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INTRODUCTION

Joyce Neu, Executive Director of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice (IPJ), made introductory remarks. She explained that the seminar was organized as a tribute to the late Joan Kroc, who bequeathed $40 million to establish a School of Peace Studies at the University of San Diego (USD). The seminar was organized to help the university learn more about peace and conflict issues as it began development of the school.

Dr. Neu thanked USD President Mary Lyons and Interim Provost Anne Donnellan, as well as the prominent scholars in the field, for their roles in this event.

Dr. Neu observed that a 1978 article by Kenneth Boulding in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* asserted that for a discipline to be considered such, it needs to:

- have a bibliography;
- offer courses;
- have a way of examining knowledge of the field;
- produce publications in specialized journals.

In addition, the term “peace and conflict studies” is problematic because conflict is not normative, whereas peace is. Conflict resolution, in turn, denotes both the analysis of conflict and the resolution of conflict, which is normative.

Dr. Neu then welcomed and introduced Dr. Mary Lyons, President of the University of San Diego.

Mary Lyons observed that in 2003 USD embarked on a five-year strategic plan. One of the plan’s five goals is to establish a School for Peace Studies. Another goal is the internationalization of the campus—to educate men and women with cultural competencies beyond their own cultures.
Dr. Lyons posed the following five questions to the seminar participants:

1. Mrs. Kroc said that “we must not only teach peace, but make peace.” What is the correct balance between these two?

2. Because this is a small university, cross-disciplinary opportunities will be important. How can we maximize the opportunities?

3. How can we increase the opportunities to bring peace to our globe?

4. How can we take advantage of our being on the border with Mexico, and near Latin America and the Asia/Pacific region?

5. What is the role of our Catholic identity, and specifically of Catholic Social Teaching (CST), in the establishment of the school?
PANEL I: 10- 11:45 AM
WHAT IS PEACE STUDIES/CONFLICT RESOLUTION?

Moderator:
• Vidya Nadkarni, Political Science and International Relations, USD

Panelists:
• Tamra Pearson d’Estrée, Denver University
• I. William Zartman, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University
• Scott Appleby, Kroc Institute, University of Notre Dame

Tamra Pearson d’Estrée is a social psychologist and the Henry R. Luce Professor of Conflict Resolution at the University of Denver, and a former professor at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) at George Mason University, the United States’ first Ph.D.-granting program in peace/conflict studies.

Dr. Pearson d’Estrée began by invoking the ceremony of seed-planting in Native American tradition, explaining that she saw this seminar as the planting of a seed that will grow into the School for Peace Studies. She also noted that the goal today is brainstorming, in the sense of suspending judgment, and reminded participants that the questions to be addressed were:

- What is peace studies/conflict resolution?
- What are overlapping areas of inquiry?
- What is to be done?

Dr. Pearson d’Estrée used a Venn diagram to illustrate the overlap among peace research, conflict resolution, and restorative justice. Peacebuilding is the overarching theme encompassing all of these. It touches upon security studies, human rights, justice studies, conflict studies, conflict prevention, conflict management, conflict transformation, and dialogue and deliberation. These in turn range along a continuum between theory and practice. Theories that contribute to some or all of the three areas are:

• system theories
• theories of conflict
• theories of social change
• theories of democracy

Dr. Pearson d’Estrée said that peace studies/conflict resolution is “gloriously interdisciplinary”—like social work, or planning. A discipline has a dominant paradigm or at least a dominant epistemology. Does this mean that the field is a swamp of confusion? On the contrary, it is at the interstices that the most interesting things happen. Borrowing metaphors and models from other disciplines is desirable (like William Zartman’s theory of “ripeness”).

This interdisciplinarity brings a burden, however. Intersecting or competing models of research—in fact, of methodologies—lead us to ask: what is the level of analysis being used? What is considered to be evidence? A plurality of methods is needed.
Peace studies/conflict resolution is a field of practice, which means that we face not
only the question, “What is?” but also, “What should we do?” This will affect the field's
epistemology—not unlike with medicine or architecture, for example—in the following ways:

- We are seeking knowledge about what is to be done.
- The usefulness of the knowledge is as important as its universal generalizability.
- Ways of testing knowledge in the field are required: i.e., internships and partnerships.

We need a place to cross boundaries and borders, and a place that allows for reflection
and self-examination.

William Zartman, Jacob Blaustein Professor of International
Organizations and Conflict Resolution and Director of the
Conflict Management Program at the Paul H. Nitze School for
Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at Johns Hopkins
University, spoke next. He said that conflict management at
SAIS is a subfield of International Relations, and observed that
SAIS, where he teaches, is known for its almost exclusive focus
on Realism and on security studies.

He shared the questions the panelists had been given:

- How and when did this field evolve?
- What is the difference between peace studies and conflict studies or conflict resolution?
- What is core knowledge in this (or these) fields?
- How do we recognize scholars in this field/these fields?
- What are the goals of this field?

Dr. Zartman then gave a quick history of the field, remarking that it came out of
social psychology and international relations. He recalled the preamble to UNESCO’s
constitution: “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the
defenses of peace must be construed.” During the interwar period, there was a focus on
the study of peace. The Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact, in its naiveté, had outlawed war. In
this way, the study of peace created for itself a sense of non-credibility. Consequently, in
the post-World War II era the thinking swung toward Realism, concentrated on the drive
of states for power. Realism in turn was followed by a counter-wave of peace studies. The
U.S. Institute of Peace was founded in the 1980s.

But then, social psychology asserted that “the roots of conflict are deep, and you cannot
resolve conflict.” This led to the development of the discipline of conflict management,
tasked with demoting conflict from a violent pursuit to a political pursuit. Another
school, in turn, asserted that conflict transformation was necessary. This would be
accomplished by replacing relations of dominance with relations of interdependence.

The distinction between Track One and Track Two diplomacy was another development,
with Track Two diplomacy first in competition with, and then in support of, Track One.
“Peace may hide or prevent justice. Justice is something you fight for, and that may destroy peace.”
—William Zartman

Peace studies has an aura of naïveté about it, Zartman said, because of its focus on the pursuit of peace at the expense of knowledge about conflict. Conflict resolution, in contrast, has been in danger of being swallowed up in security studies. There is a question whether conflict resolution will breed new social studies, or simply provide background for students as they pursue other careers. Obviously, the answer is all of the above. Conflict resolution applies to our interpersonal activities as well as to lofty international ones. Conflict resolution assumes that conflict is a natural state. On the other hand, Francis Deng states that “We [in Africa] assume harmony, whereas you in the West assume conflict.” Conflict management is the enemy of conflict resolution. Peace may hide or prevent justice. Justice is something you fight for, and that may destroy peace.

Zartman disagreed with Boulding’s definition, asserting that conflict resolution is not a discipline. Boulding concludes that it is, because he uses procedural questions to define what a discipline is. But a discipline needs a paradigm. In the 1970s, Jeff Rubin and William Zartman wrote separate books on negotiations and each had 1,000 references with not one overlap. Today, that would be impossible.

What do we know? Concepts are generalizable knowledge. Theories are dynamic generalizable knowledge. We have to have theories, otherwise, all we have is the Book of Proverbs.
We know seven things:

1. Peace comes first. We must reduce the pressure of violence, while assuring the promise of justice.
2. Time needs to be used. We are in a dynamic process. We have to explore stalemate and ripeness.
3. Before negotiations, there are pre-negotiations and dialogue groups and so on— a continual process. You must get to know one another and understand that your enemy has dignity.
4. You must develop an overarching formula of an agreement that will look forward to conflict transformation.
5. Power is useful. Use it. Not just force, but all power of persuasion. Power is the ability to mobilize gratifications and deprivations.
6. Security is conflict management, not defense — whether state security or personal security.
   There are people who are uninterested in dialogue.
7. Peace studies needs a conceptual basis in conflict management, so as not to be just hortatory.

Dr. Zartman then spoke about SAIS, which is interdisciplinary, and was set up 60 years ago by Paul Nitze and Christian Herter. He recommended that, as USD develops a School of Peace Studies, it consider the model of PeaceKids for students in the School. PeaceKids is a program whereby SAIS graduate students teach conflict management to sixth graders. The graduate students try to teach the three Rs of conflict resolution: Recognize, Respect, and Reconcile.

Scott Appleby, Director of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, observed that peace studies is “a discipline that is interdisciplinary.” Peace studies is the interdisciplinary study of the conditions under which societies can forge a sustainable, just peace, and of the obstacles thereto. Peace studies is about seeking alternatives to violence and progressing incrementally. It is about the nexus between peace research on the one hand, and strategic peacebuilding on the other.

The research goes into a dizzying variety of topics: there are areas that are researched differently— whether it is water or arms or diamonds. One does not define a discipline by its methodology— rather a coordinative, integrative approach is needed. Peace studies is precisely the interaction of research and practice, therefore one needs resources from all levels— international, national, sub-national, local, etc. One needs access to all manner of leaders (religious, traditional, etc.), and access to people in the community. Dr. Appleby asserted that conflict resolution and conflict management have disciplinary features, but are very different than peace studies. They would be included within peace studies.

In 2000, Chad Alger wrote an article about how the field has unfolded, describing how after World War I, assumptions were shattered, and this gave rise to heavily empirical research into the causes of violent conflict. After World War II, there were new issues to deal with, namely, the threat of nuclear war. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) was founded in 1966. This era also saw the rise of game theory and the study of psychological effects. The Journal of Conflict Resolution and the Journal of Peace Studies were founded.
Later, there was emphasis on the integration and interdependence of nations, and on the containment of nuclear weapons. But the Vietnam war threw all of this into doubt. Neo-Marxist analysis was in its ascendancy.

Finally, with the end of the Cold War, by the year 2000 there was awareness that the nature of conflict was changing, that there were competition for resources and identity wars.

What needs to be done? Alger asserts that we need to combine these issues and tools at different levels: social psychology, mediation, and transformation over the long term. What is needed is a peace culture. There are multiple dimensions to conflict, including environmental factors. Conflict itself is embedded at different levels. This is in no way to abandon Getting to Yes. John Paul Lederach has identified the long-term embeddedness of conflict in societies, and his method is to elicit cultural cues. Alger speaks to cultural, religious, and ethnic dynamics.

Peace studies needs a conceptual basis in conflict management, so as not to be just hortatory.

Regarding post-conflict peacebuilding, this should be called post-violence peacebuilding. We need to ask what is being transformed: attitudes, structures? Finally, we need to address the need for forgiveness and reconciliation—this is profoundly human. Peace studies ought to be as central to International Relations as these areas are to peace studies. If we think of peace studies this way, we need to find resources at these levels.

At the Kroc Institute at Notre Dame, the areas of focus are:
- International norms and security and institutions
- Cultural, religious, and ethnic identities
- Strategic peacebuilding

Vidya Nadkarni, the moderator, concluded this portion of the panel by making the following observations:
- There is an empirical component and a normative component. The epistemological warrant is for the empirical component. She added that many believe that the normative component is defined by the powerful.
- We need to think about the order: which comes first, justice or peace?
- We cannot eliminate conflict. Instead we must think about the role of the powerful. What happens when it is in their interest to keep conflict going?

Tamra Pearson d’Estrée noted that just as there is positive and negative peace, there is positive and negative conflict. Conflict resolution is always ongoing.

William Zartman observed that conflict is normal and even beneficial and not to be eliminated per se. We sometimes miss the paradox that even the management of conflict is just the prelude to greater conflict later on.

He noted that it is sad to hear the question framed as “whose peace, whose justice” and to hear that the strong are solely responsible. All parties have interests involved, and think that their side is just. From Aristotle to Rawls, and all in between, there has been an attempt at defining justice.
We cannot say *prima facie* that either side is right, and must not thereby becloud the issue.

DISCUSSION

A participant had a question for Zartman and Appleby about the extent to which the humanities and law can contribute to peace studies/conflict resolution. He cited *The Shield of Achilles*, by Phillip Bobbitt at the University of Texas at Austin, and asked whether this was a fertile area of inquiry, or merely current and fashionable.

Dr. Zartman replied that he hoped it was not merely fashionable, and Dr. Appleby recommended to the audience John Paul Lederach’s book, *The Moral Imagination*. Lederach asks what constitutes justice and peace, asserting that these are nurtured by the humanities. Just as “peace and justice” is stigmatized as something that involves merely “singing Kumbaya around the campfire,” so are the humanities. Yet *The Moral Imagination* argues that nurturing imagination through the humanities is essential.

Dr. Pearson d’Estrée noted that the humanities provide an interpretive lens in looking at how humans derive meaning. There may be a role for the hermeneutical, or even for revelation. Law is one of the six elements in her university’s program. Law is, after all, a way to resolve conflict. She therefore takes issue when alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is posited as an alternative to the law.

Another participant noted that she had perceived some missing links. First, she looks at peace and conflict studies not so much as being about researching the past as about the future. Secondly, powerful people can start conflicts, but only powerless people can perpetuate them—or end them. We have to consider how we look into the future.
Dr. Pearson d'Estrée responded that there are exciting techniques and tools out there, such as community visioning.

Dr. Appleby responded to the remark about the powerful and the powerless. There is a conundrum here: if we don't find a way to control arms, a minority can undo the work of years. For this reason, it is necessary to be realistic and to take into account the hoarding of arms, the hoarding of resources.

Another participant noted that it is important to look at development and the causes of poverty. It is important to underline the mix of state, market and civil society expectations. The prevailing models of economic development, as promoted by the international financial institutions, are leading to more poverty rather than less. He also asked to what degree peace studies is a social science endeavor, or instead constitutes professional training, characterized, for example, by case studies and practice.

To the second question, Appleby responded that he prefers not to make that choice. The two are not mutually exclusive. Peace studies draws upon the disciplines in the social sciences, and the precedent is in the literature. The question is, how do the social scientific methods serve a better understanding? Jackie Smith is a sociologist who studies transnational social networks, including social movement dynamics such as riots, etc. But she also approaches the issue with a normative agenda, from a peace studies background.

Dr. Zartman recommended Paul Collier's Breaking the Conflict Trap, while Dr. Pearson d'Estrée agreed that both theory and practice are needed. Yet, when one looks at the strong professional schools, they are the ones that are strong in theory (while the converse is not true). The study of cases is also critical.

Dr. Zartman reminded listeners that theory is dynamic generalized knowledge. Case studies are important if they are used to study conceptual notions. We tend to get caught up in grand theories: realism, idealism, constructivism. Yet, neither must we get caught up in cases for their own sake, without asking, “What is this a case of?” In short, generalizable theory is extremely important. In the words of Lewin, “there is nothing so practical as a good theory.”

A participant asked the panelists to compare programs in conflict resolution/peace studies.

Tamra Pearson d'Estrée noted that the University of Denver has been working on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. She said that there are many programs with a focus on domestic conflict management and conflict resolution and this has had an impact in creating corporate positions in conflict management. Conflict resolution is even being used at the Centers for Disease Control and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Scott Appleby remarked that the Kroc Institute at Notre Dame has now produced 385 graduates. Sixty percent of these are working for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), UN agencies, governments, etc. (it is not known what the remaining 40 percent are doing with their degrees). One of the very first graduates, a Cameroonian, is now working in counterterrorism at the African Union.
Dr. Zartman responded that we need to put more effort into finding how post-conflict situations have been resolved/handled by negotiations. Dr. Pearson d’Estrée added that numerous programs have had some results. Many agencies that used to call in outside experts now have conflict experts on their permanent staff.

A participant asked whether there is space in conflict resolution to look at the AIDS epidemic—or at the mass imprisonment of poor people and people of color in the United States—as cases of conflict. And, if so, could actions such as the Brazilian government’s victory on intellectual property rights, enabling it to manufacture generic anti-retrovirals, be counted as conflict resolution?

Dr. Zartman responded that conflict is incompatibility of position. In prisons, the agenda can be reconciliation, atonement, being accountable. Therefore, intriguing cases such as those are very much part of our field.

Dr. Pearson d’Estrée responded that conflict is “the perception that one’s needs and priorities cannot be met without [obviating] the needs and priorities of the other.” That distinguishes conflict from violence and oppression themselves, which are sources of violent conflict. The question is, how can we think differently about the interests and priorities of actors? Finally, Dr. Appleby responded that public health is certainly an aspect of peace studies.

A participant asked whether there is something inherently different between the resolution of conflict at the interpersonal and at the larger levels.

Pearson d’Estrée replied that interpersonal conflict does not involve constituencies. Intragroup dynamics are not present in it, therefore you do not have the phenomenon of having to negotiate on two fronts (i.e., with the enemy and with your base).

For Zartman, the answer was yes and no. Usually an individual operates within a community, within which there are legally and socially binding norms. By contrast, the same does not apply to nation-states, because international law is not binding.

Dr. Appleby further responded that the religious communities are constantly being contested regarding the readings of their scriptures. The personal and the spiritual need to be integrally linked to the cultural, educational and political. Otherwise, you condemn those who are being transformed to isolation.
PANEL 2: 1:45 — 3:30 PM

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE ART IN PEACE & CONFLICT?

Moderator:
• Dipak Gupta, Chair, International Security and Conflict Resolution, San Diego State University
Panelists:
• Ronald Fisher, School of International Studies, American University
• Pamela Aall, U.S. Institute of Peace
• Eileen Babbitt, Fletcher School for Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University

Ron Fisher, Professor of International Relations in the Division of International Peace and Conflict Resolution, School of International Service at American University, began by affirming the importance of understanding the controversial nature of peace studies/conflict resolution. In 1959, the first center on conflict resolution was established at the University of Michigan. Sometime between 1969 and 1972, during the war in Vietnam, the center supported a strike by black students and indeed turned over its offices to the student activists. A year later, the university pulled the center’s funding (implausibly claiming budget constraints), and effectively shut it down. But ideas and institutions live. There has been a lot of progress in peace studies, but there has not been a school established.

Dr. Fisher explained that he teaches in a dual-degree program: International Peace and Conflict Resolution. SIS also has a dual-degree program with the school of theology, with ethics, and with business.
He also observed that Louis Kriesberg has written *Constructive Conflicts*, and there is also Miall et al. on conflict resolution. In addition, there are the U.S. Institute of Peace publications—a number of groundbreaking books have been published there. Fisher said that we need to be careful to stay true to our moral and ethical base—to find nonviolent ways to resolve conflict. We do not believe in the use of violence.

This does not mean that we do not talk to others. After all, we believe in complementarity.

There is an expansion in practice. There used to be only negotiation and mediation, now there is also problem-solving, reconciliation, and peace-building.

The AICPR—Alliance for International Conflict Prevention and Resolution—has grown, and just held its third annual retreat. The field has moved vertically (down to the grassroots) and horizontally (to issues of development, poverty, humanitarian work, etc.). There is both profusion and diffusion. There is now a Conflict Management and Mitigation Unit at USAID, and the World Bank has a Post-Conflict Unit. That is why we have to see to it that our value base is replicated in this field. Peace studies and conflict resolution are now being infused into more complex domains of peacebuilding and peacekeeping, and there is a need for enhanced collaboration.

Dr. Fisher developed the certificate in peacebuilding with emphasis in conflict resolution, development, and human rights. The question is, “What are the professional standards in the field?” And the answer is, if you are out there “buying conflict resolution services,” caveat emptor. We do not yet have professional competencies or even standards of practice. “Do no harm” is a minimal standard, but that precept may prevent one from getting involved in conflict resolution at all, so it may also be a very high standard.

The field developed on the grievance model, based on the assumption that oppressed groups have legitimate grievances. But then, in the 1990s, we found ourselves up against “ethnic entrepreneurs” who manipulated ethnic divisions for their own gain. This is the greed-based model. In this light, Alexander George’s *Branding the Gap* is recommended.

What challenges do we face? What do graduates do? We do not yet know (but Notre Dame is collecting the data). There is also the challenge for scholars to have more input into policy.

Pamela Aall, Director of the Education Program at the U.S. Institute of Peace, explained that the U.S. Institute of Peace is a funding and policy organization.

In answer to the question posed, “What are the substantive issues being discussed in this field,” she posited that the end of the Cold War made a huge difference. New conflicts exploded every day. People at that point realized that what they knew about conflict was not very much. It gave room for non-official organizations to learn about conflict. This in turn increased the need to know what grassroots peacemaking was all about.

---

1 The Alliance was founded in 1998 as the Applied Conflict Resolution Organizations’ Network; the name change occurred in 2002.
There are three major groupings of the substantive issues in conflict resolution:

1. One focuses on how to end the fighting. This is the think-tank world. It focuses on mediation, negotiation, facilitation and dialogue. These people also talk about the use of force, and believe that force is necessary whether used or not, including sanctions. The really hot topic in the think-tank world is post-conflict reconstruction and how to get settlements to stick. It is not called “post-violence,” though perhaps it should be.

2. Another grouping focuses on how to transform the world that caused the conflict in the first place. This is the traditional focus of peace studies in preventing social and economic inequities. Work has been done on the role of the World Bank and IMF in promoting conflict. Work has also been done on post-conflict accountability, and on intractable conflict — and we have found that the causes of conflict are not always what makes conflict intractable.

3. There are also old security studies and new security studies. There are WMD (weapons of mass destruction), resource-fuelled conflicts — e.g., as with conflict diamonds — and transnational health problems severe enough to threaten stability. The shorthand for these could be, “Drugs, Thugs, and Bugs” (with “Sludge” thrown in to cover the threat posed by environmental degradation).

As we consider these three groupings, are they considered different bodies of knowledge? No, the three spill over into each other, and this is reflected in academic programs. For example, the University of California at Santa Barbara has a program on Global Peace and Security. San Diego State University has an Institute for International Security and Conflict Resolution.
The University of Louvain in Belgium has a Center for Peace Research and Security Studies. These titles do not represent muddy thinking, but rather, the recognition that one needs to understand some of the above phenomena in order to understand the others.

Instead of being interdisciplinary,

conflict resolution is multidisciplinary.

It is to be hoped that there will be some professional schools like business schools. The problem in the field is that if one fails in a mediation, it will not disqualify one for a future mediation. On the contrary, it almost raises one’s profile to have it known that one participated in a particularly difficult, if ultimately unsuccessful, mediation. In other words, we have a problem of accountability. It is very hard to define standards for the field. In the humanitarian field, we have the “Do No Harm” concept, pioneered by Mary Anderson. The problem is that, in our field, is it better to hang back and do nothing in the hope of doing no harm?

About the market for graduates: the truth is that employers have tall orders to fill. Where will they find qualified candidates? Prospective employers want experience. Without it, recent graduates will end up as secretaries (also known as program assistants). Prospective employers also want management skills (for example, budgeting) and writing skills, in addition to conflict resolution skills. They need students who are realistic, but also optimistic.

Eileen Babbitt, Assistant Professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, former Director of Education and Training at the U.S. Institute of Peace, observed that in addition to being a field of study and practice, conflict resolution is a social change movement. It has skills-building, practical applications, and conceptual work. But it also has normative values. And it is mostly a nongovernmental movement.

Conflict resolution rests upon a set of assumptions:

- Conflict per se is not the problem.
- We accomplish this goal itself (the resolution of conflict) nonviolently.
- The skills and knowledge involved can be learned (need not be innate).

Conflict resolution also rests upon a set of principles:

- Participation: all who are affected by conflict should be at the table. It is important to at least start with an assumption of inclusion.
- Empowerment: making sure that everyone has the skills to participate.
- Equity: treating everyone with respect and dignity.
- Benefit to all: no winners and losers.

Dr. Babbitt has been working with colleagues in the human rights field, and the human rights experts have said that “the problem with conflict resolution is that it is non-normative.” She notes that we need to be more explicit about our norms. In addition, instead of being interdisciplinary, conflict resolution is multidisciplinary.
Students need to become experts in several fields. We need to be able to embrace and embody complexity.

The Fletcher School at Tufts University does not offer an M.A. in conflict resolution and peace studies. The only degree is the M.A.L.D.—Master of Arts in Law and Diplomacy. Fletcher is an APSIA school—Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs—and APSIA’s hallmark is preparing practitioners. One-third of incoming students choose International Negotiation and Conflict Resolution, Dr. Babbitt’s department. The following is a summary of what that department is teaching and would like to be teaching.

**Negotiation analysis:** This is strategic and has to do with bargaining. Negotiation analysis spans bargaining, labor, trade, business, etc. It draws from game theory. Students taking this course of study may have an interest in business or other areas, not necessarily in conflict resolution for its own sake.

**Ethnic conflict:** This has to do with identity-based conflict, whether linguistic, historic, cultural, religious, etc. There is a huge literature on identity conflict. We need to map conflict in order to stop its trajectory. Ted Robert Gurr at the University of Maryland founded the “Minorities at Risk” project which monitors and analyzes the status of conflicts of over 250 politically-active communal groups.2 Paul Collier has looked at economic causes of conflict.

**Conflict prevention:** The Carnegie Commission did a study on conflict prevention with recommendations that have had only a lukewarm reception.

**Post-conflict/violence/settlement work:** This involves issues of transitional justice, trauma healing, and democratization.

New efforts are taking these already multidisciplinary efforts and pairing them with other multidisciplinary efforts, e.g., with human rights and humanitarian work.

Regarding the market for graduates, Dr. Babbitt remarked that she counsels them to pair conflict resolution with a functional or regional area of expertise. This is very important because it gives one a hook whereby one can become competitive. There are only a small number of humanitarian and development NGOs that hire people to do conflict resolution.

USAID now has a Conflict Management and Mitigation unit, which means that private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and private contractors alike need people with these skills. In addition, there is a new office at the State Department for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation. There is the Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) at USAID.

The World Bank has a Post-Conflict Fund, as well as a new internal ombudsman unit, which is meant to mediate between the Bank and any given Bank client. There is also the UN Secretariat, and UN agencies such as the UNHCR, UNIFEM, UNESCO, etc., and the private voluntary organizations (PVOs).

---

2 Regarding other causes of conflict, Babbitt remarked that Paul Collier has looked at economic causes of conflict. She also pointed out that the UN Agenda for Peace, written in 1992 by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, is a typology that has brought about the need for Track One actors to think about how they interact with Track Two actors.
DISCUSSION

Dipak Gupta began the discussion by observing that conflict resolution is a very new field and that there is a tension between the need to keep peace and the need for a just society. He asserted that peace studies/conflict resolution requires us to be not just interdisciplinary but also multidisciplinary.

Eileen Babbitt remarked on a number of the challenges:

- When we go into another country as outsiders, we are ourselves intervening. In addition, much of the conceptual and practical work is being done by people who are not trained in conflict resolution — representatives of PVOs, lawyers, etc. Thus, Dr. Babbitt asked whether, as the concepts and practices are mainstreamed, we disappear as a field.
- The applicability of our practices to (perceived) post-9/11 threats is crucial. Our field is not as visible as it should be in the post-9/11 world.

Pamela Aall asked whether it is possible to be at war and be a credible third party at the same time. Can one intervene in a conflict when one’s own government is at war? She was referring specifically to the United States in the current context of the war in Iraq, and posed two other questions: first, are people morally obliged to react to conflict? Second, are we going to be reactive to conflict, “ambulance-chasers” only? We talk today about post-conflict, but the Carnegie Corporation spent $9 million on the Carnegie Commission for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, and yet today, in the post-September 11 world, no one talks about conflict prevention any longer.

DISCUSSION

A participant asked whether there are any steps for establishing accrediting agencies, and noted that his own university (in Tanzania) is moving toward this. Standardized accreditation/credentialing is crucial, otherwise a credential from a U.S. university will have more acceptance than one from a Nigerian one, for example.
Dr. Fisher responded that there are no internationally accepted standards for conflict resolution (although PVOs have developed standards). The Association for Conflict Resolution, which is domestic, has some kind of credentialing. The field is struggling with issues of identity and marketing — it is dealing with its own survival, in other words.

A participant asked how we balance the need for students to acquire practical experience with the need to protect their safety.

Dr. Babbitt responded that her program tries very hard to give students all the information they need before going into the field, and that they are supervised, but ultimately, it is the student’s decision to go or not go. Her students do not go to Iraq, though they do go to conflict zones. It is important to note that students need not end up in the middle of a “hot” situation to get some exposure.

Dr. Zartman asked about other challenges:

• How do you teach dialogue with non-dialoguers? For example, with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)? It is very hard to talk with them because their stake depends on their ability to consolidate and hold a hard line. Or, for that matter, with the Groupe Islamique Armée (GIA) in Algeria, or with Rached Ghannouchi, the Tunisian fundamentalist leader.

• Our field does not say much to International Relations high theory. They are involved in Realism vs. Constructivism, and the people we should be talking to are not there.

• As to funding, Hewlett has left the field. Ford and Rockefeller are pulling back. The focus has not disappeared, however, for security studies.

Dr. Fisher responded that the field has always relied on the voluntary nature of negotiations. Sometimes it may be necessary to wait until a hard rock softens.

Fisher agreed with Zartman’s comment that funding is decreasing for conflict resolution work and said that Hewlett used to fund overhead costs. We (in the field) have no idea how to replace them as few, if any, funders today will cover basic operating costs.

Dr. Babbitt added that internally, we have to talk about the prospect of opening ourselves up to the idea that in some cases, coercion may be acceptable as a means of dealing with conflict. Finally, Pamela Aall concluded by observing that the Norwegian government does talk with the LTTE, and it is also a major donor so perhaps the two phenomena are not unrelated.
Panel 3: 3:45 — 5:30 PM

Over the next decade, what do you see as the challenges facing the field?

Moderator:
• Joyce Neu

Panelists:
• Robert Rubinstein, Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict (PARC), Syracuse University
• Louis Kriesberg, Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict (PARC), Syracuse University
• Mari Fitzduff, Slifka Program on Intercommunal Coexistence, Brandeis University

Robert Rubinstein, who directs the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict (PARC) at Syracuse University, spoke about the institutional situation. PARC is double-hatted in the sense that it is linked both to a professional school (the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs) and to the social science department at Syracuse University. PARC works in applied conflict resolution, and has several different streams:

• applied conflict resolution/facilitation, leadership, and mediation
• conflicts and public participation
• social movements
• international conflicts and management

PARC offers a Certificate of Advanced Studies in Conflict Resolution. A student chooses a major and a minor from among the above four streams. Students are required to obtain practical experience and write about it. In addition, the Maxwell School is an APSIA school. The program’s goal is to affect public policy. Negotiation and conflict resolution courses are full even when they are not required and students find that the certificate is a useful adjunct to their substantive work in International Relations. Also, PARC is the home of undergraduate programs on nonviolence and social change as the Maxwell School has taken on a focus on human security.

Thus, PARC is a catalytic consolidator within the field of conflict resolution and peace studies. It also now offers a certificate of advanced studies in conflict resolution. The point is that these programs — and even ROTC (Reserve Officer Training Corps) and the National Security Training Program — have come to PARC.

Dr. Rubinstein further observed that his own training is in anthropology, although anthropologists have traditionally been a minority in conflict resolution.

Dr. Rubinstein described a desired focus for the next two decades: peace studies must look at issues of development, identity, and the recognition and redress of structural inequalities within and between societies. Peace studies needs to look at the individual, the group, and the large group—in other words, at all levels and at how each level is affected by what goes on at the adjacent level.

Regarding the proposed new school at USD, he commented that the school must serve the need both for knowledge and the application of knowledge: a hybrid model is desirable. An academic model and a practitioner model must consciously interact. The important thing is to develop practitioners who are reflective.

The academic side is about:
- how social movements articulate with the political process;
- how groups legitimate their authority (see Jarat Chopra);
- the variety and range of institutional actors in peacebuilding;
- the dynamics of multilateral action;
- strategic nonviolence as a core area;
- culture, identity, values, and structural pressure towards, and away from conflict resolution;
- human rights, the rule of law, and nonproliferation—not the technical side but rather an understanding of why people resort to collecting such weapons, in other words what it means to have an “Islamic” (or “Jewish/Argentine/Indian”, etc.) bomb;
- structural inequalities and structural violence;
- the role of the media, given that peace studies is stigmatized.

Professionally, students need:
- a set of tools;
- the ability to know the stakeholders;
- the knowledge of how to give briefings, write concise reports, and do budgets.

This is all in addition to basic skills in negotiation analysis, mediation, and facilitation.

Thus, Dr. Rubinstein would like to see the following results from a future School of Peace Studies at USD:
- graduates working in private voluntary organizations, the State Department, etc., as well as having careers in other policy-related fields with a peace perspective;
- perhaps a dozen Ph.Ds teaching in the field;
- for USD to be identified by its School of Peace Studies.
If we fail to offer a Ph.D., there will be no next generation of peace studies.

Louis Kriesberg, Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Maxwell Professor Emeritus of Social Conflict Studies at Syracuse University, was the founding director of the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflict (1986–1994) and continues as an associate of the program. Dr. Kriesberg shared some autobiographical information, explaining his interest in peace studies arising from growing up in Chicago as a child of immigrants from Russia, hearing stories of pogroms and wars, and anxious about the rise of Hitler. He collected pictures from the newspapers of the civil war in Spain and the Japanese invasion of China. He was determined to help avert wars and recurrences of the horrors of World War II.

He went to the University of Chicago to learn what might be done to prevent wars and build a peaceful world. He discovered sociology and thought that would provide the best understanding of the bases for peace, looking at the underlying social processes for the construction of institutions to channel conflicts peacefully.

In that spirit, he went on several years later to carry out a study of the European Coal and Steel Community as a Fulbright research scholar in Germany, 1956-57. A few years later, he began a program of research on international nongovernmental organizations. Robert Angell had written about this back then. Currently, researchers such as Jackie Smith are doing work related to the increasing role of transnational nongovernmental organizations.

During all this time, Dr. Kriesberg also was doing mainstream sociology, but in the late 1960s he began to devote himself fully to the field of peace studies. He observed that many peace researchers were collecting quantitative data to study what causes war. But he reasoned that understanding what causes wars does not tell us what secures and sustains peace, and turned to focus on that.

Gene Sharp’s book on nonviolent action was a start at studying nonviolent ways to conduct conflicts, and Dr. Kriesberg continued this thread by adding considerations about other inducements, including rewards and persuasion. Back then, peace and conflict studies constituted a kind of work that colleagues seemed to regard as worthy only of admiration, but not emulation. However, the field began to expand and more resources became available in the early 1980s. This was aided by the emergence of the field of conflict resolution.

Dr. Kriesberg noted the directions in which the field is moving. He observed that conflict resolution adds some tools and legitimacy to peace studies. The fields have now somewhat merged, even though it is (in some cases) analytically useful to keep them distinct. There is even some convergence with security studies. At the same time, there is more and more differentiation going on within each of these fields. Some of that pertains to different phases of conflicts, with peace researchers focusing on one or two phases, such as conflict prevention, limiting destructive escalation, fostering constructive de-escalation, and building a just and enduring peace.
There is also specialization in regional areas, in different issues of contention, and on different methods of doing peace work.

He noted likely directions of peace work in the '00s:
- Post-settlement reconstruction, and work on reconciliation and recovery from mass violence.
- The war in Iraq, and reconstruction there.
- The role of the United States in the world and repercussions of American unilateralist policies and reliance on force.

Dr. Kriesberg said we need more knowledge about the following:
- The role of violence has to be dealt with in a more nuanced way. Instead of rejecting it out of hand, we need to ask what kind of violence, in what context, and in conjunction with what else might it be constructive? What can be the uses of nonviolent coercion (such as sanctions, mixed with the promise of reward)?
- What is the nature of the justice and peace relationship?
- We need to pay closer attention to strategies and sequencing of tactics, and how different actors can complement each other over time. He noted how peace researchers’ studies of “non-provocative defense” aided in ending the Cold War.

Dr. Kriesberg noted that there is a growing acceptance of the field, but too often only in the form of lip service with the adoption of the words of conflict resolution and peace studies. There is the danger that we have been accepted by the government and employed by the government, and are thus at risk of being co-opted. Some in the field of peace studies are concerned about this, while others are relieved to be accepted by the government as partners in conflict resolution.

He suggested that we need to retain our independence (and critical thinking), but avoid being marginalized. We should work to develop and sustain relations with the mass media, with civic organizations, with political parties and with government officials at all levels.

We need to wrestle with the hard cases in ways (and in terms) that respect all of the actors involved, within and outside the United States. This includes working on ways to respond to the threat of terrorism. It may not be possible to negotiate with Osama bin Laden, but it may be possible to talk with some among his base or to the wider sympathetic circle.

There is great enthusiasm on the part of students for this field. Some of the teaching, however, has become too routine, and has not changed in ten years. We need more assessment of the intended and unintended consequences of different methods of doing peace work and conflict resolution. We need to think of the training relating to all conflict phases and not just to the negotiation stage. On that basis we need to retool the training.

On the bases of his prior observations, Dr. Kriesberg noted that there are lots of ideas about what USD might do with its School of Peace Studies. It is not a matter of simply transmitting knowledge but of creating knowledge. If the evidence does not go the way we think it ought, we must be forthright about this.
Given the limited personnel at each institution, researchers are well advised to draw from many different disciplines, in different institutions, and work as a team. They might work on short-term projects, perhaps publish a book and then disband, because it is not desirable to freeze an institution in one endeavor.

Finally, drawing an analogy with medicine to describe diplomacy, Dr. Kriesberg observed that physicians are proud of their clinical skills. They see them as an art, but to exercise those skills well, they draw on physiology, pharmacology, and other scientific disciplines. Diplomacy similarly is an art.

Mari Fitzduff, Director and Professor of the Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis University, shared her history. Being from Northern Ireland, Dr. Fitzduff was at the time a “customer in search of a field,” and so she earned her Ph. D. and then set up courses on conflict resolution in Northern Ireland at two universities.

Dr. Fitzduff referred to Thomas Barnett’s new book, The Pentagon’s New Map, in asserting that military and international relations specialists are all waiting for the big wars to start again. Governments tried the security approach, and the economic approach, to no avail. So, they came to the peace and conflict researchers.

They (Dr. Fitzduff and her colleagues) set up a unit inside government and one outside. She called upon academics: Collier, Wilkinson, Kelman, and others. Each one saw matters from his own perspective. Finally, in Northern Ireland, the dominoes began to fall. She knew a turning point had been reached when Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams began to use the same language as the peace researchers. Dr. Fitzduff learned that academics do have a lot to give; it is just that they know do not how to give it.

Dr. Fitzduff worked at UNU/INCORE, a UN university based in Derry/Londonderry. Ambassadors came to her for briefings, and that experience in itself was very revealing. It became evident that mainstreaming was needed. This is what led her to set up the program at Brandeis. She and her colleagues chose mid-career people for the program—those who are “cynical yet with hope.” She drew an analogy with basic medical training for a general practitioner: the Slifka program provides a model, a scan of what Collier says, what Lederach says, and so forth. These are general core competencies. Political will is needed: the fact of the matter is that peace researchers do know what to do, if only the political will is there to implement solutions.

Partnering with organizations is crucial to developing expertise, as is a practical experience such as a field project. Regarding methodology, she observed that evaluation skills are increasingly critical and that Search for Common Ground had received a grant to do evaluation.

Finally, regarding desirable directions for the field, Dr. Fitzduff said the lack of a meta perspective and the lack of collegiality are important concerns. We need to clarify whether or not we are pacifists. There is a perception that peace studies is “touchy-feely.” It is essential that we look at 9/11 and our silence. There is also the matter of where to set up a peace and conflict studies program. For example, for Program on Negotiation (PON) people at the law faculty at Harvard, any initiative to broaden their scope will bring huge questions from their colleagues.
New, creative research is needed, and also the ability to present key findings in just two pages for use by policymakers.

In addition, it is important to observe that there is a huge range of conflicts and they require different skills. Thus, the program at Brandeis has 3½ core courses, and also electives. Brandeis has two professional schools and moves between the two. The Slifka Program is within Arts and Sciences. The fact that monitoring and evaluation are increasingly important is a sign of our maturity as a field.

Finally, Dr. Fitzduff cited an unidentified U.S. official, who told her, “Someday, the grave errors being made in Iraq will be acknowledged, and we will come to you. I only hope that you and your colleagues are ready.”

“Someday, the grave errors being made in Iraq will be acknowledged, and we will come to you. I only hope that you and your colleagues are ready.”

—Unnamed U.S. government source

DISCUSSION

Joyce Neu summarized the panelists’ remarks and noted that the field is not addressing some of the issues of the day. For example, after September 11, 2001, at a meeting of the Alliance for International Conflict Prevention and Resolution (AICPR), some felt that the community ought to issue a statement, while others disagreed. In the end, AICPR opted not to. The IPJ, however, did make a statement that was placed on its Web site and focused on using tools of conflict management and resolution rather than military solutions.

Development experts have been outspoken on issues related to their field while conflict resolution people have not been.

A participant commented that he had just organized a conference in Pasadena on cosmopolitanism and global justice. He was glad to see that human security—which he interpreted to mean basic human needs—is on the agenda. He asked the panelists’ opinions regarding the possible contributions of radical proposals such as the Tobin tax, carbon schemes, cancellation of developing-country debt, etc.

Dr. Rubinstein replied that a conference has just been held on male incarceration and its impact on marriage prospects for women in communities of color. Part of the challenge lies in convincing governments of the merits of this broader understanding and action.
Dr. Kriesberg remarked that a number of people are working on transnational social movements. Dr. Fitzduff said that she is acquainted with some mediators who have been mediating the ongoing “Seattle crisis” between the international financial institutions and their principal shareholders, on the one hand, and with those who question the way in which globalization is taking place on the other. It is important to have tough talk, but also to be careful regarding how to do it. The question she poses to her staff is, “Will both sides invite you back because they trust you?”

Scott Appleby said on another note to the audience that Mrs. Kroc had asked the university to offer a Ph.D. in peace studies. Thus, he posed the following two contradictory proposals for the panel’s consideration:

Proposal One: We ought not to aspire to a Ph.D. in peace studies. Why not? There are no jobs available, and to teach in the field one needs to wear the hats of several different departments—in effect, to be three professors. Instead, USD should focus only on having a very rigorous M.A. program.

Proposal Two: If we fail to offer a Ph.D., there will be no next generation of peace studies. We are not preparing the scholars needed to pass on the knowledge.

A participant asked if we could combine regional studies with peace studies. He asked whether there is an opportunity for USD to find synergies between the two proposals.

Another participant asked about pedagogy. Given that the clinician was described as an artist, have the panelists thought about how to teach that art?

Dr. Fitzduff responded that she was not certain that credibility lies with the institutions. For example, her last job was as a professor of peace studies. Dr. Fitzduff would like to see two to three Ph.D.s coming out of every class. Students need three to four core courses; after that, they can take on an area or functional specialization—but these ought to be a complement to, rather than a substitute for, the core competencies.
Regarding whether the “art” can be taught, a variety of skills are needed. What is certain is that we need to be very careful to preempt the tendency of some students to glamorize conflict (the “groupie” effect).

“The lack of one single dominant paradigm does not mean that peace studies/conflict resolution is not a field.”

—Robert Rubinstein

Dr. Kriesberg picked up on the latter theme by using the metaphor of riding a bicycle: Practical field experiences need to be very carefully supervised and reflected on. His response to the question regarding area studies is that they wax and wane, and are too fragile, because they are regarded as “political” in a pejorative sense. Regarding whether to offer a Ph.D. or not—one possible way out of the conundrum is to have Distinguished Chairs in Peace Studies. This would help to increase the demand for Ph.D.s.

Dr. Rubinstein affirmed that as with the bicycle-riding metaphor, the issue is supervision. Supervised practice is a good model. He disagreed that the lack of one single dominant paradigm meant that peace studies/conflict resolution is not a field. In anthropology, he pointed out, there are competing paradigms and yet anthropology is a discipline. Regarding the Ph.D., he offered that in his view, USD has an obligation to offer a Ph.D. in peace studies, and to develop visibility. Notre Dame has a gift and USD has a gift. Therefore, synergies are important. And, because the job market is tough, USD is advised not to put its students into debt.

Dr. Zartman remarked that the answer to Scott Appleby’s question about the Ph.D. is “Yes.” Ten to 20 years from now there will be good programs offering Ph.D.s. To USD, he advised that the University should do what it wants to do, but do it well, and strongly, and gradually. It should build up a strong M.A. program.

Dr. Neu concluded the proceedings by thanking the participants, and quoting from T.S. Eliot:

“We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started, and know the place for the first time.”

—T.S. Eliot
Attending the seminar were (clockwise from top) graduate students in Peace Studies: Lisa Lungren, Brynna Jacobson, and Laura Taylor; IPJ Women Peace Makers Christiana Thorpe and Luz Mendez; and Robert Rubinstein, PARC, Syracuse University.
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Pamela R. Aall is the director of the Education Program of the U.S. Institute of Peace. Prior to joining the Institute in 1993, she worked for the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the Institute of International Education, The Rockefeller Foundation, European Cultural Foundation (Amsterdam), and the International Council for Educational Development. She is also president of Women in International Security, an organization dedicated to promoting the visibility and influence of women in foreign affairs. With Chester A. Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson, she is co-editor of Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict (1996), Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World (1999), and Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict (2001). She also is co-author of Taming Intractable Conflicts: Mediation in the Hardest Cases (2004), and the Guide to IGOs, NGOs and the Military in Peace and Relief Operations (2000).

Scott Appleby (Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1985) is the John M. Regan, Jr. Director of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. His research examines the roots of religious violence and the potential of religious peacebuilding. He teaches courses in American religious history and comparative religious movements. From 1988 to 1993, Appleby was co-director of the Fundamentalism Project, an international public policy study conducted by the American Academy of arts and Sciences. From 1985 to 1987, he chaired the religious studies department of St. Xavier College, Chicago. Appleby is the author of The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence and Reconciliation (Rowman & Littlefield 2000), and editor of Spokesmen for the Despised: Fundamentalist Leaders of the Middle East (University of Chicago 1997). With Martin E. Marty, he co-edited the five-volume Fundamentalism Project (University of Chicago Press), Appleby is also the author of Church and Age Unite! The Modernist Impulse in American Catholicism (Notre Dame 1992), co-editor of Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America (Indiana 1995) and co-author of Transforming Parish Ministry: The Changing Roles of Clergy, Laity, and Women Religious (Crossroad, 1989). He has been a Fellow of the Institute since 1996, and director since 2000.

Eileen F. Babbitt is an Assistant Professor of International Politics and Co-Director of the Center for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. She is also an Associate of the Program on Negotiation at the Harvard Law School and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Before joining the Fletcher faculty, Dr. Babbitt was Director of Education and Training at the United States Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C. and Deputy Director of the Program on International Conflict Analysis and Resolution at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University. Her practice as a facilitator and trainer has included work in the Middle East with Israelis and Palestinians; in the Balkans, Southeastern Europe, and Cyprus with government officials, NGOs, and professional groups; and in the Horn of Africa with U.S. government agencies, regional organizations and local NGOs. Her current research interests include roles for third parties in self-determination conflicts, coexistence and trust-building in the aftermath of civil war, and the interface between human rights concerns and peacemaking. Dr. Babbitt holds a Master’s Degree in Public Policy from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and a Ph.D. from MIT.
Ronald J. Fisher is a Professor of International Peace and Conflict Resolution in the School of International Service at American University in Washington, D.C. He holds a B.A. (Hon.) and M.A. in Psychology from the University of Saskatchewan (Canada), and a Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of Michigan. His primary interest focuses on interactive conflict resolution, which involves informal third party interventions in protracted and violent ethnopoliitical conflict. Dr. Fisher’s publications include Social Psychology: An Applied Approach (1982), The Social Psychology of Intergroup and International Conflict Resolution (1990), Interactive Conflict Resolution (1997), and Paving the Way: Contributions of Interactive Conflict Resolution to Peacemaking (Forthcoming, 2005). In 2003, he received the Morton Deutsch Conflict Resolution Award from the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and Violence, Division 48 of The American Psychological Association, and in 2004, he was elected as a Fellow of APA.

Mari Fitzduff is currently the Director and Professor of the Master’s Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis College, near Boston (www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/master). Previously she was Professor of Conflict Studies, and Director of UNU/INCORE (International Conflict Research) United Nations University centre based in Derry/Londonderry in Northern Ireland. (www.incore.ulst.ac.uk) From 1990 to 1997 Mari was Director of the Community Relations Council, set up in 1990 to work with government, statutory bodies, trade unions, the media, businesses, and community groups developing policy, programs, and training on issues of conflict in Northern Ireland. She has also worked as a program consultant on projects addressing conflict in the Middle East, in Sri Lanka, in the Basque country, in Indonesia and in the CIS. Her publications include Community Conflict Skills (translated into Indonesian, Spanish and Russian), Beyond Violence – Conflict Resolution Processes in Northern Ireland, a UNU/Brookings book which has won an American Library Association Notable Book award, NGOs at the Table published by Rowan and Littlefield and a four-volume series on Ending Wars? Psychological Approaches to Ending Conflicts, due to be released in Spring 2005.

Louis Kriesberg received his Ph.D. in 1953 from the University of Chicago. He is professor emeritus of sociology and Maxwell Professor Emeritus of Social Conflict Studies at Syracuse University. He was the founding director of the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts (1986–1994) and continues as an associate of the program. His most recent book is Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution (2nd ed., 2003, 1st ed., 1998). In addition to 100 book chapters and articles, his other published books include Social Processes in International Relations (ed., 1968), Social Conflicts (1973, 1982), Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change (ed., vols. 1–14, 1978–1992), Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation (co-ed., 1989), Timing the De-escalation of International Conflicts (co-ed., 1991), and International Conflict Resolution: The US-USSR and Middle East Cases (1992). He is currently doing research on American foreign policy and on reconciliation and changing accommodations between ethnic, religious, and other communal groups. He lectures and consults regarding Middle East issues, conflict resolution, peace studies, and national security.
Tamra Pearson d’Estrée, Ph.D. in Social Psychology, Harvard University, is the Henry R. Luce Professor of Conflict Resolution at the University of Denver, and the Director of their Conflict Resolution Institute’s Center for Research & Practice. She has also held faculty appointments at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) at George Mason University, and the Psychology Department at the University of Arizona. Her research interests lie at the intersection of conflict resolution and social psychology, including work on social identity, intergroup relations and conflict resolution processes, as well as on evaluation research and reflective practice. She is the author, with Bonnie G. Colby, of Braving the Currents: Evaluating Conflict Resolution in the River Basins of the American West (Kluwer), as well as several book chapters and articles in various interdisciplinary journals. She has led trainings and facilitated interactive problem-solving workshops in various intercommunal contexts including Israel-Palestine, Ethiopia, and in U.S. intertribal disputes, and she has directed and/or evaluated projects aimed at conflict resolution capacity- and institution-building in Israel-Palestine, Ukraine and Georgia. She is currently working with community mediation centers in Colorado to develop a common evaluation framework, and has just begun a State Department-funded project partnering the University of Denver with the University of the West Indies to develop mediation capacities in Trinidad & Tobago.

Robert Rubinstein is an anthropologist with expertise in political and medical anthropology and in social science history and research methods. He received his Ph.D. in Anthropology from the State University of New York at Binghamton in 1977. He received a master’s degree in public health from the University of Illinois in Chicago in 1983. Rubinstein has conducted overseas research in urban and rural Egypt, where he lived from 1988-1992, and in Belize and Mexico. In political anthropology, Rubinstein’s work focuses on cross-cultural aspects of conflict and dispute resolution, including negotiation, mediation and consensus building. He is a founder of the field of the anthropology of peacekeeping. Since 1985, he has conducted empirical research and policy studies in this field. Dr. Rubinstein has collaborated on policy applications of his work with the International Peace Academy, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and the United States Army Peacekeeping Institute. He has published more than 50 articles in journals and books, and is author or editor of six books and research monographs. In 1983, Rubinstein was a founding member of the Commission on Peace and Human Rights of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. He is co-chair of the commission, and since 2000 he has been editor of the commission’s official journal, Social Justice: Anthropology, Peace and Human Rights.
I. William Zartman is the Jacob Blaustein Professor of International Organizations and Conflict Resolution at the School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) at Johns Hopkins University, and Director of the Conflict Management Program. He is former director of the African Studies Program and a former faculty member at the University of South Carolina and New York University. He served as Olin Professor at the U.S. Naval Academy, Haley Professor at the Institute of Political Studies in Paris, and visiting professor at the American University in Paris. He has been a consultant to the U.S. Department of State, president of the Tangier American Legation Museum Society, past president of the Middle East Studies Association, and of the American Institute for Maghrib Studies. His areas of expertise include Africa, North and Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern Africa, Middle East, conflict resolution and negotiation, treaty negotiations, developing nations, diplomacy and diplomatic history, human rights, international relations, North-South issues, and political risk analysis. Dr. Zartman is fluent in French and has a Ph.D. in international relations from Yale University.

JOAN B. KROC INSTITUTE FOR PEACE & JUSTICE

The mission of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice (IPJ) is to foster peace, cultivate justice, and create a safer world. Through education, research, and peacemaking activities, the Institute offers programs that advance scholarship and practice in conflict resolution and human rights. The Institute for Peace & Justice at the University of San Diego draws upon Catholic social teaching that sees peace as inseparable from justice and acts to prevent and resolve conflicts that threaten local, national and international peace. The IPJ was established in 2000 through a generous gift from the late Joan B. Kroc to the University of San Diego to create an institute for the study and practice of peace and justice.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

The University of San Diego is a Roman Catholic institution committed to advancing academic excellence, expanding liberal and professional knowledge, creating a diverse and inclusive community, and preparing leaders dedicated to ethical conduct and compassionate service.

Chartered in 1949, the university enrolls more than 7,000 students and is known for its commitment to teaching, the liberal arts, the formation of values, and community service. Located on 180 acres overlooking the city of San Diego, Mission Bay, and the Pacific Ocean, USD offers more than 60 bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees. Academic divisions include the College of Arts and Sciences, and the schools of Business Administration, Leadership and Education Sciences, Law, and Nursing and Health Science. A School of Peace Studies, funded by a $50 million gift from the late Mrs. Joan B. Kroc, is in development.