HISTORY and CONFLICT RESOLUTION:

CHALLENGES and OPPORTUNITIES

Rita KORYAN

July 2002

HISTORY and CONFLICT RESOLUTION:
CHALLENGES and OPPORTUNITIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
SABANCI UNIVERSITY

BY

RİTA KORYAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

JULY 2002

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Muhittin Oral
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Art.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Alkan
Dean

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as thesis for the degree of Master of Art.

Assistant Prof. Dr. Nimet Beriker

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Ömür Evin

Assistant Prof. Dr. Ahmet Ersoy

ABSTRACT

HISTORY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION:

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

RİTA KORYAN

M.A., Political Science

Supervisor: Assistant Dr. Nimet Beriker

JUNE 2002, 83 pages

This thesis revolves around the question of whether it is possible to develop a history-sensitive approach within the field of conflict resolution. In conflict analysis and resolution, the significance of history in contemporary conflicts is not well acknowledged. The development of such a historical orientation will introduce a new perspective involving historical concerns such that it both draws on and enriches the conflict resolution tradition. Thinking about history may contribute to our comprehension of contemporary conflicts, to their resolution and finally to an eventual transformation of conflicts.

In order to have a more thoroughgoing field of conflict resolution, a threefold - theoretical, methodological and practical- reformulation is needed. The task of solving conflicts on a short-term and long-term basis, or terminating them requires the inclusion of historical considerations into the theory, methodology, and practice of conflict analysis and resolution. First of all, its interdisciplinary character makes it possible to collaborate with other fields of social sciences. Methodologically, going beyond a simple positivist research approach will open up a place for the inclusion of history as well. Practically speaking, problem-solving workshops may be revised and re-designed with a specific sensitivity to historical concerns.

Keywords: conflict resolution, history, conflict transformation, culture, identity.

ÖZET

TARİH VE UYUŞMAZLIK ÇÖZÜMÜ:

FIRSATLAR VE ZORLUKLAR

Rita Koryan

Siyaset Bilimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Nimet Beriker

TEMMUZ 2002, 83 sayfa

Bu tezin temel tartışması uyuşmazlık çözümü disiplini içinde tarihe duyarlı bir yaklaşımın mümkün olup olmadığıdır. Söz konusu disiplinde, tarihin günümüzdeki çatışmalarda oynadığı rol pek fazla dikkate alınmamaktadır. Tarihsel bir yönelimin ortaya çıkması hem tarihi meseleleri içeren yeni bir yaklaşımı beraberinde getirecek, hem de uyuşmazlık çözümü geleneğini zenginleştiren bir katkıda bulunacaktır. Tarih üzerine düşünmek günümüzdeki çatışmaları anlama biçimimize, uyuşmazlıkların sona erdirilmesine ve bu toplumsal çerçevenin uzun vadede dönüştürülmesine katkıda bulunacaktır.

Daha derinlikli bir uyuşmazlık çözümü disiplini yaratmak için üç boyutlu – teorik, metodolojik ve pratik- bir yeniden yapılanma gereklidir. Uyuşmazlıkları kısa ve uzun vadelerde çözmek veya sona erdirmek gibi bir amacı gerçekleştirmek için tarihin uyuşmazlık analizi ve çözümü disiplininin teori, metodoloji ve pratiğinin bir parçası olması gerekir. Teorik olarak, bu disiplinin disiplinler-arası niteliği diğer sosyal bilimlerle işbirliğini kolay kılmaktadır. Metodolojik olarak, sade bir pozitivist araşırma yönteminin ötesine geçmek tarihin içerilmesine izin verecektir. Uygulama açısından, problem- çözümü atölyelerinin gözden geçirilerek tarihe duyarlı uygulamaları içerir hale getirilmeleri uygun olur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: uyuşmazlık çözümü, uyuşmazlığın dönüştürülmesi, tarih, kültür, kimlik.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to her thesis supervisor, Assistant Professor Nimet Beriker for her guidance in all phases of the thesis and for her constant encouragement. Throughout the thesis, she also helped the author to broaden her spectrum on various subjects of conflict analysis and resolution.

Special thanks are due to Professor Ahmet Ömür Evin and Assistant Professor Ahmet Ersoy for their suggestions and constructive criticisms.

The moral support and encouragement provided by Ohannes, İpek and Aret Koryan, and by the friends of the author are gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HISTORY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the possible contribution of history to the field of conflict analysis and resolution. This aim stems from a personal impression about the under-use or underestimation of history in this field. Bringing in the historical dimension to the field of conflict resolution gives scholars and practitioners a more thoroughgoing understanding of issues and problems.

This thesis revolves around the question of whether developing a history-sensitive approach within the field of conflict resolution is possible. The development of such a historical orientation introduces a new perspective involving historical concerns such that it both draws on and enriches the conflict resolution tradition. Using history and the historical imagination, I argue, may be the way of anchoring past experiences within practical approaches to grasp the basics of the current issues. In other words, thinking about history may contribute to our comprehension of contemporary conflicts, to their resolution and eventual transformation.

The main purpose of this thesis, hopefully, is to open up a discussion of history in contemporary conflict resolution. The following three questions seem central to address:

- How history is treated in the field of conflict resolution?
- What are the reasons of this treatment?
- What, if anything, can history and historical perspectives contribute to the field of conflict studies?

With these questions in mind, I would now like to provide a more extensive illustration of my reasoning throughout the thesis. I will necessarily start my discussion with a description of the field of conflict resolution. To be sure, the field of conflict studies is so large that it cannot be studied in all its extent within the scope of a single thesis or, for that matter, within one discipline. The field of conflict resolution in its broader definition involves all studies that deal with social conflict. Consisting of theoretical as well as the practical approaches to conflict, conflict resolution is not a

homogenous field and monolithic body of knowledge in terms of its assumptions, issues, techniques/methods, and methodologies.[1] In order to make sense of this huge body of literature, it is crucial to look into the development/genealogy of the field in order to make sense of the eventual contribution of historiography to the field.

Conflict resolution itself, in an academic sense, is very much an interdisciplinary field. At a very broad level, it represents an integration/interaction of several disciplines: economics, psychology, sociology, history, communication, law, organisational behaviour, etc. No single discipline, however sophisticated, can adequately explain a conflict without being accompanied by theories from other disciplines. In other words, the richness of studies in conflict resolution lies in the fact that scholars from different disciplines contribute to descriptive and prescriptive insights. This hybrid aspect of the field is in a sense imposed by the fact that deep-rooted conflicts have many causes and background problems. Every specialist in the various fields of social sciences can explain one or the other side of the conflict with its own method. Obviously, each and every conflict has its own story and history of development. In other words, history itself is one of the main aspects of conflicts, just as other dimensions such as sociological, economic, religious, ethnic and political concerns add up to the emergence of a conflict.

Nevertheless, with respect to the weight of other disciplines within the field of conflict resolution, historical analysis often remained marginal to the discussion of conflicts. Throughout its evolution and development, conflict analysis and resolution tried to keep a distance away from history, based on the legitimate assumption of the impartiality of historical analysis. Despite much scholarly interest in stereotyping and collective identity construction, drawn from the societies and nations historical and cultural baggage the field of conflict resolution has awarded little attention to history, historical images, and meanings attached to various perceptions. Within the field of conflict resolution, history has been often used as descriptive account, basically for chronological purposes. Nevertheless, the insufficiency of dominant paradigms in explaining some important aspects of contemporary conflicts necessitates the introduction of the historical analysis and an in-depth critical thinking. But, the lasting

[1] See, for example, Christopher Mitchell, "Conflict Research" in *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, eds. A. J. Groom and Margot Light (London: Pinter, 1994) and Alan C. Tidwell, *Conflict Resolved? A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution* (London: Pinter, 1998).

debate over the epistemological status of history and its predictive utility ensures: history has a secondary status as an analytical framework. Moreover, the problem of uniqueness, i.e. that historical events can not be generalised and that they are therefore not applicable across cases places history in a highly suspect category be handled only with extreme care.

To sum up, the importance of values as a source of conflict is emphasised in a large literature on conflict resolution. The predominant ascribed value in these is an improved understanding of a society's relevant conceptions, norms, and practices. However, history and its contributions/burdens are mostly ignored in such studies. Another dimension, somehow related to history, is culture. Much has been written on the relation between culture and conflict resolution. Curiously, however, this literature makes little mention of history. Perhaps this is because the study of history is assumed to be exclusively a matter for historians or area specialists. Obviously, history is one of the most basic determinants of the formation of culture. Past experiences and lineages form the identity of an actor as well as that of a society in general. When students review the conflict resolution literature, they can feel the missing link between history and culture. The lack of history as a variable within the general body of conflict resolution theory may become an important problem, even a theoretical and practical weakness. As such, this particular attitude vis-à-vis history requires special treatment. For the time being, we may say that the field, mostly eclectic in its nature, has much to gain from different methodologies. More than its mechanical and descriptive application of history, conflict resolution has to utilise the potential offered by historical understanding. It needs to put together a carefully crafted, intelligible, and fair presentation of the historical accounts that can shed light on present conflict situations.

After stating the absence of history in the field of conflict resolution, I would like to clarify what I mean by history, and what use I want to make of history within this particular context. First of all, historical analysis provides a useful tool for thinking. Studying history necessarily involves freeing and considering oneself out of the present context and exploring an alternative past world. This cannot help but make us more aware of our lives and contexts. To see how differently people behaved in the past presents us with an opportunity to think about how we behave, why we think in the ways

we do, and what things we take for granted or rely upon. To study history is to study ourselves. To think differently about oneself, to gather something of how we "come about" as individual human beings is to be made aware of the possibility of doing things differently. History is an argument, and arguments present the opportunity to change. It is a challenge to dogmatic thinking. History allows us to point out that there have always been many courses of action, many ways of being. The disdain for history can be restraining, even for the most future-oriented people. History focuses us on future opportunities and not only constrains our minds with past failures and resentments. In that sense, history can open new vistas beyond the conventional technology of conflict resolution. It appears that history is not only a feature of conflict, but also a powerful analytical tool. It is both one of the most crucial ingredients of culture as well as a medium of communication.

History is often used as a battlefield in inter-group conflicts as well as in problems within the society itself. Opponents in both cases choose this arena for two reasons: first, because history powerfully strengthens the collective identity of a social group and second, because national narratives of history can be used to fence off "the other". Historically shaped conceptions of self and other are important in helping us to understand differences. Consciously or unconsciously, the historical heritage is part of the identity of the society, handed down from generation to generation. The memory of the past is an everlasting discourse on self-definition and society's vision. As such, history is a crucial part of culture and culture, in turn is obviously a product of history. Moreover, both culture and history critically in shape the manner in which people perceive, evaluate, and choose options for dealing with conflict. Thus, history automatically comes to the fore while dealing with any kind of conflict.

The kind of reasoning history adopts may exert fruitful influences in understanding the contemporary conflict situations and deep-rooted problems that last for generations. Without disregarding the effects of structural and material parameters, it can safely be argued that the actors' interests will largely be derivative of their self-definition and identity, confirming the necessity of a historical perspective in conflict studies.

Particularly, three kinds of relationships between history and conflict resolution can be identified. First, history is an item of social identity and as such is a necessary tool for all social scientists, among them the practitioners of conflict studies. Second, history has a perception-shaping role and is a crucial element for the understanding of attitudes and behaviours. Third, history provides practitioners and scholars with direction, as it also provides explanations for actors' motivations.[2] To analyse the sophisticated web of social relations, history is obviously one of the most important fields to guide researchers studying conceptions, assessments of conflicts, value systems and the like. Far from being deterministic, historical arguments may bring in an important aspect of conflict behaviour into scholarly consideration. The impact of past experiences and images in defining and generating interests and the contested/constructed nature of identities remain to be important topics in the field of conflict resolution.

While discussing the problematic state of history in the field of conflict resolution, this thesis seeks to contribute to and extend the ongoing debate over the connections between different aspects of the discipline. In particular, it attempts to draw out and make more explicit some of the characteristics in terms of theory, methodology and practice.

Thus, the contribution of this thesis would be to propose and encourage the development of a social theory in its broadest sense. It is necessary to view social theory as multi-disciplinary and pluralist, reaching across social sciences and humanities/liberal arts. The identity of the field of conflict resolution should especially be transitive and multiple. European/Continental in origin and Anglo-Saxon in practice, the field must now cultivate a diversity of social sciences. At present, there is dissociation between history and conflict resolution are dissociated: Practitioners in the field of conflict resolution do not pay much attention to history; historians on the other hand do not deal with the immediate, close social evidence dealt with in the field of conflict studies. The best work remains to be done through a new academic division of labour and by the cooperation of scholars from different disciplines.

---

[2] See Judy Giles and Tim Middleton, *Studying Culture. A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 81-104.

After thus laying out the basic concerns of the thesis, I will now describe the organisation of the work.

The thesis consists of five loosely arranged chapters. The flow of the sections appears independent but are interrelated in their very nature. Following this brief introduction, the second chapter describes the basic notions, definitions and concepts of the field of conflict resolution. In this chapter, I differentiate conflict management and resolution. Then, I cover the basic aspects of intangibles, non-negotiable needs and cultural values. The chapter thus broadly elaborates the panorama of the field of conflict resolution and invites the reader to deeper study.

The third chapter tries to understand the reasons of the limited use of history in conflict analysis. The genealogy of the field, together with its distant stance towards history is described and discussed. Basically, the a-historical nature of conflict resolution, an exclusively chronological understanding of history and the field's presumptions about the applicability of historical points of view constitute the orbits of the discussion. While describing the development of the discipline and its final portrait, the reasons behind the ignorance of history are also discussed. In order to grasp the current state of the field, I have designed three channels of discussion: Issues of theory, methodology and practice of conflict resolution, and pursue the analysis with reference to these three topics.

The fourth chapter elaborates of the potential contributions of history to conflict resolution. As history has been part and parcel of conflicts in general, and to dealing with its potential to expand the repertoire of conflict resolution theory as well as to increase its analytical potential and necessity are crucial. My understanding of history involves the independent effect of history as an explanatory variable for differential patterns of interpretation. I personally tend to highlight the past for the sake of the present, and to make benefit of a more comprehensive and sophisticated understanding that will lead to a more successful assessment and resolution of conflicts. In this chapter too, I look at the possible contributions of history through a threefold model of theory, methodology and practice.

At the end of this study, the fifth chapter presents the conclusions reached throughout the thesis and to provide new vistas for further discussion.

II. WHAT IS CONFLICT RESOLUTION? AN OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD

Conflict resolution students accept the inevitability of conflict and seek ways to avoid the worst consequences of waging conflict. Today, conflict resolution has many advocates, and the language of conflict resolution has begun to be spoken by many people engaged in the analysis and practice of international relations. The field of conflict resolution presents an interdisciplinary examination of how conflicts are perceived and handled in a variety of cultural settings. Drawing on data and models from anthropology, psychology, and political science, the field works across the societal spectrum. The conflict resolution approach has a variety of emphases largely because it has developed from many sources. The rational, calculative emphasis is derived largely from game theory and the formal analyses done by economists and mathematicians.[3] The emphasis on emotional and institutional factors is derived, for example, from work on perception by social psychologists. The emphasis on organisational commitments, social movement conduct, and cultural assumptions is derived from work by sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, and other social scientists.[4] Finally, we have to mention another particularity of the field. Since it employs both theoretical and practical approaches to conflict, it has a very wide range of application. Unlike most of other social sciences, conflict resolution is both an analytical tool and a way to analyse and resolve conflicts in real life.

The notion of conflict resolution, both in theory and in practice, is thus very open-ended and resists a simple definition. With this caveat in mind, it is necessary to examine the notion of conflict resolution vis-à-vis similar disciplines to separate conflict resolution from other approaches. First of all, conflict resolution in comparison peace studies, for example, has, according to Kriesberg, three major approaches that encompass much of the field: analyzing past failures and criticizing contemporary conditions, imagining possible future peacemaking conditions, and analyzing past successes in

[3] Kenneth E. Boulding, *Conflict and Resolution* (New York: Harper, 1962) quoted in Louis Kriesberg, "Conflict Resolution Applications to Peace Studies", *Peace & Change*, 16, 4 (October 1991): 400-20.
[4] Irving L. Janis, *Victims of Groupthink* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972) quoted in Louis Kriesberg, *op. cit.*

peacemaking.[5] To sum up, unlike conflict resolution that deals with all conflict situations, the field of peace studies has the definite aim of establishing peace, and intervenes only in conflicts that involve war. It is thus not very surprising to notice that an uneasy alliance exists between people working in the conflict resolution and peace studies fields.[6] In general terms, some people in peace studies believe that conflict resolvers are too eager for a settlement, too ready to support any agreement the parties may reach. The criticism is that such an approach gives too little recognition to the need for social, economic, and political change as a necessary condition for peaceful relations among people. Peace researchers argue that the conflict resolution approach does not give sufficient importance to justice or other significant values or to the fairness of a settlement reached between parties. On the other side, some people pursuing studies in conflict resolution believe that peace studies is often too utopian and to distant from applications that affect the everyday lives of most people. Conflict resolution students accept the inevitability of conflict and seek ways to minimise the worst consequences of waging conflict. To sum up, the field of conflict resolution appears to be more pragmatic than peace studies. Normally, the practice of the field of conflict resolution does not follow ideals, but tries to reach settlements in any condition. It does not mean that ideals are completely ignored. If ideals may contribute to a settlement, they are taken into account. However, what is more important is to work out the terms of a settlement rather than identifying and pursuing ideals.

As mentioned earlier, conflict resolution is not the only tool to deal with conflicts. In that sense, neither its assumptions nor its tools are exclusively effective. Although the ultimate aim is the same, the way of conduct and the underlying assumptions are different.

Oliver P. Richmond's three-tiered categorisation of approaches to end conflict[7] seems to be comprehensive framework to describe the field. Richmond's picture is composed of first-generation, second-generation, and third-generation approaches.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, 401.
[6] N. H. Katz, "Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 504 (1989): 14-21.
[7] Oliver P. Richmond, "A Genealogy of Peacemaking: The Creation and Re-Creation of Order", *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 26, 3 (July-September 2001): 317-49. For a more comprehensive picture, see Oliver P. Richmond, *Maintaining Order, Making Peace* (London: Palgrave, 2001).

According to Richmond, first-generation approaches are based on the traditions, norms, and culture of Western diplomacy. Here, the effort is directed to maintain the existing international order based on nation-states, with their respective territories and jurisdictions. An example of a first-generation approach to end a conflict is "conflict management". Conflict management approaches attempt only to settle conflicts into a status quo. People working in the field of conflict management believe that order and stability are constituted by the strategic management and reinforcement of states and their interests. Within this perspective, all the methods geared towards the resolution of conflicts are defined by these underlying assumptions: Negotiation revolves around the zero-sum exchange of concessions in an environment defined by power. Mediation strategies revolve around bringing the disputants together, the exercise of coercion, or the facilitation of the process of communication. Mediation is meant to offer incentives and guarantees, and provide a face-saving mechanism. Conflict management is thus applied to fine-tune the balance of power and only occasionally used for crisis management. To sum up, first-generation approaches are to some extent reductionist and undervalue some significant aspects of the conflict.

Second-generation approaches, on the other hand, allow for a consideration of subjective issues. Second-generation approaches work within a human needs context, underlining the inconsistency of the international system's attempts to reconcile state security with human security. As it is to be expected, second-generation approaches are closer to these levels of the conflicts that involve human expectations, desires, values and needs. Within the scheme provided by Richmond, conflict resolution approaches are described as second-generation approaches. They are mostly developed in reaction to the realist "balance of power" associated with conflict management techniques. Conflict resolution places more emphasis on the non-state social and psychological levels and intersubjective factors. The perception of conflict is essentially different as compared to status-quo oriented management efforts. Conflict resolution tends to be beyond realist, state-centric and power-political leanings of high politics. Thus, there is a fundamental difference between conflict management and conflict resolution. More than that, conflict resolution approaches provide a critique of traditional conflict management tools centered on a simplistic status quo perspective. More optimistically and constructively, conflict

resolution presupposes the possibility of some kind of natural harmony of interests and integrative outcomes. It looks for the roots of conflict in the structural deficiencies of the systems, and it deals with the tension of structures, individual needs, and desires. To sum up, the approach of conflict resolution deals with deeper levels of conflicts, as compared to first-generation approaches like conflict management. Conflict resolution addresses underlying causes of conflict while conflict management refers to controlling conflict. While conflict management approaches are restrictive to ending conflict, conflict resolution approaches strive for broadening their vision on the way to a deeper analysis and enduring solutions.

The problem with both generations is that they serve "the task of historical and cultural reproduction in times of crisis"[8] in favour of dominant actors and their discourses. This means that they reproduce the frameworks that underpin the sociopolitical and international systems that the proponents are constituting and are constituted by. Before any intervention to make peace or settle a conflict takes place, there needs to be a critical understanding of what is being reproduced, why, and whether it is normatively desirable to do so. This criticism opens up the way for third-generation approaches. In his categorisation of third-generation approaches, Richmond uses conflict transformation, borrowing this notion from Terrell Northrup[9], as a key concept. Accordingly, conflict transformation is based on four assumptions: parties to conflict are rational; misperception constitutes a central cause of conflict; conflict resolution principles can be applied across social settings to include labour, international, and interpersonal conflict; and a high value is placed on peaceful resolution. Conflict transformation theory sees problems of injustice and inequality as causes of conflict to be understood through competing socially and culturally-constructed meanings. Northrup basically argues that first- and second-generation approaches do not acknowledge the tension between the universal and the particular.[10] In response to these shortcomings, third-generation approaches are characterised by their complex and multilevel/multidimensional nature. Third-generation approaches are thus a move to

[8] D. Jones, *Cosmopolitan Mediation* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1999), 3, quoted in O. P. Richmond, "A Genealogy of Peacemaking".
[9] Louis Kriesberg, Terrell A. Northrup, and Stuart J. Thorson (eds.), *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse UP, 1989), 57; quoted in Richmond, *op. cit*.

synchronise conflict management, conflict resolution, and transformation. Richmond gives Jean-Paul Lederach's model of the problem-solving approach to conflict resolution as another example of third-generation approaches. In this model, the understanding of the conflict is combined with a process-oriented approach in order to address the multi-dimensional nature of protracted social conflicts in the context of a non-linear peace-building process. This emphasises the need for a multi-sectoral approach to conflict transformation that brings in grassroots, local, and non-governmental actors in order to create a sustainable process. Third-generation approaches have tried to create multi-dimensional processes that include diverse actors, issues, norms, and frameworks for understanding and organisation. These processes have not been defined only on systemic and strategic terms but also at a normative level. As a result, third-generation approaches have attempted to create a hybrid approach combining traditional diplomatic and military approaches with conflict resolution approaches, state security with human security. In order to do that, they have simultaneously employed states, international organisations, regional organisations, and non-governmental organisations to contribute to the transformation of a conflict.

The field of conflict analysis and resolution has some basic assumptions. At its outset, conflict resolution, like peace research, evolved as a critique of realism in international relations. According to the assumptions of realist theory, states are in control over the proportion of resources they control; the power they wield in the international community is related to these resources. In such a power-oriented relationship, cooperation is only possible to the extent that it maximises self-interested goals of individual states and minimises risks of sovereignty. Violent conflict, in this context, can only be contained and controlled, rather than managed and discussed.[11]

According to realist formulas, conflicts are caused by scarcity of resources and any attempts by states to control those resources. From this perspective, conflicts are objective - caused by known, measurable, reducible objects, outside of and separate from the subject. In this line of thinking, methodologies employed for minimising the effects

---

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] For a discussion of realism, see Robert Keohane (ed.), *Neorealism and its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986); D. A. Baldwin (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

are limited to settlement strategies. Such strategies (in the applications of mediation, negotiation, arbitration) seek to achieve a distribution of scarce resources. The settlements are almost always zero-sum and focus on divergent interests. This is one of the reasons why realism is considered by conflict resolution as a paradigm that gives an inaccurate picture of the world.

From the perspective of conflict resolution, realist approaches are not effective at dealing with violent conflict and its various versions. There is no possibility of transforming the structure in the realist paradigm. This is, thus, the first and perhaps most important assumption of conflict resolution, that conflicts may in fact be "resolved". Conflict resolution attempts at analysing both the objective and subjective aspects of conflicts and looks for means of resolving the conflict, pushing the involved parties to an understanding by seeking a new balance rather than trying to establish the *status quo ante*.

My impression, after making a literature survey, is that there are two basic ways to end conflicts: by reaching a settlement and by achieving a resolution. Some techniques can help produce settlements, including expanding the resources available and thus enlarging the pie to be divided, allowing for the venting of feelings in a non-provocative manner, combining issues so that tradeoffs are possible, and creating new options for solution.[12] However, those settlement practices miss the point because they focus only on interests, failing to take into account the importance of relationships and perceptions and, underneath it all, human needs. Such strategies work, at best, as short-term perspectives, never getting to the root and therefore never resolving conflict. On the other hand, conflict resolution is a long-term process involving both pre- and post-settlement tasks, not just reaching a signed agreement.[13] As Miall, Ramsbotham, and Woodhouse have noted, conflict resolution approaches aim to transform conflict "into a peaceful nonviolent process of social and political change" rather than attempt to eliminate conflict[14]; this means that conflict resolution is a never-ending task.

---

[12] L. Kriesberg, "Strategies of Negotiating Agreements", in *Social Conflict*, eds. Dean G. Pruitt and Jeffrey Z. Rubin (New York: Random House, 1986).
[13] Marc Howard Ross, "'Good Enough' Isn't So Bad: Thinking about Success and Failure in Ethnic Conflict Management", *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 6, 1 (2000): 27-47.
[14] See Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution* (Cambridge: Polity, 1999), 15.

A more stable and long-term solution may be provided by resolution techniques. Scholars in the conflict resolution field mostly emphasise the techniques of negotiation and mediation on the way to resolution. For example, they stress the utility of going beyond arguing about positions by searching for underlying interests.[15] Resolution techniques lead to more viable solutions. To be sure, another one of these techniques may include an analysis of historical perceptions and the establishment of conflict resolution mechanisms aware of these perceptions. This is my argument throughout this thesis that the inclusion of an analysis of historical perceptions as a social and psychological ingredient will pave the way to a deeper understanding of the conflict and to a more accurate resolution.

Beyond these techniques, there is an important element in conflict resolution: compromises between parties may not last long if the parties do not feel that their problems have been satisfactorily dealt with. Settlement of specific cases and issues may not involve changes in the relationship that was the main source of contention. As the result of a constructive way of dealing with conflict, all the parties should be better off than before. Conflict resolution requires changes in the social, psychological, political, and cultural environments. At the same time, descriptions that focus only on an individual's motives miss the fundamental nature of social conflict. The goals of conflict resolution lie in helping alienated parties analyse the causes of the conflict and explore strategies for changes in the system that generates it.

There is another remark that I would like to make about the nature of conflict resolution. Mediators, intermediaries, third parties, etc. are not really conflict resolvers. They can not resolve the conflict by themselves. They can only facilitate directly involved parties in their endeavour to resolve their conflict. Therefore, it is the conflicting parties, the individuals, or groups of individuals directly involved in a conflict, who can be the true conflict resolvers. Yet, some conflicts cannot be resolved without the help of an intermediary, a third party. Parties' perceptions of each other and of the issues of the conflict may be so biased, so limiting that they cannot see mutually satisfactory, mutually beneficial, or integrative options, even when they have the desire to settle their

[15] Roger Fisher and William Ury, *Getting to Yes* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981); Howard Raiffa, *The Art and Science of Negotiation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).

differences. It is in such cases that third parties can be the most helpful. By bringing to the conflict their own knowledge and experience, their own perspective, and, of course, their own power and leverage, they make previously unconsidered options visible and feasible.

One criteria for successful conflict resolution includes the satisfaction of nonnegotiable needs and cultural values. Changes in perceptions result from the recognition of the other side's legitimate needs, and shared interests should be redefined by participatory processes. Collaborative processes rather than power bargaining can help discover accommodations that bring net advantages to all concerned. Removing the causes of conflictual behavior results from the transformation of relationships. Dealing with a particular conflict situation does nothing to prevent the occurrence of another incident of the same kind unless the broad causal problems are understood. Successful conflict resolution has a preventive effect on future conflicts by eliminating the possible causes of problems without using threats. In that sense, history, as an important discourse that shapes perceptions and ideologies, is necessary for the successful resolution of a conflict.

***

To conclude, I would like to quote Herbert Kelman according to whom conflict is "an interactive process with an escalatory, self-perpetuating dynamic". The needs and fears of parties involved in an intense conflict relationship impose perceptual and cognitive constraints on their processing of new information.[16] Since conflict is a complicated phenomenon, the tools that deal with it require special attention and a carefully constructed theoretical background. Conflict resolution itself involves different assumptions, approaches, and procedures.

In the case of one single conflict, different interpretations and related mechanisms can be employed. While interventions based on each of the theories attempt to alter both the attitudes and skills of those with whom they work, the particular beliefs and skills to which each pays attention are quite different. To give an example, in case of an ethnic conflict, the school of community relations wants to strengthen communities by building

[16] Herbert C. Kelman, "Interactive Problem Solving: An Approach to Conflict Resolution and Its Application in the Middle East", *P.S.: Political Science & Politics*, 31, 2 (1998): 190.

local organisations which exercise control over decisions affecting people's lives and raise community capacity and self-esteem. Scholars who seek to establish a principled negotiation try to build analytic abilities that help disputants to identify common interests and devise solutions to achieve mutual gains. Human needs theory wants participants to identify common needs, to discover shared goals and objectives, and to recognise that they have meaningful choices and options. Interventions based on identity theory want the parties to address deep threats to identity rooted in unresolved past losses as a method for exploring areas of mutual agreement and possibilities for coexistence. Intercultural miscommunications theory builds its practice around increasing awareness of cultural barriers to effective communication, such as increasing knowledge of other cultures, and developing less threatening metaphors and images of opponents.

In short, an effort of conflict resolution encompasses different disciplines, and brings together the contributions of various scholars. Therefore, conflict resolution is not a monolithic body of knowledge and action, but a hybrid and eclectic one.

III. THEORY, METHODOLOGY, AND PRACTICE IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

After considering the basic definitions and concepts related to the field of conflict resolution, my aim in this chapter is to show, by providing some examples, to what extent history has been left outside the field of conflict resolution. This chapter broadly elaborates theoretical, methodological and practical aspects of conflict resolution in terms of their relations with history. It tries to grasp the general mode of how history has been treated. The development of the discipline will be given and the final portrait of the discipline with relation to history will be described. Based on the insights provided by a review of the existing literature, the use of history within conflict resolution will be designated.

As the genealogy of the discipline shows, from its emergence onwards, conflict resolution separated itself from history. Throughout its development it tried to keep a distance away from history. So, studies on the relation of human imagination of history and historical consciousness are quite few in the field. Considerations about history or historical consciousness are usually embedded in general studies on culture. Indeed, much has been written on the relation between culture and conflict resolution. Conflict resolution presents an interdisciplinary examination of how conflicts are perceived and handled in a variety of cultural settings. Drawing on data and models from anthropology, psychology, and political science, the field works across the societal spectrum. Curiously, however, this literature makes little mention of history. Perhaps this is because the study of history has been assumed to be exclusively a matter for historians or area specialists. Obviously, history is one of the most basic determinants of the formation of culture. Past experiences and traces form the identity of the agent as well as that of the society in general. When one reviews the conflict resolution literature, she/he can feel the missing link between the history and culture. The lack of history as a variable within the general body of conflict resolution theory is a definite fact and requires special treatment. While demonstrating the extremely important impact of culture on conflict resolution processes, it is equally important to emphasise their historical characteristics.

Basically, conflict resolution has used history simply for chronological purposes. Conflict resolution seems to be *a-historical*; it generally borrows the tools of the positivist tradition in order to reach general conclusions. However, the field, mostly eclectic in its very nature, has much to gain from different methodologies. Beyond its mechanical and descriptive calendar-formatted application, conflict resolution has to utilise the potential of historical understanding. I suggest that conflict resolution needs to put together a carefully crafted, intelligible, and fair presentation of the historical accounts that can shed light on present conflictual situations. In accordance with this suggestion, this thesis considers the limits of conflict resolution with respect to history, in theory and practice. While conflict resolution has been a critical response to the realist approach of the field of international relations, I argue that the field of conflict resolution itself needs to undergo a reappraisal in the light of interpretative /critical social theory. The purpose of my analysis is thus to consider the ways in which conflict resolution is limited by its own discursive practices and, as a result, is largely irrelevant for the very problems it attempts to tackle.

In order to re-evaluate the basics of the field of conflict resolution in the light of the above-mentioned considerations, it seems proper to develop a threefold approach to conflict resolution, and to look at its theory, methodology, and practice by seeking why and how historical concerns are left aside. There are critical issues related to both the theoretical, empirical, and practical status of historical knowledge in conflict resolution. Here, my aim is to provoke a critical approach, and debate how such an approach might be created and used in social research.

III. 1. Theoretical Aspects of Conflict Resolution

III. 1. a. What is Conflict?

Conflict is a constant and unavoidable feature of human relations, with both good and bad corollaries. To quote Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff:

> Social scientists are divided on the question whether social conflict should be regarded as something rational, constructive, and socially functional or something irrational, pathological, and socially dysfunctional.[17]

For some, social conflicts are inherent in social life; they are not indicators of disorder or phenomena that should be prevented[18]. According to this line of thinking, conflicts can bring about functional and beneficial change. They are thought to be an opportunity to resolve problems and are accepted as challenges pushing individuals and institutions to find creative solutions. However, besides the motivational impetus, drawbacks related to conflicts are obvious enough. Uncontrolled, unregulated conflict is destructive to the orderly functioning of human systems. To sum up, social scientists approach conflict in two contrasting ways, with regards of its positive and negative implications.

With this caveat in mind, all social systems have established mechanisms for limiting and regulating conflict. Social systems have various procedures built into their structure for managing conflicts. Conflicts can be managed by institutional forms (collective bargaining), social roles (third party mediation), or social norms.[19]

Before proceeding, I should state here as a reservation that there is a difference between dispute and conflict. According to Burton, who makes a distinction between disputes and conflicts, disputes are "those situations in which the issues are negotiable, in which there can be compromise, and which, therefore, do not involve consideration of

---

[17] James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Relations* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1981), 187.
[18] Louis Kriesberg, *Social Conflicts*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982).
[19] J. Berkovitch and Richard Jackson, *International Conflict: A Chronological Encyclopedia of Conflicts and Their Management 1945-1995* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1997), 21.

altered institutions and structures."[20] On the other hand, the issues that lead to conflict "are not the ordinary ideas, choices, preferences and interests that are argued and negotiated as part of normal social living. They are those whose sources are deeply rooted in human behaviours."[21]

The term "conflict" is defined as the clashing of overlapping interests (positional differences) around values and issues (tangibles and intangibles). In ordinary usage, conflict denotes apparent, coercive interactions in which contending parties seek to impose their own will on one another. However, a conventional usage of the term does not capture the full range of the phenomena. Conflicts include more than their overt manifestations. In fact, much before they are identified in the open, they remain latent and grow inside individuals and systems. Conflict is a process of interaction between adversaries to destroy their opponents because they have incompatible goals or interests. Thus, the conflict relationship is characterised by a specific set of attitudes and behaviours, and the conflict process implies a level of interdependence. Interaction between the adversaries brings dynamism to the relationship. On the other hand, conflict attitudes engender conflict behaviour, which in turn induce a further hardening of attitudes in a cyclical fashion.

Within the traditional view that prevailed in the 1930's and 1940's, all conflicts were thought to be bad and harmful and they were thus treated as something that must be avoided. Conflict was also seen to be synonymous with violence, irrationality, and destruction. Consequently, it appeared as something dysfunctional that impeded growth. It was considered that all conflict is due to lack of communication, lack of openness and trust between parties. The failure of one set to be sensitive and responsive to the needs and aspirations of the other was considered one of the main reasons behind the outburst of conflicts. Thus, as soon as conflict was observed, its cause should be identified and the conflict should be immediately eliminated.

From 1950's till mid 1970's, the discipline of human relations held the view that conflicts were a natural and an inevitable occurrence and that they should thus be accepted to exist in all levels of human interaction. There was a general consensus that

---

[20] John W. Burton (ed.), *Conflict: Human Needs Theory,* Vol. 2 (London: Macmillan, 1990), 2.
[21] *Ibid*., 2.

conflicts could not be wiped away or eliminated. Basically, this school regarded conflict as inevitable; conflict could even be useful, especially in organisational life.

Since the late 1970's, the interactionist view went out provocatively to encourage a minimum level of conflict within groups to stimulate them for higher performance or goals. Conflict, when controlled, could be used to keep a system dynamic, viable, self-critical and creative. In organisational behaviour literature, for instance, conflict has been tolerated in order to improve team performance.

As seen in this brief historical sketch about the evolution of the meaning of the term "conflict", what we have at hand is a highly dynamic concept the definition of which changes according to circumstances and periods. Moreover, a conflict in the sphere of business relations may not be always as harmful as another conflict in international relations that can cause war and destruction. Conflict, unless accurately analysed and mastered, can be a serious threat to peaceful order. Of all the social processes, conflict is perhaps the most universal - and also potentially the most dangerous. It is one of the most inevitable social phenomena between and within different units, on individual, societal, international, even global/ecological level.[22]

Another interesting thing about a conflict is that it involves various factors, various aspects of human life. When a conflict emerges, considerations of different nature and origin come to the fore. In our private affairs, to give an example, we consult our experiences and memories, i.e. our personal histories, as well as our immediate profits when we have to make a decision. We also take into account considerations of, for example, morality, common sense, or emotional disposition. This is just normal and expected in the sense that every single unit has its own needs, interests, and styles that it regards as appropriate. As a feature of every single person and every form of relationship, conflict can be found at any level of human interaction, from peer conflict to hot war.

This inevitability of conflict, together with its versatility and complexity, has led to the emergence of various theories trying to make sense of it. An overview of these different theories is useful for the sake of the central argument of this thesis, of the

[22] D. J. D. Sandole, "A Comprehensive Mapping of Conflict and Conflict Resolution: A Three-Pillar Approach", *IAPTC Newsletter* (International Association of Peacekeeping Training), www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/sandole.htm.

problematic relation of the field of conflict resolution to history. Below are given some of the important theories trying to explain conflict, and making sense of it.

III. 1. b. Macro and Micro Theories of Conflict

We may say, first of all, that two important approaches to conflict are the classical and the behaviourist ones. The classical approach focuses on the macro level of analysis. It is primarily concerned with analysing the interaction of groups. These groups can be divided along many different cleavages: national, institutional, ethnic, class-based, and ideological, to name but a few. The classical theoretician is concerned with the interaction of groups at the conscious level.

The use and exercise of power is a central concept of the macro theory of conflict. Macro theorists would agree that power comes in many forms: economic, political, military, even cultural. The common assumption of macro or classical theories is that the roots of conflict stem from competition and the pursuit of power and resources. These assumptions operate on conscious motivational factors directed towards material, tangible targets. Classical theory capitalises on observations of group phenomena for single events in order to study the problem in depth, and to determine the importance and relationships of many variables rather than using few variables for many cases. The predominant methodologies used are historical or case study approaches.

The behaviorist, on the other hand, focuses on the micro level, the unit of measurement being the individual rather than the group. The unconscious is examined by the behaviorist in order to understand unstated motivational factors. Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff give a quick definition of the different research methodologies:

> The [behaviorist] prefers to isolate a few variables and analyse a large number of cases to determine the relationships among variables. The traditionalist [classicist], in contrast, will often wish to examine all the variables which could conceivably have a bearing on the outcome of a single case. [23]

[23] Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, *op. cit.*, 33.

Among the most important assumptions of the behaviorist school is the belief that the fundamental causes of violence and conflict lie in human nature and human behaviour, and that an important relationship exists between interpersonal conflict and a conflict that pervades the external social order. The behaviorist school believes in the centrality of the stimulus-response hypothesis. This school seeks to establish whether humans possess either biological or psychological characteristics that would predispose them towards aggression and conflict. It also seeks to explore the relationship between the individual and its existence in its environment. The followers of the behavioral school wish to extrapolate, by way of inductive reasoning, specific variables regarding interpersonal conflict and generalisations regarding interpersonal and international conflict.

Behavioral or micro theories are based on observations of the individual within their environment. They analyse the subconscious mind in order to establish motivational variables. Behavioral theories evolved from animal studies using comparisons with human behaviour, to more sophisticated theories examining the relationship between the individual and the group identities. While behaviorism still assumes the centrality of the simple stimulus-response hypothesis, the field has managed to create complex models of human behavior such as the social learning and social identity theories.

To sum up, micro theories have obviously added an important dimension to our understanding of conflict. They put complex situations into workable models that stand up to empirical analysis and constitute a useful asset in our attempt to impose some objectivity on specific situations. But, there are some inevitable shortcomings of micro theories. However in-depth an empirical analysis on the micro level to explain conflict behavior may be, such an analysis still fails to take into consideration all variables and attributes of conflict, particularly those at the conscious level. This is where macro theory comes into play in our analysis of human conflict.

After a certain look into these theories, one has the impression that they are in fact not mutually exclusive, but complementary. While behavioral/micro theories examine the individual subconscious, the classical/macro theories concentrate on the conscious interaction of groups. Classical theory has often been occupied with the exercise of power and the use of force in inter-group relations. While the classical theory is useful in

explaining acts and events, it does not answer questions about subconscious motivational factors. Deep conflicts with a certain historical baggage illustrate the depth and complexity of emotions that are at work. What is required is a synthesis of both behavioral and classical approaches to explain the phenomenon of such conflicts. This will enable researchers to break through the circumscribed mid-range theories presently available.

I have described the micro and macro theories of conflict for the sake of providing an insight into the two most general approaches to conflict. However, as micro and macro theories have been insufficient to explain conflicts in a comprehensive manner, searches for new paradigms, seeking either a fusion or synthesis of both macro and micro theories, or trying to supersede them, began. An attempt to do this is evident with the development of such theories as the Enemy System Theory, the Human Needs Theory and John Burton's Conflict Resolution Theory. All these theories can be labelled as "generic theories of conflict".

The Enemy System Theory, developed to help explain intractable conflict, and particularly was used to explain the Cold War in the late 1980s and early 1990s before the collapse of the Soviet Union. developmental psychology and international relations theory. This theory presents some important conceptualizations, which help to create a sophisticated explanatory model of conflict, and particularly of antagonistic group relationships. The gist of the Enemy System Theory is the hypothesis that humans have a deep-rooted psychological need to dichotomise and to establish "enemies" and "allies".[24] Within this theory, group membership is a crucial component of human life. Identification with ethnic or national groups largely determines how we relate to people within our "in-groups" and with those of our "out-groups". The way the masses within each group perceive themselves and their relationships with groups with which they are associated helps to determine whether their relationship will be based on cooperation, competition, or conflict. This relationship is also determined by historical relations between these groups. Consequently, this theory combines concepts from individual and group psychology, as well as international relations. As Vamik Volkan explains:

---

[24] Vamik D. Volkan, "An Overview of Psychological Concepts Pertinent to Interethnic and/or International Relationships", in *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*, Volume I, *Concepts and Theories* eds. Vamik Volkan, et. al. (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990), 31-46.

> This particular approach requires a penetrating examination of how the human mind is reflected in the process of decision making by a large group. It explores the following phenomenon: the psychological need to have enemies and allies; the intertwining of the individual's sense of self and that of the group's identity with the concepts of ethnicity and nationality; and the ways in which wars, with all their logistical planning, are connected to man's primitive and unconscious impulses. In terms of large-group interaction, most of these processes are involuntary. [25]

III. 1. c. Generic Theories of Conflict

The Enemy System Theory thus offers a sophisticated theory of conflict that explains difficult problems such as terrorism and deep ethnic conflict. While it is a behavioural theory, it also offers a bridge to classical theory by combining elements of developmental psychology with international relations theory. It transcends the realist paradigm in international relations theory by using communal or ethno-national groups as an important unit of analysis.

III. 1. d. Human Needs Theory

The Human Needs Theory, another theory about conflict, was developed in the 1970s and 1980s as a generic or holistic theory of human behaviour. This theory is based on the hypothesis that individuals have "basic needs" to be met in order to maintain stable societies. In this sense, this theory joins John Burton's definition of conflict in the context of his Conflict Resolution Theory. As John Burton states:

> We believe that the human participants in conflict situations are compulsively struggling in their respective institutional environments at all social levels to satisfy primordial and universal needs - needs such as security, identity, recognition, and development. They strive increasingly to gain the control of their environment that is necessary to ensure the satisfaction of these needs. This struggle cannot be curbed; it is primordial.[26]

---

[25] *Ibid.*, p.31.
[26] J. Burton, "Conflict Resolution as a Political System" in *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*, Volume II, *Unofficial Diplomacy at Work*, eds. Vamik Volkan et. al. (Massachusetts/Toronto: Lexington Books, 1991), 82-3.

This struggle for primordial needs is theoretically related to the Frustration-Aggression Theory that is based in turn on the stimulus-response hypothesis. The frustration of not satisfying needs leads to aggression and subsequently, conflict. What distinguishes Human Needs Theory from the Frustration-Aggression Theory is that the former is concerned only with absolute requirements (needs) while the later is also concerned with wants and desires. Burton further states:

> Now we know that there are fundamental universal values or human needs that must be met if societies are to be stable. That this is so thereby provides a non-ideological basis for the establishment of institutions and policies. Unless identity needs are met in multi-ethnic societies, unless in every social system there is distributive justice, a sense of control, and prospects for the pursuit of all other human societal developmental needs, instability and conflict are inevitable.[27]

There are some automatic assumptions in this theory. If the hypotheses of this theory are correct- if there are certain human needs that are required for human development and social stability- then the solution to conflict must be the ability to create an environment in which these needs can be met by all segments of societies. By accepting the assumptions and hypotheses of the Human Needs Theory, Burton suggests that there is a need for a paradigm shift away from power politics and towards the "reality of individual power".[28] In other words, individuals, as members of their identity groups, will strive for their needs within their environment. If they are prevented from this pursuit by elites, other identity groups, institutions and other forms of authority, there will inevitably be conflict. This is particularly relevant when the conflict is over needs that cannot be bargained and not material interests, which can be negotiated and compromised.

To sum up, we can say that Burton has tried to develop a generic theory of conflict based on ontologically derived human needs, thus supplying a new objective basis for conflict. Burton argues that "there are certain ontological and genetic needs that will be pursued, and that socialisation processes, if not compatible with such human

[27] Burton, "Political Realities" in Volkan, Vol. II, *op. cit*., 21.

needs, far from socialising, will lead to frustrations, and to disturbed and anti-social personal and group behaviours." Realist approaches to international relations cannot work, Burton argues, because settlement strategies are based on wrong assumptions about the causes of conflict and ultimately about human nature. Realism operates as if human beings, living within the protective boundaries of states, can be controlled or, as Burton puts it, are socially malleable. Aggressive natures, according to the realist paradigm, can be contained under the rule of law. However, aggression is not inherent to human nature but only an outcome of attempts to deny human needs, and these, Burton maintains, are not malleable or controllable. If these needs are not met, problems, and ultimately, violent conflict results at the end.[29]

Thus, there is here an important shift from a conflict based on material needs to conflicts based on non-material needs, on intangible conditions of problems. At that point, the Protracted Social Conflict Theory provides important insights.[30] Protracted social conflict is a type of conflict that is not based on material interests, but is one based on needs, and particularly identity-related needs of ethno-national or communal groups. Edward Azar describes this conflict type as follows:

> These identity groups, whether formed around shared religious, ethnic, racial, cultural, or other characteristics, will act to achieve and insure their distinctive identity within a society. When they are denied physical and economic security, political participation, and *recognition* from other groups, their distinctive identity is lost, and they will do whatever is in their power to regain it. In short, this is the origin of protracted social conflict.[31]

This theory has the merit of bringing in, in conjunction with the Human Needs Theory, the subjective aspects of conflicts. While violent conflict (alternatively referred to as "protracted social conflict"[32] or "deep rooted conflict"[33]) has objective features, it

---

[28] Burton, "Conflict Resolution as a Political System", in Volkan, Vol. II, *op. cit.*, 84.
[29] John W. Burton and Dennis J. Sandole, "Generic Theory: The Basis of Conflict Resolution", *Negotiation Journal*, 2, 2 (1986): 333-44; John W. Burton and Dennis J. Sandole, "Expanding the Debate on Generic Theory of Conflict Resolution: A Response to Critique," *Negotiation Journal*, 3, 1 (1987): 97-100.
[30] Edward E. Azar, "The Analysis and Management of Protracted Conflict", in Volkan, Vol. II, *op. cit.*, 93.
[31] *Ibid.*, 95.
[32] Edward E. Azar, *The Management of Protracted Conflict: Theory and Case* (Aldershot, U.K.: Dartmouth Publishing, 1990).
[33] John W. Burton, *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention,* Volume I (London: Macmillan, 1990). See also John W. Burton and Frank Dukes, *Conflict: Practices in Management, Settlement and Resolution*, Volume

also always has subjective aspects. The study of the subjective aspect of conflict is derived from work in the field of psychology where empirical studies have examined the processes of conflict and found that people's perceptions of each other and of out-groups changes through different stages of escalation and de-escalation.[34] While conflict has objective causes, psychological aspects of conflict will in some cases shadow those objective causes. Actually, conflict is understood as a situation in which parties perceive that they have incompatible goals.[35] The structure of conflict, then, is seen as having three essential aspects, often represented in a triangle - including behaviours, attitudes, and the context, all of which interact to produce conflict.[36] From this perspective, conflict has to be dealt with at two levels: the psychological, to get "past" blocks to positive communication, and, ontological, to uncover the "real" causes of conflict.

After this inquiry into the new theories of conflict beyond the micro and macro ones, one has this impression: On the one hand there is a school of thought that hypothesises the denial of ontologically derived basic human needs as the ultimate source of all violent conflicts. John Burton is the key figure here. Others prefer more psychological interpretations of conflict. Fisher and Keashly see conflict "at least partly and at times predominantly as a subjective social process. The rationale here does not deny the subjective approach to conflict, but accepts the tenets of realist conflict theory that real differences in interests cause inter-group conflict".[37] This significantly differs from Burton's basic needs approach. However, it seems that there is a real need to step away from the specifics of the conflict and take a holistic approach. Such an abstraction would accomplish the goal of being more objective in the search for an adequate explanation. As Burton states:

IV (London: Macmillan, 1990); John W. Burton and Frank Dukes (eds.), *Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution*, Volume III (London: Macmillan Press, 1990).

[34] Ronald J. Fisher, *The Social Psychology of Intergroup and International Conflict Resolution* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990).

[35] Christopher R. Mitchell, *The Structure of International Conflict* (London, Macmillan, 1981), 17.

[36] *Ibid*.

> [Conflict] is due to an assertion of individualism. It is a frustration-based protest against lack of opportunities for development and against lack of recognition and identity. Whether the tension, conflict, or violence has origins in class, status, ethnicity, sex, religion, or nationalism, we are dealing with the same fundamental issues. [38]

In this explanation by Burton, there is in fact a convergence between objective and subjective features of conflicts, between real interests and imaginary needs. Another important issue that emerges out of this discussion of differing conflict theory, for the purpose of this thesis, may be stated as follows: the weight of imaginary, psychological, historical arguments may at times be as important as real and immediate needs of individuals. Concerns related to identities, which are necessarily historical constructions, are lived as real rather than imaginary things, and should be taken into account as such. Therefore, as a first step into the main argument of this thesis, I suggest that a scholar working in the field of conflict resolution should, rather than identifying everything with real and tangible concerns, look into the background, often with the help of history as a methodological tool, in order to identify real causes of conflicts.

III. 1. e. Considering Culture, Identity, and History in Conflict Resolution Theory

As historical variables, culture and identity occupy a certain place in the literature. We can even say that culture and identity have evolved into the fundamental determinants of the theory and practice of contemporary conflict resolution. However, historical roots of culture and identity have received a poor coverage on the part of scholars. The impact of past experiences and images in defining and generating interests and the contested/constructed nature of identities remain to be important challenges to the existing structure of the field. One of the ways of identifying such a challenge, I think, is to look at the theoretical underpinning of the field, especially with respect to culture and identity.

---

[37] Ronald J.Fisher and Loraleigh Keashly, "The Potential Complementarity of Mediation and Consultation within a Contingency Model of Third Party Intervention", *Journal of Peace Research*, 28, 1 (1991): 32.
[38] Burton, "Political Realities", in Volkan, *op. cit.*, 20.

Conflict resolution is obviously about conflictual behaviour. It is known that culture itself is very relevant in shaping behaviours of individuals, groups, and communities. Three kinds of causality between culture and behaviour can be identified: Culture as the seat of social identity has a goal-defining role whereby collective interests are formulated; it has a perception-shaping role; and it has a tactic-formulating role. Culture provides the possibilities and options for proper behaviour under certain conditions and orient realisable forms of behaviour.[39] Thus, any attempt at conflict resolution must consider this affinity between culture and behaviour, and culture and conflict.

Conflict is much more than what meets the naked eye as "trouble", direct violence. There is also the violence frozen into structures and the culture that legitimises violence.[40] The resolution of a deep-rooted conflict that reflects long-term hostilities requires intensive efforts to understand perceptions, emotions, values, and needs of parties. Parties should be helped with assessing the costs of conflict and exploring conditions for resolution. In contrast with conflict over material interest, issues over values and basic needs cannot be compromised. Highly emotional and value-oriented issues are not for trading and cannot be handled easily by the imposition of third party decisions. For example, group identity, autonomy, and freedom cannot be bargained away, and conditions for realisation of human dignity and self-fulfilment should be understood and recognised.

Culture is critical in shaping the manner, in which people perceive, evaluate, and choose options for dealing with conflict. Each society has its "culture of conflict", to use Ross' term[41], which includes some options but excludes others. On the one hand, a number of general conflict strategies that occur across cultural situations can be identified.[42] On the other hand, the cultural meaning of a specific conflict present in any given society should be analysed within that particular cultural environment. An awareness of the impact that culture has on conflict behavior allows for a consideration of

---

[39] Giles and Middleton, *op. cit.*, 9-29 *passim*.
[40] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, and Civilisation* (London: Sage, 1996), viii.
[41] Marc Howard Ross, *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1993).
[42] For cultural theory and practice of conflict resolution see the works of Kevin Avruch and Peter W. Black.

how conflicting parties might be limiting their approaches to those found within their specific culture.

The goal of cultural analysis is to understand the system of meanings and beliefs. The basic method of cultural analysis used in conflict resolution is thick description. Thick descriptions seek to specify the mechanics of the event within more complex contexts of meaning. Cultural analysis primarily seeks to make sense of, or explain, an event. It tries to understand the significance of an event within its own cultural context. It is a basic fact that approaches used across a variety of cultures constitute a wealth of options. An awareness of the diversity of cultural approaches to conflict may lead to the discovery of hitherto ignored dynamics and fruitful applications. The development of a culture-sensitive approach may allow different readings without imposing any normative solution.

A study realized by Kevin Avruch, *Culture and Conflict Resolution*, is perhaps the most comprehensive study on this issue.[43] In his book, K. Avruch offers a concise but critical consideration of conflict resolution. He is especially concerned with the manner in which culture has been defined, perceived, or deemed relevant or irrelevant by students and practitioners of conflict resolution and international relations. One of the merits of his study is that he starts with a general debate on what culture is. Avruch chooses the broadest possible definition of culture as "an evolved constituent of human cognition and social action".[44] He then identifies the standard but mistaken definitions of culture in social sciences and particularly in conflict resolution. These definitions are the following: culture is homogeneous; culture is a static "thing"; culture is uniformly distributed among members of a group; an individual possesses but one culture; culture is custom (i.e., uniform behavior), and culture is timeless. The concern of Avruch is thus to identify the old and mistaken uses of the notion of culture in the field, and to replace these with a new, dynamic understanding of culture.

---

[43] Kevin Avruch, *Culture and Conflict Resolution* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1998).
[44] *Ibid.*, 4.

Obviously, Avruch's approach is also based on a criticism of realism. Avruch basically contends that the so-called "realist" school of international relations, which continues to exert a pervading influence in the field, tends to ignore the relevance of culture because it believes that conflict is motivated by a universal human logic (i.e., competition for scarce resources). Other approaches to international relations emerged in the 1940s and 1950s that purported to pay closer attention to the relevance of culture in conflict situations. However, these studies in "national character" and "political culture", according to the author, still espoused a notion of culture as something timeless and neatly contained. Indeed, Avruch argues against the realist argument when he suggests that power often becomes irrelevant when deep-rooted issues of ethnicity and identity are at stake. Similarly, he challenges the notion that there is an alleged universal "culture of diplomacy" which lessens the importance of cultural differences in negotiations. Once again, Avruch defends that culture changes according to contexts, and that it is dynamic, not static.

After these general considerations on culture, Avruch goes on with the discussion of the field of conflict resolution with relation to cultural issues. One of his basic arguments is that "Eurocentric" notions of rationality have historically informed conflict mitigation techniques in the international sphere. He urges the student to consider the possibility of different "logics" corresponding with different cultures and their impact on the success or failure of negotiations. Having incorporated language into his concept of culture, he convincingly shows that negotiation is based on the parties' cultures because it incorporates their subjectivity, cognition, and context. To sum up, Avruch presents a holistic approach to culture and conflict resolution strategies. One of the strongest aspects of this book is the author's ability to make culture relevant to conflict, both in theory and in practice, and to clarify misconceptions about the term in international relations. However, it is my argument that the lack of knowledge and understanding of the cultural factor in conflict and conflict resolution stems, among other reasons, from the fact that practitioners as well as scholars of conflict resolution have not been paid enough attention to the historical roots of the conflicts. Similar to culture, history is a complex and multifaceted concept. Avruch's analysis could have been deeper and more related to culture if he had expanded it to include more interpretative approaches.

While dealing with culture it is important to put some words on identity. Identity is a concept which virtually all theories of practice consider, albeit in different ways. Some scholars (Ross 1995; Volkan 1988, 1990; Montville 1991) give a central role to identity in the origin and persistence of ethnic conflict[45]. According to those scholars, addressing identity issues is central to a successful resolution of these conflicts.

Identity has both individual and social connotations. It links the individual to larger social groupings and is experienced at the deepest emotional levels. Social identity begins to develop at the earliest stages of the life cycle and its intensity is crucial in explaining why people are willing to make the greatest personal sacrifices in its name.[46] According to Vamik Volkan:

> The psychoanalytic view indicates that ethnicity or nationality originates much as other emotional phenomena do in clans or tribes. The sense of self is intertwined at a primitive level with the identity of the group. Membership in these groups is not like that in a club or professional organization, since it is tinged with raw and primitive affects pertaining to one's sense of self and others and to their externalization and projections.[47]

People with a common identity share targets of externalization or, to put it differently, they create common enemies. This practice reinforces a shared view of a world filled with enemies and allies. [48]High emotional prominence is attached to group differences that are reinforced through symbolic and ritual behaviours binding individuals to their own groups. These historical events which guide group actions many years (or even centuries) later as psycho-cultural processes collapse time and space.

Another scholar who discusses identity in a similar vein, Herbert Kelman's concept of identity plays a central role in his analysis of conflict.[49] He argues that identity is central in ethnic conflict because it is associated with a sense of mutual vulnerability

---

[45] Marc Howard Ross, "Creating the Conditions for Peacemaking: Theories of Practice in Ethnic Conflict Resolution", *Ethnic & Racial Studies,* 23, 6, (November 2000): 1002-35.
[46] Paul Stern, "Why Do People Sacrifice for their Nations?", *Political Psychology*, 16, 2 (1995): 217-235.
[47] Vamik Volkan, "An Overview of Psychological Concepts Pertinent to Interethnic and/or International Relationships", in Vamik D. Volkan, Vol. I, *op.cit*.,36.
[48] Vamik D. Volkan, *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relationships* (New York: Jason Aronson, 1988).
[49] Herbert C. Kelman, "Interactive Problem Solving: the Uses and Limits of a Therapeutic Model for the Resolution of International Conflicts", in Vamik D. Volkan, Vol. II, *op. cit.,*145-60.

which leads each side to fear that recognising the other's national identity is denying one's own identity:

> Each side seems concerned, then, -perhaps at an unconscious level- that acceptance of the other's nationhood would undermine the moral basis of its own claims. … In sum, fulfilment of the other's national identity is perceived by each side as equivalent to the destruction of its own identity. … Thus, neither side can be expected to make a move to accept the other unless and until it develops a sense of assurance that its own existence is secure.[50]

Another important factor in conflicts is communication or an absence of communication. Culture, identity, and communication are inherently related phenomena that require treatment as components of a same social context. In social sciences it is frequently suggested that groups with very different cultural beliefs and practices get into conflict because of their inability to communicate effectively.[51] To a degree, this is because the communication process contains so many elements of which participants are not aware. Therefore, problems of mis-communication and misunderstanding give rise to more tension whose sources remain unknown. As Carroll argues, "the small wounds … are all the more painful as we do not know how to attribute them to intercultural misunderstanding; we therefore attribute them to the other's faults or to our own inadequacies".[52] Related to this is that people are more prone to explain their own negative actions and those of their friends in terms of situational factors while attributing those of opponents to hostile motives.[53] Intercultural mis-communication is especially central in intense ethnic conflicts where culturally meaningful rituals and symbols emphasize differences between communities, contain negative images of the other community, or evoke strong opposite reactions from each community.

While cultural differences in beliefs and behaviours certainly are viewed as barriers to effective inter-group communication and sources of mis-perception and

---

[50] Herbert C. Kelman, "Israelis and Palestinians: Psychological Prerequisites for Mutual Acceptance", *International Security*, 3 (3) (1978), 171.
[51] Edward T. Hall, *The Silent Language* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959); Edward T. Hall, *The Hidden Dimension* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) cited in Ross, "Creating the Conditions for Peacemaking: Theories of Practice in Ethnic Conflict Resolution", *op.cit.*
[52] Raymonde Carroll, *Cultural Misunderstandings: The French-American Experience* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 11; quoted in Ross, *op.cit.*
[53] Dean G. Pruitt and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate and Settlement* (New York: Random House, 1986).

distrust, what I focus on here is the theory that cultural differences in styles of communication produce significant divergence in terms of actions. When the parties are not aware of their differences, tensions begin to rise.[54] Each side has a trouble in understanding what the other is saying and as a result is unable to respond effectively on a number of occasions. This atmosphere of mis-communication, if not non-communication, leads thus to conflict situations. This is the reason behind the relevance of the theory of cultural mis-communication for conflict resolution. Intercultural mis-communication theory stresses incompatibilities between cultural communication styles as a cause of conflict. This theory builds its practice around increasing awareness of cultural barriers to effective communication, such as increasing knowledge of other cultures, and developing less threatening metaphors and images of opponents.

The theory of Jean-Paul Lederach is a good example of how to bring together culture, identity, communication, and conflict resolution. Conflicts, Lederach argues, are best approached through the cultural frameworks of disputants. They should be understood as social and cultural constructions whose meanings can be transformed as people change their knowledge, perceptions, and models of what is at stake. The socially constructed nature of conflict presents opportunities for conflict transformation in constructive directions that can reshape perceptions, social relationships, and lead to mutually beneficial outcomes.[55] Central to transformation is "seeking resource and root in the cultural context itself".[56] To do this, particularly in cross-cultural settings, Lederach articulates an approach in which "the participants and their knowledge are seen as the primary resource for the training".[57] This approach seeks to have participants evaluate the conflict in terms of local practices rather than view them in terms of external standards. Participants are then encouraged to develop local approaches to their problems. The ultimate goal of such training is empowerment and "the development of appropriate models of conflict resolution in other cultural contexts".[58]

---

[54] Edward T. Hall, cited in Ross*, op. cit.*
[55] Jean Paul Lederach, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995).
[56] *Ibid.*, 55.
[57] *Ibid*., 56.
[58] *Ibid.,* 63.

To sum up, the depiction of culture definitely paves the way to the substantial solution. This objective might usefully be made a focal point from which to critique existing approaches to conflict resolution and analysis. The analysis and consideration of specific characteristics of any culture is a valuable piece of information on the way to its analysis. However, the inclusion of culture or culture-related material is not enough. Historical considerations that form the basis of cultural constructions are also important.

As the above discussion suggests, in conflict resolution, there is a need for analysis not only of economic, social and political factors, but also of the use of historiography in the present-day world. A fundamental premise on which this thesis is written is the need to understand the specificity of the history of the societies in which conflicts are taking place. This is not to argue against generalizations. It is rather an attempt to bring to the attention of those involved in studying conflicts both the general methodological debates in social sciences about the interaction between universal categories and specific historical experiences, and the methodological issues that social science research has to face when generic universal categories are utilized in specific historical circumstances. Historiography can be used consciously in conflict resolution. The kind of reasoning history adopts may exert fruitful influences in understanding the current situation and problems in general. Without disregarding the effects of structural and material parameters, it can safely be argued that the actors' interests will largely be derivative of their self-definition and identity, confirming the necessity of historical perspective in conflict resolution.

***

The theory of the field of conflict resolution takes history, culture and identity into account in order to understand the nature and dynamics of conflicts, but deals with these as separate entities. As a consequence of this deficiency, conflict resolution theory does not represent a well-structured and solid body of knowledge. What I propose is to identify the links between history, culture, and identity in the context of conflict resolution and equally distribute their contributions to the theoretical background of the field.

III. 2. An Uneasy Relationship between Conflict Resolution and History: Methodological Concerns

In Chapter II, I have dealt with some theoretical aspects of conflict resolution by focusing on some particular issues such as the inclusion of culture, identity, and communication, and finally the exclusion of history. Now, with the same concerns in mind, I will go into some methodological issues.

As I mentioned before, the field of conflict resolution is highly eclectic in many senses. Methodology is not an exception to that eclecticism. Throughout its development, conflict resolution has borrowed various methods from different approaches such as game theory and social psychology. History too has not been completely ignored. Basically, though, the use of history remained within the limits of a classical positivist approach. In other words, history existed as data to explain some patterns. History has been used either as a dry chronology to provide a time sequence or as a background where some important variables lay. To sum up, history has never been an original methodology or an independent explanatory variable but a marginal figure within a larger picture.

However, history includes more potential than that. In the domain of science, social action, politics, religion, or art, to mention a few essential areas, the presence of historical knowledge is indispensable. To be sure, this takes various forms. Each science has its own horizon of truth which history must respect. Moreover, as a science of time, history is an indispensable component of any activity in time. As in the case of culture, historical knowledge is both personally and socially constructed, and therefore bound up with subjective uncertainty, ideology, discourse, and legitimisation. It means that the qualitative interpretation of such data, in many ways, can be more demanding than the quantitative interpretation, since it is more critical that researchers are thorough, rigorous, and honest in their interpretation of these data.

It is clear that history-focused work in the field of conflict resolution has had its ups and downs. The premises of historical analysis, however neat, still raise the question of how we are to deal with it. It is also essential, however, to assert the necessity of the presence of historical knowledge in any scientific inquiry or in any praxis.

As I have mentioned before, there has been little "real" dialogue between international relations/conflict resolution theorists and historians. To be sure, any attempt at a disciplinary crossover presents a certain difficulty, if not impossibility, at least when it comes to such disciplines as history and international relations/conflict resolution. The problem of interdisciplinary arrangement is neither new nor is it anywhere near to being resolved. Obviously, different perspectives and sources require different analytical and methodological approaches, with their own strengths and weaknesses. In many ways, this is not surprising. Although some scholars of the field have their reservations, I argue that historical references must increasingly exert their impact upon the course of international relations and conflict resolution in particular.

The insufficiency of dominant paradigms in explaining some important aspects of contemporary conflicts necessitates the introduction of the historical analysis and a critical thinking. But there is a lasting debate over the epistemological status and causal power of history and its predictive utility in conflict resolution. Here are some of the arguments suggesting reservations in the use of history:

- History has a secondary status as an analytical framework; it is a residual category to which scholars appeal whenever more concrete factors fall short of explanation.
- Historical factors can not be generalised and therefore they are not applicable across cases (the problem of uniqueness).
- There are definitional difficulties and problems of operationalisation and measurement.[59]

As these arguments suggest, in the vast literature dealing with research methods in social sciences, there is always scepticism concerning the risks of researcher reflexivity, openness, and sensitivity to different ways of knowing. While history is generally accepted in the framework of humanities rather than social sciences, dominant positivist approaches are given an important place in scientific research. The field of conflict resolution is not an exception in this use of positivist methods.

[59] For a discussion of the uses, as well as of the shortcomings of history in the field, see Paul C. Stern and Daniel Druckman, "Evaluating Interventions in History: The Case of International Conflict Resolution", in *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War,* eds. Paul C. Stern and Daniel Druckman (Washington DC: National Academy Press, 2000).

I think that it may be useful to go to some extent into this debate about historical methodology. From the very beginning of the emergence of modern social and natural sciences in the last decades of the nineteenth century, there has been a critical distinction between a "nomothetic" methodology that posits universal laws, and an "idiosyncratic" approach that does not deal with general laws. All natural sciences, according to that approach, propose general laws that are applicable everywhere. Social sciences and humanities, on the other hand, do not propose general laws but deal with specific cases in depth.[60]

In the twentieth century, one of the leading scholars who argued against the existence of general historical laws was Karl Popper. In *The Poverty of Historicism* as well as in other works, Popper has strongly attacked the idea of historical laws. According to Popper, history has no meaning, no goal, its future course cannot be predicted, and no laws exist to explain singular historical events.[61] Obviously, finding a law in history cannot be achieved by performing reproducible experiments, which is the standard procedure in natural science. The special problem of testing and proving hypotheses has been invoked to challenge the scientific status of historiography. Testing a hypothesis concerning non-reproducible events of the past is certainly a difficult business. In other words, since history can neither be reproduced nor experimented with, many have argued against the very idea of historical laws. Thus, the methodology of historical studies has to be different from the methodology of natural science. As a consequence, historical studies are not in the prediction and control business. Nevertheless, this does not mean that history is useless for social scientific research. Its interpretational convergence still has a degree of relevance in terms of analysis as well as interpretation.

The difficulty in the incorporation of historical methodology as a tool of research, as seen in Popper's remarks about the impossibility of general historical laws, has also been due to the fact that an important number of social sciences started to use positivist research methods, especially after the Second World War. The use of mathematical and

---

[60] Immanuel Wallerstein et. al., *Open the Social Sciences :Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences* (Stanford, California : Stanford University Press, 1996).
[61] Karl R. Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism* (Boston and London: 1957), cited in *Social Forces*, 80 (1) (September 2001), 349.

statistical methods in economics, but also in other social sciences, led to the construction of a research paradigm based on these general laws.

It is true that history cannot provide similar general laws. However, it is also obvious that the uncertainties and ambiguities of historical knowledge are not problems to be solved according to benchmarks set out by positivist science. Historical research has its own virtues, and the uses of history are valuable with respect to what ends the researcher hopes to use that knowledge. In my opinion, there has been significant value in every major, long-standing, interpretational controversy in historical studies: we not only know more now, we understand the issues better. Historical research has an important role in developing general explanations, among its other uses. For example, such research provides the emergence and evolution of tendencies over time, the analysis of which is of crucial importance for understanding conflictual behaviour that rests behind the scene.

In front of this fact, I have to emphasise that my aim is to offer an alternative, underplayed perspective on some of these problems, rather than to claim to raise original questions and provide definitive answers. What I suggest is that historical analysis may be used as a supplementary tool next to the existing positivist research framework. This is not a question of mutual exclusion, but of complementarity and division of labour.

***

In terms of methodology, conflict resolution has a hybrid nature, borrowing different methodologies from various disciplines within the limits of the positivist tradition. In the context of positivism, history becomes reduced to a simple chronology or to a body of evidence. Despite the existence of a certain inclusion of history within the field, the potential that history offers for social sciences has not been fully exploited by conflict resolution.

To conclude, I want to argue that any kind of research is not only concerned with objective accounts of physical-material, space-time interactions but also seeks to discover the motivations that actors have in acting in particular ways. Historical methods are especially useful in uncovering the latter. Any knowledge is both personally and socially constructed, and therefore bound up with issues of contingency, uncertainty, ideology,

discourse and legitimisation that history, rather than a solely positivist approach, may understand and explain.

III. 3. Practical Aspects of Conflict Resolution Theory: Problem-Solving Workshops as Application

In this section practical aspects of the field of conflict resolution, including some resolution strategies that are sensitive to culture and identity. However, a similar ignorance of historical issues appears in the field's practice as well.

All practice is grounded in beliefs about the nature of social, political and psychological reality. These core beliefs, which explain why and how practitioners expect to produce their intended effects, are more often implicit than explicit. Making them explicit permits us to identify the core assumptions of specific theories of practice, to articulate indicators which could help us evaluate if given theories are correct, and to revise practice if the core assumptions on which it is based are found to be imprecise or unwarranted. Thus, conflict resolution theory leads to the development of methodologies different in scope and aim for resolution strategies. Moving beyond mere control, conflict resolution strategies aim to resolve by dealing with the deep causes of conflict.

In this section, my emphasis is on problem-solving workshops. These workshops are the closest point where conflict resolution practice meets culture and identity concerns. Hence, these workshops also involve the eventuality of including historical concerns, even if this is not something very often encountered up to the present.

There are three groups of scholars-practitioners who were involved in the development of the theory and practice of problem-solving workshops: a group at University College, London, a group at Yale University, and later, a group at Harvard University. But the founding father of the method itself is John W. Burton. Burton starts with a human needs theory that uses analytical problem-solving workshops as the primary method for the resolution of deeply rooted conflicts such as those between ethnic communities.[62] Analytical problem solving brings the parties together

[62] Burton, *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*; Christopher Mitchell and Michael Banks, *Handbook of Conflict Resolution: The Analytical Problem-Solving Approach* (London: Pinter, 1996); Ronald Fisher, *Interactive Conflict Resolution* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997).

> in a setting that enables them to check on their perceptions of each other, and on the relevance of their conflictual tactics in terms of possible consequences, and to explore alternatives that are available once re-perception and reassessment have taken place.[63]

There are various views about the definition and process of these workshops. Kevin Avruch argues that the problem-solving workshop is a rather informal affair in which

> [a] third party … brings conflicting parties together in a neutral and unthreatening setting to help them analyse the deeply-rooted or underlying causes of the conflict; to facilitate unhampered conversation between them; and to encourage creative thinking about possible solutions.[64]

Interestingly, neither third parties nor disputants in the workshop are traditional diplomats but rather academics, journalists, labour leaders, etc. In sum, in Avruch's approach, problem solving is "nonofficial diplomacy". One merit of Avruch's approach, at least for my concerns in this thesis, is that he proposes a merging of problem-solving approaches that pays attention to the culturally generated, contextual nuances of conflict situations. For Avruch, individuals are active agents in constituting culture and in creating or resolving conflicts. Thus, what is at stake in conflicts is not just that which is negotiable but also non-negotiable human needs.

Mitchell and Banks' handbook of conflict resolution (actually a execution only of analytical problem-solving workshops) identifies six steps in the sequence: analysis, access, preparation, workshop, re-entry and effects.[65] According to Fisher and Keashly, the aim of problem-solving workshops is to induce mutual motivation for problem solving, improving the openness and accuracy of communication, diagnosing the processes and issues of the conflict".[66] Bringing about an atmosphere of inclusiveness is key to the process because it opens space "to focus on the structural, social, attitudinal, and interpersonal dimensions of the conflict relationship. Among scholars dealing with problem solving workshops, Joseph Montville pays a special attention to the impact of

---

[63] Burton, *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*, 204.
[64] Kevin Avruch, *Culture and Conflict Resolution* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1998), 85.
[65] Mitchell and Banks, *op. cit.*
[66] Ronald J. Fisher and Loraleigh Keashly, "The Potential Complementarity of Mediation and Consultation within a Contingency Model of Third Party Intervention": 32.

history, and his approach is to some extent relevant for my discussion in this thesis. According to Montville, the process that takes place during the workshops can be described by the concept of "confirming". In his context to confirm means "to remove doubt".[67] Through dialogue, parties confirm each other's humanity and recognise beliefs and values of the other person. The first stage that the parties go through at the problem-solving workshop is the examination of conflict history. According to Montville, by looking at the history of their relationships, the parties get a chance to present grievances that have not been acknowledged by the other side. Montville strongly emphasises the importance of historical analysis, including sharing of grievances and their recognition by the opponents, for encouraging transformation in the parties' relationships. He particularly stresses the behaviours such as accepting responsibility, contrition, and forgiveness. He discusses the contribution made by psychological research in identifying "the role of contrition and forgiveness in the resolution of conflict".[68] He draws the conclusion that in political conflict resolution, the act of unilateral forgiveness does not constitute transformation. There should be a reciprocal process of acknowledgment of injustices committed and forgiveness through dialogue between the adversaries. Transformation also requires negotiations on the future relationships of the former enemies.

Herbert Kelman, on the other hand, is one of the most productive scholar-practitioners dealing with problem-solving workshops. His designs of problem-solving workshops basically give a central role to identity issues. While his work is grounded in Burton's needs theory and problem-solving workshops, it some crucial differences compared with that of Burton. Kelman has a deeper focus on the dynamics of identity and on non-cognitive elements in a conflict. Herbert C. Kelman has defined seven central features of these workshops: "its healing purpose, its analytical process, its focus on needs, its establishment of alternative norms, its stress on self-generated learning, the facilitative role of its third party, and the clinical nature of its research enterprise."[69]

---

[67] Joseph V. Montville, "The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution" in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application*, eds. Dennis J. D. Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993), 115.
[68] *Ibid*., 118.
[69] Herbert C. Kelman, "Interactive Problem Solving: The Uses and Limits of a Therapeutic Model for the Resolution of International Conflicts" in Volkan, Vol. II, *op. cit.*, 146.

Chataway and Kelman[70] argue that while workshop participants seem to underestimate the importance of identity and related symbolic acts, they argue that there is a need for participants to develop the language and gestures of reassurance that might pave the way to getting to the negotiation table, basically to discuss the unmet needs, frustrations and fears they have towards the other. However, to change the nature of the deep-rooted and complicated conflict at the end of the workshop, insights gained within the problem solving workshop need to be fed into each community's policy process and provide a model for directions that future relationships might take.[71]

After looking into the different approaches about them, we can find out some general characteristics of problem-solving workshops. Apparently, central to analytical problem-solving workshop is the hypothesis that once the relationships between the parties "have been analysed satisfactorily, once each side is accurately informed of the perceptions of the other, of alternative means of attaining values and goals, and of costs of pursuing present policies, possible outcomes are revealed that might be acceptable to all parties".[72]

At the first step in the workshops, parties are encouraged to deal with the conflict analytically rather than polemically - to explore the ways in which their interaction helps to escalate and perpetuate the conflict, rather than to blame to the other side while justifying their own. This analytic discussion helps the parties penetrate each other's perspective and understand each other's concerns, needs, fears, priorities, and constraints. They are asked to work together in developing new ideas for resolving the conflict in ways that would satisfy the fundamental needs and allay the existential fears of both parties. They are then asked to explore the political and psychological constraints that stand in the way of such integrative, win/win solutions and that, in fact, have prevented the parties from moving to or staying at the negotiating table, or from negotiating productively. Next, they are asked to engage in another process of joint problem solving, designed to generate new ideas.

---

[70] Cynthia Chataway and Herbert C. Kelman, "Researching the Interactive Problem-Solving Workshop: Convergent Insights from Action Research", in *Innovations in Unofficial Third Part Intervention in International Conflict*, ed. Nadim Rouhana (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press), cited in Ross.
[71] Herbert Kelman and Stephen P. Cohen, "Resolution of International Conflict: an Interactional Approach", in *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, eds. Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin (Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall, 1986), 323-42.

To summarise, then, workshops have a dual purpose. First, they are designed to produce changes in the workshop participants' perceptions, to ensure more different image of the enemy, greater insight into the dynamics of the conflict, and new ideas for resolving the conflict and for overcoming the barriers to a negotiated solution. A second purpose of workshops is to maximise the likelihood that the new insights, ideas, and proposals developed in the course of the workshop are fed back into the political debate and the decision-making process within each community.[73]

***

Problem-solving workshops are among the practical applications of the field of conflict resolution. Although perceptions, personal histories, story-telling and mutual expression of feelings are important ingredients of the process, the problem-solving workshops try to design the process in a controlled way where history is reduced to a sterile and dry expression of the situation. The third party controls this process, tries to downplay the emotional aspect of the communication. He/she puts some ground rules in order to prevent provocation and the accusative tone of the discussion. After this controlled communication, the process tends to turn back to the procedure which is mechanical and free of historical concerns. This tendency leaves history outside of the process after this brief and controlled story-telling, self- expression session . There are both advantages and disadvantages of this tendency. As an advantage, this mechanism of control balances the environment and creates a neutral discussion ground free of claiming and blaming of both sides. In such an atmosphere, objective arguments can take place and subjective opinions are necessarily curtailed. On the other hand, many nuances based on historical perceptions are sacrificed for the sake of objectivity. To be sure, a critical balance is to be obtained in order to reach an outcome at the end of the process. However, instead of working for a reasonable equilibrium, history is simply ignored.

To conclude this chapter where I have discussed different orbits of conflict resolution, I argue that theory, methodology, and practice are the components of a single

---

[72] Burton, *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention,* 205.
[73] See Herbert C. Kelman, "The Political Psychology of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: How Can We Overcome the Barriers to a Negotiated Solution", *Political Psychology*, 8, 3 (1987): 347-63.

body of knowledge. A weakness in one of these three has an impact on the whole field. Both structural and cultural matters as well as objective and subjective considerations must be included in theory, methodology, and practice. Some attempts to cover subjective considerations, cultural needs, identity concerns and the necessary connections between those have been realised in conflict resolution to some extent. This effort should be enlarged to include history as the real basis of social and cultural constructs.

IV. WHAT USE CAN WE MAKE OF HISTORY?

It has been discussed above that the field of conflict resolution has kept a distance from history throughout its development. The present panorama of the field, with the emphasis on identity and culture, should have brought some historical considerations into the discussion when we think that culture and identity are historical constructions. Nevertheless, despite this opportunity of coming closer to historical issues, practitioners in the field of conflict resolution preferred to make use of essential notions of culture and identity, rather than historical ones.

My criticism about the absence of historical concerns in the field of conflict resolution has some objectives. The first one of these is to bring in a more balanced understanding of human conflict. It is obvious that people see conflicts through identity concerns, and culture provides a lens through which real issues are assessed. Moreover, historical conceptions keep an important place within culture, and some issues are simply understood through a certain ideological system of values legated by history. My second objective, as a logical conclusion of the first one, is to provide new ways for conflict resolution and management. Thus, I argue that bringing history in will ensure a more accurate analysis of any given situation. In addition, historical knowledge about a problem will make it easier to reach a solution through a more detailed understanding of the claims and expectations of the parties. Conflict resolution should consider history as an integral part of the process of problem solving.

I would like to give some further details about what I mean when I talk about a certain historical knowledge that is necessary for conflict analysis and resolution. I am not interested with the academic practice of history as such, but rather with the "public use" of history. By the "public use of history" I am referring to all that is developed outside the domain of scientific research, outside the history that is written by historians. Public use of history includes the various ways of mass communication but also the arts and literature, public places such as schools, museums, and monuments. Institutions such as cultural associations, parties, religious, ethnic groups also endeavour to promote a more or less polemic reading of the past based on the memory of their respective groups. This public

use of history, rather than a scientific history, contributes to the formation of an individual or collective identity.[74] Because of this, the political power has always given importance to the control of the past as a privileged instrument for the control of the present. The political function of historiography is to regulate memory and in order to shape the characteristics and collective identity of a community and to distinguish it from others, and to construct a project and a prophesy for the future. Thus, an understanding of the stereotypes of public history, a careful analysis of the education of history, or the function of the media is necessary. The researcher in the field of conflict resolution is expected to have some awareness about the impact of these institutions on the perceptions of the present.

I have mentioned in the first part of this thesis that conflict resolution emerged as a reaction to the realist stereotyping of the field of international relations. However, especially in the context of ethnic and regional conflicts, the field of conflict resolution now faces the same risk of falling into the trap of adopting simplistic views about ethnic conflict, nationalism, regional problems, racial hatred and the like. I want to bring in a collaboration with historians, and more history-sensitive methods of working. My aim is not to turn the practitioners of the field into historians, nor to push them to leave aside their own concerns and make historical research. I rather want to establish a missing link within the multi-disciplinary approach of the field.

This chapter makes a threefold division, like the one that I did while analysing conflict resolution in the third chapter. I look at the theory, methodology and practice of history as it is relevant for the aims of conflict resolution and analysis to make necessary connections between these two fields and emphasize the importance of history for conflict analysis and resolution. The potential contribution of history, together with that of other social science, is elaborated in order to produce more fruitful results in the field.

---

[74] M. Frisch, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (New York, 1990).

IV. 1. Theoretical concerns: History at the roots of identity, memory, and ethnicity

In this section, I will show to what extent history is present in some issues that conflict resolution is often concerned. I expect that such an inquiry will enrich the theoretical analysis of these issues as well as practical applications that stem from these analyses. Analysis and resolution are different but interdependent, and history is crucial for both.

The place of history in the conduct and understanding of conflict analysis and resolution is a much-understudied field. Historical studies have found a place in many studies of conflict, but these have been contained within the various disciplines such as international relations, political science, or industrial relations. These studies are highly specific to the given conflict event and description, yet reflect little integration into the corpus of conflict resolution.

In the field of conflict analysis and resolution, there has been a considerable emphasis on participant behaviour, examining conflict strategy, and the selection of options. However, adequate explanations as to why and how actors come to the choices they make has not been explored. In this section of my thesis, I will try to suggest some ways in which history may be useful to conflict analysis and resolution.

The field of conflict analysis and resolution deals with all kind of conflicts. A clear identification of the roots of a conflict obviously depends on the historical load of the respective parties. Besides this objective argument, the subjective opinions and perceptions of the parties also matter. The analyst as third party intervener/facilitator or mediator has to keep in mind that conflicts are defined by different historical concerns, and that these different concerns will shape present-day interests and positions. Accordingly, conflicts with a political and historical background, like war, inter-ethnic clashes, border problems, problems of minorities, will have to be dealt with in the context of a particular set of notions and solutions. This is where history becomes part of conflict analysis, and contributes to conflict resolution. Even in workplace conflicts or intra-family problems, the “history” of the conflict is of great importance.

While discussing theoretical aspects of history and conflict resolution, some critical concepts come to the fore. These concepts, of critical importance for social

sciences at large as well as for conflict resolution, are to some extent touched upon by history. One of the most important issues, standing at the crossroads of history and conflict resolution, is identity. Identity is a difficult concept with which to study, but in the case of conflict analysis it offers an insightful and interesting route to explore. Identity is "a conception of self in relation to others".[75] This conception includes aspects of language, tradition, history, culture, territoriality, and ethnicity.[76]

History provides society with identity, just as memory does for an individual. People lay claim to past events as a basis for their collective identities. But it is also a danger, as the conflicts between different ethnic groups certainly attest. We can lay claim to the past as a part of our identity but to become imprisoned by the past is to lose something of our humanity, our capacity to make different choices. Identities are created in a dual process of convergence and divergence/differentiation. They are the result of a process in which members of one group discover what they have in common as well as what differentiates them from other groups.[77] Identities are thus the product of relations within and outside the group, with a particular reference to past experiences and traditions.

At this critical juncture, I have to put forward a critical argument in order to escape a much-repeated error about history. Very often, historical concerns are always evaluated in the context of communal, national, or ethnic identities. However, these evaluations do not leave much room for the individual. I find it crucial to argue that constructions of the past have some importance not only for groups as a whole, but for the individual members who create them. By helping to define the group, stories about the past also help define the individual; they locate the self both in the social world and in a temporal order. Indeed, individuals often connect their own personal or family histories to the common past, linking their own separate lives to the narratives of the group. Such individual narratives help construct the group at the same time as they reflect its influence. The history of the group, the charter for its existence, emerges to a

---

[75] Janice Gross Stein, "Image, Identity, and Conflict Resolution", in *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester A. Crocker, et. al. (United States Institute of Peace: Washington, D.C. 1996), 94.
[76] Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (London: University of Nevada, 1991), 21.
[77] V.B. Rosoux, "National Identity in France and Germany: From Mutual Exclusion to Negotiation", *International Negotiation*, 6, 2 (January 2001): 175-198.

considerable degree out of the body of individual stories about the past that its members tell. To the extent that they define individual members, the memories and re-tellings of history shape the contours of the group, the nature of belonging and exclusion, and the relationship between the group and the outside world.[78] This fact illustrates very well the flexibility and pragmatic influence of history. History is an overall ideological discourse that infiltrates group identities as well as individual notions of self-definition. In this sense, historical formations of individual identities are to be taken into account even in intra-family conflicts, where historically constructed gender roles occupy an important role.

There is considerable plausibility to the idea of "history as shaper of identity". We make sense of our lives through stories. Indeed, understood in a certain way, stories constitute identities. Alasdair MacIntyre insists that "man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially a story-telling animal."[79] This is so because we "cannot characterise behavior independently of intentions, and we cannot characterise intentions independently of the settings which make these intentions intelligible both to agents themselves and to others."[80] These settings transfer stories and traditions to future generations in the form of narratives. We inherit our identities just as we inherit our hair colour – our identities are given by the ongoing stories into which we find ourselves born. Moreover, our defining commitments- our moral identities- also arise from the roles, expectations, limitations, and duties we inherit, whether we assume them as our own or resist and react against them.

Next to individual identities, another important issue is "collective identity". Individual and collective identities interact with each other but, in some cases, collective identities become the real motivation behind attitudes and behaviours. In the case of a conflict, and especially in an ethnic or inter-state conflict, these collective identities, formed in a same way but according to different premises, clash with each other. Within the context of these collective identities, "every identity is the affirmation of a difference,

---

[78] Yueh-Ting Lee, L. Albright and T. E. Malloy, "Social Perception and Stereotyping: An Interpersonal and Intercultural Approach", *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 30, 2 (Summer 2001): 183-209.
[79] Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981), 201.
[80] *Ibid.*, p.192. See also Jerome Bruner, *Acts of Meaning* (Cambridge, Massachussets.: Harvard University Press, 1991).

the determination of an "other" that is going to play the role of a "constitutive outside".[81] Upon this "other" we project negative attributes, defining our own group by contrast.

Together with the notion of a "collective identity", another equally important term is "collective memory" or "historical memory". An overlapping notion with that of "collective identity", we can use here the definition of Barry Schwartz about collective memory: "Collective memory is a metaphor that formulates society's retention and loss of information about its past in the familiar terms of individual remembering and forgetting".[82] Halbwachs explained that memory is the product of a social group.[83] It is a past that is shaped by and meaningful for a community. Collective memory, the meaning that a community makes of its past, is home to critical aspects of political culture, community tradition, and social identity. It informs our understanding of past events and present relationships, and it contributes to our expectations about the future. According to Consuelo Cruz,

> collective memory is both a seemingly factual narrative and normative assessment of the past; it shapes a group's inter-subjective conceptions of strategic feasibility and political legitimacy. This is why collective identity is above all an expression of normative realism: a group's declaration to itself and to others about what it can or cannot do; what it will or will not do.[84]

Very similar to collective identity, collective memory is defined in more practical terms. A collective identity is somehow placed on a higher sphere, and is not frequently questioned. Collective memory, on the other hand, is based on selective events (significant battles, victories or defeats, great achievements) and works as the representative of a collective identity in the short run. Events are constantly being reshaped and reconstructed. In this process, nations and individuals select the elements of their memory that will be given greater importance in view of the objectives being pursued. For the concerns of conflict analysis and resolution, it should be noted here that

---

[81] Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of the Political* (London: Verso, 1993), 2.
[82] Barry Schwartz, "Iconography and Collective Memory: Lincoln's Image in the American Mind", *Sociological Quarterly*, 32 (1991): 301-319.
[83] M. Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, trans. by Francis J. Ditter, Jr. & Vida Yazdi Ditter (New York: Harper & Row, 1980 [Original work published in 1950]).
[84] Consuelo Cruz, "Identity and Persuasion: How Nations Remember Their Pasts and Make Their Futures", *World Politics*, 52, 3 (April 2000): 276.

memory can be reshaped according to the requirements of any particular conflict. This ambiguous and vague character of history and memory should be kept in mind.

The concerns related to history, and specifically to collective memory are especially important in the case of group conflicts. Blake and Mouton show the impact of history in the collective identity of groups. According to them, history has both a positive and a negative role in group behaviour and perception. The positive side, according to them, is this:

> On the positive side, a group's history provides its members with continuity and stability - an anchor in time and space. History helps group members understand where they are and how they got there. Records of the past are useful to group members in charting growth and development and in establishing important patterns and trends.[85]

History, as a constructive discourse of identity and group membership, is an undeniable social and political factor. However, history has also some negative impacts on group identity that should be taken into account as well. Especially for the sake of conflict analysis and resolution, this negative side that often produces conflicts must be specifically handled. To quote Blake and Mouton again,

> History limits a group's vision of future alternatives and possibilities to those that individuals believe other members will understand, approve and accept. Past experiences, distorted by time and tainted by subjectivity, are characteristically accepted as valid predictors of the group's response to various suggestions. Recommendations that are contrary to history may be summarily dismissed, and the individual who proposed them may be censured and temporarily rejected.[86]

It is true that history may lead to a rigid attitude in front of new situations, and especially in times of conflict. However, the task of conflict resolution is exactly this: to analyse that rigidity, to try to change the situation towards a new understanding of things. Moreover, even if it is true that a historical perspective sometimes pushes individuals towards conflict by limiting and curtailing options for behaviour, a historical perspective is also a window into motivation, and the rationale behind choices made.

---

[85] Robert R. Blake and Jane Srygley Morton, *Solving Costly Organisational Conflicts* (San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, 1984), 3-4, quoted in Tidwell, *op. cit.*, 108.

There are countless examples of groups involved in conflicts that have an especially heightened sense of history. It would be hard to find groups in conflict, which do not have a strong sense of the past. The group may be a town council, members of an association, a union, an ethnic group, or even a nation. Any and all of these collectivities, when faced with conflict will call up their histories to explain who they are and why they are in conflict. The field of conflict resolution and analysis is interested with all kinds of groups, and deals with various conflicts stemming from intra-group as well as inter-group problems. However, in order there to be a "group", there must be an overarching ethos of common cause, shared past and projected future. Hence, the importance of imaginary categories next to immediate material concerns is obvious.

To give an example, this importance of constructed categories is shown by the mechanism called by Vamik Volkan "chosen trauma".[87] A chosen trauma refers to a tragic event that is shared by a people, the mental representation of which influences the group's collective identity. Over the years, through internalization, such traumas and glories are recreated in the external world and often linked to new events. Such attitudes and perceptions promote the consolidation of the status quo and the promotion of the culture of conflict. The model is built on the "blame/defend" mindset and the polarised view of "us versus them" and the "enemy image". Especially when the basic human needs of identity, security, recognition, autonomy, participation, self-esteem and a sense of justice continue to be frustrated and remain unfulfilled, then fears of the other (often exaggerated and understood in the context of dehumanisation) and a culture of conflict prevail. This facilitates the "us versus them" mindset which is then instituted in discourse and behaviours. A consequence of the reconstruction of the past is that memories of suffering because of the other are chronically transferred to young generations while the pain or experiences of the other group are being ignored. This promotes the impression that only "we suffered", a notion that gives rise to historic wrongs and latent feelings of revenge.[88] Thus the "us versus them" ideology is deepened and the dehumanisation

---

[86] *Ibid.*
[87] Vamik Volkan, "On Chosen Trauma", *Mind And Human Interaction*, 3, 1 (1991); Vamik Volkan, et. al., Vol. II, *op. cit.*
[88] Yannis Papadakis, "Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process", *American Ethnologist*, 25, 2 (1998): 149-165.

process becomes institutionalised. The cases of "chosen trauma" show the relevance of a collectively constructed memory and identity for any kind of conflict analysis.

Groups employ two main mechanisms in the construction of the collective memory aimed at creating and developing group identity.[89] The first mechanism accentuates the conflictual past. Recalling heroic narratives is aimed at reinforcing unity within the group, while emphasising past persecutions imposes the duty of fidelity of group members. The second mechanism adopts the opposite approach. Here the past events, unlike in the first, are not overemphasised but instead concealed. In particular, this mechanism is employed when representatives face embarrassing and shameful past episodes. However, both mechanisms share fundamental characteristics. They do not imply any recognition of the representation of the past shared by members of the other group - nor even knowledge of the existence of other interpretations. Both mechanisms are incompatible with the idea of an identity resulting from a negotiation with the other party.[90] What is expected of conflict resolution is to bring in this negotiation whose absence constitutes a huge barrier preventing the recognition of the "other".

Historical identities and historical memories, especially in modern times, are inescapably related to the definition of a nation. Despite all the recent discussions on globalisation and on the eventual disappearance of nation-states, nationalism still holds its immense psychological and political capital. E. Hobsbawm's definition about the nation is explicative in this sense: "a sufficiently large body of people whose members regard themselves as members of a nation".[91] The creation of this sense of "nationness" brings about various mechanisms of identity formation with reference to past events. An analysis of these mechanisms and of their impact on consciousness and identity formation is especially crucial for conflict transformation in the long run.

In modern nation-states, this process of identity formation through history is realised often via education. Each nation-state tries to create and reproduce a certain understanding of history that contributes to the formation of citizenship. From the very beginning, an individual is confronted with history as a building block of his or her

[89] For an analysis of these mechanisms in groups, see Rosoux, *op. cit.*
[90] *Ibid.*
[91] Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 8.

identity and culture. Historical learning provides more than useful information; it fosters a sense of history, which in turn provides perspective and distance on immediate affairs and aids in making judgments. In these ways historical knowledge contributes to citizenship, and thus to "nation-building". Because stories are so important in our self-understanding, school history naturally suggests itself as a vehicle for shaping political identity.[92] National history tells children of the "great deeds and the high purposes" of their predecessors and locates them as "participants in an unfinished story."[93] It makes them bearers of a heritage. It reminds children that the opportunities and well being they now enjoy resulted from the hard work and sacrifices of earlier generations, grounding a sense of gratitude to the past and responsibility for future generations. This particular way of teaching history may be termed as "patriotic history", a form of pragmatic history that contributes to the strengthening of identity bonds for the concerns of nation-building and political reproduction.

Next to education, another critical institution in the context of national identity formation is communication, or the role played by the news media. Communication is a critical element of collective memory. It is what transcends the psychological aspects of memory and makes the concept sociological. Within this web of communication, journalism occupies perhaps the most important instance of the creation of a collective memory. The present is immediately turned by journalism into a lived experience, and is recorded as such.[94] The media are unique in their ability to reach huge communities simultaneously. Communication networks, by reproducing the understanding of a common historical past provided by education, enhance and enlarge the field of impact of collective memory. B. Zelizer shows that the news media is crucial in simplifying and handing down a collective national memory.[95] Thus, the impact of education and news

---

[92] "History has generally played a more fundamental role than literature in the creation and maintenance of national identities. A democratic public culture can not survive without broad commitments to democratic ideas, traditions, and freedoms that come in part from a knowledge of history. Public debate requires a shared vocabulary that emerges from the historical experience and language of people people who acknowledge some common values or principles or founding events": Lloyd Kramer and Donald Reid, "Introduction : Historical Knowledge, Education, and Public Culture," in *Learning History in America*, ed. Lloyd Kramer, Donald Reid and William L. Barney (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 4.
[93] Walter Lippman, *Essays in the Public Philosophy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1955), quoted in *ibid,* 137.
[94] For the impact of journalism on collective memory, see Jill A. Edy, "Journalistic Uses of Collective Memory", *Journal of Communication* (Spring 1999).
[95] B. Zelizer, "Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies", *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12 (1999): 214-239.

media is to be kept in mind while analysing conflicts. These are the dynamics that are used as tools in the process of the formation of national identities and memories. Education instils a sense of history in the members of a given community, while the news media reproduces and reshapes this particular past.

In light of this discussion of collective identity and memory with respect to their relation with history, that most of the efforts at reshaping the past and instilling a sense of history in the minds of people are introduced by nation-states or national entities, which are by definition unique and exclusive. Below, I want to give some cases of conflict displaying the impact of the past on identity formation. These examples make it possible to see that nationalism is one of the biggest stakes in ethnic and interstate conflicts. A conflict analyst should bear in mind that a careful analysis of nationalist claims is at hand each time a group's or a country's identity becomes problematic.

Especially after the demise of the Soviet Union, a considerable number of ethnic clashes climbing up to the level of full-scale wars erupted. In all these conflicts, identity formation, historical claims and a belated sense of nationality came to the fore. Some examples, illustrate how identities are constructed with reference to history and as such become important contentions in conflicts, are necessary. Again, I do not mean that history is the only dimension of such conflicts. Competitions over scarce resources or political crises are obviously part of the picture. Nevertheless, when historical claims are ignored, conflict analysts deal only with the present, current terms of the conflicts and can only devise short-term solutions. Unless the potential to conflict that is provided by history is eliminated or transformed, a conflict may not be deemed fully resolved.

One such example, illustrating the prominence of identity concerns, is the question of Nagorno-Karabagh between Armenians and Azerbaijanis. In this conflict, still unresolved despite many efforts on the part of the international community, even political aggression and violence has been defined according to historical and identity-related concerns. Historiography is used as a battlefield for the conflict regarding Nagorno-Karabakh as well as for conflicts within the Armenian society itself. The opponents in both cases chose this arena for two reasons: firstly, because history is a powerful means of strengthening the collective identity of a social group and secondly, because historiography can be used to fence off "the Other". To be sure, history is only one aspect

of this ethnic conflict. However, especially in the case of Armenian claims, history constitutes an open-ended question, still waiting to be resolved. Historical considerations are reflected into immediate problems and viewed within this continuity.[96] Again in the context of that conflict, Anthony Baird states that an important part of the effort of conflict resolution has to be centred on dissolving collective fears and historical hatreds by taking into account "the symbolic 'identity' nature" of the conflict.[97] Thus, next to an analysis of international relations, economic considerations and political problems, the mutual considerations of Azerbaijanis and Armenians are to be taken into account.

Another example of a conflict where identity concerns tied to historical notions is the recent Kurdish question. According to Konrad Hirschler, Kurdish historiography in Turkey in the 1990s constructed, defined, and reworked Kurdish national identity. Based on the assumption of the existence of a historically oppressed identity, Kurdish historiography has been one of the most powerful tools in the assertion of this identity in the present.[98] According to Hirschler, the struggle for national liberation and the future establishment of a nation-state is represented as the result of a teleological historical development, as part of a pre-determined process. Within this process, Turks are attributed the function of the Other against whom the struggle is waged.[99] Turks are portrayed as the barbaric Other, and history is seen as the eternal struggle between the defending, civilised insider and the aggressive, barbaric outsider. Thus, in this Kurdish search for ethnic identity, the absence of a definable ethnic identity is blamed on the historical invention of an occupying force that divested Kurds of their identities. According to this scheme, the assertion of identity starts with the rediscovery of historical roots: Identity is something that lies in the depths of history, and it is possible to revive it. This revival includes the standardisation of language, the rewriting of a national past in essentialist terms, the finding out of a national core culture. To sum up, while history is a contested terrain for the interpretation of a contemporary question in the Nagorno-

---

[96] Nora Dudwick, " Trouble on the Periphery: The Cultural Construction of Political Violence in Armenia and Azerbaijan", *Problems of Post-Communism*, 42, 4 (July-August 1995): 18.
[97] Anthony Baird, "Atmosphere of Reconciliation: A Theory of Resolving Ethnic Conflicts Based on the Transcaucasian Conflicts", http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/2_4baird.htm.
[98] Konrad Hirschler, "Defining the Nation: Kurdish Historiography in Turkey in the 1990s", *Middle Eastern Studies,* 3, 3 (July 2001): 147.
[99] A. Vali, "The Kurds and their 'Others'", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 18 (1998): 82-95.

Karabakh question, it becomes a toll with which to structure a previously non-existing national identity in the context of the Kurdish question.

Another interesting example is the question of North Ireland, where historical identities are formed not only on the basis of national differences, but also with reference to religious differences. Catholics and Protestants define their alignments with reference to their historical-religious identities.[100] Irish language is used by Catholics as the symbol of their independence from a Protestant control under English rule. This conflict, to sum up, illustrates another modality of the problematization of history. In this case, religious affiliations come before other national concerns; in fact, an exclusive nationalist item such as language is subjected to a historical experience of Catholicism.

Examples about the weight of history in ethnic conflicts or identity formation are limitless. In fact, the main focus of this thesis is not to provide an extensive analysis on how history is used in identity formation. The three examples given above are intended to illustrate the fact that history may serve different purposes, may be used for various intentions and in different manners in cases of conflict. What is important is to look, in each separate case, about the particular function and the relative weight of that ideological discourse. This has a relative weight, indeed, according to the importance attributed to historical issues by involved parties. However, the existence of this relative weight, with all its implications for the outbreak and continuation of a conflict, is never to be neglected.

This section gives a theoretical analysis in order to illustrate the necessary connection between history and conflict resolution by focusing on the role of history in identity formation, collective memory, group consciousness. I have intended to illustrate that identities, be they ethnic or individual, cannot be grasped outside historical processes. As a consequence, history is a crucial part of the mechanism of conflicts, when we think that a conflict is often conceived of in terms of identities and self-definitions. This theoretical background is necessary for a conflict analyst. If we accept that present-day definitions of a conflict are shaped by history among other factors, history then becomes an important component of the work of the conflict analyst.

---

[100] Karen V. Armstrong, "The Irish Language in Northern Ireland: The Politics of Culture and Identity", *American Anthropologist*, 102,2 (June 2001): 555-6.

IV. 2. Conflict analysis methodology and history

Throughout its development, social psychology, game theory, quantitative analyses have been used by conflict analysis and resolution.[101] Social psychology has always been a popular method in conflict analysis and resolution, as demonstrated by Kenneth Kressel[102] and Morton Deutsch.[103] Game theory, on the other hand, is another popular method in the field. Game theory's formulation of the problem of conflict of interests in mathematical terms, its recognition of the intertwining of cooperative and competitive interests in situations of conflict has had a positive impact on the social psychological study of conflicts.[104] In the words of Morton Deutsch, "game theory helped to develop a systematic understanding of conflict processes and conflict resolution".[105] Thus, from the very beginning, conflict analysis and resolution employed a hybrid methodology, based on a positivistic understanding of research methods and analysis. Another feature of conflict resolution methodology has been its interdisciplinarity. The field of conflict analysis and resolution displayed a flexibility in its research methods. This is the reason why I argue that history has a potential to be a part of the field in its methodology.

This thesis employs a triangular argument bringing together theory, methodology and practice in a same picture. Within this picture bringing theory, methodology and practice together, history has an obvious contribution in each step. To quote Druckman and Stern, international conflict resolution

> should use multiple perspectives, sources of data, constructs, interpretive frameworks, and modes of analysis to address specific questions on the presumption that research approaches that rely on certain perspectives, constructs, and so forth can act as partial correctives for the limitations of research approaches that rely on different ones.[106]

---

[101] See Morton Deutsch and Peter T. Coleman (eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution. Theory and Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000), 11-17.
[102] Kenneth Kressel, "Mediation", in Deutsch and Coleman (eds.), *op. cit.*, 522-45.
[103] Morton Deutsch, "A Framework for Thinking about Research on Conflict Resolution Training", in Deutsch and Coleman (eds.), *op. cit.*, 571-90.
[104] *Ibid.*, 13-14.
[105] *Ibid.*
[106] Stern and Druckman (eds.), *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War.*

History, in my argumentation, is one of these perspectives that are expected to enrich the analysis of the conflict and to go beyond the limitations of the field. Accordingly, I want to emphasise that there is a relationship of complementarity between these three layers of theory, methodology and practice, and between history and conflict analysis. My emphasis of history is significant since historical contextualization provides us with an opportunity to comprehend the specific events and perceptions within a larger picture.[107] In the words of Druckman and Stern,

> Careful analysis of historical and other evidence together with the development of clear diagnostic concepts and empirically tested theories of peace processes can make a modest but significant contribution to practitioners' ability to understand and intervene to resolve conflicts.[108]

At this juncture, two reservations regarding the inclusion of history in the methodology of conflict analysis and resolution need to be made. First, history has not been completely neglected within the field. As I mentioned before, the field uses history as a chronological tool, or as a data set to explain some patterns. In that sense, although history is somehow used, this use remains heavily within the overall positivistic methodology of the field. One example of the use of history is given by a study realised by Nimet Beriker and Daniel Druckman[109]. By examining a historical case systematically, they have tried to infer an outcome from the minutes of the negotiations around the Lausanne Treaty.

My second reservation is about the extent to which the practitioners of the field can use history as a method. I do not want to claim that a conflict analyst has also to act as a historian. That big fallacy would create confusion. Stern and Druckman point at this risk present for a conflict analyst in his/her relation with history. They quote Neustadt and May and say that there are "serious dangers ... in relying on single historical

---

[107] Richard Johnson, "Historical Returns: Transdisciplinarity, Cultural Studies, and History", *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 4 (3) (2001), 261-88 *passim*.
[108] Stern and Druckman, *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War.*
[109] Nimet Beriker and Daniel Druckman, "Models of Responsiveness: Lausanne Peace Negotiations (1922-23), "*Journal of Social Psychology,* 131, 2 (1992): 297-300; Nimet Beriker and Daniel Druckman, "Simulating the Lausanne Peace Negotiations, 1922-23: Power Asymmetries in Bargaining," *Simulating and Gaming,* 27 (1996): 162-183.

analogies for policy guidance".[110] Moreover, Druckman and Stern are also aware of the fact that a conflict analyst cannot work as a historian would do in the same case:

> Taking a purely empirical approach may not be fruitful because there are normally a very large number of potentially relevant events going on … Thus, history normally leaves us with multiple, sometimes conflicting, explanations based on different causal variables.[111]

To sum up, a conflict analyst is not expected to deal with all the historical data present in a case of conflict. In the middle of this proliferation of data, a conflict analyst has must carefully use relevant bits of information for the analysis and resolution of the conflict. The acknowledgment among various "propositions, hypotheses and expectations about contingent relationships and temporal processes can provide practitioners with a useful diagnostic guide for action".[112] However, practitioners have to have defined agenda to identify the relevant historical information that would suit the aims of conflict analysis and resolution.

Analysts need to learn the lessons of history, but history provides no definitive or comprehensive text. History provides us with a link tying past events with contemporary issues. In that sense, historiographical approaches and historical methods pave the way of understanding a conflict as a part of a larger historical formation. An analyst endowed with historical lenses attempts to read the character of the times and its conditions. As Paul Ricoeur states, history has a highly "fictional" character. Ricoeur makes a fundamental distinction between "fictional narratives" and "empirical narratives" of various actors.[113] In case of a conflict, fictional narratives are often encountered as a party's subjective version of the history of the conflict. While dealing with the narratives of parties about a specific conflict, an analyst has to keep in mind the subjective and multiple readings hidden in the different histories/stories of a conflict.

To conclude, conflict analysis methodology can gain additional insights from the inclusion of history and historiography. This effort is valuable but should be handled with special attention. No one expects a conflict analyst to assume the role of a historian, but

---

[110] Stern and Druckman *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War,* 39-40.
[111] *Ibid.*, 53.
[112] *Ibid.*, 59.
[113] Quoted in Johnson, *op. cit.*, 281-2.

to act with an awareness for historical issues. A conflict analyst has a practical task in case of history, and this task is to make use of evidences presented by history in a selective manner. However, this use should be beyond a positivist understanding of history as a simple data set. A conflict analyst should also deal with the necessary effort of interpretation of historical evidence.

IV. 3. Practical uses of history in conflict analysis and resolution

After describing the theoretical and methodological use of history, my next step is to describe how history can be used in conflict analysis and resolution. As mentioned before in this thesis, it appears that history is not only a feature of conflict, but also a most powerful analytical tool. Without a good sense of history, no conflict can be understood in a way meaningful for resolution. In other words, no conflict can be practically resolved. As Tillett argues, "the history of each party is important in understanding the origins and the nature of the conflict, in identifying the nature of the conflict, and in preparing for resolution".[114] History is more than a mere description of the past; it provides insight into the deeper layers of meaning. Whether it is a descriptive study, or the telling of history by a participant in conflict, the third party must do more than simply account for details. The analyst has to employ various methods in order to discover the motivations and sub-texts behind the conflict; the key here is to cut beyond the descriptive detail and access the more deeply seated sources of motivation.[115] A practice consists of analysis and subsequent action. For a successful practical application of conflict resolution, history must be brought in both in analysis as well as in tactical considerations.

Thus, the first task is to make history part of the process of analysing the conflict. History is then another one of the methodological tools to be used by the conflict analyst. Pruitt and Rubin offer some useful insights into how an analysis of conflict may be

[114] Greg Tillett, *Resolving Conflict: A Practical Approach* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1992) cited in Tidwell, *op. cit.*, 15.
[115] Vamik Volkan, *Cyprus: War and Adaptation* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1979), 34.

completed with the inclusion of historical issues.[116] They suggest that before conflicts occur, those more deeply seated forces, such as human needs or values, must become articulated in terms of goals or standards, or what they term "aspirations". There are five determinants of aspiration levels: past achievement, perceived power, rules and norms, comparison with others and the formation of struggle groups. These five determinants are important for the study of conflict because they provide a historical dimension. Each of these determinants involves some sense of history. Understanding the deep-rooted currents in history is a vital point for understanding the dynamics of the conflict. According to that model, the analyst of conflict should not look for a unique version of past events, since this would be a mistake. A conflict analyst should rather examine the different versions of past experiences that provide guidance and motivation for the actions of parties in the present. History provides the analyst with some explanation of the behaviours of parties; it also tells about the state of mind of the parties. An analysts has to include history in his/her evaluation of the conflict in order to understand the nature of emotional commitment exhibited by the parties.[117]

After dealing with the importance of history in conflict analysis, I will now examine how we can use history in conflict resolution. While dealing with the respective positions of the parties during the process of resolution, we have to be aware of the place that history occupies in the definition of the groups. Those who wish to disarm an opponent will seek the simple ploy of decoupling the present and future from the past; this is a position often adopted by more powerful parties. On the other hand, weak parties will cling to their sense of history much more tightly than those will with relatively more power. This argument is especially true in the cases of ethnic conflicts where one side, more powerful than the other, incites some acts of aggression.

As I said before, history plays a central role in the resolution of conflict. In the practices of mediation, negotiation, and problem-solving workshops, a blueprint provided by history is always present but not activated so much. For example, most methods of conflict resolution have as one of their first steps that the parties in conflict describe the story, or the past, of the conflict. This is a clear recognition that one cannot plan for a

---

[116] Pruitt and Rubin, *Social Conflict* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1986), quoted in Tidwell, *op. cit.*, 120-2.
[117] *Ibid.*

resolution today without taking into account what has happened in the past. The process of detailing the history of a given conflict serves several important contributions. It offers an opportunity to learn about the conflict from both sides. It illustrates how the various parties perceive the conflict, it highlights similarities and differences. The description of mutual stories has an important mission: the prevention of the dehumanisation of the "other". In order to achieve this, we have to abandon popular and preconceived notions of history. It is a widely held belief that the future is open and not yet determined, whereas the past is immutable. In fact, the past is probably never altogether closed. Admittedly, events can not be erased, one cannot undo what has been done, or pretend that what happened never occurred. However, the process of conflict resolution can bring in an alternative view of human relationships.

A negotiation informed by historical concerns would be very close to the model presented by Dupont.[118] According to him, negotiation consists of five steps: the preliminary phase, the information phase, the argumentation phase, the adjustment phase and the formation of the agreement. In the first phase, there should be calls for mutual confidence. The second step, called "information exchange" by Dupont, involves the description of the interpretation given by each side to the past events. In the third phase of argumentation, each side is asked justification of their interpretations. The fourth phase is about reconstruction, i.e. the recognition of the plural character of interpretation. In the final phase, there should be attempts at building a common memory and agreement, and this may be done by developing a common language about the past. In this scheme of resolution, the common past of the parties to the conflict is explored. It is shown that they have been living through a same past, but that they made differing and conflicting interpretations of it.

In such a practical scheme, the work of memory occupies an important place. The work of memory may be analysed as a particular form of negotiation. It contains four components of a negotiation:

[118] C. Dupont, *La Négociation. Conduite, théorie, applications* (Paris: Dalloz, 1994), cited in V.B. Rosoux, *op. cit*.

- it implies an interaction between protagonists;
- it takes root in the divergences between the perception and representation of the past, and emphasises the need of a new negotiated interpretation;
- this negotiation is only undertaken if the parties share common interests;
- the objective is a mutually acceptable solution.[119]

In fact, the objective is to avoid being locked into memories. This work of memory implies a new understanding of identity that would go far beyond the exclusivity of a national or ethnic identity. The purpose of the facilitator in this process is to develop a common language capable of encompassing the common past of the involved parties. At the very least, the aim is to establish a minimum basis of a common interpretation of future events. The ultimate goal is to increase the potential for a rapprochement rather than encourage further distancing. In this context, the identity that is presented by groups must include the recognition of the existence of others.

A critical step in the way to resolution is constituted by the problem-solving workshops, started by John W. Burton, that aim at changing people's negative perceptions about an adversary and re-establishing trust. The process that takes place during the workshops can be described as "confirming". Through dialogue, people confirm each other's humanity and recognise beliefs and values of the other side. Third party intervention is also important at that stage. The goal of third party communication and facilitation is aimed to de-legitimise negative stereotypes that the opponents have about each other. The workshop is designed so as to create a more human image of the opponent.

The first stage that the parties go through at the problem-solving workshop is the examination of conflict history. By looking at the history of their relationships, the parties get a chance to present grievances that have not been acknowledged by the other side. There should be a reciprocal process of acknowledgment of injustices committed and forgiveness through dialogue between the adversaries. In these story-telling processes, the historical perceptions, emotional baggages and subjective interpretations of objective situations are expressed. Here, the role of the third party is to regulate this "claiming and blaming" session and open the table to reasonable discussion. In other words, without

[119] Rosoux, *op. cit.*

ignoring the use of history in the self-definitions of the respective parties, these emotional stakes must be limited. The risk is that historical perceptions may prevent people from assessing real situations. There is a critical balance that has to be handled by the third party. On the one hand, he/she has to convince the parties that they are heard, that their stories are recognised. On the other hand, he/she has to prevent them from being entrapped into their own positions. Perhaps, the inclusion of objective historians from both sides may provide a common language and decent discussion on the way to resolution.

On the practical side, the problem-solving workshop puts into question the negative stereotyping and polarised images that come from history. The next step is joint learning and creative thinking. The "us versus them" dichotomy is challenged by the establishment of empathy with others.

To be sure, these workshops have a limited number of participants. Only a limited number of participants are involved in the process of resolution. Even if the participants of a problem-solving workshop may be influent members of a community or a nation, they cannot change by themselves the perceptions of a community or a society as a whole. Therefore, a larger effort should follow these workshops in order to transform public consciousness. Especially for preventing the re-emergence of conflictual issues in the future, a work of conflict transformation on a long-term basis is to be realised.

Joseph Montville's scheme for a history-conscious conflict resolution is one of the best examples that illustrate the promising future of the contribution of history to conflict transformation.[120] According to Montville, efforts to transform public consciousness should follow the resolution or termination of the conflict. For example, an armed conflict may first and foremost be ended by an intervention of peacekeeping forces. However, after the termination of the armed conflict, in Montville's terms, "wounds should be healed". The feelings of victimhood and the traumas that lie behind the conflict must be remedied for a long-term and sustainable conflict resolution effort. It is obvious that the past experiences can not be erased, nor can they be easily wiped away. That is why conflict transformation in the long-term should interact with the history of conflicts

[120] Joseph V. Montville, "The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution" in Dennis Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (eds.), *op.cit*., 112-27.

and with historical perceptions of adversaries. In this sense, I agree with Montville who states that

> healing and reconciliation in violent ethnic and religious conflicts depend on a process of transactional contrition and forgiveness between aggressor and victims which is indispensable to the establishment of a new relationship based on mutual acceptance and reasonable trust. This process depends on joint analysis of the history of the conflict, recognition of injustice and resulting historic wounds, and acceptance of moral responsibility where due.[121]

A possible solution to the deepened feelings of hatred and enmity can come from a "walk through history" carried out together by the winners and losers to rediscover what happened in the past which keeps alive so much anger and resentment in the present. Such a walk establishes an agenda for healing. Ideally, this process produces an acknowledgment of wrongs, a critical first step in liberating the victims from their fears and resentments.[122]

A reconsideration of historical claims on a wider basis is an important step in the transformation of public consciousness. Of course, the task of changing public opinion is more complicated than changing a single person. It has been proven that there are many barriers in the way of its transformation: social factors such as social networks or political leaders, and psychological factors such as family and friends who reinforce negative stereotypes. However, these barriers can be susceptible to new information, if it comes from reliable sources and is disseminated in various ways through mass media and personal networks, and includes both sides of the issue.

In modern nation-states, two institutions are crucial in the formation and transformation of public consciousness, official memory, patriotic history, etc. While taking into account the impact of history, the field of conflict resolution has to be aware of the dynamic aspect of education and the media. Often used to strengthen nationalist sentiments and produce stereotypes about the other, education and the media can also be utilised in order to create and propagate an alternative understanding of history and identity.

---

[121] *Ibid.*, 112.
[122] *Ibid.*

Historical perceptions of nations and communities or collective memory concerns, like Pearl Harbour for the American public, or the War of Independence for the Turkish public, are often dealt with in the news media, documentaries, popular history books, television serials, etc. To be sure, each use of the past has important implications for popular consciousness and collective memory. What is important in the uses and misuses of collective memory lies in the fact that commemorative rituals and stories may serve as a means of developing unity in the wake of social discord rather than a means of celebrating unity.[123] Thus, in times of conflict, it is obvious that there will be an effort at recalling all the items of a collective memory, at redefining historical events. This mechanism, often fostered by the media, makes history part of the conflict itself, and the media becomes one of the parties to the conflict.

Therefore, it is crucial to make a sensible use of the news media in the process of conflict resolution and transformation. The media is one of the most important creators and perpetrators of an official memory. However, this impact may be reversed and used in the way of an alternative representation of the roots and present state of a conflict.

Another method for conflict transformation, for the process of influencing and changing public opinion, is to deal with education, and especially with the way history is taught in schools. In nearly all countries, history is taught in a nationalist-patriotic fashion. Worse, in serving as the handmaiden of nationalism, patriotic history "creates a mythical land in which people understand themselves and each other" and "legitimates attacks on people (within) whose lives are different."[124] Accordingly, in case of a conflict, it is not enough to call the involved agents as "parties". What is required is to be aware of this category of the historical "Other" that exists in minds.

A more balanced education, based not only on patriotic aspects of history, may be helpful in the prevention of future conflicts. Teaching children to view their own identities as a cultural product implicitly teaches them to respect people with other identities. Education must help foster the understanding of civic citizenship responsibilities, promote the principles of pluralism and teach something about the others' culture and the way of life. Students should be able to develop a knowledge and

---

[123] D. Dayan, & E. Katz, *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).
[124] Richard Sennett, "Narrative as Knowing", *Yale Journal of Criticism,* 5 (1992): 179-82.

understanding of the similarities and differences between the cultural traditions and historical experiences that influence both themselves and others. The process of conflict transformation should include the constitution of joint committees for teaching history, and the writing of new textbooks should be supervised. For political reasons the prevalent education paradigm has been mainly based on the "us versus them" dichotomy resulting in a culture of psychological and historical divergences. A new educational paradigm should call for abandoning the competitive and antagonistic approach to addressing differences, replacing it with a new joint problem-solving oriented paradigm that promotes the building of a new social and political culture based on the principles of democracy, pluralism and multiculturalism. Education can thus function as a healing platform for past mutual grievances, and develop joint responsibility toward a future to benefit all.

***

Throughout this chapter, I have tried to show what could be the modalities of collaboration between conflict analysis and resolution and history by making a threefold distinction of theory, methodology, and practice. Obviously and inevitably, there is an overlap among these three dimensions. Theoretical ideas that have been developed are useful in understanding conflict processes as well as in helping people to manage their conflicts constructively. Historical underpinnings should be of value to anyone interested in understanding and analysing the nature of conflict and more generally social interactions of any kind. More than that, I think that short-term conflict resolution and long-term conflict transformation are both helped by an awareness about historical backgrounds of conflicts. I have discussed both conflict resolution and conflict transformation in my sections on theory and practice in order to better illustrate different uses of history for conflict analysis.

Having said this, I have first discussed the importance of history in the formation of identity and memory. Arguing that a considerable number of conflicts are defined on the basis of identities and imaginary categories, I wanted to show the role played by history at the background of conflicts. The modern nation-state, for instance, creates

identities to sustain its political and economic existence; however, in the process, it also leads to the formation of categories of otherness that may become problematic in cases of conflict. Education and mass media often support this identity of "us versus them", by strengthening it through various means. Ethnic groups, as seen in post-Cold War ethnic conflicts, also show the power of identities constructed with reference to past events. Moreover, history does not only intervene in the cases of big groups like ethnic formations or nations. Each group has a history of its own, has some historically formed leadership, decision making and resource allocation mechanisms.

Methodology is an essential part of a triangular approach of any scientific inquiry and is as such an integral part of my discussion in this thesis. My criticism to conflict resolution is that it failed to a large extent to include historiography and history in its methodology. Beyond simple chronological uses of history and positivist evaluations of historical data sets, there are few studies making sense of the historical background of conflicts, of the contribution of history to the formation of subjective arguments by conflicting parties. My argument is that history should be included in the method of the practitioner in a selective manner. It must be used not as a nomothetical, rule-making discipline, but as a complement to the already interdisciplinary method of the conflict analyst. It must be used, as a contextual frame, to verify and re-assure our conclusions.

In terms of practice, there are some concrete steps to be made. First of all, in the problem-solving workshops, while bringing different parties together, it seems necessary to involve neutral historians in the discussion. This procedure can be used in order to create alternative understandings of history and identity. After conflict resolution efforts, a follow-up step would be conflict transformation. A long-term conflict transformation effort can be centred on an alternative use of education and the media. One of the major tasks for education is to promote objective facts and think empathically in terms of other as well. As Feinberg states, "knowledge of the other culture enables the student to see his/her own position as contingent and subject to reflexive development and change."[125]

[125]Walter Feinberg, *Common Schools/ Uncommon Identities: National Unity and Cultural Difference* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), cited in Maria Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, "A Partnership Between Peace Education and Conflict Resolution: The Case of Cyprus", http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~cerpe/papers/mariaht.htm.

Education and the media should be re-tuned to include a more balanced, just and fair assessment of other cultures and identities.

V. CONCLUSION

I have started my discussion with a general description of the field of conflict analysis and resolution. In order to cover a broad range of topics, I have used a threefold approach to the field, emphasising the theoretical, methodological, and practical aspects. After a review of the current state of the theoretical approaches to conflict and conflict resolution, I proceeded with an analysis of methodological and practical aspects of the field. These inquiries necessarily dealt with history and its relation to conflict analysis and resolution. Finally, in the fourth chapter, I tried to find an answer to the question of how to make history a component of conflict resolution theory, methodology and practice. Below, I will summarise the conclusions that I reached throughout my discussion.

First of all, I have to repeat once again that conflict is an undeniable fact of social and individual life. In addition, conflict is a highly dynamic phenomenon that, if handled correctly, may lead to productive resolution situations. Thus, rather than seeing conflict as the disruption of a status quo and preaching for a return to the status quo ante, I argue that conflict situations open up new vistas for new settlements.

In this context, conflict analysis and resolution appears as a necessary tool with which to handle conflicts and to create new resolution environments. Conflict resolution's criticism of realism endows this field with a sophisticated understanding of conflicts, and makes it ready to develop productive resolution strategies. Conflict resolution's interdisciplinary character makes it possible to use the insights of various disciplines, to see conflict environments as sophisticated atmospheres involving various dynamics. However, the field of conflict resolution and analysis made use of history only for descriptive and chronological concerns, and preferred to adopt a positivistic approach in its research strategies.

History is not just what happened in the past. Indeed, history is what people in the present think and say about the past. It is what shapes the culture and identity of an individual or a group. For short-term conflict resolution purposes, an analyst, a scholar or a practitioner must make use of history and bring in historical components of the process of analysis and resolution. Moreover, especially in modern times, with the emergence of

modern nationalism and the “public use of history” with the aim of forging a new political consciousness, historical concerns have been deeply written into culture and identity. These concerns acted more than once as motivators in ethnic conflicts in national and international level. At that point, efforts of conflict transformation, working for long-term settlements, have to make sense of this particular weight of history.

Conflict resolution is in fact well placed for such a theoretical, methodological and practical reformation. It can include historical considerations into its theory, methodology, and practice in order to solve conflicts on a short-term and long-term basis, to terminate conflicts and to prevent them from popping up again in the future. First of all, its interdisciplinary character makes it possible to collaborate with other fields of social sciences. Methodologically, going beyond a simple positivist research tool will open up a place for the inclusion of history as well. Practically speaking, problem-solving workshops may be revised and re-designed with a specific sensitivity to historical concerns. In the context of conflict transformation, the creation of an alternative understanding of history may be realised through the revision of textbooks, together with a publishing and broadcasting activity to supersede the stereotypes propagated by the media.

Bibliography

Avruch, Kevin. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.

Avruch, Kevin and Peter W. Black. "Conflict Resolution in Intercultural Settings: Problems and Prospects". In *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice Integration and Application*, eds. D. Sandole and H. van der Merwe, 131-45. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

_____. "The Culture Question and Intercultural Conflict Resolution". *Peace and Change* 16 (1991): 22-45.

Avruch, Kevin, Peter W. Black and J. Scimecca, eds. *Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Azar, Edward A. "Protracted International Conflicts: Ten Propositions". In *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, eds. J. Burton and E. A. Azar. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf, 1986.

_____. *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict*. Hampshire, UK: Dartmouth, 1990.

Baldwin, D. A., ed. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Banks, M. and Christopher Mitchell. *Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. London: Pinter, 1996.

Beriker, Nimet and Daniel Druckman. "Models of Responsiveness: Lausanne Peace Negotiations (1922-23)", *Journal of Social Psychology,* 131, 2 (1992): 297-300.

Beriker, Nimet and Daniel Druckman. “Simulating the Lausanne Peace Negotiations, 1922-23: Power Asymmetries in Bargaining”, *Simulating and Gaming,* 27 (1996): 162-183.

Berkovitch, J. and R. Jackson. *International Conflict: A Chronological Encyclopedia of Conflicts and Their Management 1945-1995*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1997.

Burton, J. W. *Conflict Resolution: Its Language and Processes*. London: Scarecrow Press, 1996.

_____. *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990.

_____. *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1990.

_____. *Conflict Resolution as a Political System.* Working Paper 1. Fairfax, Virginia: Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, 1988.

_____. *Resolving Deep-rooted Conflict: A Handbook*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.

_____. “The History of Conflict Resolution”. In *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, eds. J. Burton and E. A. Azar. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf, 1986.

Burton, J. W. and F. Dukes. *Conflict: Practices in Management: Settlement and Resolution*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1990.

Burton, J. W. and D. J. Sandole. “Expanding the Debate on Generic Theory of Conflict Resolution: A Response to Critique”. *Negotiation Journal* 3, 1 (1987).

_____. “Generic Theory: The Basis of Conflict Resolution”. *Negotiation Journal* 2, 2 (1986): 333-44.

Bruner, Jerome. *Acts of Meaning.* Cambridge, Massachussets.: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Cruz, Consuelo. “Identity and Persuasion: How Nations Remember Their Pasts and Make Their Futures”. *World Politics* 52, 3 (April 2000).

Daniels, R. V. “Does the Present Change the Past?”. *The Journal of Modern History* 70 (1998): 431-435.

Dayan, D. & Katz, E. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Deutsch, M. “Subjective Features of Conflict Resolution”. In *New Directions in Conflict Theory*, ed. Raimo Vayrynen. London: Sage, 1991.

Dougherty J. E. and R. L. Pfaltzgraff. *Contending Theories of International Relations.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1981.

Duryea, M. L. and J. Potts. “Story and Legend: Powerful Tools for Conflict Resolution”. *Mediation Quarterly* 10, 4: 387-395.

Feinberg, Walter. *Common Schools/ Uncommon Identities: National Unity and Cultural Difference*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Fisher, Ronald J. *Interactive Conflict Resolution.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

_____. "Interactive Conflict Resolution". In *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, eds. William Zartman and Louis Ramussen. Washington D.C.: U. S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

_____. "Prenegotiation Problem-Solving Discussions: Enhancing the Potential for Successful Negotiations". In *Getting to the Table: The Processes of International Prenegotiation*, ed. J. G. Stein. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Fisher, R. and W. Ury. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.* New York: Penguin, 1981.

Fisher, R. and L. Keashly, "The Potential Complementarity of Mediation and Consultation within a Contingency Model of Third Party Intervention". *Journal of Peace Research* 28, 1 (1991).

Frisch, M. *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. New York, 1990.

Galtung, J. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, and Civilization.* London: Sage, 1996.

Giles, J. and T. Middleton. *Studying Culture: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Hadjipavlou- Trigeorgis, Maria, and L. Trigeorgis. "Cyprus. An Evolutionary Approach to Conflict Resolution". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, 2 (1993): 340-61.

Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, Maria. "A Partnership Between Peace Education and Conflict Resolution: The Case of Cyprus". http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~cerpe/papers/mariaht.htm.

Hobsbawm, E. J. Nations and Nationalism Since 1780. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Katz, N. H. "Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 504 (1989):14-21.

Kelman, H. C. "Negotiating National Identity and Self-Determination in Ethnic Conflicts". *Negotiation Journal* 13, 4 (1997): 327-340.

_____. "Group Processes in the Resolution of International Conflicts: Experiences from the Israeli-Palestinian Case". *American Psychologist* 52 (1997): 212-20.

_____. "Interactive Problem Solving Approach". In *Managing Global Chaos: Sources and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Hampson and Pamela Aall. Washington DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1996.

_____. "Applying a Human Needs Perspective to the Practice of Conflict Resolution". In *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*, ed. John W. Burton. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

_____. "Israelis and Palestinians: Psychological Prerequisites for Mutual Acceptance". *International Security* 3, 2 (1978): 162-86.

Kelman, H. C and S. P. Cohen. “Resolution of International Conflict: An Interactional Approach”. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations, eds.* Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986.

Keohane, R, ed. *Neorealism and its Critics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Kriesberg, L. “Social Conflict Theories and Conflict Resolution”. *Peace and Change* 8, 2 (1982): 3-17.

_____. *Social Conflicts,* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Kriesberg, L., Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson, eds. *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Lederach, J. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Tokyo: United Nations UP, 1997.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue.* Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

Miall, Hugh, O. Ramsbotham, and T. Woodhouse. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2000.

Mitchell, C. R., “Conflict Research”. In *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, eds. A. J. Groom and Margot Light. London: Pinter, 1994.

Mitchell, C. R. *The Structure of International Conflict.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981.

Montville, J. V. "The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution". In *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application, eds.* Dennis J. D. Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993: 112-127.

Montville, J. V. *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies*. Lexington Books, 1990.

Mouffe, Chantal. *The Return of the Political.* London: Verso, 1993.

Popper, K. R. *The Poverty of Historicism.* Boston and London, 1957.

Pruitt, Dean G. and P. J. Carnevale. *Negotiation in Social Conflict.* Buckingham: Open University Press, 1993.

Pruitt, Dean G. and J. Rubin. *Social Conflict.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1986.

Raiffa, Howard. *The Art and Science of Negotiation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Richmond, O. *Maintaining Order, Making Peace.* London: Palgrave, 2001.

_____."A Genealogy of Peacemaking: The Creation and Re-Creation of Order". *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 26, 3 (July-September 2001): 317-49.

Ricoeur, P., *Time and Narrative*, translated from French by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rosoux, V. B., "National Identity in France and Germany: From Mutual Exclusion to Negotiation". *International Negotiation* 6, 2 (2001): 175-198.

Ross, Marc Howard. *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective.* New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

_____. "Creating the Conditions for Peacemaking: Theories of Practice in Ethnic Conflict Resolution". *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 23, 6 (November 2000): 1002-35.

_____."'Good Enough' Isn't So Bad: Thinking about Success and Failure in Ethnic Conflict Management". *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 6, 1 (2000): 27-47.

Rubin, J. Z., D. G. Pruitt, and S. H. Kim. *Social Conflict, Escalation, Stalemate and Settlement.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc, 1994.

Sandole, D. J. D., "A Comprehensive Mapping of Conflict and Conflict Resolution: A Three- Pillar Approach", *IAPTC Newsletter* (International Association of Peacekeeping Training Center).

Sandole, D. J. D. and H. van der Merwe eds. *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Schwartz, Barry. "Iconography and Collective Memory: Lincoln's Image in the American Mind". *Sociological Quarterly* 32 (1991): 301-319.

Sennett, Richard. "Narrative as Knowing". *Yale Journal of Criticism* 5 (1992): 179-82.

Smith, A. D. *National Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Stern, Paul. "Why Do People Sacrifice for their Nations?". *Political Psychology* 16, 2 (1995): 217-235.

Stern, Paul, and D. Druckman, eds. *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War.* Washington D. C.: National Academy Press, 2000.

Tidwell, Alan C., *Conflict Resolved?: A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution.* London: Pinter, 1998.

Tilett, G., *Resolving Conflict: A Practical Approach.* Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1992.

Tillett, G. *Myth of Mediation*. Center for Conflict Resolution, Discussion Paper Series. Sydney: Macquarie University, 1990.

Volkan, V. "Ethnonationalistic Rituals: An Introduction". *Mind and Human Interaction* 4, 1 (1992): 3-19.

_____. *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies.* Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1988.

_____. *Cyprus: War and Adaptation.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1979.

Volkan, V., D. A. Julius and J. V. Montville, eds. *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume II: Tools of Unofficial Diplomacy.* Lexington, MA, Lexington Books, 1991.

_____, eds. *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume I: Concepts and Theories*. Lexington, MA, Lexington Books, 1990.

Yueh-Ting Lee, L. Albright and T. E. Malloy. “Social Perception and Stereotyping: An Interpersonal and Intercultural Approach”. *International Journal of Group Tensions* 30, 2 (Summer 2001): 183-209.

Zelizer, B. “Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies”. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995), 214-239.

Bibliography

Avruch, Kevin. *Culture and Conflict Resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.

Avruch, Kevin and Peter W. Black. "Conflict Resolution in Intercultural Settings: Problems and Prospects". In *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice Integration and Application*, eds. D. Sandole and H. van der Merwe, 131-45. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

_____. "The Culture Question and Intercultural Conflict Resolution". *Peace and Change* 16 (1991): 22-45.

Avruch, Kevin, Peter W. Black and J. Scimecca, eds. *Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Azar, Edward A. "Protracted International Conflicts: Ten Propositions". In *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, eds. J. Burton and E. A. Azar. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf, 1986.

_____. *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict*. Hampshire, UK: Dartmouth, 1990.

Baldwin, D. A., ed. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Banks, M. and Christopher Mitchell. *Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. London: Pinter, 1996.

Beriker, Nimet and Daniel Druckman. "Models of Responsiveness: Lausanne Peace Negotiations (1922-23)", *Journal of Social Psychology,* 131, 2 (1992): 297-300.

Beriker, Nimet and Daniel Druckman. “Simulating the Lausanne Peace Negotiations, 1922-23: Power Asymmetries in Bargaining”, *Simulating and Gaming,* 27 (1996): 162-183.

Berkovitch, J. and R. Jackson. *International Conflict: A Chronological Encyclopedia of Conflicts and Their Management 1945-1995*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1997.

Burton, J. W. *Conflict Resolution: Its Language and Processes*. London: Scarecrow Press, 1996.

_____. *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990.

_____. *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1990.

_____. *Conflict Resolution as a Political System.* Working Paper 1. Fairfax, Virginia: Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, 1988.

_____. *Resolving Deep-rooted Conflict: A Handbook*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.

_____. “The History of Conflict Resolution”. In *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*, eds. J. Burton and E. A. Azar. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf, 1986.

Burton, J. W. and F. Dukes. *Conflict: Practices in Management: Settlement and Resolution*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1990.

Burton, J. W. and D. J. Sandole. “Expanding the Debate on Generic Theory of Conflict Resolution: A Response to Critique”. *Negotiation Journal* 3, 1 (1987).

_____. “Generic Theory: The Basis of Conflict Resolution”. *Negotiation Journal* 2, 2 (1986): 333-44.

Bruner, Jerome. *Acts of Meaning.* Cambridge, Massachussets.: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Cruz, Consuelo. “Identity and Persuasion: How Nations Remember Their Pasts and Make Their Futures”. *World Politics* 52, 3 (April 2000).

Daniels, R. V. “Does the Present Change the Past?”. *The Journal of Modern History* 70 (1998): 431-435.

Dayan, D. & Katz, E. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Deutsch, M. “Subjective Features of Conflict Resolution”. In *New Directions in Conflict Theory*, ed. Raimo Vayrynen. London: Sage, 1991.

Dougherty J. E. and R. L. Pfaltzgraff. *Contending Theories of International Relations.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1981.

Duryea, M. L. and J. Potts. “Story and Legend: Powerful Tools for Conflict Resolution”. *Mediation Quarterly* 10, 4: 387-395.

Feinberg, Walter. *Common Schools/ Uncommon Identities: National Unity and Cultural Difference*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Fisher, Ronald J. *Interactive Conflict Resolution.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

_____. "Interactive Conflict Resolution". In *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, eds. William Zartman and Louis Ramussen. Washington D.C.: U. S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

_____. "Prenegotiation Problem-Solving Discussions: Enhancing the Potential for Successful Negotiations". In *Getting to the Table: The Processes of International Prenegotiation*, ed. J. G. Stein. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Fisher, R. and W. Ury. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In.* New York: Penguin, 1981.

Fisher, R. and L. Keashly, "The Potential Complementarity of Mediation and Consultation within a Contingency Model of Third Party Intervention". *Journal of Peace Research* 28, 1 (1991).

Frisch, M. *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. New York, 1990.

Galtung, J. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, and Civilization.* London: Sage, 1996.

Giles, J. and T. Middleton. *Studying Culture: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Hadjipavlou- Trigeorgis, Maria, and L. Trigeorgis. "Cyprus. An Evolutionary Approach to Conflict Resolution". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, 2 (1993): 340-61.

Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, Maria. "A Partnership Between Peace Education and Conflict Resolution: The Case of Cyprus". http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~cerpe/papers/mariaht.htm.

Hobsbawm, E. J. Nations and Nationalism Since 1780. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Katz, N. H. "Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 504 (1989):14-21.

Kelman, H. C. "Negotiating National Identity and Self-Determination in Ethnic Conflicts". *Negotiation Journal* 13, 4 (1997): 327-340.

_____. "Group Processes in the Resolution of International Conflicts: Experiences from the Israeli-Palestinian Case". *American Psychologist* 52 (1997): 212-20.

_____. "Interactive Problem Solving Approach". In *Managing Global Chaos: Sources and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Hampson and Pamela Aall. Washington DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1996.

_____. "Applying a Human Needs Perspective to the Practice of Conflict Resolution". In *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*, ed. John W. Burton. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

_____. "Israelis and Palestinians: Psychological Prerequisites for Mutual Acceptance". *International Security* 3, 2 (1978): 162-86.

Kelman, H. C and S. P. Cohen. “Resolution of International Conflict: An Interactional Approach”. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations, eds.* Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986.

Keohane, R, ed. *Neorealism and its Critics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Kriesberg, L. “Social Conflict Theories and Conflict Resolution”. *Peace and Change* 8, 2 (1982): 3-17.

_____. *Social Conflicts,* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Kriesberg, L., Terrell A. Northrup and Stuart J. Thorson, eds. *Intractable Conflicts and Their Transformation.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1989.

Lederach, J. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Tokyo: United Nations UP, 1997.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue.* Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

Miall, Hugh, O. Ramsbotham, and T. Woodhouse. *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2000.

Mitchell, C. R., “Conflict Research”. In *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, eds. A. J. Groom and Margot Light. London: Pinter, 1994.

Mitchell, C. R. *The Structure of International Conflict.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1981.

Montville, J. V. "The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution". In *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application, eds.* Dennis J. D. Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993: 112-127.

Montville, J. V. *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies*. Lexington Books, 1990.

Mouffe, Chantal. *The Return of the Political.* London: Verso, 1993.

Popper, K. R. *The Poverty of Historicism.* Boston and London, 1957.

Pruitt, Dean G. and P. J. Carnevale. *Negotiation in Social Conflict.* Buckingham: Open University Press, 1993.

Pruitt, Dean G. and J. Rubin. *Social Conflict.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1986.

Raiffa, Howard. *The Art and Science of Negotiation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Richmond, O. *Maintaining Order, Making Peace.* London: Palgrave, 2001.

_____."A Genealogy of Peacemaking: The Creation and Re-Creation of Order". *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 26, 3 (July-September 2001): 317-49.

Ricoeur, P., *Time and Narrative*, translated from French by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rosoux, V. B., "National Identity in France and Germany: From Mutual Exclusion to Negotiation". *International Negotiation* 6, 2 (2001): 175-198.

Ross, Marc Howard. *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective.* New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

_____. "Creating the Conditions for Peacemaking: Theories of Practice in Ethnic Conflict Resolution". *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 23, 6 (November 2000): 1002-35.

_____."'Good Enough' Isn't So Bad: Thinking about Success and Failure in Ethnic Conflict Management". *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 6, 1 (2000): 27-47.

Rubin, J. Z., D. G. Pruitt, and S. H. Kim. *Social Conflict, Escalation, Stalemate and Settlement.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc, 1994.

Sandole, D. J. D., "A Comprehensive Mapping of Conflict and Conflict Resolution: A Three- Pillar Approach", *IAPTC Newsletter* (International Association of Peacekeeping Training Center).

Sandole, D. J. D. and H. van der Merwe eds. *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Schwartz, Barry. "Iconography and Collective Memory: Lincoln's Image in the American Mind". *Sociological Quarterly* 32 (1991): 301-319.

Sennett, Richard. "Narrative as Knowing". *Yale Journal of Criticism* 5 (1992): 179-82.

Smith, A. D. *National Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Stern, Paul. "Why Do People Sacrifice for their Nations?". *Political Psychology* 16, 2 (1995): 217-235.

Stern, Paul, and D. Druckman, eds. *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War.* Washington D. C.: National Academy Press, 2000.

Tidwell, Alan C., *Conflict Resolved?: A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution.* London: Pinter, 1998.

Tilett, G., *Resolving Conflict: A Practical Approach.* Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1992.

Tillett, G. *Myth of Mediation*. Center for Conflict Resolution, Discussion Paper Series. Sydney: Macquarie University, 1990.

Volkan, V. "Ethnonationalistic Rituals: An Introduction". *Mind and Human Interaction* 4, 1 (1992): 3-19.

_____. *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies.* Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1988.

_____. *Cyprus: War and Adaptation.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1979.

Volkan, V., D. A. Julius and J. V. Montville, eds. *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume II: Tools of Unofficial Diplomacy.* Lexington, MA, Lexington Books, 1991.

_____, eds. *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume I: Concepts and Theories*. Lexington, MA, Lexington Books, 1990.

Yueh-Ting Lee, L. Albright and T. E. Malloy. “Social Perception and Stereotyping: An Interpersonal and Intercultural Approach”. *International Journal of Group Tensions* 30, 2 (Summer 2001): 183-209.

Zelizer, B. “Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies”. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995), 214-239.