ‘Social forces, states and world orders: beyond International Relations theory’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10: 2, 1981, pp. 126–55, <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298810100020501>. See also Alex Bellamy, ‘The “next stage” in peace operations theory?’, *International Peacekeeping* 11: 1, 2004, pp. 17–38 at p. 18; Kristoffer Lidén, Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver P. Richmond, ‘Introduction: beyond northern epistemologies of peace: peacebuilding reconstructed?’, *International Peacekeeping* 16: 5, 2009, pp. 587–98 at p. 593, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533310903303230>; Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, ed, *Rethinking the liberal peace: external models and local alternatives* (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 2–4; Roger Mac Ginty, ‘Complementarity and interdisciplinarity in peace and conflict studies’, *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4: 2, 2019, pp. 267–72, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogz002>.

⁵ Cox, ‘Social forces, states and world orders’, p. 128.

⁶ Inger Skjelsboek and Dan Smith, eds, *Gender, peace and conflict* (London: SAGE, 2001); Louise Olsson and Theodora-Ismene Gizelis, eds, *Gender, peace and security* (London: Routledge, 2015); Tarja Väyrynen et al., eds, *Routledge handbook of feminist peace research* (London and New York: Routledge, 2021); Mahdis Azarmandi, ‘Freedom from discrimination: on the coloniality of positive peace’, in Katerina Standish, Heather Devere, Adan Suazo and Rachel Rafferty, eds, *The Palgrave handbook of positive peace* (Singapore: Springer, 2021); Mahdis Azarmandi, ‘The racial silence within peace studies’, *Peace Review* 30: 1, 2018, pp. 69–77, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2017.1418659>; Toni Haastруп and Jamie J. Hagen, ‘Racial hierarchies of knowledge production in the Women, Peace and Security agenda’, *Critical Studies on Security* 9: 1, 2021, pp. 27–30, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2021.1904192>.

⁷ Sara Hellmüller, ‘Knowledge production on mediation: practice-oriented, but not practice-relevant?’, *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1847–66.

justice.⁸ Without dismissing the scientific qualities of quantitative methods as such, she reveals how the selection of cases, choices of datasets and interpretation of ‘messy cases’ tend to reinforce ingrained political assumptions in the field of transitional justice. This represents more continuity between recent quantitative studies and the normative qualitative studies that they replaced in an effort to make the field more objective. As such, Lühe reveals a politics of knowledge production in peace research that both invites more explicit methodological choices in quantitative studies and highlights the continued scientific relevance of qualitative approaches.

Elisabeth Prügl focuses on the knowledge produced on the role of gender in the causation of violent conflict.⁹ She discusses the meaning of causation in relation to feminist methodology and highlights how identifying gender in causal mechanisms can contribute practical knowledge to efforts seeking to advance gender equality and reduce violence. As a norm, identity and mode of othering, gender can lend dispositional force to social mechanisms and become a causal driver of conflict in intersection with other aspects of differentiation. Prügl develops the concept of ‘intersectionally-gendered mechanisms’ and illustrates it with three examples, that is, masculinist protection, masculinist competition and gendered mobilization for survival.

Whose knowledge?

The second part of the special section analyses aspects of *whose knowledge* on peace and conflict is considered legitimate, and in whose eyes. Some scholars have explored how expertise in conflict resolution and peacebuilding is created.¹⁰ Debates on this question have mostly revolved around the interaction between ‘external’ and ‘internal’ knowledge in a given conflict context. Authors in an edited volume by Leander and Wæver, for instance, show how the expertise that shapes responses to conflict always excludes some views.¹¹ Other scholars have argued that external actors are often unwilling to renegotiate their concepts of peace and conflict and mostly apply their technical knowledge in their peacebuilding efforts, because they are under time and financial constraints and need to deliver concrete and measurable results.¹² This has led to criticism about peace policies and programmes being more strongly influenced by outside expertise than

⁸ Ulrike Lühe, ‘The politics of methods in transitional justice knowledge production’, *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1867–83.

⁹ Elisabeth Prügl, ‘Gender as a cause of violent conflict’, *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1885–1902.

¹⁰ Briony Jones, ‘The performance and persistence of transitional justice and its ways of knowing atrocity’, *Cooperation and Conflict* 56: 2, 2020, pp. 163–80, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836720965994>; Elodie Convergne, ‘Learning to mediate? The Mediation Support Unit and the production of expertise by the UN’, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 10: 2, 2016, pp. 181–99.

¹¹ Anna Leander and Ole Wæver, eds, *Assembling exclusive expertise: knowledge, ignorance and conflict resolution in the global South* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).

¹² Ole Jacob Sending, *Why peacebuilders fail to secure ownership and be sensitive to context* (Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 2009); Laurent Goetschel and Tobias Hagmann, ‘Civilian peacebuilding: peace by bureaucratic means?’, *Conflict, Security & Development* 9: 1, 2009, pp. 55–73 at p. 64, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678800802704911>; Sara Hellmüller, *Partners for peace: the interaction between local and international peacebuilding actors* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

by knowledge of what works in a given setting, what already exists in this context and what people who have lived through the conflict might prioritize.¹³ In the famous ‘local turn’ in peace studies, scholars have long called for a re-evaluation of ‘local’ knowledge and expertise.¹⁴ Moreover, in its ‘Sustaining Peace’ agenda, the UN acknowledges peacebuilding as a locally led endeavour, pointing to the importance of diversifying the sources of knowledge influencing its design.¹⁵ However, unequal access to knowledge production on peace and conflict remains a central issue.¹⁶ The second part of the special section therefore explores the complex processes of knowledge production on peace between a diverse set of actors, and asks how a more pluralistic approach can be supported and to what extent it may strengthen the performance of the various efforts in which peace actors are engaged.

In her contribution, Navnita Chadha Behera analyses how a focus on the state in peace and conflict research silences non-state actors and perspectives.¹⁷ Revisiting Gayatri Spivak’s paradigmatic question of whether ‘the subaltern can speak’, she argues that the problem is rather a failure of scholars to listen to the experiences and expertise of marginalized groups. Behera’s argument is illustrated by knowledge production on the Kashmir conflict of the early 1990s, in which the everyday lives of ordinary people and their contributions to both the conflict and peacebuilding efforts have been ignored.

Luisa Cruz Lobato and Victoria Santos explore the rise of digital objects such as databases, indicators, apps, big data or data analysis algorithms as ‘experts’ in international peace and security.¹⁸ They inquire into how the politics of design of such objects influences who is considered an expert on a particular topic and how they produce actionable knowledge. In particular, they examine how the norm of inclusion is integrated into these objects’ design and how they thereby contribute to promoting more inclusive and transparent peace policies and practice. As such, the authors show how digital objects significantly change the relationship between experts and the public, and therefore make an important contribution to the question of whose knowledge counts and how that knowledge is produced.

¹³ Kwaku Danso and Kwesi Aning, ‘African experiences and alternativity in International Relations theorizing about security’, *International Affairs* 98: 1, 2022, pp. 67–83, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiab204>; Navnita Chadha Behera, ‘Globalization, deglobalization and knowledge production’, *International Affairs* 97: 5, 2021, pp. 1579–97, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiab119>.

¹⁴ Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver P. Richmond, ‘The local turn in peace building: a critical agenda for peace’, *Third World Quarterly* 34: 5, 2013, pp. 763–83, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.800750>; Hellmüller, *Partners for peace*; Annika Björkdahl and Kristine Höglund, ‘Precarious peacebuilding: friction in global–local encounters’, *Peacebuilding* 1: 3, 2013, pp. 289–99, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2013.813170>; Primitivo Cabanes Ragandang, ‘What are they writing for? Peace research as an impermeable metropole’, *Peacebuilding* 10: 3, 2022, pp. 265–77, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2021.2000159>.

¹⁵ UN Security Council Resolution 2282, 27 April 2016, UN Doc. S/RES/2282; General Assembly Resolution 70/262, 27 April 2016, UN Doc. A/RES/70/262; UN Secretary-General, *Report of the Secretary-General: Peacebuilding and sustaining peace* (New York: United Nations, 2018).

¹⁶ Haastrup and Hagen, ‘Racial hierarchies of knowledge production in the Women, Peace and Security agenda’.

¹⁷ Navnita Chadha Behera, ‘The “subaltern speak”: can we, the experts, listen?’, *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1903–27.

¹⁸ Luisa Cruz Lobato and Victoria Santos, ‘Digital tools as experts in international peace and security’, *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1929–51.

What influence?

The third part of the special section investigates *what influence* knowledge on peace and conflict has on policy and practice. Whereas the first two parts start from the perspective of scholars, this one begins with policy-makers and practitioners by analysing what forms of knowledge influence them the most. Scholars have pointed to the challenge that, while academics conceive of the advancement of knowledge as an iterative process involving doubt, critique and debate, policy-makers and practitioners usually look for unambiguous and concise information.¹⁹ Several authors have proposed typologies on different knowledge types and their transmissibility. Walt, for instance, distinguishes knowledge according to the level of influence scholars have on its production in terms of abstraction.²⁰ In increasing order, he identifies factual knowledge, 'rules of thumb', typologies, empirical laws and theories. Similarly, Hirsch Hadorn and colleagues distinguish three types of knowledge according to their rising influence on practice. These are: systems knowledge concerned with the origins of problems, underlying structures and social processes; target knowledge focused on actors and their roles, interests, options, strategies and needs for change and transformation knowledge providing the information needed for changing existing ways of acting.²¹ When it comes to the transmission of knowledge, one main distinction is between conceptual and instrumental use of research, in other words whether it influences the ways practitioners think or act.²² The third part of this special section builds on these typologies about the forms of knowledge that influence policy-makers and practitioners, through which channels and with what potential impact.

Isabel Bramsen and Anine Hagemann analyse channels of knowledge transmission into policy.²³ Based on interviews with prominent Nordic peace researchers and practitioners, they identify four ways in which researchers influence practice: by personally engaging with policy; by providing empirical findings; by sharing their research and theorizing and conceptualizing about global affairs and by teaching. They describe the particularities of Nordic peace research, showing that it critically and constructively engages in policy, and point to important challenges in the transfer of knowledge from research to practice. These reflections remain relevant, even though both Finland and Sweden have recently significantly revised their peacebuilding and peace research policies.

¹⁹ Johan Eriksson and Bengt Sundelius, 'Molding minds that form policy: how to make research useful', *International Studies Perspectives* 6: 1, 2005, pp. 51–71 at p. 58, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3577.2005.00193.x>.

²⁰ Stephen M. Walt, 'The relationship between theory and policy in International Relations', *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 8, 2005, pp. 23–48 at p. 25.

²¹ Gertrud Hirsch Hadorn et al., 'The emergence of transdisciplinarity as a form of research', in Gertrud Hirsch Hadorn et al., eds, *Handbook of transdisciplinary research* (Bern: Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences, 2008).

²² Sandra Nutley, Janie Percy-Smith and William Solesbury, *Models of research impact: a cross-sector review of literature and practice* (London: Learning and Skills Research Centre, 2003), p. 35; Thomas G. Weiss and Anoulak Kittikhoun, 'Theory vs. practice: a symposium', *International Studies Review* 13: 1, 2011, pp. 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2010.00991.x>; Gerry Stoker and Mark Evans, 'Evidence-based policy making and social science', in Gerry Stoker and Mark Evans, eds, *Evidence-based policy making in the social sciences: methods that matter* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2016).

²³ Isabel Bramsen and Anine Hagemann, 'How research travels to policy: the case of Nordic peace research', *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1843–72.

Laurie Nathan challenges the often-made argument that mediation research has had no impact on policy and practice.²⁴ He reviews international mediation policies to show that policy and practice have been strongly influenced by research. He identifies the types of research that policy-makers and practitioners find useful and where mediation research has had an impact: case-specific research, comparative research on thematic issues and research on mediation best practices. In contrast, he argues, policy-makers and practitioners are less interested in large-N statistical analysis. He concludes that the supposed gap between mediation research and practice only applies to certain types of research and not all of it.

Jamie Pring's study of African mediation support structures further nuances this picture by distinguishing between different communities of practice involved in mediation efforts.²⁵ Providing insights on the shortcomings of generalized technocratic approaches to peacebuilding, Pring documents a divide between the technocratic expertise of mediation support units and the more context-specific diplomatic community involved in the practice of mediation. This also serves as an illustration of why international organizations sometimes fail to effectively solve the problems they set out to address: they generate a specialized community of practice that becomes detached from the communities of practice that they are supposed to serve. While thereby explaining a common feature in peacebuilding and global governance, Pring points to ways in which such disconnects can be bridged through active cooperation and knowledge exchange among different communities of practice.

Takeaways for peace research and IR

The articles in this special section contribute to peace research as well as to broader IR, as they provide insights on several questions at the heart of the two disciplines. The first part, on the nature of the knowledge produced in peace research, speaks to the core of debates about the original purpose of peace research and its proximity to or distance from policy debates.²⁶ This is also reflected in debates in IR as a practice-oriented discipline. While it is generally accepted that 'normative purposes' influence analyses,²⁷ the question about whether empiricism or norma-

²⁴ Laurie Nathan, 'The customer is always right: the policy research arena in international mediation', *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1973–93.

²⁵ Jamie Pring, 'Analysing the divide between technocrats and diplomats in international organizations', *International Affairs* 99: 5, 2023, pp. 1995–2014.

²⁶ Tanja Brühl, 'Friedensforschung als "Superwissenschaft" oder Sub-Disziplin?', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 19: 1, 2012, pp. 171–83, <https://doi.org/10.5771/0946-7165-2012-1-171>; Harald Müller, 'Über allen Gipfeln ist Ruh: zum Verhältnis von Friedensforschung und IB', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 19: 1, 2012, pp. 155–69, <https://doi.org/10.5771/0946-7165-2012-1-155>; Keith Krause, 'Emancipation and critique in peace and conflict research', *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4: 2, 2019, pp. 292–8, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogy049>; Isak Svensson, 'Letter to the editors: emancipation and critique in peace and conflict research', *Journal of Global Security Studies* 5: 4, 2020, pp. 703–7, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogaa037>.

²⁷ Robert O. Keohane, 'Big questions in the study of world politics', in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds, *The Oxford handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Steve Smith, 'Six wishes for a more relevant discipline of International Relations', in Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds, *The Oxford handbook of International Relations*.

tivism should prevail remains contested.²⁸ Second, the inquiry into whose knowledge counts is firmly embedded in the current call for a stronger valuation of locally-produced knowledge and discussions about trans-scalar peacebuilding.²⁹ This also relates to debates about globalizing and decolonizing the study of IR and the need for more diversity and pluralism in the study of broader world politics.³⁰ Finally, the question about the ways in which research influences policy and practice is part of an emerging research agenda in peace studies on what types of knowledge influence which types of actors and institutions.³¹ This is also relevant to the broader discipline of IR as it identifies the obstacles to more policy-relevant research, in terms of the different incentive structures, requested competencies, quality measurements and professional ethos.³²

Overall, as several of the articles in this special section reiterate, the uptake of scientific evidence into policy does not follow a linear path. Interactions between the spheres of science and policy and practice are characterized by iterative processes, and policies are never just about problem-solving, but also about values and political preferences. This special section critically reviews these aspects by looking not only at transmission channels from academia to practice, but also at the ways knowledge is produced in the first place and how political practices feed back into these knowledge production processes.

Beyond its scholarly audience, the special section is also relevant for practitioners, as one of its core questions is about how peace research can become more policy-relevant without thereby reproducing prevalent biases and hierarchies in the field of practice. By addressing the questions of ontology and methodology at the heart of peace research, such an inquiry is even more important given the recent changes in world politics. Not just since the military invasion by Russia

²⁸ Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, 'Between utopia and reality: the practical discourses of International Relations', in Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds, *The Oxford handbook of International Relations*; Krause, 'Emancipation and critique in peace and conflict research'; João Nunes, 'Reclaiming the political: emancipation and critique in security studies', *Security Dialogue* 43: 4, 2012, pp. 345–61, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010612450747>; David Chandler and Nik Hynek, *Critical perspectives on human security: rethinking emancipation and power in International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2011); Jonathan Bright and John Gledhill, 'A divided discipline? Mapping peace and conflict studies', *International Studies Perspectives* 19: 2, 2018, pp. 128–47, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekx009>.

²⁹ Björkdahl and Höglund, 'Precarious peacebuilding'; Gearoid Millar, 'Toward a trans-scalar peace system: challenging complex global conflict systems', *Peacebuilding* 8: 3, 2020, pp. 261–78, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2019.1634866>; Sara Hellmüller, 'A trans-scalar approach to peacebuilding and transitional justice: insights from the Democratic Republic of Congo', *Cooperation and Conflict* 57: 4, 2021, pp. 415–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00108367211059448>.

³⁰ Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, *The making of global International Relations: origins and evolution of IR at its centenary* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019); Smith, 'Six wishes for a more relevant discipline of International Relations'.

³¹ Eriksson and Sundelius, 'Molding minds that form policy'; Gearoid Millar, 'Decentering the intervention experts: Ethnographic peace research and policy engagement', *Cooperation and Conflict* 53: 2, 2018, pp. 259–76, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836718768631>; Krause, 'Emancipation and critique in peace and conflict research'; Luc Reychler, 'Challenges of peace research', *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11: 1, 2006, pp. 1–16, https://www3.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol11_1/11n1Reychler.pdf; Oliver P. Richmond, *The grand design: the evolution of the international peace architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2022). (Unless otherwise noted at point of citation, all URLs cited in this article were accessible on 24 July 2023.)

³² Eriksson and Sundelius, 'Molding minds that form policy', p. 57; Stephen D. Krasner, Joseph S. Nye, Jr, Janice Gross Stein and Robert O. Keohane, 'Autobiographical reflections on bridging the policy-academy divide', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22: 1, 2009, pp. 111–28 at p. 118, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557570902727551>.

in Ukraine in 2022 and recent discussions about a ‘change of time’ (*Zeitenwende*), the liberal internationalism which created a favourable environment for concerted peacebuilding endeavours in the 1990s has been waning,³³ with scholars questioning the performance of both the liberal international order and liberal peacebuilding strategies.³⁴ From the contributions to this special section, however, it becomes clear that any such revisiting of historical arguments and positions must consider what knowledge is privileged, whose knowledge this is, and how the knowledge relates to the practices that it seeks to inform. Only then can built-in biases, hierarchies and practical disconnects be overcome in future knowledge production on peace.

³³ Constance Duncombe and Tim Dunne, ‘After liberal world order’, *International Affairs* 94: 1, 2018, pp. 25–42, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix234>; G. John Ikenberry, ‘The end of liberal international order?’, *International Affairs* 94: 1, 2018, pp. 7–23, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix241>.

³⁴ Hendrik Hegemann and Martin Kahl, ‘Weniger Demokratie wagen? Möglichkeiten und Grenzen liberaler Friedensstrategien nach der *Zeitenwende*’, *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung*, publ. online 6 April 2023; John J. Mearsheimer, ‘Bound to fail: the rise and fall of the liberal international order’, *International Security* 43: 4, 2019, pp. 7–50, https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00342; John Karlsrud, ‘From liberal peacebuilding to stabilization and counterterrorism’, *International Peacekeeping* 26: 1, 2019, pp. 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2018.1502040>; John M. Owen, ‘Liberalism and its alternatives, again’, *International Studies Review* 20: 2, 2018, pp. 309–16, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy026>; John Heathershaw, ‘Towards better theories of peacebuilding: beyond the liberal peace debate’, *Peacebuilding* 1: 2, 2013, pp. 275–82, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2013.783260>.