
**CONVERGENCES BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL
SECURITY STUDIES AND PEACE STUDIES**

Louis Kriesberg

MILLENNIAL REFLECTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

**CONFLICT, SECURITY, FOREIGN
POLICY, AND INTERNATIONAL
POLITICAL ECONOMY**

Past Paths and Future Directions
in International Studies

Edited by

Michael Brecher and Frank P. Harvey

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

2002

CONVERGENCES BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY STUDIES AND PEACE STUDIES

Louis Kriesberg

International security studies and peace studies are not a single sub-field of international relations. Analysts in security studies and those in peace studies have generally viewed themselves and been viewed by others as working in quite different domains. Some persons in each area have been critical or dismissive of the efforts of those in the other. Nevertheless, many persons across both areas actually share significant concerns and questions, such as how to avoid or to limit wars and other violent conflicts. Furthermore, the work being done in each of these domains is increasingly overlapping. To enhance the possibilities of beneficial cooperation among analysts in these domains, the past relations and the current movements toward convergence should be examined. After doing so, I will discuss promising options for the future.

Earlier Relations

In previous decades, many persons working in security studies and many persons working in peace studies differed in several significant ways. For example, they tended to draw from different inter-

national relations approaches. Persons doing international security studies tended to draw from the realist approach and those doing peace studies tended to draw from a liberal idealist or constructivist approach.¹ Realists generally assume that states are unitary actors seeking to maximize power. Liberal idealists, however, generally stress the importance of diverse domestic actors, transnational organizations, and normative factors. Realists emphasize the anarchic nature of the world system, and other approaches stress the varying degree of integration and the shared ways of thinking in the world or regions of it.²

Peace studies analysts have generally drawn from a wider variety of fields of inquiry than have analysts working in international security studies. Many workers in peace studies have been more receptive, for example, to the perspective and insights of feminist thinking in international relations.³ The feminist attention to the manifold roles of women in sustaining social life fits well with the concern of many in peace studies about the ways people at the grass roots affect and are affected by so-called high politics. The emphasis among many feminists upon the distinctive qualities of women has contributed to studying the roles women have played in peace movements and the roles they might play in countering wars and overcoming large-scale violence.⁴

Some peace studies analysts have also been relatively attentive to the possible impact of religion and of culture on war and peace.⁵ Analysts have shown how religious beliefs, organizations, and leaders have contributed to mitigating as well as to exacerbating violent conflicts. Additionally, some workers in the peace studies domain have been relatively attentive to transnational social movement organizations and to critical analyses of global political economy. The many trends constituting globalization have increased the power of multinational corporations, and the persons who control those organizations increasingly shape and use the global market for their benefit.⁶ They also provide new opportunities for resistance and more egalitarian relations.⁷

Other differences are also noteworthy. International security analysts have tended to assume the perspective of one primary actor in an international conflict, typically their own country, while peace studies analysts tended to take a more global or systemic perspective. Persons in international security studies generally focused on military means while persons in peace studies stressed nonviolent

I thank the following persons who read earlier drafts of this paper and kindly gave me their comments: Eileen Babbitt, James Bennett, Volker Franke, and Nils Petter Gleitsch. I, of course, remain responsible for the observations and judgments made in this chapter.

International security analysts have examined in great detail, for example, the nature of nuclear warheads and delivery systems and their impact on military strategy.⁸ Issues relating to deterrence and to nuclear proliferation have drawn great attention since the end of World War II. More recently, attention has been given to chemical and bacteriological weapons and to terrorism.

Finally, international security analysts tended to concentrate on avoiding war (negative peace), while peace researchers often stressed issues of justice and equity (positive peace) as well. Members of each camp also tended to differ in their institutional bases: those working in international security often were employed in institutes receiving foundation and government funds, while those in peace studies often were employed in colleges and in universities, and sometimes in nongovernmental social movement organizations.

These differences were particularly strong in the United States in the early decades after World War II. The differences arose in large part from varying career origins, intellectual traditions, and network associations. In the United States, an important tradition in peace studies, emphasizing nonviolence and social justice, initially developed in church-related colleges. The first peace studies program was established in 1948 at the Church of Brethren-affiliated Manchester College in Indiana. In the late 1950s, research-oriented centers began to be established, notably the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan.

Many of the people engaged in security studies flourished in college and university departments and international relations programs. They also were associated with academic and nonacademic institutes associated with the U.S. government and its armed forces—for example, RAND.⁹ As I discuss later, the divergence in theory, research, and practice between people engaged in these two domains has hampered the members' work in each camp.

Some people, of course, did research and examined policy alternatives that in some ways bridged these differences. One arena of shared interests was the causes of war and of peace; indeed, analyses on this topic by Wright, Richardson, and Deutsch et al. were part of the important quantitative tradition in peace research and hence peace studies.¹⁰ Work in this tradition has continued among both peace researchers and international security analysts, as illustrated by the work of Singer, Isard, Leng, and Vasquez.¹¹ They have tended to analyze factors that might account for variations in warfare over time and among different countries, often using quantitative data.

Those factors include systemic features such as the number of major powers in the system, state characteristics such as type of governance, and relationship factors such as trading interdependency.

Among other topics, considerable writing about crisis management and foreign policy decision making constituted areas where peace studies and international security studies have overlapped, with some variance in emphasis. Thus, some persons in the international security studies domain tended to assume that officials generally acted in terms of rational calculations of relatively fixed national interests, while analysts in the peace studies domain often emphasized group, normative, and emotional factors. Nevertheless, some analysts identified with each domain read and critiqued each other's work and influenced each other. This may be noted in work on the way officials from antagonistic states interact with each other in crises.¹²

Many professional associations also provided settings for informal and formal exchanges of ideas. For example, the International Studies Association has long included an International Security Studies Section and a Peace Studies Section, and members from each section sometimes participated together on the same panels. Within the American Sociological Association, the Section on the Sociology of World Conflicts was established in the early 1970s and its membership always has included students of peace and of military forces. The name of the section currently is Peace, War, and Social Conflict. The International Sociological Association included a Research Committee on Armed Forces and Society (RCoI), and in 1980 that was reorganized to include sociologists studying international relations, peace, and conflict resolution; the name of the research committee was changed to Armed Forces and Conflict Resolution.¹³

The differences between the peace and security domains have not been as great in Europe as in the United States. Thus, many European peace institutes included work related to alternative military doctrines. In varying degrees this was the case for the International Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), established in 1959; the Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford, England, established in 1973; the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF); the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI); and the Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI). In such European centers, ideas were developed, for example, about nonoffensive defense, which many peace researchers argue contributed to changes in Soviet thinking and hence to the ending of the cold war.¹⁴ Thus, the Soviet

military posture was modified so that it would be recognized as defensive and not regarded as threatening offensive actions.

In many other countries in the world, international security studies and peace studies emerged only in the 1980s or 1990s. In the contemporary context, for reasons that I will discuss, the domains are becoming less sharply differentiated. Consequently, work in the relatively new centers of study reflects some of the changes that emerged after the cold war ended, including greater convergence between international security studies and peace studies.

From 1948 until the end of the 1980s, Americans both in security studies and in peace studies typically concentrated their attention on the cold war. The former generally viewed it as a military contest between two camps consisting of governments.¹⁵ Persons working in international security studies emphasized military relations, particularly concerning nuclear deterrence and extended deterrence. They gave attention to the military hardware as well as the doctrines about their use. Some of them also studied foreign policy decision making and crisis management, particularly as conducted by high officials.¹⁶

Analysts working in peace studies examined social movements, such as peace movement organizations opposing nuclear weapons or engaged in people-to-people diplomacy.¹⁷ They also analyzed the role of the military-industrial complex, particularly in the United States.¹⁸ In addition, many of them examined the processes of socialization in families and schools and the influences of the mass media.¹⁹ Some of these researchers were themselves associated with peace movement organizations.

Interestingly, analysts in both camps generally failed to anticipate the sudden transformation and ending of the cold war. Neither camp undertook intensive analyses about the possible explanations and implications of that failure. However, some persons in each domain offered reasons for the transformation in terms of the policies they had previously argued, those policies, they said, worked to prevent an escalation of the cold war and eventually to transform it.²⁰ Thus, security analysts contended that the long-standing militant containment policy of Democratic and Republican governments or the arms buildup and proactive anti-Soviet policy of President Ronald Reagan's first administration forced the Soviet leaders to yield and accept a new accommodation.

On the other hand, peace studies analysts pointed to other factors to account for the transformation of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, the ending of the cold war, and then the dissolution of the Soviet Union. They stressed the importance of the assurances given to the Soviet Union in the 1975 Helsinki Accords about the permanence of the borders established at the end of World War II. They also stressed the growing social exchanges and human ties fostered by détente, which continued despite the Reagan administration's lack of support for such activities.²¹

In short, many differences existed in past decades between persons working in peace studies and security studies. They differed in their research methodologies, in the importance accorded to particular values, in the questions they posed, and hence in the kinds of answers they tended to provide. These differences limited the work of persons in each domain, as they talked past each other. They too often ignored each other's ideas and findings, or when they did give them attention, it was to argue against them. If analysts in each domain gave more consideration to each other's work, they might have complemented each other's efforts and each enriched the other, as discussed in this chapter.

Contemporary Developments

In the post-cold war era, the domains of peace studies and international security studies have moved much closer together. Thus, security is now understood to refer to much more than military matters. It is widely thought to include concerns such as environmental degradation, refugee flows, and economic issues. Furthermore, large-scale violence directed against ethnic, religious, and other communal groups became matters of broadly shared international attention.²² The roles of international governmental organizations and of nongovernmental organizations in preventing and stopping highly destructive conflicts rapidly expanded. Many of those organizations also increasingly became engaged in peacebuilding after such conflicts.²³ These and related developments are due to profound global changes and associated changes in ways of interpreting the transformed world. Partly because of these new circumstances, the analysts in both domains have also undergone many changes in the questions they pose and the answers they offer.

Global Changes

In recent decades, as is widely noted, the world has been undergoing profound and rapid changes. This is evident in the increasing economic integration, ever more swift and intensive communication, and many other global trends. Consequently, the world is becoming more homogenized, but with various people resisting and some reacting violently against that very development.²⁴ Furthermore, multinational business corporations, transnational social movement organizations, and international governmental institutions are increasing in number, size, and resources.²⁵ All this contributes to reducing state sovereignty.

These interacting developments have profound significance for peace and security studies. Conflicts marked by large-scale violence within states greatly increased in the 1990s but show some signs of slackening since then.²⁶ These conflicts have often been between peoples mobilized by appeals to different ethnic, linguistic, religious, or other communal identities. Although these conflicts may seem to be domestic, external connections generally are significant; they are manifested in the growing engagement of diaspora groups, the impact of the violence on neighboring countries, and the support given to one side by officials in other governments who seek to advance their own interests.

As a consequence of such developments and the other global trends previously noted, international norms about human rights are increasingly shared. The demand to take action to stop gross violations of human rights has become widespread and insisted upon by many states and international organizations, nongovernmental as well as governmental. The visibility of such human rights violations and the normative insistence to stop them have resulted in numerous interventions by international organizations such as the United Nations. These interventions, unlike earlier UN interventions, were not contingent upon the concurrence of the combating parties.²⁷ This has given a new legitimacy to the use of force in international settings.²⁸ Yet the costs in deaths and protracted engagement have diminished the willingness of many governments to undertake such interventions. In any event, the increased relative significance of large-scale internal conflicts has raised the salience of domestic conflicts for security studies workers and violence management for peace studies workers.²⁹

Changes among Peace and Security Analysts

Many changes in the activities, institutional settings, and ways of thinking among persons in the security studies and peace studies domains have occurred since the 1970s and especially since 1989. These changes have tended to bring security analysts and peace analysts into closer association.

The development of problem-solving conflict resolution ideas and practices has affected greatly both security and peace studies.³⁰ This has been particularly so in the United States since the early 1970s.³¹ By the end of the last century, the ideas and applications of problem-solving conflict resolution had spread and evolved in most parts of the world. This development provides a newly-shared language and way of thinking for persons working in peace studies and international security studies. Even tough-talking diplomats are now likely to assert that they are striving for win-win outcomes.

The growth of the field of conflict resolution, in conjunction with the other previously noted developments, has affected the practice of people in both international security and in peace studies. Peace researchers are much more likely themselves to conduct and to associate with people who engage in peacemaking and peace-building work. This includes arranging and facilitating conflict resolution workshops and dialogue groups, providing conflict resolution training, and consulting about conflict management systems. Such work is undertaken by a wide variety of organizations, such as the Carter Center of Emory University, CDR Associates, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Mennonite Conciliation Service, Search for Common Ground, and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP).

In a complementary fashion, persons engaged in international security studies are increasingly engaged in studying how to prevent large-scale violence and to build stable peace.³² They strive to do so using a wide array of nonviolent methods, including economic sanctions and diplomatic mediation. The Institute for Defense Analysis in Alexandria, Virginia, in conjunction with the United States Institute of Peace, has designed a computer-based peace-building/postsettlement transition simulation to help examine alternative strategies. Persons in international security studies increasingly work with their own and foreign governments to foster reconciliation and institutions to manage conflicts, as they are involved with activities relating to peacekeeping, nation-building, and peace-building. Furthermore, they increasingly associate with persons in nongovern-

mental organizations—for example, those providing peace-building services, advocating the protection of human rights, and giving humanitarian assistance.³³

As a result of all these developments, more people are engaged in the practice of peace-building, and persons with backgrounds in the international security and the peace studies camps more often interact with each other. In addition, more venues for such interactions have been established—for example, the United States Institute of Peace, founded in 1984. Intellectual exchange is fostered by journals such as *Security Dialogue* and *International Security*. Conflict resolution courses and programs are increasingly being introduced in traditional international relations programs. Furthermore, programs in civilian institutions provide training for military and other national defense executives and managers, as in the national security studies courses provided by Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs and Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies. Finally, the curricula at military service academies, the command and general staff colleges, and the war colleges increasingly reflect a broader range of perspectives and of security tasks, such as peacekeeping.³⁴

Future Developments

In anticipating the future, I will stress likely developments that I regard as desirable. I anticipate that new subfields will develop that cut across the domains of security and peace studies. Some of these subfields will focus on substantive issues. For example, they are likely to relate increasingly to different conflict stages: prevention, limiting and interrupting violent conflict escalation, terminating violence, and postconflict peace-building. In addition, they are likely to focus on particular ways of conducting and terminating conflicts; such methods include mediation and negotiation, constructive ways of conducting a struggle, contributing to conflict transformation, and fostering domestic conditions and institutions that are conducive to peace. Finally, some issues relating to general theoretical and analytical approaches will affect the work of most people in peace studies and security studies.

One substantive subfield that has rapidly grown relates to early warning and preventive diplomacy. At first, the emphasis was on forecasting the outbreak of intense violence and providing informa-

tion officials might use in anticipating their responses to such violence and its consequences. This work drew on the international security approach. Subsequently, the emphasis shifted to developing policies for averting and limiting such violent outbreaks. This emphasis upon preventive diplomacy drew relatively more on the peace studies approach.³⁵

A major subfield focuses on interrupting and stopping violence. The matter of particular interest here is the role of external actors, whether international governmental organizations, nongovernmental actors, or national governments. Thus, there is important new work on sanctions. For example, targeted, or "smart," sanctions have recently been stressed, but even their effectiveness is in question for certain goals.³⁶

Another expanding substantive subfield relates to peacekeeping and postconflict peace-building. Several issues are currently receiving considerable attention, and that is likely to increase among peace and security analysts. Peacekeeping by the UN and by regional international organizations has expanded greatly after the end of the cold war.³⁷ Military personnel are increasingly trained in peacekeeping operations and how to avert conflict escalations.³⁸

Currently, increasing attention also is being given to sustaining agreements that have been reached.³⁹ Particular attention is more and more given to building institutions that would reduce intercommunal conflicts and provide channels for their nonviolent management.⁴⁰ This includes various forms of federal structures, autonomy, and power sharing. It also includes democratic processes providing basic political rights. Increasingly, too, attention is being given to the civil society needed to sustain democratic processes and institutions.

The finding that democracies do not make war against each other has become a matter of great interest and the subject of considerable research. Workers in peace studies and security studies are examining the nature of that relationship and of the relationship between democratic polities and foreign intervention.⁴¹ Nongovernmental organizations that provide humanitarian relief, medical care, and other services are proliferating. They are working in some of the same areas as do national governmental organizations and international governmental organizations. Consequently, inefficient use of resources and inappropriate competition sometimes arise. Ways to achieve a more effective division of labor and better coordination are increasingly being discussed.⁴²

Practitioners and analysts alike are giving great attention to attempts at reconciliation between antagonists, and this attention is likely to grow. The issues are complex, since the very concept is multidimensional. In moving toward reconciliation, one or more party in a fight is likely to seek justice, truth, security, and kindness, perhaps even forgiveness.⁴³ Various groups may emphasize one or another of these dimensions at different times. Consequently, balancing the achievement of various dimensions of reconciliation is difficult and occurs in varying sequences and degrees among different groups in the opposing communities.⁴⁴

Aside from various substantive subfields within which persons working in peace studies and in security studies will act in some degree cooperatively, some general issues will affect people working in these domains. For example, policy-relevant work is likely to be increasingly done for and with nongovernmental actors and not directed only at government officials. Academics may well spend some time engaged in nonacademic work, while persons engaged in applied work are likely for a time to take academic appointments. This engagement will most likely affect not only the questions asked but also the kind of answers sought and found. Thus, attention is likely to be given to relatively malleable factors, to agency rather than to structural conditions.

In addition, the increased interaction and overlap between persons in these domains may have a salutary effect on theory, research, and practice in each. Much international relations theorizing has been directed at what others have written, with too little reference to evidence relevant to the ideas. Advocates of particular approaches may overstate the case in order to get a hearing for matters that they feel have been given too little attention. But that can result in having the ideas dismissed, and that further escalates the debate. So driven, the debates become difficult to resolve.

Attention to the shared questions is a way to transform such debates. Attention also needs to be given to the information that would help answer the questions that are posed. The information may be qualitative or quantitative, but in either case, it has an external referent about which experientially-based consensus is possible. Thus, the discussions about the finding that democracies do not make war on each other have relied heavily on a variety of empirical analyses.

Finally, some persons in these domains are likely to undertake analyses that help synthesize the ideas and practices of international security studies and of peace studies. Some such work is being done,

and more is needed.⁴⁵ The synthesizing work obviously requires focusing on policy-relevant issues. One such focus relates to the dilemmas associated with advancing human rights and justice while also settling fights and ending violence. Not all values can be maximized at the same time, and this poses dilemmas as the pursuit of a good goal may result in many bad consequences. Improving knowledge about the likelihood of various consequences of different strategies will contribute to resolving the dilemmas.

Such knowledge, however, cannot be precise for any single case. We mortals will have to rely on good judgment in each case.⁴⁶ Yet, insofar as good information and understanding is widely shared, good judgment is more likely to occur and be able to be followed.

Conclusions

I anticipate that convergence between security studies and peace studies will continue as the range of the peacemaking and peacebuilding agenda grows broader and more complex. Work in each domain has already benefited by the increasing overlap between the domains. The policy questions addressed and the repertoire of answers offered by persons in each domain have expanded. Peace studies workers increasingly recognize that atrocities occur, that violence takes many forms, and that there are times for acting with urgency. Security studies workers increasingly recognize the growing importance of cooperating with nongovernment actors and of expanding reliance on nonmilitary options.

Progress is being made. One important sign of and contributor to that progress is the increased range of voices joining the conversations about peace and security. As previously noted, this is the case for the increasing engagement of women in peace and security studies and the growing application of feminist thought in those domains. They are providing new insights and important perspectives.

In addition, work by persons in and from regions of the world previously excluded or ignored from conversations are now included. Thus, many centers of peacemaking and security studies are being established in more and more countries in the developing world. In South Africa, for example, some centers have done significant work for many years and are now broadening their range of work. The Centre for Intergroup Studies, for instance, was founded in Cape-town in 1968, under the leadership of Hendrik W. van der Merwe; it focused on conflict resolution within South Africa, helping to de-

- relates of War I: Research Origins and Rationale*, ed. J. David Singer (New York: Free Press, 1979), 265–97; Walter Isard, *Understanding Conflict and the Science of Peace* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1992); Russell J. Leng, "Influence Strategies and Interstate Conflict," in Singer, *The Correlates of War*, 124–57; John Vasquez, *The War Puzzle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
12. For example, see Glenn H. Snyder and Paul Diesing, *Conflict among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making, and System Structure in International Crises* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977); Richard Ned Lebow, *Between Peace and War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981); Michael Brecher, *Crises in World Politics* (Oxford, England: Pergamon, 1993); Margaret G. Hermann and Charles F. Hermann, "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry," *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1989): 361–87; Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976).
 13. In the late 1970s, the idea of broadening the scope of RCoI was raised by some International Studies Association members interested in finding a hospitable research committee for their activities. Exploring options for this group, I was encouraged by Morris Janowitz, a leading figure in RCoI, to join that research committee and broaden its scope. Gwyn Harries-Jenkins, then chair of RCoI, agreed, and the scope and name of the committee was formally changed. Sociologists studying military forces predominate in the membership of the committee, but those studying conflict resolution and nonviolence also belong and participate in panel sessions and other committee activities.
 14. Jorgen Dragsdahl, "How Peace Research Has Reshaped the European Arms Dialogue," in *Annual Review of Peace Activism, 1989*, ed. John Tierman (Boston: Winston Foundation for World Peace, 1989), 39–45.
 15. Many peace researchers, particularly in Europe and in the Third World, examined imperialism and economic dependency. For example, see the frequently cited article by Johan Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism," published originally in the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1971; it is reprinted in Johan Galtung, *Peace and World Structure: Essays in Peace Research* (Copenhagen: Ejlers, 1980).
 16. Snyder and Diesing, *Conflict among Nations*; Graham T. Allison, *The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).
 17. John Lofland, *Polite Protestors: The American Peace Movement of the 1980s* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Sam Marullo and John Lofland, eds., *Peace Action in the Eighties* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990).
 18. Dieter Senghass, *Rüstung und Militarismus* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972).
 19. James William Gibson, *Warrior Dreams: Violence and Manhood in Post-Vietnam America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995).
 20. Louis Kriesberg, *International Conflict Resolution: The U.S.-USSR and Middle East Cases* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992); Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, eds., *International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995); William Curti Wohlforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions during the Cold War* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993).
 21. Mary Kaldor, "Who Killed the Cold War?" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (July–August 1995): 57–60.
 22. Walker Conner, *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994); Donald L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).
 23. Larry Dunn and Louis Kriesberg, "Mediating Intermediaries: Expanding Roles of Transnational Organizations," in *Studies in International Mediation: Essays in Honour of Jeffrey Z. Rubin*, ed. Jacob Bercovitch (London and New York: Macmillan and St. Martin's, 2002).
 24. Benjamin Barber, "Jihad vs. McWorld," *Atlantic Monthly*, March 1992, 53–63.
 25. Smith, Chatfield, and Pagnucco, *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics*.
 26. Ted Robert Gurr, *Peoples versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2000).
 27. Otara A. Otunna and Michael W. Doyle, eds., *Peacemaking and Peacekeeping* (New York/Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998).
 28. Andrew J. Goodpaster, *When Diplomacy Is Not Enough: Managing Multinational Military Interventions* (New York: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1996), 1–38.
 29. Noted in personal communication by Eileen Babbitt.
 30. Persons working in the problem-solving conflict resolution approach tend, in varying degree, to emphasize ways in which adversaries in a conflict shift from seeing each other as engaged in a struggle in which what one side gains is at the expense of the other to seeing a mutual problem for which they seek a solution that has some mutual benefit.
 31. Louis Kriesberg, "The Growth of the Conflict Resolution Field," in *Turbulent Peace*, ed. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aal (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2000), 407–26.
 32. Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, *Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1997); Arie M. Kacowicz, Yaacov Bar-Siman Tov, Ole Elgstrom, and Magnus Jerneck, eds., *Stable Peace among Nations* (New York/Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000).
 33. Alice Ackermann, *Making Peace Prevail: Preventing Violent Conflict in Macedonia* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2000).
 34. Volker Franke pointed out some of these developments in a personal communication.
 35. David Carment and Patrick James, eds., *Peace in the Midst of Wars* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998); Michael S. Lund, *Preventing Violent Conflicts* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1996).

36. David Cortright and George A. Lopez, eds. *Economic Sanctions: Panacea or Peacebuilding in a Post-Cold War World* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1995); David Cortright and George Lopez, with Richard W. Conroy, Jaleh Dashti-Gibson, and Julia Wagler, *The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2000). Evidence against the effectiveness of economic sanctions has been reported for a long time by peace researchers and others. For example, see Peter Wallensteen, "Characteristics of Economic Sanctions," *Journal of Peace Research* 5, no. 3 (1968): 248-67.
37. Robert A. Rubinstein, "Cultural Aspects of Peacekeeping: Notes on the Substance of Symbols," *Millennium* 22, no. 3 (1993): 547-62.
38. David Last, "Organizing for Effective Peacebuilding," in *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*, ed. Tom Woodhouse and Oliver Ramsbotham (London: Cass, 2000), 80-96.
39. Fen Osler Hampson, *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlements Succeed or Fail* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1996).
40. John McGarry and Brendan O'Leary, eds., *The Politics of Ethnic Conflict* (London: Routledge, 1993).
41. Nils Petter Gleditsch and Havard Hegre, "Peace and Democracy," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41, no. 2 (1997): 283-310; Margaret G. Hermann and Charles W. Kegley Jr., "The U.S. Use of Military Intervention to Promote Democracy: Evaluating the Record," *International Interactions* 24, no. 2 (1998): 91-114; Bruce Russett, "The Democratic Peace: And Yet It Moves," *International Security* 19 (spring 1995): 164-75; Bruce Russett and John R. Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organization* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).
42. Louis Kriesberg, "Coordinating Intermediary Peace Efforts," *Negotiation Journal* 12 (October 1996): 341-52; John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997).
43. Michael Henderson, *The Forgiveness Factor* (London: Grosvenor Books, 1996); Martha Minow, *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998); Eugene Weiner, ed., *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (New York: Continuum, 1998).
44. Louis Kriesberg, "Paths to Varieties of Inter-Communal Reconciliation," in *From Conflict Resolution to Peacebuilding*, ed. Ho-Won Jeong (Fitchburg, Md.: Dartmouth, 1999).
45. Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution* (Cambridge, England: Polity, 1999).
46. Isaiah Berlin, "My Intellectual Path," *New York Review of Books*, May 14, 1998, 53-60.
47. Lederach, *Building Peace*; Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen, Kai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen, and Finn Tschudi, *Searching for Peace* (London and Sterling, Va.: Pluto, 2000).