

Managing Conflict for a Peaceful Society

Paul Wehr

(An essay based on Otomar Bartos and Paul Wehr, *Using Conflict Theory*, 2002)

Social conflict is just as natural a part of human relations as cooperation. Though the two are often thought of as opposites, in fact they can work quite nicely together for peace if the conflict is clearly understood, then managed toward positive rather than negative consequences for Society. Over the past two centuries, humans have had to learn more and more how to manage conflict as they have increased in number and developed more destructive weapons. With each new historical crisis...a war, a revolution, a challenge from those oppressed...new theories and methods have emerged in response. While we know more about how conflict works and how to make it less harmful and more beneficial, that knowledge would be better applied if we used a few simple theories of conflict and the peacemaking methods they suggest (Chapter 3).

A conflict is a situation where conflict actors...persons, groups, organizations, governments...use conflict behavior against one another either to attain goals they believe are incompatible, or to express hostility. Often the actors (sometimes called parties) are fighting needlessly, because their goals are not incompatible, they simply seem to be. Perhaps they could end the conflict or avoid it altogether by representing those *goals*...what they demand of their opponent.. and *interests*...what they really need to have from them...with a matrix. An agreement could be reached that would insure the best interests of , the greatest payoffs for, both sides. Resolving or avoiding conflict in this way would be rational conflict action. Many conflicts are managed rationally with everyone better off as a consequence. But humans are emotional beings as well as rational ones and often hostility not reason determines conflict behavior.

Constructive conflict is where reason predominates, hostility is minimal, negotiation is prominent, and the conflict actors agree to a solution willingly. An agreement is reached when the payoffs identified have persuaded each actor that they are better off settling the dispute than continuing it. A cooperative relationship among the actors emerges with the agreement. Destructive conflict, to the contrary, is where hostility predominates and coercion by one side forces unwilling or dissatisfied agreement from the other. In such cases, negative emotions such as anger and resentment persist and can rekindle the conflict later. We

can think of conflict action as a continuum with greater or lesser amounts of coercion (Fig.2.1). The more cooperation and reward and less coercion and threat there is between the actors the better will be the chance for agreement and a good post-conflict relationship. Unfortunately, modern weapons increasingly permit conflict actors to threaten, coerce and injure their opponents. To counter this unfortunate trend, each society needs to better train its members how to reach agreement through cooperation, persuasion and reward. The more aware, deliberate and thoughtful we become in our handling of conflict, the less harm and the more benefit will result. A good approach is to ask ourselves several questions about a conflict, find a simple theory that helps answer them, and apply a method of resolving the conflict the theory suggests might be effective.

WHAT is this conflict? *Que passa aqui?* As a first step in peacemaking, we create a picture of the conflict to better understand what is happening, who is involved, and why. We *map* the conflict with questions and information. What is the context within which it happens and where are the boundaries? Who are the conflict actors; are their goals truly incompatible and why? Which are the causes and which the consequences of the conflict behavior? How do the actors' goals (positions) differ from their interests (payoffs)? What stage is the conflict in...emergence? escalation? stalemate? Is intervention appropriate? Does the good the conflict is doing for the actors outweigh the harm? What resources within and outside the conflict exist for moderating it...third side actors such as trusted mediators and intermediaries, for example? My main point here is that everyone wanting to be a peacemaker should first and foremost be a skilled conflict mapper. Of course, at the outset the map will be very incomplete. The answers to essential questions about the conflict...What? Why? When surfacing? Where going? How to control? Who controls?... will be adequately answered only as the mapper studies the conflict further.

WHY is this conflict occurring? *Porque sucede esta conflicto?* We can understand most specific conflicts by using a well-tested theory about why conflict in general happens (Chapter 3). Much conflict occurs because the opponents have incompatible goals (Fig. 3.1). They may be pursuing the same limited resources such as wealth, power and prestige, or they may occupy different positions/roles within a group or

organization and thus have different perspectives, or their standards of what is right and good may be in conflict. In some cases, all three conditions may be causing incompatibilities in the same conflict.

A contest over resources is at the root of most society-wide conflicts where large numbers of people are seeking a decent life and mutual respect. Members of social class, racial and ethnic groups and their leaders are the major actors in such conflict. A sense of injustice, when one group feels another has an undeserved share of a society's resources fuels such conflict. No human emotion is more aggravating than the feeling of being treated unfairly. The civil rights movement in the United States drew much of its strength from that emotion. So, what we have in life and think we should have, in comparison with others, may produce goal incompatibility.

Conflict may also occur when the conflict actors' goals differ because their positions and roles within an organization, such as a university or government agency, give them different levels of authority and responsibility. The higher the position, the greater the responsibility for the wellbeing of the organization as a whole rather than for simply a part of it, such as a department. Our roles in our family, our workplace, our church may be another reason why our goals conflict with those of others. The goals and perspectives of parents and children, for example, will differ greatly out of such role distinctions.

Finally, the incompatibility of a person or group's standards of rightness and goodness with those of another may be a source of conflict. When communities are separated, their value systems diverge over time, increasing the potential for conflict between them when the modern urban world brings them together. Separation can be forced, where race or caste has been used to prevent free interaction, or less direct, as where social classes are separated geographically and socially by wealth disparities, education, and housing opportunities.

When we apply the theory of goal incompatibility to an actual conflict, such as the US civil rights struggle of the 1960s, we can learn much about why the conflict occurred (Figures 3.2 and 4.1). By identifying the various causal elements and their directions of influence, we can also learn how similar conflicts might be moderated in other settings or societies. Where could we as citizens or policy makers make changes that would make the goals of potential conflict groups more compatible, shorten the periods of their conflict, reduce the hostility, the resentment, the violence?

I noted that hostility might also be a cause of a social conflict. Since very few communities, groups or individuals are innately hostile or bellicose toward others, the hostility usually stems from a lack of communication or even miscommunication with them. This often produces a negative feedback dynamic, a sort of “self-fulfilling prophecy.” The less “we/they” communicate with “them/us”, the less accurate knowledge the actors have about one another, the more suspicion, stereotyping, feelings of hostility develop.

Reducing the causes of conflict. I have suggested that social conflict in general and the particular conflict one is mapping occur because of (1) incompatible goals of those in conflict, and (2) hostility and miscommunication between them. There are ways to reduce that incompatibility and hostility. Some of these you are quite familiar with since they are native to your own society. Strengthening and refining those “home grown” techniques would be the most effective approach and is probably already being done by peace-supportive institutions in Dominican society.

Preventing unnecessary conflict by eliminating its causes is always less costly than resolving it once it emerges (p. 148.) A society can do so first by training its members to regard *conflict as both friend and foe*. When conflict occurs in a controlled manner, without disruption and violence, it permits necessary social change to occur gradually. It is then Society’s friend. When conflict is suppressed, denied, ignored, it builds up toward explosion and violence and becomes Society’s enemy. To strengthen the friendly face of conflict, a society can teach its members how to engage in conflict behavior without harming others. Such “conflict education” would include developing *third side* and *safety-valve* organizations such as mediation agencies, even civil disobedience training by which citizens learn how to resist the state nonviolently when it violates their civil and human rights. Ensuring that such third sides exist to which conflict groups can turn for help when conflict is emerging and escalating is extremely important.

Consultation is another way of preventing unnecessary conflict. When those in authority make decisions they then impose on others, whose interests and opinions have not been represented in the decision, a latent conflict is created and will emerge sooner or later as confrontation. Inclusive decisionmaking involves those affected by the decisions and reduces their sense of being controlled by others, control no one happily accepts.

Much conflict results unnecessarily from misunderstanding when we do not communicate clearly. So, teaching ourselves and others *better communication skills* is an important way to prevent conflict. Much of that skill can be taught formally in the schools and in adult training courses. The technique of “active listening” (p. 152), for example, not only helps the listener better understand a speaker’s message but encourages the latter to send a clearer message, and to feel listened to.

Finally, Society can *inhibit the development of conflict groups* in a number of ways. It can maximize free interaction across the inevitable group boundaries that give structure to Society. The more people within those groups can share with others across those boundaries, the less likely is harmful conflict to develop. Regular meetingplaces like church, school, workplace can be particularly useful for encouraging bonding rituals (p. 154) which emphasize values and memberships...religious faith, national identity, common humanity... that unite rather than separate people within a society.

Of course, *redistribution of life chances* is perhaps the most important way a society can inhibit conflict group development. The greater the perceived social and economic distance between classes in a society, the greater the likelihood of eventual harmful conflict. The “revolution of rising expectations” will sooner or later occur and latent conflict will develop into open confrontation. Present-day Venezuela is an excellent case in point. There is no more effective preventer of serious conflict in society than social justice.

WHEN will conflict emerge and WHERE will it go? Every conflict can be said to have a *path* that originates in a latency period. Certain conditions have been preparing for its emergence (Fig. 5.2). As I have just noted, some conflicts can be prevented from developing past a *latent stage*. With those that cannot, at some point conflict groups begin to form identities...a sense of “we-ness” and “they-ness.” A group’s solidarity begins to build, drawing on emotions based in common grievances and free interaction among its members. Even in interpersonal conflict a sort of “solidarity” can develop as individual actors talk to themselves, build self-confidence and look for supporters. As conflict actors organize and mobilize their conflict resources, they reach a high level of sensitivity and readiness. Only a *triggering event* is required to bring a latent conflict into the open.

Since the event that brings a conflict into the open releases much pent-up energy and negative feeling toward an opponent, most conflict groups are too influenced by emotion and the immediate demands of

mobilizing their members to plan rationally for the most productive emergence of their conflict. They inevitably see the conflict initially as a power contest...a win-lose struggle. A society's universities are particularly vulnerable to conflict around ideological, ethical and social differences as they increasingly admit members of disadvantaged groups as students and faculty. Incompatibility of goals within a more open university will likely be caused by all three of the influences already noted....contested resources and values incompatibility because of more student/faculty diversity, and role differences because of its bureaucratic structure. As institutions where intellect and reason are prized and practiced, one might expect conflict there to be more amenable to thoughtful and productive analysis. But from our experience, academicians seem as vulnerable to emotion's triumph over reason as those outside the university. A case in point is a destructive conflict within and around a university sociology department we describe (Chapter 6), that with careful strategizing on all sides might have been ended more creatively.

Conflict actors can make conflict emergence productive. With conscious analysis and strategizing, they can control the conflict and direct it toward outcomes beneficial for all involved. Such analytical thinking is not easy for conflict groups in the emergence stage since they are, at that point, by definition self-centered and must be so to build solidarity and identity. They see the conflict as struggle not problem-solving. Still, they could be more successful even then by building conflict mapping into their strategizing. Early on, they would *analyze the goals/positions and interests/payoffs*, their's and opponent's alike, to learn where true goals/interests incompatibility existed. They might also create an *influence map*, a matrix showing what it is they want their opponents to do and the various ways (with costs attached) they could influence them to do so. Such an exercise clarifies the emerging conflict for the conflict group... the true issues, the possible payoffs for them and their opponents, where they should look for allies and other resources, the best means of integrating and mobilizing their group, and the best *power strategies mix* (p. 163) of persuasion/reward/coercion for achieving their interests.

An emerging conflict will be more productively managed the more the conflict actors move toward cooperation and away from coercion. In cooperative conflict, the actors see their conflict as a problem to be solved together so that all sides achieve all or many of their interests. This is commonly called a win-win approach to managing conflict. In competitive conflict, however, the actors see themselves not as joint

problem-solvers but as power contestants, one winning (usually by force of one sort or another), what the other loses.

To keep an emerging conflict from escalating, the actors must first “reframe” their conflict as a problem to be solved by them rather than as a contest over rights or power (p. 157). *Negotiation* is the usual method they use once reframing has occurred. The opponents-turned-problem solvers engage in methods that will get each of them, with the other’s help, much if not all they want. One common negotiation method is “integrative bargaining” (p. 158) where agreement is sought on the basis of achieving for the negotiators their interests/payoffs not the specific positions/goals they may be stating. For example, in Table 2.2, the interests of both the workers and the managers are to have the firm continue to operate with workers feeling they are fairly paid. Their demands and offers (ie their goals)may not accurately reflect those deeper interests. Integrative bargaining, sometimes called interest-based negotiation, has several stages; first, promoting trust between the negotiators, then imagining multiple solutions that could bring agreement, then insuring the fairness of the agreement by using accepted standards from the outside (Fisher and Ury, “The Method.”). Only if the negotiators have a good relationship and feel fairly treated when they reach agreement, are the negotiations truly successful.

Such conflict management approaches as integrative bargaining would fit within a society’s *institutionalized peacemaking framework* (p. 161) that would include: *institutional forms* such as neighborhood mediation centers; *social peacemaker roles* like professional mediators and police trained in negotiation and nonviolent peacekeeping; the *social norms* of fairness, reciprocity and equality that underly peaceful settlement of disputes; the *rules and procedures* of conflict management taught perhaps in the schools (Deutsch, “Factors Influencing”). When such a framework is in place, citizens and groups increasingly use it to settle their conflicts.

As emerging conflict comes to be directed in more equal measure by reason and emotion, it becomes more easily controlled and directed toward ends beneficial for the conflict actors and Society alike. But human nature and the dynamics of conflict being what they are, much conflict will escalate in intensity despite our best efforts to moderate it. Controlling that escalation and reversing it toward settlement is a serious

challenge. We are slowly learning how to do it, but as the flawed efforts in Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor and Somalia in the 1990s suggest, we still have far to go.

When a Conflict Escalates. An escalating conflict takes on a life of its own. It seems to control the actors involved rather than they it. In a perverse way, escalation is both necessary for conflict groups to achieve goals/interests, and dangerous for them as conflict intensity and negative emotions carry them along. We speak of *runaway processes* that occur as conflict escalates. Attitudes become hostile, individuals polarize into tighter factions, more moderate leaders are replaced by extremists, personal antagonism replaces disagreement over issues, physical weapons replace verbal ones.

Conflict escalation can be either unilateral or reciprocated (Chapter 7). In the former case, one side can increase the conflict intensity even though the other does not retaliate. In the latter, there is retaliation by both sides, usually with the response of each being a bit more hostile than the one received. Thus a spiral of retaliation is formed, a kind of tit-for-tat dynamic. Escalation can also be either a strategic rational choice of one or both sides, or of non-rational motivation as hostility takes over. Usually both reason and emotion are influencing the escalation.

Escalation can occur because at least one side has achieved enough internal solidarity, has increased its conflict resources, and sees escalating the conflict to be to its strategic advantage. An illustration of this might be the current Bush administration's unilateral escalation of its conflict with the Sadaam Hussein regime in Iraq. Bush escalated the conflict substantially after his solidarity with US Americans had soared following the September 11 attacks, after the US Congress had voted him the money and the authority to escalate, and as victory over Sadaam was seen by him and his political advisors as ensuring his re-election in 2004.

Deescalation of a conflict occurs for several reasons. As the conflict persists it becomes more and more costly for the conflict actors. They start to use up their resources, solidarity on their side begins to weaken, and feedback (p. 114) from the costs and the emotional strain of the conflict begin to make accommodation with, rather than victory over, the other side more attractive (Figure 8.7). Strategic considerations on one or both sides may also suggest the wisdom of deescalating, even unilaterally. Bush, for example, might realize

that a US economy weakened by war fears and oil supply disruption might reduce his chances of re-election. Sadaam might decide that full cooperation with the UN might save his regime.

WHO controls escalation? Escalating conflict can be a dangerous and costly process with unpredictable consequences. Emotions such as hostility and revenge are ever increasing. The momentum of retaliation has captured the conflict. Often potential third side peacemakers are forced to wait for a *stalemate*, when the conflict actors are exhausted and impoverished. Given the increasing availability of modern weaponry, reaching stalemate can be immensely costly in human suffering. There are, fortunately, better ways to control escalation than waiting for opponents to tire. Escalation can be controlled both by the actors in a conflict themselves through their power strategies, and by third side intervenors from outside the conflict.

The Role of the Power Strategist. Each side in a conflict makes use of a mix of what Kenneth Boulding has called the three faces of power: threat, exchange and integration (p. 163). Each can be forcing the other to do something, or persuading them to do so by trading with them, or giving them something, expecting nothing in return but a peaceful relationship. As a conflict escalates, both sides generally move quickly to use force against the other, as did the conflict actors in the Nicaraguan civil war of the 1980s (Wehr/Nepstad, “Nicaragua”). If, instead, the sides in such a conflict were to use a *mix of power strategies* that would bring about an early deescalation, they could reduce the costs of the conflict. For a more conciliatory mix, the conflict actors would emphasize exchange (negotiation) and integration (gift) over force (threat) in their behavior toward one another. In the Nicaraguan case, over a period of years, various factors led the Sandinista government to shift its strategic mix increasingly toward conciliation and settlement. The US civil rights movement, by contrast, made the opposite shift, from integration and conciliation toward separation and force, as its focus moved from South to North (Wehr, “Nonviolence-Differentiation”).

Self-Limiting Conflict. A conflict group can control escalation by renouncing violent action. The model for this would, of course, be the Gandhian movement of the 20th century. With their ethical commitment to nonviolence and the methods they invented to limit a conflict’s intensity, the Gandhians were able to push for liberation and justice in a controlled fashion with *stepwise escalation* (p. 171). Gandhi and his movement leaders would retreat to an ashram at the end of each satyagraha campaign for days or weeks of prayer,

meditation, discussion, manual labor before deciding whether to escalate their action and step up the pressure on their opponents. They might even *loop back* to a lower level if successful negotiation with their opponents had become more likely. In that way, escalation would be controlled by reasoned decision and not spiral out of control as it otherwise might. To reach agreement at the lowest level of conflict without sacrificing principle was the movement's intention (Wehr, "Self-Limiting Conflict").

The Role of the Third Side Intervenor. While getting conflict actors to use moderating strategies when a conflict is escalating is a worthy objective, the process by which conflict groups are formed makes it very difficult to achieve. Expecting conflictants to be rational rather than emotional as conflict escalates may be unrealistic. We therefore most often turn to intervenors from outside the conflict for help. The third side, often referred to as third-parties, are those actors not directly involved in a conflict who are asked to intervene to move it toward deescalation and a settlement. They must be impartial toward those in conflict so they will be trusted to be fair in their intervention.

Perhaps the most common form of third side intervention is *mediation*, a process where a mediator, often with formal training, is asked by the sides in conflict to help them reach a settlement, and sometimes to ensure that the agreement reached is adhered to by the signatories. Mediation involves formal sessions, out-of-session consultation and preparatory work. A mediator facilitates the development of a settlement and may even make suggestions for it, but it is the negotiators on each side who create the settlement.

Arbitration is a second form of intervention. The arbitrator asks the disputants to describe their conflict and often for their proposals to resolve it, and then decides what the settlement should be, a decision which, in binding arbitration, the conflict actors agree beforehand to accept. In arbitration, the disputants usually have little involvement in building the solution, while in mediation, great emphasis is given to the conflictants themselves creating the solution. In both mediation and arbitration, the third sider creates a triangular relationship structure for the conflict by intervening. The dynamics, too, change between the conflictants in that the mediator transforms them from contestants into cooperating problem-solvers with three-way communication patterns. The presence of a mediator also encourages the disputants to be more reasonable and communicative, and less hostile toward one another (p. 166).

The *intermediary* is yet another type of third side intervenor. Intermediation is much less formal and structured than mediation and arbitration, often as simple as carrying messages between adversaries. Religious organizations known for their pacifist convictions are often accepted as intermediaries. Quaker intermediaries sometimes work for years simply meeting with the opposing sides, building trust with and between them, laying groundwork for what might eventually be a peaceful resolution of such intractable conflicts as the Sri Lankan civil war. Mennonites performed such an intermediary function in the conflict between the indigenous peoples and the Sandinista government in Nicaragua (Wehr/Lederach, "Mediating Conflict").

In *interposition*, third side intervenors stop harmful conflict by physically separating the conflictants, as when parents send fighting children to separate rooms. Interposition is the basis for United Nations peacekeeping and has been used by the UN in numerous civil wars over 40 years. In a few cases, other multinational organizations such as NATO, the European Union and the Organization of African Unity have practiced interposition. Interposition requires that the third side is intervening as a neutral party against neither one military force nor another. In recent years, however, humanitarian intervention has become more common, with a third side intervention against military and paramilitary forces to protect a civilian population, followed by physical separation of the forces once fighting has stopped. Humanitarian intervention may be increasingly necessary but it involves great risk of failure, which the uncontrolled escalation and botched interventions in the Bosnian civil war have demonstrated all too well (p. 143). Intervention in conflict when the intervenor is not perceived as neutral and fair is fraught with danger for all concerned.

The Skills of the Conflict Moderator. Every concept and method discussed in these pages can be used to manage conflict at any level of human interaction...interpersonal, intergroup, intraorganizational, international. The application will differ somewhat according to the level, but the theory and the practice it supports remains essentially the same. If one learns to practice the theory in one's personal life, he or she can use those principles and methods just as effectively in the workplace, in the classroom, in the neighborhood, at home. A culture of peace develops within a society to the degree that its citizens become

conflict moderators, people who know how conflict works and how to “do” it without harming themselves or others in the process. The possibilities for training as a conflict management professional increase each year (Chapter 10).

Discovering, Borrowing and Inventing.

A society develops a structure and culture of peace in three ways. First, it examines itself and how it already handles conflict. What are the norms, the roles, the organizations, the practices already in place that manage conflict in Dominican society? Much of this peacemaking capacity will have been time-tested over centuries. What is already in place and works well should be at the core of a society’s peace culture. This discovery by citizens of “how we make peace” might be an exercise for each schoolchild to learn with. Second, a society looks outside itself to borrow what other societies use, particularly those national cultures closest to it geographically and linguistically (See Appendix B).

Finally, a society combines peacemaking practices it already uses with useful “borrowings” to create new approaches as they are needed. Often such “social inventing” occurs in response to crisis. To end its civil wars in the 1980s, Central America had to create the peacemaking structure and process of Esquipulas, a process led by Costa Rica, which had learned the benefits of internal peace after abolishing its army in 1948. To end their civil war, the Nicaraguans had to invent a novel combination of outsider-neutral and insider-partial mediation (Wehr/Lederach, “Mediating Conflict”). Nicaraguan society also used an unusual set of conflict-moderating restraints to reduce the violence during the war itself (Wehr/Nepstad, “Nicaragua”). While I noted that much conflict knowledge has been created over the past two centuries, much more remains to be invented by the world’s peoples. Each national *structuroculture of peace* is part of a global violence reduction network with electronic information sharing within it becoming ever easier and cheaper (Wehr, “Toward a History”).

The Marriage of Reason and Emotion.

I have emphasized the need to use human rationality more deliberately in how we manage conflict. Fear, anger and resentment too often take over conflict to lead it to uncontrolled escalation and violence. Yet, it is important to remember that other powerful emotions such as love and compassion are also at work to

restrain us in our conflict. With the value of both reason and emotion in mind, conflict actors must use the proper combination of those two essential motivators as they manage their own and others' conflict.

Peacemaking in Theory and Practice.

Let us review some important points about how conflict works and the ways humans have learned to reduce its harmful consequences. A conflict begins in a latent form because conditions for it develop. We can control its intensity when it occurs by watching for its early warning signs and changing the conflict conditions by altering the social, economic and political structures producing incompatible goals. I noted that goals (what we demand from an opponent)and interests (what will best meet our true needs) are by no means identical and that by using payoff matrices we can learn what the interests of conflict actors really are and how incompatible goals can give way to compatible payoffs. We saw that by mapping a conflict we can understand its several elements, each of which can be influenced with certain methods like clearer ways of communicating, negotiation skills, and careful strategizing by conflict groups. We saw how and when latent conflict emerges, the dynamics such as retaliation and spiralling by which it escalates, and the various ways such as third side intervention and self-limiting conflict by which escalation can be controlled and made less violent.

Finally, I noted how a society can build into its educational, economic and political structures the capacity to understand and manage conflict for the good of all its members. The more compatible are the goals and interests of the various groups in a society, the less they are separated by contested resources, the more easily one can move across group boundaries, the more manageable will be its conflict. There won't necessarily be *less* conflict, but it will be less intense, more predictable, more routine, and therefore more beneficial in its outcomes. When conflict does surface, as it inevitably will... in families, neighborhoods, workplaces... people will know how to handle it constructively. The structures and culture of peace will be

there to support them as they remember and practice certain principles of conflict knowledge such as:

- 1) Conflict action is a cooperation/coercion continuum, so to reach agreement , use methods toward the cooperative rather than the coercive end.
- 2) Conflict can be friend or foe to Society and its members, so create structures to help it be friendly.

- 3) Conflict develops in stages. Prevent it in its latent form if possible, guide it toward cooperative resolution if it emerges, with a strong third side ready to intervene if it escalates.
- 4) The skill of managing conflict is learned, so teach children the value of mediation and self-limiting conflict methods such as stepwise escalation.
- 5) Resolving disputes requires identifying alternatives and determining which will provide acceptable payoffs for the disputants.
- 6) Goals may often be made more compatible by communicating more clearly and by representing the conflict as a payoff matrix..
- 7) A power contest will give way to negotiation as it is reframed as a mutual problem to be solved.

Note: The page, figure and chapter references are to material in Otomar Bartos and Paul Wehr, Using Conflict Theory . The other references give author/title information for articles in English available at Paul Wehr's homepage at <<http://socsci.colorado.edu/~wehr/index.html>>

Appendix A

Relevant Literature in English

Otomar Bartos and Paul Wehr, Using Conflict Theory, New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Kenneth Boulding, Three Faces of Power, Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications, 1989

Morton Deutsch, The Resolution of Conflict, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1973

Roger Fisher, International Conflict for Beginners, New York: Harper and Row, 1970

Roger Fisher and William Ury, Getting to Yes: Negotiating Without Giving In, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981

Paul Wehr and John Paul Lederach, "Mediating Conflict in Central America," *Journal of Peace Research*, 28:1, February 1991

Paul Wehr, Heidi Burgess and Guy Burgess (eds), Justice Without Violence, Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994

Paul Wehr, "Toward a History of Nonviolence," Peace and Change, 20:1, 1995

Relevant Literature in Spanish

Appendix B

Programs for Conflict Management Study and Research

Universidad para la Paz, Apartado 199-1250 Escazu, Costa Rica, Fax 506 49-19-29

Centro Estudios Internacionales, Apartado 1747 Managua, Nicaragua, Fax 505 26-70-517

IRIPAZ, 1a Calle 9-52 Zona 1, 01001 Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala, 502 2 531-532

Institute for Peace Research (IPRCNM), Apto. Postal 14-0034, Lima 14, Peru, Fax 51 14 492 645

Peace/ Integration Studies, Univ. Nur, Av. Banzer No. 100, Casilla 3273, Santa Cruz, Bolivia

Latin American Council of Peace Research, Prov. Rio Bravo #1, Col. Vita Hermosa 62290, Cuernavaca Mor., Mexico, Fax 52 7317 59 81

Peace Research Center, Foru Plaze z/g, E-48300 Gernika-Lumo, Spain Fax 34 4 6256765.

Conflict Transformation Studies, Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg VA 22801-2462 USA

Fax 703 432 4449

Servicio Paz y Justicia, Casilla 09-01-8667, Guayaquil, Ecuador Fax 593 4 203600

Conflict Resolution Studies, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Carera 7, # 40-62, Edificio 25 Piso 3, Sede

Santafe, Bogota, DC Colombia Fax 571 2880830

Bancaja Intl. Center (CIBPD), Jaume 1 Universitat, Fundacio Caja Castellon, C/Enmedio 82, 12001 Castellon,

Spain Fax 34 964 230-212

Instituto Democracia/Derechos Humanos, Edificio Cediaz, Universidad Central de Venezuela, Avenida

Casanova, Caracas 1050, Venezuela Fax 58 2-761-5035