In N. Young (Ed.), *The Oxford international encyclopedia of peace* (Vol., 3, pp. 453–458). New York: Oxford University Press. 2010.

Europe; Ecology and Peace; Forced Migration; Gender and Peace; Global Political Economy; Indigenous Peoples' Rights; Internal Conflicts; International Human Rights; Nonviolence; Peace Culture and Communications; Peace Education; Peace History; Peace Journalism; Peace Movements; Peace Theories; Reconciliation Commission; Religion and Peace; Security and Disarmament; Youth and Peace.

[*See also* Bentham, Jeremy, and Liberal Internationalism; Boulding, Kenneth; Bouthoul, Gaston; Center for Research on Conflict Resolution; Cold War; Conflict Resolution; Erasmus, Desiderius; Game Theory; Ghandian Influence on Peace Movement; Gender and Peace Cultures; International Peace Research Institute; Kant, Immanuel; King, Martin Luther, Jr.; Lentz, Theodore; Nordic Peace Research; Peace, Negative and Positive; Peace Institutes, Global; Peace Science and the Peace Science Society; Peace Studies; Penn, William; Philosophy; Postmodern Approaches to Peace; Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs; Rapoport, Anatol; Richardson, Lewis Fry; Russell, Bertrand; Saint-Pierre, Abbé de; Sorokin, Pitirim; Stockholm International Peace Research Institute; Universities, Peace in; *and* Wright, Quincy.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, Ulrich. "The Costs of Armamentism." *Journal of Peace Research* 10, no. 3 (1973): 265–283.

Brinton, Crane. *The Anatomy of Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1938.

Dedring, Juergen. *Recent Advances in Peace and Conflict Research: A Critical Survey*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1976.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1970.

Harty, Martha, and John Modell. "The First Conflict Resolution Movement, 1956–1971: An Attempt to Institutionalize Applied Interdisciplinary Social Science." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35, no. 4 (1991): 720–758.

Kriesberg, Louis. "The Development of the Conflict Resolution Field." In *Peacekeeping in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, edited by I. William Zartmann and Lewis Rasmussen, pp. 51–77.Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press 1997.

Krippendorff, Ekkehardt. *Staat und Krieg. Die historische Logik politischer Unvernunft*. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1984.

Laswell, Harold D. *Psychopathology and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Lewin, Kurt. *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper and Row, 1948.

Mitrany, David. *A Working Peace System*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1943.

Nobel, Jaap, ed. *The Coming of Age of Peace Research*. Groningen, The Netherlands: STYX, 1991.

Patomaki, Heikki. "The Challenge of Critical Theories: Peace Research at the Start of the New Century." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 6 (2001): 723–737.

Ramsbotham, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity, 1999.

Richardson, Lewis F. *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*. Pacific Grove, Calif.: Boxwood, 1960

Rogers, Paul, and Oliver Ramsbotham. "Then and Now: Peace Research—Past and Future." *Political Studies* 47, no. 4 (1999): 740–754.

Senghaas, Dieter. *Abschreckung und Frieden. Studien zur Kritik organisierter Friedlosigkeit*. 3d ed. Frankfurt, Germany: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1981.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Vol. 4. New York: Bedminster, 1941.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. The *Sociology of Revolution*. Philadelphia, Pa.: J. B. Lippincott, 1925.

Wallensteen, Peter. "The Growing Peace Research Agenda." *Kroc Institute Occasional Papers*, no. 21 (2001).

Wallensteen, Peter, ed. *Peace Research: Achievements and Challenges*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1988.

Woolman, David C. *"International Development of Peace Studies and Education."* Presented at the World Education Fellowship Biennial Conference, Hartford, Conn., 1992.

Wright, Quincy. *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

JOÁM EVANS PIM

Beginnings

The beginnings of peace research—as a movement and as a defined discipline (or interdiscipline, to be more exact)—are usually set in the 1950s. Exactly when in the 1950s peace research is said to have begun varies among researchers.

Important forerunners carried out peace research before the 1950s and provided models and insights for an emerging and developing field—most notably Quincy Wright, Lewis Richardson, and Pitirim Sorokin, who pioneered the interdisciplinary, empirical, and quantitative study of the problems of war and peace. One should add to the list Mary Parker Follett, whose work on creative problem solving anticipated much of the recent work on conflict resolution. There were also scholars in the 1940s who defined peace research as a distinct domain of study and established programs to pursue it, notably Ted Lentz, an early advocate of the concept of a science of peace, and Bert Röling, who used

the term *polemology* to designate the field (and who later became one of the founders of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA). As an organized effort and intellectual movement, however, peace research began in the 1950s.

This entry offers an account of those beginnings of peace research as experienced and personally participated in by one of the founders of that movement. Having chosen social psychology as a field of graduate study because he saw it as a discipline in which his interests in the issues of peace, justice, and social change could be pursued, the author began graduate work at Yale University in 1947. In 1951, while completing his doctoral dissertation, the author joined Arthur Gladstone, a colleague at Yale (and, like himself, a conscientious objector to the Korean War) in publishing a letter in *The American Psychologist*, which pointed out that pacifist theory rests on a number of psychological assumptions that could be put to empirical test, and proposed that psychologists and other social scientists might fruitfully place such efforts on their research agenda.

The Gladstone-Kelman letter elicited a number of responses, some in the pages of *The American Psychologist* and others in private correspondence. Some of the responses were negative, reflecting the mood of the McCarthy era in which the United States found itself at the time. Many, however, were supportive. Among the positive respondents was Harold Guetzkow, another pioneer of peace research, who also started out as a social psychologist but transformed himself into an international relations (IR) specialist and later—along with Chadwick Alger and other colleagues—developed the Inter-Nation Simulation (INS), which became a major tool for research and training in international relations.

The positive responses to this letter identified a community of scholars interested in pursuing a peace research agenda. The respondents were mostly, but not entirely, young (Ted Lentz was part of the initial group) and mostly, but not entirely, psychologists. They called a meeting at one of the psychological conventions in 1951, at which it was decided to establish an organization devoted to the promotion of research on issues of war and peace. The group took final shape in 1952, adopting the name "Research Exchange on the Prevention of War," and began publishing the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War*, with Arthur Gladstone as editor and Herbert Kelman as book review editor. Over the next few years, the Research Exchange organized discussion groups at academic conventions, as well as symposia that included Quincy Wright and Pitirim Sorokin among others. Two symposia (including papers by Wright and Sorokin) were published in professional journals in 1954 and 1955. The Exchange also organized two summer workshops to explore theoretical approaches and research ideas in the field of peace research.

In retrospect, the Research Exchange accomplished much in the few years of its operation. From the historical perspective of today, these efforts marked the beginnings of the peace research movement. At the time, however, some of those involved were frustrated about their failure to start an active research program in peace research—to go beyond writing about what needs to be done and actually start to do it. At the organizational level, it was disappointing that they failed to attract IR specialists to the Research Exchange.

An opportunity to act on this organizational concern arose in 1954–1955, when the author was one of the first group of fellows to be invited to the newly established Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, California. Though one of the youngest members of the group, he was able—in the collegial, egalitarian atmosphere of the Center—to convene a subgroup of fellows to inform them about the Research Exchange and to solicit their advice on how to broaden its base and move the enterprise forward. The group included, among others, the economist Kenneth Boulding, the mathematical biologist Anatol Rapoport, and a young sociologist named Stephen Richardson, who had brought with him the manuscripts of two unpublished books by his late father, Lewis Richardson: *The Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* and *Arms and Insecurity*. Boulding and Rapoport, incidentally, were greatly impressed with these two manuscripts and, indeed, helped to get them published. Lewis Richardson's work persuaded them of the possibility of applying mathematical models and quantitative methods to the study of issues of war and peace.

In discussing the early history of peace research, it is important to mention that Elise Boulding was also at Stanford in 1954–1955—not as a fellow at the new Center but as the very engaged wife of Kenneth Boulding. She had become interested in the ideas of Fred Polak, one of the fellows at the Center who had written a book—in Dutch—about the impact that the image of the future—held by individuals and societies—actually

had on the reality of the future itself. She felt that it was important to make Polak's book accessible to a wider audience. She therefore proceeded to learn Dutch in order to be able to translate the book. Later, Elise Boulding obtained her doctorate in sociology and became a leading figure in the peace research movement. Following up on her interest in the image of the future, one of her important contributions to the field was the workshop on envisioning the future as a tool in peace building. Kenneth Boulding spent the final months of his stay at the Center—the summer of 1955—producing his short book, *The Image*.

The working group at the Center, after discussing the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War, decided to start a new interdisciplinary journal that would replace and expand on the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange*. We named the new publication *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: A *Quarterly for Research Related to War and Peace* (*JCR*). It was decided to base the *JCR* at the University of Michigan, because Kenneth Boulding was on the faculty there, Anatol Rapoport was about to join the Michigan faculty, and two energetic graduate students at Michigan—William Barth and Robert Hefner—were already handling the technical work of producing the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange* there.

The journal began publication in 1957 as the first in the newly emerging field of peace research. It was guided by an interdisciplinary editorial board, chaired by Kenneth Boulding. The majority of the original board members were drawn from the Michigan faculty. The historical origins of the enterprise are reflected in the long list of names (including editorial board, managing editors, associate editors, and sponsoring committee) on the cover page of the early issues of the *JCR*. It includes seventeen (out of a total of thirty-six) members of the 1954–1955 class of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, as well as the founding director of the Center, Ralph Tyler, and ten of the active members of the Research Exchange. The *JCR* was based at the University of Michigan until it moved to Yale University in 1972, where it continues to be published under the editorship of Bruce Russett. The journal has changed over the years, reflecting changes in the field, but until recently some continuity with its origins was maintained by the presence of two of the founders of the journal—the late Anatol Rapoport and the author—on the editorial board.

With the establishment of the new journal, the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War* ceased publication, and the members of the organization decided that many of its other activities could be carried out by a new committee of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), chaired by Morton Deutsch, a pioneer in the study of conflict and cooperation. SPSSI, which is a division of the American Psychological Association, had formed an active Committee on the Psychology of War and Peace in the early 1940s. In 1945, it had published a yearbook, entitled *Human Nature and Enduring Peace*, edited by Gardner Murphy. In the decade or so after World War II, however, it paid relatively little attention—as an organization—to issues of war and peace. This began to change in the mid-1950s.

One of the symposia organized by the Research Exchange was held at a joint meeting of the SPSSI and the Society for the Study of Social Problems and was published as a special issue of the SPSSI's journal, *The Journal of Social Issues* ("Research Approaches to the Study of War and Peace"), edited by Herbert C. Kelman, William Barth, and Robert Hefner, in 1955. In 1959, the SPSSI sponsored preparation of a book that was eventually published in 1965 under the title *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*, edited by the author. So the SPSSI again became the address for research on issues of war and peace. Over the years, the engagement of psychologists with these issues has grown along with the development of the field of peace research as a whole—much of it stimulated by the threat of nuclear war. By the 1990s, a separate Division of Peace Psychology was established within the American Psychological Association, which has published its own journal, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, since 1995.

Returning to 1957, the work of the editorial team that produced the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* created an interdisciplinary community of scholars at the University of Michigan interested in issues of war and peace—including, significantly, several IR specialists. This development led to the establishment of the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan, which was soon joined by J. David Singer and, in 1962, by the present author. Contrary to some historical accounts, the journal was not a product of the Center; the journal was established first and the Center was created around the journal—a product of the community of scholars engaged in editing the journal.

To provide a context for the beginnings of peace research in the 1950s, it is proposed that a major

impetus to the development of the movement in those years came from the convergence of two strands, loosely corresponding to two groups of scholars who recognized their interdependence: scholars from fields outside of international relations—such as economists, psychologists, anthropologists, or sociologists, as well as occasional physicists, biologists, or mathematicians—who were interested in applying the concepts and methods of their fields to the study of war and peace because of their strong commitment to peace (as well as, of course, the intellectual challenge of the enterprise); and scholars of international relations (many of whom also had those commitments), who felt the need to go beyond the traditional approaches of international law, international organization, and diplomatic history, and develop a scientific basis for the study of war and peace.

Among the forerunners of peace research, Lewis Richardson—a physicist/astronomer, as well as a Quaker—epitomizes the first strand. In the early 1950s, the founding of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War and the establishment of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* clearly represent the first strand: They emerged largely from the community of peace-oriented scholars who were not specialists in IR. The same can be said for some of the developments in the later 1950s and the early 1960s, including the establishment of the Canadian Peace Research Institute (founded by Hannah and David Newcombe in 1959), the Peace Research Institute in Oslo (conceived by the philosopher Arne Naess and originally established in 1959, under the direction of Johan Galtung, as a unit within the Institute for Social Research), the Polemological Institute at the University of Groningen (founded by Bert Röling in 1961), as well as the Peace Science Society (founded through the efforts of Walter Isard—like Kenneth Boulding, an economist and a Quaker).

The forerunner who epitomizes the second strand is Quincy Wright. This strand was represented, in the United States, by research and training programs established in the 1950s by Richard Snyder (at Northwestern University), Robert North (at Stanford University), and Karl Deutsch (at Yale University and later at Harvard). At Northwestern, Snyder was joined by Harold Guetzkow, who—as already mentioned—had started out as a social psychologist (and, incidentally, also came from a pacifist background). Chadwick Alger began his academic career in that Northwestern program in the late 1950s, as did a number of other major contributors to peace research. Several important projects reflecting the new approach to the study of international relations—such as the work of Snyder and colleagues applying a decision-making model to the study of international politics, the work of North and colleagues using content analysis in the study of international crises, the development of the Inter-Nation Simulation by Guetzkow and colleagues, and the "Correlates of War" project of J. David Singer and colleagues—had their origins in the 1950s and early 1960s.

The two strands needed each other in order to fulfill their potential. The nonspecialists needed the specialists in order to legitimize their forays into areas in which they had not been trained, to fill in the substantive knowledge they lacked, and to provide reality testing for their conceptual models. The IR specialists, in turn, depended on their colleagues from other disciplines as sources of concepts and methods, as well as sources of the validation and encouragement that they did not always receive in those days from their more traditional IR colleagues. The two groups thus formed a mutually beneficial coalition that provided stimulation and legitimization to both.

It is important not to exaggerate the distinctiveness of these two paths that led to the development of the North American peace research movement. Both the IR specialists and the nonspecialists shared a normative commitment to the prevention of war and to the creation of a peaceful world order. And both shared the belief that the theories and empirical research methods of the behavioral sciences can be applied to the analysis of war and peace. Over time, the different origins of the two groups of scholars became relatively unimportant as they became partners in the new interdisciplinary field of peace research. It is not surprising, in this connection, that the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* was conceived at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, which was dedicated to the development of an interdisciplinary, multilevel, methodologically diverse approach to the study of social behavior. The interweaving of the two strands in a new field of peace research shared by IR specialists and scholars from various other disciplines was already evident in the establishment of the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan. It was institutionalized in the formation of the IPRA in 1964. It was reflected in the publication of *International Behavior* in 1965. And it was fully operational in the establishment of John Burton's Centre for the Analysis of Conflict at University College, London, in 1966.

Those involved in the beginnings of the peace research movement in the 1950s could not imagine the progress that the field would make over the decades, to become a field represented (albeit not equally) in all parts of the world, ranging over many disciplines, using a wide variety of methods, and effectively integrating theory, research, and practice.

Four dichotomies have marked the field over the years, each characterized by tension between what may be seen as two opposing elements: quantitative vs. qualitative methods, theory vs. practice, a micro vs. a macro level of analysis, and peace vs. justice (or negative vs. positive peace). The challenge to the field is to bridge the gap and maintain the balance among these seemingly opposing elements. The continuing attention to both sides—and perhaps even the continuing tension between them—is necessary to the vitality of the field.

Quantitative versus Qualitative Methods

It must be remembered that the application of quantitative methods and mathematical models to the study of war and peace was one of the most important innovations of the field of peace research, starting with the work of scholars such as Richardson, Rapoport, Boulding, Isard, and many others of the forerunners and founders of the peace research movement. The use of quantitative methods was a critical step in establishing war and peace as a legitimate topic for scientific research, and it remains critical to bringing the continuing claims of the field to the attention of policy makers, political analysts, and the wider public. At the same time, it would be a mistake to fetishize quantitative methods and to treat them as the exclusive approach to the systematic study of war and peace. A vital field of peace research must be hospitable to the entire range of qualitative methods, including historical, ethnographic, literary, and narrative approaches, and such methods as participant observation, discourse analysis, and action research.

Theory versus Practice

This issue brings to mind Kurt Lewin's well-known dictum that there is nothing so conducive to theoretical insight as reflective application and practice, and nothing so practical as a good theory. The inclusion of applied researchers and reflective practitioners within the peace research enterprise is likely to enhance the quality and relevance of the research, the effectiveness of the practice, and the vitality of the shared enterprise.

The Micro versus the Macro Level

On the issue of the appropriate level of analysis, peace research is ultimately concerned with macro-level phenomena—with societal, intersocietal, and global processes. But, from its inception, one of the important contributions of the field has been the exploration of micro-level processes—such as decision-making behavior, leadership, public opinion, or the formation of national identity—that can help to explain the functioning of national or international systems. Analysis of microprocesses is particularly useful for the understanding—and the promotion—of change in macrosystems. Micro-level research may also provide useful analogs for the analysis of the behavior of larger systems, as in the use of simulation or gaming experiments. Moreover, the study of conflicts and of the resolution of conflicts between individuals or small groups is itself a legitimate focus for peace research, broadly defined. For all of these reasons, micro-level research is a legitimate and useful component of peace research, as long as we are careful to avoid the pitfalls of reductionism.

Peace versus Justice

This issue has long been and continues to be debated within the peace research movement. When peace and justice are framed in terms of negative peace—the absence of systematic collective violence, accompanied by a sense of security that such violence is improbable—and positive peace—the prevalence of conditions conducive to meeting the needs and interests of the population—two conclusions stand out: First, both negative and positive peace are high-order values and significant foci for research in their own right. Second, negative and positive peace are highly interdependent, in that negative peace is a vital condition for the fulfillment of human needs, and positive peace enhances people's sense of security and reduces the probability of large-scale violence. Nevertheless, the pursuit of justice, especially in the form of holding perpetrators accountable for human rights violations in a conflict zone, may at times be an obstacle to conflict resolution. Peace research must be alert to the possible tension between human rights and conflict resolution while continuing to maintain its commitment to both of the values from which it sprang.

[*See also* Boulding, Kenneth; Center for Research on Conflict Resolution; Correlates of War; Deutsch, Karl; International Peace Research Association; International

Peace Research Institute; Lentz, Theodore; Peace, Negative and Positive; Peace Science and the Peace Science Society; Peace Studies; Rapoport, Anatol; Richardson, Lewis Fry; Röling, Bert; Sorokin, Pitirim; Universities, Peace in; *and* Wright, Quincy.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boulding, K. E. *The Image*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.

Burton, J. W. *Conflict and Communication: Controlled Communication in International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1969.

Deutsch, K. W. *Nationalism and Social Communication*. New York: Wiley, 1953.

Follett, M. P. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper, 1942.

Guetzkow, H., C. F. Alger, R. A. Brody, R. C. Noel, and R. C. Snyder. *Simulation in International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Kelman, H. C., ed. *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Kelman, H. C., ed. "Relevance of Social Research in War Prevention—A Symposium" (with contributions by S. S. Sargent, P. A. Sorokin, and D. V. McGranahan). *Journal of Human Relations* 2, no. 3 (1954): 7–22.

Kelman, H. C., W. Barth, and R. Hefner, eds. "Research Approaches to the Study of War and Peace" (with contributions by Q. Wright, W. F. Cottrell, A. I. Gladstone, M. L. Farber, R. C. Angell, and H. C. Kelman). *Journal of Social Issues* 11, no. 1 (1955): 1–57.

Lentz, T. F. *Towards a Science of Peace*. London: Halcyon, 1955.

Murphy, G., ed. *Human Nature and Enduring Peace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1945.

North, R. C., O. R. Holsti, M. G. Zaninovich, and D. A. Zinnes. *Content Analysis: A Handbook with Applications for the Study of International Crisis*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

Richardson, L. F. *Arms and Insecurity*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Boxwood Press, 1960.

Richardson, L. F. *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Boxwood Press, 1960.

Singer, J. D., ed. *The Correlates of War. I. Research Origins and Rationale*. New York: Free Press, 1979.

Snyder, R. C., H. W. Bruck, and B. Sapin. *Decision-making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Foreign Policy Analysis Project, 1954.

Sorokin, P. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Vol. 3. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Bedminster, 1962.

Wright, Q. *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

HERBERT C. KELMAN

1990 to Present

Peace research emerged after World War II, spurred by fear that nuclear weapons could exterminate the human race. Learning through both experience and research since that time has greatly widened the peace research agenda. A significant indicator of this development was the founding meeting of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in Clarens, Switzerland, in the summer of 1963, and the first IPRA conference in Groningen, the Netherlands, in July 1965. The development of a worldwide association of peace researchers reflected the broadening of peace research to include both negative peace (eliminating violence caused by armaments) and positive peace (overcoming social structures that deprive people of necessities of a normal life, such as food, shelter, education, and medical care).

Since that time the peace research agenda has broadened to the extent that it draws on contributions from virtually all academic disciplines, while at the same time becoming a separate discipline that is required to integrate all of its components. These developments have included movement from research on reaction to violence and seriously disruptive conflict to research on preventive measures, including preventive diplomacy, early warning, and long-term peacebuilding. Very significant is how this research reveals peacebuilding roles that extend beyond government or executives of states and includes civil society organizations, businesses, local governments, and parliamentarians. Thus, peace research is illuminating Johan Galtung's (1980) assertion that there are "tasks for everybody" in the pursuit of peace. At the same time, peace research is providing knowledge required by a recent movement, supported by the UN and UNESCO, advocating the development of a "culture of peace."

Trends in Contemporary Peace Research

Seven trends illuminate the broadening contemporary scope of peace research. First, there have been increasing efforts to combine a number of tools into comprehensive peace strategies. One example is I. William Zartmann and J. Lewis Rasmussen's 1997 edited volume, *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, which describes tools and skills for peacemaking that are currently available and critically assesses their usefulness and limitations. The chapters include negotiation, mediation, adjudication, social-psychological dimensions, problem-solving workshops between unofficial representatives, religion, a diplomat's view, nongovernmental organization (NGO) perspective, and training for conflict resolution.