

The Evolution of Conflict Resolution¹

Louis Kriesberg

*BERCOVITCH, JACOB, WICTOR KREMYNYUK AND I. WILLIAM ZARTMAN (EDS.) 2009.
THE SAGE HANDBOOK OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION. THOUSAND OAKS, CA: SAGE

INTRODUCTION

Before discussing how the field of contemporary conflict resolution (CR) has evolved and continues to evolve, we must consider different views of its parameters and of the major realms it encompasses. This is needed because consensus about those characteristics is lacking. For some workers in the field, the term refers essentially to a specific kind of work, for example, engaging in mediation in a particular manner. For many other conflict resolvers, it refers to ways of settling or ending conflicts that entail joint efforts to reach mutually acceptable agreements. For still others, conflict resolution is a *Weltanschauung* that can apply to all stages of conflicts, and encompasses relatively constructive ways of conducting and transforming conflicts and then maintaining secure and equitable relations. A very broad conception of CR is adopted here, which facilitates discussing the changing conceptions of the field as it evolves.

Conflict resolution relates to all domains of conflicts, whether within or between families,

organizations, communities, or countries. Workers in the CR field differ in the degree to which they focus on theory, research, or practice, attending to a single domain or to a wide range of arenas. This chapter emphasizes large-scale conflicts, within and among societies, but conflict resolution work in all arenas is recognized.

CR workers often stress that the field incorporates conflict applications as well as academic theorizing and researching. Indeed, the changing interplay among these realms is quite important in the evolution of the field. Therefore, each realm: theory, research, and practice, and their relations are discussed at the outset of this chapter.

Theory building in CR, as in other social science disciplines, varies in range and to the degree that it is inductive or deductive. Some theories refer to limited conflict arenas or to particular conflict stages, while some purport to provide a general understanding of a wide range of conflicts in their entire course; but there is no consensus about any comprehensive theory of social conflicts

and their resolution. There is, nevertheless, general agreement that conflicts can be managed better than they often are. This view may entail a vision of a harmonious world or it may entail only the belief that terribly destructive conflicts often can be avoided or at least limited.

Considerable agreement exists about particular conflict processes and empirical generalizations, as noted in this Handbook. Without a comprehensive theory, however, inconsistencies among various generalizations and propositions are not reconciled. Moreover, without a comprehensive theory or theories of a middle range, it is difficult to know under what specific conditions a particular social process or empirical generalization is or is not operative, and difficult to focus the application of such knowledge on practice. On the other hand, the more general and necessarily abstract theories about social conflicts lack the precision needed for reliable applications. Despite these considerations, empirical generalizations and knowledge of relevant conflict processes can be useful guides to effective actions that minimize the destructiveness of conflicts, if used in conjunction with good information about them.

The realm of practice includes actions that particular persons or groups undertake to affect the course of conflicts, applying their understanding of CR methods. For the purposes of this chapter, practice also includes actions taken by persons unwittingly applying CR, such as in the work of many traditional mediators. Because of their relevance to CR theory and research, practice will also include the actions of persons and groups that are inconsistent with good CR principles and methods. The experiences and consequences of acting contrary to CR ideas provide the appropriate comparisons to assess the effectiveness of adhering to conflict resolution ideas. Practice, in this broad sense, provides much of the data for conflict resolution research and theory building. The data may be case studies of peace negotiations or quantitative analyses of mediations or of crises, as discussed in other chapters.

Finally, the realm of research includes the analyses that help test deductive theory and are the bases for inductive theory building. Furthermore, analysis is an integral part of good conflict resolution applications. Every conflict is unique in some ways, but like some other conflicts in certain ways; determining how a conflict is like and unlike other conflicts helps decide what would be appropriate actions. Good analysis of the conflict in which a practitioner is engaged or is considering entering, whether as a partisan or as an intermediary, helps determine which strategy and tactics are likely to be effective. Significantly, research assessing the consequences of various CR methods is now underway and increasing.

PERIODS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION EVOLUTION

Since humans have always waged conflicts, humans have also always engaged in various ways to end them. Often, one side coercively imposes its will upon the other side, sometimes violently, and thus terminates a conflict. Within every society, however, many other ways of settling fights have long been practiced, including various forms of mediation or adjudication. Even between opposing societies, negotiations have been used throughout history to reach agreements regarding issues of contention between them.

Contemporary CR differs in several ways from many traditional conflict resolution methods. The differences include the CR emphasis upon conflict processes that generate solutions yielding some mutual gains for the opposing sides. In addition, the contemporary CR approach builds on academic research and theorizing, as well as traditional and innovative practices. It tends to stress relying minimally, if at all, on violence in waging and settling conflicts. Finally, it tends to emphasize the role of external intermediaries in the ending of conflicts.

The breadth and diversity of the contemporary CR field is a consequence of the long history of the field and of the

many sources of its present-day character. Its contemporary manifestation initially focused on stopping violence but it has broadened greatly to incorporate building the conditions for peace, including post-violence reconciliation, enhancing justice, establishing conflict management systems, and many other issues. Certainly, calls and actions for alternatives to war and other violent conflict have a long history; major exemplary documents, starting from classical Grecian times, are available in Chatfield and Ilukhina (1994). The time between the American and French revolutions and the First World War deserve noting, prior to discussing the more proximate periods. The revolutions of the late 1770s established the importance of popular participation in governance and of fundamental human rights. Many intellectual leaders of that time, particularly in Europe and North America, discussed the processes and procedures to manage differences and to avoid tyrannies. They include Voltaire (1694–1778), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), Adam Smith (1723–1790), Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826), and James Madison (1751–1836). The moral and practical issues related to dealing with various kinds of conflicts were widely discussed, emphasizing the importance of reasoning. For example, Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) wrote about perpetual peace resulting from states being constitutional republics and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) wrote about the value of liberty and the free discussion of ideas.

But the path of progress was not smooth; wars and oppression obviously were not abolished. Many explanations for these social ills and ways to overcome them were put forward, including the influential work of Karl Marx (1818–1883), which emphasized class conflict and its particular capitalist manifestation. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870–1924) elaborated Marxism with his still influential analysis of the relationship between capitalism and imperialism, which generated wars and struggles for radical societal transformations. Many other non-Marxist and more reformist efforts were undertaken to advance

justice and oppose war-making, for example, by Jane Adams in the United States.

Finally, during this time, religious thought and practice were also developing in ways that proved relevant to CR. Pacifist sentiments and commitments had long been an element of Christianity and other religions, often expressed by quiet withdrawal from worldly conflicts. During this time, however, various forms of engagement became manifest, for example, in the anti-war reform efforts of the peace societies in North America, Britain, and elsewhere in Europe (Brock 1968).

Mohandas Gandhi, drawing from his Hindu traditions and other influences, developed a powerful strategy of popular civil disobedience, which he called Satyagraha, the search for truth (Bondurant 1965). Gandhi, after his legal studies in London, went to South Africa, where, in the early 1890s, he began experimenting with different nonviolent ways to counter the severe discrimination imposed upon Indians living in South Africa. The nonviolent strategies he developed were influential for the strategies that the African National Congress (ANC) adopted in its struggle against Apartheid.

With this background, we can begin examining four major periods in the evolution of contemporary CR: (1) preliminary developments, 1914–1945, (2) laying the groundwork, 1946–1969, (3) expansion and institutionalization, 1970–1989, and (4) diffusion and differentiation, since 1989. In the last part of this chapter, current issues are discussed.

Preliminary developments, 1914–1945.

The First World War (1914–1918) destroyed many millions of lives and also shattered what seemed to have been illusions of international proletarian solidarity, of global harmony from growing economic interdependence, and of rational political leadership. The revulsion from the war's mass killings was expressed in the growth of pacifist sentiments and organizations, in the Dada art movement, and in political cynicism. Nevertheless, in the United States and in many European countries, peace movement organizations

renewed their efforts to construct institutions to reduce the causes of war and in many cases to foster collective security to stop wars (Cortright 2008). These efforts pressured many governments to establish the League of Nations; but the terms of the Versailles treaty undercut the League. Similarly, public pressures fostered the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw wars; however, to the consternation of peace movement organizations, the governments failed to take actions consistent with the Pact.

Numerous religious and other nongovernmental groups had mobilized to stop warfare; for example, in December 1914, at a gathering in Cambridge, England, the interfaith Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) was organized; and in 1915, the US FOR was founded. In 1919, the International FOR (IFOR) was established to foster reconciliation, nonviolence, and to empower youth to be peacemakers. The IFOR and other groups began to win governmental recognition of the right for individuals to refuse military service, as conscientious objectors. In the United States, these efforts were significantly pursued by members of the Jehovah Witness, and by traditional peace churches, the Brethren, the Mennonites, and the Society of Friends (Quakers).

The worldwide economic depression of the 1930s, the rise of Fascism in Germany and Italy, and the recognition of the totalitarian character of Stalinism in the Soviet Union, however, made these efforts seem inadequate. In any case, in actuality, governments and publics tried to deal with conflicts in conventional ways to advance their narrow interests and relying upon military force. The result was the wars in Spain and in China, culminating in the horrible disasters of World War II.

Many societal developments in the period between the outbreak of World War I and the end of World War II were the precursors for contemporary conflict resolution. They include research and social innovations that pointed to alternative ways of thinking about and conducting conflicts, and ending them. The variety of sources in the emergence of CR resulted in diverse perspectives and concerns

in the field, which produced continuing tensions and disagreements.

Much scholarly research focused on analyzing violent conflict; it included studies of arms races, war frequencies, revolutions, and also peace making, for example, by Quincy Wright (1942), and Pitirim Sorokin (1925). Other research and theorizing examined the bases for conflicts generally, as in the work on psychological and social psychological processes by John Dollard and others (1939).

Non-rational factors were also recognized as important in the outbreak of conflicts. Research on these matters examined scapegoating and other kinds of displaced feelings, susceptibility to propaganda, and the attributes of leaders who manipulated political symbols (Lasswell 1935, 1948). These phenomena were evident in various social movements and their attendant conflicts. For some analysts, the rise of Nazism in Germany exemplified the workings of these factors.

Conflicts with non-rational components may erupt and be exacerbated in varying degrees by generating misunderstandings and unrelated concerns. In some ways, however, the non-rational aspects of many conflicts can make them susceptible to control and solution, if the source of displaced feelings are understood and corrected. The human relations approach to industrial conflict is built on this assumption (Roethlisberger et al. 1939). Other research about industrial organizations stressed the way struggles based on differences of interest 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, as exemplified in the United States, with the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board in 1942. Mary Parker Follett (1942) influentially wrote about negotiations that would produce mutual benefits.

Laying the groundwork, 1946–1969.

Between 1946 and 1969, many developments provided the materials with which contemporary CR was built. Many governmental and nongovernmental actions were undertaken to

prevent future wars by building new transnational institutions and fostering reconciliation between former enemies. Globally, this was evident in the establishment of the United Nations (UN), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank. Regionally, such efforts were most notable in Europe. A prime example is the European Coal and Steel Community, which was established in 1952 and was the forerunner of the European Union. In 1946, in Caux, Switzerland, a series of conferences began to be held to bring together persons, from countries and communities that had been in intense conflict, for mutual understanding and forgiveness; this nongovernmental endeavor was inspired by Moral Re-Armament (Henderson 1996).

The developments also included numerous wars and crises associated with the global Cold War and the national liberation struggles of the de-colonization process. Those conflicts generated traumas that were a source of more violence, but, if managed well, some offered hope that conflicts could be controlled (Wallenstein 2002). For example, the outbreak of the Cuban Missile Crisis was a frightening warning about the risks of a nuclear war, and its settlement an example of effective negotiation. Also, high-level, non-official, regular meetings of the Pugwash and the Dartmouth conferences, starting in 1957 and 1960, respectively, greatly aided the Soviet-American negotiations about arms control.

Indian independence from Britain was achieved in 1947, following many years of nonviolent resistance, led by Mohandas Gandhi. The Satyagraha campaigns and related negotiations influentially modeled methods of constructive escalation. The strategies of nonviolent action and associated negotiations were further developed in the civil rights struggles in the United States during the 1960s. For many academic analysts, the value of conflicts to bring about desirable social change was evident, but the dangers of failure and counterproductive consequences also became evident.

Many scholarly endeavors during this period helped provide the bases for the evolution of contemporary CR (Stephenson 2008). In the 1950s and 1960s, particularly in the United States, the research and theorizing was intended to contribute to 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 international relations "realist" approach.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS), at Stanford, California, played a catalytic role in the emergence of what was to be the contemporary CR field (Harty and Modell 1991). CASBS was designed to foster major new undertakings in the behavioral sciences. In its first year of operation, 1954–55, several scholars were invited who reinforced each other's work related to the emerging field of CR; they included: Herbert Kelman, Kenneth E. Boulding, Anatol Rapoport, Harold Laswell, Ludwig von Bertalanffy, and Stephan Richardson. Kelman brought some issues of the mimeographed newsletter, *The Bulletin of Research Exchange Prevention of War*, which was begun in 1952, under the editorship of Arthur Gladstone. Richardson brought microfilm copies of the then unpublished work of his father, Lewis F. Richardson (1960); his statistical analyses of arms races and wars was influential in stimulating such research.

After their CASBS year, Boulding, Rapoport, and von Bertalanffy returned to the University of Michigan; and joined with many other academics to begin *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957, as the successor to the *Bulletin*. Then, in 1959, they and others established the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan. Robert C. Angell was the first director, succeeded by Boulding.

Scholars at the Center and in other institutions published a variety of works that might contribute to developing a

comprehensive inter-disciplinary theoretical analysis of conflicts. Such works were authored by Boulding (1962), Coser (1956), Lentz (1955), and Schelling (1960). Other works focused on particular phases of conflicts, such as those written by Karl Deutsch and associates (1957), about the formation of security communities between countries. Ernest B. Haas (1958) analyzed the European Coal and Steel Community as an example of functionalism, how international cooperation in one functional area can foster increased cooperation and integration in other areas, an idea developed by David Mitrany (1948).

Influential research and theorizing 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 USA and elsewhere (Mills 1956; Pilusik and Hayden 1965; Senghaas 1970).

Numerous research projects were undertaken, varyingly part of a shared endeavor. They included 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, also at the University of Michigan. The logic of game theory and the experimental research based on it has also contributed to CR, showing how individually rational conduct can be collectively self-defeating (Rapoport 1960, 1966).

Related work was conducted at a few other universities. At Stanford, Robert C. North led a project examining why some international conflicts escalated to wars and others did not. At Northwestern, Richard Snyder analyzed foreign policy decision-making and Harold Guetzkow developed computerized models and human-machine simulations to study and to teach about international behavior. A great variety of work was done by academics in other institutions, including research and theorizing about ways conflicting relations could be overcome and mutually beneficial outcomes achieved, for example, by forming superordinate goals, as discussed by Muzafer

Sherif (1966) and by Graduated Reciprocation in Tension-Reduction (GRIT), as advocated by Charles E. Osgood (1962).

CR centers in Europe took a somewhat different course. Most began and have continued to emphasize peace and conflict research, which often had direct policy relevance. Many centers were not based in colleges or universities, receiving institutional 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 Johan Galtung as Director for its first ten years. Galtung founded the *Journal of Peace Research* at PRIO in 1964, and in 1969 he was appointed Professor of Conflict and Peace Research at the University of Oslo. His work was highly influential, not only in the Nordic countries, but also throughout the world; for example, his analysis of structural violence was important in the conflict analysis and resolution field in Europe and in the economically underdeveloped world (Galtung 1969).

In Sweden, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) began operations in 1966 (see anniversary.sipri.org/book/book_html/intro/introduction). Its establishment followed years of discussion in the Swedish Government and Parliament and Swedish universities and research institutes. Two security issues were matters of high priority: the uncontroversial policy of neutrality and the decision on whether or not to acquire nuclear weapons. Alva Myrdal was Sweden's chief disarmament negotiator and urged the government to produce more information and analyses relevant to disarmament. She and her husband Gunnar Myrdal pushed for the establishment of a research center that would gather such material and make it available. SIPRI was established with governmental support and it began to publish the vitally significant *SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament*.

In 1968, Swisspeace was founded in Bern, Switzerland to promote independent action-oriented peace research. Also in 1968, the Centre for Intergroup Studies was established

in Capetown, South Africa, which became a channel for meetings between meetings of ANC officials and African leaders (van der Merwe 1989).

Some academics began to apply their CR ideas to ongoing conflicts; for example, they conducted problem-solving workshops with officials, or often with non-officials, from countries in conflict. Thus, John W. Burton, in 1965, organized such a productive workshop with representatives from Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore. Burton, who had held important offices in the Australian government, including Secretary of External Affairs, had established the Centre for the Analysis of Conflict, at the University of London, in 1963. The workshop was an effort to apply the ideas he and his associates were developing as an alternative to the conventional international relations approach (Fisher 1997).

Finally, we should note the development of professional CR networks in the form of national and international associations. Thus, in 1963, the Peace Science Society (International) was founded with the leadership of Walter Isard. In 1964, the International Peace Research Association was founded in London, having developed from a 1963 meeting in Switzerland, which was organized by the Quaker International Conferences and Seminars.

Expansion and institutionalization, 1970–1989

The years 1970–1989 include three distinctive international environments. Early in the 1970s, the Cold War became more managed, a variety of arms control agreements between the USA and the USSR were reached and détente led to more cultural exchanges between the people of the two countries. Furthermore, steps toward the normalization of US relations with the People's Republic of China were taken. However, at the end of the 1970s, US–Soviet antagonism markedly rose, triggered by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and intensified during the first administration of Ronald Reagan. Finally, in 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev was chosen to

lead the Soviet Union, which accelerated the Soviet transformation that resulted in the end of the Cold War in 1989.

Within the United States and many other countries around the world, the civil rights struggle and the women's, student, environmental, anti-Vietnam war, and other social movements reflected and magnified the power of nongovernmental actors. These phenomena appeared to many people to demonstrate that conflict was a way to advance justice and equality, and improve the human condition. Importantly, these struggles also revealed how conflicts could be conducted constructively, often with little violence. The CR field's evolution was affected by these international and national developments, and at times affected them as well.

Interestingly, the period of rapid CR expansion and institutionalization began in the 1970s, at a time when many of the pioneers in CR in the United States had become disappointed with what had been achieved during the 1950s and 1960s (Boulding 1978; Harty and Modell 1991). Many of them felt that too little progress had been made in developing a comprehensive agreed-upon theory of conflicts and their resolution. Moreover, funds to sustain research and professional activities were inadequate, and academic resistance to CR remained strong. All this was exemplified in the 1971 decision by the University of Michigan trustees to close the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution.

The improvement in the fortunes of the CR field in the 1970s and 1980s was spurred by the great increase in a variety of CR practices in the United States. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) practices quickly expanded, partly as a result of the increase in litigation and court congestion in the 1970s and the increased attraction of non-adversarial ways of handling disputes. Community dispute resolution centers with volunteer mediators were established across the country.

The productive US mediation in the Middle East in the 1970s, by national security adviser and then secretary of state Henry Kissinger and by President Jimmy Carter, raised

the visibility and increased the confidence in the potentialities of such undertakings. During the 1970s and 1980s, numerous interactive problem-solving workshops were conducted by John W. Burton, Leonard Doob, Herbert C. Kelman, Edward E. Azar, Ronald J. Fisher, and other academically based persons; the workshops related to conflicts in Northern Ireland, Cyprus, the Middle East, and elsewhere. In addition, NGOs were founded in this period that conducted training, consultations, and workshops relating to large-scale conflicts.

Many professional associations in the social science disciplines established sections related to peace and conflict studies, in response to the escalating war in Vietnam and the intensified Cold War. These have continued and in many cases have incorporated the CR approach as it rose in salience and relevance.

Academic and non-academic books and articles continued to be published along the lines of research and theory begun earlier. Some of these works developed fundamental ideas about the possibilities of waging conflicts constructively, as in the social psychological research (Deutsch 1973). Analyses were also made of the ways that conflicts de-escalated, as well as escalated, and how even seemingly intractable conflicts could become transformed and cooperative relations established (Axelrod 1984; Curle 1971; Kriesberg 1973; Kriesberg, et al. 1989; Sharp 1973).

During this period, the increase in writing about negotiation and mediation is particularly striking, reflecting the expansion of these activities within the now fast-growing field of CR. The book, *Getting to YES*, by Roger Fisher and William Ury (1981), was and remains highly popular and influential, explaining how to negotiate without giving in and moreover how to gain mutual benefits. Many other analyses of the different ways negotiations are done in diverse settings were published, with implications for reaching agreements that strengthen relations between the negotiating sides; (see, for example, Gulliver 1979; Rubin and Brown 1975; Strauss 1978; Zartman

1978; Zartman and Berman 1982). Mediation was also the subject of research and theorizing, often with implications for the effective practice of mediation (Moore 1986). Much research was based on case studies (Kolb 1983; Rubin 1981; Susskind 1987; Touval and Zartman 1985), but quantitative data were also analyzed (Bercovitch 1986).

During the 1970s and 1980s, CR took great strides in becoming institutionalized within colleges and universities, government agencies, and the corporate and nongovernmental world. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation contributed greatly to this development, expansion, and institutionalization of the field. William Hewlett, the founding chairman of the Foundation, and Roger Heyns, who became its first president in 1977, shared a commitment to develop more constructive ways to resolve conflicts (Kovick 2005). This was evident in the Foundation's support for new decision-making models in regard to environmental issues beginning in 1978 and in joining with the Ford, MacArthur, and other foundations to establish the National Institute of Dispute Resolution in 1981. Then, in 1984, the Foundation launched a remarkable field-building strategy, providing long-term grants in support of CR theory, practice, and infrastructure. Bob Barrett, the first program officer, began to implement the strategy, identifying the persons and organizations to be recruited and awarded grants. The first theory center grant was made in 1984 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*. In 1985, Hewlett grants were made to start centers at the Universities of Hawaii, Michigan, and Minnesota; in 1986, Hewlett-funded centers began at Northwestern, Rutgers, Syracuse, and Wisconsin Universities, and then at George Mason University in 1987. By the end of 1994, 18 centers had begun to be funded. Practitioner organizations in the environment, community, and in many other sectors were also awarded grants. The infrastructure for the field was strengthened, primarily

by supporting professional organizations. In 1985, Hewlett began providing funding to the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) and to the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPDR), and went on to support many other professional CR associations.

The establishment of graduate programs in CR in the 1980s and 1990s was also spurred by the rising demand for training in negotiation and mediation. MA degree programs were instituted in several universities, including the Eastern Mennonite University, the University of Denver, the University of Notre Dame, and Wayne State University. Many universities began to offer educational concentrations in conflict resolution, often issuing certificates in conjunction with PhD or other graduate degrees; this was the case at Cornell University, Fordham University, The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Syracuse University, and the Universities of Colorado, Hawaii at Manoa, and New Hampshire. A major PhD program in CR was established at George Mason University in 1987; yet since then only two other PhD programs have been instituted in the USA, at Nova Southeastern University and at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Several other kinds of independent centers were also established in the United States, during the 1980s, to carry out a variety of CR applications. In 1982, former US President Jimmy Carter and former First Lady Rosalynn Carter founded the Carter Center, based in Atlanta, Georgia. The Center's activities include mediating conflicts, overseeing elections, and fighting disease worldwide. Also in 1982, Search for Common Ground (SFCG) was founded in Washington, DC, funded by foundations and nongovernmental organizations. It conducts a wide range of activities to transform the way conflicts are waged around the world, from adversarial ways to collaborative problem-solving methods. Significantly, after long Congressional debates and public campaigns, the United States Institute of Peace Act was passed and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan

in 1984. The Institute was opened in 1986, and includes programs of education, of research grants and fellowship awards, and of policy-related meetings and analytical reports.

In Europe, too, many new CR centers were founded, but with somewhat different orientations. 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 were also different than those for the American CR organizations. The 1969 electoral victory of the Social Democratic party (SPD) in West Germany had important CR implications. Under the leadership of Chancellor Willy Brandt, a policy that recognized East German and East European realities was undertaken; this "Ost-Politik" entailed more East-West interactions.

In 1975, after long negotiations, the representatives of the 35 countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) signed the Helsinki Accords. The agreement entailed a trade-off between the Soviet Union and the Western countries. The Soviets achieved recognition of the permanence of the border changes following World War II, when the Polish borders were shifted westward, incorporating part of Germany and the Soviet borders were shifted westward incorporating part of Poland. In a kind of exchange, the Soviets agreed to recognize fundamental human rights, including greater freedom for its citizens to leave the Soviet Union.

The new German government moved quickly to help establish independent peace and conflict institutes, for example, the Hessische Stiftung Friedens und Konfliktforschung (HSFK) was founded in Frankfurt 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 (COPRI) as an independent institute in 1985.

In the early 1970s, peace and conflict chairs and programs began to be established in more 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 emerged at Uppsala University, in Sweden, which soon began teaching undergraduate students; in 1981, the Dag Hammarskjöld Peace Chair was established and after Peter Wallensteen was appointed the chair in 1985, a PhD program was begun in 1986.

The research and theorizing in these European centers were undertaken to have policy implications for nongovernmental as well as governmental actors (Senghaas 1970). The Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn (AFB) or Peace Research Information Unit (PRIU) was established in 1984 to provide information about peace research findings in forms that were accessible and relevant to government officials.

The International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) was created in 1973 in Laxenburg, Austria, as an international think-tank to bridge Cold War differences. Subsequently, in the 1980s, the Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) Project was launched at IIASA to develop and propagate knowledge about negotiation (Kremenjuk 1991; Mautner-Markhof 1989; Zartman and Faure 2005). PIN brought together a group of six European scholars and diplomats and two (later one) Americans. It was initially funded by the Carnegie Corporation and then for ten years by the Hewlett Foundation.

The work of peace 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 NATO and reported on how the Warsaw Pact Soviet forces were arrayed to ensure that a war, if it came, would be carried forward against the enemy, and not have their forces fall back to fight the war in their homeland. At the same time,

the NATO forces were also structured to quickly advance eastward, to avoid fighting on West European territories. Each side, studying the other side's military preparations, could reasonably believe that the other side was planning an aggressive war (Tiedtke 1980). The peace researchers developed possible ways to construct an alternative military posture, which would be clearly defensive, a non-provocative defense (Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie 1982). They communicated their findings to officials on both sides of the Cold War, and received an interested hearing from Soviet officials, in the Mikhail Gorbachev government. Gorbachev undertook a restructuring of Soviet forces and adopted some of the language of the peace researchers. These developments helped convince the US government and other governments in NATO of the reality of a Soviet transformation.

Institutions providing training in CR methods as well as engaging in mediation and dialogue facilitation continued to be established in other countries in the world. For example, in Kenya, the Nairobi Peace Initiative–Africa (NPI–Africa) was founded in 1984 and conducts such activities in East, Central and West Africa. The increasing CR activities throughout the world are discussed in the next section.

Diffusion and differentiation, 1990–2008.

The world environment was profoundly changed by the ending of the Cold War in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. With the end of the Cold War, the UN was better able to take actions to stop conflicts from escalating destructively, and consequently wars that had been perpetuated as proxy wars were settled. Many other developments contribute to limiting destructive international and domestic conflicts. These include the increasing economic integration of the world and the intensification of global communications. The developments also include the growing adherence to norms protecting human rights, the increasing number of democratic countries, the growing engagement of women in governance, and the

increasing attention to feminist perspectives. Finally, transnational social movements and organizations increased in number and level of engagements. All these developments contributed to greater resistance in allowing destructive conflicts to arise and persist (Kriesberg 2007).

Indeed, since 1989, international wars declined in number and magnitude (Eriksson and Wallensteen 2004; Human Security Centre 2005; Marshall and Gurr 2005). Civil wars, after the spike of wars in 1990–1991 associated with the breakup of the Soviet Union, also declined. Since the end of the Cold War, many large-scale conflicts, which had been waged for very many years, were settled by negotiated agreements (Wallensteen 2002). Of course, all destructive conflicts were not ended; some continued and new ones erupted.

The September 11, 2001 attacks carried out by Al Qaeda against the United States and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq may seem to have marked the beginning of a new world system in which terrorist attacks, violent repressions, and profound religious and ethnic antagonisms were intensifying and spreading. These new destructive conflicts are, to some degree, the consequence of some of the global developments noted above. Some social groups feel harmed or humiliated by the new developments and, using particular elements of them, fought against other elements. This is illustrated by the increase in religious militancy within Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, and Christianity.

The CR field has been deeply affected by these many developments, but it also impacts on them. The CR field affects the way various conflicts are conducted and contributes to the increase in peaceful accommodations in the 1990s and beyond. The witting and unwitting rejection of the CR approach by leaders of Al Qaeda, and in some ways the response of leaders in President George W. Bush's administration, have exacerbated erupting conflicts, increasing their destructiveness and duration. These complex matters cannot be fully explored in this chapter, but they provide

the context for the observations that will be made regarding the ongoing evolution of the CR approach.

Beginning in the 1990s, the practice of CR grew in its established arenas and expanded into new spheres of work. More specialized applications and research activities became evident, for example, in the publication of *International Negotiation* by the Johns Hopkins Washington Interest in Negotiation Group. In addition, external interventions and negotiated agreements increased, ending many protracted international and civil conflicts. Even after violence was stopped or a negotiated agreement was reached, the frequent recurrence of wars made evident the need for external intervention to sustain agreements. Governments and IGOs were not fully prepared and lacked the capacity to manage the multitude of problems that followed the end of hostilities. They increasingly employed nongovernmental organizations to carry out some of the needed work of humanitarian relief, institution building, protection of human rights, and training in conflict resolution skills. The number and scope of NGOs working on such matters grew quickly, many of them applying various CR methods.

Some of the CR methods that had been developed earlier to help prepare adversaries for de-escalating steps began to be employed at the later phases of conflicts as well. These include small workshops, dialogue circles, and training to improve capacities to negotiate and mediate. Such practices helped avert a renewal of vicious fights by fostering accommodations, and even reconciliation at various levels of the antagonistic sides. Government officials have become more attentive to the significance of nongovernmental organizations and grassroots engagement in managing conflicts and in peace-building, matters that have always been important in the CR field.

Concurrent with these applied CR developments, numerous publications described, analyzed, and assessed these applications. An important development, linking theory and applied work, is the assessment of

practitioner undertakings. A growing body of empirically grounded assessments of CR applications examine what kinds of interventions, by various groups, have diverse consequences (Anderson and Olson 2003; O'Leary and Bingham 2003).

A growing literature focuses on post-agreement problems and solutions, relating to external intervention and institution building (Paris 2004; Stedman et al. 2002). The role of public engagement and attention to participatory governance has also increased in the CR approach. Another trend is greater attention to conflict prevention and to establishing new systems of participatory governance to minimize unproductive and destructive conflict. These developments are related to the growing view that conflict transformation is central to the field of CR (Botes 2003; Kriesberg 2006; Lederach 1997).

The period since 1989 is characterized by worldwide CR diffusion and great expansion. The diffusion is not in one direction; rather, ideas and practices from each part of the world influence the ideas and practices in other regions. Analyses and reports about CR methods and approaches in diverse cultures increased, for example, in African and Arab societies (Malan 1997; Salem 1997). Moreover, more and more organizations function as transnational units, with members from several countries. For example, the PIN Project, associated with IIASA gave rise in turn to national networks, such as Groupe Français de Négociation (GFN) (Faure et al. 2000 Faure 2005; Zartman and Faure 2005), FinnPIN, and the Negotiation Biennale (Dupont 2007), as well as to negotiation courses in as diverse places as the Catholic University of Louvain and Foreman Christian College in Lahore (Kremenjuk 1991; Zartman 2005). The Locom Academy and the Deutschen Stiftung Friedensforschung have supported CR programs (Hauswedell 2007), and the Bernheim Foundation program at the Free University of Brussels has developed a teaching, research, and publication program (Jaumain and Remacle 2006).

The Internet provides other ways of conducting CR education and training

transnationally. TRANSCEND, led by Johan Galtung, is a prime example of such programs (see www.transcend.org). It is a "peace and development network for conflict transformation by peaceful means" and it operates the Transcend Peace University online. The Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, based in Barcelona, also offers graduate degrees in conflict resolution, also online. In addition, some websites provide information about various CR methods and approaches and analyses of specific conflicts. See, for example, www.crinform.org, The Conflict Resolution Information Source; www.beyondintractability.org, Beyond Intractability; mediate.com, information about resolution, training, and mediation; www.c-r.org, Conciliation Resources; www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/cds, ethnic conflicts; and www.crisisgroup.org, International Crisis Group.

CR educational programs are being established in countries around the world. As of 2007, 88 graduate programs of some kind are active in the United States, but PhD programs remain few (Botes 2004; Polkinghorn et al. 2007). There has been a great increase in certificate programs, associated with Law Schools and graduate degrees in international relations and public administration. CR programs are increasing in many countries. In 2007, there were 12 active programs in England, 4 in Ireland and Northern Ireland, 12 in Canada, and 10 in Australia (Polkinghorn et al. 2007). In Latin America, there are more than 25 certificate mediation training programs, and Master Programs in CR in five countries: Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Mexico (Femenia 2007).

CR research centers and organizations providing CR services are also increasingly being established in many countries. For example, the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), based in Durban, South Africa, was founded in 1991 and operates throughout Africa. Academic Associates Peace Works (AAPW) was founded in Lagos, Nigeria in 1992 and under the leadership of Judith Asuni, it has conducted very many skills-building

workshops as well as mediated conflicts throughout Nigeria.

Beginning in the 1990s, ADR programs spread in Latin America and some countries reformed their legal systems to include mandatory mediation. CR organizations proliferated, offering mediation training and services to help settle private disputes, for example, the Libra Foundation began training mediators in Argentina in 1991, the Instituto Peruano de Resolución de Conflictos, Negociación, y Mediación was established in Peru in 1992, and Mediare opened in Brazil in 1997. Publications pertaining to CR increasingly began to appear in many languages, including German, Spanish, and French (Camp 1999, 2001; Eckert and Willems 1992; Six 1990).

The diffusion of the CR approach also takes the form of institutionalizing CR practices, for example, by mandating mediation in disputes of a civil matter. This is the case in Peru and other Latin American countries (Ormachea-Choque 1998). In the United States, state and local governments, as well as the US Government, increasingly mandate the utilization of CR methods in providing services, settling child custody disputes, improving inter-agency relations and in formulating and implementing policy. At the federal level, this is particularly evident in managing conflicts relating to environmental issues; see the Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (www.ecr.gov). On August 28, 2004, President George W. Bush released Executive Order 13352, "Facilitation of Cooperative Conservation," to support constructive approaches to resolving conflicts regarding the use, conservation, and restoration of the environment, natural resources, and public lands.

Asia is also a growing locus of CR practices and institutions (Jeong 2006). For example, in South Korea, the increased freedom in the civil society and the decline in the "high context" or "collectivist" character of its culture, which had contributed to conflict avoidance, have helped generate interest in CR training and the adoption of the CR approach. The Korean government has established CR working groups by presidential decree and

allocated funding for CR education from elementary to college levels. The Korean government has also established various dispute resolution mechanisms, including ombudsman offices and mediation in cases of divorce. In Japan, CR has been less in demand for domestic issues, but more developed in foreign policy circles and development aid groups.

China has not yet become a locus of significant contemporary conflict resolution activity. It is true that mediation has been an important conflict settlement method in China before Maoist rule and during it. But in the Imperial period, mediation was done by the gentry who decided which side was correct in a dispute and in the period under Mao, mediation committees decided what the ideologically correct outcome was to be. In both periods, the process was closer to arbitration than to mediation, as understood in the conflict resolution field. Subsequently, mediation has continued to be practiced, but in a less doctrinaire manner. There has been a great expansion of the judicial system in recent years, but it is not yet functioning satisfactorily for many people. Access to official procedures is limited and unequal, with local officials who are viewed as the cause of many grievances being seen to have privileged access to the official justice system (Michelson 2007). The socio-political-cultural conditions are not conducive to the widespread adoption of the contemporary conflict resolution approach. The growing prevalence of protests and demonstrations, however, may increase the attractiveness of the CR approach.

CONTEMPORARY CR ISSUES

Workers in the CR field differ about the directions the field should take. Many of these differences are primarily internal to the field, while some relate to public policy and to relations with other fields. The resulting issues are interrelated, as the following discussion makes evident.

A major internal issue concerns the extent to which CR is and should be a focused discipline or a broad general approach. The vision for many workers in the CR field in the 1950s, of a new interdisciplinary field with a shared research-grounded theory, has not been realized. Some CR workers continue to work toward this vision and some programs and centers are relatively focused on particular matters for investigation and practice, for example, the Program on Negotiation (PON) based in Harvard University, the Dispute Resolution Research Center at Northwestern University, and the Washington Interest in Negotiation Group at the Johns Hopkins University. Others tend to emphasize a wider range of CR matters, for example, The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, the Institute of Global Conflict and Cooperation at the University of California, and the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts (PARC) at Syracuse University.

A related issue is the relative emphasis on core topics that are crucial in training and education or attention to specialized knowledge and training for particular specialties within the broad CR field. Another contentious issue is the degree to which the field is an area of academic study or is a profession, with the academic work focused on providing training for practitioners. In addition, there are debates about certification and codes of conduct and who might accord them over which domains of practice.

An underlying difference is between CR analysts and practitioners who stress the process that is used in waging and settling conflicts and those who emphasize the goals sought and realized. Thus, in theory and practice about the role of the mediator, some CR workers stress the neutrality of the mediator and the mediator's focus on the process to reach an agreement. However, others argue that a mediator either should avoid mediating when the parties are so unequal that equity is not likely to be achieved or should act in ways that will help the parties reach a just outcome. Some maintain that the way ADR is practiced tends to adversely

affect the weaker party, otherwise protected by the equalizing rules and standards of law (Nader 1991). The reliance on the general consensus embodied in the UN declarations and conventions about human rights offers CR analysts and practitioners standards that can help produce equitable and enduring settlements.

An enduring matter of controversy relates to the universality of CR theory and practices (Avruch 1998). Obviously, ways of negotiating, forms of mediation, styles of confrontation, and many other aspects of conducting and settling conflicts vary to some degree among different national cultures, religious traditions, social classes, gender, and many other social groupings (Abu-Nimer 2003; Cohen 1997; Faure 2005). Moreover, within each of these groups, there are sub-groupings and personal variations. The differences between groups are matters of central tendencies, with great overlaps of similarities. More needs to be known about the effects of situational as well as cultural effects and of the ease with which people learn new ways of contending and settling fights.

Another contentious issue relates to the use of violence in waging conflicts. There is widespread agreement among CR analysts and practitioners that violence is wrong, particularly when violence is used to serve internal needs rather than for its effects upon an adversary. They generally agree that it is morally and practically wrong when it is used in an extremely broad and imprecise manner, and when it is not used in conjunction with other means to achieve constructive goals. However, some CR workers oppose any resort to violence in conflicts while others believe various kinds of violence are sometimes necessary and effective in particular circumstances. These differences are becoming more important with increased military interventions to stop destructively escalating domestic and international conflicts and gross violations of human rights. More analysis is needed about how specific violent and nonviolent policies are combined and with what consequences under various conditions.

CR workers also differ in their time perspectives. Frequently, CR analysts stress long-term changes and strategies for conflict transformation, while CR practitioners tend to focus on short-term policies of conflict management. Theoretical work tends to give attention to major factors that affect the course of conflicts, which often do not seem amenable to change by acts of any single person or group. Persons engaged in ameliorating a conflict feel pressures to act with urgency, which dictates short-term considerations; these pressures include fund-raising concerns for NGOs and electoral concerns for government officials driven by upcoming elections. More recognition of these different circumstances may help foster useful syntheses of strategies and better sequencing of strategies.

These contentions are manifested in institutions of higher learning among the diverse MA programs, certificate programs, courses, and tracks within university graduate schools, law schools, and other professional schools in the United States and around the world (see www.campusadr.org/Classroom_Building/degreeoprograms.html). PhD programs remain few in number, reflecting the emphasis on training students for applied work, the lack of consensus about CR being a discipline, and the resistance of established disciplines to the entry of a new one.

A major issue relates to the degree and nature of the integration of theory, practice, and research. Each has varied in prominence within the field and all have been regarded as important, in principle. In actuality, however, they have not been well integrated. Research has rarely sought to specify or assess major theoretical premises or propositions. Often, it is largely descriptive of patterns of actions. Recently, more research is being done on assessing practice, but this has been focused on particular interventions and within a short time-frame. Overall, however, much more work is needed to integrate these realms more closely.

Another set of issues pertain primarily to external relations. Funding for CR poses

a major concern. The Hewlett Foundation ended its 20-year program of support for the conflict resolution program in December, 2004, and no comparable source for sustaining programs of theory, research, and applications has appeared. Tuition charges help support education and training, service fees help sustain NGOs doing applied work, and government agencies and various foundations provide funds for particular research and service projects. All this keeps the work relevant for immediate use. However, the small scale and short duration of such kinds of funding hamper making the long-term and large-scale research assessments and theory building that are needed for creative new growth and appropriate applications.

Coordination of applied work poses other issues. As more and more intervening governmental and nongovernmental organizations appear at the scene of major conflicts, the relations among them and the impact of their relations expand and demand attention. The engagement of many organizations allows for specialized and complementary programs but also produces problems of competition, redundancy, and confusion. Adversaries may try to co-opt some organizations or exploit differences among them. To enhance the possible benefits and minimize the difficulties, a wide range of measures may be taken, ranging from informal ad hoc exchanges of information, regular meetings among organizations in the field, and having one organization be the "lead" agency.

Finally, issues relating to autonomy and professional independence deserve attention. CR analysts as well as practitioners may tailor their work to satisfy the preferences, as they perceive them, of their funders and clients. This diminishes those goals that in their best judgment they might otherwise advance. These risks are enhanced when tasks are contracted out by autocratic or highly ideological entities. Furthermore, as more NGOs are financially dependent on funding by national governments and international organizations, issues regarding autonomy and co-optation grow (Fisher 2006).

CONCLUSION

The CR field is in continuing evolution. The breadth of interests considered continues to expand both in the range of conflict stages and in the variety of conflicts that are of interest. The field is necessarily becoming more differentiated, with workers in the field specializing in particular kinds and stages of conflicts and particular aspects and methods of conflict resolution.

The CR field is likely to increase in size and societal penetration in the future. The need and the potentiality for growth are great in many regions of the world, notably the Middle East, parts of Asia, and in Western and Central Africa. Furthermore, the need for increased knowledge and application of the CR approach is growing. Intensifying world integration is a source of 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 rising and CR can help foster more constructive methods to wage and resolve conflicts. Traditional reliance on coercive impositions with little regard to possible mutual gains and reasonable regard for opponents' concerns is proving to be increasingly maladapted to contemporary global developments.

NOTES

1 I thank the editors of this volume, I. William Zartman, Victor Kremenyuk, and Jacob Bercovitch, for their helpful comments and suggestions. I also want to thank the many persons who commented on earlier versions of this chapter and provided me with information about CR developments in particular places and times, including Nora Femenia, Geraldine Forbes, Ho Won Jeong, Karlheinz Koppe, Marie Pace, Brian Polkinghorn, Peter M. Wallensteen, Hongying Wang, and Honggang Yang.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. 2003. *Nonviolence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Anderson, Mary B. and Lara Olson. 2003. "Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners." pp. 1–98. Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative for Development Action, Inc.
- Avruch, Kevin. 1998. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bercovitch, Jacob. 1986. "International Mediation: A Study of Incidence, Strategies and Conditions of Successful Outcomes." *Cooperation and Conflict* 21: 155–168.
- Bondurant, Joan V. 1965. *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Violence*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Botes, Johannes. 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.
- . 2004. "Graduate Peace & Conflict Studies Programs: Reconsidering Their Problems & Prospects." *Conflict Management in Higher Education Report* 5 (1): 1–10.
- Boulding, Kenneth. 1962. *Conflict and Defense*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. 1978. "Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22 (2) June: 342–354.
- Brock, Peter. 1968. *Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Camp, Eduard Vinyamata. 1999. *Manual de Prevención y Resolución de Conflictos: Conciliación, Mediación, Negociación*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- . 2001. *Conflictología: Teoría y Práctica en Resolución de Conflictos*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Chatfield, Charles, and R.M. Ilukhina. 1994. *Peace/mir: An Anthology of Historic Alternatives to War*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Cohen, Raymond. 1997. *Negotiating Across Cultures*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press.
- Cortright, David. 2008. *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1956. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: The Free Press.
- Curle, Adam. 1971. *Making Peace*. London: Tavistock.
- Deutsch, Karl W., 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, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Deutsch, Morton. 1973. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dollard, John, Leonard W. Doob, Neal E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, and Robert R. Sears. 1939. *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dupont, Christophe (Ed.). 2007. *Transformations du Monde et Négociation Implications, Défis et Opportunités*. Paris: Negocia.
- Eckert, Roland and Helmut Willems. 1992. *Konfliktintervention: Perspektivenübernahme in gesselschaftlichen Ausienandersezungen*. Opladen: Leske and Budrich.
- Eriksson, Mikael and Peter Wallensteen. 2004. "Armed Conflict, 1989–2003." *Journal of Peace Research* 41, 5: 625–636.
- Evangelista, Matthew. 1999. *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Faure, Guy Olivier (Ed.). 2005. *La Négociation: Regards sur sa Diversité*. Paris: Publibook.
- Faure, Guy Olivier, Mermet L., Touzard H. and Dupont C. 2000. *La Négociation: Situations et Problématiques*. Paris: Dunod.
- Femenia, Nora. 2007 January 15. "Personal communication." email.
- Fischer, Martina. 2006. "Civil society in Conflict Transformation: Ambivalence, Potentials and Challenges." Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. 1–33.
- Fisher, Roger and William Ury. 1981. *Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fisher, Ronald. 1997. *Interactive Conflict Resolution*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Follett, Mary Parker. 1942. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York and London: Harper.
- Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 3 (3): 168.
- Gulliver, P.H. 1979. *Disputes and Negotiations: A Cross-cultural Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Haas, Ernst B. 1958. *The Uniting of Europe*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- 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: 720–758.
- Hauswedell, Corinna (Ed.). 2007. *Deeskalation von Gewaltkonflikten seit 1945*. Essen: Klartext.
- Henderson, Michael. 1996. *The Forgiveness Factor*. London: Grosvenor Books.
- Human Security Centre. 2005. *Human Security Report 2005*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jaumain, Serge and Remacle Eric (Eds.). 2006. *Mémoire de Guerre et Construction de la Paix*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Jeong, Ho-Won. 2006 December 3. "personal communication." email.
- Kolb, Deborah M. 1983. *The Mediators*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Komitee für Grundrechte und Demokratie. 1982. *Frieden mit Anderen Waffen*. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Kovick, David. 2005. "The Hewlett Foundation's Conflict Resolution Program: Twenty Years of Field-Building, 1984–2004." Menlo Park, CA: Hewlett Foundation.
- Kremenyuk, Victor A. (Ed.). 1991. *International Negotiation: Analysis, Approaches, Issues*. San Francisco and Oxford: Jossey-Bass.
- Kriesberg, Louis. 1973. *The Sociology of Social Conflicts*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1992. *International Conflict Resolution: The US-USSR and Middle East Cases*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2006. "Assessing Past Strategies for Countering Terrorism in Lebanon and by Libya." *Peace and Conflict Studies* 13 (1): 1–20.
- . 2007. "Long Peace or Long War: A Conflict Resolution Perspective." *Negotiation Journal* 20 (1): 97–116.
- Kriesberg, Louis, Terrell A. Northrup, and Stuart J. Thorson (Eds.). 1989. *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Lasswell, Harold Dwight. 1935. *World Politics and Personal Insecurity*. New York and London: McGraw-Hill.
- . 1948. *Power and Personality*. New York: Norton.
- Leatherman, Janie. 2003. *From Cold War to Democratic Peace*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, John Paul. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lentz, Theodore F. 1955. *Towards a Science of Peace: Turning Point in Human Destiny*. New York: Bookman Associates.
- Lewin, Kurt. 1948. *Resolving Social Conflicts: Selected Papers on Group Dynamics 1935–1946*. New York: Harper.
- Malan, Jannie. 1997. *Conflict Resolution Wisdom from Africa*. Durban, South Africa: African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD).
- 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.
- Mautner-Markhof, Frances (Ed.). 1989. *Processes of International Negotiations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Michelson, Ethan. 2007. "Climbing the Dispute Pagoda: Grievances and Appeals to the Official Justice System in Rural China." *American Sociological Review* 72 (3): 459–485.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mitrany, David. 1948. "The Functional Approach to World Organization." *International Affairs*.
- Moore, Christopher W. 1986. *The Mediation Process*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nader, Laura. 1991. "Harmony Models and the Construction of Law." pp. 41–59 in *Conflict Resolution: Cross-cultural Perspectives*, edited by Keven Avruch, Peter W. Black, and Joseph A. Scimecca. New York: Greenwood Press.
- O'Leary, Rosemary and Lisa Bingham (Eds.). 2003. *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future Press.
- Ormaechea-Choque, Ivan. 1998. *Análisis de la Ley de Conciliación Extrajudicial*. Lima, Peru: Cultural Cuzco.
- Osgood, Charles E. 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.
- Pilusik, Marc and Thomas Hayden. 1965. "Is There a Military Industrial Complex Which Prevents Peace?" *Journal of Social Issues* 21 (January): 67–117.
- Polkinghorn, Brian, Robert LaChance and Haleigh LaChance. 2007. "A Comprehensive Profile and Trend Forecast of the Conflict Resolution Field in the United States." Center for Conflict Resolution at Salisbury University.
- Rapoport, Anatol. 1960. *Fights, Games, and Debates*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1966. *Two-Person Game Theory: The Essential Ideas*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Richardson, Lewis F. 1960. *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*. Pittsburgh, PA: The Boxwood Press.
- Roethlisberger, Fritz Jules, William John Dickson, Harold A. Wright, and Western Electric Company. 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.
- Rubin, Jeffrey Z. (Ed.). 1981. *Dynamics of Third Party Intervention: Kissinger in the Middle East*. New York: Praeger.
- Rubin, Jeffrey Z., and Bert R. Brown. 1975. *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Salem, Paul, (Ed.) 1997. *Conflict Resolution in the Arab World: Selected Essays*. Beirut: American University of Beirut.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Senghaas, Dieter. 1970. *Friedensforschung und Gesellschaftskritik*. München: C. Hanser.
- . 1972. *Rüstung und Militarismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.
- Sherif, Muzafer. 1966. *In Common Predicament*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Six, Jean-François. 1990. *Le Temps des Médiateurs*. Paris: Seuil.
- Sorokin, Pitirim Aleksandrovich. 1925. *The Sociology of Revolution*. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott.
- Stedman, Stephen John, Donald Rothchild, and Elizabeth M. Cousens (Eds.). 2002. *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Stephenson, Carolyn M. "Peace Studies, Overview," in Lester Kurtz (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict* 2nd Ed. Oxford: Elsevier, 2008.
- Strauss, Anselm. 1978. *Negotiations: Varieties, Contexts, Processes, and Social Order*. San Francisco, Washington, and London: Jossey-Bass.
- Susskind, Lawrence. 1987. *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tiedtke, Stephen. 1980. *Rüstungskontrolle aus sowjetischer Sicht*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Touval, Saadia and I. William Zartman. 1985. *International Mediation in Theory and Practice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- van der Merwe, Hendrik. 1989. *Pursuing Justice and Peace in South Africa*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wallensteen, Peter. 2002. *Understanding Conflict Resolution: War, Peace and the Global System*. London: Sage.
- Wright, Quincy. 1942. *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zartman, I. William (Ed.). 1978. *The Negotiation Process*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Zartman, I. William and Guy Olivier Faure (Eds.). 2005. *Escalation and Negotiation in International Conflicts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zartman, I. William and Maureen Berman. 1982. *The Practical Negotiator*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.