



Ethiopian Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed (l) and Eritrean President Isaias Afwerki sign a Joint Declaration of Peace and Friendship, July 9, 2018. Photo: Eritrea Ministry of Information

From Conflict Management to Multidimensional Conflict Resolution

Amira Schiff

“Conflict Resolution is a vibrant field of enquiry. This is the first thing to understand. One can hardly imagine the current world of policy without it.”

Bercovitch et al., 2009, p. 2

The literature review below presents the leading conceptualizations and approaches in the field of conflict resolution.¹ The starting point of this discussion is the understanding that the field of conflict resolution is shaped by the shifting structure of global politics and the changes that have occurred in conflicts in the international arena since the emergence of the discipline in the late 1940s. These changes have significantly influenced how researchers in the field think about conflict resolution processes. Developments have posed new challenges and shaped paradigmatic changes in the field since its inception, from a paradigm of conflict management to that of conflict resolution, which

is post-rational, multidimensional, and diverse in terms of its approaches and the strategies it proffers. The trend of ongoing development of change and expansion processes in the field continues today, amidst the widespread challenges that the international system has witnessed over the past two decades in a system of world disorder (Zartman, 2019).

The review is divided into two main sections: the first explains what constitutes the essence of the field of conflict resolution. It presents the two main paradigms underlying the various approaches in the field and their basic assumptions. Four main research clusters in the field are presented in the second section.

What is Conflict Resolution?

Conflict resolution is a general approach that offers parties to the conflict, or third parties, tools that enable constructive management of a conflict or its resolution (Kriesberg & Neu, 2018). Researchers in the field see the phenomenon of conflict, from the level of the individual to the level of the state and the international system, as a generic social phenomenon.

Conflict occurs when two or more actors (individual or collective) perceive their goals as incompatible, and each side invests efforts to achieve its goals (Kriesberg & Neu, 2018). Each conflict is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon that contains three main components: the subject of the conflict; the attitudes and perceptions of the parties to the conflict; and the behavior of the parties to the conflict. These components are present in every conflict and at every social level, and over time interact dynamically with each other (Mitchell, 2014).

The field of conflict resolution is both analytical and normative: it includes analysis and understanding of the respective interests of the parties to the conflict and their mutual perspectives, while studying the right way to transition from violent conflict or potentially violent conflict to a constructive relationship, and even resolution of the conflict.

Conflict resolution researchers who study international conflicts focus on inter-state conflicts and intra-state conflicts occurring within the borders of a country that have a regional or global impact. This impact may also derive from the involvement of external actors—nation states, global or regional international governmental organizations, international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), non-state actors, and various transnational actors whose activities cross borders—who serve as mediators that provide assistance to the actors involved in the conflict (Ramsbotham et al., 2016).

The Conceptual Paradigms

East-West relations during the Cold War, the changing nature of the international system after the Cold War, and the need to deal with different and often violent types of conflicts in the international arena have generated changes in thinking about conflict resolution processes. The multidimensionality of conflicts has prompted the need to develop integrated, effective, and relevant strategies for managing and resolving conflicts by tapping knowledge from various fields: economics, peace studies, international relations, political science, law, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and mathematics.

There is no grand theory in the conflict resolution field. The various approaches and strategies span a wide range that includes approaches and theories of conflict management, conflict resolution, conflict prevention, and conflict transformation. Some refer and apply to different stages in the life cycle of conflicts, some lend particular importance to diverse forms of intervention by third parties in formal and informal processes of conflict management or resolution, and some provide the parties themselves with tools to improve their capabilities to manage and resolve conflicts.

The wide range of theories and approaches in the field can be divided into two paradigms: conflict management and conflict resolution. The two paradigms differ in their view of the sources of international conflicts, the actors in the international system, and their mode of operation, and diverge regarding the meaning of the term “peace.” While the conflict management paradigm is rooted in the realist approach, the origins of the conflict resolution paradigm are rooted in the liberal approach (Schiff, 2019).

The conflict management paradigm dominated for the first three decades of research in the field, and was influenced principally by the bipolar structure of global politics during the Cold War. The theories in this paradigm

rested on the assumptions about the supremacy of power politics, anarchy as the natural state of the system, and the effect of the security dilemma on the conduct of the actors.

The approaches that developed herein are rational, interest-based, one-dimensional, and focused at the state level. They are characterized by a minimalist approach to the mitigation of conflicts, aiming at reaching a state of “negative peace” marked by the absence of direct violence between the parties, as well as an attempt to control violence, minimize conflict damage, make conflict less destructive and more constructive, and direct the parties toward cooperation based on their mutual interests (Maoz et al., 2004). Key principles in the conflict management discourse are the preservation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state, non-interference in states’ internal affairs (in intra-state conflicts and humanitarian crises), and the supremacy of national interests (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009).

A conflict, if it is managed in a constructive manner that is acceptable to all parties, may succeed in promoting important values. Therefore, the issue is not to prevent the very phenomenon of conflicts, but to prevent violent manifestations of conflicts and destructive consequences.

The roots of the conflict resolution paradigm can be found in approaches that developed during the first decades of the field and in parallel with conflict management approaches. Researchers proposed perspectives and tools for dealing with international conflicts that reflected universal values rooted in the liberal approach, such as individual liberties and belief in the ability to change political reality through the individual, and through state and international institutions (Schiff, 2019). The approaches that developed from the conflict resolution paradigm are maximalist, and deal with long term processes toward fulfillment of basic human needs that motivate the parties in

the conflict and the responses that aim at the complete removal of the roots of the conflict (Maoz et al., 2004). In this context, a wide range of liberal approaches to conflict resolution has developed that include rational and post-rational conflict resolution approaches, conflict transformation approaches, and peacebuilding. These approaches have expanded greatly over the past three decades with the proliferation of violent intra-state conflicts and the increase in the number of failed states, along with the widening range of conflict issues and actors that are party to conflicts or are third party mediators.

The current prevailing paradigm is a multidimensional conflict resolution paradigm that includes normative and practical dimensions. It combines new approaches with traditional first-generation conflict management approaches, and is divided into four main research clusters (see below). This paradigm offers tools designated for implementation at different stages of conflicts, and strategies to create multidimensional and two-way processes, from the leadership to the people (top-down) and from the people to the leadership (bottom-up). These consider a variety of actors who are a party to conflicts or engage as third parties to issues and norms—not only in systemic or strategic terms, but also at the normative level, which links civil society to the state level and to regional and international levels. Emphasis today is on processes that provide human security alongside state security, the division of roles between the state and the individual in global politics, and the aspiration to achieve goals according to the context of each conflict (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009).

Main Insights

Alongside the variety of approaches and divergent theories in the field are also certain shared basic insights. First, conflicts at all social levels, including the international level, are a phenomenon that is not necessarily negative. A conflict, if it is managed in a constructive manner

that is acceptable to all parties, may succeed in promoting important values. Therefore, the issue is not to prevent the very phenomenon of conflicts, but to prevent violent manifestations of conflicts and destructive consequences (Kriesberg & Neu, 2018).

A second insight concerns the distinction between conflict resolution and conflict management, and the dialectic between these two concepts (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2010). Conflict resolution is a process in which the parties to a conflict or a third party work to reach a fundamental resolution to the issues in dispute by addressing the basic needs that are at the root of the conflict and motivate the parties. This is in contrast to conflicts where efforts to reach a resolution fail repeatedly, and which must be managed constructively by controlling violence and promoting the interests of each of the parties to the conflict in a way that allows them to live with it (Maoz et al., 2004). The hope is that conflict management will be a preliminary step and will influence the transition to conflict resolution in the future (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2010).

A third insight is that conflict derives from the parties' perceptions of the relations between them, which can be changed through a third party or by the parties to the conflict themselves (Kriesberg & Neu, 2018). Many times, the parties perceive their relations as containing only conflicting interests. This situation is described in the field as "pure conflict," which means that if one party gains, the other party loses—yet in practice this is almost always not the case. In most cases, the dynamics of the conflict prevent the parties from also seeing common or complementary interests. Therefore, the key to conflict resolution lies in the ability to change the perceptions of the parties and bring them to the realization that relations between them consist of both conflict and interdependence, enabling cooperation that will lead to a win-win solution that benefits both sides.

Researchers see international conflict as a dynamic phenomenon that progresses in

several stages, though not necessarily in linear fashion: emergence, escalation, de-escalation and settlement, and sustaining peace (Kriesberg & Neu, 2018). Different strategies have been suggested for each of the stages. Selecting the right strategy is a necessary (although insufficient) condition for an effective outcome.

Research Clusters in the Multidimensional Conflict Resolution Paradigm

The multidimensional conflict resolution paradigm is currently divided into four main research clusters:

- a. Rational conflict management approaches (traditional approaches)
- b. Rational conflict resolution approaches—based on interests and problem-solving processes
- c. Post-rational approaches
- d. International intervention through preventive diplomacy and humanitarian intervention

Some of the strategies proposed in the field, such as those designed to prevent and manage conflicts, will be satisfied with conflict management and its maintenance, while others designed to resolve or transform conflicts will work to eliminate the sources of the conflict (Schiff, 2019).

Rational Conflict Management Approaches (Traditional Approaches)

Rational conflict management approaches refer to a wide range of influence strategies and tactics that rely on the rational actor assumption, and can be implemented by the actors involved in a conflict with or without third-party assistance. The goal is to prevent, limit, or control the spectrum of violence without resorting to extensive military use of force, and to create an environment that allows for interaction to promote cooperation that will enable conditions for a future resolution, while maximizing the benefits or interests of each of the parties, though without resolving the conflict (Bar-

Siman-Tov, 2010). The strategies are unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral, and primarily address the processes of de-escalation and negotiation within the framework of traditional diplomacy through negotiation and mediation, coercion and deterrence, and coercive diplomacy with a combination of threats and incentives—with parties to a conflict or a third party employing hard power, soft power, and smart power.

The bargaining negotiation paradigm, which dominated the field for the first three decades, emphasized the competitive nature of negotiation. It was influenced by the development of the realist paradigm during the Cold War period, which emphasized the competitive nature of state relations in an anarchic environment, and by game theory which served as the foundation for many studies (Hopmann, 2001). Alongside the understanding that the parties are in a conflictual situation of “mixed motivations” (Schelling, 1960), there was an emphasis on each state’s efforts to advance its own interests, as well as the need for each of the parties to bargain competitively so that its adversary gains the impression that it cannot be taken advantage of easily (Hopmann, 2001).

Based on the rationality assumption, researchers focused on formulating prescriptions, with a top-down logic (focusing on the leadership and decision makers) intended to increase benefit in the give-and-take dynamic around the negotiating table, producing a compromise agreement. Prominent in these studies were the classic works of scholars such as political economist Thomas Schelling (1960; 1966), who developed the art of deterrence as part of a bargaining strategy in negotiation that also allows for changes in perception from a zero-sum game to a non-zero-sum game that includes possibilities for cooperation; the works of the mathematician Anatol Rapoport (1960; 1966); the work of the economist Kenneth Boulding (1962); and the work of political scientist Fred Charles Iklé (1964), which includes theory and examples from the world of diplomacy, with the aim of

helping to formulate a policy for state conduct in the nuclear age (Kriesberg, 2007).

The bargaining paradigm also influenced studies that dealt with negotiations conducted with the mediation of third parties—three-way bargaining aimed at balancing the positions of the conflict parties, employing the carrot and stick method, and helping the parties reach an arrangement that would basically maintain the status quo (Iklé, 1964; Young, 1967). These were influenced by international norms such as territorial integrity, non-intervention, and self-determination.

The reality of the Cold War and the need for conflict management led to the development of the idea of combining negative sanctions (e.g., economic, diplomatic, military) with positive sanctions (various incentives that encourage change of undesirable behavior, and seen as helping to create the foundation for peace and long-term cooperation) (George, 1996; Art & Cronin, 2007), to increase the possibility of peaceful conflict management. Others have highlighted the difficulty in implementing unilateral strategies of deterrence and coercive diplomacy in conflicts involving non-state actors—especially non-state actors that are split among themselves—that are determined to achieve their goals (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2005). Alongside these were confidence-building strategies such as Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT), formulated by the psychologist Charles Osgood (1962), and Tit for Tat (TFT), formulated by the political scientist Robert Axelrod (1984).

Rational Conflict Resolution Approaches—Interest-Based and Problem-Solving Processes

Approaches that appeared in the early years, based on problem-solving processes and on collaborative efforts to enable the potential realization of the mutual interests of the parties and increase mutual benefits (Walton & McKersie, 1965; Rapoport, 1966; Burton, 1969), have increased significantly in scope and

impact. With the expansion of liberal thinking in recent decades, they have influenced the prevailing negotiation paradigm of problem solving (Hopmann, 2001).

A conflict may derive from an objective situation of conflicting interests, but it can also derive from the parties' different perceptions regarding the subjects of conflict, which imprison the parties in a state of hostility and adherence to threat perceptions. In these two situations it is possible through negotiation as a collaborative process, in the spirit of the problem-solving paradigm, to lead a creative problem-solving process that includes identifying the roots of the problem, providing a response to the needs of the parties, searching for a common denominator, or creating and drafting an agreement that reflects mutual benefit, contrary to the zero-sum game perception (Schiff, 2019). There are two main approaches within the problem-solving negotiation paradigm. The first is the rational and interest-based; the second is the identity approach (discussed below). The approach of Roger Fisher and his colleagues to negotiations (Fisher et al., 1991) is perhaps the most prominent among the interest-based rational approaches. The theory aims to develop the capabilities of a third party and the parties to a conflict, in order to conduct a negotiation process based on common interests that build mutual trust and conclude in an agreement that will lead to optimal results in terms of providing a response to the parties' needs, and will last over time.

The process school of thought of negotiation has played a key role in the development of the problem-solving paradigm. Contrary to the bargaining paradigm, which focused on give-and-take relationships around the negotiating table, the process school of thought sees negotiation as a long process with complex dynamics that commences even before the parties meet at the negotiating table and ends long after an agreement is signed, and is influenced by many different aspects that must be considered (Zartman & Berman, 1982;

Druckman, 1986). The discussion of ripeness, which deals with the appropriate conditions required for the successful inauguration of negotiations, has played a central role in the development of this school of thought. Over the past decade the discourse has also dealt with the necessary conditions for concluding negotiations with agreement (Zartman, 2000; 2012).

Changes in the international system after the end of the Cold War and the spread of inter-communal conflicts with their unique characteristics, as well as the diversity in the types of third parties or peacemakers, required a different approach than in the past to the phenomenon of mediation. The reference is to third-party intervention—from official actors and unofficial actors—that does not make use of military force to help the parties reach agreement to manage or resolve their conflict. There is no single formula for action that can instruct a mediator seeking to mediate in an international conflict. The challenge facing researchers as well as potential mediators is first, to recognize the difference in the phenomenon of mediation from the perspective of the third parties that are involved in terms of their power; to recognize their capabilities, advantages, and limitations, based on the understanding of the context in which the conflict and the mediation take place, sometimes with the involvement of several third parties, which requires coordination, and then to use the most effective range of tools in any given conflict situation (Zartman, 1995; Touval & Zartman, 2001; Aall, 2007; Bercovitch, 2009; Vuković, 2015; 2019).

In the past, in studies that were part of the bargaining paradigm, the objective measure for assessing the success of mediation was the achievement of an agreement at the conclusion of negotiations—be it a ceasefire, or a full or partial agreement—which spelled short-term success (Iklé, 1964). However, given the way peace processes have played out in the last three decades, the trend has begun to change,

and researchers believe that a broader objective criterion for the success of mediation should be considered, and that a distinction is required between the short and long terms, alongside the use of tools and concepts from the world of preventive diplomacy and humanitarian intervention. It is important to examine objective indexes of the success of mediation processes in the long term, whether a mediated agreement is in fact actually implemented, what the mediator's role was in ensuring and guaranteeing the implementation of the agreement, whether the parties are abiding by the agreement, and more (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009).

Post-Rational Approaches

This cluster includes three main approaches: the identity approach, the intercultural approach to negotiation, and the transformative approach for peacebuilding.

The Identity Approach

The identity approach includes a wide range of concepts and theories that are based on social psychological theory and understandings and form the foundation for the social psychology school and its prominence in the field of conflict resolution in the last three decades.

The approach that developed under the influence of the liberal school out of John Burton's work (Burton, 1969) in the 1960s represented the most striking change, when compared to the rational conflict management approaches. The approach grew out of the disappointment from the limitations inherent in traditional approaches to conflict management, especially with regard to identity-based conflicts. The identity approach scholars contend that the root causes of conflicts, and in particular identity-based conflicts, are to be found in the non-fulfillment of basic needs and collective fears of the groups involved in the conflict. Thus, emphasizing the inter-societal nature of conflicts, scholars contend that as long as the parties to the conflict do not acknowledge

these needs and fears, do not clarify them, and do not address them to the satisfaction of all, the obstacles to the resolution of the conflict will remain. Therefore, researchers from the identity approach focus on the importance of addressing shared human needs and collective fears in inter-societal peace processes through dialogues in unofficial diplomacy tracks, and on the importance of creating mutual trust and changing attitudes toward others, through psychological processes, transformational dialogues, and reconciliation processes of long-term changes aimed at reaching a stable peace.

Identity approach researchers focus in their work on the subjective perceptions of the parties to identity conflicts, and on exploring misunderstandings and misconceptions of the conflict by members of an ethnic identity group who are central actors in an identity conflict (Kelman, 1998). Burton (1969), whose pioneering work was also one of the first attempts to connect between conflict resolution theory and practice, and his successors in the identity approach Edward Azar (Azar et al., 1978) and Herbert Kelman (1991) developed techniques that focused on mitigating the subjective and relationship component in identity conflicts, through a transformation processes conducted in the framework of "interactive problem-solving" workshops (Fisher, 2005). In the processes that take place in these workshops, which are based on the assumptions of the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954), a dialogue takes place between representatives of elites from the parties to the conflict, facilitated by academics from the field. The participants do not hold official positions, rather are private individuals who are close to decision makers in their group.

A distinction was made between "Track I," which refers to formal diplomacy, and "Track II," which refers to informal diplomacy (Davidson & Montville, 1981) and contributes to the removal of psychological barriers to agreements in the first track. Research has further focused on studying the effects between the two levels

(Fisher, 2005). Further concepts developed: “multi-track diplomacy” (Diamond & McDonald, 1996), “Track 1.5 diplomacy” (Nan, 2005), and “Track III” or people-to-people diplomacy.

The Intercultural Approach to Diplomacy

The 1980s and 1990s saw an expansion of research with regard to cultural diversity as a source of obstacles to conflict management and resolution, leading to the development of the intercultural school (Hall & Hall, 1983; Cohen, 1996; Avruch, 1998). It focuses on studying the impact of intercultural differences between parties to conflicts on negotiation processes and their outcomes. Researchers argue that since different cultures attach different meanings to events in reality, an understanding of the adversary’s culture and its impact on the ability to reach an agreement is required. The assumption is that in the absence of common beliefs and norms, the parties to the conflict will define the situation differently and will interpret signals sent from the other party and its negotiation strategy in negotiations in different ways. These become an obstacle or disruption to the process of resolving the conflict. In this approach, importance is attached to cultural understanding and intercultural diversity, and therefore a third party, the mediator, and the parties themselves must take these factors into account when preparing for negotiations or when in negotiations. Among the dimensions that create cultural diversity and require cultural understanding are norms of communication style, the cultural values of individualism versus collectivism, egalitarianism versus hierarchy, and more.

The Transformative Approach and Peacebuilding

Studies conducted by Burton and Azar were the foundation for the development of the conflict transformation approach and peacebuilding (which was also based on knowledge from the field of peace studies). Researchers such as the sociologist Johan Galtung (1996; 1967) and John

Paul Lederach (1997) developed frameworks that address human needs and structural sources of violence from a transformative perspective that transforms conflicts in processes of mutual influence between the various levels of society, while emphasizing the role of civil society and a civilian peace discourse in the process of peacebuilding. Galtung coined the term “positive peace,” which refers to the creation of change in relationships and is conducted as part of a long-term and in-depth proactive process.

Since the 1990s, work by Galtung and by Lederach on peacebuilding has also led to work on reconciliation processes. These processes focus on a multi-dimensional psychological process, intended to help former rivals establish a stable and lasting peace following the signing of a peace agreement (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2002; Kriesberg, 2002).

In recent decades, the focus on peacebuilding processes based on a liberal peace perception has expanded and deepened, with the liberal perception seen as central to the resolution of conflicts and peacebuilding processes. However, despite the good intentions of mediators in peace processes in civil wars and the investment of significant resources, peace processes in violent intra-state conflicts have not succeeded in bringing about lasting peace. Most of the civil wars that took place after 2003 were found to be a recurring phenomenon (Westendorf, 2015). This insight has led to the expansion of research into the factors that contribute to the success and stability of peace agreements (sustaining peace) in intra-state conflicts. Special emphasis is placed on mechanisms that may enable security and stability, the construction of functioning and legitimate government institutions that will provide the state the capabilities to implement the agreement, and third-party intervention in the peace process and at the implementation phase of the agreement (Walter, 2002; DeRouen et al., 2010). The literature also deals with mechanisms capable of addressing issues

that arise during the implementation phase, such as international oversight and arbitration mechanisms and reconciliation processes. The literature further studies the role of civil society in negotiations and at the implementation phase of the agreement (Pouligny et al., 2007; O'Reilly et al., 2015).

Some studies require the allocation of a more significant role to civilians in peacebuilding processes. Others argue that too rapid or too strong a push for democratization and reconciliation may create greater polarization and intra-state competition, rather than the cooperation required for a functioning state.

Studies conducted over the past decade point to considerable difficulty coordinating the multitude of agencies involved in state-building processes—among themselves and between themselves and the local population and the local authorities—and emphasize the need to devote intellectual time and practical effort to improving coordination. Some require the allocation of a more significant role to civilians in peacebuilding processes. Others argue that too rapid or too strong a push for democratization and reconciliation may create greater polarization and intra-state competition, rather than the cooperation required for a functioning state (Hampson & Mendeloff, 2007; Crocker et al., 2018).

International Intervention Approach—Preventive Diplomacy and Humanitarian Intervention

The traditional approaches to conflict management focused on conflicts at the state level while adhering to the principle of sovereignty, and have struggled to address the expanding and challenging phenomenon of the civil wars—the “new wars” (Kaldor, 2006)—that has grown since the end of the 20th century. These have included massacres of innocent civilians in the territories of sovereign states

committed either by the state or sponsored by the state; chaos created within the boundaries of the states where fighting took place; and mass displacement and regional and global dangers inherent in conflicts spilling beyond the borders of the state where they arise. These challenges demanded new theoretical and practical thinking and led to the development of a discourse on human security, which focused on an effective response to prevent violence and cease violent conflict. The international community's failures to deal with conflicts in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Somalia in the 1990s amplified the recognition that preventing and ending civil wars and creating the conditions for long-term peace requires a multidimensional, comprehensive, and proactive approach (Bercovitch & Jackson, 2009).

Preventive diplomacy is the intervention of a third party by diplomatic means or through the threat of the use of force to prevent escalation of a conflict (Ackerman, 2003; Lund, 2009) (or conflict prevention). *Humanitarian intervention* is a collective intervention using scaled measures such as diplomatic and humanitarian and even the use of force, in order to stop widespread and critical harm to the civilian population (Bellamy, 2012; 2013). Both of these approaches evolved as third-party intervention strategies. The innovation in the concept of preventive diplomacy is in the use by various actors, including the parties to the conflict, of diplomatic tools of conflict management and resolution, as part of an international early warning system against the escalation and prevention of conflicts.

The discourse of international intervention, which may also include the use of military force to protect an innocent civilian population, has created tension between the civil population's right to protection and the principle of maintaining state sovereignty and the state's right to non-interference in its internal affairs. This is the background to the emergence of the concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) as a normative legal framework for intervention,

Two paradigms: Conflict management vs. multidimensional conflict resolution

| | Conflict management paradigm | Multidimensional conflict resolution paradigm |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Period | Dominant in the field from the 1950s to the late 1970s | Dominant in the field from the 1980s to the present day |
| Political context | Cold War | Era of the "new wars" |
| Theoretical context | Based on the realist rational approach. (This period also saw the appearance of liberal approaches that served as a basis of the conflict resolution paradigm familiar today) | Post-rational theoretical period, dominance of liberal approaches combined with realist approaches |
| Approach | One dimensional: focused on the state level, rationality, and interests | Multi-dimensional: emphasis on response to needs, human security alongside state security, liberal values, multiple actors, and central importance to civil society |
| Includes | Conflict management strategies | Conflict prevention strategies Conflict management strategies Conflict resolution strategies Conflict transformation strategies |
| Negotiations paradigm | Bargaining paradigm | Problem-solving paradigm |
| Main concepts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative peace • De-escalation of conflicts • Game theory • Tit for Tat (TFT) • Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) • Peacemaking or mediation in the framework of bargaining paradigm for negotiations • Peacekeeping in the framework of the realist perspective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive peace • Peacemaking in the framework of problem solving paradigm for negotiations • Peacekeeping • Peacebuilding • The identity approach • Interest-based approach • Reconciliation • Interactive conflict resolution • The inter-cultural approach to negotiations <p>But also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De-escalation of conflicts • Games theory • Tit-for Tat (TFT) • Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) |

Source: Schiff (2019), p. 76.

including the use of force for humanitarian reasons (for more on R2P, see Bellamy, 2013). Today, the principle of humanitarian intervention is evolving in theory and in practice in the shadow of the international community's military intervention to stop combat, as in the case of Libya in 2011 and in contrast to the lack of decisive intervention to halt the harm to the

civilian population, such as in the civil war in Syria (Bellamy, 2012; 2013).

Legal, normative, political, and operational challenges make it difficult to implement R2P uniformly. While there have been some successes, the application of the principle is still stumbling and has failed to prevent or stop bloody civil wars. The selectivity in the

implementation of R2P, such as in the war in Syria, suggests that the attempt to implement it is limited by power struggles between states. Moreover, it appears that lack of response has become the new normal in an international system that is characterized by normative chaos. In the context of R2P, the claim has been made that in the face of an international system characterized as a system of global disorder, there is a need for a greater effort than in the past to build stable states with legitimate regimes, capable of realizing the state's responsibility to protect its citizens (Zartman, 2019).

Conclusion

The review presents four main clusters of research in the field of conflict resolution, and the diverse range of approaches included in them. Mitigating international conflicts, in the effort to manage or resolve them, requires the combined use of various levels of different strategies from the approaches in the field. A prerequisite for correct handling of conflict, whether by a third party or the conflict parties themselves, is an understanding and analysis of the characteristics of the conflict, while adapting and channeling optimal methods to the conflict theater.

Dr. Amira Schiff is a faculty member in the Program for Conflict Resolution, Management and Negotiation at Bar-Ilan University. She specializes in peace processes in international conflicts. Her book *Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution* (Open University Press) is due out in autumn, 2021.

References

- Aall, P. (2007). The power of nonofficial actors in conflict management. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war: Conflict management in a divided world* (pp. 477–494). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Ackerman, A. (2003). The idea and practice of conflict prevention. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(3), 339–347.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Art, R., & Cronin, P. M. (2007). Coercive diplomacy. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war: Conflict management in a divided world* (pp. 299–318). Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture and conflict resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. Basic Books.
- Azar, E. E., Jureidini, P., & McLaurin, R. (1978). Protracted social conflict: Theory and practice in the Middle East. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 29, 41–60.
- Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (2005). From conflict resolution to conflict management. In Y. Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *The Israeli-Palestinian conflict: From a peace process to violent confrontation, 2000-2005* (pp. 16–34). Jerusalem: Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies [in Hebrew].
- Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Ed.) (2010). *Barriers to peace in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies [in Hebrew].
- Bar-Tal, D., & Bennink, G. (2002). The essence of reconciliation. *Politika*, 9, 9–34 [in Hebrew].
- Bellamy, A. J. (2012). R2P—Dead or alive. In M. Brosig (Ed.), *The responsibility to protect: From evasive to reluctant action? The role of global middle powers* (pp. 11–29). Institute for Security Studies.
- Bellamy, A. J. (2013). The responsibility to protect: Towards a “living reality.” United Nations Association-UK.
- Bercovitch, J. (2009). Mediation and conflict resolution. In J. Bercovitch, V. A. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 340–357). Sage.
- Bercovitch, J., & Jackson, R. (2009). *Conflict resolution in the twenty-first century: Principles, methods, and approaches*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Bercovitch, J., Kremenyuk, V. A., & Zartman, I. W. (2009). Introduction: The nature of conflict and conflict resolution. In J. Bercovitch, V. A. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman, (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of conflict resolution*. Sage.
- Boulding, K. E. (1962). *Conflict and defense: A general theory*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Burton, J. W. (1969). *Conflict and communication: The use of controlled communication in international relations*. Macmillan.
- Burton, J. W. (1987). *Resolving deep-rooted conflict: A handbook*. University Press of America.
- Cohen, R. (1996). Cultural aspects of international mediation. In J. Bercovitch (Ed.), *Resolving international conflicts: The theory and practice of mediation* (pp. 107–128). Lynne Rienner.
- Crocker, C. A., Hampson, F. O., & Aall, P. (2018). *International negotiation and mediation in violent conflict*. Routledge.
- Davidson, W. D., & Montville, J. V. (1981). Foreign policy according to Freud. *Foreign Policy*, 45, 145–157.
- DeRouen, K. Jr., Ferguson, M. J., Norton, S., Park, Y. H., Lea, J., & Streat-Bartlett, A. (2010). Civil war peace agreement implementation and state capacity. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(3), 333–346.

- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. Yale University Press.
- Diamond, L., & McDonald, J. (1996). *Multi-track diplomacy: A systems approach to peace*. Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy.
- Druckman, D. (1986). Stages, turning points and crises: Negotiating base rights, Spain and the United States. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 30(2), 327–360.
- Fisher, R. J. (2005). Introduction: Analyzing successful transfer effects in interactive conflict resolution. In R. J. Fisher (Ed.), *Paving the way: Contributions of interactive conflict resolution to peacemaking*. Lexington Books.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating without giving in*. Penguin.
- Galtung, J. (1967). *Theories of peace: A synthetic approach to peace thinking*. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute.
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. PRIO.
- George, A. L. (1996). The role of force in diplomacy: Continuing dilemma for U.S. foreign policy. In C. Crocker, F. Hampson & P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing Global Chaos*. United States Institute of Peace. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/military/force/article.html#1>
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1983). *Hidden differences: Studies in international communications, how to communicate with the Germans*. New York: Stern.
- Hampson, F. O., & Mendeloff, D. (2007). Intervention and the nation-building debate. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war: Conflict management in a divided world* (pp. 679–700). United States Institute of Peace.
- Hopmann, P. T. (2001). Bargaining and problem solving: Two perspectives on international negotiation. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. R. Aall (Eds.), *Turbulent peace: The challenges of managing international conflict* (pp. 445–468). United States Institute of Peace.
- Iklé, F. C. (1964). *How nations negotiate*. Harper and Row.
- Kaldor, M. (2006). *New and old wars: Organized violence in a global era*. Polity Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1991). Interactive problem solving: The uses and limits of a therapeutic model for the resolution of international conflicts. In V. D. Volkan, D. A. Julius, & J. V. Montville (Eds.), *The psychodynamics of international relationships* (pp. 145–160). Lexington Books.
- Kelman, H. C. (1998). Social-psychology contributions to peacemaking and peacebuilding in the Middle East. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47, 5–28.
- Kriesberg, L. (2002). Reconciliation actions in the domestic arena and in the international arena. *Politika*, 9, 35–58 [in Hebrew].
- Kriesberg, L., & Neu, J. (2018). Conflict analysis and resolution as a field: Core concepts and issues. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.512>
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lund, M. S. (2009). Conflict prevention: Theory in pursuit of policy and practice. In J. Bercovitch, V. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 287–321). Sage.
- Maoz, Z., Mintz, A., Morgan, T. C., Palmer, G., & Stoll, R. J. (Eds.), (2004). *Multiple paths to knowledge in international relations*. Lexington Books.
- Mitchell, C. (2014). *The nature of intractable conflict: Resolution in the twenty-first century*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nan, S. A. (2005). Track one-and-a-half diplomacy: Contributions to Georgian-South Ossetian peacemaking. In R. J. Fisher (Ed.), *Paving the way: Contributions of interactive conflict resolution to peacemaking* (pp. 161–173). Lexington Books.
- O'Reilly, M., Súilleabháin, A. Ó., & Paffenholz, T. (2015). Reimagining peacemaking: Women's roles in peace processes. International Peace Institute.
- Osgood, C. (1962). *An alternative to war and surrender*. University of Illinois Press.
- Pouligny, B., Chesterman, S., & Schnabel, A. (Eds.). (2007). *After mass crime: Rebuilding states and communities*. United Nations University Press.
- Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary conflict resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts* (4th ed.). Polity Press.
- Rapoport, A. (1960). *Fights, games, and debates*. University of Michigan Press.
- Rapoport, A. (1966). *Two-person game theory: The essential ideas*. University of Michigan Press.
- Schelling, T. (1960). *The strategy of conflict*. Harvard University Press.
- Schelling, T. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press.
- Schiff, A. (2019). *Conflict resolution in the international arena*. Open University Press. Temporary edition [in Hebrew].
- Touval, S., & Zartman, I. W. (2001). International mediation in the post-cold war era. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. R. Aall (Eds.), *Turbulent peace: The challenges of managing international conflict* (pp. 427–443). United States Institute of Peace.
- Vuković, S. (2015). International multiparty mediation and conflict management: Challenges of cooperation and coordination. Routledge.
- Vuković, S. (2019). International multiparty mediation: Prospects for a coordinated effort. *Global Policy*, 10, 76–83.
- Walter, B. F. (2002). *Committing to peace: The successful settlement of civil wars*. Princeton University Press.
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (Eds.). (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations*. McGraw-Hill.
- Westendorf, J. K. (2015). *Why peace processes fail: Negotiating insecurity after civil war*. Lynne Rienner.

- Young, O. R. (1967). *The intermediaries: Third parties in international crises*. Princeton University Press.
- Zartman, I. W. (1995). Dynamics and constraints in negotiations in internal conflicts. In I. W. Zartman (Ed.), *Elusive peace: Negotiating an end to civil wars* (pp. 3–24). Brookings Institution.
- Zartman, I. W. (2000). The hurting stalemate and beyond. In P. C. Stern & D. Druckman (Eds.), *Conflict resolution after the Cold War* (pp. 224–250). National Academy Press.
- Zartman, I. W. (2008). Ripeness revisited: The push and pull of conflict management. In I. W. Zartman (Ed.), *Essays on theory and practice* (pp. 232–244). Routledge.
- Zartman, I. W. (2012). Process reasons for failure. In F. Cede & G. O. Faure (Eds.), *Unfinished business: Why international negotiations fail* (pp. 303–317). University of Georgia Press.
- Zartman, I. W. (2019). Fragmented conflict: Handling the current world disorder. *Global Policy*, 10, 6–13.
- Zartman, I. W., & Berman, M. R. (1982). *The practical negotiator*. Yale University Press.

Note

- 1 Space constraints prohibit the mention of all relevant research sources in the current review. For a more extensive review of the literature on conflict resolution, see A. Schiff (2019), *Conflict Resolution in the International Arena*. Raananna: The Open University Press.