THE CONFLICT RESOLUTION FIELD

Origins, Growth, and Differentiation

Louis Kriesberg

As the world changes, so does the field of conflict resolution (CR). Moreover, as the techniques of CR develop, CR affects the way the world changes. This chapter traces those interactions.

CR is oriented toward changing conflicts so that they can be conducted constructively, even creatively, in the sense that violence is minimized, antagonism between adversaries is overcome, outcomes are mutually acceptable to the opponents, and settlements are enduring. CR includes long-term strategies, short-term tactics, and actions by adversaries as well as by mediators. It is based on the work of academic analysts and official and nonofficial practitioners. As such, the rapidly expanding CR field is not a narrowly defined discipline but a general approach.[1]

The first part of this chapter examines the major phases in the development of the CR approach, particularly as it relates to international relations. The second part of the chapter discusses current issues in the field and likely future developments.

PHASES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CR

CR is a complex field of endeavor, with many interdependent kinds of activities. This is the natural consequence of the many tasks its practitioners seek to accomplish and the diverse sources of its development. This section discusses

the contributions made by scholars, practitioners, and organizations within four periods: 1914–45, when ideas and actions prepared the way for the emergence of the CR field; 1946–69, a period of early efforts and basic research; 1970–85, a period of crystallization and expansion; and 1986–present, a time of differentiation and institutionalization.

The periods are not discrete; events and developments in later years have antecedents in earlier periods. The sequence in which matters are discussed indicates their relative salience, not their origins. For a chronological listing of major publications and events in the field, see the appendix. Developments in the United States are given particular attention, partly because of the central role they have played in what is becoming an increasingly global endeavor.

1914–45: Precursors

The outbreak of World War I undermined liberal optimism that spreading democracy and economic expansion would produce a relatively harmonious world in the near future. Wilsonian idealism briefly revived such expectations in the postwar era, but they were short-lived. The Great Depression, the rise of fascism, and the horrors and devastation of World War II further diluted faith in the attainment of enduring peace. These occurrences provided the context for efforts that helped create modern CR.

In the post–World War I period, analyses of the eruption of large-scale conflicts advanced CR's development, including studies of class-based struggles, particularly revolutions, as exemplified in the work of Crane Brinton (1938). Case studies examined the outbreak of wars, and quantitative analyses were made of the incidence of wars, notably in Quincy Wright's monumental study (1942). Another major subject in this period was the analysis of conflicts within organizations, particularly labor-management conflicts. In this regard, the work of Mary Parker Follett (1942) notably helped lay the groundwork for contemporary CR.

The importance of nonrational sources in the outbreak of revolutions and wars was a major theme in some of this work. Thus, research on these matters examined scapegoating and other kinds of displaced feelings, susceptibility to propaganda, personal attributes of leaders, and their manipulation of powerful political symbols (Lasswell 1930). These phenomena were evident in various social movements and their attendant conflicts. For some analysts, the rise of Nazism in Germany exemplified many aspects of these developments.

In addition to analyzing the causes of intense conflicts, work was done on ways in which conflicts can be managed and how their destructive escalation can be avoided. First appearing in the 1930s, these analyses of social-psychological and group processes in ethnic, industrial, family, and other

conflicts left a legacy of methods and issues upon which CR scholars have built (Lewin 1948).

To some extent, the nonrational aspects of many conflicts make them amenable to management, because they are not based entirely on a clash of objective interests. The human relations approach to industrial conflict built on this assumption (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1943). Other research about industrial organizations stressed the way struggles based on differences of interests could be controlled by norms and structures if asymmetries in power were not too large. The experience with regulated collective bargaining provided a model for this possibility (e.g., see Jackson 1952 and the National Labor Relations Board, www.nlrb.gov).

1946–69: Early Efforts and Basic Research

In the 1950s and 1960s, rapid growth in many CR-relevant scholarly and practitioner activities provided the foundations for further CR research. Some of the work was spurred by the specter of nuclear annihilation that the Cold War evoked, but many other components of CR had independent origins. Basic research in many academic disciplines helped establish a foundation for the development of CR. An early locus for such work was the University of Michigan, where the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* began publication in 1957 and the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution was established in 1959 (Harty and Modell 1991). The International Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO) was also founded in 1959 (see www.prio.no).

Obviously, social context profoundly affects the course of social conflicts and the way analysts and partisans think about them. For many years after the end of World War II, nations were preoccupied with economic reconstruction and growth. This period was followed by an era largely distinguished by concerns about justice, autonomy, and equality. In the 1960s, national liberation struggles emerged in European colonies in Africa and Asia; the United States was the scene of mass social unrest over civil rights and the country's involvement in Vietnam; and student demonstrations and national revolutions seemed to engulf the world's political landscape. Many analysts as well as activists viewed these struggles as based on valid grievances and worthy of support.

The Cold War profoundly structured world politics and the ways analysts thought about CR for more than four decades, but its character changed significantly over that time. The 1962 Cuban missile crisis was followed by a brief thaw in the Cold War. A longer-lasting transformation began in 1969, aided by three changes. First, the antagonism between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China became especially intense, as revealed in the bloody skirmishes along their border. Second, the Social Democratic Party

came to power in West Germany and instituted its policy of accommodation with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union (*Ostpolitik*). Third, Richard Nixon became president of the United States and, partly as a way to end U.S. engagement in the war in Vietnam, undertook a policy of détente with the Soviet Union and of opening of relations with the People's Republic of China.

Spurred by concerns about the possible eruption of nuclear as well as non-nuclear wars, an important body of scholarly work based on quantitative methods flourished from the onset of the Cold War. Systematic data began to be collected in an effort to examine the incidence and correlates of wars (Richardson 1960; Singer 1972). In addition, quantitative data on conflicting and cooperative interactions among nations began to be collected. These data continue to be analyzed, testing CR as well as traditional international relations concepts (McClelland 1983; Isard 1988; Leng 1993; Vasquez 1993).

Another important body of work focused on the ways cooperative activities and institutions provide a basis for increasing international integration that lessens the possibility of destructive conflict. Much of this work consisted of examining variations in the levels of integration and cooperation among countries; it found that highly integrated countries formed communities with little likelihood of war, as documented in the work of Karl Deutsch et al. (1957) and others. Some analysts argued that institutions providing functional integration in limited economic or political spheres would expand and help create the reality of a common interest in peace (Mitrany 1943). Ernst B. Haas (1958) analyzed how integration crested a common interest in peace in the European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1951, which evolved into the present-day European Union.

Game theory also influenced the development of CR. It helped analysts think about the conflict implications of various payoff matrices and the strategies chosen by interacting players (Rapoport and Chammah 1965). The prisoner's dilemma payoff matrix especially has been the basis of much study. Rather than assuming a zero-sum game, in which one side wins what the other loses, the variable-sum or mixed-motive game of the prisoner's dilemma has been the subject of considerable research. In the prisoner's dilemma game, each side can choose to cooperate or to defect (and seek unilateral advantage). In the payoff matrix, if one side cooperates and the other does not, the player who cooperates loses a great deal and the defecting player gains a great deal. If they both cooperate, they both gain something; if they both defect, they both lose much. From the perspective of each party, with no additional information about what the other side will do, the best strategy is to defect; but if both sides do that, they both lose. Many experiments have been conducted to discern what factors affect the likelihood that people will follow

one strategy or the other. Thomas Schelling's (1960) influential work, also drawing from game theory, examined the logic of bargaining.

During this period, traditional diplomacy was also subjected to careful analysis, with researchers inferring principles of practice that could be used to create policy in a nuclear age (Iklé 1964). The increasing attention to the new conditions of international politics created by nuclear weapons, especially for the purpose of deterrence, stimulated growing interest in the subjective and nonrational components in foreign policy decision making and crisis behavior (Jervis 1976; Jervis, Lebow, and Stein 1985; Janis 1972).

Considerable research was done in the 1950s and 1960s on factors affecting the relations between potentially contending groups and how overt struggle can be prevented or, failing that, waged constructively and resolved amicably. Research methods included public opinion surveys, field observations, and small-group experimentation. For example, research on race and ethnic relations produced the well-documented finding that equal-status interaction among members of different ethnic groups reduces prejudice and antagonistic behavior among them. Another relevant finding is that the development of superordinate goals can bring contending groups into a cooperative relationship (Sherif 1966). Morton Deutsch (1973) conducted a variety of experiments on constructive and destructive conflict processes, helping to set the agenda for much subsequent work.

Also during this period many sociologists analyzed the processes of industrial, community, ethnic, and other kinds of conflicts (Coleman 1957). Moreover, some analyses treated social conflicts as a generic phenomenon, noting similarities as well as differences among them (Coser 1956). Recognizing the ubiquity of conflicts, many sociologists directed their attention to the functions of conflicts and how conflicts were waged and settled. Some anthropologists studied dispute settlement processes in societies with and without formal legal systems (Nader 1965; Gulliver 1979).

The analysis of nonviolent action provided another significant contribution to the development of CR (Sharp 1973; www.aeinstein.org). As articulated by some leaders of nonviolent campaigns, committing violence made future negotiation and reconciliation much more difficult. Instead, they argued, waging a nonviolent struggle enhanced the likelihood of later attaining an enduring and mutually acceptable outcome.

An additional influence in the growth of CR has been the diverse field of peace research (Stephenson 1999), which makes several kinds of contributions. It draws attention to how people in different cultures and roles are socialized to believe that certain ways of waging conflicts are proper and others are not. Peace research also examines the social and institutional bases of war,

including the military-industrial complex and other vested interests influencing the decision to pursue external conflicts; in so doing, this school of research contributes to the demystification of large-scale conflicts. The peace research community's examination of how protracted conflicts may be de-escalated is particularly germane to CR. For example, the idea underlying Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) is that de-escalation of tensions between adversaries can occur if one side announces it is undertaking conciliatory actions, invites reciprocation, and persists in conciliatory moves even when there is no immediate reciprocation (Osgood 1962). This idea has been influential in the CR field, and there is evidence that GRIT has been an effective instrument in peacemaking, under certain conditions, when applied to protracted international conflicts (Etzioni 1967; Goldstein and Freeman 1990).

While much work was being done on the academic front, actual CR practice underwent significant change during 1946–69, when unofficial diplomacy became increasingly important in international affairs. For example, in 1957, nuclear physicists and others engaged in analyzing the possible use of nuclear weapons from the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union began meeting to exchange ideas about reducing the chances that nuclear weapons would be used again (Pentz and Slovo 1981). The first meetings were held at the summer home of Cyrus Eaton in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, and developed into what have come to be called the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs. From the 1950s through the 1970s, the discussions at these meetings contributed to the signing of the Partial Test-Ban Treaty, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, and the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. In 1995, the Pugwash Conferences and Joseph Rotblat, their executive director, won the Nobel Peace Prize.

Other regular, nonofficial meetings between well-connected persons from adversarial parties also were significant in opening up new channels of communication to discuss solutions for contentious issues. One important international example is the Dartmouth Conference (Chufrin and Saunders 1993). At the urging of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Norman Cousins, then editor of the *Saturday Review*, brought together a group of prominent U.S. and Soviet citizens to find an alternate communications channel when official relations were especially strained. The first of many such meetings was at Dartmouth College in 1960.

Practice was also changing in the domestic sphere. Lines of communication among diverse community groups were sustained by ongoing interethnic and interreligious councils or dialogue groups. More particularly, in the United States the civil rights struggle gave new salience to the power of nonviolent

action. In response to these actions and to the outbreaks of violence, efforts to mitigate the civil strife associated with the protests and demonstrations included commissions of inquiry and also quiet mediation carried out by the U.S. Justice Department (see http://www.civilrightsmediation.org/).

1970–85: Crystallization and Expansion

During 1970–85, the practice of CR flourished. As new fields of CR activity were cultivated and grew, publications disseminated CR ideas and reports of experience with more and more types of mediation were published. Academic and nonacademic institutions added training in negotiation and mediation to their programs.

A consensus on many of the core ideas of CR crystallized during this period. Part of this consensus included the idea that conflicts often could be restructured and reframed so that partisans would regard the conflict as a shared problem that had mutually acceptable solutions. The consensus did not preclude the option of coercive struggle to help bring about such change. Another core idea was that intermediaries provide many services that assist adversaries to construct mutually acceptable agreements to settle and ultimately resolve their conflicts. Yet another idea was that negotiators and mediators could learn how to improve their skills to manage and settle disputes in ways that would enhance the adversaries' relationships.

The rapid expansion of CR in the United States was in many ways a social movement, whose origins can be traced to the convergence of several other social movements, including the post-1960s appeal of local self-government and community activism (Adler 1987; Scimecca 1991). CR as a social movement was also fostered by the peacemaking and mediation activities of religious organizations, particularly those associated with the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the Mennonites. In addition, the expansion was furthered by the growth of the legal profession, litigation, and the ensuing congestion of the American court system. The emerging alternative dispute resolution (ADR) movement seemed attractive to some lawyers and many nonlawyers as an alternative to adversarial proceedings and an attractive option to some of the judiciary as a way to reduce the burden on the courts (Ray 1982). Also, CR seemed to offer peace movement members, whose numbers soared in the early 1980s, a practical alternative to the nation's reliance on military options (Lofland 1993). Finally, CR ideas arising from research and theory provided a theoretical basis and intellectual justification for CR practices.

During this period, the Cold War underwent profound changes as well. Official détente began to crumble in the mid-1970s and collapsed by the end of the decade. The Cold War intensified again, spurred by the Soviet military

engagement in Afghanistan and by the rhetoric and policies of the Reagan administration. But the growing integration of the world economy undermined the premises of the superpower rivalry. Suffering economic stagnation, the Soviet Union began a radical course of reform with Mikhail Gorbachev's accession to power in 1985, which led to the end of the Cold War.

One important development in CR during the 1970–85 period was the expansion of CR work throughout the world. Notable contributions to theory and practice emerged from European peace research. In Germany, several peace and conflict research institutes were established after the Social Democratic Party came to power in 1969. Ideas about nonoffensive defense and how military defense could be structured so that the other side was not threatened spread across the continent; such ideas included a new generation of confidence-building measures. Finally, the work of Gene Sharp (1973) on nonviolent action evolved into the idea of a civilian-based defense.

Feminist theory and research were another source of ideas in the development of CR. Feminist thought provided a critique and an alternative to the prevailing emphasis on hierarchy and coercive power as the essential mode of decision making in social life, including the international realm (Harris and King 1989). The feminist critique, viewing the traditional perspective largely as a product of men's socialization and dominance, emphasized the importance of nonhierarchical social relations and the possibility of reaching integrative agreements through relatively consensual decision-making processes. Feminist theory also highlighted the many contributions of women in public as well as private life, even in a patriarchal world. In many ways, these feminist ideas were congenial with CR and contributed to its growth.

Additional contributions during this period stemmed from further scholarly investigations of game theory. For example, Snyder and Diesing (1977) analyzed international crises and found that the variation in representative payoff matrices of the crises helped explain their outcomes. Another body of work was based on the payoff matrix for the prisoner's dilemma game. Computer simulations and other evidence indicated that cooperation would result if one party followed a tit-for-tat strategy in an extended series of reiterated games (Axelrod 1984). In an analysis of interactions among the Soviet Union, the United States, and the People's Republic of China, however, the GRIT model seemed to provide a better fit with movement toward de-escalation and cooperation than did tit-for-tat (Goldstein and Freeman 1990).

An extensive body of social-psychological theory and research also made important contributions to CR. In testing a variety of theories pertaining to cognition, interaction, and personality, the research methodology has been predominantly small-group experimentation. Some work, for example, focused on how entrapment (persisting in behavior because of previous investment in

the behavior) contributes to escalating conflicts and how the process can be interrupted (Brockner and Rubin 1985). A great deal of work in many disciplines during this period focused on the negotiation process (Druckman 1977; Zartman 1978).

Another important contribution to the growth of CR is the considerable research and theorizing about social movements (Tilly 1978; Toch 1965). The resource-mobilization approach stresses not only the importance of grievances as a source of social movement activity, but also the belief that such grievances can be redressed. The emergence and transformation of large-scale conflicts, therefore, can be regarded as a function of the apparent weakness of the opposition, the capabilities of the social movement's members, and the leaders' formulation of credible goals.

Peace movement actions during 1970–85 manifested themselves in traditional ways, such as mass public demonstrations, but they also took on new forms, such as innovative kinds of civil disobedience. The anti–Vietnam War demonstrations and resistance ended as U.S. military forces were withdrawn from Vietnam. After years of quiescence, peace movement actions were renewed in the early 1980s, with new goals and different forms, including demonstrations and political mobilization in the United States in favor of a bilateral freeze on the production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons (Marullo and Lofland 1990; Meyer 1990). In many Western European countries, protest demonstrations and political pressure were directed at preventing the deployment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO's) cruise and Pershing II missiles in their countries. In addition, a groundswell of people-to-people diplomacy occurred during this period, as large numbers of U.S. citizens visited the Soviet Union and U.S. cities developed ties with Soviet counterparts (Lofland 1993).

Also during this period, interactive problem-solving workshops were increasingly undertaken. In this method of CR, a convenor (in most cases, an academic) brings together a few members from the opposing sides to guide and facilitate discussions about their conflict (Kelman 1992). The participants typically have ties to the leadership of their respective sides or have the potential to become members of the leadership in the future. The workshops usually go on for several days, moving through several distinct stages.

John Burton, Leonard Doob, Herbert Kelman, Edward Azar, Ronald Fisher, and others are responsible for developing the workshop concept as a method of CR (Fisher 1996). Workshops typically have been held in relation to protracted internal and international conflicts, such as those in Northern Ireland, Cyprus, and the Middle East.

The workshops' participants themselves sometimes become quasi-mediators upon returning to their adversary group, but as workshop participants,

they do not attempt to negotiate agreements (Kriesberg 1995). Sometimes they later become negotiators, as was the case in the negotiations between the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Israeli government in the early 1990s (Kelman 1995).

Problem-solving workshops are one channel in what is often referred to as track-two diplomacy in international relations (Montville 1991). Track one consists of the mediation, negotiation, and other official exchanges between governmental representatives. Track two includes more than problem-solving workshops and is best viewed as multitrack (McDonald 1991). Among the many unofficial channels are transnational organizations within which members of adversarial parties meet and discuss matters pertaining to the work of their common organizations. Another track includes ongoing dialogue groups, with members from the adversary parties discussing contentious issues between their respective countries, communities, or organizations (Weiner 1998; Smock 2002; also see www.coexistence.net).

Finally, the practice of ADR also greatly expanded during this period, as community dispute resolution centers were established in many parts of the United States (see the Conflict Resolution Information Source, www.crinfo.org). CR was also increasingly used in public disputes over environmental issues, such as disposal of radioactive waste, water usage, and landfills (Susskind and Cruickshank 1987).

1986–Present: Differentiation and Institutionalization

Since the mid-1980s, the nature and the context of large-scale conflicts have changed in significant ways. The end of the Cold War at the close of the 1980s profoundly transformed the international system and greatly affected intrastate conflicts. For example, conflicts among groups identifying themselves in terms of ethnicity, religion, language, and similar attributes, rather than ideology, became more salient (Gurr 2000, for documentation on the Minorities at Risk project, see www.cidcm.umd.edu/mar; for information about specific ethnic conflicts see www.incore.ulst.ac.uk). The globalization of the world due to technological advances and the increased integration of the global market has also transformed international and intrastate conflicts, for example, by raising the likelihood of external intervention into large-scale domestic as well as international conflicts and by the transnational mobilization of people in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) using Internet technologies (Ronfeldt et al. 1998).

All these changes have affected CR ideas and practices. The rise of complex communal, environmental, and socioeconomic conflicts—often without clear right and wrong sides—has enhanced the pertinence of the CR approach to finding and maximizing mutual benefits for all groups that find themselves

in conflict with one another. Moreover, some of these conflicts, particularly those involving ethnic and religious differences, have been especially brutal and destructive. These developments have also directed increased attention to cultural attributes as the source of intercommunal conflicts and their management (Rubinstein and Foster 1988; Cohen 1997; Faure and Rubin 1993; Ross 1993; Lederach 1995; Zartman 1996; Avruch 1998; Salem 1997; Johnston and Sampson 1994; Gopin 2000, 2002).

In addition, recent developments have renewed attention to the emotional factors in conflicts and their resolution (Scheff 1994). Memories of past atrocities and humiliations often arouse the desire for revenge to regain lost honor and ease emotional traumas. Several academics and practitioners have developed CR methods that incorporate alternative ways of addressing such feelings (Volkan 1988). These emotional factors also affect the formation and transformation of ethnic, religious, and other collective identities (Herb and Kaplan 1999; Coy and Woehrle 2000).

CR research has continued to be directed at the use and effects of different kinds of mediation in international and other types of conflicts (Mitchell and Webb 1988; Kressel and Pruitt 1989; Princen 1992; Bercovitch 1996, 2002). Research examining the conditions that lead to de-escalating efforts, whether mediated or not, has also expanded. Many elements must converge for conflicts to undergo a transition to de-escalation, including the adversaries' belief that they cannot gain what they want unilaterally or that efforts to do so would be too painful. Another important element is the possibility of an agreement among the adversaries, offering a mutually acceptable alternative (Touval and Zartman 1985). Policy-relevant research is often framed in terms of discerning the right time to undertake various kinds of de-escalating strategies (Zartman 1985; Kriesberg and Thorson 1991).

In addition to mediation and negotiation, CR analysts and practitioners have expanded their work to include more and more phases of conflicts. Thus, increasing attention has been devoted to the prenegotiation phase, or the process of getting adversaries to the table (Stein 1989). Work at even earlier phases, before a conflict escalates, is also gaining attention, as is work in the postsettlement phase, involving the development of stable political structures and methods of reconciliation between the conflict's adversaries. All this research is part of viewing conflicts in a long-term perspective, including the avoidance of intractable conflicts, the transformation of protracted conflicts into tractable ones, and the establishment of a stable peace, and perhaps reconciliation, between former adversaries.

The expansion in CR activities has led to considerable differentiation within the field. From the outset, interpersonal and intergroup conflicts were distinguished, as were domestic and international conflicts. However, more

and more specific arenas of CR work have emerged that address conflicts that vary according to the context, the issues at stake, the nature of the adversaries, and the CR methods employed. For instance, CR research and practice may focus on school settings, family relations, public disputes over environmental issues, ethnic relations, interreligious struggles, interstate border disputes, and fights about the allocation of scarce resources.

Significantly, too, specialization has developed relating to various phases of a conflict. Thus, a great deal of attention has been given to early warning and preventing the eruption of large-scale violence within and between states, often emphasizing the efforts of official and nonofficial interveners (Ackerman 2000; Lund 1996; Carnegie Commission 1997). Many CR practitioners and analysts have begun to pay more attention to institutional arrangements for managing recurrent conflicts before they become protracted and destructive. Their work applies in a variety of conflict-prone venues, ranging from large industrial enterprises to multiethnic societies (Ury, Brett, and Goldberg 1988; Hechter 2000).

Other practitioners and analysts focus on ways to stop the escalation of a conflict, for example, by managing crises (Brecher 1993), by initiating de-escalation (Kriesberg 1992; Mitchell 2000), by conducting peacekeeping interventions, and by applying sanctions (Brecher 1993; Cortright and Lopez 2000). Finally, CR practitioners and scholars are giving increasing attention to posthostilities peacebuilding, including research into sustaining peace agreements, promoting reconciliation, and developing cultures of peace (Hampson 1996; Boulding 2000; Weiner 1998; Lederach 1997; Kacowicz et al. 2000; Walter 2002).

In addition to becoming increasingly differentiated, CR is becoming more institutionalized. In the United States, its practice is legislatively mandated in certain circumstances, for example, in the development of certain federal regulations and in child custody divorce cases in some jurisdictions. In 1998, the U.S. congress established the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource, and public lands conflicts. That same year, the U.S. congress enacted the federal Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, requiring federal trial courts to promote the use of ADR.

Institutionalization is also evident in the establishment of many research centers, several of the more prominent ones being based at universities and originally funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. In addition, many universities provide graduate training in conflict analysis and resolution, including certificate programs within professional schools and graduate degree programs, as well as MA and PhD programs in CR. Many independent and university-based centers also provide training and consulting services in

CR and mediation. Training and practice in mediation are increasingly evident at all levels of education, in private corporations, and in government agencies. CR techniques are being introduced in more and more areas of the world—for example, in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, as illustrated by the activities of Partners for Democratic Change, based in the United States. Finally, comprehensive syntheses of the field as it relates to large-scale conflicts have been published (Kriesberg 2007; Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall 2005; Wallensteen 2002).

The practice of CR has continued to evolve. In the domestic arena, applications have increased in areas relating to deeply rooted ethnic and other communal antagonisms, often exacerbated by immigration, and to deeply held value differences, such as those relating to abortion in the United States. These issues often require long-term strategies to build mutually respectful relations and legitimate institutionalized procedures to manage conflicts and to achieve a sense of justice for all parties involved.

In the international realm, the engagement of outside unofficial intermediaries in the conflicts within and among countries has greatly increased. The CR method requires considerable sensitivity to elicit and adapt local approaches rather than to impose methods developed in another setting (Lederach 1995). This type of international response to conflict has been accompanied by a parallel increase in conventional interventions by international governmental organizations and individual governments into the internal affairs of other countries, particularly in cases of humanitarian crises and extreme violations of human rights, as evident in Somalia, Iraq, Haiti, Rwanda, the former Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Sierra Leone, and elsewhere during the 1990s. Such governmental actions raise profound questions about the existence of shared standards and conceptions regarding sovereignty and human rights (Damrosch 1993; Deng et al. 1996). Moreover, human rights violations may be used selectively to justify interventions for self-aggrandizing purposes of the intervening state.

CURRENT AND FUTURE ISSUES

Having considered the evolution of the CR field, we can now examine areas of consensus and of disagreement within the field and also how international relations theory and practice and CR are converging and complementing each other. We then suggest how the diversity of CR activities provides opportunities for more effective efforts.

Many technological, cultural, political, economic, and social changes in recent decades have already been noted; some of them combine to generate

new challenging concerns. These include the increasing number and power of nonstate transnational actors, including multinational corporations, transnational social reform organizations, criminal groups, and organizations relying on terrorist methods. Although the CR approach may have particular adaptability for conflicts involving nonstate actors, it may seem particularly inappropriate for conflicts involving a reliance on terrifying and intimidating violence. Even in such cases, however, the approach may have some value (Kriesberg 2002). CR analysis demonstrates that relying on such violent methods is often counterproductive, whether exercised by challenging groups or repressive states. The CR approach also may provide alternative and constructive methods to challenge authorities or for authorities to isolate challenging groups resorting to terrorist methods.

Consensus and Dissensus within the CR Field

As CR activities have evolved, crystallized, and become institutionalized, some elements of consensus have emerged among those working in the field. Yet the great variety of conflicts to which CR is applied and the diverse sources of CR ideas make universal agreement on CR precepts and techniques unlikely.

Matters of Consensus. There is general agreement, at least in principle, that specific CR strategies and tactics fit particular kinds of conflicts and conflict stages. Thus, long-term strategies that combine a variety of methods typically are required to prevent a conflict from escalating destructively. Attention has been devoted to the various methods that are appropriate for intermediaries trying to hasten de-escalation at different stages of a conflict, referred to as the "contingency approach" (Keashly and Fisher 1995; also see Kriesberg 1996).

There is also widely shared recognition that more evaluation of CR methods is needed. The difficulties in conducting assessments of different CR methods in various settings are increasingly recognized and ways of overcoming them are being developed. More evaluation research using quantitative methods and case study approaches is being undertaken. Practitioners are more often reflective about their work in order to improve their efforts (see, e.g., the work of the Reflecting on Peace Project, www.cdainc.com). Research is often directed at the study of particular methods to limit, de-escalate, or end destructive conflicts, including economic sanctions, mediation, confidence-building measures, negotiations, and interposition of peacekeeping forces (Cortright and Lopez 2000, 2002; Kressel and Pruitt 1989; Bercovitch 2002; Walter and Snyder 1999; O'Leary and Bingham 2003).

In addition, the CR community generally recognizes the important influence adversaries have on each other in both escalating and de-escalating a

conflict. Partisans, however, frequently attribute the cause and course of a conflict to the other side's internally driven characteristics or to characteristics within the larger social system that they cannot readily affect (Jervis 1976; Kelley and Michela 1980). The CR approach stresses that both sides impact the relationship and emphasizes what each party can do to influence the course of a struggle (Kriesberg 2007).

Finally, there is growing recognition among CR practitioners that every social conflict involves many parties and issues (Putnam 1988; Kriesberg 1992; Colaresi 2005). Viewed as such, social conflicts share certain elements and are thus interlocked. The changing salience of one conflict relative to another serves as a source of escalation and de-escalation; consequently, reframing a conflict so that its salience is reduced often promotes its settlement and resolution. Emphasizing a threatening common enemy is a frequent reframing device.

Matters of Dissensus. CR analysts and practitioners, as well as others outside the field, debate many aspects of the field. Thus, CR workers vary in the emphasis they place on "conflicts" versus "disputes" and on their settlement, resolution, or transformation. "Dispute" sometimes refers to contestations over matters that are negotiable and contain the elements of compromise, whereas "conflict" is about issues that involve deep-rooted human needs (Burton 1990). According to this view, "conflict resolution" means solving the problems that led to the conflict, and "transformation" means changing the relationships between the parties to a conflict; "conflict settlement" refers to suppressing the conflict itself, without dealing with deeper causes and relations. Not all CR analysts and practitioners make such a sharp distinction; many generally regard some types of contestations as more limited than conflicts but recognize that disputes may also be episodes in a larger conflict. The settlement of disputes, then, may contribute to changes in the relationship between adversaries and the gradual transformation of their conflict. A related question persists: to what extent is attaining justice and satisfying basic needs for the contending parties crucial for an enduring peace?

CR analysts and practitioners also differ in the importance they accord to coercion and violence in the way conflicts are conducted and settled or resolved. Some analysts reason that any reliance on coercion is antithetical to a problem-solving resolution of a conflict. Traditional "realists," on the other hand, tend to assume that all conflicts are ultimately resolved by coercion. Many people working in the CR field, believing that power differentials are an inescapable fact of all relationships, take a middle ground. They stress the varieties of power, such as the ability to impose positive and negative sanctions,

normative or persuasive inducements, and altruism and shared identity (Bould-
ing 1989). They also emphasize how conflicts are reframed and the parties'
self-identity is redefined in the course of a struggle and efforts to resolve it.

Some observers argue that the dominant party in a conflict may use CR as
an instrument of control. Without taking sides in this debate, we must con-
cede that insofar as parties are unequal in status, power, or other resources,
the weaker party tends to give up more in a mediated or negotiated agree-
ment (Gulliver 1979; Nader 1991; Mitchell 1995, 25–57). But this is perhaps
even more likely to be true if the dispute is settled by other procedures.

Finally, practitioners disagree about when various methods of conflict de-
escalation and resolution may be appropriate (Laue and Cormick 1978).
Some would not try to mediate or otherwise facilitate a settlement between
parties in a highly asymmetrical relationship. Indeed, many feminists and
others criticize CR practitioners for their tendency to ignore power differ-
ences in their haste to employ CR techniques (Taylor and Miller 1994). How-
ever, others in the field believe that mediation should still be undertaken,
although thoughtfully, because conflict parties rarely are equal in their re-
sources and capabilities. These CR practitioners may even regard facilitating
the adversaries' recognition and acceptance of the realities of their relation-
ship as contributing to a settlement.

One way to resolve the dilemmas these views pose is to incorporate con-
structive methods of waging a struggle into the adversaries' strategic reper-
toire (Kriesberg 2007). Thus, some CR analysts and practitioners emphasize
ways of redressing power imbalances without denying the grievances or inter-
ests of the opposition, which is the appeal of nonviolent action for many peo-
ple (Wehr, Burgess, and Burgess 1994; Sharp 2005). However, CR also refers
to strategies and tactics to help balance asymmetrical parties in negotiations
(Deutsch 1973; Zartman and Rubin 1996; Zartman 1987).

Convergence and Complementarity between CR
and International Relations

The fields of CR and international relations (IR) overlap and are increasingly
converging, in part because of the radically changing nature of the world and
of social conflicts. Also, practitioners and academics in each field have sought
to build links to the other community. Professional associations, foundation-
supported meetings, and the efforts of many academic and nonacademic insti-
tutions, such as the United States Institute of Peace (www.usip.org), have
facilitated interchanges and this convergence.

However, CR and conventional international relations theory and practice
will and should remain somewhat divergent. Traditional IR thinking tends to

be "realist" in its emphasis on sovereign states, the centrality of power seeking by political leaders, and the importance of military force. CR can provide a corrective to inappropriate reliance on these views (Galtung et al. 2000). Conversely, traditional IR approaches can provide a corrective to overreliance on good intentions as the basis to resolve conflicts. Although much current IR thinking and practice are converging with many kinds of CR work, the continuing differences can provide a sound basis for complementary work.

Convergence. Many CR ideas have gone beyond the confines of academia to the general public and official and unofficial practitioners. One notable example is the idea that adversaries can achieve win-win outcomes. Thus, the transmission of German and other European peace researchers' ideas about nonoffensive defense to Soviet leaders in the early and mid-1980s played an important role in Gorbachev's "new thinking" and its acceptance within the Soviet foreign policy bureaucracy (Kriesberg 1992). Furthermore, a variety of CR practices have become widely accepted in coping with conflicts. These practices include establishing informal dialogue groups, incorporating brainstorming periods in negotiations, and using mediators.

Innovative ideas and practices in IR have contributed to some noteworthy CR developments, resulting in useful and enduring syntheses. For example, analyses of actual cases of mediation in international conflicts have broadened the concept of the mediator's role and mediation activities. When officials of major states serve as mediators, their access to economic, military, and status resources and their interests in the outcome of the mediation all contribute to the process (Princen 1992). Despite the widespread belief that mediators must strive for neutrality and minimize assertiveness, information about mediation in many arenas reveals that mediators are often active in shaping both the process used and the agreement reached (Kolb 1994). The great variety of mediation activities that can be combined differently in manifold roles and the diversity of persons who provide some of those services—inside as well as outside those roles—are increasingly being explored (Bercovitch 1996).

Another example of synthesis derives from the attention traditional IR has devoted to the study of institutions. Recent analyses of normative regimes and an array of other formal and informal institutional arrangements, which have been negotiated to resolve problems related to weapons, human rights, environmental protection, and many other issues, enrich the repertoire of options adversaries can consider for various ways out of a destructive conflict. Increasingly, CR practitioners focus not only on the processes of de-escalation and negotiation, but on the fairness and durability of the outcomes as well.

Such attention fosters consideration of formulas that cannot only settle a dispute, but also settle it in a way that makes its recurrence unlikely.

Finally, the profound changes in the nature of the world system, noted at the outset of this chapter, have impelled convergence. This convergence may be seen in the increasingly crucial role of non-governmental agents as both partisans and intermediaries in many transnational conflicts (Chatfield, Pagnucco, and Smith 1996). The many factors supporting convergence reinforce each other, as is evident in the evolution of sanctions as a way to nonviolently control conflicts and bring about constructive outcomes. Cortright and Lopez (2002) analyze the many factors shaping this evolution, including the increasing role of NGOs; the interactions among researchers, advocates, and diplomats; the changing international environment; and the blending of persuasive and positive inducements as well as negative sanctions.

Complementarity. Peacemaking practices of CR and of traditional IR often complement one another, whether sequentially or simultaneously. Many examples of sequential complementarity can be cited, usually when the CR practice involves nonofficial or track-two methods that precede the more traditional diplomatic approaches, because track-two diplomacy may prepare the groundwork for official negotiations. At other times, negotiations are initiated in a track-two channel and then handed off to an official negotiating forum. Sometimes, the traditional diplomatic channel reaches an impasse and a new track is opened informally. When progress is made, the negotiations are then transferred back to the official channel, as was the case in the 1993 negotiations between Israelis and PLO representatives in Oslo, Norway (Kriesberg 2001).

Another example is the work deriving from one of the task forces established in 1982 under the auspices of the Dartmouth Conference. Following the deterioration of U.S.-Soviet détente, members of the conference established task forces on (1) arms control and (2) regional conflicts to examine what had gone wrong. Reflection on the process and the phases of the conference's development provided the basis for two members of the regional conflicts task force, Gennady Chufrin and Harold Saunders, to cochair the Inter-Tajik Dialogue (Saunders 1995). The dialogue brought together a wide range of Tajiks in 1993, following the first round of a vicious civil war that erupted after the Soviet Union dissolved and Soviet Tajikistan became independent. Meeting several times a year, the dialogue group's members moved through five stages: (1) deciding to engage in dialogue to resolve mutually intolerable problems; (2) coming together to map out the elements of the problems and the relationships that perpetuate the problems; (3) uncovering the underlying dynamics

of the relationships and beginning to see ways to change them; (4) planning steps together to change the relationships; and (5) devising ways to implement their plan. In practice, participants may remain at one stage for several meetings and even return to an earlier stage when circumstances change.

Some of the Tajiks from different factions participated in the official negotiations that began in 1994, after the Inter-Tajik Dialogue had met several times (Saunders 1999). Changes in the government and the opposition, as well as in Russia, Iran, and other engaged countries, contributed crucially to the conduct of the negotiations and to reaching the final agreement, signed in 1997. In addition, the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, in a subsidiary way, provided mediating services. The activities of all these parties and of the unofficial dialogue group were well coordinated (Saunders 1999; Iji 2001).

In some instances, organizers of short-term problem-solving workshops have turned the workshops into a series, constituting a continuing workshop with the same participants, as was the case with the continuing Israeli-Palestinian workshop organized by Rouhana and Kelman (1994). Meeting four times between November 1990 and July 1992, the workshops lasted three or four days and followed ground rules designed to facilitate analytical discussion of the issues that encouraged joint thinking about the conflict. The third-party facilitators steered the participants through two major phases: first, the presentation of concerns and needs; second, joint thinking about satisfying them and overcoming barriers to doing so.

These and earlier workshops involving Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs contributed in several ways to the later official negotiations between the Israeli government and the PLO (Kelman 1995). For example, the understandings about each other's points of views and concerns and possible ways to reconcile them provided the basis for officials on each side to believe a mutually acceptable formula could be found. However, the breakdown in negotiations in the fall of 2000 indicates that the support for the negotiations needed to be much wider and deeper, that the agreements previously reached needed to be more completely implemented, and that mutual reassurances about the needs of both being understood needed to be more clearly articulated (Kriesberg 2002).

CR efforts sometimes complement relatively traditional IR activities when they are carried out simultaneously, as may occur when unofficial tracks parallel official negotiating tracks, such as in the case in the Pugwash and Dartmouth meetings during the years of U.S.-Soviet negotiations regarding arms control.

The multiplicity of intermediary efforts, however, can also hamper effective de-escalation and the achievement of enduring, mutually acceptable

agreements in several ways. Too many uncoordinated efforts can undermine one another because they convey different messages to the adversaries about what different intermediaries have in mind regarding the future course of the conflict. Or one or more of the adversaries may try to play one intermediary off against another. In addition, intermediaries may compete for attention and strain the capability of the adversaries' representatives to provide an adequate response.

Nevertheless, in large-scale conflicts, various intermediaries and approaches generally need to be combined in order to be effective. If they are well coordinated, their effectiveness enhances the efforts of any one approach. Such coordination includes actions pursued simultaneously and sequentially, as exemplified in the 1989–92 peace process that ended Mozambique's war (Hume 1994). In the course of its missionary and humanitarian work in Mozambique, the Community of Sant'Egidio, a Catholic lay order based in Rome, had developed ties with both the government of Mozambique and the insurgent Mozambican National Resistance (Renamo) forces. Both sides found various international governmental organizations to be unacceptable mediators, even as they both began to consider ways of ending the war. Yet Sant'Egidio was accepted to act as a facilitative mediator. Because it was not a state actor, it could facilitate negotiations, minimizing issues about the status of the adversaries.

A four-person mediation team consisted of two members of Sant'Egidio, the archbishop of Beira, and a member of the Italian parliament who had previous foreign ministry service. During the negotiations, representatives of many governments also assisted in the peace process. The Italian government helped with the arrangements and consulted with the negotiating parties. Representatives of the governments of France, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States and representatives of the United Nations consulted with the mediators and with representatives of Renamo and the Mozambican government; in 1992, the representatives joined the formal negotiations as observers. In addition, the governments of neighboring countries contributed to the process. For example, President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe helped arrange the first meeting and handshake between President Joaquim Chissano of Mozambique and Renamo leader Afonso Dhlakama. In addition, NGOs, including those providing humanitarian assistance, actively consulted during the negotiations. As the process evolved, the various intermediaries consulted with one another and coordinated their efforts. A peace agreement was signed in Rome on October 4, 1992.

CONCLUSION

Some disagreements about what can and should be done regarding specific conflicts arise from strongly held values. People assign different priorities to alternative values, such as between achieving freedom or securing economic well-being and between advancing social justice or avoiding deadly violence. The priority given to such alternatives affects preferences about the timing of de-escalation and peacemaking efforts, for example, whether to equalize the power differential between belligerents before trying to settle the conflict. Values also affect preferences about which parties should participate in negotiating a settlement; for example, in deciding whether to exclude especially hard-line factions on one or more sides.

At present, when so many peoples in the world seek to realize their own values, difficult choices may be necessary between conflicting values. Such trade-offs inevitably pose moral dilemmas. For example, how much pain and suffering should be borne (and by whom) to continue fighting to perhaps gain a better settlement later? The CR approach cannot solve such moral dilemmas. However, CR tends to favor long-term processes and outcomes that take into account all sides of a conflict and that maximize the participation of the people directly affected. In addition, the process of problem-solving ways of waging and ending struggles foster creative and constructive options. Consequently, attaining at least some measure of a wide range of values is increased.

CR is a vigorous, evolving field of endeavor, encompassing a great variety of perspectives and methods; its many advocates are familiar with interdisciplinary strife as well as cooperation. The diversity is natural and even beneficial, because no single perspective or method suits every conflict during every phase of its course. Familiarity with the many methods of CR is valuable because proper policymaking in response to conflict requires a large repertoire of possible strategies and techniques. Some are suitable for one person or organization and not another, and rarely can any single person or group transform a conflict or resolve it. Many people contribute a bit, and in this new globalized era of relative political instability among and within nation-states, many people must combine their efforts if destructive conflicts and oppressive outcomes are to be avoided or reduced. Since the end of the Cold War, there have been notable declines in various indicators of large-scale violence (Human Security Centre 2006; Marshall and Gurr 2005; Wallensteen 2002). The expanding and evolving CR field is one of the many developments accounting for those declines.

Chronology of Publications, Developments, and Events Relevant to Conflict Resolution

Year	Publications Pertaining to Conflict Resolution	Institutional Developments in Conflict Resolution and Global Political Events
1942	M. P. Follett, *Dynamic Administration* Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*	National War Labor Board established in United States
1945	J. P. Chander, *Teachings of Mahatma Gandhi*	World War II ends
1947		U.S. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service established British sovereignty over India ends
1948		Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations signed
1956	L. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict*	Successful ending of civil rights bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama
1957	K. Deutsch et al., *Political Community and the* *North Atlantic Area*	*Journal of Conflict Resolution* begins publishing, University of Michigan Pugwash Conferences begin, in Canada
1959	R. Dahrendorf, *Class and Class Conflict in* *Industrial Society*	Center for Research on Conflict Resolution established, University of Michigan International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) founded, Oslo, Norway
1960	L. Richardson, *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* T. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*	Dartmouth Conferences begin
1961	T. F. Lentz, *Towards a Science of Peace*	
1962	K. Boulding, *Conflict and Defense* C. E. Osgood, *An Alternative to War or Surrender*	Cuban missile crisis
1964		*Journal of Peace Research* begins publishing, based at PRIO International Peace Research Association founded
1965	A. Rapoport and A. Chammah, *The Prisoner's* *Dilemma*	J. W. Burton and others organize problem-solving workshop with representatives from Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore
1966	M. Sherif, *In Common Predicament*	
1968		Centre for Intergroup Studies established in Capetown, South Africa
1969	J. W. Burton, *Conflict and Communication*	
1970	L. Doob, *Resolving Conflict in Africa*	Peace Research Institute Frankfurt established in Germany
1971	A. Curle, *Making Peace*	Department of Peace and Conflict Research established at Uppsala Universitet, Sweden
1972	J. D. Singer and M. Small, *The Wages of War,* *1816–1965*	Détente reached between Soviet Union and United States Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missile Systems signed
1973	M. Deutsch, *The Resolution of Conflict* G. Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* L. Kriesberg, *The Sociology of Social Conflicts*	Department of Peace Studies established, University of Bradford, United Kingdom Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) initiates conference
1975		Helsinki Final Act signed, product of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
1977		Panama Canal Treaty signed

APPENDIX *(cont.)*
Chronology of Publications, Developments, and Events Relevant to Conflict Resolution

Year	Publications Pertaining to Conflict Resolution	Institutional Developments in Conflict Resolution and Global Political Events
1979	P. H. Gulliver, *Disputes and Negotiations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*	Egyptian-Israeli Treaty, mediated by President J. Carter Iranian revolution
1981	R. Fisher and W. Ury, *Getting to YES*	
1982		Carter Center established in Atlanta, Georgia National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR) initiated in United States Search for Common Ground established in Washington, D.C. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea adopted
1984	R. Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation*	United States Institute of Peace founded in Washington, D.C. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation initiates grant program supporting conflict resolution theory and practice International Association for Conflict Management founded
1985	S. Touval and I. W. Zartman, eds., *International Mediation in Theory and Practice* I. W. Zartman, *Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Intervention in Africa*	The Network for Community Justice and Conflict Resolution established in Canada
1986	C. W. Moore, *The Mediation Process* (1st ed.)	International Alert founded in London
1987	L. Susskind and J. Cruickshank, *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*	
1989	K. Kressel and D. G. Pruitt, eds., *Mediation Research* H. W. van der Merwe, *Pursuing Justice and Peace in South Africa* L. Kriesberg, T. A. Northrup, and S. J. Thorson, eds., *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation*	Berlin Wall falls Partners for Democratic Change founded, linking university-based centers in Sofia, Prague, Bratislava, Budapest, Warsaw, and Moscow
1990		Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, 55-state institution, originated with the Charter of Paris for a New Europe Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) begins informal workshops
1992	W. Isard, *Understanding Conflict and the Science of Peace*	Instituto Peruano de Resolución de Conflictos, Negociación, y Mediación (IPRECONM) established in Peru Government of El Salvador and the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional sign peace agreement
1993	M. H. Ross, *The Management of Conflict*	PLO and Israel sign Declaration of Principles European Union established
1994	D. Johnston and C. Sampson, eds., *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* A. Taylor and J. B. Miller, eds., *Conflict and Gender*	Nelson Mandela elected president of South Africa UN Security Council creates the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
1995	J. P. Lederach, *Preparing for Peace*	U.S. brokers end of war in Bosnia International Crisis Group established in Brussels
1996	F. O. Hampson, *Nurturing Peace* Michael S. Lund, *Preventing Violent Conflicts*	South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission established
1997	P. Salem, ed., *Conflict Resolution in the Arab World*	

APPENDIX *(cont.)*
Chronology of Publications, Developments, and Events Relevant to Conflict Resolution

Year	Publications Pertaining to Conflict Resolution	Institutional Developments in Conflict Resolution and Global Political Events
1998	E. Weiner, ed., *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence*	U.S. Federal Alternative Dispute Resolution Act enacted Good Friday Agreement reached for Northern Ireland International Criminal Court established by Rome statute; entered into force in 2002
1999	H. H. Saunders, *A Public Peace Process* B. F. Walter and J. Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*	People of East Timor vote for independence from Indonesia Peace Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone
2000	E. Boulding, *Cultures of Peace* J. Galtung et al., *Searching for Peace* T. R. Gurr, *Peoples versus States*	Second intifada begins between Palestinians and Israelis
2001		September 11 terror attacks on United States
2002	D. Cortright and G. A. Lopez, *Sanctions and the Search for Security* D. R. Smock, ed., *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*	
2003	R. O'Leary and L. Bingham, eds., *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution* E. Uwazie, ed., *Conflict Resolution and Peace Education in Africa*	U.S. and allied forces invade Iraq
2004	Y. Bar-Siman-Tov, ed., *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation* R. Paris, *At War's End*	Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies founded at University of Queensland, Brisbane Peace agreement signed between government of Sudan and Sudan People's Liberation Army
2005	C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, and P. Aall, eds., *Grasping the Nettle* D. Druckman, *Doing Research: Methods of Inquiry for Conflict Analysis*	PhD program in peace and conflict studies established at University of Manitoba, Canada
2006	Human Security Centre, *Human Security Report 2005* T. A. Borer, *Telling the Truths*	Full diplomatic relations restored between United States and Libya

REFERENCES

Ackermann, Alice. 2000. *Making Peace Prevail: Preventing Violent Conflict in Macedonia*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Adler, Peter S. 1987. "Is ADR a Social Movement?" *Negotiation Journal* 3 (1): 59–66.

Avruch, Kevin. 1998. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Bar-Siman-Tov, Yaacov, ed. 2003. *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bercovitch, Jacob, ed. 1996. *Resolving International Conflicts: The Theory and Practice of Mediation*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Bercovitch Jacob, ed. 2002. *Studies in International Mediation: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Z. Rubin*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Borer, Tristan Anne. 2006. *Telling the Truths: Truth Telling and Peace Building in Post-Conflict Societies*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Boulding, Elise. 2000. *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Boulding, Kenneth. 1962. *Conflict and Defense*. New York: Harper and Row.

————. 1989. *Three Faces of Power*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Brecher, Michael. 1993. *Crises in World Politics: Theory and Reality*. New York: Pergamon.

Brinton, Crane. 1938. *The Anatomy of Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Brockner, Joel, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. 1985. *Entrapment in Escalating Conflicts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Burton, John W. 1969. *Conflict and Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations*. London: Macmillan.

————. 1990. *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York: St. Martin's.

Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict. 1997. *Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Carnevale, Peter J., and Tahira M. Probst. 1997. "Conflict on the Internet." In *Culture of the Internet*, ed. S. Kiesler. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Chander, Jag Parvesh. 1945. *Teachings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Hyderabad: Indian Printing Works.

Chatfield, Charles, Ronald Pagnucco, and Jackie Smith, eds. 1996. *Solidarity beyond the State: The Dynamics of Transnational Social Movements*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Chufrin, Gennady I., and Harold H. Saunders. 1993. "A Public Peace Process." *Negotiation Journal* 9 (2): 155–77.

Cohen, Raymond. 1997. *Negotiating across Cultures*, rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Colaresi, Michael P. 2005. *Scare Tactics: The Politics of International Rivalry*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Coleman, James. 1957. *Community Conflict*. New York: Free Press.

Cortright, David, and George Lopez, with Richard W. Conroy, Jaleh Dashti-Gibson, and Julia Wagler. 2000. *The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Cortright, David, and George A. Lopez. 2002. *Sanctions and the Search for Security*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Coser, Lewis. 1956. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press.

Coy, Patrick G., and Lynne M. Woehrle, eds. 2000. *Social Conflicts and Collective Identities*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall, eds. 2005. *Grasping the Nettle: Analyzing Cases of Intractable Conflicts*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Curle, Adam. 1971. *Making Peace*. London: Tavistock.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1959. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Damrosch, Lori F. 1993. *Enforcing Restraint: Collective Intervention in Internal Conflicts*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

Deng, Francis, Sadikiel Kimaro, Terrence Lyons, Donald Rothchild, and I. William Zartman. 1996. *Sovereignty as Responsibility*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Deutsch, Karl, Sidney A. Burrell, Robert A. Kann, Maurice Lee Jr., Martin Lichterman, Raymond Lindgren, Francis L. Loewenheim, and Richard W. Van Wagenen. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Deutsch, Morton, 1973. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Doob, Leonard W., ed. 1970. *Resolving Conflict in Africa: The Fermeda Workshop*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Druckman, Daniel, ed. 1977. *Negotiations: Social-Psychological Perspectives*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Druckman, Daniel. 2005. *Doing Research: Methods of Inquiry for Conflict Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1967. "The Kennedy Experiment." *Western Political Quarterly* 20 (June): 361–80.

Faure, Guy Olivier, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, eds. 1993. *Culture and Negotiation*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Fisher, Roger, and William Ury. 1981. *Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Fisher, Ronald F. 1996. *Interactive Conflict Resolution: Pioneers, Potential, and Prospects*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Follett, Mary Parker. 1942. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York, London: Harper and Brothers.

Galtung, Johan, Carl G. Jacobsen, Kai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen, and Finn Tschudi. 2000. *Searching for Peace*. Sterling, Va.: Pluto.

Goldstein, Joshua S., and John R. Freeman. 1990. *Three-Way Street: Strategic Reciprocity in World Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gopin, Marc. 2000. *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of Religion, Violence, and Peacemaking*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2002. *Holy War, Holy Peace: How Religion Can Bring Peace to the Middle East*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gulliver, P. H. 1979. *Disputes and Negotiations: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Gurr, Ted Robert. 2000. *Peoples versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Haas, Ernst B. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Hampson, Fen Osler. 1996. *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlements Succeed or Fail*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Harris, Adrienne, and Ynestra King, eds. 1989. *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Harty, Martha, and John Modell. 1991. "The First Conflict Resolution Movement, 1956–1971: An Attempt to Institutionalize Applied Interdisciplinary Social Science." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35 (4): 720–58.

Hechter, Michael. 2000. *Containing Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Herb, Guntram H., and David H. Kaplan, eds. 1999. *Nested Identities: Nationalism, Territory, and Scale*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

Human Security Centre. 2006. *Human Security Report 2005*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hume, Cameron. 1994. *Ending Mozambique's War*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Iji, Tetsuro. 2001. "International Mediation in Tajikistan: The 1997 Peace Agreement." Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Studies Association, Chicago.

Iklé, Fred Charles. 1964. *How Nations Negotiate*. New York: Harper and Row.

Isard, Walter. 1988. *Arms Races, Arms Control, and Conflict Analysis: Contributions from Peace Science and Peace Economics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Isard, Walter. 1992. *Understanding Conflict and the Science of Peace*. Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Jackson, Elmore. 1952. *Meeting of Minds: A Way to Peace through Mediation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Janis, Irving L. 1972. *Victims of Groupthink*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Jervis, Robert, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Stein. 1985. *Psychology and Deterrence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Johnston, Douglas, and Cynthia Sampson, eds. 1994. *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kacowicz, Arie M., Yaacov Bar-Siman Tove, Ole Elgstrom, and Magnus Jerneck, eds. 2000. *Stable Peace among Nations*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

Keashly, Loraleigh, and Ronald J. Fisher. 1995. "Complementarity and Coordination of Conflict Interventions: Taking a Contingency Perspective." In *Resolving International Conflicts*, ed. Jacob Bercovitch. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Kelley, Harold, and John Michela. 1980. "Attribution Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Psychology* 31: 457–501.

Kelman, Herbert C. 1992. "Informal Mediation by the Scholar Practitioner." In *Mediation in International Relations*, ed. Jacob Bercovitch and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. New York: St. Martin's.

————. 1995. "Contributions of an Unofficial Conflict Resolution Effort to the Israeli-Palestinian Breakthrough." *Negotiation Journal* 11 (1): 19–27.

Kolb, Deborah M. 1994. *When Talk Works: Profiles of Mediators*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kressel, Kenneth, and Dean G. Pruitt, eds. 1989. *Mediation Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kriesberg, Louis. 1973. *The Sociology of Social Conflicts*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

————. 1992. *International Conflict Resolution: The U.S.-USSR and Middle East Cases*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

————. 1995. "Varieties of Mediating Activities and of Mediators." In *Resolving International Conflicts*, ed. Jacob Bercovitch, 219–33. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

————. 1996. "Preventing and Resolving Destructive Communal Conflicts." In *The International Politics of Ethnic Conflict: Theory and Evidence*, ed. Patrick James and David Carment. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

————. 2001. "Mediation and the Transformation of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 38 (3): 373–92.

————. 2002. "The Relevance of Reconciliation Actions in the Breakdown of Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations." *2000 Peace and Change* 27 (4): 546–71.

————. 2007. *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution*, 3rd ed. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kriesberg, Louis, Terrell A. Northrup, and Stuart J. Thorson, eds. 1989. *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Kriesberg, Louis, and Stuart J. Thorson. 1991. *Timing the De-escalation of International Conflicts*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Lasswell, Harold D. 1930. *Psychology and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laue, James, and Gerald Cormick. 1978. "The Ethics of Intervention in Community Disputes." In *The Ethics of Social Intervention*, ed. Gordon Bermant, Herbert C. Kelman, and Donald P. Warwick. Washington, D.C.: Halsted.

Lederach, John Paul. 1995. *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation across Cultures*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

————. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Leng, Russell J. 1993. *Interstate Crisis Behavior, 1816–1980*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lentz, Theodore F. 1961. *Towards a Science of Peace*. New York: Bookman Associates.

Lewin, Kurt. 1948. *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Lofland, John. 1993. *Polite Protesters: The American Peace Movement of the 1980s*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Lund, Michael S. 1996. *Preventing Violent Conflicts: A Strategy for Preventive Diplomacy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Marshall, Monty G., and Ted Robert Gurr. 2005. *Peace and Conflict, 2005*. College Park, Md.: Center for International Development and Conflict Management (University of Maryland).

Marullo, Sam, and John Lofland, eds. 1990. *Peace Action in the Eighties*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

McClelland, Charles A. 1983. "Let the User Beware." *International Studies Quarterly* 27: 169–78.

McDonald, John W. 1991. "Further Explorations in Track-Two Diplomacy." In *Timing the De-escalation of International Conflicts*, ed. Louis Kriesberg and Stuart J. Thorson. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Meyer, David S. 1990. *A Winter of Discontent*. New York: Praeger.

Miall, Hugh, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse. 1999. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management, and Transformations of Deadly Conflict*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Mitchell, Christopher R. 1995. "Asymmetry and Strategies of Regional Conflict Reduction." In *Cooperative Security: Reducing Third World Wars*, ed. I. William Zartman and Victor A. Kremenyuk. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Mitchell, Christopher. 2000. *Gestures of Conciliation: Factors Contributing to Successful Olive Branches*. New York: St. Martin's.

Mitchell, Christopher R., and K. Webb. 1988. *New Approaches to International Mediation*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.

Mitrany, David. 1943. *A Working Peace System: An Argument for the Functional Development of International Organization.* New York: Oxford University Press. (Reprinted in 1966 as *A Working Peace System.* Chicago: Quadrangle Books.)

Moore, Christopher W. 1986. *The Mediation Process.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Montville, Joseph V. 1991. "Transnationalism and the Role of Track-Two Diplomacy." In *Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map,* ed. W. Scott Thompson and Kenneth M. Jensen. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Nader, Laura, ed. 1965. "The Ethnography of the Law." Special issue, *American Anthropologist* 67 (6): part 2.

————. 1991. "Harmony Models and the Construction of Law." In *Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives,* ed. Kevin Avruch, Peter W. Black, and Joseph A. Scimecca. New York: Greenwood.

O'Leary, Rosemary, and Lisa Bingham, eds. 2003. *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution.* Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future Press.

Osgood, Charles, 1962. *An Alternative to War or Surrender.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Paris, Roland. 2004. *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pentz, Michael J., and Gillian Slovo. 1981. "The Political Significance of Pugwash." In *Knowledge and Power in a Global Society,* ed. William M. Evan. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Princen, Thomas. 1992. *Intermediaries in International Conflict.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, Robert. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42 (summer): 427–53.

Ramsbotham, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall. 2005. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution,* 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK, and Malden, Mass.: Polity.

Rapoport, Anatol, and Albert M. Chammah. 1965. *The Prisoner's Dilemma: A Study in Conflict and Cooperation.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ray, Larry. 1982. "The Alternative Dispute Resolution Movement." *Peace and Change* 8 (summer): 117–28.

Richardson, Lewis. 1960. *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels.* Pittsburgh: Boxwood.

Roethlisberger, Fritz Jules, and William J. Dickson. 1943. *Management and the Worker.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ronfeldt, David, John Arquilla, Graham E. Fuller, and Melissa Fuller. 1998. *The Zapatista Social Netwar in Mexico.* Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND.

Ross, Marc Howard. 1993. *The Management of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Rouhana, Nadim N., and Herbert C. Kelman. 1994. "Promoting Joint Thinking in International Conflicts: An Israeli-Palestinian Continuing Workshop." *Journal of Social Issues* 50 (1): 157–78.

Rubenstein, Robert A., and Mary LeCron Foster, eds. 1988. *The Social Dynamics of Peace and Conflict*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Salem, Paul, ed. 1997. *Conflict Resolution in the Arab World: Selected Essays*. Beirut: American University of Beirut.

Saunders, Harold H. 1995. "Sustained Dialogue on Tajikistan." *Mind and Human Interaction* 6: 123–35.

———. 1999. *A Public Peace Process: Sustained Dialogue to Transform Racial and Ethnic Conflicts*. New York: St. Martin's.

Scheff, Thomas J. 1994. *Bloody Revenge: Emotions, Nationalism, and War*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Schelling, Thomas. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Scimecca, Joseph A. 1991. "Conflict Resolution in the United States: The Emergence of a Profession?" In *Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, ed. Kevin Avruch, Peter W. Black, and Joseph A. Scimecca. New York: Greenwood.

Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Sharp, Gene. 2005. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Sherif, Muzafer. 1966. *In Common Predicament*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Singer, J. David. 1972. "The Correlates of War Project: Interim Report." *World Politics* 24 (2): 243–70.

Singer, J. David, and Melvin Small. 1972. *The Wages of War, 1816–1965: A Statistical Handbook*. New York: John Wiley.

Smock, David R., ed. 2002. *Interfaith Dialogue and Peacebuilding*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Snyder, Glenn Herald, and Paul Diesing. 1977. *Conflict among Nations: Bargaining, Decision Making, and System Structure in International Crises*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Stein, Janice Gross, ed. 1989. *Getting to the Table: The Processes of International Prenegotiation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stephenson, Carolyn M. 1999. "Peace Studies: Overview." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, vol. 2, ed. L. Kurtz, 809–20. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.

Susskind, Lawrence, and Jeffrey Cruickshank. 1987. *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.

Taylor, Anita, and Judi Beinstein Miller, eds. 1994. *Conflict and Gender*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Toch, Hans. 1965. *The Social Psychology of Social Movements*, 2d ed. New York: Bobbs Merrill.

Touval, Saadia, and I. William Zartman, eds. 1985. *International Mediation in Theory and Practice*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Ury, William L., Jeanne M. Brett, and Stephen B. Goldberg. 1988. *Getting Disputes Resolved*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Uwazie, Ernest, ed. 2003. *Conflict Resolution and Peace Education in Africa*. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books.

van der Merwe, Hendrik. 1989. *Pursuing Justice and Peace in South Africa*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vasquez, John A. 1993. *The War Puzzle*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Volkan, Vamik D. 1988. *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies*. Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson.

Wallensteen, Peter. 2002. *Understanding Conflict Resolution: War, Peace and the Global System*. London: Sage.

Walter, Barbara F. 2002. *Committing to Peace: The Successful Settlement of Civil Wars*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Walter, Barbara F., and Jack Snyder, eds. 1999. *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wehr, Paul, Heidi Burgess, and Guy Burgess. 1994. *Justice without Violence*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Weiner, Eugene, ed. 1998. *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence*. New York: Continuum.

Wright, Quincy. 1942. *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zartman, I. William. 1987. *Positive Sum: Improving North-South Negotiations*. New York: Transaction.

———. 1985. *Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Intervention in Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 1978. *The Negotiation Process: Theories and Applications*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

———, ed. 1996. *Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Zartman, I. William, and Jeffrey Z. Rubin. 1996. *Power and Asymmetry in International Negotiations*. Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis.

NOTE

1. Web sites are important sources of information about different approaches to the field and various arenas of research and practice (Carnevale and Probst 1997, 235–55). They also provide channels to the views of contending adversaries. Moreover, new information and communication technologies have significant implica-

tions for international conflict management, which are being assessed in the Virtual Diplomacy Initiative, sponsored by the United States Institute of Peace (see www.usip.org/oc/virtual_dipl.html; for access to a broad range of relevant material, see also the Conflict Resolution Information Source, www.crinfo.org).