U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AGENDA

VOLUME 1 AN ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY NUMBER 19

Interviews with John Kornblum and James Steinberg

December 1996

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY
AGENDA

American Perspectives on Conflict Resolution

U. S. FOREIGN POLICY AGENDA USIA ELECTRONIC JOURNALS VOLUME 1 • NUMBER 19 • DECEMBER 1996

The United States is at the forefront in developing techniques and strategies to prevent, reduce, or resolve conflict, whether among nations, groups, or individuals. Known generally as conflict resolution, these efforts by the U.S. and other U.N. member states have their roots in the United Nations Charter and have gained growing recognition and support since the end of the Cold War.

The U.S. government's wide-ranging initiatives in this field include mediating regional conflicts, promoting democracy and human rights around the world, and strengthening the institutions that provide the basis for global peace and prosperity. A host of nongovernmental organizations assist in these efforts by bringing together conflicting parties, out of public view, to further mutual understanding and develop creative solutions.

This issue of *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda* offers American perspectives on many issues related to the study and practice of peacebuilding and explores both official and unofficial U.S. efforts to manage, prevent, and resolve conflicts.

In the focus section, two high-ranking U.S. officials, in separate interviews, give an overview of U.S. policy regarding conflict resolution and preventive diplomacy and discuss the work being done in this field by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe; in addition, a prominent scholar defines preventive diplomacy and describes how it works. Another expert assesses the future of U.S. efforts — governmental and nongovernmental — to promote peace. Finally, representatives of three well-known organizations involved in conflict resolution — the United States Institute of Peace, The Carter Center, and the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy — describe their work, and a fact sheet outlines 20 U.S. groups involved in the field.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AGENDA

An Electronic Journal of the
U. S. Information Agency

AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION

CONTENTS

FOCUS

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY: A KEY ELEMENT IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY 5

An Interview with James Steinberg
Director, State Department Policy Planning Staff

THE OSCE: A LEADER IN CONFLICT PREVENTION 11

An Interview with John Kornblum
Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs

PREVENTING AND REDUCING CONFLICT: GOALS ALL NATIONS CAN SHARE 16

By I. William Zartman
Professor of International Organization and Conflict Resolution
The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies

COMMENTARY

CONFLICT RESOLUTION: A UNIQUE U.S. ROLE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY 19

By Dennis J.D. Sandole
Professor of Conflict Resolution and International Relations
George Mason University

THE PROCESS AND THE PLAYERS

FORGING NEW WAYS TO MANAGE CONFLICT IN THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD 23

An interview with Richard Solomon
President of the United States Institute of Peace

FOSTERING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEACEMAKING AROUND THE WORLD 28

An interview with Harry Barnes
Director, Conflict Resolution and Human Rights Programs, The Carter Center

TRACK TWO DIPLOMACY: NONGOVERNMENTAL STRATEGIES FOR PEACE 32

By James Notter and John McDonald
Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy

U.S.-BASED INITIATIVES TO STUDY AND PRACTICE PEACEBULDING 37

Fact Sheet on programs throughout the nation

A GUIDE TO ADDITIONAL READING

AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION: KEY INTERNET SITES 42

Internet links to resources on conflict management

AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION: BIBLIOGRAPHY 43

Spotlighting other views on the subject

AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION: ARTICLE ALERT 45

Abstracts of current articles

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY
AGENDA

AN ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY
VOLUME 1 • NUMBER 19 • DECEMBER 1996

USIA's electronic journals, published and transmitted worldwide at two-week intervals, examine major issues facing the United States and the international community. The journals — Economic Perspectives, Global Issues, Issues of Democracy, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, and U.S. Society and Values — provide analysis, commentary, and background information in their thematic areas. French and Spanish language versions appear one week after the English. The opinions expressed in the journals do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Government. Articles may be reproduced and translated outside the United States unless copyright restrictions are cited on the articles.

Current or back issues of the journals can be found on the U.S. Information Service (USIS) Home Page on the World Wide Web at "http://www.usia.gov/journals/journals.htm". They are available in several electronic formats to facilitate viewing on-line, transferring, downloading and printing. Comments are welcome at your local USIS post or at the editorial offices:

Editor, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda
Political Security - I/TPS
U.S. Information Agency
301 4th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20547
United States of America

ejforpol@usia.gov

PUBLISHER . . . . Judith S. Siegel
EDITOR . . . . Patricia H. Kushlis
MANAGING EDITOR . . . . Margaret A. McKay
ASSOCIATE EDITORS . . . . Wayne Hall
. . . . Guy Olson
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS . . . . . Hugo Bayona
. . . . Ralph Dannheisser
. . . . Sophie Folly
. . . . Jim Kelman
. . . . Jason Kuznicki
. . . . Dian McDonald
. . . . Jacqui S. Porth
. . . . Wendy S. Ross
REFERENCE SPECIALISTS . . . . . Samuel M. Anderson
. . . . Vivian Stahl
ART DIRECTOR . . . . Barbara Morgan
GRAPHICS ASSISTANT . . . . Sylvia Scott
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT . . . . Yvonne Shanks
EDITORIAL BOARD . . . . Howard Cincotta
. . . . Rosemary Crockett
. . . . Judith S. Siegel

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY: A KEY ELEMENT IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

An Interview with James Steinberg
Director, State Department Policy Planning Staff

Crisis after crisis in the post-Cold War world has demonstrated "the importance and cost-effectiveness of preventive actions in dealing with conflict and complex emergencies," says Steinberg. "The number one task facing the United States and the international community as a whole for many years to come is to make sure that the forces of integration prevail over those of disintegration," he notes, and "this is at the heart of our preventive strategy." Steinberg responded in writing to questions submitted by the managing editor.

Q: How would you assess the role of preventive diplomacy and conflict management in U.S. foreign policy?

STEINBERG: One of the lessons that has been driven home again and again is the importance and cost-effectiveness of preventive actions in dealing with conflict and complex emergencies. Crisis after crisis has taught us that it is far more effective to help prevent nations from failing than to rebuild them after an internal crisis, far more beneficial to help people stay in their homes than it is to feed and house them in dangerously overcrowded refugee camps, and far less taxing to overextended relief agencies and international organizations to strengthen the institutions of conflict resolution than to heal ethnic and social divisions that have already exploded into bloodshed. In short, while crisis management and crisis resolution are necessary tasks for our foreign policy, crisis prevention is obviously far preferable.

Q: How does the administration advance its goals in conflict management and preventive diplomacy?

STEINBERG: Although the term "preventive diplomacy" has become fashionable in recent years, it is not a new concept here at the State Department. Diplomacy, in a very real sense, is the first line of defense against the outbreak of threats to national and international security. The great post-World War II diplomatic achievements from the Marshall Plan to the establishment of key institutions — such as the United Nations, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank — helped to build prosperity in the West and prevent the return of war to Europe. On a day-to-day basis, our foreign policy professionals work to avert crises or keep them from getting out of control.

Earlier this year, Secretary of State Christopher articulated "core principles" that guide U.S. foreign policy. Each of them, in a sense, is a conflict prevention strategy. For example, one of the core principles is support for democracy and human rights. As the secretary said during his recent trip to Africa, "The very best strategy for preventing conflict is to promote democracy." The world is a more secure place where the rule of law protects both political rights and free market economies. From working with courageous reformers in South Africa, Mexico, or the new democracies of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union to supporting the War Crimes Tribunal in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the investments the international community makes in democracy today can make urgent emergency responses unnecessary tomorrow.

Conflict prevention also is at the heart of another core principle: strengthening the institutions that provide an enduring basis for global peace and

prosperity. For instance, we're building a more integrated Europe, less subject to conflict and division, by adapting and adjusting proven institutions, such as NATO, and extending their benefits to new members. We are also enhancing security by creating new arrangements with our European allies through the New Transatlantic Agenda. President Clinton has taken major steps toward strengthening consultation and cooperation in our hemisphere through the Summit of the Americas, and in Asia through the annual APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum) leaders' meetings, the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) Regional Forum, and the Northeast Asian Security Dialogue.

Another key principle, of course, is the centrality of U.S. leadership and engagement. Whether through U.S. mediation, strengthening our role in the global economy, or fighting transnational threats from nuclear proliferation, crime, terrorism, or environmental decay, U.S. leadership is critical to building a more integrated world and to averting crises.

Q: What has been the impact of the end of the Cold War on U.S. efforts in conflict management and preventive diplomacy?

Steinberg: The end of the Cold War greatly reduced the danger of the deadliest conflict — nuclear war — while increasing the danger of another species of deadly conflict — the kind we have seen in the Balkans. On the one hand, the welcome end of the Cold War has made possible unprecedented advances in economic and political freedom and the opening of societies and markets. On the other hand, it has also broken down old rules and old underpinnings of stability, while new ones have yet to take their place. That is part of why we have seen, over the last several years, new risks created by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and a surge in international crime — not to mention the failure of state structures, new regional tensions, ethnic conflicts, aggressive and intolerant nationalism, and even a recurrence in Europe of what Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott has aptly called "the single ugliest phenomenon in the entire catalogue of political evil — genocide."

The number one task facing the United States and the international community as a whole for many years to come is to make sure that the forces of integration prevail over those of disintegration. This is at the heart of our preventive strategy.

Q: How important is cooperation with our allies in pursuing conflict management and preventive diplomacy efforts? How would you assess the effectiveness of the allied peace effort in Bosnia and the U.S. role in it?

Steinberg: Cooperation with our allies is essential to our approach to conflict prevention. Last year, President Clinton signed the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA) committing the United States and the European Union (EU) to 150 specific items for cooperation, including many with a direct bearing on our preventive diplomacy. For example, the NTA commits the U.S. and the EU, which together account for 90 percent of the world's humanitarian assistance, to coordinate their assistance programs to make them more effective and efficient. U.S. and EU officials are developing new ways of cooperation in support of democratic development in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Mexico; strengthening the new democratic government in Haiti; advancing civil society in the Andean region and Guatemala; cooperating on the environment in the New Independent States and Bulgaria, and on health and population in Asia and the Middle East. The U.S. and EU have established an international law enforcement training center for the police forces of Central and Eastern Europe, and are engaged in joint counternarcotics action in the Caribbean. Together we and the EU have agreed to establish a global early warning network on infectious and emerging diseases. Our joint task force on communicable diseases has already started to track outbreaks of "food-borne" diseases, such as hepatitis and E. coli bacterium, and is taking steps to build up capacity around the world to find them.

The U.S. and its major NATO allies have worked diplomatically to prevent historic tensions from boiling over. For example, the NATO states have sent a clear message to the states of Central and Eastern Europe that they must resolve lingering historical tensions in their regions if they are to reap the full benefits that a new Europe has to offer. This coordinated approach has produced impressive benefits in a short time, including Hungary's recent conclusion of good-neighbor treaties with Romania and Slovakia, progress between Romania and Ukraine on a similar arrangement, and settlement of a variety of issues between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) that threatened their relations. Provide Comfort, the multinational mission offering humanitarian assistance to the Kurds, depends on the cooperation of NATO allies. In FYROM, the U.S. has joined with several allies and partners to prevent the conflict in the former Yugoslavia from spreading. In the Caucasus, we are working with Armenia, Azerbaijan, and their neighbors to move toward resolution of the complex conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh, which would not only help stabilize the region but also advance our interest in diversifying global energy supplies. Cooperation with the EU and Japan has been essential to the successful effort to shut down North Korea's nuclear program. The lesson of Bosnia is that when we and our allies agree — and act together — there is much we can accomplish. There is much to be proud of in the successful, but unfinished, U.S.-led implementation of the Dayton accords. This process is an example of post-conflict rehabilitation, designed to prevent the reemergence of conflict in and around Bosnia. During the past year we have worked closely and effectively with our allies and partners. As a result of our actions, the fighting and bloodshed have stopped, national elections have been held, joint institutions are beginning to function, and Bosnian people of all nationalities are rebuilding their lives.

But there is much more to do to assure that the peace holds. That is why on November 15, the president announced that, in principle, the U.S. would participate in a new international military force to maintain stability in Bosnia during the next 18 months, when concerted civilian implementation will be underway. The main civilian tasks include: ensuring that those responsible for war crimes are brought to justice; promoting freedom of movement throughout Bosnia; and promoting economic reconstruction, democratization, and the creation of new national institutions in the new Bosnian state.

Q: What are some of the major U.S. programs in preventive diplomacy? Would you give examples from several different areas of the world?

Steinberg: An excellent example is our ongoing effort to reach a lasting settlement to the simmering border dispute between Peru and Ecuador — a conflict that has lasted more than a century and had erupted into a shooting war as recently as last January. As guarantors of the 1942 Rio Protocol, which ended the 1941 Ecuador-Peru war, the United States, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile immediately brought Peru and Ecuador into direct talks. Under guarantor pressure, the two nations agreed in February 1995 to establish a cease-fire, to separate forces, to create a demilitarized zone, and to seek a negotiated solution to remaining border issues. Working with the other guarantors, the U.S. has helped turn this conflict into a success for preventive diplomacy and a demonstration that in South America even the most bitter problems can be addressed cooperatively.

Through the administration's Greater Horn of Africa Initiative the U.S. assists efforts by members of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) to negotiate settlements to the long-standing civil conflicts in Sudan and Somalia. Also in Africa the U.S. provides considerable financial and technical assistance to efforts by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to develop its Conflict Resolution Mechanism.

Other examples include Guatemala, where the U.S., as a member of the Group of Friends of the Guatemalan Peace Process, has supported the mediation effort between the Guatemalan

government and the insurgent leadership, a process which will culminate in a peace accord to be signed on December 29 that will end the 36-year-old conflict.

I already mentioned our efforts at resolving historic tensions in Central and Eastern Europe. In Estonia U.S. discussions with Russia led to Moscow's withdrawal of its military forces from that country. Today, we continue to consult closely with the Russians and Estonians regarding the rights and status of Russian speakers in Estonia.

Q: The United Nations is a major player in the area of conflict prevention. How does the U.S. work with the U.N. in this field?

STEINBERG: The United Nations uses a variety of means to help parties avoid conflicts or resolve disputes once they have broken out, and we give active support in many ways. One example I alluded to earlier is the U.S. role, in partnership with the Nordic countries, in carrying out the first United Nations preventive deployment mission. Known as UNPREDEP, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the mission has helped keep the Balkan conflict from spreading. Its presence built confidence within the FYROM and stabilized the FYROM border with the rest of the former Yugoslavia, permitting those countries to make progress toward settlement of their border dispute. On other occasions a special representative of the secretary general will conduct good offices missions to mediate between the parties to a dispute, sometimes in conjunction with the deployment of a limited number of military observers as, for example, in Tajikistan, Liberia, or Georgia; and sometimes by human rights monitors, as in Burundi or Rwanda. The U.S. supports these efforts through our actions as a member of the U.N. Security Council, bilaterally, and in concert with regional organizations. Along with these more traditional diplomatic tools, the U.N., with U.S. help, conducts a panoply of assistance programs, through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and other similar activities. Designed to build an environment for a durable peace, this assistance includes support for reintegration of combatants into local economies; strengthening police, judicial, and human rights institutions; and electoral monitoring.

Q: One recent U.S. effort has been the proposal to establish an all-African intervention force to deal with regional conflicts. What was the U.S. reason for proposing such a force and what does Washington hope it will accomplish?

STEINBERG: Through the formation of the African Crisis Response Force (ACRF), the U.S. is seeking to form a partnership with Africa, Europe, the U.N., OAU and other entities to build the capabilities of African militaries to respond to international crises. It builds on ongoing peacekeeping initiatives in Africa and throughout the world. If successful, it will answer a critical long-term need on the African continent and improve the international community's near-term ability to respond to a potential massive humanitarian crisis in Burundi or elsewhere in Africa.

The security and humanitarian situation in Burundi, the sudden recent crisis in eastern Zaire, and the potential for other crises on the continent all underscore the need for a crisis response capacity in Africa.

The ACRF consciously builds on ongoing peacekeeping initiatives and concepts: to name but a few, the U.N. Standby Arrangements System, the OAU's proposal that members voluntarily earmark troops for peacekeeping operations, and the Western European Union's Joint Initiative on Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution in Africa. The ACRF concept also builds on U.S. efforts to improve regional peacekeeping forces elsewhere in the world through programs such as the Partnership for Peace with former Warsaw Pact nations, through assistance in the formation of an integrated Baltic Brigade for IFOR (the Bosnian peace Implementation Force), and through peacekeeping exercises in Latin America.

The U.S. has begun concrete steps toward implementing the ACRF. We are in the process of intensive consultations aimed at uniting the contribution of African military forces with the resources, training, and equipment that can be provided by donor nations to create an ACRF. By early next year, assessment teams will have visited Uganda, Ethiopia, Tunisia, and Mali — the countries that have signed on to participate.

As African peacekeepers' capabilities are enhanced, African forces will be capable of working together more effectively to respond to peacekeeping needs, and to natural and humanitarian crises in Africa and elsewhere. The ACRF would not be capable of peace enforcement activities — at least in the near term.

The ACRF would not serve as a standing army, but rather build on existing African military capabilities which would remain trained and ready, but resident in their home countries. Given our limited resources and desire to build a quality force as quickly as possible, we have to start with an initial limited group of countries.

The ACRF would be a fully inter-operable, fully trained and African-led and manned capability of 5,000-10,000 African soldiers, composed of a headquarters element, support units and up to ten African battalions. The training and supplemental equipping of this force should be jointly underwritten by the U.S. and other donor partners. Command and control arrangements would be the same as they are at present in U.N. missions. However, we do seek to expand the pool of capable African forces competent to lead and command U.N. missions. The current estimated cost to launch the ACRF is $25-40 million. The U.S. looks to other donors to meet a substantial portion of this sum through a combination of financial assistance, training, and in-kind contributions. Once deployed under U.N. auspices, we envisage that the sustainment and other costs of the mission would be borne by U.N. member states in accordance with the U.N. scale of assessments.

Q: In addition to working with allies, the U.N. and private organizations, the U.S. also is engaged in its own official efforts in conflict management and preventive diplomacy — for example in Northern Ireland and the Middle East, where successive administrations have engaged in "shuttle diplomacy." What is unique about these efforts and how would you characterize their effectiveness?

Steinberg: A key aspect of preventive diplomacy in Northern Ireland, as elsewhere, is economic development. Resolution of the conflict would open dramatic economic possibilities, alleviating the unemployment that undermines stability. Economic programs, in turn, create incentives for solidifying peace once it is attained. President Clinton appointed Senator George Mitchell to serve as Special Adviser for Economic Initiatives in Ireland to lead the efforts of all U.S. agencies in promoting economic development as a force for peace in Northern Ireland and the border countries. Senator Mitchell also co-chairs multiparty talks along with Canadian and Finnish co-chairmen to help the parties reach agreement~. All the parties present have affirmed their commitment to the six "Mitchell principles" of democracy and nonviolence. We have strongly backed the multiparty talks and consistently made clear to all participants our view that there can be no alternative to the peace process.

The Middle East is one area where the U.S. must continue to take the leading role in peacemaking. This is not only because we are the only player with the requisite credibility on all sides, but also because peace in this region is a vital national interest of the U.S. That is why President Clinton and Secretary Christopher, like many of their predecessors from both parties over the past 30 years, have made such a strong personal commitment to stand with the Israeli and Arab peacemakers at every step of the way. And that is why the newly reelected president and the next secretary of state will continue to make the advancement of the Middle East peace process a top priority over the next four years.

There are historic gains to preserve and build on. There are landmark agreements between Israel and the Palestinians — a reality almost unthinkable just a few short years ago. There is peace — not just formal peace, but full peace — between Israel and Jordan. There is a new set of diplomatic and commercial relations between Israel and many other Arab and Muslim countries. And there is the founding pillar of peace — that between Israel and Egypt — still firmly in place. While the parties have in each case reached and maintained these agreements of their own free will, they would be the first to proclaim that U.S. support for their efforts was, and is, a uniquely indispensable ingredient in crowning those efforts with success.

To be sure, this peace process has been severely tested by traumatic acts of violence in Israel, in Lebanon, and in the Palestinian areas over the past year. But over the same period, the process also has demonstrated great resilience. The challenge ahead is how to move incrementally toward final peace between Israelis and Palestinians, while broadening the circle of peace to include all of Israel's other neighbors and deepening the content of peace so that its dividends reach all people in the region.

THE OSCE: A LEADER IN CONFLICT PREVENTION

An Interview with John Kornblum
Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has been in the forefront in the field of conflict prevention, helping to calm conflicts early on, before they escalate into major crises, Kornblum says. In an interview conducted between visits to Bosnia and to Dayton, Ohio for a celebration of the first anniversary of the Dayton peace accords, the former U.S. ambassador to the OSCE discusses the organization's efforts to find common ground between the parties in Tajikistan, Nagorno-Karabakh, Moldova, Chechnya, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and cites the challenge of helping to shape security for the next century. The interview was conducted by Contributing Editor Jacqui S. Porth.

QUESTION: The OSCE has played a leading role in conflict prevention and management in the post-Cold War era in Europe. What are the guiding principles behind the OSCE and how do they relate to its role of conflict prevention and management?

KORNBLUM: The OSCE began as the most basic effort to avoid conflict. That was to define principles of behavior between two opposing sides — East and West — and to agree to begin a dialogue on how these principles were to be fulfilled. And for its first 10 years, from 1975 to 1985, the OSCE functioned very much as a floating conference: a series of meetings where representatives from East and West debated a vision of society. And in debating this vision of society, they illuminated where conflicts could arise and illuminated in a very slow, almost imperceptible fashion the underlying reason for possible conflict in Europe, which was the denial of human rights.

At the beginning of the OSCE there was a major debate between East and West over the legitimacy of human rights as a topic of international dialogue. Russia and its partners argued quite strongly that human rights were internal matters and not an aspect of international life. At the same time, by defining the basic human rights which were available to all citizens in these countries and by beginning a debate, the OSCE actually established human rights as a matter of international dialogue and, many people believe, contributed substantially to the loosening up and the ultimate demise of the Soviet system.

So that was a major conflict prevention effort based on strong confrontation between two opposing blocs. Now once the blocs were dissolved and Europe became very open, methods of conflict prevention needed to be more sophisticated and more developed. But the foundation for it continues to be the OSCE's commitment to pursing implementation of basic human rights. The Helsinki Principles, the many other conference documents that have emerged, the Copenhagen meeting, the Moscow meeting, the Valetta meeting (in Malta) — a number of meetings came up with more and more detailed definitions of how basic human rights should be implemented inside countries and internationally. The OSCE is not an organization with great military abilities. It is not a treaty-based organization. It is not on anybody's side. What it has is a basic catalogue of commitments which everyone has signed on to and which can form the basis for its conflict prevention activities.

Q: What structures and foundations have been most successful for the OSCE in the post-Cold War era?

KORNBLUM: Based on this movable conference idea we had, the OSCE then built up more structured ways of having dialogue and finding solutions to problems. The most important remains consultations. There is now a permanent council of the OSCE where everybody is represented by an ambassador. This permanent council does have a wide range of consultations on all sorts of issues which we never hear about publicly. This helps countries feel that their problems are being listened to, that they can bring up consensus. One of the first places where the West heard about the problems in Tajikistan, for example, was in the OSCE Permanent Council.

Secondly, the OSCE has been in the forefront of the organizations which have developed conflict prevention missions. These are small groups of people, usually no more than six or eight or 10, who go to a conflict area or an area of potential conflict with a very specific mandate, which is worked out in the Permanent Council, to help give a sense of international solidarity, to help mediate, to help provide information.

One of the most successful of these — in Skopje, Macedonia (FYROM) — was opened in the fall of 1992 by Ambassador Robert Frowick, who is now the head of the OSCE election commission in Bosnia. This mission was designed to help this country get a sense of stability and international presence at a time when it was just becoming independent and was in a very shaky position.

A similar mission was sent to Moldova, also in 1992. It's still there to help both with the question of nation-building but also the conflict with the separatists on the east bank of the Dniester River. This problem is now almost solved and the OSCE has played a very important role in doing that.

Another mission which had quite a dramatic role was the OSCE observer team to Chechnya. It was the only international agency allowed to have a political presence in Chechnya by the Russians. It played a very important role in keeping the lines of communication open between the Russians and Chechen separatists, in reporting what was going on, and helping push forward new mediation.

So these are examples of the kinds of things that the OSCE does. It has lots of other activities, too, which are longer term. This was all culminated, of course, with the OSCE presence in Bosnia where it has conducted the elections and worked on human rights, overseeing the arms control provisions of the Dayton peace agreement. So you can see what the OSCE is developing in the field of conflict prevention is a careful step-by-step approach, which, again, is not based on great negotiations or use of force, but rather on careful piecing together of common ground among people in conflict regions. And so far it has not been much in the news, but some of the work the OSCE has done has really been quite important.

Q: How well do you think the OSCE has done in the field of conflict resolution and how do you decide when to put it into play?

KORNBLUM: In Macedonia, it clearly played an important role. In Moldova, it really helped move forward the solution, as it did in the Baltic states. There has been an OSCE mission in Tajikistan which also has made a contribution. I think that, taken in sum, the conflict prevention aspects of the OSCE have proven to be very useful tools to effect things early on. And the important principle of the OSCE is that it starts right at the grass roots. It starts with basic human rights and works its way up through building consciousness.

If something gets into a military exchange or if there is a major confrontation, then in most cases, the role of the OSCE has been overtaken by events. Chechnya is perhaps an exception; the OSCE also has been working very hard to negotiate the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh.

But, in general, the OSCE works very well at the low end of the conflict; it's low end conflict prevention. And there are institutions that work

even in advance of the OSCE missions. There is, for example, the High Commissioner for National Minorities, who goes out and tries to deal with possible conflict situations before they even become public.

The OSCE has conflict-prevention and dispute-settlement mechanisms which unfortunately are not used very often because people don't seem to want to use them.

Q: Why is that?

KORNBLUM: Because, I think, they don't want to admit that there is a dispute. But the OSCE has a whole array of dispute settlement mechanisms. It also holds seminars on topics of great importance such as tolerance of minorities. There is also an economic wing to the OSCE. So I think, taken together, the OSCE is the low end of conflict prevention, the grass roots, the building up of structures, the building up of confidence before you actually have an open clash.

Q: At the December OSCE summit, do you expect the heads-of-state to take up any issues dealing with conflict prevention?

KORNBLUM: The main goal at the summit (in Lisbon, Portugal) is to seek to draw together all the things I've been telling you about and to come up with a definition of a model for security in the 21st century. And this will be a culmination document which takes all the lessons, all the developments, all the thoughts that we've had, boils them down into a small document, and tries to provide the kind of lessons we have been talking about, and then has a work program for the future.

Q: With a timetable?

KORNBLUM: Yes, the American proposal is to have a timetable for a new program of European security by the year 2000. I don't think there will be any new mechanisms or decisions taken at the summit but there will be decisions to start a very detailed exercise.

Q: What are the near-term problems and challenges for the OSCE in the conflict prevention field?

KORNBLUM: I think the challenges are the challenges of Europe. As the artificial stability of the Cold War has broken away, there are a number of differences — ethnic, political, geographic — which can lead to conflict, and the major goal of everyone is sustained democratic development throughout the continent. This is coming at a time of great turbulence in East as well as West. And I think the OSCE will have a very important role in defining how security should be seen.

Q: So you see the OSCE having a long-term continuing role?

KORNBLUM: Yes, I see the OSCE as having a continuing and a very central role. It is not going to be, as some people have suggested, either a new European United Nations with a legal treaty, nor is it going to be the one organization that ties everything together. But it will have a central role because of its basic definition of structures and ideals and commitments. And because, as I said, it deals with these broad grass-roots issues which are the underlying causes of security problems to begin with.

So I think its probably going to have a very important role. The OSCE has changed many times, including changing its name from CSCE (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe) to OSCE. And I have a feeling it will change quite often again. That is one of its strengths — that it is a structure that responds to whatever tasks people want to give it.

Q: What can, or should, the United States do to continue its leadership role in the OSCE in the area of conflict prevention?

KORNBLUM: What we are doing is to take a very active role in the Vienna Council, in the missions and in the political formulation of the future of the OSCE. We are contributing, for example, in a major way to the Bosnia mission. The size of our

mission was higher than that of any other country and we are contributing ideas.

Q: Where does CFE II stand and how does that play into the concept of conflict prevention?

Kornblum: CFE (Conventional Armed Forces in Europe) is a treaty that was negotiated within the framework of the OSCE, but it is a separate treaty among 30 countries, which is not the full membership of the OSCE. It is a very complex treaty focused on armament reductions. There is to be an adaptation conference — CFE II, if you will, which begins in 1997.

And it will be important as a means for building on the foundation of both the OSCE and the CFE and in adapting the commitments of the CFE to the new era. Since the CFE was negotiated when there was still a NATO and a Warsaw Pact, there is still a good deal to do just to update the structures. We will also be looking at possible means to expand the coverage, the commitments, to deal with the new security problems.

Q: How do the efforts of the OSCE and NATO intersect in Bosnia?

Kornblum: OSCE and NATO are very closely related organizations, but they have really totally different mandates. NATO in Bosnia is a military force, pure and simple. It does lots of tasks which also support civilian implementation, but it is essentially a military force. The OSCE has a broad civilian and human rights mandate. And so they cooperate closely both between their headquarters and in Bosnia, but there really isn't any direct intersection of their duties.

Q: Do you expect it to stay that way?

Kornblum: Yes.

Q: You mentioned the conflict prevention mission in Skopje. The situation there has been cited as an example in which political chaos and war have been kept in abeyance. What is your reaction?

Kornblum: Well, so far they have. We are watching it carefully. Macedonia is interesting because it is, in fact, a very successful cooperation in political conflict prevention between the OSCE and a military presence, in this case under a U.N. banner, with a large percentage of American troops.

The OSCE mission came in first, helped establish a foundation. Then there was a feeling that for a number of reasons, including the many conflicts going on to the north, that Macedonia would benefit from a small contingent of several hundred peacekeeping observers, who basically monitor the border.

This was done under a U.N. mandate and includes, I think, about 500 Americans and a large number of Nordic forces. It really has been a very successful example of how you can use a limited commitment of military forces with a political conflict prevention mission to help stabilize a situation and help the country to prosper.

Q: Do you see that force as being semi-permanent?

Kornblum: Well, I don't know. Everything is semi-permanent. Its mission will end. It's been there now for four years. It certainly won't be there another four years. But the situation is still tense and I don't see it ending anytime soon.

Q: Do the NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) play any role at all in OSCE policy development?

Kornblum: Yes, they play a big role because they are the ones who feed us the information from the grass roots. They tell us what is important. The United States, in particular, has always felt there should be a major role for the NGOs and we have them on our delegation. We make sure they can come to OSCE meetings. We expect a great deal from the NGOs and they usually deliver.

Q: Do you see the OSCE as being an instrument of first resort in Europe?

KORNBLUM: It ought to be, and it is every day the instrument of first resort. It is the place where people talk about how to build democratic structures. That is also conflict prevention. If you mean there is some kind of formal agreement where people will go to OSCE first, we never see things in that kind of structured sense. We believe that political and international issues should be dealt with as efficiently as possible. Sometimes that means using NATO, sometimes that's OSCE. Sometimes it is done in the Council of Europe. There isn't any real hierarchy of organizations and they should all be used as appropriate.

PREVENTING AND REDUCING CONFLICT: GOALS ALL NATIONS CAN SHARE

By I. William Zartman
Professor of International Organization and Conflict Resolution
The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies

"Preventive diplomacy and the reduction of conflict at any stage of its evolution should be an integral part of the foreign policies of all nations," says Zartman. There may be disagreement among nations on the reasons behind a conflict, he notes, but the conclusion of that conflict, "and its pursuit without violence, are goals that all states can share." Zartman is professor of international organization and conflict resolution and director of African studies at The Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C. He was professor of politics at New York University and has lectured at universities in Africa, the Middle East and Europe. A specialist in North Africa, he was elected president of the newly-organized American Institute for Maghribi Studies. He is the author of numerous articles and books, including "Ripe for Resolution: Conflict and Intervention in Africa," and "Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars."

Like Moliere's M. Jourdain, who spoke prose all his life without knowing it, diplomats have long been practicing preventive diplomacy without being particularly aware of it. But since naming is the beginning of knowledge, the identification of the practice permits specific focus on its meaning and components. Preventive diplomacy refers to diplomatic measures taken to prevent political conflicts from turning violent, or more comprehensively, in the words of U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "action to prevent disputes from arising among parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts, and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur."

The concept and practice of preventive diplomacy were first identified in the United Nations Charter, which states that the purpose of the world organization is to use "effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace...(to) save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." U.N. secretaries-general have spoken of its importance for the U.N. and its member states, and the latter in turn have adopted the concept as their own.

THE FAMILY OF STRATEGIES

The family of conflict reduction strategies to achieve this purpose — prevention, management, resolution, transformation — relate to different moments in the life of a conflict when preventive diplomacy measures can be effective. Conflict, it should be remembered, is a necessary, inevitable, and often useful part of human relations. Whenever two parties cannot accomplish related goals at the same time, there is conflict, and whenever there is change, conflict is likely to be involved. Conflict should be able to be dealt with on the political level, but when pressure and resistance are too strong, it escalates to violence.

Conflict prevention focuses on efforts to keep conflict on the political level and to deal with the causes that might press it on to violence. One of the most striking American-led efforts at conflict prevention was the Namibian initiative, which began under President Carter and continued to a successful conclusion by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester Crocker under President Reagan; although some violence was present in the Namibian efforts to attain independence (and increased during the course of the decade of negotiations), it was

much lower than the level of conflict in neighboring Angola or Zimbabwe — thanks to early efforts to resolve the issue diplomatically.

Conflict management deals with violent conflict which diplomatic efforts seek to reduce to the political level. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Richard Holbrooke managed the conflict in Bosnia in 1995 by mediating the Dayton agreement that ended the war and left the conflict to be worked out at the political level. However, conflict management does not remove the conflict.

Conflict resolution brings the political issues to a conclusion, although this might often be clearer conceptually than in reality. The new constitution in South Africa finalized a resolution of the conflict over apartheid, opening up the new political system to handle remaining and consequent problems as part of a next chapter in South African history. Conflict resolution is usually left to time and the parties themselves, with little room for a direct diplomatic role for outsiders. The United States played a positive role in helping South Africa along, particularly with its sanctions and its aid programs to anti-apartheid civil society, but resolution was in local hands.

Conflict transformation is a more recent term used to indicate the establishment of new, positive relationships among the formerly conflicting parties. It is a long process, the kind of evolution that characterized Franco-German reconciliation within the successive institutions that grew to be the European Union, or the reversal of hostile relations with the Axis powers after World War II, or the change in Russo-American relations after the Cold War, or the tentatively begun and frequently rejected advancement in Arab-Israeli relations since the peace process first began with U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 after the 1967 war. The United States has had a role in these gradual changes, and the latter three have been important parts of American foreign policy.

The U.N. classification of strategies to promote peace shows a slightly different focus that is directly related to the provisions in the U.N. Charter. Preventive diplomacy in U.N. parlance refers more generally to conflict prevention, and Secretary General Boutros-Ghali's new focus on peacebuilding refers to measures that can induce conflict transformation. In between is the classic U.N. distinction between peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. Peacemaking relates to Chapter VI activities where the consent of the conflicting states and the use of peaceful means are involved. For example, the special representative of the secretary general in Angola, Alioune Blondin Beye — supported by the U.S. special representative to Angola, Paul Hare — produced the Lusaka agreement ending the Angolan civil war in 1994. Peace enforcement refers to Chapter VII activities; they are carried out without the consent of the states and with the use of coercive measures. The U.S.-led coalition that liberated Kuwait from Iraqi occupation during the 1991 Gulf War is such a case. Peacekeeping, often called "Chapter VI 1/2" because it is not explicitly provided for in the charter, refers to military deployment that is intended to facilitate an agreed settlement but that may involve danger from non-consenting forces. There are currently 16 of these U.N. operations — called "Blue Helmet" missions — deployed in the world.

This complex of activities involves multiple tactical means, ranging from the use of military forces to diplomatic measures, from economic pressure to even social and cultural programs. Indeed, the general goal would be not to exorcise conflict from the world but to infuse interstate relations with a "Culture of Conciliation," whereby conflict can be managed, resolved, and transformed without violence.

AGENTS AND THEIR INTERESTS

Preventive diplomacy can be accomplished by many agencies, both governmental and nongovernmental, from the United Nations through regional organizations to member states, and from global NGOs (nongovernmental organizations) to private institutions. Since preventive diplomacy deals primarily with state action, its primary agents are states and interstate organizations. In addition to the U.N., regional organizations are active in dealing

with conflicts among members by diplomatic means; the Organization of African Unity, for example, incorporated a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, and Resolution into its structure in 1993. An unusual peace enforcement activity of a sub-regional organization has been the Economic Community of West African States' Military Observer Group (ECOMOG); it has far exceeded the limitations of its name in its attempt, since 1990, to bring peace to Liberia.

It should be remembered that such international organizations are rarely independent agents; their actions are authorized and often performed by member states. States benefit from their use of global and regional organizations because such cooperative efforts diffuse responsibility, rather than leaving even positive intervention in the hands of one state. The world community can act with its moral authority and the material resources provided by its members rather than taxing the authority and resources of a single state.

State coalitions, broadening the notion of collective defense, can perform preventive diplomacy where there is no regional organization and where global interests are not involved. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), first in a military role and then as the coordinator of and a major contributor to the international peacekeeping force (IFOR), provided support for U.S. mediation in the Bosnian crisis. This collective effort replaced earlier peacekeeping attempts by other international bodies, including the U.N. and its peacekeeping force (UNPROFOR) and the Western European Union (WEU).

Individual states acting alone (although often with a legitimizing collective cover) are the most frequent agents of preventive diplomacy, and as the remaining superpower, the United States is called on to perform this function more often than most. A particularly successful action has been the U.S. role — in conjunction with resolutions of the Organization of American States (OAS) — in restoring Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to his elected position in 1994, after his removal by a coup in 1991.

Although diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts are conducted at the state level, states can often benefit from assistance provided by private organizations and individuals. U.S.-based organizations such as Refugees International, World Vision, Search for Common Ground, the Kettering Foundation, the U.S. Institute of Peace, and the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, among others, train, connect, prepare, convene, analyze, and organize individuals and groups in areas of conflict to help them better handle their conflicts and avoid violence in the pursuit of their goals. The public and private sectors are gradually learning that unofficial diplomacy has a role to play and official diplomacy can benefit from such assistance. In the end, official agreements are concluded among state representatives, but, particularly in internal conflicts where other states are less legitimate interveners, private efforts in preparation and implementation complement state efforts. It is notable that the United States — with its participatory, associational culture noted by Alexis de Tocqueville — has been a pioneer in developing such methods and activities.

Conflicts have a cause and a reason, even if they are not universally understood. Some conflicts, such as anti-colonial struggles for independence, need to be carried to their conclusion; the rationale for other conflicts may seem less justifiable. But the conclusion of conflict and its pursuit without violence are goals that all states can share. With few exceptions, violence — even in the achievement of laudable or shared goals — is in no one's interest. Preventive diplomacy and the reduction of conflict at any stage of its evolution should be an integral part of the foreign policies of all nations. Even when geopolitical and material calculations of national interest are not evident, the saving of human life and dignity and the preservation of resources that can be used to improve the human condition are overarching justifications for preventive diplomacy. ◉

CONFLICT RESOLUTION: A UNIQUE U.S. ROLE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

By Dennis J.D. Sandole
Professor of Conflict Resolution and International Relations
George Mason University

The United States and its security partners can enhance prospects for conflict resolution by striving not only to prevent or end violent conflicts but to eliminate their underlying causes as well, says Sandole. The United States must lead on this, he notes, because the "political will" of others and "our common security" depend on it. Sandole is professor of conflict resolution and international relations at George Mason University's Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution in Fairfax, Virginia. He has been a visiting scholar with the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), where he worked on both the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) and the Confidence and Security-Building Measures (CSBM) negotiations, and served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the CSBM negotiations in Vienna, Austria. He has also been a NATO research fellow and has recently been awarded a Fulbright scholarship to conduct research on the development of peace and security in post-Cold War Europe within the context of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

"Conflict resolution" means different things to different people. For many, including diplomats, the term means processes designed to achieve "negative peace": the prevention, cessation, or absence of war or hostilities in general.

Negative peace, however, does not go far enough; it is one part — albeit, often an essential part — of a larger process that is rarely attempted — and if attempted, rarely achieved — by traditional diplomacy. The remaining part consists of "positive peace": the elimination of the underlying structural causes and conditions that have given rise to the violent conflict which negative peace processes seek to contain. To put it simply, negative peace deals with symptoms of underlying problems — "putting out fires" — while positive peace deals with the underlying, "combustible" problems themselves.

Why doesn't traditional diplomacy deal with positive peace? One reason is that diplomats are trained in dispute settlement — reaching agreements about how to establish negative peace — without, good intentions to the contrary, necessarily addressing the underlying problems that gave rise to the disputes that are being settled. Hence, negotiations to end wars or to control or reduce armaments, resulting in treaties or other agreements, are efforts to halt or manage actual or threatened violence resulting from conflicts without necessarily dealing with their underlying, deep-rooted causes and conditions.

Also, diplomats, acting on behalf of their governments, tend to seek negative peace by usually (but not only) competitive (win-lose) processes. To be fair, it is difficult, morally and otherwise, to pursue a win-win strategy with people who are clearly war criminals. This does not, however, diminish the fact that negative peace alone is never enough to do the job; indeed, that without positive peace, negative peace may collapse, thereby leading to a resumption of the very hostilities it sought to suppress. This can be a never-ending prospect, as is the case in Cyprus where a fragile negative peace has, with one notable exception in the 1970s, held for some 30 years, but which is always at risk because of the failure of the parties, working together with the international community, to achieve positive peace.

Hence, former U.S. diplomat Joseph Montville coined the term Track Two diplomacy to reinforce

the need for nongovernmental actors to complement the efforts of Track One (governmental) actors, especially when the latter have reached an impasse. Track Two organizations — such as The Carter Center (Atlanta); the Conflict Management Group (Cambridge, Massachusetts); the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (Washington, D.C.); Partners for Democratic Change (San Francisco) and Search for Common Ground (Washington, D.C.) — tend to use cooperative (win-win) processes to achieve positive peace.

Former President Jimmy Carter, for example, has been actively engaged in conflict resolution activities in countries around the world, including the Baltics, Ethiopia, Liberia, North Korea, and Haiti.

The Conflict Management Group has been engaged in conflict resolution programs with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), particularly the High Commissioner on National Minorities, which has been tasked with early warning and early action in potentially explosive situations involving minorities in the OSCE area, especially in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD) has been active on a number of fronts, including facilitating dialogue:

- between Chinese and Tibetans
- among different factions in the Liberian civil war (with The Carter Center and George Mason University's Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution)
- between left- and right-wing Israelis
- between Palestinians and Israelis and
- among Ethiopians from various ethnic groups residing in the Washington, D.C. area.

IMTD is also in Cyprus (with the Conflict Management Group) where it has worked successfully with Greek and Turkish Cypriots to establish a bicommunal board that includes persons close to the leaders on both sides, and, more recently, to create a joint conflict resolution center on the Green Line separating the two communities. Partners for Democratic Change has established university-based conflict prevention and training centers — plus national programs, including ethnic conciliation commissions — in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, and Slovakia, to assist these countries in their transition from communism to democracy.

Search for Common Ground has been pioneering techniques and processes, including the use of television and other media, for bringing together adversaries seeking "common ground" in East-West relations, Europe, the former Soviet Union, the Middle East, and Africa.

Taken together, these and other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in Track Two conflict resolution are creating an international cadre of appropriately trained persons who can complement, and therefore enhance, Track One negative peace with positive peace efforts.

Track One is clearly dominant in international conflict resolution, usually with little if any linkage to Track Two, doing what Track One does best: pursuing, achieving, and maintaining negative peace. Negative peace is where Bosnia is now. A few years ago, when I was interviewing heads of delegations to the (then) Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Vienna, one of my respondents implied that, without active U.S. participation in a NATO intervention, the wars in the former Yugoslavia could not be halted. Subsequent events have borne him out as negative peace seems to have come to Bosnia precisely because of NATO bombing of Bosnian-Serb positions following the fall of the U.N. "safe areas" of Srebrenica and Zepa, and the peace mission led by former Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke that culminated in the Dayton peace agreements of November/December 1995.

Until recently, many thought that negative peace in Bosnia was doomed to failure, as the United States was adhering to its commitment to begin withdrawing its forces by December 20, 1996, the deadline for the withdrawal of the U.S.-led NATO Implementation Force (IFOR). According to

many — the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency, and Richard Holbrooke among them — this would lead to the resumption of war. But President Clinton's recent victory at the polls has enabled him to announce that the United States will remain militarily in Bosnia as part of a reduced NATO-led follow-on force — a Stabilizing Force (SFOR) — for an additional 18 months, until June 1998.

What can the United States do to enhance the prospects for success in the extended NATO-led mission in Bosnia?

The stage has been set for this: NATO, under U.S. leadership, established the North Atlantic Cooperation Council in 1991 and the Partnership for Peace in 1994, to reach out to, and collaborate with, its former Warsaw Pact adversaries. These developments are a powerful sign that the Cold War is over and therefore, by implication, that nations are undergoing a shift from a narrow world view based on national security to a comprehensive one based on common security.

Hence, the United States and its security partners are conceptually able to move beyond negative into positive peace. What this will entail in Bosnia is for the United States and its NATO and other partners to remain there long enough to ensure that negative peace holds. At the same time, they should work with international governmental and nongovernmental (including conflict resolution) organizations, and with the conflicting parties, to pursue, achieve, and maintain positive peace.

With secure negative peace as a point of departure, positive peace in Bosnia begins with the reconstruction of the country. But lest the United States and its partners repeat the failure of the European Union to achieve positive peace in the Bosnian city of Mostar through substantial investments in rebuilding Mostar's infrastructure, this reconstruction must reflect a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy — reconciliative as well as physical — over a period of time.

Some frameworks that could be useful in guiding U.S.-led activities in this regard are:

- the "contingency model" of Ron Fisher and Loraleigh Keashly, which matches an intervention with the intensity of a given conflict, and then follows up with other interventions designed to move the parties toward positive peace;
- the "multi-track framework" of IMTD's Ambassador John McDonald and Louise Diamond, which combines the resources of nongovernmental conflict resolution practitioners with those of the business and religious communities, media, funders, and others as well as governmental actors, in the pursuit of positive peace; and
- my own design for a "new European peace and security system" which combines elements of these and other frameworks within the context of the OSCE.

There is a working hypothesis implicit in all this: by expanding their options to include cooperative processes geared to positive peace as well as competitive processes associated with negative peace, the United States and its partners will enhance their prospects for success in dealing with the deep-rooted intrastate ethnic and other conflicts that seem to be the dominant form of warfare in the post-Cold War world.

Intervening in such conflicts may mean "taking casualties," particularly in cases where one party is attempting to impose a genocidal "final solution" on another, as in Rwanda or Bosnia. In such situations, the use of an appropriate amount of force to achieve negative peace may be a necessary (but not sufficient) condition of positive peace. We should not, in such cases, allow the U.S. experience in Somalia to prevent us from acting. Genocide in Rwanda or Bosnia does, sooner or later, affect the interests of the United States and others. The use of such extreme violence to "resolve" conflicts anywhere in the world is not only morally reprehensible, but constitutes a model for others to emulate, perhaps increasing the costs of dealing with it later on.

The implicit emphasis here on early warning and early action is part of the gist of conflict resolution: being proactive instead of reactive. A proactive approach to problem solving worldwide is in the U.S. national interest. This means, among other things, pursuing a bipartisan U.S. foreign policy to avoid the necessity of having to issue unrealistic timelines in any future deployment of forces, plus paying the massive U.S. debt to the United Nations so that the United States can more credibly and effectively lead in the debate over U.N. reform as well as in efforts to craft effective international responses to problems worldwide.

Effective international responses imply working synergistically with other regional international organizations — including the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of American States, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations — to facilitate dealing with local problems, as well as working with the OSCE, NATO, the European Union (EU) and NGOs engaged in conflict resolution, in dealing with Bosnia and other conflicts in Europe.

The United States — where conflict resolution is most advanced as an applied field — cannot afford *not* to lead on this one: the "political will" of others and our common security depend on it. ◉

FORGING NEW WAYS TO MANAGE CONFLICT IN THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD

An interview with Richard Solomon
President of the United States Institute of Peace

While the end of the Cold War opened up opportunities to resolve long-standing disputes in some parts of the world, the last years of this century are not turning out to be an era of peace, says Richard Solomon, president of the United States Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C.
Creative approaches are needed to deal with new sources of international conflict, he says, and the work of the Institute of Peace has been refocused to meet this challenge. Solomon earlier served as assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, director of the State Department's policy planning staff, and U.S. ambassador to the Philippines. He was interviewed by Contributing Editor Dian McDonald.

QUESTION: What was the rationale for creating the United States Institute of Peace in 1984?

SOLOMON: For quite a few years there had been a national campaign to establish a "peace academy." The notion was to create a four-year degree-granting educational institution as a complement to the military training academies — West Point and Annapolis. In support of this idea, there was a public organization, with more than 70,000 members, that lobbied Congress to establish this kind of an educational institution.

There also was a feeling during the Cold War that the Communist world had co-opted the notion of "peace." The Communists had created various front organizations — peace committees and peace institutes — that were, frankly, very political and part of their Cold-War activities. Many people in the United States believed that we should not let the Communist world dominate and corrupt the notion of peace. This was one motivation for creating the U.S. Institute of Peace, which was established by a bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans who passed the legislation to establish the institute in 1984.

The legislation did not create a four-year degree-granting "university," but rather an institute whose primary purpose was educational and that had more flexibility — and was, in effect, a little less grandiose — than the concept of an academy on the order of the American military training academies.

Q: What are USIP's key objectives now?

SOLOMON: The original congressional charter of the institute is still our basic orienting document. It says that our purpose is to "strengthen our national capabilities for resolving international conflict without resort to war or violence." With the end of the Cold War, that directive from Congress has become in some ways more relevant than ever because the end of the U.S.-Soviet confrontation meant the end of the nuclear standoff that had dominated all aspects of international relations for a generation. In the early 1990s many long-standing disputes and conflicts suddenly seemed amenable to negotiated approaches to resolution. Consider, for example, the progress that has been made in recent years in the Middle East peace process, the U.N. settlement for Cambodia, and in peacemaking in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa. In that sense, our charter today reflects the new opportunities for peacefully resolving long-standing international disputes.

That said, however, the end of the Cold War did not mark the beginning of an era of peace. There are some long-standing conflicts, like Kashmir or

Cyprus, or more recent ones like Bosnia, that have proven to be very durable and resistant to resolution. We have also seen the outbreak of new ethnic and religious conflicts; and some long-standing confrontations — including the one on the Korean Peninsula — have become more tense as the discipline that the Cold War confrontation imposed in many parts of the world has eased.

Therefore the work of the institute has been refocused to try to (1) understand the new sources of international conflict, (2) develop approaches to dealing with ethnic and religious conflicts that were not on our Cold War agenda, and (3) develop educational and professional training programs to strengthen the skill base of foreign affairs practitioners — both U.S. diplomats and representatives of nongovernmental organizations promoting humanitarian assistance programs — to facilitate the negotiated resolution of these conflicts.

Q: How would you describe the primary milestones in USIP's evolution during the past decade?

Solomon: There has been an interesting systematic evolution in our work and programs. In the mid-1980s we focused on our grant program, which stimulated the academic community and the "think-tank" world to develop the intellectual base of understanding about processes of conflict management and resolution. In other words, our first effort was to build the intellectual capital, through research, that would help professionalize our understanding of what "peace studies" really meant. In 1989 we published a book called *Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map*, which laid out the intellectual framework for research on conflict management and resolution — the components of peacebuilding.

Subsequently we developed a fellowship program that annually brings to the institute about 14 senior scholars and other outstanding professionals representing academic institutions, the media, and governments around the world. They pursue year-long studies here in Washington on topics relevant to our charter.

More recently, our education and training program has become the most active area of the institute's operational focus. The "education" part of the program develops specialized studies for high school and university students designed to cover a range of topics that will deepen understanding about the sources of and the means for resolving international conflict. These studies are the basis for summer enrichment seminars for high school, community college, and university faculty as well. The institute's fellowship program supports this work by awarding scholarships to graduate students to generate more new knowledge about what peacemaking and conflict resolution mean.

We have also expanded our professional training program to include workshops with the professional military to develop their skills for peacekeeping operations. In collaboration with the U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute at Carlisle Barracks, in Pennsylvania, we work with people who are professionally trained as war fighters and teach them skills that are appropriate to running international peacekeeping operations. We also are developing a program to improve the skills of those who do international negotiating across cultural barriers.

Our work also has evolved in the area of policy support. Since I came here three years ago, we have tried — with the encouragement of our board of directors — to make our programs more policy-relevant, and to work with government officials in helping them think through political approaches to resolving international conflict — so they have options between doing nothing and sending in troops.

And finally we have developed a capacity for what is generally referred to as "Track Two" diplomacy — semiofficial dialogues — to facilitate resolution of long-standing international conflicts. "Track Two" diplomacy is usually preparatory to formal government negotiations. In the case of the Middle East peace process, for example, the

Norwegian Academy of Social Sciences brought the Israelis and the Palestinians together off site and quietly helped them assess the basis for further progress in the peace effort. We and other organizations have played a similar role in a number of conflicts — in Africa, South Asia, and other parts of the world — in helping to lay the basis for what one hopes will be formal — government-mediated — negotiations for resolving the conflicts.

Q: Do other governments sponsor organizations that parallel the structure and mission of USIP?

Solomon: There are, of course, many international affairs "think tanks" around the world that various governments have set up and support. But our congressional charter is fairly unique in its focus on strengthening capacities for non-military, nonviolent approaches to resolving or managing international conflict.

Developing cooperative programs with other institutions around the world is one of the areas for future growth of this institution. We have not been able to pursue this possibility very actively thus far, given the relative youth of our organization and its small staff. But that is something that we will certainly want to do over time.

Q: How would you assess the American public's understanding of and support for the efforts of USIP?

Solomon: Our work has received an enthusiastic response in a number of communities as it has acquired some visibility. One of our major outreach vehicles is our annual national peace essay contest in high schools in all 50 states. Each year upwards of 10,000 students compete for college scholarships awarded through the contest by writing essays that focus on some contemporary issue of war and peace. As a result, the institute and its work are increasingly well-known at the "grass-roots" level in communities around the country.

Our grant program, which takes up almost a third of our annual budget with an allocation of about $3 million, has received a very positive response. The program supports research and other conflict resolution activities in universities and in the private sector by nongovernmental organizations involved in humanitarian assistance work. Our grant program receives such a positive response in part because the major private sector foundations that for many years had supported this kind of activity are cutting back now on international programs. And both the Congress and the administration, as they see what we are able to do with a very modest annual appropriation of federal money, are asking us to do a lot more joint programming in support of their work.

We believe that the way we use our small annual budget is a good example of how a semi-independent federal agency can play an innovative role in helping the government adapt to the changing international environment. We are trying to make the institute a center of innovation and education that is helping our country adapt to the post-Cold War world.

The global "information revolution" really will enable us to take our modest congressional budget and give our programs an international voice and much broader impact, because, in effect, we now have global outreach through the Internet, teleconferencing, fax machines, radio programs, and even the humble telephone. After we move to permanent facilities, we are going to build in much more of this electronic outreach capacity, which will give us the ability to conduct "virtual" training programs in classrooms anywhere in the country, to run seminars with a "think tank" anywhere in the world, and to make our publications and our other activities visible on a global basis.

Q: Does USIP have a role in trying to ameliorate the current crisis in Central Africa?

Solomon: The current crisis in Central Africa is not a recent one; its immediate origins go back to the civil war in Rwanda and the genocide of 1994. We have numerous projects on the three states

enmeshed in the conflict — Rwanda, Zaire, and Burundi — and some of the issues at play, such as peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention, repatriation of refugees, accountability for perpetrators of genocide, and ways to manage ethnic strife. In September 1996, the institute cosponsored with the State Department a symposium on Burundi designed to help the State Department generate a possible negotiating plan for the international mediators trying to bring peace to Burundi and avoid the kind of genocide that devastated neighboring Rwanda.

I think the most important issue on the immediate-term time horizon is the future of Zaire, which is teetering on the brink of collapse and potential dissolution. The institute is in the process of publishing a report on ways for the international community to engage and prevent this collapse from happening. It will offer recommendations on how international organizations like the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, national governments, and nongovernmental organizations can help stabilize Zaire.

Q: USIP has held an ongoing series of study group meetings on U.S. policy in the Korean Peninsula. What are key aspects of that effort and has it had an impact on U.S. policy in the region?

Solomon: The institute's North Korea Working Group, which we started in 1993, has analyzed the changing situation on the Korean Peninsula both in the context of North Korea's nuclear program and more recently as North Korea's economy has entered a period of decline and crisis. Today there is a need for contingency planning that is more political than military in its focus. The institute's study groups and reports have influenced the administration's thinking about how to deal with the serious situation on the Korean Peninsula; we have stimulated longer-range strategic thinking as the administration has reassessed Korea-related issues.

Q: What are the objectives of the "Virtual Diplomacy" conference that USIP is sponsoring in April of next year?

Solomon: The conference will focus on the global impact of the information revolution and the telecommunications transformation of our world, and how these new technologies are transforming international relations and creating new opportunities for conflict prevention, management, and resolution.

We believe the conference will be pathbreaking in helping people think through how the world is changing and how new technologies can be used for the peaceful resolution and management of international conflict. The use of the "virtual mapping" capacity that played an important role in the Dayton negotiations on Bosnia is an example of how it is possible to meld technology with diplomacy to advance negotiated solutions to various disputes.

Q: USIP recently published *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, a book that examines the complex politics of the post-Cold War period. What is the significance of this publication, which has been described as a "unique" aid for teachers in the field of international conflict management?

Solomon: The book is a direct outgrowth of the faculty enrichment program that the institute runs for professors who teach at the undergraduate level. Through these seminars, the institute became aware of the need for a comprehensive undergraduate text that examines both the changing nature of international conflict and new approaches to conflict management and peacemaking.

The volume explores factors that may spark or exacerbate violent conflicts, and examines ways in which the international community can respond effectively to both inter- and intra-state wars. By considering the many options available to the policymaker and practitioner, the book seeks to change the perception that, in responding to international conflicts, our choices are limited to the extremes of either doing nothing or sending in troops.

Through the volume, the institute hopes to advance understanding of the many choices available to government, private sector organizations, and individuals in responding to conflict. This is what makes it unique. By emphasizing the steps that both government officials and private citizens can take to prevent, contain, manage, and resolve conflict, the book gives students hope in the future and a blueprint for their own professional contributions to peacemaking.

Q: What are the objectives and scope of USIP's "Religion, Ethics and Human Rights Initiative?"

Solomon: One of the objectives of the REHR initiative is to examine the relevance of human rights norms to resolving religious and ethnic conflict in places like Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Tibet, and to identify ways such norms might be implemented. A second objective is to foster mutual understanding and collaboration among religious communities. The institute has hosted two meetings involving representatives of Christian, Jewish, and Islamic communities to discuss their respective approaches to the use of force and the strategy of nonviolence. In addition, the institute is designing a program in Bosnia which would revive a 20-year-old interreligious symposium to address contemporary questions of reconciliation and reconstruction there.

Q: What is USIP's "Rule of Law Initiative" and how would you explain the relationship between the rule of law and a nation's ability to prevent or manage conflict?

Solomon: The Rule of Law Initiative seeks to build on the premise that a society governed by the rule of law is more likely to be peaceful than are centrally-controlled societies governed by a small group of people, or one paramount leader. This view has been affirmed not only by USIP-sponsored research, but also by such organizations as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which has declared that "societies based on...the rule of law are prerequisites for...the lasting order of peace, security, justice and cooperation." The initiative conducts original research, conferences, consultation and writing that combine legal and political perspectives to explore the role of the rule of law in the prevention, management and resolution of international conflict, as well as in the post-conflict phase. The initiative currently focuses on several broad themes, including "transitional justice," which involves approaches to dealing with leaders accused of war crimes or gross violation of human rights; the role of international and regional organizations in the advancement of the rule of law; and constitutional approaches to post-conflict peacebuilding.

Q: What is the most difficult aspect of your work and what are the dividends?

Solomon: The most difficult challenge is coming up with effective ways of dealing with international conflict. Everyone had hoped that the end of the Cold War would mean a more peaceful world. But in fact the conflicts that have broken out, particularly those based on ethnic or religious differences, are proving to be very difficult to manage and resolve.

But that said, this is very satisfying work, precisely because it is not just deterring an adversary in a military sense, but it involves developing mechanisms, strategies, and approaches to try to resolve conflicts — and to do it without having to employ military force. ◉

FOSTERING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEACEMAKING AROUND THE WORLD

An interview with Harry Barnes
Director, Conflict Resolution and Human Rights Programs, The Carter Center

Keys to achieving conflict resolution are listening, identifying common interests, and refusing to give up, says Ambassador Harry Barnes, director of the Conflict Resolution and Human Rights Programs at The Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia. It is important for peacemakers "to stay with the process as long as the parties think it is still useful," and also to "have the trust and confidence of all parties," he says. The Carter Center — a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute founded by former President Jimmy Carter and his wife, Rosalynn — is actively involved in efforts to resolve conflicts worldwide and to promote understanding of the causes of conflict. Barnes joined the Center in 1993 after 37 years of service in the U.S. State Department. He was U.S. ambassador to Chile, India, and Romania, and Director General of the Foreign Service. Barnes was interviewed by Contributing Editor Wendy S. Ross.

QUESTION: Could you briefly tell us the genesis of The Carter Center — when and why was it founded and what are its objectives?

BARNES: The Center was founded in 1982 by President and Mrs. Carter because they wanted to continue working on issues that were important to them after they had left public life. That encompassed a range of activities in the areas of improving world health, resolving disputes, and promoting human rights. They felt it was possible for them to do this with the help of other people, who they have assembled as a staff here at The Carter Center in Atlanta.

Q: How large is The Carter Center staff?

BARNES: We now have about 150 people. We don't have overseas operations as such. However, we have people who work overseas for particular purposes for specific periods of time. The work is done largely by the staff in Atlanta, and the people who work in Atlanta may — as in the case of the Nicaraguan elections — travel to a region and be there for some time, but they are not stationed there permanently. The exception is the agricultural program, which sends agronomists to some countries in Africa. We also have people who are working on African health issues, but they work primarily out of Atlanta. They spend substantial amounts of time in Africa but are not posted there, because the hands-on work is done almost entirely by the people in a country.

Q: How is the Center funded?

BARNES: Basically it got started through private contributions. Our funding now comes from four main sources: individual contributions, foundations, corporations, and international development assistance agencies.

For example, the work we have been doing in conjunction with the civil war in Sudan has received support from the government of the Netherlands. Our human rights work in Ethiopia was funded by the Danish government. Earlier, some of our programs in Liberia, when we still had an office there, were supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development. But the funding for most of our ongoing programs, as compared to special project work, tends to come from foundations.

Q: Could you comment on the Conflict Resolution Program's efforts to help resolve and prevent conflicts around the world?

Barnes: President Carter has had a strong interest in Africa ever since he was president. For more

than a year, he has been involved most intensively in the conflict in the Great Lakes Region of Central and Eastern Africa. He talked at length with the heads of state and government officials of countries in the area about the regional nature of the problems, and his conviction — which they shared — is that there has to be a regional approach to many of these problems.

That in turn led to a summit conference in Cairo in November 1995 and one in Tunis in March 1996, at which the then five heads of state — representing Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zaire — agreed on actions that should be taken. In a sense, the direct and very definite involvement of several African heads of state in the Burundi crisis grows out of President Carter's work.

At the moment our involvement is more in the background — keeping track of what's going on and staying in touch with the parties concerned. But I wouldn't be surprised if President Carter were asked to play a role again.

That is one aspect of our work in Africa. However, some of our other African programs involve efforts that may be of longer duration and take a different approach.

Consider the situation in Sudan where President Carter and other members of the Center's staff have been involved for a number of years. Forces in southern Sudan are insisting on a different direction for the country from that of the fundamentalist Islamic government in Khartoum. This situation is the current variation of a civil war that has been going on for about 20 years.

President Carter was able last year to negotiate a cease-fire with the two sides. He did that by reminding them, or "insisting" you might say — because he is a very persuasive person — that, despite all their differences, they remember their common interests, such as the value they place on the health of their families, particularly children.

Because of the fighting in Sudan, The Carter Center could not continue its health-related projects — such as trying to eradicate Guinea worm, which has been a major plague through much of sub-Saharan Africa, controlling river blindness, and immunizing children. The cease-fire lasted for about six months, and, on the whole, the situation now is somewhat better. We hope that the two parties can get together and start talking again. We are cooperating with others who also are working to resolve this conflict.

Outside of Africa we are involved in other kinds of work. In Estonia, for example, Joyce Neu, the associate director of the Conflict Resolution Program, is involved in a cooperative effort with the Kettering Foundation and the University of Virginia's Institute on the Study of the Mind and Human Interaction.

When the Baltic States regained their independence following the collapse of the Soviet Union, each of the states, to varying degrees, found itself with a significant Russian-speaking population. In Estonia, people representing the two communities — Estonians and Russian-speaking Estonians — came to the conclusion a couple of years ago that they wanted to get some outside help to sort out the tensions. Joyce Neu and her colleagues have tried to assist in that effort. They are trying to find ways to enable the two communities to talk with each other. Now in its third year, the group organizes a couple of sessions a year in Tallinn with representative groups of Estonians and Russian-speaking Estonians. One of the interesting innovations has been to include university students so that several generations are represented. Some of the participants from Tallinn came to this country last spring. This effort has made some interesting headway.

Q: How does the Center decide which conflicts to address?

Barnes: President Carter has identified a few general criteria that have to be met. First, the parties must want our involvement. Second, we do not get involved if other entities, national and international, already are involved and are doing a reasonable job. And third, we must see some way

of covering the expenses of our involvement. Now, having said that, we do monitor, at any given time, from 10 to 20 conflicts, so that if an occasion arises that calls for our involvement, we are prepared to become involved and know something about the conflict.

Some of the conflicts we address are situations where we had been involved before and still maintain an interest. And the whole broad range of questions related to non-proliferation requires that we watch what is going on in certain parts of the world — the Indian subcontinent, for example. In addition, we get faxes and phone calls and letters asking us to help out in certain conflict areas.

I happened to be involved in President Carter's mission to Bosnia in 1994. That mission came about because a letter from an attorney in Los Angeles conveyed to us a message from Bosnian-Serb leader Radovan Karadzic inviting President Carter to come to the Serbian part of the former Yugoslavia. There were a lot of quick consultations, including telephone discussions between President Carter and President Clinton before we ended up in Bosnia a week later.

Q: Are you still involved in the Bosnian situation?

Barnes: Not at the moment. Other than general monitoring of the situation, we don't see any particular role for ourselves at this stage.

Q: You also direct the Center's Human Rights Program. How does this program relate to the Conflict Resolution Program?

Barnes: Clearly, one could argue that many, if not most, conflicts are ones that either produce human rights abuses, or are caused by them. So there is a very intimate link between the Human Rights Program and the Conflict Resolution Program. The two initiatives are so interrelated that it makes sense to have one person in charge of both.

At the same time, there is a tension here as well. For example, when one is asked to define a typical "human rights" position, from the viewpoint of people who are trying to resolve conflicts, there is the tendency to believe that human rights activists are overly judgmental; they have to consider international conventions, treaties, and so on, and thus are more interested in seeing that justice is done, rather than in stopping the fighting.

But if you turn that around and consider it from the perspective of the people who are working in the human rights field, there is the tendency to say that people working on conflict resolution are interested in stopping the fighting at any price and don't care about what happens afterward.

One of our interests has focused on working with people in the human rights and conflict resolution fields to try to help the two communities better understand each other's concerns and the reasons for them. We have had a couple of discussions here at the Center with that in mind, trying to promote a better comprehension of this while recognizing that the two roles are different but also very strongly linked.

Q: Could you describe some of the most effective methods of conflict resolution that are used at The Carter Center. What works?

Barnes: I have some reservations about resolution. I think conflict is inherent in human society. I think nonviolent conflict very often can be useful. It's a way of sharpening alternatives and trying to reach decisions that recognize the interests involved. What you can do is ameliorate conflicts, promote understanding of the causes of conflict, and help people find ways of developing their own appropriate mechanisms for handling conflict. With that philosophical introduction, let me try to answer your question.

It is very easy, at one level. If I told you one of the most important things is to listen, you would wonder why I have to say it because it is so obvious. But let me point to a somewhat dramatic incident involving President Carter. It's not that nobody had thought about ways out of the impasse with North Korea in 1994, but nobody

had decided it was important to talk to then North Korean President Kim Il Sung. What President Carter did was to listen to what Kim Il Sung had to say in a very basic way. On the basis of those discussions, President Carter was able to move toward a better understanding of how to approach problems that were having an impact on the world community as well as the North Koreans.

A second important aspect of achieving conflict resolution — again in the realm of the obvious — is to look for ways to identify where there are common interests, or even better, common values. That is sometimes hard, particularly where the antagonism is very deep and where the historical memory is part of the present reality. But it is necessary to help the sides learn to talk with each other by identifying what is important to each.

And there are various ways of doing that. Some people use role playing; some simply work initially with one side and the other, without insisting on bringing the two sides together. President Carter used that approach at Camp David a number of years ago.

The third essential component in conflict resolution is persistence: Don't give up too easily. Remember that the people who are inviting you to get involved are probably doing it because they are very frustrated because they haven't found any other way to resolve the conflict. Also, it is important to recognize that the frustration is very real, the grievances are very real. If you are playing a mediating, facilitating role, just keep at it. And remain willing to stay with the process as long as the parties think it is still useful.

The last element is again in the area of the obvious. You have to have the trust and confidence of all parties and be perceived to be neutral — not in the sense that you have no feelings or values — but in terms of the particular dispute, where you are not judging the position of one side or another, but are there to listen and try to understand. At some point, your judgment may come into play and it may be essential, but your initial role is that of listener, of facilitator.

Q: Does President Carter spend much time at the Center?

Barnes: Both President and Mrs. Carter spend about one week a month here. They are directly involved in various activities at the Center. For example, President Carter is chair and Mrs. Carter is co-chair of our International Human Rights Council, which is associated with the Human Rights Program. When they are not in Atlanta, they stay at their family home in Plains, Georgia, which has very good communication links with the Center. Even when he is not in Atlanta, President Carter stays in close touch with the Center and the decision-making process here. At the present time, he is on a nationwide tour to promote his new book, *Living Faith*.

Q: Is he involved personally at the moment in any particular conflict situation?

Barnes: He is involved — although not as actively as previously — in the situation related to the Great Lakes Region (of Africa). Not very long ago, he was in touch by telephone with former president Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who is doing some mediation in the Burundi situation. Also, President Carter has been very involved in trying to mediate a dispute initiated by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua related to the election. ◉

TRACK TWO DIPLOMACY: NONGOVERNMENTAL STRATEGIES FOR PEACE

By James Notter and John McDonald
Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy

Track Two diplomacy — unofficial contact and interaction aimed at resolving conflicts — is a growing field that not only can support Track One (government) efforts but "can also play an important role in its own right," say the authors. Conflict resolution and prevention efforts must involve both government officials and nongovernmental participants, they contend, because "it is only through a collaborative effort among all societal sectors and power structures that real change is possible." McDonald is chairman and co-founder of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD) in Washington, D.C.; Notter is the institute's program director.
McDonald, a 40-year career diplomat, was appointed ambassador twice by President Carter and twice by President Reagan to represent the United States at various U.N. world conferences. A lawyer, scholar, and development expert, he earlier worked in Western Europe and the Middle East. Notter, who has been with IMTD since 1992, has been primarily involved with the institute's long-term initiative in Cyprus.

The term Track Two Diplomacy was coined in 1981 by Joseph Montville, referring to a broad range of unofficial contact and interaction aimed at resolving conflicts, both internationally and within states. Montville, then a U.S. diplomat, used the term in contrast to Track One diplomacy, which refers to diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts through the official channels of government.

In the early years of the development of the concept of Track Two diplomacy, the term focused mainly on the work of professionals in the budding field of conflict resolution. These professionals brought people together informally to develop creative solutions to international conflicts that were simultaneously being worked on (usually without success) at the Track One level.

By 1991 it had become clear that the range of unofficial interaction that can support the resolution of international conflicts is far too varied and complex to be adequately represented by the term Track Two. Louise Diamond coined the phrase "multi-track diplomacy," which outlines nine different "tracks" that together comprise a system for creating peace internationally. The system includes Track One (government) and Track Two (nongovernmental) conflict resolution professionals, but it also recognizes the influence of seven other tracks: business, private citizens, research and education, activism, religion, philanthropy, and the media.

Within the growing community of conflict resolution practitioners, each individual or organization offers something different in terms of methodology, conceptual background, or general approach. Despite this understandable variety, we have identified three categories of Track Two activities that together describe a large portion of the Track Two initiatives operating in the field today. These categories are consultation, dialogue, and training.

CONSULTATION

Consultation — perhaps the most common form of Track Two activity — brings people together from conflicting groups, in their personal

capacities, to facilitate discussion or generate creative ideas for problem solving. When these unofficial participants have political influence, then there is an opportunity for these creative ideas to be included in the official conflict resolution process as well.

A common form of consultation has been the "problem-solving workshop." These workshops bring parties together unofficially to conduct a joint analysis of the conflict from a problem-solving perspective, facilitated by a panel of conflict resolution practitioners. Such meetings are often held in a neutral site, in a secluded and comfortable setting, without press coverage or position papers. All discussions are confidential, allowing the participants to explore options without having to make any commitments. Problem-solving workshops analyze the root causes of the conflicts and examine the interests and needs that underlie the rigid positions of the conflicting parties.

Recent consultation initiatives have had great success; however several of the pioneering efforts in the 1960s and 1970s did encounter difficulties. Some of the early consultation projects achieved outstanding results at workshops — the participants developed deep personal relationships with each other and experienced some form of transformation — but as the participants returned to their communities, they were ostracized and marginalized for getting too close to the "enemy." This damaged the credibility of Track Two efforts somewhat, both in these specific cases and for the field in general.

More recent consultation initiatives have accounted for this issue by building in strong "re-entry" elements into their programs, which are designed to ensure the successful transfer of the learning to the broader community. Participants are helped to create tangible projects to apply their learning and continue to interact with members of the "other" community in a safe way once they return home. In cases of ethnic conflict, this might mean groups forming across ethnic lines to do joint projects, such as art or cultural exhibitions, or studies of substantive issues such as security, economic development or human rights. Some Track Two programs work with specific sectors of society, such as educators; participants from these workshops might return home and form a multi-ethnic committee to review how textbooks in schools portray the other community. By creating an outlet for participants to apply what they have learned, the power of these Track Two initiatives is greatly enhanced.

Several good examples of Track Two consultation projects have been implemented with Israelis and Palestinians. Most prominently, work done unofficially by Israeli and Palestinian academics — hosted by the Norwegian government in Oslo — was a crucial component of the process that led to the historic agreement between Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin and Palestine Liberation Organization leader Yasser Arafat that was signed on the White House lawn in 1993. On another front, Herbert Kelman of Harvard University has been running a series of problem-solving workshops with Israelis and Palestinians since 1971. Although all of the participants at his workshops attended in their personal capacities, the impact of his work can be seen by the fact that many of the members of the Palestinian and Israeli negotiating teams had attended some of these workshops.

DIALOGUE

In the context of Track Two diplomacy, dialogue is a form of facilitated communication between parties in conflict where the communication is not for the purpose of convincing or persuading, but to explore meaning — the meaning groups give to their existence or to particular circumstances. It is about sharing that meaning, and in so doing, finding a connection or a bridge across what divides the groups in conflict. Some dialogue processes do involve influential people who will have an impact on Track One negotiations. These dialogues contribute to more productive negotiations by generating a freer flow of ideas between the parties. Dialogue processes are obviously most effective in situations where official communication has been cut off or has stalled.

Dialogue can also be vital for building trust between communities in conflict, particularly when it is used at a grass-roots level.

The United States Information Service (USIS) has sponsored a Track Two dialogue process between Indians and Pakistanis. Meeting alternately in Pakistan and India, the Neemrana dialogue — which is now funded by the Ford Foundation — convenes equal representation from Pakistan and India. Individuals from many of the tracks in the multi-track diplomacy system are participating, including former diplomats, generals, and representatives from business and education. This dialogue is the first of its kind for these two countries and is happening at a time when communication between India and Pakistan is difficult. These unofficial, bilateral meetings are occurring among influential figures who are meeting to discuss a range of contentious issues.

The Neemrana process has been supplemented by a series of Traveling Seminars, organized by USIS India and USIS Pakistan, that introduce new people from a wider spectrum of society to conflict resolution. Often led by Neemrana participants, the seminars, which take place in alternate sites in India and Pakistan, give participants contact with people from the other country and encourage them to create conflict resolution chapters in their own towns or institutions. One group that was formed, just this year, as a direct result of the Traveling Seminars is the Indian Peace Action and Analysis Network.

Dialogues can be equally as useful within communities as between them. A group of psychologists in Israel has been running a dialogue between members of the political left and the political right within Israel since 1993. The recent political shift to the right in Israel has seriously affected the peace process there, so Track Two efforts addressing that issue are important. Dialogue is a particularly good tool for dealing with diversity within groups.

TRAINING

The third category of Track Two intervention is training. Conflict resolution professionals use training to give conflicting parties skills that they can use in resolving and transforming those conflicts. These skills are often applicable in many different situations, from interpersonal disputes to deep-rooted national or ethnic conflicts.

Training interventions can involve participants from all levels of society, from grass-roots private citizens, to high-level political figures, although people generally participate in their private capacity. Typically, Track Two training initiatives focus on conflict resolution skills, such as communication, conflict analysis, reconciliation, cooperation, and negotiation. Like most Track Two initiatives, training programs are designed to maximize the impact of the training on the conflict resolution process, including at the Track One level. Training programs are also particularly helpful in generating grass-roots support for conflict resolution in societies where social conflict is deep rooted.

Training, dialogue, and consultation can be used in conjunction with one another within any given intervention. For example, many dialogue initiatives include training in communication skills to make the dialogue more productive, and training programs often use both dialogue and analytical problem-solving processes to provide opportunities to practice the newly acquired skills.

The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD) has been engaged in an ongoing Track Two training initiative in Cyprus since 1991. In conjunction with the NTL (National Training Laboratories) Institute of Alexandria, Virginia, and the Conflict Management Group of Cambridge, Massachusetts, IMTD formed the Cyprus Consortium to provide Greek and Turkish Cypriots with an extensive program of training. Since 1991, the Cyprus Consortium has trained or educated over 500 Turkish and Greek Cypriots. The bulk of this program was jointly sponsored by America-Mideast Educational and Training

Services (AMIDEAST) and the Cyprus Fulbright Commission, with funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

Programs have ranged from three-day training sessions in basic conflict resolution skills, to week-long training programs for leaders of bicommunal projects, to a two-part series in which participants were trained as trainers so they could carry on conflict-resolution training independently. The program also has included training programs designed for specific audiences, such as policy leaders, journalists, and educators. This multi-track, capacity-building approach has contributed greatly to the success of this training initiative. The Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot participants in this extensive program are now running a number of bicommunal conflict resolution projects on their own, including several training programs. In total, people involved in this bicommunal conflict resolution work now number in the thousands, and their work has been described on the island as a social movement. The participants in the program have noticed the difference their work has made both in the political realm and in the media.

THE LINK BETWEEN TRACK ONE AND TRACK TWO

Track Two, like any track in the multi-track system, will always be more effective when employed in conjunction and coordination with efforts from all of the other tracks, including Track One.

Track Two practitioners recognize that success in their endeavors contributes to a climate ripe for Track One leaders to get to the negotiating table and begin to formally resolve existing differences. In situations of deep-rooted conflict, the formal ratification of peace treaties is clearly only one step toward a lasting peace. Track Two, particularly when it takes a multi-track approach, not only can support the efforts of Track One, but can play an important role in its own right.

Grass-roots projects facilitate the much needed "bottom-up" peace potential. In addition, as Track One is more often used as a means of crisis intervention, the other tracks can be utilized at any point, particularly in a preventive diplomacy capacity. The interrelationship between the tracks can be a sensitive one. Those working unofficially do not want to feel pressured or unduly constrained when they explore a policy or process that Track One opposes. Often the rejection of a multi-track plan by officials at the Track One level can preclude project implementation. When there is acceptance or support, however, there can be much-needed mutual aid.

Track One, on the other hand, should be kept informed. Track Two practitioners must recognize that if their initiative is successful, they will probably have to coordinate their activities with Track One. It is governments, after all, who are responsible for negotiating, signing, and ratifying treaties and other formal documents that may be needed to seal the unofficial, successful initiatives.

As an example, in the Cyprus Consortium's multi-year training program in Cyprus, the consortium was in contact with Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot officials as it developed and implemented the program. The consortium also stayed in close communication with representatives from the U.S. State Department, both in Washington and in Cyprus, and with representatives from the various United Nations agencies that are operating on Cyprus. These contacts and relationships greatly facilitated the implementation of the program. The U.S. and U.N. officials — having been continuously informed of the goals and progress of the project — continue to support the work indirectly by hosting receptions, sponsoring training events, and providing facilities for training.

Another excellent example of Track One and Track Two cooperation took place in Tanzania earlier this year. The U.S. Information Service (USIS) in Dar es Salaam has developed a program in preventive diplomacy featuring a one-week training session in conflict resolution skills for 23 leaders from Track One and Track Two. In fact, all of the tracks in the multi-track system were represented. IMTD led a four-person team to implement this

workshop in April 1996, which was co-hosted by the Tanzanian Foreign Ministry and USIS.

The participants were so stimulated by this learning experience that they decided to organize their own Conflict Resolution Center, so they could begin to spread these peacebuilding skills across the nation. This is what can happen when Track One and Track Two learn how to work together.

CONCLUSION

Resolving deep-rooted social conflicts requires change — change in attitudes, change in structures, and change in political and legal relationships. Change at the political level is for the most part the domain of Track One. True conflict resolution, however, is not sustainable through a single-track effort. Track Two diplomacy is a growing field, and with each new Track Two initiative there is an opportunity for cooperation and collaboration with Track One efforts. In the end, it is only through a collaborative effort among all societal sectors and power structures that real change is possible.

U.S.-BASED INITIATIVES
TO STUDY AND PRACTICE PEACEBUILDING

Thousands of Americans and many citizens of other nations are now involved in U.S.-based programs in the fields of conflict prevention, resolution and management. Their work ranges from theory development and education to training and active participation in mediation and negotiation. They deal with all levels and types of conflicts — from interpersonal to international — in a variety of activities initiated by universities, commercial enterprises, private foundations and institutions, governmental agencies, research centers, charitable organizations, and religious and other groups. Here is a sampling of some of those efforts:

CDR ASSOCIATES

CDR Associates (formerly Center for Dispute Resolution) in Boulder, Colorado, provides decision-making and conflict management services and training for individuals and organizations in the United States and abroad. CDR's areas of work include environmental, public policy, organizational, and interpersonal issues. The organization pioneers procedures that directly involve concerned parties in decision-making and ensure that all parties are treated with respect. CDR has held seminars or consultations in Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Hungary, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, and the Philippines.

CENTER FOR PREVENTIVE ACTION

The Center for Preventive Action (CPA) is a new initiative established by the Council on Foreign Relations in New York to study conflict prevention and evaluate how it is working. The CPA sends investigative teams to pre-explosion crisis areas to devise strategies to settle or manage conflicts there and to advocate action by appropriate governments and organizations. It convenes an annual conference to assess the state of the art of conflict prevention, bringing together representatives of governments, international organizations, academia, nongovernmental organizations, foundations, and the U.S. Congress. CPA also serves as a coordinating center, informing those involved in conflict prevention about what others are doing in the field. In that regard, it serves as a repository of relevant books, articles, and documents.

CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C., is a public policy research institution dedicated to the analysis of policy and its impact. CSIS maintains resident experts on all of the world's major geographic regions, and it also covers key functional areas, including international finance, the emerging markets, and U.S. foreign policy and national security issues. For more than three decades, CSIS has emphasized long-range, anticipatory, and integrated thinking on a wide range of policy issues. CSIS "action commissions" and other high-level groups have been formed in Russia, Poland, Ukraine, South America, Singapore, and Turkey to explore concrete ways of expanding economic, financial, and political ties with the United States.

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT GROUP

The Conflict Management Group (CMG) in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is dedicated to improving methods of negotiation, conflict resolution, and cooperative decision-making. CMG, a non-profit organization, is engaged in negotiation training, consulting, process design,

facilitation, consensus-building, and mediation. Its activities build on years of research at Harvard University and practical experience around the world in a variety of arenas including trade, bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, border conflicts, business, labor-management, the environment, and internal and ethnic conflict. CMG has been involved in projects in many nations, including Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Finland, Newly Independent States, Greece, Indonesia, Malaysia, and South Africa.

CONFLICT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

The University of Colorado Conflict Research Consortium in Boulder, Colorado, is a multidisciplinary program of research, teaching, and application focused on finding more constructive ways of addressing difficult, long-term conflicts. A joint university-community program, the consortium unites researchers, educators, and practitioners from many fields for the purposes of theory-building, testing, and application of new conflict management techniques. These efforts are designed to lead to an improved understanding of conflict dynamics, along with better methods for confronting and managing continuing and intractable conflicts and reaching good decisions. The consortium's research has focused in part on issues related to environmental and natural resource conflicts, and racial and ethnic conflicts, including the atrocities committed in Rwanda and Bosnia.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROGRAM, THE CARTER CENTER

The Conflict Resolution Program (CRP) at The Carter Center — a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute founded by former President Jimmy Carter and his wife, Rosalynn, in Atlanta, Georgia — marshals the experience of peacemakers to address suffering caused by armed conflicts around the globe. The Carter Center is a separately chartered and independently governed member of the Emory University community. Through its International Negotiation Network (INN), the Conflict Resolution Program monitors conflicts weekly and, upon request, offers advice and assistance to resolve disputes. Chaired by Jimmy Carter, the INN includes world leaders and experts in dispute resolution from international organizations, universities, and foundations who seek peaceful ways to prevent and end civil conflicts. CRP also has undertaken a preventive conflict project to reduce ethnic tensions in Estonia. CRP's projects have focused on many other regions, including North Korea, the Great Lakes Region of Africa, Liberia, Bosnia, and Sudan.

CONSENSUS BUILDING INSTITUTE

The Consensus Building Institute, Inc. (CBI), in Cambridge, Massachusetts, conducts independent studies and assessments of consensus building and dispute resolution efforts in the United States and abroad, and assists public and nonprofit agencies in their efforts to develop and employ consensus building and dispute resolution in performing their public-interest functions. CBI organizes workshops, seminars, and other training programs, and develops instructional materials to advance public understanding of the theory and practice of dispute resolution and consensus building. During the past three years, CBI has provided training and services to a broad spectrum of organizations and groups, including the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment; the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development; and ambassadors to the World Trade Organization.

INSTITUTE FOR CONFLICT ANALYSIS AND RESOLUTION, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, seeks to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent human conflicts among individuals, small groups, communities, ethnic groups, and nations. Offering Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Science degrees in conflict analysis and resolution, the institute is engaged in research and publishing, a clinical and consulting program, and public education. Major

research interests include the analysis of deep-rooted conflicts and their resolution; the exploration of conditions attracting parties to the negotiation table; the role of third parties in dispute resolution; and the testing of a variety of conflict intervention methods in community, national, and international settings.

INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION, SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

The San Diego State University Institute for International Security and Conflict Resolution (IISCOR), in San Diego, California, encourages and facilitates teaching and research in the multidisciplinary area of international security and conflict resolution. The topics covered include nuclear armaments, international conflict, sociopolitical violence, and global environmental issues as they relate to security. The institute promotes teaching and research by organizing public forums, and convening faculty and student seminars. The institute is a joint effort of the College of Sciences, the College of Arts and Letters, and the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.

INSTITUTE FOR MULTI-TRACK DIPLOMACY

The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD), a nonprofit organization located in Washington, D.C., is dedicated to conflict resolution and peacebuilding. Its mission is to promote a systems approach to peacebuilding and to facilitate the transformation of deep-rooted social conflict. IMTD's projects put the skills of conflict resolution, intergroup relations, and systems change in the hands of local peacemakers and peacebuilders in conflict areas around the world. IMTD acts as a catalyst in the multi-track diplomacy community to explore issues and activities that advance the field, encourage cooperation and creative partnerships, develop state-of-the-art methodologies in conflict transformation, and educate the general public on the importance of nonviolent conflict resolution. IMTD has implemented peacebuilding projects in Cyprus, Liberia, the Horn of Africa, and South Asia.

INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS

The Institute of World Affairs (IWA), which has offices in Washington and New York, is a non-profit, non-partisan organization devoted to international understanding and peaceful resolution of conflict. It provides training programs designed to enhance professional skills in conflict resolution and infrastructure development. IWA also conducts independent evaluations and designs systems to improve the management of international conflict. Responding to the need to coordinate conflict resolution initiatives operating in the same conflict situation, the IWA created an electronic clearinghouse of conflict initiatives around the world called the International Conflict Initiatives Clearinghouse (ICIC). The information contained in the clearinghouse is accessible via the Internet (http://www.iwa.org/iwa/icicidx.htm) and is distributed by mail and fax to individuals and organizations active in conflict transformation activities.

KETTERING FOUNDATION

The Kettering Foundation, a foundation rooted in the American tradition of inventive research, seeks to understand the way bodies politic function or fail to function. The foundation — which has offices in Dayton, Ohio; Washington, D.C.; and New York City — produces "issue books" that encourage serious deliberation on hard policy choices facing the public. It formulates "rules of engagement" that citizens and officials of government can use to turn unproductive relationships into more constructive ways of working together. It also designs, in collaboration with nongovernmental groups in other countries, such as Russia and China, methods for improving relationships between nations with substantial differences. For use by the parties in conflict themselves and not third parties, these processes are designed for situations where traditional negotiation and mediation are of limited usefulness.

MERCY CORPS INTERNATIONAL

Mercy Corps International (MCI) in Portland, Oregon, is part of an international family of

humanitarian organizations that alleviate suffering, poverty, and oppression by helping people build secure and productive communities. Since its founding in 1979, MCI has given more than $230 million in assistance to over 45 countries worldwide. It provides agricultural development assistance, primary health care, development education, and emergency relief. Mercy Corps targets those countries or regions in transition to democracy or plagued by civil, religious, and ethnic conflict where humanitarian assistance not only meets basic needs but can help lay the foundation for building a just, inclusive civil society. MCI is actively working with Bosnian communities and international donors to assist in the implementation of the peace agreement signed in Dayton, Ohio.

PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE

Partners for Democratic Change in San Francisco, California, assists evolving democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union in the development of collaborative planning, problem solving, and dispute resolution skills essential to the success of a democratic society. Through its National Centers in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, and Slovakia, it provides training services to national government ministries, local government officials, environmental groups, elementary and secondary schools, ethnic/minority groups, nongovernmental organization activists, and private enterprise. Combining U.S. resources and expertise with indigenous talent and knowledge of the social, economic and political climate of the region, the National Centers design and implement conflict resolution programs and projects relevant to the specific needs of each country.

PROGRAM ON NEGOTIATION AT HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

The Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is an applied research center committed to improving the theory and practice of negotiation and dispute resolution by people, organizations, and nations. Scholars from a variety of disciplines and professional schools in the Greater Boston area — including Harvard, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts University, and Simmons College — work collaboratively on an array of activities, including research and theory-building, post-graduate education and training, the development of teaching materials, and numerous publications. The program's newest research project focuses on the human element, which has been described as "probably the defining factor in most negotiations."

PROGRAM ON THE ANALYSIS AND RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTS, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

The Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts (PARC) is an interdisciplinary center within Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs in Syracuse, New York. The program is dedicated to enhancing knowledge about social conflicts — their nature, course of development, and possible resolution — through theory-building and research, education, and practice. PARC's efforts include individual and group research projects, conferences, seminars, a conflict forum speaker series, and a conflict resolution consulting group. PARC also conducts the Program in Nonviolent Conflict and Change (PNCC), which offers an undergraduate major in nonviolent conflict and change. PNCC's mission is peace education and research on nonviolent means of resolving conflict and bringing about or resisting change.

RESOLVE

RESOLVE is an independent, neutral, not-for-profit organization in Washington, D.C., that provides dispute resolution services in environmental and public policy matters. It was founded by a coalition of business leaders and environmentalists to mediate controversial environmental issues and promote the effective use of conflict resolution processes in public decision-making. In recent years, RESOLVE staff have

mediated efforts to address many issues, including chemical policy, climate change, coastal management, drinking water, fisheries, forestry, and pollution prevention. RESOLVE's services include training in negotiation, alternative dispute resolution, mediation, meeting management, and facilitation.

SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND

Search for Common Ground in Washington, D.C., is an independent, non-profit organization dedicated to transforming conflict into cooperative action. Its goal is to help the United States and the world become less polarized and more cooperative, and its programs are designed to find workable solutions to divisive national and international problems. The organization has developed the "common ground approach," which draws from techniques of conflict resolution, negotiation, collaborative problem-solving, and facilitation. The aim is to discover not the lowest, but the highest common denominator. Search for Common Ground has conducted initiatives in the Middle East, Burundi, Russia, South Africa, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA INSTITUTE FOR PEACE

The Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace in Honolulu, Hawaii, is an academic community designed to explore, develop, and share knowledge of peace through teaching, research, publication, and public service. Recognizing the late Senator Spark M. Matsunaga's vision of a peaceful world, the Board of Regents at the University of Hawaii established the institute in 1986. Situated at the crossroads of the Pacific, and surrounded by disparate cultures, the institute has a unique opportunity to explore new and creative ways of building a world where all are free to realize their individual dignity. Addressing the major issues of conflict management, community building, and the reduction of violence, the institute offers courses that investigate the practical and theoretical dimensions of peace and conflict resolution at global and local levels. The institute's courses are appropriate for undergraduates, graduates, public and private school teachers, and the local community.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) in Washington, D.C., is an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created and funded by Congress to strengthen the nation's capacity to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict. Its 15-member, bipartisan board of directors is appointed by the president of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. One of USIP's key objectives is to mobilize the best national and international talent from research organizations, academia, and government to support policymakers by providing independent and creative assessments of how to deal with international conflict situations by political means. The institute's wide-ranging programs include grants, fellowships, conferences, workshops, library services, publications, and other educational activities. USIP trains international affairs professionals in conflict management and resolution techniques, mediation, and negotiating skills. ◉

American Perspectives on Conflict Resolution: KEY INTERNET SITES

Please note that USIS assumes no responsibility for the content and availability of the resources listed below which reside solely with the providers.

BosniaLINK
http://www.dtic.dla.mil/bosnia/index.html

The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict
http://www.carnegie.org/program.htm#deadly

The Carter Center
http://www.emory.edu/CARTER_CENTER/homepage.htm

Conflict Management Group Online
http://www.cmgonline.org/

ConflictNet@igc
http://www.igc.apc.org/conflictnet/

Contemporary Conflicts in Africa
http://www.synapse.net/~acdi20/welcome.htm

IANWEB Resources: Peace and Conflict Resolution
http://www.pitt.edu/~ian/resource/conflict.htm

Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University
http://www.gmu.edu/departments/ICAR/index.html

Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy
http://www.igc.apc.org/imtd/

International Peace and Conflict Resolution Resources
http://www.contact.org/peace.htm

International Relations: Conflict and Conflict Resolution
http://www.cfcsc.dnd.ca/links/intrel/confli.html

The International Student Symposium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution
http://www.delve.com/iimcr.html

Nonviolence International
http://www.igc.apc.org/ni/

Other International Organizations & Institutions
http://faraday.clas.Virginia.edu/~rjb3v/io.html

Peace Brigades International
http://www.igc.apc.org/pbi/index.html

The Peace Studies Association
http://csf.colorado.edu/peace/main.html

Professors World Peace Academy
http://www.pwpa.org/

The Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival
http://hdc-www.harvard.edu/cfia/pnscs/homepage.htm#about

United States Institute of Peace
http://www.usip.org/

The University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation
http://www-igcc.ucsd.edu/igcc/igccmenu.html

Welcome to the Homepage of Peacemakers
http://spider.lloyd.com/~fdelmer/

American Perspectives on Conflict Resolution: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Nimer, Mohammed. “Conflict Resolution Approaches: Western and Middle Eastern Lessons and Possibilities.” AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY, January 1996, pp. 35-52.

Aolain, Fionnuala Ni. “Where Hope and History Rhyme: Prospects for Peace in Northern Ireland.” JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, Summer 1996, pp. 63-89.

Bendana, Alejandro. “Conflict Resolution.” PEACE AND CHANGE, January 1996, pp. 68-77.

Bercovitch, Jacob, editor. RESOLVING INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS: THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MEDIATION. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner, 1996, 279 pp.

Black, Davidson. “Widening the Spectrum: Regional Organizations in Peacekeeping Operations.” PEACEKEEPING & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, May/June 1996, pp. 7-8.

Brinkley, Douglas. “Jimmy Carter’s Modest Quest for Global Peace.” FOREIGN AFFAIRS, November/December 1995, pp. 90-101.

Broome, B.J. “Managing Differences in Conflict Resolution.” In CONFLICT RESOLUTION THEORY AND PRACTICE: INTEGRATION AND APPLICATION. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1993, pp. 95-111.

Crocker, Chester A., Hampson, Fen Osler and Aall, Pamela, editors. MANAGING GLOBAL CHAOS: SOURCES OF AND RESPONSES TO INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996, 640 pp.

Diamond, Louise and McDonald, John. MULTI-TRACK DIPLOMACY: A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO PEACE. Third Edition. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press, 1996, 182 pp.

Diehl, Paul F., Reifschneider, Jennifer and Hensel, Paul R. “United Nations Intervention and Recurring Conflict.” INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, Autumn 1996, pp. 683-700.

Feerick, John D. “Standards of Conduct for Mediators.” JUDICATURE, May-June 1996, pp. 314-317.

Goodpaster, Andrew J. WHEN DIPLOMACY IS NOT ENOUGH: MANAGING MULTINATIONAL MILITARY INTERVENTIONS. New York, New York: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1996, 45 pp.

Hampson, Fen Osler. NURTURING PEACE: WHY PEACE SETTLEMENTS SUCCEED OR FAIL. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996, 287 pp.

Hehir, J. Bryan. “Intervention: From Theories to Cases.” ETHICS & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, vol. 9, 1995, pp. 1-13.

Hermann, Margaret G. and Kegley, Charles W. “Ballots, A Barrier Against the Use of Bullets and Bombs: Democratization and Military Intervention.” JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION, September 1996, pp. 436-459.

Kleiboer, Marieke. “Understanding Success and Failure of International Mediation.” JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION, June 1996, pp. 360-389.

Kolb, Deborah M. WHEN TALK WORKS: PROFILES OF MEDIATORS. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1994, 535 pp.

Kuperman, Alan J. “The Other Lesson of Rwanda: Mediators Sometimes Do More Damage Than Good.” SAIS REVIEW, Winter/Spring 1996, pp. 221-240.

Last, David. “Peacekeeping Doctrine and Conflict Resolution Techniques.” ARMED FORCES AND SOCIETY, Winter 1995/1996, pp. 187-210.

Lederach, John Paul. PREPARING FOR PEACE: CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION ACROSS CULTURES. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1995, 133 pp.

Lefebvre, Jeffrey A. "Middle East Conflicts and Middle Level Power Intervention in the Horn of Africa." MIDDLE EAST JOURNAL, Summer 1996, pp. 388-404.

Lund, Michael S. PREVENTING VIOLENT CONFLICTS: A STRATEGY FOR PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996, 220 pp.

McDonald, John W. and Bendahmane, Diane, editors. CONFLICT RESOLUTION: TRACK TWO DIPLOMACY. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, 1995, 115 pp.

Munuera, Gabriel. PREVENTING ARMED CONFLICT IN EUROPE: LESSONS FROM RECENT EXPERIENCE. Paris, France: Western European Union, 1994, 105 pp.

Notter, James and Diamond, Louise. "Building Peace and Transforming Conflict: Multi-Track Diplomacy in Practice." OCCASIONAL PAPER #7. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, 1996, 25 pp.

O'Hanlon, Michael. STOPPING CIVIL CONFLICT WITH FORCE. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1996, 100 pp.

Prescott, Victor. "Contributions of the United Nations to Solving Boundary and Territorial Disputes, 1945-1995." POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY, March/April 1996, pp. 287-318.

Rabie, Mohamed. U.S.-PLO DIALOGUE: SECRET DIPLOMACY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 1995, 203 pp.

Ray, James Lee. DEMOCRACY AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT: AN EVALUATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PEACE PROPOSITION. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 243 pp.

Reyes, Alejandro. "After the War Games." ASIAWEEK, May 17, 1996, pp. 70-72.

Rotberg, Robert J., editor. VIGILANCE AND VENGEANCE: NGOS PREVENTING ETHNIC CONFLICT IN DIVIDED SOCIETIES. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1996, 250 pp.

Rubin, Barnett R., editor. TOWARD COMPREHENSIVE PEACE IN SOUTHEAST EUROPE: CONFLICT PREVENTION IN THE SOUTH BALKANS. New York, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996, 135 pp.

Sandole, Dennis and van der Merwe, H., editors. CONFLICT RESOLUTION THEORY AND PRACTICE: INTEGRATION AND APPLICATION. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1993, 298 pp.

Slim, Randa and Saunders, Harold. "Managing Conflict in Divided Societies: Lessons from Tajikistan." NEGOTIATION JOURNAL, January 1996, pp. 31-46.

Smock, David R. and Crocker, Chester A., editors. AFRICAN CONFLICT RESOLUTION: THE U.S. ROLE IN PEACEMAKING. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1995, 163 pp.

Spear, Mary and Keller, Jon. "Conflict Resolution in Africa: Insights from U.N. Representatives and U.S. Government Officials." AFRICA TODAY, April-June 1996, pp. 121-139.

Thompson, W. Scott and Jensen, Kenneth, editors. APPROACHES TO PEACE: AN INTELLECTUAL MAP. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1991, 413 pp.

Woodhouse, Tom. "Commentary: Negotiating a New Millennium? Prospects for African Conflict Resolution." REVIEW OF AFRICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY, June 1996, pp. 129-140.

Zartman, I. William, editor. ELUSIVE PEACE: NEGOTIATING AN END TO CIVIL WARS. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1995, 353 pp.

Zartman, I. William and Rasmussen, J. Lewis, editors. PEACEMAKING IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT: METHODS AND TECHNIQUES. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996, 368 pp. ◉

American Perspectives on Conflict Resolution: ARTICLE ALERT

Crocker, Chester A. and Hampson, Fen Osler. MAKING PEACE SETTLEMENTS WORK (Foreign Policy, no. 104, Fall 1996, pp. 54-71)
Third parties such as the United States, NATO and the United Nations have a "critical role" to play in nurturing peace and helping to implement peace settlements, the authors say. Crocker and Hampson discuss the problems encountered by third-party interventions in Somalia, Cyprus, and Bosnia; they outline five "operational and strategic rules" with regard to the implementation of peace settlements.

Dixon, William J. THIRD-PARTY TECHNIQUES FOR PREVENTING CONFLICT ESCALATION AND PROMOTING PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT (International Organization, no. 4, Autumn 1996, pp. 653-681)
The two most constructive techniques used by third parties in managing international crises are mediation efforts and activities to open and maintain lines of communication, Dixon says. Crisis management methods that have proven historically effective in a bipolar world, he notes, should prove similarly successful for achieving peaceful settlements in a post-Cold War world.

McFerson, Hazel M. RETHINKING OF ETHNIC CONFLICT, SOMALIA AND FIJI (American Behavioral Scientist, vol. 40, no. 1, September 1996, pp. 18-32)
Using Somalia and Fiji as examples, McFerson challenges the view that violent conflict is "invariably associated with ethnic pluralism." In Somalia, she notes, a culture of conflict has persisted despite the common ethnicity of the Somali clans and subclans. In Fiji, on the other hand, a culture of avoidance has held down violent confrontation although severe tensions exist between ethnic Fijians and the 44 percent Indian minority. McFerson concludes that "the causes of conflict in society are varied," and the search for a single-factor explanation "is futile and counterproductive."

Haass, Richard N. THE MIDDLE EAST: NO MORE TREATIES (Foreign Affairs, vol. 75, no. 5, September/October 1996, pp. 53-63)
Describing the past five years as the "era of treaties" in the Middle East, Haass contends prospects are bleak for further treaties in the region during the next five years. But he says this does not have to lead to the end of the peace process. "What is called for is a new approach to diplomacy, one more modest in what it attempts but no less demanding in what it will require," Haass argues. The United States must not compromise its "basic beliefs" and "should speak out when it disagrees with what any party says or does," he writes.

Powers, Gerard. RELIGION, CONFLICT AND PROSPECTS FOR RECONCILIATION IN BOSNIA, CROATIA AND YUGOSLAVIA (Journal of International Affairs, vol. 50, no. 1, Summer 1996, pp. 221-252)
Examining the forces at work in the former Yugoslavia, the author contends that religion has often been manipulated by the leaders of the different populations and the churches have sometimes fueled antagonisms. But he emphasizes that many religious figures have taken "positive, even heroic, steps to minimize" the conflict. "The challenge for religious leaders in the Balkans is to show that religion can be a counter to extreme nationalism and a source of peace because of, not in spite of, its close link with culture and national identity," Powers says.

Rubin, Amy Magaro. LEARN PEACE, NOT WAR, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS ADVISE STUDENTS IN DEVELOPING NATIONS (Chronicle of Higher Education, vol. 43, issue 3, September 13, 1996, p. A51)
Several foundations and government agencies are funding a project sponsored by the International Association of University Presidents to establish courses in developing countries on conflict resolution, arms control and disarmament, and the effect of war on the economy and environment, the author reports. Courses in peace studies have been established at 51 universities in 26 nations, he notes, and the association hopes to expand the project to more countries, especially those that have been disrupted by war or civil strife. ◉

The annotations above are part of a more comprehensive Article Alert offered on the home page of the U.S. Information Service: http://www.usia.gov/admin/001/wwwhapub.html