

# Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies

## **Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field**

Joyce Neu and Louis Kriesberg

Subject: Conflict Studies Online Publication Date: Mar 2019

DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.521

### **Summary and Keywords**

The field of conflict analysis and resolution (CAR) is primarily defined as ideas about and applications of ways in which conflicts can be addressed constructively. The boundaries of the field cannot be sharply drawn. There are scholars, practitioners, and outside analysts who sometimes apply conflict resolution ideas and methods but who do not self-identify as belonging to the field. They do, nevertheless, contribute to the field. The field also refers to people designated or self-identified as conflict analysis and resolution scholars and/or practitioners. This article focuses on the development of the CAR field as an interdisciplinary social science endeavor within the broad international relations domain. The major periods covered include (1) development of the field and its preliminary beginnings from 1914 to 1945; (2) emergence of CAR as a field between 1946 and 1969; (3) expansion and institutionalization from 1970–1989; (4) diffusion and differentiation from 1990–2008; and, (5) advances and challenges 2009 through 2017.

From 1914 to 1945, as a result of World War I, there was a rise in pacifism. The creation of the United Nations in 1945 following World War II was intended as a means to prevent war and maintain peace. CAR research focused on analyzing the causes of violent conflicts. Researchers drew on psychoanalytic tools to examine, for example, attributes of leaders and social movements.

From 1946 to 1969, as a result of the Cold War and national liberation struggles, the world experienced an increase in the number of conflicts. Governmental organizations worked to avert a possible nuclear war and to limit conflict escalation through the United Nations and by the creation of forerunners to the European Union. In the nongovernmental sector, high-level unofficial meetings began taking place to build peace and reduce tensions. CAR research grew and included the use of game theory and rational models.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

The period of expansion and institutionalization (1970–1989) saw the growth of alternative dispute resolution that positively affected the creation of new CAR institutions. Nongovernmental CAR organizations grew in number and effectiveness offering dialogue and problem-solving workshops to disputing parties. Research focused on nonviolent means of resolving conflicts as well as how conflicts can be waged constructively.

From 1990 to 2008, the field witnessed a period of diffusion and differentiation. The end of the Cold War gave way to a period with fewer armed conflicts. Nongovernmental organizations and university programs in CAR increased. Intergovernmental organizations such as the UN and the African Union began to focus on professionalizing their mediation and peacemaking efforts.

The period from 2009 through 2017 saw the field continue to grow. New challenges included the quashing of nonviolent resistance movements in the Middle East and North Africa, the impacts of climate change, the rise in terrorism, and the widespread use of technology for both positive and negative impacts on peace. This period saw a dramatic increase in the application of CAR research and experience in governmental and intergovernmental organizations' work.

Keywords: conflict analysis, conflict resolution, civil society, diplomacy, gender, human rights, peace research, peace studies, war

---

## Introduction

This article focuses on the field of conflict analysis and resolution (CAR) primarily in terms of ideas as expressed in research about and application of ways in which conflicts can be addressed constructively. The field also refers to people designated or self-identified as conflict analysis and resolution scholars and/or practitioners. There are partisans, interveners, and observers of a conflict who sometimes apply conflict resolution ideas in understanding, escalating, de-escalating, or settling a conflict. They do not do so primarily as members of the field. They may, nevertheless, contribute to the field and draw from it. Broadly conceived, the field relates to all domains of conflicts, whether within or between families, organizations, communities, or countries. This article emphasizes CAR scholarship on large-scale militant conflicts, within and among societies.

The breadth and diversity of the contemporary CAR field is a consequence of the field's development from many sources (Kriesberg, 2007; Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2016). In assessing this breadth and diversity, we distinguish five periods: (a) preliminary beginnings, 1914–1945; (b) emergence of the field, 1946–1969; (c) expansion and institutionalization, 1970–1989; (d) diffusion and differentiation, 1990–2009; and (e) advances and challenges, 2010–2017. Readers may also wish to consult our companion article, "Conflict Analysis and Resolution as a Field: Core Concepts and Issues."

### Preliminary Beginnings, 1914-1945

World War I and its consequences stimulated ideologies that justified resorting to violence. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin elaborated Marxism with his influential analysis of the relationship between capitalism and imperialism and the consequent wars. Lenin also espoused and demonstrated how an authoritarian vanguard could use violent means, deemed necessary to achieve a just society. Later, fascism, as asserted by Adolf Hitler and others, celebrated totalitarian domination and the use of violence.

The horrors of World War I and its mass killings, however, also spurred pacifist sentiments and organizations. In the United States and in many European countries peace movement organizations renewed earlier efforts to construct institutions that would reduce the causes of war and foster collective security to stop wars (Cortright, 2008). These efforts contributed to the establishment of the League of Nations, but the punishing severity of the Versailles Treaty undermined the effectiveness of the League. Similarly, public pressures fostered the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw wars; however, to the consternation of peace movement organizations, the governments did not adhere to the Pact.

Much scholarly research has focused on analyzing the outbreak of violent conflicts and explanations for them—in studies of war frequencies, arms races, and revolutions (Richardson, 1960; Sorokin, 1925; Wright, 1942). Research and theorizing about the causes of wars presumably would help understand how they might be avoided. Other research and theorizing have examined the bases for conflicts generally, as in the work on psychological and social psychological frustration-aggression processes by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears (1939).

Nonrational factors have also been recognized as important in the outbreak of conflicts. Research on these matters examines scapegoating and other kinds of displaced feelings, susceptibility to propaganda, and the attributes of leaders who manipulate political symbols (Lasswell, 1935). Psychoanalytic premises were influential, with attention to unconscious mechanisms. For example, these ideas were applied to social movements and the rise of Nazism in Germany.

Psychological processes can contribute to the eruption and the exacerbation of conflicts by fostering misunderstandings and misperceptions and conflating unrelated concerns. In some circumstances, however, such processes can make conflicts susceptible to control and transformation. The influential human relations approach to industrial conflicts built on this assumption, providing good attention to workers and alleviating their tensions arising outside the workplace (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Critics argued this view denied the reality of conflicts between workers and managers. 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.

Mary Parker Follett (1942) influentially wrote about negotiations using integration strategies, rather than domination or compromise, which would produce mutual benefits.

### Emergence of the Field, 1946-1969

The conflict analysis and resolution field emerged between 1946 and 1969 as numerous wars and crises erupted, associated with the Cold War and with the national liberation struggles of the decolonization period. Many doctrines, theories, and research appeared to explain and influence those conflicts. Thus persons associated with national security affairs elaborated ideas about using nuclear weapons for purposes of deterrence (Brodie, 1959; Kahn, 1960). Such work generally presumed rational calculations by adversaries seeking to defend themselves from external aggression. Other approaches sought to explain and justify violence. Drawing upon Lenin's writing and actions, Mao Tse-tung wrote influentially and seemed to demonstrate in China how reliance on armed struggle was necessary to achieve independence and progress toward a just order.

Also during this period, however, many new governmental and nongovernmental actions contributed to preventing future wars by building transnational institutions and fostering reconciliation between former enemies. Globally, this was evident in the establishment of the United Nations (UN) and associated international governmental organizations. Regionally, such efforts were most notable in Europe, where the European Coal and Steel Community was established in 1952, the forerunner of the European Union. In 1946, in Caux, Switzerland, a series of conferences brought together persons from countries that had been at war for mutual understanding and forgiveness; this nongovernmental endeavor was inspired by Moral Re-armament (Henderson, 1996).

Particular war-averting events also became models for and illustrations of basic CAR ideas. For example, the resolution of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis revealed the effectiveness of measured responses and creative negotiations (Holsti, Brody, & North, 1964). The high-level, nonofficial, regular meetings of the Pugwash and the Dartmouth conferences, starting in 1957 and 1960, respectively, greatly aided the Soviet-American negotiations about arms control (Evangelista, 1999). These actions contributed to the growing practice of Track II diplomacy, which has become a major arena of research and theorizing in the CAR field.

India and Pakistan achieved independence from Britain in 1947, following many years of nonviolent resistance led by Mohandas Gandhi. He drew from Hindu traditions and other influences to develop and advocate for a strategy of popular civil disobedience, which he called Satyagraha, or the search for truth (Bondurant, 1965). The Satyagraha campaigns and related negotiations influentially modeled methods of constructive escalation. The strategies of nonviolent action developed in the civil rights struggles in the United States during the 1960s stimulated more applications and research (Sharp, 1973). For many in the CAR field, the possibility of limiting destructive escalation while struggling for

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

desirable social change was demonstrated. This provided evidence that nonviolence could be an effective means of achieving independence and justice.

Scholarly work during this period helped establish the bases for the field. In the 1950s and 1960s, particularly in the United States, research and theorizing focused on preventing a devastating war, perhaps a nuclear war. Many academics consciously tried to build a broad, interdisciplinary, cooperative endeavor to apply the social sciences so as to overcome that threat. Several clusters of scholars undertook projects with perspectives that differed from the prevailing national security and international relations “realist” approaches.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS), in Stanford, California, was a catalyst for the emergence of the field (Harty & Modell, 1991). CASBS was designed to foster major new undertakings in the behavioral sciences. In its initial year, 1954–1955, several scholars were invited who reinforced each other’s work related to the emerging field of CAR; they included the social psychologist Herbert Kelman, the economist Kenneth E. Boulding, the mathematician Anatol Rapoport, the political scientist Harold Lasswell, and the general systems theorist Ludwig von Bertalanffy.

After their CASBS year, Boulding and Rapoport returned to the University of Michigan and joined with other colleagues to begin the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957. Then, in 1959, they and others established the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan, with the sociologist Robert C. Angell as the first director.

Scholars at the Center and in other institutions published a variety of works that were directed at formulating a comprehensive interdisciplinary theory of social conflicts (Boulding, 1962; Lentz, 1955; Schelling, 1960). Other works focused on particular phases of conflicts, such as those written by Deutsch, Burrell, and Kann (1957) about the formation of security communities between countries. Haas (1958) analyzed the European Coal and Steel Community as an example of how international cooperation in one functional area can foster increased cooperation and integration in other areas, an idea developed by Mitrany (1948). Influential work also examined the bases for conflicts generally, for example the work on psychological and social psychological processes (Lewin, 1948) and the functions of social conflict (Coser, 1956). More specifically, analyses were done about the military industrial complex in the United States and elsewhere (Mills, 1956; Pilusik & Hayden, 1965; Senghaas, 1972). Such work challenged the idea that reliance on armed force was rationally calculated to provide defense against external threats and that mutual deterrence would prevent wars.

Workers in the field conducted research projects that entailed the collection and analyses of quantitative data about interstate wars, notably the Correlates of War project, initiated in 1963, under the leadership of J. David Singer. The logic of game theory and the experimental research based on it also has contributed to CAR, showing how individually rational conduct can be collectively self-defeating (Rapoport, 1966). Within the CAR field, game theory research has largely focused on the Prisoners’ Dilemma game, with the payoff matrix of win-lose, lose-win, and also win-win and lose-lose. Other analysts have

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

examined a wide variety of different payoff matrices in understanding crises outcomes (Snyder & Diesing, 1977). In addition, CAR-related work was conducted at Stanford University, where Robert C. North led a project examining why some international conflicts escalated to wars and others did not.

Significantly, research and theorizing about ways conflicting relations could be overcome and mutually beneficial outcomes achieved was done during this period, for example by forming superordinate goals, as discussed by the social psychologist Muzafer Sherif (1966) and by Graduated Reciprocation in Tension-Reduction, as advocated by the psychologist Charles E. Osgood (1962).

CAR centers in Europe emerged in this period as well, but they took a somewhat different form. Most began and have continued to emphasize peace and conflict research, which often had direct policy relevance. Usually, the centers were not based in colleges or universities but received support and research grants from their respective governments and from foundations. The first such center, the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), was established in Oslo, Norway, in 1959, with the sociologist Johan Galtung as director. Galtung founded the *Journal of Peace Research* at PRIO in 1964. His work has been widely influential; for example, his analysis of structural violence was important in providing a basis for conflict and a criterion for positive peace (Galtung, 1969).

In Sweden, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) began operations in 1966. SIPRI was established with governmental support and publishes the widely used *SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament*. In Switzerland, swisspeace was founded in 1968 to promote independent action-oriented peace and conflict research. In Cape Town, South Africa, the Centre for Intergroup Studies was also established in 1968 and became a channel for meetings between officials of the African National Congress and Afrikaner leaders (van der Merwe, 1989).

In what has become a central activity in the field, some academics began to apply their CAR thinking to ongoing conflicts and use this experience to further develop their ideas. They conducted interactive conflict resolution workshops with government officials, or often with nonofficials, from countries in conflict (Fisher, 1997). John W. Burton, in 1965, organized such a workshop with representatives from Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore. Burton, who had been Secretary of External Affairs in the Australian government, established the Centre for the Analysis of Conflict at the University of London in 1963. The workshops applied the ideas he and his associates were developing as an alternative to the conventional international relations approach. A key concept in this approach is based on the idea later developed that all humans have a set of basic human needs and the thwarting of those needs results in conflict (Burton, 1990).

# Expansion and Institutionalization, 1970-1989

Interestingly, the rapid expansion and institutionalization of conflict analysis and resolution began in the early 1970s, when many American pioneers in the field had become discouraged by their failure to accomplish more during the 1950s and 1960s (Boulding, 1978; Harty & Modell, 1991). Many of them felt that no real progress had been made in developing a comprehensive theory of conflicts and their resolution. In addition, research funds were inadequate, and resistance by academic departments was strong. Consequently, the University of Michigan closed the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution in 1971.

A remarkable change in the fortunes of the CAR field, however, started in the 1970s. It is attributable in good measure to the great increase in conflict resolution practices in the United States. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) quickly expanded, partly as a result of the increase in litigation and court congestion in the 1970s and the increased attraction of nonadversarial ways of handling disputes. Community dispute resolution centers, with volunteer mediators, were established across the country. In West Germany, the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies was established as a nonprofit organization in 1971.

The international context also changed. The effective U.S. mediation in the Middle East in the 1970s, by Henry Kissinger and President Jimmy Carter, raised the visibility and increased the confidence in the potentialities of international mediation. During the 1970s and 1980s, Edward E. Azar, John W. Burton, Leonard Doob, Ronald J. Fisher, Herbert C. Kelman, James Laue, Christopher Mitchell, and other academically based persons conducted problem-solving workshops. The workshops related to conflicts in Northern Ireland, Cyprus, the Middle East, and elsewhere (Fisher, 1997). In addition, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) were founded in this period that conducted training, consultations, and workshops to moderate and resolve large-scale conflicts. Joseph Montville's coining of the terms "Track One" (official) and "Track Two" (unofficial) diplomacy captured the contributions of such unofficial actors in diplomacy and peace processes (Davidson & Montville, 1981-1982). Diamond and McDonald (1996) further elaborated this distinction between a spectrum of third-party actors in their writings on "multi-track diplomacy."

Academic and nonacademic writing continued to be published along the lines of earlier research and theory. Some of these works stressed ideas about waging conflicts constructively, which helped bridge the concerns about mitigating violence and yet advance justice and positive peace. This included social psychological research related to negotiation (Deutsch, 1973). Analyses also pertained to the ways that conflicts are fought using nonviolent action and by applying noncoercive inducements, including positive sanctions and persuasion (Curle, 1971; Kriesberg, 1973; Sharp, 1973). Such work contributed to understanding how even seemingly intractable conflicts could become transformed and cooperative relations established (Axelrod, 1984; Kriesberg, Northrup, & Thorson, 1989).

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

During this period, the increase in publications about negotiation and mediation is particularly striking. The book *Getting to YES* by Fisher and Ury (1981) remains highly popular and influential, explicating how to negotiate without surrendering and to obtain mutual benefits. Several ways to conduct this interest-based negotiation were set forth, taught, and applied. They include ways to elicit the interests underlying stated positions and to construct options that might satisfy those interests. Many empirical analyses portrayed the ways negotiations are done in diverse settings that strengthen relations between the negotiating sides (Gulliver, 1979; Rubin & Brown, 1975; Strauss, 1978; Zartman, 1978).

Mediation also was the subject of much research and theorizing, often with implications for the effective practice of mediation (Moore, 1986). Research was often based on case studies (Kolb, 1983; Rubin, 1981; Susskind, 1987; Touval & Zartman, 1985), but quantitative data were also analyzed (Bercovitch, 1986). The research made clear the great range of contributions mediators can make to facilitate reaching mutually satisfactory agreements efficiently.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the field made remarkable progress in becoming institutionalized within colleges and universities, government agencies, and the corporate and nongovernmental world. In Europe, the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University was created in 1971. The UN General Assembly established the University of Peace as an independent organization in 1980. In the United States, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation contributed greatly to this progress (Kovick, 2005). In 1984, the Foundation launched a remarkable field-building strategy, providing long-term grants in support of conflict analysis and resolution theory, practice, and infrastructure. The first theory center grant in 1984 went to the Harvard Program on Negotiation, a consortium of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts University, and Harvard University. In the same year, it initiated publication of the *Negotiation Journal*. By the end of 1994, it had funded 18 centers. Practitioner organizations pertaining to the environment, community, and many other sectors were also awarded grants. The Hewlett Foundation further strengthened the infrastructure for the field by supporting professional organizations.

Graduate programs in the field grew greatly after 1989, spurred by the rising demand for training in negotiation and mediation (Polkinghorn, La Chance, & La Chance, 2008). Master's degree programs were instituted in several universities, and many universities began to offer educational concentrations in conflict resolution. A major PhD program in CAR was established at George Mason University in 1987.

Several other independent centers were founded in the United States during the 1980s, applying and developing CAR ideas. In 1982, former President Jimmy Carter and Rosalyn Carter created The Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia; its activities include mediating conflicts, overseeing elections, and fighting disease worldwide. Also in 1982, Search for Common Ground was established in Washington, D.C., funded by foundations and NGOs. It conducts many programs to help transform the way conflicts are waged in countries



## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

around the world. Proposed by then-President Carter, the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) was finally opened in 1986 after long Congressional debates and public campaigns. The USIP has conducted programs in CAR education, research, and peacebuilding activities in the field and initiated grants and fellowship programs. It has served as a major convener of policy-related meetings and has published seminal books in CAR (e.g., the Crocker, Hampson, and Aall edited collections among others).

In Africa, the Nairobi Peace Initiative-Africa was founded in 1984 and conducts training and facilitation activities in East, Central, and West Africa. In Europe, too, many new CAR centers were founded, but with somewhat different orientations than in the United States. Generally designated as peace and conflict research centers, they were more directed at international affairs, more closely related to economic and social development, and more linked to government policies, as well as to peace movements in some instances. The international and societal contexts for the European centers also differed from those of the American organizations. After the 1969 electoral victory of the Social Democratic party in West Germany, Chancellor Willy Brandt initiated "Ost-Politik," a policy that recognized East German and East European realities and entailed more East-West interactions.

In 1975, the representatives of the 35 countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Accords (Leatherman, 2003). The agreement incorporated a tradeoff between the Soviet Union and the Western countries. The Soviets finally achieved acceptance of the border changes following World War II, when the Soviet borders were shifted westward, incorporating part of Poland, and the Polish borders were shifted further westward, incorporating part of Germany. In a kind of exchange, the Soviets conceded recognition of fundamental human rights, including greater freedom for its citizens to leave the Soviet Union.

The new West German government helped establish independent peace and conflict institutes, for example, the Hessische Stiftung Friedens und Konfliktforschung was founded in 1970. Additional peace and conflict institutes were established in other European countries, including the Tampere Peace Research Institute, which was founded by the Finnish Parliament in 1969 and opened in 1970. The Danish Parliament established the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute as an independent institute in 1985.

In the early 1970s, peace and conflict chairs and educational programs also began to be established in European universities. For example, in 1973 the Department of Peace Studies was opened at the University of Bradford in the United Kingdom. In 1971, a university-based center was founded at Uppsala University in Sweden; in 1981 the Dag Hammarskjold Peace Chair was established, and after Peter Wallensteen was appointed to the chair in 1985, a PhD program was begun.

The research and theorizing in these European centers were undertaken to have policy relevance for nongovernmental as well as governmental actors (Senghaas, 1970). (These centers) tried to do work that reflected and built upon the changing international context, for example developing ideas relating to nonoffensive (standard American English uses

---

## **Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field**

---

the hyphen) defense. In Germany, the Peace Research Information Unit was established in 1984 to provide information about research findings in forms that were accessible to government officials.

The International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) was created in 1973 in Austria as an international think-tank to bridge Cold War differences. Subsequently, in the 1980s, the Processes of International Negotiation Project was launched at IIASA to develop and propagate knowledge about the processes of negotiation (Kremenjuk, 1991; Zartman & Faure, 2005).

Work in the field helped in managing the Cold War. It contributed to arms control negotiations and agreements, the development of confidence-building measures, and plans for civilian conversions from military bases and production. Peace and conflict researchers in Denmark, West Germany, and other European centers significantly contributed to ending the Cold War (Evangelista, 1999; Kriesberg, 1992). The researchers analyzed the military structures and doctrines of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and of the Warsaw Pact. Each side's forces were arrayed to ensure that a war, if it came, would be carried forward against the enemy, rather than falling back to be fought in their own homeland. Each side, studying the other side's military preparations, could reasonably believe that the other side was planning an aggressive war. The peace and conflict researchers envisaged alternative military postures, which would be clearly defensive—a nonprovocative defense (Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie, 1982). They communicated their findings to officials on both sides of the Cold War. Soviet officials considered the ideas, and Mikhail Gorbachev undertook a restructuring of Soviet forces, adopting some of the language of the peace researchers. These Soviet actions helped convince the U.S. government and other NATO governments of the reality of a Soviet transformation.

## **Diffusion and Differentiation, 1990-2008**

The international system profoundly changed after the Cold War ended in 1989 and the Soviet Union broke up in 1991. Proxy wars, which the Cold War had perpetuated, were settled. Other developments contributed to limiting destructive international and domestic conflicts, and the incidence and magnitude of international wars declined (Gleditsch, 2008; Human Security Centre, 2005; Marshall & Gurr, 2005; Sollenberg & Wallensteen, 1997). UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali's 1992 "Agenda for Peace" laid out a stronger role for the UN in peacemaking in the post-Cold War era specifying engagement in conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. The UN gained importance as a third-party mediator and was better able to act and stop conflicts from escalating destructively. That same year, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe established the office of High Commissioner for National Minorities to engage in "quiet diplomacy" to prevent conflicts from escalating (Kemp, 2001). In the midst of the war in Bosnia and the genocide in Rwanda, the Carnegie Corporation of New York's Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict (1994-1999)

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

launched a project to examine how such wars could be prevented, resulting in a series of reports widely disseminated to the U.S. and international policy community as well as to CAR professionals. The interest in conflict prevention resulted in a number of studies (cf. Djalal & Townsend-Gault, 1999; Leatherman, DeMars, Gaffney, & Väyrynen, 1999; Lund, 1996, 2009; Neu & Volkan, 1999; Wallensteen, 1998).

The growing adherence to norms protecting human rights led to the creation of the first-ever permanent, treaty-based International Criminal Court (ICC) on July 1, 2002. The court was established to help end impunity for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Since its creation, from the initial ratification of the Rome Statute by 60 states, as of April 2017, there were 124 states parties (ICC, N.D.). Alongside the process to create an international criminal court, the Program on Conflict Resolution and Human Rights at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, led by Eileen Babbitt and Hurst Hannum, held a series of discussions on the differences and synergies between CAR and human rights with scholars and practitioners in these fields that led to a number of scholarly publications (e.g., Babbitt & Lutz, 2009; Babbitt & Williams, 2008; Bell, 2000; Mani, 2002; Mertus & Helsing, 2006; Neu, 2012; Parlevliet, 2002, 2009; Scharf, 1999; Stover & Weinstein, 2004; Williams & Scharf, 2002). While the advent of the ICC was widely applauded, the CAR community faced new uncertainty about whether the ICC and other war crimes tribunals would make it more difficult to bring parties together for peace talks (Hayner, 2009).

Following centuries of women's mobilization as both peacemakers and combatants (Boulding, 1976; Cohn, 2013; Kabira & Masinjila, 1997), on October 31, 2000, the UN Security Council voted unanimously in support of Resolution 1325, establishing a new norm for the inclusion of women in all phases of conflict resolution—from prevention through peacebuilding. "Women's knowledge and experience worlds have equipped them to function creatively as problem solvers and peacemakers in ways that men have not been equipped by their knowledge and experience worlds" (Boulding, 2000, p. 109). Implementation of the women, peace, and security agenda has been slow to take root, during which time CAR literature on this topic has grown (Benard et al., 2008; Conaway, 2007; Feminist Institute, 2006; Goetz et al., 2009; Naraghi-Anderlini, 2007).

In 2009, the Security Council adopted two "sister" resolutions (1888, 1889) to emphasize the urgency of women's inclusion in peace processes and to address sexual violence against women in conflict. Within the UN, staff positions such as gender advisors and gender "focal points" were created to advance the implementation of the UNSRC 1325 agenda across UN departments and agencies. International women's organizations had lobbied for such a resolution since the UN endorsed the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action that stipulated that there be equal participation by and opportunities for women to participate in all peace activities at all levels, particularly at the decision-making level, including in the UN Secretariat (Fourth World Conference on Women, 1995).

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

After 1990 CAR spread around the world. The diffusion was not in one direction; rather, ideas and practices from each part of the world influenced the ideas and practices in other regions. For example, the attention given in traditional societies to restoring relations after their disruption by conflicts became increasingly recognized in the field. Similarly, the roles of ritual in peacemaking in many societies drew attention to the uses of various symbols in overcoming the legacies of destructive conflicts (Schirch, 2004; Volkan, 1997). Analyses and reports about CAR methods and approaches in diverse cultures increased, for example, in African and Arab societies (Malan, 1997; Salem, 1997).

The Internet provided increasingly important ways of conducting conflict analysis and resolution education and training transnationally. Perhaps the first CAR presence on the Internet was the Conflict Resolution Consortium, founded online in 1988 at the University of Colorado by Heidi and Guy Burgess as a multidisciplinary center for research and teaching about conflict. Another educationally focused CAR organization, TRANSCEND, led by Johan Galtung, was established as a “peace and development network for conflict transformation by peaceful means,” and it operates the online Transcend Peace University. Similarly, the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, based in Barcelona, offers online graduate courses and degrees in conflict resolution. The United States Institute of Peace created an online searchable database of peace agreements as did the UN’s Department of Political Affairs through its UN Peacemaker website. Websites providing information about the field as well as analyses of specific conflicts grew during this period.

Numerous educational programs related to the field existed; as of 2007, 88 graduate programs were active in the United States, but PhD programs remained few (Botes, 2004; Polkinghorn et al., 2008). In addition, certificate programs associated with professional schools greatly increased. CAR programs emerged in many other countries, notably in Europe, Canada, Africa, and Australia. In Latin America there were many certificate mediation training programs and several master’s programs (N. Femenia, personal communication, January 15, 2007). This was associated with the proliferation of ADR programs as many countries reformed their legal systems to include mandatory mediation (Ormachea-Choque, 1998).

CAR ideas, practices, and institutions continued to develop internationally. The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, based in Durban, South Africa, was founded in 1991 and operates internationally. Femmes Solidarité Africa, based in Geneva and Dakar, was established in 1996 to support women’s initiatives in conflict prevention and management. The Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center, which offers courses for peacekeeping troops and others in conflict prevention, analysis, and mediation, was opened in Accra, Ghana, in 2004. The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding, also based in Accra, began providing training and publications on CAR in 1998. In Asia, CAR developments were notable in South Korea and Japan. The increased freedom of civil society in South Korea and the decline of the “high context” or “collectivist” character of its culture, which had contributed to conflict avoidance, raised

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

interest in adopting CAR methods (H.-W. Jeong, personal communication, December 3, 2006). In Japan, conflict analysis and resolution was less in demand for domestic disputes but more developed in foreign policy circles and development aid groups. In Canada, the Pearson International Peacekeeping Training Center, from 1994 to 2013, provided broad training to military personnel and others from countries around the world.

The September 11, 2001, attacks carried out by Al Qaeda against the United States and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq seem to have marked the beginning of a new world disorder in which terrorist attacks, violent repressions, and profound religious and ethnic antagonisms were intensifying and spreading. The failure to comprehend and use a CAR approach by leaders of Al Qaeda and those in former U.S. President George W. Bush's administration greatly exacerbated erupting conflicts, increasing their destructiveness and duration (Kriesberg, 2015).

The characteristics of large-scale violent conflicts changed in several regards relevant to CAR. Interstate wars became rare while internal wars increased in the early 1990s. Since then they had declined, but they remained frequent and recurrent. These conflicts more frequently involved issues relating to religion and ethnicity, which involved sacred values and seemed less amenable to rational calculations of costs and benefits leading to compromises. In addition, they were often conducted in the context of greater global attention, which contributed to more frequent external interventions. This generated more attention in the field to the role of religious beliefs and ethnic loyalties in waging and settling large-scale conflicts.

CAR practitioners returned to earlier considerations of emotions in conflicts and to new thinking about how to deal with them in ways that avoid and end destructive escalations. This was the case, for example, in examining feelings of humiliation and the desire for revenge (Fontan, 2008; Volkan, 1997). Current work on identities in conflict has become attentive to their fluidity and potential for transformations that contribute to conflict regulation and resolution (Coy & Woehrlé, 2000; Jenkins & Gottlieb, 2007; Volkan, 2006). The role of cultural narratives, rituals, enactments, and other symbolic manifestations in de-escalating and recovering from violent conflicts have also become a focus for scholarly work (Ross, 2007). Indeed, there is evidence that symbolic concessions can be more effective than material concessions in reaching mutually satisfactory peace agreements (Atran, Axelrod, & Davis, 2007).

Some CAR methods developed earlier to help prepare adversaries for de-escalating steps began to be employed at the later stages of conflicts as well. These include small problem-solving workshops, dialogue circles, and training to improve capacities to negotiate and mediate. Such practices, usually conducted at the Track Two level, help avert a renewal of vicious fights by fostering accommodations, and even reconciliation, at various levels of the antagonistic sides. Ideas about reframing conflicts help account for conflict de-escalation and transformation.

## **Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field**

---

After 1990, the CAR field flourished within its established arenas and expanded into new spheres of endeavor. More specialized applications and research activities were undertaken as external interventions and negotiated agreements increased, ending many protracted international and civil conflicts (Wallensteen, 2002). Even after violence stopped or a negotiated agreement was reached, the frequent recurrence of wars made evident the need for external intervention to sustain agreements. Governments and international governmental organizations were not fully prepared and lacked the capacity to manage the multitude of problems that followed the end of hostilities. They increasingly employed NGOs to carry out some of the needed work of humanitarian relief, institution building, protection of human rights, training in conflict resolution skills, and unofficial diplomacy. The number and scope of NGOs working on such matters grew quickly, many of them applying the CAR approach. The Alliance for Peacebuilding, established in the late 1990s, served as a network for conflict resolution NGOs nationally and internationally.

Governmental and intergovernmental organizations became more attentive to CAR and the significance of NGOs and grassroots engagement in managing conflicts and in peacebuilding. At the UN, a Mediation Support Unit was established in 2007 and a cross-agency position of peace and development advisor was created. The UN Peacemaker website was launched with a database of peace agreements and UN guidelines on aspects of CAR. The African Union and other intergovernmental organizations also established entities focused on CAR during this time.

Concurrent with such applied CAR developments, numerous publications described, analyzed, and assessed these applications. An important development linking theory and applied work was the assessment of practitioner undertakings. Empirically grounded assessments of CAR applications increasingly examine what kinds of interventions, by various groups, have diverse consequences (Anderson & Olson, 2003; Fisher, 2005).

A growing literature focused on post-agreement problems and solutions, relating to external intervention and institution building (Paris, 2004; Stedman, Rothchild, & Cousens, 2002). The role of public engagement and attention to participatory governance also increased in the CAR approach. Greater attention was also given to establishing new systems of collaborative governance to minimize ineffective and destructive conflicts. These developments were related to the growing view that CAR should go beyond focusing on negotiating settlements and examine the broader transformation of conflicts, which occurs at many levels over an extended time span (Botes, 2003; Kriesberg, 2006; Lederach, 1997; Saunders, 1999).

## **Advances and Challenges, 2009-2017**

In the United States, 2009 marked an historic turning point with the first African American elected president taking office with promises to end U.S. involvement in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, close Guantanamo, ban the use of torture, and engage

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

diplomatically with Iran. The era of the “war on terror” with its heightened emphasis on security seemed to be ending.

Barely a year later in 2010, the balance between safeguarding citizens’ rights while ensuring their security seemed to shift back, directly impacting the work of CAR practitioners. In a 2010 Supreme Court decision, *Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project* (Supreme Court of the United States, 2010), the Court upheld the Patriot Act’s prohibition on providing material support to terrorists. Material support was defined to include providing training and/or expert advice on such topics as negotiations and human rights. It can apply extrajudicially to non-U.S. citizens (Cole, 2012; Doyle, 2010; William Aceves, personal communication, June 5, 2016). Although talking with tyrants and terrorists in pursuit of peace has been an ethical question CAR scholar-practitioners have answered differently over the years, this legal decision placed the CAR community in an untenable position. If practitioners choose to engage with groups that might (knowingly or unknowingly) contain a member of a terrorist group, they risk being prosecuted for providing “material support” to that group when they offer training or advising on conflict resolution processes. Complicating this further is the lack of a clear definition of terrorists, so CAR practitioners cannot know with whom they can legally interact (Babbitt & Hampson, 2011). Former President Jimmy Carter reacted to the *Holder* decision, saying,

The “material support law”—which is aimed at putting an end to terrorism—actually threatens The Carter Center’s work and the work of many other peacemaking organizations that must interact directly with groups that have engaged in violence. The vague language of the law leaves us wondering if we will be prosecuted for our work to promote peace and freedom.

(Carter, 2010)

Another threat to peace is climate change that can result in the loss of livelihoods and displacement, contributing to conflicts across North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. Attempting to address the negative impacts of climate change, in January 2009 the UN convened an historic summit in Copenhagen that resulted in a less than hoped for outcome: a nonbinding agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Almost seven years later, in December 2015, 195 countries at the Paris Climate Conference could not agree to limit the rise in greenhouse gas emissions to the desired 1.5°C but pledged to limit it to 2°C—a goal at which climate change could become dangerous to humanity. In fact, that goal may have been breached in March 2016 for the first time in human history (Holthaus, 2016).

In 2011, nonviolent people’s movements against dictatorships, corruption, and human rights abuses spread across the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). Tunisians launched the first popular, nonviolent movement in the region against President Ben Ali and succeeded in peacefully unseating him. Popular uprisings across the MENA region became known as the “Arab Spring,” yet the peoples’ movements in Egypt, Libya, Syria, and Yemen had far less successful results. Presidents Mubarak of Egypt and Saleh of

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Yemen stepped down peacefully, yet the hoped-for democratic political change did not occur in either country. Yemen has been the locus of war since 2015 and has one of the worst humanitarian situations in the world. In Syria, the response of the Assad regime to the people's movement was all-out war, including the use of chemical weapons against the Syrian people. By 2016, almost 500,000 Syrians had died with 6.5 million internally displaced and more than 4.8 million refugees (UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 2016). In Libya, the uprising led to a civil war in which the United States and NATO became involved. Libyan leader El-Qaddafi was killed by his own people in October 2011.

In response to the rise of terrorist groups, the Institute for Economics and Peace, known for its Global Peace Index, launched the Global Terrorism Index in 2013. The 2015 Index (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2015) reported that deaths from terrorism increased by 80% over the previous year, the largest increase in 15 years. Pettersson and Wallensteen (2015) report that there were 40 armed conflicts in 2014, an increase of 18% over the previous year, saying that the trend toward decreasing conflict seen in previous years appears to have been reversed. According to the Global Terrorism Index, 78% of the deaths took place in five countries: Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Syria. Boko Haram overtook Daesh as the deadliest terrorist group, killing more than 7,500 people ("Daesh" is known in English as Islamic State, Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, or Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant) (Irshaid, 2015). In 2014, reversing more than a decade of decreasing numbers of armed conflicts, there were more wars than in any year since 2000 (SIPRI, 2015).

Addressing the rise of nonstate extremist actors, CAR scholars and practitioners have produced research on extremism and terrorism that includes analyses of social movements in the MENA region (Abboud, 2016; Beinin & Vairel, 2013). Research includes examining how to prevent and counter violent extremism (Imam, 2016; Ould Mohamedou, 2016), women's roles in countering violent extremism (Couture, 2014), violent nonstate actors as perpetrators and enablers of atrocities (Gerber & Rapp, 2015), and the discourse on peace by jihadist movements (Ali, 2016). Analyses of extremist/terrorist groups have found that these groups fill a void left by failed or absent states (Aoun, 2016; Bauman, 2016) and that these groups (e.g., Boko Haram, Al-Qaeda in the Magreb, traffickers and former soldiers) are mutable and opportunistic (M. Alexis, personal communication, January 25, 2016; Bauman, 2016).

There has been much attention paid to the role of technology and social media during the Arab uprisings. Social media offered powerful networks for prodemocracy citizens to discuss and mobilize political action in closed societies (Gilmore, 2012). In Egypt and Tunisia, people used their cell phones to call and send texts to organize protests and posted to social media to share information instantaneously to both local and international audiences. Some of that information was then shared with a wider audience via television or the Internet (Seib, 2012; Shirky, 2011). In the post-November 2016 U.S. elections, social media were similarly used to organize and mobilize civil society to resist executive orders and policies from the new White House administration. Social media



## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

have been instrumental in the record global turnout for the Women's March in 2017, held the day after President Trump was inaugurated, and in the creation of grassroots civil resistance groups in the United States (e.g., Indivisible, SwingLeft).

The use of technology and social media in CAR includes providing early warnings of conflict (Martin-Shields, 2013; Pham & Vinck, 2012),; mapping conflicts in real time, as is being done for the war in Syria (The Carter Center, 2014); and analyzing and examining data on the short-term dynamics of military conflict (Zeitsoff, 2011). Providing early warnings and mapping conflicts in real time are activities that depend on people who are on the ground in the conflict zone providing the data. Thus while these technologies provide new opportunities for social movements to be heard at home and globally, they risk putting those who use them in danger. Repressive regimes may use the same technologies to identify and track dissidents. There are ethical challenges regarding the use of these new media that include ensuring that data are protected and that individuals have the right to delete their data and/or opt out of participation (Martin-Shields, 2013).

Terrorist attacks in Europe in early 2016 strengthened the case for maintaining the security apparatus put in place post-9/11. While the war on terror launched in 2003 continues to frame approaches to diplomacy and peacemaking (Tonge, 2014), increasingly, intergovernmental organizations, governments, and militaries have reached out to CAR specialists for assistance in analyzing conflict, designing and assisting in peace processes, and supporting peacebuilding approaches. Recently, CAR researchers have drawn from systems theory (Ricigliano, 2012) and complexity theory (Nathan, 2016) to help understand the multiplicity of actors, issues, and interactions in conflict and peacemaking.

Graduate programs in CAR have grown in number from 88 programs in 2007 to 135 academic programs in peace studies, conflict intervention (resolution), and/or ADR in 2017 (Bosserman Center for Conflict Resolution at Salisbury University, personal communication with Executive Director Brian Polkinghorn, July 27, 2017). The transmission of CAR research and knowledge has expanded into more policy arenas in the past decade, focused on the analysis and assessment of conflicts as well as mediation and peace processes. Drawing on earlier work (cf. Bush, 1998; Goodhand, Vaux, & Walker, 2002; Mason & Rychard, 2005; Samarasinghe, Donaldson, & McGinn, 2001; Sardesai & Wam, 2002; Slim, 2007), guidelines and manuals have been produced to help diplomats, CAR professionals, humanitarians, and development workers design and implement more effective interventions (cf., e.g., Conflict Sensitivity Consortium, 2012; Naraghi-Anderlini, 2015; Irmer, 2009; Sandole, Byrne, Sandole-Staroste, & Senehi, 2009; Smith & Smock, 2008; UN Security Council, 2009, UN, 2012A) U.S. Interagency Working Group, 2008; West Africa Network for Peacebuilding, 2012; Zartman & de Soto, 2010).

Drawing from CAR work, the UN has produced reports highlighting its role in leading more effective conflict prevention and mediation efforts (Hayner, 2009; UN Security Council, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2015). Intergovernmental and governmental organizations have allocated funding for units and/or projects aimed at CAR (often referred to as

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

“mediation support”) either within their organizations or to outside CAR consultants and NGOs. Mediation units have proliferated since the creation of the UN’s Mediation Support Unit in 2007 with the establishment of new units or focus areas in intergovernmental, governmental, and nongovernmental organizations (e.g., Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue’s Mediation Support and Policy Programme; the recently created European Institute of Peace designed to contribute to the European Union’s global peace agenda; European Union’s Mediation Support Group; United States Institute of Peace’s issue area foci on Mediation, Negotiation, and Dialogue and on Peace Processes; Berghof Foundation’s Dialogue, Mediation, and Peace Support Structures; and swisspeace’s Mediation Program). Mediation in these cases often refers to a broad range of activities including providing technical expertise on such issues as security sector reform, governance, and natural resource management.

CAR scholars and practitioners have emphasized inclusivity in peace processes. Inclusivity has become an accepted norm if not an accomplished fact. Research is ongoing to determine what impact opening up peace processes would have on outcomes and the sustainability of agreements. The goal of inclusivity is to ensure that the views and needs of conflict parties and other stakeholders are represented and integrated into the process and outcome of peace processes (UN, 2012B). Inclusivity does not mean that everyone is present in every stage and part of the process; different models for inclusion have been proposed (Naraghi-Anderlini, 2015; Paffenholz, 2014; Verwijk, 2012; von Burg, 2015).

In a study of 20 peace talks from 1993 to 2008 with high, moderate, or low participation by civil society groups, all of the processes that had a high level of civil society engagement resulted in sustained peace in the peacebuilding phase. This research also found that civil society groups with active roles in the peace talks resulted in their being invested in the process as well as in the peacebuilding phase that followed (Wanis-St. John & Kew, 2008).

Women have increased their participation in CAR work, but not without resistance (de Alwis, Mertus, & Sajjad, 2013; Kaufman & Williams, 2013; Naraghi-Anderlini, 2007). Women engaging in peace processes or in acts of resistance and political violence during conflict are seen as challenging gender norms (Kaufman & Williams, 2013). In 2012, women continued to be largely excluded from official peace processes. Women constituted only 9% of negotiators, 4% of signatories, 2.4% of chief mediators, and 3.7% of witnesses to peace talks (Paffenholz, Potter Prentice, & Buchanan, 2015). A recent qualitative study of 40 conflict cases examined the influence that the inclusion of women’s groups in peace processes had on the quality and sustainability of peace agreements (O’Reilly, Ó Súilleabháin, & Paffenholz, 2015). Among other results, the study found that where women’s groups were able to influence the talks or push for a peace deal, an agreement was almost always reached (one case excepted). Another study analyzed 182 signed peace agreements between 1989 and 2011 looking at the impact of women’s inclusion on the durability of peace agreements (Stone, in progress). The researcher found that women’s participation had a statistically positive effect on the

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

duration of an agreement. An agreement is 20% more likely to last at least two years with women's inclusion and there is more than a 35% chance that it will last 15 years if women participate in the creation of the agreement.

Inclusivity therefore concerns both the process (who) and content (what) of peace processes. Research has found that process-related inclusivity strengthens the process by getting "buy-in" from important groups; by civil society members acting as watchdogs and applying pressure to the parties; by gaining more support and legitimacy for the process and the agreement; by bringing more diversity that can counter the interests of the elites to include broader public interests; and by the inclusion of civil society experts, NGOs, and international NGOs who can provide needed expertise (Paffenholz, 2014; von Burg, 2015; Wanis-St. John & Kew, 2008). For example, one of the criticisms of the early Geneva talks on Syria was that the process intentionally excluded local and international actors who were part of the conflict and had the power to shape its trajectory (Abboud, 2016).

Content-related inclusivity is about the issues on the table during peace talks. Armed actors may have a more limited number of issues that they want to discuss than do representatives of civil society (von Burg, 2015). Civil society and women can expand the agenda to ensure that a peace agreement will address the central concerns of the people and not just the armed actors. One concern about the Geneva talks on Syria, for example, has been that the focus was on the issue of political transition at the expense of other issues (Abboud, 2016). Prioritizing inclusivity in a peace process is a challenge for mediation teams as they try to balance a quick and effective process to end the violence while setting up a foundation for longer term sustainability (von Burg, 2015).

A complicating factor in inclusion is that civil society does not speak with one voice, can be highly fragmented, may be extensions of the state and/or warring factions, and may be led by elites (Srinivasan, 2016; von Burg, 2015). Another challenge is that civil society organizations that have legitimacy in their own communities may be seen as undemocratic or "uncivil" by outsiders who may hesitate or decline to work with such individuals or groups. In fact, some scholars have pointed out that the notion of civil society as construed by the West may not exist as such in all societies and that in some countries, those civil society organizations supported by international funders are "bureaucratized" organizations that do not serve the same purpose of acting as a counterpower (Srinivasan, 2016; Wanis-St. John & Kew, 2008). When the uprising began in Syria in 2011, there was no independent civil society that could mobilize protesters (Abboud, 2016).

In the future, we expect that the CAR field will continue to grow in size and societal penetration. Support for professional associations, NGOs, research, and university programs in CAR is crucial to advancing the field. The need and the potentiality for growth are great in many regions of the world, notably the Middle East, parts of Asia, and in Africa. In addition, the need for increased knowledge and application of the CAR approach is growing since intensifying world integration and dis-integration is a source of

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

more and more potentially destructive conflicts, as well as a source of reasons to reduce and contain them. The cost of failing to prevent and stop destructive conflicts is enormous and increasing. CAR can help foster more constructive methods to wage and resolve conflicts. Recent regressive nationalist and authoritarian developments in the United States and elsewhere are gnawing at the foundations and values of CAR. They make it all the more imperative that we continue to pursue research and application to more successfully prevent and transform destructive conflicts.

### Links to Digital Materials

**Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue.**

### References

Abboud, S. N. (2016). *Syria*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Ali, H. E. (2016, March). *A radical theology of peace: Perception of peace in the discourse of radical jihadists movements*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Atlanta, GA.

Anderson, M. B., & Olson, L. (2003). *Confronting war: Critical lessons for peace practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: Collaborative for Development Action.

Aoun, E. (2016, March). *Wasted peace in Lebanon: From the end of the civil war to the radicalization of the Sunni youth*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Atlanta, GA.

Atran, S., Axelrod, R., & Davis, R. (2007). Sacred barriers to conflict resolution. *Science*, 317, 1039-1040.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Babbitt, E. F., & Hampson, F. O. (2011). Conflict resolution as a field of inquiry: Practice informing theory. *International Studies Quarterly*, 13(1), 46-57.

Babbitt, E. F., & Lutz, E. L. (Eds.). (2009). *Human rights and conflict resolution in context*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Babbitt, E., & Williams, K. (2008). *Complimentary approaches to coexistence work: Focus on coexistence and human rights*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, Coexistence International.

Bauman, P. (2016, March). *Bullets and Band-Aids: Alternatives for preventing violent extremism in the Lake Chad Basin*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Atlanta, GA.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Beinin, J., & Vairel, F. (Eds.). (2013). Introduction. In J. Beinin & F. Vairel (Eds.), *Social movements, mobilization, and contestation in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 1-29). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bell, C. (2000). *Peace agreements and human rights*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Benard, C., Jones, S. G., Oliner, O., Thurston, C. Q., Stearns, B. K., & Cordell, K. (2008). *Women and nation-building*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Center for Middle East Public Policy.

Bercovitch, J. (1986). International mediation: A study of incidence, strategies and conditions of successful outcomes. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 21, 155-168.

Bondurant, J. V. (1965). *Conquest of violence: The Gandhian philosophy of violence*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Botes, J. (2003). Conflict transformation: A debate over semantics or a crucial shift in the theory and practice of peace and conflict studies? *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 8(2), 1-27.

Botes, J. (2004). Graduate peace and conflict studies programs: Reconsidering their problems and prospects. *Conflict Management in Higher Education Report*, 5(1), 1-10.

Boulding, E. (1976). *The underside of history: A view of women through time*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Boulding, K. E. (1962). *Conflict and defense*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Boulding, K. E. (1978). Future directions in conflict and peace studies. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 22(2), 342-354.

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An agenda for peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peace-keeping: Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Brodie, B. (1959). *Strategy in the missile age*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Burton, J. (1990). *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Bush, K. (1998). *A measure of peace: Peace and conflict impact assessment of development projects in conflict zones*. Working Paper, Evaluation Unit, International Development Research Centre. Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Centre.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

- Carter, J. (2010). **Statement on the Supreme Court decision on *Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project***. New York, NY: American Civil Liberties Union.
- Cohn, C. (Ed.). (2013). *Women & wars*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.
- Cole, D. (2012). The First Amendment's borders: The place of *Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project* in First Amendment doctrine. Georgetown Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper 12-047. *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 6, 148-177.
- Conaway, C. P. (2007) *United Nations reform: Improving peace operations by advancing the role of women*. Muscatine: IA: The Stanley Foundation.
- Conflict Sensitivity Consortium. (2012). **How to guide to conflict sensitivity**. London, U.K.: Department for International Development.
- Cortright, D. (2008) *Peace: A history of movements and ideas*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Coser, L. A. (1956) *The functions of social conflict*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Couture, K. L. (2014). *A gendered approach to countering violent extremism lessons learned from women in peacebuilding and conflict prevention applied successfully in Bangladesh and Morocco*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- Coy, P. G., & Woehrlé, L. W. (Eds.). (2000) *Social conflicts and collective identities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Curle, A. (1971). *Making peace*. London, U.K.: Tavistock.
- Davidson, W. D., & Montville, J. V. (1981-1982). **Foreign policy according to Freud**. *Foreign Policy*, 45, 145-157.
- de Alwis, M., Mertus, J., & Sajjad, T. (2013). Women and peace processes. In C. Cohn (Ed.), *Women & war* (pp. 169-193). Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.
- Deutsch, K. W., Burrell, S. A., & Kann, R. A. (1957). *Political community and the North Atlantic area*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Diamond, L., & McDonald, J. W. (1996). *Multi-track diplomacy: A systems approach to peace*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Djalal, H., & Townsend-Gault, I. (1999). Managing potential conflicts in the South China Sea: Informal diplomacy for conflict prevention. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Herding cats: Multiparty mediation in a complex world* (pp. 107-133) Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Doyle, C. (2010). *Terrorist material support: An overview of 18 U.S.C. 2339A and 2339B: CRS report for Congress*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

Evangelista, M. (1999). *Unarmed forces: The transnational movement to end the Cold War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Feminist Institute. (2006). *Peace and security for all: A feminist critique of the current peace and security policy*. Berlin, Germany: Heinrich Böll Foundation.

Fisher, R. (1997). *Interactive conflict resolution*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Fisher, R. (2005). *Paving the way: Contributions of interactive conflict resolution to peacemaking*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981) *Getting to yes*. London, U.K.: Penguin.

Follet, M. P. (1942). *Dynamic Administration*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Fontan, V. (2008). *Voices from post-Saddam Iraq: Living with terrorism, insurgency and new forms of tyranny*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Fourth World Conference on Women. (1995). *Beijing declaration and platform for action*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 3(3), 167-191.

Gerber, R., & Rapp, S. J. (2015). *Violent nonstate actors as perpetrators and enablers of atrocity crimes*. Policy Dialogue Brief. Muscatine, IA: The Stanley Foundation.

Gilmore, E. (2012). Democratisation and new media. *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 23, 5-12.

Gleditsch, N. P. (2008). The liberal moment fifteen years on. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(4), 691-712.

Goetz, A. M., Cueva-Beteta, H., Eddon, R., Sandler, J., Doraid, M., Bhandarkar, M., . . . Dayal, A. (2009). *Who answers to women? Gender & accountability*. Progress of the World's Women 2008/9. New York, NY: UNIFEM.

Goodhand, J., Vaux, T., & Walker, R. (2002). *Conducting conflict assessments: Guidance notes*. London, U.K.: Department for International Development.

Gulliver, P. H. (1979). *Disputes and negotiations: A cross-cultural perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Haas, E. B. (1958). *The uniting of Europe*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

---

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Hancock, K. J., Baum, M. A., & Breuning, M. (2013). Women and pre-tenure scholarly productivity in international studies: An investigation into the leaky career pipeline. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14, 507-527.

Harty, M., & Modell, J. (1991). The first conflict resolution movement, 1956-1971: An attempt to institutionalize applied interdisciplinary social science. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 35(4), 720-758.

Hayner, P. (2009). *Negotiating justice: Guidance for mediators*. Geneva, Switzerland: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue Report.

Henderson, M. (1996). *The forgiveness factor*. London, U.K.: Grosvenor Books.

Holsti, O. R., Brody, R. A., & North, R. C. (1964). Measuring affect and action in international reaction models: Empirical materials from the 1962 Cuban crisis. *Journal of Peace Research*, 3-4, 170-189.

Holthaus, E. (2016, March 12). **Our planet's temperature just reached a terrifying milestone**. *Slate*.

Human Security Centre. (2005). *Human security report 2005*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Imam, A. (2016). *The devil is in the details: At the nexus of development, women's rights, and religious fundamentalisms*. Toronto, ON: Association for Women's Rights in Development.

Institute for Economics and Peace. (2015). **Global terrorism index 2015**. New York, NY: Author.

International Criminal Court. (ICC) (n.d.). **The States Parties to the Rome Statute**. The Hague: The Netherlands: Author.

Irmer, C. (2009, April). **A systems approach and the interagency conflict assessment framework (ICAF)**. Paper presented at The Cornwallis Group XIV: Analysis of Societal Conflict and Counter-Insurgency, Vienna, Austria.

Irshaid, F. (2015, December 2). **Isis, Isil, or Daesh? One group, many names**. *BBC News*.

Jenkins, J. C., & Gottlieb, E. E. (Eds.). (2007). *Identity conflicts: Can violence be regulated?* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Kabira, W. M., & Masinjila, M. (1997). *Towards gender responsive politics*. Nairobi, Kenya: Friedrich Ebert Foundation.

Kahn, H. (1960). *On thermonuclear war*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.



## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

- Kaufman, J. P., & Williams, K. P. (2013). *Women at war, women building peace: Challenging gender norms*. Boulder, CO: Kumarian.
- Kemp, W. (2001). *Quiet diplomacy in action: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.
- Kolb, D. M. (1983). *The mediators*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie. (1982). *Frieden mit anderen waffen*. Reinbeck, Germany: Rowohlt.
- Kovick, D. (2005). *The Hewlett Foundation's conflict resolution program: Twenty years of field-building, 1984-2004*. Menlo Park, CA: Hewlett Foundation.
- Kremenyuk, V. A. (Ed.). (1991). *International negotiation: Analysis, approaches, issues*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kriesberg, L. (1973). *The sociology of social conflicts*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kriesberg, L. (1992). *International conflict resolution: The US-USSR and Middle East cases*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kriesberg, L. (2006). Assessing past strategies for countering terrorism in Lebanon and by Libya. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 13(1), 1-20.
- Kriesberg, L. (2007). Contemporary conflict resolution applications. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war: Conflict management in a divided world* (pp. 873-894). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Kriesberg, L. (2015). *Realizing peace: A constructive conflict approach*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Kriesberg, L., Northrup, T. A., & Thorson, S. J. (Eds.). (1989). *Intractable conflicts and their transformation*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1935). *World politics and personal insecurity*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Leatherman, J. (2003). *From Cold War to democratic peace*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Leatherman, J., DeMars, W., Gaffney, P. D., & Väyrynen, R. (1999). *Breaking cycles of violence: Conflict prevention in intrastate crises*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Lentz, T. F. (1955). *Towards a science of peace: Turning point in human destiny*. New York, NY: Bookman.

Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics 1935-1946*. New York, NY: Harper.

Lund, M. (1996). *Preventing violent conflicts: A strategy for preventive diplomacy*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Lund, M. (2009). Conflict prevention: Theory in pursuit of policy and practice. In J. Bercovitch, V. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook on conflict resolution*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Malan, J. (1997). *Conflict resolution wisdom from Africa*. Durban, South Africa: African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes.

Mani, R. (2002). *Beyond retribution: Seeking justice in the shadows of war*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Marshall, M. G., & Gurr, T. R. (2005). *Peace and conflict, 2005*. College Park: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland.

Martin-Shields, C. (2013). The technologist's dilemma: Ethical challenges of using crowdsourcing technology in conflict and disaster-affected regions. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 14(2), 157-163.

Mason, S. A., & Rychard, S. (2005). *Conflict analysis tools*. Bern, Switzerland: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

Mertus, J. A., & Helsing, J. W. (2006). *Human rights & conflict: Exploring the links between rights, law, and peacebuilding*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mitrany, D. (1948). The functional approach to world organization. *International Affairs*, 24(3), 350-363.

Moore, C. W. (1986). *The mediation process*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Naraghi-Anderlini, S. (2007). *Women building peace: What they do, why it matters*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Naraghi-Anderlini, S. (2015). *The Better Peace Tool*. Washington, DC: International Civil Society Network.

Nathan, L. (2016, March). *International mediation and the management of complexity*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association conference, Atlanta, GA.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Neu, J. (2012). Pursuing justice in the midst of war: The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 5(1), 72-95.

Neu, J., & Volkan, V. (1999). *Developing a methodology for conflict prevention: The case of Estonia*. Atlanta, GA: The Carter Center.

O'Reilly, M., Ó Súilleabháin, A., & Paffenholz, T. (2015). *Reimagining peacemaking: Women's roles in peace processes*. New York, NY: International Peace Institute.

Ormachea-Choque, I. (1998). *Análisis de la Ley de Conciliación Extrajudicial*. Lima, Peru: Cultural Cuzco.

Osgood, C. E. (1962). *An alternative to war or surrender*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Ould Mohamedou, M. (2016). Religious extremism, insurgent violence, and the transformation of the new African security landscape. In P. Aall & C. Crocker (Eds.), *Minding the gap: African conflict management in a time of change* (pp. 65-76). Waterloo, ON: Center for International Governance Innovation.

Paffenholz, T. (2014). *Broadening participation in peace processes*. Geneva, Switzerland: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue.

Paffenholz, T., Potter Prentice, A., & Buchanan, C. (2015). *Fresh insights on the quantity and quality of women's inclusion in peace processes*. Policy Brief. Helsinki, Finland, and Geneva, Switzerland: CMI and the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.

Paris, R. (2004). *At war's end: Building peace after civil conflict*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Parlevliet, M. (2002). Bridging the divide: Exploring the relationship between human rights and conflict management. *Track Two*, 11, 8-43.

Parlevliet, M. (2009). *Rethinking conflict transformation from a human rights perspective*. Berlin, Germany: Berghof Foundation.

Pettersson, T., & Wallenstein, P. (2015). Armed conflicts, 1946-2014. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(4), 536-550.

Pham, P. N., & Vinck, P. (2012). Technology fusion and their implications for conflict early warning systems, public health, and human rights. *Health and Human Rights*, 14(2), 106-117.

Pilusik, M., & Hayden, T. (1965). Is there a military industrial complex which prevents peace? *Journal of Social Issues*, 21, 67-117.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Polkinghorn, B. D., La Chance, H., & La Chance, R. (2008). Constructing a baseline understanding of developmental trends in graduate conflict resolution programs in the United States. In R. Fleishman, C. Gerard, & R. O'Leary (Eds.), *Pushing the boundaries: New frontiers in conflict resolution and collaboration* (pp. 233-265). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group.

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary conflict resolution* (4th ed.). Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Rapoport, A. (1966). *Two-person game theory: The essential ideas*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Richardson, L. F. (1960). *Statistics of deadly quarrels*. Pittsburgh, PA: Boxwood.

Ricigliano, R. (2012). *Making peace last: A toolbox for sustainable peacebuilding*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker: An account of a research program conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ross, M. H. (2007). *Cultural contestation in ethnic conflict*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, J. Z. (Ed.). (1981). *Dynamics of third party intervention: Kissinger in the Middle East*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Rubin, J. Z., & Brown, B. R. (1975). *The social psychology of bargaining and negotiation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Salem, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Conflict resolution in the Arab world: Selected essays*. Beirut, Lebanon: American University of Beirut.

Samarasinghe, S., Donaldson, B., & McGinn, C. (2001). *Conflict vulnerability analysis: Issues, tools, & responses*. Washington, DC: USAID/Africa Bureau's Office of Sustainable Development.

Sandole, D. J. D., Byrne, S., Sandole-Staroste, I., & Senehi, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution*. Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge.

Sardesai, S., & Wam, P. (2002). *The conflict analysis framework (CAF) identifying conflict-related obstacles to development*. Washington, DC: Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit, World Bank.

Saunders, H. H. (1999). *A public peace process: Sustained dialogue to transform racial and ethnic conflicts*. New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Scharf, M. (1999). The amnesty exception to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 32, 507-527.

---

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Schelling, T. C. (1960). *The strategy of conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schirch, L. (2004). *Ritual and symbol in peacebuilding*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.

Seib, P. M. (2012). Lessons from the Arab Awakening of 2011. *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 23, 13-21.

Senghaas, D. (1970). *Friedensforschung und gesellschaftskritik*. Munich, Germany: C. Hanser.

Senghaas, D. (1972). *Rüstung und militarismus*. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.

Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of nonviolent action*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.

Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Shirky, C. (2011). The political power of social media: Technology, the public sphere, and political change. *Foreign Affairs*, 90(1), 28-41.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2015). *SIPRI yearbook 2015*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Slim, H. (2007). *A guide to mediation: Enabling peace processes in violent conflicts*. Geneva, Switzerland: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue.

Smith, A., & Smock, D. R. (2008). *Managing a mediation process*. Peacemakers Toolkit. Washington, DC, U.S.: Institute of Peace Press.

Snyder, G. H., & Diesing, P. (1977). *Conflict among nations: Bargaining, decision making, and system structure in international crises*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sollenberg, M., & Wallensteen, P. (1997). Major armed conflicts. In *SIPRI yearbook 1997* (p. 1). Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Sorokin, P. A. (1925). *The sociology of revolution*. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott.

Srinivasan, S. (2016). Civil society as counter-power: Rethinking international support toward tackling conflict and fostering non-violent politics in Africa. In P. Aall & C. Crocker (Eds.), *Minding the gap: African conflict management in a time of change* (pp. 295-310). Waterloo, ON: Centre for International Governance Innovation.

Stedman, S. J., Rothchild, D., & Cousens, E. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Ending civil wars: The implementation of peace agreements*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Stone, L. (2016). Quantitative analysis of women's participation in peace processes. (Manuscript in preparation).

Stover, E., & Weinstein, H. M. (2004). *My neighbor, my enemy: Justice and community in the aftermath of mass atrocity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

---

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Supreme Court of the United States. (2010, June 21). *Holder, Attorney General et al v. Humanitarian Law Project et al*. 561 U.S. Nos. 08-1498 and 09-89.

Susskind, L. (1987). *Breaking the impasse: Consensual approaches to resolving public disputes*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

The Carter Center (2014). *Syria*. Countrywide Conflict Report 3. Atlanta, GA: Conflict Resolution Program, The Carter Center.

Tonge, J. (2014). *Comparative peace processes*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Touval, S., & Zartman, I. W. (Eds.). (1985). *International mediation in theory and practice*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

United Nations. (2012a). *UN guidance for effective mediation*. UN A/66/811. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations General Assembly, & United Nations Security Council. (2012b). *Report of the Secretary-General on causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa*. UN A/67/205- S/2012/715. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. (2016). **About OCHA Syria**. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations Security Council. (2009). *UN Security Council report of the Secretary-General on enhancing mediation and its support activities*. UN S/2009/189. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations Security Council. (2011). *UN Security Council report of the Secretary-General on preventive diplomacy: Delivering results*. UN S/2011/552. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations Security Council. (2012). *UN Security Council report of the Secretary-General on strengthening the role of mediation in the settlement of disputes, conflict prevention and resolution*. UN A/66/811. New York, NY: Author.

United Nations Security Council. (2015). *UN Security Council report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations and conflict prevention: A collective recommitment*. UN S/2015/730. New York, NY: Author.

U.S. Agency for International Development. (2012). *Conflict assessment framework*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Interagency Working Group. (2008). *Interagency conflict assessment framework*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State.

## Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

---

van der Merwe, H. (1989). *Pursuing justice and peace in South Africa*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Verwijk, M. (2012). *Is peace not for everyone? Narratives on a struggle for peace, equality, and development in Sudan* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Volkan, V. (1997). *Blood lines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Volkan, V. (2006). *Killing in the name of identity*. Charlottesville, VA: Pitchstone.

von Burg, C. (2015). *On inclusivity: The role of norms in international peace mediation*. Basel, Switzerland: swisspeace.

Wallensteen, P. (1998). *Preventing violent conflicts: Past record and future challenges*. Uppsala, Sweden: Department of Peace and Conflict Research.

Wallensteen, P. (2002). *Understanding conflict resolution: War, peace and the global system*. London, U.K.: SAGE.

Wanis-St. John, A., & Kew, D. (2008). Civil society and peace negotiations: Confronting exclusion. *International Negotiation*, 13, 11–36.

West Africa Network for Peacebuilding. (2012). *Dialogue & mediation: A practitioner's guide*. Accra, Ghana: Author.

Williams, P. R., & Scharf, M. P. (2002). *Peace with justice? War crimes and accountability in the former Yugoslavia*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wright, Q. (1942). *A study of war*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zartman, I. W. (Ed.). (1978). *The negotiation process*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Zartman, I. W., & de Soto, A. (2010). *Timing mediation initiatives*. Peacemakers Toolkit. Washington, DC, U.S.: Institute of Peace Press.

Zartman, I. W., & Faure, G. O. (Eds.). (2005). *Escalation and negotiation in international conflicts*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Zeitsoff, T. (2011). Using social media to measure conflict dynamics: An application to the 2008–2009 Gaza conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 55(6), 938–969.

**Joyce Neu**

Facilitating Peace

**Louis Kriesberg**

# Conflict Analysis and Resolution: Development of the Field

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University