New Trends in Mediation and Conflict Resolution: A Study of Track Two Diplomacy

Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University

in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

SARANGTHEM THADOINGAMBI CHANU

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, ORGANISATION AND

DISARMAMENT

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

New Delhi 110067

2018

Date: 23/7/2018

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation titled *"New Trends in Mediation and Conflict Resolution: A Study of Track Two Diplomacy"* submitted by me in partial fulfillment for the award of the Degree of **Master of Philosophy** is my original work and has not been previously submitted for any other degree of this University or any other university.

Sarangthem Thadoingambi Chanu

Sarangthem Thadoingambi Chanu

CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation

Prof YESHI CHOEDON

Chairperson, CIPOD

Dr. HAPPYMON JACOB

Supervisor

Acknowledgement

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my Supervisor Dr. Happymon Jacob for his guidance and support during the course of this research. His immense knowledge and insights on the subject matter made it an enjoyable yet challenging task to proceed on this academic journey and emerge with this successfully completed work. I am also grateful to the faculty and staff of the Centre for International Politics, Organization and Disarmament and my colleagues in the Diplomacy And Disarmament division in particular for providing the appropriate base for this research through the course-work and various other stimulating academic activities.

Any serious and challenging endeavour is not possible to embark on without the firm and unflinching support of loved ones, and I am indebted to my family and friends for being there for me during the difficult times in the course of this work. My parents, brother and sister are my constant well-wishers and support base and they have encouraged and backed me up during my highs and lows. My friends have been invaluable to me during the course of this work and beyond it, and having each one of them around has been an enjoyable and enriching experience. The course of the research was an interesting journey, and having each other's backs during the good and bad times was an invaluable experience.

Lastly, I am grateful to the Jawaharlal Nehru University for providing a research scholar all the ideal requirements and infrastructure to carry out this course of study and research. The conducive environment of this institution with its lively and thriving atmosphere was a pleasure and privilege to be part of.

Sarangthem Thadoingambi Chanu

CONTENTS:

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The objective of the proposed study is to contextualise and place the theory and practice of Track Two Diplomacy as a means of mediation in the larger framework of Conflict Resolution. It would try to engage with the finer nuances and complexities within existing conflict resolution mechanisms and highlight the increasing importance of Track Two as an emerging trend for better management and resolution of conflicts. A dynamic and recurring phenomenon, conflict resolution demands effective techniques and mechanisms beyond Governmental and official, formal mediation and intervention. This gives rise to further engagements by private and unofficial bodies, the essential element of Track Two Diplomacy. The study would look into the linkages between Track Two and official Diplomacy and highlight how Track Two may affect official policy making and effective resolution.

The study begins with an analysis and engagement with the phenomena of conflict, reasons for intractable and protracted conflict, means of mediation, reconciliation and eventual resolution. It would look into the concept of Track Two Diplomacy, or the activities carried out by unofficial and private bodies, parties or individuals in the management and resolution of conflict. The complexities of intractable conflicts defy generalization of social, political processes in regulating and resolving irreconcilable differences. However, the study of many such experiences, both failed and successful, aids in the comprehension of conceptual knowledge which can be applicable to other conflicts, a phenomenon which continues to recur among groups. The study seeks to cover a wide range of conflict management and resolution activities and link negotiation, mediation, and facilitation methods with different stages of conflict. The

study tries to examine the larger body of work on Conflict Resolution and place the theory and practice of Track Two Diplomacy within it.

In protracted conflict, mutual understanding of the necessity for talks can be forged through dialogue or other informal facilitation methods which promote deeper analysis of the causes and analyse possible routes out of the same. Mediation can be introduced within hostile environments to improve communication and change perceptions of each other. These processes can be better understood by the knowledge about conflict relationships embedded in power, identity, and structures directly or indirectly related to inducing changes in antagonistic behaviour among belligerents.

Through an examination of the styles and methods of communication to sort out differences and minimize casualties, the study would try to explain the underlying dynamics of conflict management and resolution. Importance lies in the exploration of diverse modes of interpreting conflict in tandem with the illumination of different ways of tackling a range of problems arising from competitive relationships within and between societies. The manner of societies' response to conflict has various implications for human well-being and social change. Thus, reconciliation, along with transformation of repressive relations, emerges as an essential part of a conflict resolution process.

In the changing nature of inter-state relations in the modern world, the field of diplomacy between and among states has adapted to the changing needs and dynamics of international relations today. As opposed to the traditional, state centric nature of diplomacy where official functionaries operate in high-profile state-to-state activities that range from both the non-coercive to the coercive, there has been a gradual rise in unofficial acts of diplomacy and negotiation by a varying set of participants that seek to go beyond the narrow path set forth by states officially. There has been the creation of an opening and certain appreciation for the role of private bodies in international peace-keeping (Barbara 2006). The variety of actors in the management of interstate as well as intra-state conflicts and disputes in international relations has expanded to include multilateral and non-state agencies, groups, think-tanks and private institutions, giving rise to a track generally known as non-official diplomacy or Track Two diplomacy.

The usage of the term "Track Two Diplomacy" was popularised in 1981 by Joseph Montville, an American Foreign Service Officer (Jones 2015). The term was used to

denote unofficial conflict resolution dialogues as: "unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversarial groups or nations with the goals of developing strategies, influencing public opinion, and organising human and material resources in ways that might help resolve the conflict"(Montville 1991).

Policy oriented discussions that are non-governmental, informal and un-official in nature, but which are quite close to governmental agendas and often involve participants close to governmental quarters and influential in policy matters, such as retired diplomats, retired civil and military officials, public figures, and policy analysts are some of the best known practices of Track Two. On occasions it may also involve the participation of government officials in their private capacities (Ahmad 2014**).**

Another track of diplomacy worth mentioning is known as Track One-and-a-Half Diplomacy, which came to be classified as a separate track because of the difficulty in placing its activities comprehensively in either Track One or Track Two. According to Mapendere (2000), this Track may be explained better as:

> "Public or private interaction between official representatives of conflicting governments or political entities such as popular armed movements, which is facilitated or mediated by a third party not representing a political organization or institution. The aim of such interaction is to influence attitudinal changes between the parties with the objective of changing the political power structures that caused the conflict" (Mapendere 2000)

For Nan (2005), Track One and a Half diplomacy is understood as "unofficial interactions between official representatives of states" or the "diplomatic initiatives that are facilitated by unofficial bodies, but directly involve officials from the conflict in question" (Nan 2005).

Due its ambition to address the underlying causes of conflicts and its aim to improve relations between the adversaries, Track Two diplomacy has increasingly been recognized as a third-party intervention method to deal with intractable conflicts. While the range of goals and practices in Track Two diplomacy vary, two main assumptions appear as common denominators. The first is the underlying belief that *contact* and interactions between the members of adversarial groups in an unofficial and friendly setting, often with the help of a third party, help improve relations and generate a joint

understanding of the conflict. The second assumption is that the improved relations and jointly formulated ideas are *transferred* and incorporated into the society and/or the official policymaking processes, thus, having an impact at a larger scale (Cuhadar 2009). The field of Track Two is fluid and the terminology is far from fixed, and the same terms can be used to mean quite different things. The study seeks to contextualise the possible effects of Track Two or unofficial diplomacy in the mediation and resolution of conflicts.

Review of literature

The last three decades has witnessed a steady growth in the engagement of theoretical literature on conflict resolution and reflects a growing attention to the role of unofficial diplomacy in conflict resolution processes. As efforts to explain the expanding and increasingly diverse array of unofficial diplomatic phenomena began, so has the literature evolved. The increasing attention accorded to unofficial diplomacy was because of growing awareness of the potential of such dialogues to trigger changes in relationships and perceptions that are essential for disputants, especially in ethno-national or identity conflicts (Davidson and Montville 1981). A general process of change in the field of diplomacy which increasingly empowers non-traditional actors and networks in international relations proves to be an impetus for this research. Track Two Diplomacy, or unofficial diplomacy emerges as one of the methods employed in the larger framework of Conflict Resolution, and the study aims to engage with the linkages between conflicts, techniques of resolution and official policy making.

Defining conflicts

'Conflict' is generally associated with tensions related to decisions on various choices, sometimes being manifested in confrontations between social forces (Dahrendorf, 1959). The nature of the contest can be illustrated in terms of how issues arising from a variety of competitive social relationships are defined and framed. An unlimited array of issues that stem from diverse social settings may create various contentions among groups. Differences in opinions, disagreement, and arguments are ubiquitous in every human relationship, whether organizational, communal, or international. Long-term grievances over economic and social inequities are derived from a failure to enhance the quality of life of a particular group (Azar, 1986).

The concept of conflict has been moulded to describe any discord resulting from almost every aspect of social situations. The existential, penetrable nature of decision making over incompatible choices can affect politics down to ordinary events as well. The term 'conflict' can also be applied to domestic situations as well as violent clashes between states. Therefore, the distinctions between conflict and non-conflict are fuzzy at best and at worst are not made at all(Mack and Snyder, 1971).

While practitioners have often used 'conflict' and 'dispute' synonymously, John W. Burton (1990, 1997) was among the earlier scholars to define it in more specific terms. According to Burton, conflict is interpreted in the context of a serious nature of challenges to the existing norms, relationships, and rules of decision making. On the other hand, the term 'dispute' applies to management issues and the control of discontent relating to the implementation of specific policies. In so doing, it may respond to the unfairness of authoritative decisions without questioning the legitimacy of decision making which has its roots in dominant values and established institutional procedures.

In a broader extension of the term, polite disagreement, quarrel, litigation, and war differ in terms of the intensity and scope of conflict (Burton and Dukes, 1990). Conflict can be compared with an intense form of competition. It is inevitable, even without direct contact, as exemplified in the efforts to expand sales in a consumer market. In the natural world, competition is considered to be an underlying rule of the game for survival, regulated by the surrounding environment, between and within species in search for food, shelter, and other limited resources. Thus competition between behavioural units is the most universal and basic form of interaction in the world of living things, which is full of many mutually incompatible positions. When such a struggle is waged more directly and consciously, it may be regarded as a form of 'conflict'. Notably, competition is not identical to conflict, because the purpose of competition is winning valuable or scarce objects, not the destruction or injury of opponents (Mack and Snyder, 1971). In economic transactions and sports, competition is governed by an acknowledged process of decision making. Many forms of competitive interaction may become so highly regulated and institutionalized that the participants do not challenge the fairness of the rules that determine the outcome. Thus, disputants in a legal proceeding, partisans in a legislative body, or candidates in an electoral race are seeking irreconcilable goals by means of procedures that may be so

well accepted by all of the participants that violence is eschewed and hostility remains minimal (Jeong 2008).

Regulations usually embody rules that bind acceptable means of contest to be adopted in pursuing contradictory goals by prescribing and proscribing conduct. In general, competitors are limited regarding what they can do to each other in the course of their efforts. Established procedures and rules may clarify the legitimate forms and degree of coercion, in addition to setting a limit on the circumstances under which a permissible level of force will even be tolerated. The degree of institutionalization of competition differs according to how the rules have been internalized by the participants and have been supported by traditional norms or broadly accepted criteria. Thus the effectiveness in the control of conduct is affected by not only sanctions, available for the enforcement of rules, but also an internal sense of moral obligations. Disputes can be provoked by broken agreements, unobserved norms, and unfair rules on access to resources. The established remedies may include group sanctions, arbitration, or court procedures. Disputes within an institutional framework can also be settled either by direct bargaining or facilitated by professionals (Burton, 1997).

Fragile political and judicial institutions, combined with ambiguities in rules, lead to unregulated competition and struggle. In such a situation, conflicts outside judicial and bargaining processes emerge, along with declining central authorities. The requirements for new rules arise from modifications in technology and economic systems that create uncertainties. A lack of a world authority, in conjunction with a weak international legal system, has been one of the main obstacles to regulating the clashing interests and differences in values that are commonly manifested in an international conflict (Goodman, 2005; Waltz, 2007).

Conflict resolution in theory

Conflict Resolution is conceptualized as methods or process of arbitration and litigation to facilitate end of an on-going or impending conflict. This involves communication between parties involved (either self-initiated or by third part) about the issue at hand and discussion about their conflicting motives and ideals. Those involved in the conflict and also the third party engage in a collective negotiation in order to get out of the mutually hurting conflict.

As a defined field of study, conflict resolution started in the 1950s and 1960s as a result of the group of pioneers realising the height of Cold War and thus looking for the potential of applying approaches that were involved in industrial relations and community mediation settings to conflicts in general, including civil and international conflicts (Ramsbotham 2016). This field was to be multilevel, multidisciplinary, multicultural, analytical and normative both and theoretical and practical. Over the years various framework models of conflict resolution have been developed: Galtung's model of Structural and Cultural violence and peace, Burton's Controlled Communication, Kelman's Interactive Problem Solving Model, Fisher's Interactive Conflict Resolution model, conflict escalation and de-escalation model, the hourglass model: spectrum of conflict resolution responses and various approaches like conflict approach of win-lose, lose-lose, win-win outcomes, positions, interest and need, third party intervention, three faces of power approach etc.

Conflict Resolution models state that short term denial strategies on their own will fail unless accompanied by and embedded within medium term persuasion strategies, long term prevention strategies, and international coordination and limitation strategies (Ramsbotham 2016). William Zartman (2001) also had proposed that only Mutually Hurting Stalemate was not enough, what is required is a sense of way out from the situation among all the members involved in the conflict and creation of Mutually Enticing Opportunities to pull negotiation to a successful conclusion. These writers reiterate the point that Conflict Resolution is not an event that solves the problem of conflict, but it is a method that is utilised throughout the process of resolution. Some conflicts have witnessed the mediation and efforts by private or non-governmental groups, parties or individuals to facilitate new techniques for effective resolution, also known as Track Two Diplomacy. Track Two diplomacy uses approaches different from what the official Track One diplomacy. For instance, under the three faces of power model, Track Two diplomacy involves use of power to induce cooperation, to legitimize, to inspire and to persuade. Kenneth Boulding calls this power as integrative power (a type of soft power) (Boulding 1989).

Conflict generally refers to the competition over resources, interests, values or other needs among groups, usually triggered by incompatible economic and political interests, thus developing into attempts to suppress other groups often with violent means(Jeong 2010). It is characterised by intense hostilities between the warring or

conflicting groups. Antagonistic relations unless managed properly tend to lead to protracted social conflicts. However, for the establishment of functional relationships, the general agreement is that conflicts have to be handled in reasonable ways, through the use of tactics like talks, mediation and negotiations and not through violent means. Conflict resolution thus focuses on the examination of the roots of conflict and possible means to facilitate removal of misconceptions, settle differences and establishing new peaceful relations. There is the need to identify and acknowledge each side's needs and stabilize the different power relations between dominant and subordinate groups(Rubin 1994).

For those who have been alienated and suffered from gross injustice, an examination of various phenomena and factors such as group dynamics and structural adjustment in an adversarial social system is required so that their interests are accommodated. Complex conflicts rise from various causes, both structural and psychological, and conflict has been studied through identity issues and differences, social relations and power relations (Burton 1997). Conflict resolution scholars and practitioners aim to alter such antagonistic relations so that violence does not recur. Thus by dealing effectively with issues of power imbalances and asymmetric and inequitable economic, political and social relationships, mutually acceptable outcomes may be reached upon. Further, the nature of the conflict has to be transformed so that both parties have a consensus on power sharing and various contentious issues. In certain deep rooted conflicts, belligerents tend to regard each issue as non-resolvable and differences as irreconcilable, making resolution extremely difficult, resulting in long lasting protracted conflicts (Jeong 2010).

This study looks into the diverse types of conflict at various levels of complexity, and discusses the practices and concepts applied in the mitigation of hostilities needed to settle differences between antagonistic groups. The strategies and methods for the control of adversarial behaviour need to be adaptable to specific conflict dynamics. In identifying strategies to remove or at least mitigate conditions for a protracted conflict, a suitable starting point is to identify the causes of conflict and control escalation processes. The movement from mere disagreement to more polarized, extreme positions narrows the application of options based on a non-destructive, collaborative process.

A settlement process hinges either directly or indirectly upon the nature and causes of conflict. It is not often orderly due to the involvement of distorted psychological attributions leading to misguided and inaccurate assumptions about the events and behaviour about the other. A number of non-coercive intervention methods based on persuasion and other collaborative efforts may have to overcome the psychological hindrances associated with mental anguish in decision making, cognitive inconsistency as well as a group process which reinforces stereotypical enemy images. A positive relationship can be cultivated through empathy and increased interdependence between opposing parties (Mitchell 2002).

It is essential to shed light on diverse phenomena, extending from group dynamics to structural adjustment in an adversarial social system in order to accommodate the vital interests and needs of those who have been alienated and suffered from injustice. Whereas a complex conflict has many underlying sources (both structural and psychological), it is necessary to define conflict in a specific pattern of interactions between opponents being influenced by identity differences and overarching social relations as well as power asymmetry.

One of the primary tasks of conflict resolution is to avert the recurrence of destructive conflict by qualitatively altering antagonistic relationships. Beyond responding to a few manifest, contentious issues, mutually acceptable outcomes stem from finding remedies for power imbalances and inequitable social and economic relations which are often the main source of grievances. The nature of adverse relationships needs to be transformed by supporting consensus on power sharing, enhancement of individual and group well-being as well as a guarantee of security. A large map of conflict formation and transformation can reveal the nature of a struggle as well as the processes for changing psychological perceptions (Kriesberg 1998).

In transforming adversarial relationships, there is a need to investigate how group processes are linked to structural conditions. Inter-group relations are constrained by a superimposed political structure as well as by internal group dynamics such as rivalry between factions which take different attitudes toward conflict. A conflict situation is generally represented by perceived goal incompatibilities and attempts to control each other's choices, which generate adversarial feelings and behaviour toward the other (Lulofs and Cahn, 2000). The conflict has the potential to negatively affect an

interdependent relationship that is mutually beneficial, if the sources of discontent are not taken care of. The relationships in conflict are often described in terms of an exercise of coercive power. In a generic sense, power provides the ability to 'compel others to do something' and is also the source of people's ability to exercise control over decision making on valuable positions, limited goods and services (Winter, 1973). A coercive process is linked to one party's efforts to change the other's objectives and behaviour, particularly in adversarial relationships. In this case, power is an important element in the struggle for winning a conflict, especially as it is essential to engendering a desired difference in the targeted person's emotions and behaviour.

One of the main aims of this study is to illuminate the processes and methods of transforming contentious battles into collaborative process. The practice of conflict resolution has tried to emphasize integrative outcomes with a paradigm shift from adversarial (win‑lose) to positive sum (win‑win) solutions; the willingness to address each other's concerns for mutual coexistence stimulates a search for joint benefits. In response to the above challenges, this study highlights the underlying dynamics involved in the process of conflict resolution.

Rationale and scope of the study

Conflict is manifested through adversarial social action, involving two or more actors with the expression of differences often accompanied by intense hostilities (Jeong 2010). Conflict resolution engages with studies and analyses to avert the recurrence of destructive conflict by qualitatively altering antagonistic relationships. The last two decades have witnessed a plethora of conflict and also of activities many of which have yielded peace accords. Protracted conflicts in some regions saw the effective management and eventually ended with the establishment of new governing structures designed to mend deep layers of social and political rifts. Track Two Diplomacy tries to facilitate the resolution of such conflicts and the main actors generally include unofficial and private bodies, groups or individuals.

In spite of the increased interest in unofficial diplomacy, there has been a trend of regarding this aspect as the 'softer' version because of its lack of organised data, concrete theory and efficiency in result measurement. The key issues to be studied here include the conundrum of measuring the success or failure of Track Two, the question

of who qualifies to be a third party mediator, deciding the 'ripeness' of possible intervention and the various ethical questions associated with Track Two Diplomacy. Further, a grey area exists when it comes to the transfer of the effects and results of Track Two diplomacy to Official Track One diplomacy and policy circles. Conflict is a complicated phenomenon which requires a multi-dimensional approach to be effectively managed. There are limitations in most forms of diplomacy as not all institutions or organisations have the capacity to utilize all available mechanisms in mediation and resolution of conflicts. The separate applications of Track One and Track Two leaves a gap in the broader field of mediation and conflict resolution and their isolation continues to be a challenge. The study would try to address the need to focus on a complementarity of the official and unofficial tracks for maximum results. Of significance here, is the attempted understanding of the ecosystem within which the various methods of Conflict Resolution exist even as the study tries to delineate and identify them.

Research questions and hypothesis

The focus of this research was to carry out a thorough examination of the available literature in the field of Conflict Resolution, Track two Diplomacy and their inter-related themes in order to figure out the essential question of whether there is an identifiable linkage and spill-over between the Two Tracks of Diplomacy in relation to conflict resolution. In the course of the study, the following questions have been examined and studied:

- What are the factors that led to the emergence of Track Two Diplomacy in Conflict Studies and resolution?

- How does unofficial or Track Two Diplomacy affect policy making and resolution of conflicts?

- What are the complementary elements that link this track to official Track One Diplomacy?

- How can the successes or failures of Track Two be effectively measured?

The study was conducted to examine and test the following hypotheses as listed below:

- The complex and dynamic nature of intractable and protracted conflicts challenges the official, governmental routes to mediation and resolution

- Unofficial or Track Two diplomacy may best complement Track One and not replace it

- Opening up of lines of communication and establishing humane relations can effectively aid in transcending rigid state to state relations and foster faster resolution of conflicts

Organisation of the dissertation

This study is divided into five chapters, with chapters one and five constituting the introduction and the conclusion respectively. Chapter two deals with the theoretical frameworks of the conflict resolution field, the concepts of conflict, causes, types, popular ideas and theories, its evolution and the important theorists and thinkers who had influenced the field. The next chapter goes into the intricacies of conflict, the means and methods of dealing with conflict, techniques and the available strategies for mediation, negotiation and resolution. It also delves into the emerging trend of track two or unofficial diplomacy as a means to engage with conflict and its resolution. The fourth chapter deals with the issues pertaining to the working relationship between the official track one of diplomacy and the unofficial track two, and their possible linkages and possibilities of coordination and collaboration, as well as popular attitudes towards it. Lastly, the findings of the study are summed up and presented in the conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Introduction

The field of Conflict resolution has developed over the ages with ideas and theories contributed by practitioners, academics and theorists. The main concern of Conflict Resolution is the constructive handling, analysis and settlement of disputes to ensure minimal violence, negation or reduction of antagonisms and offer mutually acceptable and enduring outcomes. As an approach, Conflict resolution as part of conflict studies is rapidly expanding and incorporates long term as well as short term strategies and methods. The following chapter seeks to examine the basic concepts and ideas surrounding the phenomena of conflict, its related intricacies and the various reasons behind its escalation. It studies the beginnings and development of the conflict resolution field and traces its journey to the present times. It would also look into the important contributions made by the scholars and thinkers who laid down the framework and foundations for a rich and diverse field of study.

Understanding conflicts

Conflict is identified by the persistent and pervasive phenomenon of inter-group and international competition between and among various groups over disparate interests and values that governs power politics and dynamics. Besides the psychological and behavioural elements that trigger aggression, mass violence and war are better understood taking in regard the institutional roles. Conflict has been pervasive and all-encompassing and its effects permeate many aspects of a community's life. Apart from practical and tangible economic interests and struggle for power, adversarial relationships extend to differences over ideas and values (Jeong 2010).

Antagonisms may arise from interpersonal tensions between the ruling leaders, issues from within management institutions in labour organisations or within multi-national corporations and workers, different stands between nations on various policy making issues, or tussles over trade imbalances among international organisations. In the diverse social interactions, conflict is inherently entailed and its concepts have been applied in a variety of situations. In any relationship that requires an interaction with another group over opposing interests, values or needs, conflict is likely.

The latent conditions of conflict eventually translate into multiple forms of enmity in the visible issues. In general, conflict is most popularly described as 'a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources' (Boulding,1962). The efforts to attain desired objects become more intense in the absence of agreed rules prescribing their equitable allocation. People's expectations alter in response to a shift in their social and economic environment. If governing norms are too rigid to be adjusted to new demands and expectations, such inflexibility breeds resentment utilized for the mobilization of groups that are discontent with the status quo (Mack and Snyder, 1971). In conflict situations, the dynamics of actions and counteractions inevitably engage attempts to control the other's behaviour, often with the intent to injure or destroy. In addition, violence may follow an unconstrained attempt to dominate in a fight over power, prestige, and material interests (Jeong 2010).

Life cycle of conflicts

In general, an entire cycle of conflict proceeds, over time, through a series of recognizable stages, comprising initiation, escalation, de-escalation, and cessation (Kriesberg, 1998; Mitchell, 1981). Even if every conflict has its own dynamics, there is a common, though not always predictable, process, following precipitating events that signal the surfacing of a conflict. If a successful resolution is not reached, leaving a bad emotional residue, the ending may serve as a temporary stop gap for a new cycle of conflict to begin in the future. In order to understand a given context of conflict steps, it is necessary to identify the patterns of interaction between adversaries at different stages of the struggle.

Once conflict is initiated, it is exposed to various types of transformation, along with a proliferation of issues and an increase in the intensity of struggles. The number of

participants multiplies when specific issues become generalized to the level of an existential struggle, entailing identity and autonomy.

An example could be the war with the remnant of the Taliban and Osama bin Laden's group in Afghanistan, following the attacks of 11 September 2001, has quickly been expanded to a fight between the Western alliance and a range of radical Islamic groups around the world. Analysis of a conflict process can explain the development of relationships at different phases following changes in each party's perceptions of the other's intentions and goals. The modes of inter-group relations have a significant impact on escalation and resolution. Whereas enmity is a consequence of a hostile interaction during escalation, it needs to be overcome to facilitate a movement toward de-escalation and resolution. Therefore, activities of conflict are organically related to each other in terms of their synergy. In the evolution of conflict, interaction patterns become more complex, involving multiple parties and a large number of issues. The intensity of conflict is determined by the extent of destructiveness in a deadlocked struggle. In general, bipolarization in the relationship tends to bring about a conflict of greater intensity and the simplification of each party's image with dehumanization. Inter-group polarization, meanwhile, is bound to consolidate positions of hawkish leaders with an emphasis on internal cohesion and unity. Various stages demonstrate typical behavioural patterns and psychological conditions (Jones and Hughes, 2003). Dynamics of unrestrained escalation and polarization carry participants away from cooperative efforts by means of runaway responses to hostilities (Jeong 2010). Increasingly malign motives are reinforced within each party by stereotypes. In particular, opponents are perceived as a negative mirror image of oneself.

A conflict vacillates between constructive and destructive phases. The process of escalation turns a low-intensity conflict into a high-intensity struggle. Each party tries to outdo the other's behaviour in a vicious circle of hostile action and negative reaction. A retaliatory spiral is inevitable in a competitive escalation cycle. In a conflict spiral, every exchange gets increasingly intense, corresponding to each other's actions. In seeking revenge, each party punishes the other for actions regarded as aversive. A blood feud is intensified by retaliation after retaliation. This process is predominated by 'the feelings of being trapped in a set of circumstances beyond one's control (Lulofs and Cahn, 2000).

Unless one or both of the main adversaries are completely destroyed or vanish after intense fights, escalation is eventually predestined to subside, due to the difficulties in maintaining a costly struggle over a sustained period (Jeong 2010). In particular, a conflict is not likely to last when each party feels that the outcomes are too low to meet their expectations. A continuing conflict demands too much sacrifice with not only time consuming but also emotionally charged struggles. If conflict is drawn out without a settlement in sight, the losses are likely to exceed the gains. In a stalemate situation, then, conflict can be frozen following exhaustive fights without the obtainment of original objectives. In reality, it is difficult to achieve conflict resolution that fully addresses all of the contentious issues. Yet the danger of leaving unresolved conflicts in the dark is that they can grow into large and unmanageable catastrophic situations such as the Rwandan genocide in 1994. A conflict that could have been resolved initially becomes destructive if it is lent to uncontrolled emotions and behaviour. It takes much more effort to bring about the constructive transformation of a conflict once a vicious cycle of violence has been set in motion (Mitchell, 2001). Various stages of interaction are more easily recognized in a conflict which has progressed over a longer period. With changes in settlement situations, some conflicts might be reinitiated. A continuing cycle of civil wars in Angola during the mid-1990s was attributed to a failure to implement the internationally brokered arrangements that were to end armed hostilities. A conflict becomes cyclical as each wave of episodes generates similar dynamics of interaction with predictable patterns of behaviour. Such adversarial relationships can be altered not only via their own internal dynamics but also through external pressure or intervention.

Essential conditions for conflict resolution

For the successful resolution of conflict, there needs to be a commitment from the warring parties to cease hostilities and engage in dialogue and discussion. In cases where the state agencies fail or hesitate in initiating the same, the role of private or unofficial bodies becomes very important. Even for the leaders of inter-state conflicts, unofficial dialogue offers them an opportunity to address the other in an informal stage and think of alternatives without the glaring pressure of the media or their respective governments. Apart from the shared commitment to problem solving, a win-win situation has to be offered based on the convergence of interests and available

alternatives. A more tolerant and cohesive social environment is also created by the reduction of structural inequalities. In the absence of a secure, social, economic and political environment, uncertainty would loom large. In cases where there exists high chances of win-lose component, one or both of the warring parties feel threatened and resolution would turn out to be more difficult. Thus, according to Burton(1997) and Kelman(2008), the premise of conflict resolution is based on the shared understanding that different non-negotiable needs and cultural values have to be accommodated and not divided. There is the primacy of mutual respect for each other's aspirations and goals and the formulation of win-win solutions.

There are varied ways to deal with conflicts, depending on their nature and sources. Management methods range from official government dealings to unofficial, private efforts, majorly aimed at improving relations and supporting communication facilities to negotiate solutions and transform conflict. Governments can send their respective envoys for official diplomatic course of action, while international organizations may initiate and dispatch fact-finding missions to analyse, assess and facilitate dialogue and prevent human rights violations. Other formal activities range from good offices to conciliation to mediation aimed at diffusing a crisis. The scope of conflict management covers informal meetings through back channels of communication as well as unofficial contacts through intermediaries. In negotiation, parties can reach an agreement through a compromise formulated by the trade-off of different priorities. Negotiations are needed in a variety of settings not just being limited to resolving contentious issues between adversaries (Jeong 2010).

Dialogue or other interactive processes of conflict resolution utilize a collaborative method to explore the root causes of conflict and conditions for satisfying vital needs of adversaries. When official negotiating channels are closed or dysfunctional, citizen groups can play an important role in nurturing a climate of trust and even develop proposals to be delivered to their own governments. In 2006, unofficial contacts between Israeli and Syrian advocacy groups yielded an informal agreement on the conditions for the Israeli return of the Golan Heights to Syria (Jeong 2010). The importance of unofficial or Track Two diplomacy lies in the fact that these can help navigate through tense official stances and bring about alternatives by engaging in people-to-people contact.

Conflict prevention employs a number of strategies, both overt and covert, ranging from economic sanction, military intervention, short and long term such as peace-keeping, enforcement and institutional changes. Coercive diplomacy might be needed in reversing an escalatory motion, but the restoration of order through military force needs to be linked to long-term planning to change the conditions for the causes of violence. Political and economic solutions are necessary to avoid continued dependence on outside assistance (Boutros-Ghali, 1995).

The phases in the evolution of the Conflict Resolution field:

The evolution and development of Conflict resolution studies and practice has been dynamic and complex with a range of interdependent and inter-disciplinary exchange and incorporation from among and between the social sciences including sociology, management, psychology, political science, etc. Its sources are as diverse as its expanding scope. Four distinct periods would be examined according to the initial years of contribution, ranging from the years of ideas and actions, early efforts and research, shaping and expansion and to the current times of institutionalization, further spread and cementation. These periods however are not water- tight or discrete compartments. There are obvious spill-overs, and certain developments stretches into decades. The periods classified (Kriesberg 1997) below indicate not precise origins only, but the major developments during these times.

1914-45: Beginnings

The early beginnings of some of the work on Conflict resolution were contextualised in the important events and developments of the times, including the devastating effects of the two World Wars, the Great Depression and the rise of Fascism. The popular liberal beliefs that a relatively harmonious and peaceful world would be ushered in by new economic developments, liberal democracy and bustling trade was challenged by the outbreak of these events.

The important works of this time which helped in laying the foundations of the Conflict resolution studies were the works of Crane Brinton (1938) on class struggles and revolutions; Mary Parker Follett(1942) on conflicts within organizations especially in labour-management relations and academic studies on the outbreaks of war, foremost among them being Quincy Wright's (1942)study on the nature of War.

There was a lot of emphasis on non-rational feelings in the occurrence of large-scale conflicts. More weight was given to the emotional strains aroused by nationalist leaders as reasons for the cause of war and mobilisation of followers. According to Lasswell (1930), the personalities of that time were crucial in stirring up nationalistic feelings and eventually, various social movements, struggles and conflicts. National development and its related conflict, according to some analysts, could be exemplified in the rise of Nazism in Germany.

Apart from the studies on the origin of conflicts, much effort was put into studying the means for the management of the same, and for preventing the escalation of violence. Another key development in the understanding of conflict resolution, starting in the 1930s, was the incorporation of social-psychology and group processes in various conflicts- ethnic, industrial, family and others (Lewin 1948).

The human relations approach to industrial conflict management was built on the assumption that non-rational aspects of many conflicts made them manageable especially as they were not entirely based on clashes of objective interests (Roethlisbeiger and Dickson 1943).

1946-69: Early efforts and basic research

Further research in conflict resolution was spurred on by the rapid growth in various relevant academic and off-field activities in the 1950s and 1960s. Much of the work had their own independent roots, while some were goaded by the dim scenario created by the possible advent of nuclear apocalypse during the Cold War. Conflict resolution as an academic discipline had its foundations laid by the basic pioneering work in many disciplines. The University of Michigan began publishing the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957 and the Centre for Research on Conflict Resolution was subsequently established in 1959, paving the way for substantial academic work on the same (Harty and Modell 1991).

Social contexts also affect the course of social conflicts as well as their portrayal by analysts and academics. After the devastating effects of the Second World War, economic reconstruction and growth was the focus of various nations. The later era was concerned with issues of justice, equality and autonomy in the 1960s. The process of decolonisation unfolded following the national liberation movements; the United States

was in turmoil because of the civil rights movement and its involvement in the Vietnam War, and massive student demonstrations and revolutions seemed to be the order of the day in the world's political arena. These were viewed as necessary struggles on valid premises. The Cold War was one of the most important contexts that influenced the structure of international politics and the formative ideas of conflict studies for over four decades. However, the Cold War itself underwent characteristic changes, the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 being an important milestone. However, the period around 1969 was significant as certain changes occurred. There was increased rivalry between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China with skirmishes along the border. In Germany, there were accommodative policies with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union along with the coming to power of the Social Democratic Party. Most importantly, the policy of détente was initiated under US president Nixon, which relatively reduced tensions with the Soviets. Quantitative studies and scholarly work flourished during this period in the backdrop of possible wars, nuclear and non-nuclear. War as a phenomenon was the concern of various systematic studies based on collection of data (Richardson 1960; Singer 1972).

Apart from these studies, conflict and cooperation patterns among countries were studied and data collected, which were useful in the comparative studies of Conflict resolution and traditional concepts of International Relations.

Cooperative actions and institutions have been the subject of an important body of work that stresses that such systems could potentially prove to be an important means of integration and lessen the chances of violent conflicts. Differing levels of integration were found to be linked with the levels of animosity among nations, with highly cooperative and interlinked nations forming a system or community with remote chances of war or conflict. Instrumental in this theory was the work of Karl Deutsch (1957). A common interest in stability and peace, argued Mitrany (1943) would be facilitated by a functional integration of states. A possible example of this as analysed by Ernst B. Haas (1958) was the European Coal and Steel Community established in the 1950s that eventually came to be formed into the European Union.

Another important addition in the development of Conflict resolution is Game theory, with its varying payoffs and strategies. Much work has been done on the Prisoner's dilemma, as the variable or mixed motive game stands out from zero sum, win-lose

options. The logic of bargaining is well studied and analysed here, and Thomas Schelling's (1960) work also examined bargaining situations drawn from the same.

The nuclear age was ushered in, and traditional forms of diplomacy began to be subject to further analysis, and strategies studied and developed that could be used in the dynamic period. Non-rational streaks in foreign policy making and crisis behaviour were highlighted, in the volatile situation created by nuclear weapons, especially for purposes of deterrence(Jervis 1976, Lebow and Stein 1985).

In the 1950s and 1960s the focus was on alternatives to overt struggle between contentious groups and means of amicable resolution. Public opinion surveys, field observations and group experiments were carried out. Race and ethnic struggles and relations were also looked into in various studies. An important finding was that relations became more cordial and less antagonistic when different ethnic groups interacted in an equal-status manner. The development of superordinate goals also brought antagonistic groups into better cooperation, according to a study by Sherif (1966). Further research in the field was aided by the experimental works of Morton Deutsch (1973) on constructive and destructive conflict processes.

Sociologists also brought into the field, their analyses of industrial, community, ethnic and other processes of conflict (Coleman 1957). Social conflicts were treated as generic phenomena by certain analysts, highlighting their similarities as well as differences. Regarding the ever-present nature of conflict, researchers started analysing the functions of varying conflicts, the way these were waged and settled eventually. Dispute resolution systems in the absence of formal legal systems were also studied.

As articulated by Sharp(1973), another significant aspect to the study of conflict was the analysis of non-violent movements. According to the proponents of such non-violent movements, violence begets violence and removes chances of future mediation, reconciliation or negotiation. A mutually acceptable and enduring solution was much more likely if struggles were peaceful.

Peace research, sometimes considered a corollary to conflict studies, has been an added influence in the development of conflict resolution studies (Stephenson 1989). It has made certain contributions to the field, drawing attention to cultural differences, socialization and related attitudes towards 'proper' and 'improper' conflict. Peace

studies has also aided in the de-mystifying of large-scale conflicts by examining the social and institutional bases of war, the military-industrial complex and other factors that contribute to the prolonged external conflicts. Peace studies' emphasis on the methods and means to de-escalate protracted conflicts remain one of the crucial contributions to conflict resolution.

Worth mentioning may be the idea behind the Graduated Reciprocation in Tension-Reduction (GRIT) method of conflict de-escalation developed by Charles Osgood(1990) which proposes that de-escalation of tensions among adversaries can be facilitated if one side initiates conciliatory actions, that it further calls upon reciprocation, and persists in conciliatory actions even during times when there is no immediate reciprocation (Osgood 1962). This idea has been influential among conflict resolution scholars and practitioners. This idea also has been proved to be an effective instrument in peace-making especially in relation to protracted international conflicts (Etzioni 1967; Goldstein and Freeman 1990).

Practitioners of conflict resolution saw a change in the field during the 40s to 60s, with a significant presence and importance of unofficial or track two diplomacy in international affairs. Notable in this regard were the meetings between nuclear physicists and those engaged in nuclear weapon development from the nuclear capable nations of United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, during the 1950s for the exchange of ideas to reduce chances of their use(Pentz and Slovo 1981). First held in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, these came to be known as the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs. Ideas were floated, suggestions discussed and information exchanged, and these aptly made a contribution to the signing of the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Non-proliferation treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty. Taking note of their contributions to ensuring a nuclear conflict free world, the Pugwash Conferences and their executive director were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995.

There was the increasing realization that unofficial meetings, or informal get-togethers held a lot of potential in shelling out potential solutions to long drawn conflicts. These opened up new channels of communication which were closed previously. Mediators may range from within the adversarial groups or well-connected, unbiased public or other personalities or dialogue groups.

A significant international exercise of this manner was the Dartmouth Conference, first held in 1960 at Dartmouth College, initiated with the backing of US President Eisenhower and organized by Norman Cousins, the then editor of the *Saturday Review*. It brought together some eminent Soviet and US citizens during a particularly strained period during the Cold War, in hopes of establishing better communication and improve relations between the two countries.

Apart from the old methods and use of violent means, non-violence was gathering prominence and acceptance among various movements. The civil rights movement in the US incorporated various non-violent marches and demonstrations, and governmental efforts to deal with the same were carried out by the US Justice Department with appropriate observation and mediation.

1970-85: Expansion and formation

Contemporary Conflict resolution and its practice started flourishing around this time and the field expanded. Various publications including Morton Deutsch's (1973), *The Resolution of Conflict:Constructive and Destructive Processes* and Gene Sharp's(1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* emphasized on various models of Conflict resolution, ideas were discussed and more specialized types of mediation were floated. Academic activity flourished, and private foundations like the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation created a funding program for the support of work in conflict resolution theory and practice in 1984. The independent United States' Institute of Peace was established in the same year.

Various core ideas within the field were cemented around this time and consensus was formed, among the various ideas, that there was an inherent possibility of restructuring and re-framing conflicts so that these may be viewed as mutual problems for the warring parties, and that a mutually acceptable parley or solution could be floated. The importance of intermediaries in conflict mediation was also recognised. Emphasis was also placed on the skills required by such intermediaries to negotiate and mediate between antagonists so that better resolution may be facilitated.

In the United States, the expansion of conflict resolution studies and practice was in various ways linked to many social movements, going back to the convergence of many movements, such as the appeal of local self-government and community activism in the

post 1960s(Adler 1987; Scimecca 1991). The peace-making and mediation efforts of various religious organizations, such as the Society of Friends(Quakers) and the Mennonites also aided in the expansion of conflict resolution as a social movement. Changes and growth in various spheres like the legal system, litigation and over-burdening of courts furthered the growth of conflict resolution in academics and practice. Significant interest was generated by the emerging alternative dispute resolution (ADR) movement among lawyers and the like as an alternative to adversarial proceedings and to reduce the burden on judicial courts(Ray 1982). Another point of attraction was the seeming practical alternative to the reliance on the military options, especially among the peace movement members (Lofland 1993). Further, intellectual justification for conflict resolution practices were provided by the various ideas arising from research and theory in the field.

Elsewhere in the globe, the Détente in the Cold War was withering away and collapsed by the end of the 1970s. The tensions intensified greatly, spurred on by the Reagan administration as well. The cold war, however, was undermined by the growing integration of the global economy and socio-cultural relations. With the coming of the new Soviet leader Gorbachev in 1985, radical economic and social reforms were initiated in the Soviet system, which unwittingly led to the demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold war and superpower rivalry.

There was the significant and steady expansion of Conflict resolution during the period of 1970-85 in various parts of the world. European peace research proved to be a significant contributor to the theory and practice of the field. After the Social Democratic Party came up in Germany in 1969, several peace and conflict research institutes were set up, including the Tampere Peace Research Institute, established by the Finnish Parliament in 1969 and opened in 1970, and the Danish Parliament founded the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) as an independent institute in 1985 (Kriesberg 1997). Newer ideas and strategies were considered and discussed, such as non-offensive defence and re-structuring of military defense so as not to symbolise a belligerent stance. Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) were initiated and civilian based defence were also considered.

The conflict resolution field was also enriched by the contributions of feminist theory, which provided a critique and also alternatives to the predominant tradition of focusing

on hierarchy, coercive power and brute strength in the decision making processes, in the domestic as well as international arena (Harris and King 1989). Feminist theory provided much needed additional rationales to the development of CR as many of its ideas were congenial to it. They emphasized on the relevance of non-hierarchical social relations and bringing of consensus or reaching integrative agreements through cooperative and consensual decision making processes. They resented the patriarchal, traditional perspective of viewing things as a result of men's socialization and dominance.

Game theory continued to add further dimensions to the expanding field of conflict resolution through various scholarly investigations and analyses. Snyder and Diesing (1977) in their study of international crises came up with the idea that outcomes were better explained by the variations in the representative pay-off matrices. The Prisoner's dilemma was also employed to explain, through computer simulations, that cooperation was likely if one party followed a strategy of tit-for-tat in an extended series of reiterated games (Axelrod 1984).

Much of Social-psychology theory and research has also added to Conflict resolution's body of work. Theories related to cognition, interaction, personality, group behaviour, small-scale conflict and negotiation methods have been successfully incorporated. The research methodology here, is largely small group experiments. Brockner and Rubin (1985) have worked on how entrapment contributes to the escalation of conflicts and how such processes may be interrupted. In the discipline of conflict resolution, much work relates to the negotiation process during this period (Druckman 1977; Zartman 1978).

Social movement theory and research has lent their considerable work to the field of Conflict resolution theory(Tilly 1978; Toch 1965). The core ideas, or resource-mobilization approach states that unequal distribution and grievances are sources of conflict, but also stresses on the possible resolution of such grievances. Social movement theorists thus regard emergence and transformation of large-scale conflicts as functions of the strength of the sparring opposition, strength and capabilities of the movement's members and the selling power or attractiveness of the leader's goals and credibility.

The period of 1970-85 saw the manifestations of various peace movements in a variety of ways, such as mass public gatherings and demonstrations and also in the newer forms of civil disobedience. Notable were the huge processions and movements in the United States against the Vietnam War, in which the military were eventually withdrawn. The peace movements in the 1980s centred on the prevention of nuclear weapons and stockpiles, and against the arms race. Eastern Europe witnessed demonstrations against the deployment of the NATO's cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles against the Soviet Union. There was a significant number of US citizens visiting the Soviet Union and establishing what could be termed as a people's diplomacy and developed ties with each other (Lofland 1993).

Conflict resolution further expanded during this period especially with the increased acceptance and appreciation of the contributions of unofficial diplomacy. A significant rise was seen in the popularity of problem-solving workshops as a mode of conflict resolution. In this method, various academics or resource persons, generally also from the opposing sides, are brought together to brainstorm and guide their discussions about the conflict and create possible solutions (Kelman 1992). These members can be associated with the leadership of the respective parties, or have influence over the decision making process. Occasionally, well-meaning retired officials, academics and public intellectuals also participate in these workshops which continue for several days. Notable names in the development of such workshops include John Burton, Leonard Doob, Herbert Kelman, Edward Azar, Ronald Fisher, etc. Workshops of significance have been held over the long standing protracted conflicts such as those in Northern Ireland, Cyprus and the Middle East.

An active "scholar- practitioner" community had arisen after Burton's pioneering efforts. Herbert Kelman, a Harvard-based political psychologist and a leading figure in informal discussions between Israelis and Palestinians, ran one of the best known such projects and developed a refinement of Burton's "Controlled Communication," known as "Interactive Problem Solving"(Jones 2008).

Fisher's Interactive Conflict Resolution (ICR) was introduced as a refinement of the existing techniques in 1993 and has both a focused and a broad dimension: in a focused manner, ICR is defined as involving small-group, problem-solving discussions between unofficial representatives of identity groups or states engaged in destructive conflict

that are facilitated by an impartial third party of social-scientist practitioners. In a broader manner, ICR can be defined as facilitated face-to-face activities in communication, training, education, or consultation that promote collaborative conflict analysis and problem solving among parties engaged in protracted conflict in a manner that addresses basic human needs and promotes the building of peace, justice and equality(Fisher 1993).

The "classic" approach to Track Two was thus developed through these concepts. Even as some characteristics and definitions vary, most emphasise on small, informal dialogues, which the literature refers to as "Problem Solving Workshops," between players and participants from opposing sides of a conflict, usually facilitated by an impartial "Third Party" generally comprising social scientist "scholar-practitioners". There appears to be a general expectation that the participants have access to policy and decision makers back home, and would influence the mind-set of the general audience as regards the conflict. The dialogues are unique in a way that the participants step back from their official positions and jointly explore the root causes of conflict, debate on possible routes to resolution and look for viable alternatives to war and disputes. As opposed to occasional workshops, these are on-going processes where most practitioners try to address deep-seated psychological aspects and look for solutions. Most of these dialogues are conducted quietly in order to create a conducive environment where 'out-of-the-box' ideas not entertained in strict official circles are proposed and explored, without fears of misreporting.

Results from these dialogues include changed perceptions of the conflict and the "other"; opening new channels for communication between adversaries who had limited means of communication; the identification and development of new options for future negotiation; in cases of Track Two dialogues pertaining to subjects other than conflict resolution, such as regional security, it could lead to the creation of communities of experts conversant with possible new approaches to the issue under discussion; preparing the ground for the transition of ideas developed in Track Two to the official track and the development of networks of influential people who can work to change views in their countries and regions(Jones 2008).

Track Two or Unofficial Diplomacy approach upholds that such activities focus on improving the relationship between the parties through communication and

understanding, by mitigating anger, anxiety, and misunderstandings (Davidson and Montville 1981). The assumption is that if the conflicting parties overcome their psychological obstacles to negotiation, they will consent to meet for official negotiations and will conduct such negotiations on the basis of shared interests, which is an essential element in conflict resolution (Burton 1969). The unofficial nature of the process allows the parties to raise and explore ideas and reactions concerning alternative solutions and approaches in a non-obligatory framework (Davidson and Montville 1981; Burton 1987; Kelman 1995; Azar 2002). Problem-solving workshops are one of the most essential elements of Track Two diplomacy (Montville 1991). While Track One consists of the mediation, negotiations, and other official exchanges between governmental representatives, unofficial or Track Two incorporates such workshops, and much more. Other forms of unofficial conflict mediation may happen aided and facilitated by transnational organizations. The ADR practices also expanded greatly during this period, especially in the US as many community dispute resolution centres were opened.

1986-Present: Further extension and institutionalization

The period from the 1980s to the present saw a steady institutionalization and cementing of the various programmes dedicated to the study and mitigation of conflict. There was the increased focus on the development of stable political structures. A significant expansion of conflict resolution arena has been the shift to focus on the pre-negotiation stage, or the process in which adversaries are brought to the negotiating table (Stein 1989),and also into the different phases of conflict. Apart from the conflict itself, phases prior to escalation, or the post-settlement phase, and the rehabilitation, peace-building measures and methods of reconciliation among adversaries, are stressed upon. This forms part of the tradition that views conflict not just as a passing event or a random phenomenon, but as a long-term, dynamic, and inherently omnipresent feature of human civilisation and international relations.

There has also been the steady incorporation of CR in various settings, including training and practice in mediation and negotiation in various levels of education and training, private corporations, governmental systems and international and National Non-Governmental Organizations. It has been increasingly introduced in many countries, and is seen as a reliable medium of changing and transforming the way we

view conflicts. There is also the steady institutionalisation of CR and related aspects. This is further illustrated by the establishment of many research centres dedicated to conflict resolution and conflict studies. These offer graduate studies and certificate programmes in conflict analysis and resolution, while many independent and university based centres offer trainings and consultation services.

Considerable research in the field of CR has prompted analysis and research on the use and effects of various kinds of mediation in international and other types of conflicts (Mitchell and Webb 1988; Kressel and Pruitt 1989; Bercovitch and Rubin 1992; and Princen 1992). Conditions leading to de-escalation of conflict, with necessary mediation or without, are also focused on. The studies have provided insights that transformation of conflict requires a melange of elements and adversaries have to mutually agree that cooperation would be mutually beneficial (Zartman 1985). Further, policy-relevant research is often done in terms of discerning the right moment or timing to undertake various kinds of de-escalating strategies (Zartman 1989; Kriesberg and Thorson 1991).

There has been a shift or change in the context of conflicts, as communal conflicts based on identity, ethnicity, religion, language and the like have become more significant in the present era. Competition among States, communities and classes have also increased because of the technological advances and integration of the global economy and market. These in turn, affect the ideas and practice of conflict resolution. The pertinence of the conflict resolution approach has been heightened by the rise of complex communal, environmental and socio-economic conflicts, many of which are difficult to discern the right and wrong side of, to finally look for and maximize benefits for all parties to the conflict. Conversely, there was the decline of inter-state armed conflicts during this period. Many of these conflicts have been brutal and destructive, often those of ethnic conflicts. Thus, there has been increased attention directed to the social strands and construction of cultural attributes as sources of communal violence, conflict and their management (Rubinstein and Foster 1988; Cohen 1991; Zartman 1996). The emotional currents inherent in conflict and their resolution have also been addressed by the developments in the field. Conflict is often triggered by mental trauma, feeling of revenge, past atrocities and humiliation and lost honour. This has been increasingly incorporated in academic works and alternate ways of addressing such feelings were discussed (Volkan 1988). Important here are the role of institutions that work for the management of potentially violent and recurring, intractable conflicts.

This body of work can be applied in a variety of conflict prone arenas, including large industrial enterprises to multi-ethnic societies (Ury, Brett and Goldberg 1988).

As the practice of conflict resolution continues to evolve, newer perspectives are incorporated and its applications have increased and applied to various arenas. Immigration, deeply held value differences and the like are being brought into the fold of conflict resolution mechanisms. Many of these require long term, strategic to build mutually fulfilling relations and legitimate institutionalised procedures to attain justice or at least consensus.

Official, and non-official third party mediation, engagement and assistance in resolution has also increased in international conflict. This requires much sensitivity to locate and adapt to certain approaches rather than those developed in the traditional setting (Lederach 1995).

Key thinkers who influenced the field of Conflict Resolution

Edward Azar

Edward Azar, one of the leading figures in the field of Conflict resolution, in his theory, first described violent events in the developing world as Protracted Social Conflicts, which he further explained as events that occur when communities are deprived of their basic needs based on their identity, often their communal identity(1990). This deprivation, according to Azar, is caused by a complex causal chain of various factors involving the role of State and the pattern of international linkages. The genesis of social conflict is also shaped by a series of initial conditions like colonial legacy, domestic historical setting and the multi-communal and multi-ethnic nature of society. This contrasts starkly with the realist understanding of politics in which conflict is perceived as an inevitable power struggle in which actors at all levels try to establish comparative advantage at the cost of another. Azar argued for an approach that focused on collective security, community building and prosperity as compared to the traditional schools of dealing with conflict. He identified a number of key aspects that define protracted social conflicts and incorporated three phases, called the Genesis, Process Dynamics and Outcome Analysis.

Genesis: Azar identifies this as a set of conditions which are instrumental in the transformation of a non-conflict situation to one of conflict. He constructs four key variables for this process:

Communal Content: Multi-communal, or communities comprised of varying and different social composition are most prone to Protracted social conflicts. These societies, whether formed as a result of divide-and-rule policies of former colonial rulers or through historical rivalries often result in unequal patterns of living or hierarchies which Azar characterises as fragmented and disarticulated between state and society as a whole. The State or governing body may be dominated by a single communal group or a few groups that may be unresponsive to, or insensitive to the needs of other communities. However, coercive efforts to enforce cooperation and integration negatively affects the nation building process, strains social fabric and harbours fragmentation and protracted social conflict.

Human Needs: This considers the extent to which identity groups are able to access the various needs required for human development. A primary ontological requirement is the physical well-being and survival of the individual and community. This in turn, is contingent on the satisfaction of certain basic needs, and these are rarely or scarcely justly met in a situation of physical scarcity. Some groups may receive and enjoy satisfaction of fulfilment of needs, but many do not. Grievances that result, therefore, from need deprivation are collectively expressed. The seeds of social conflict are sown if these grievances are not adequately and properly met by the authorities. It is not implied by Azar that developmental needs are inherently physical or material, nor do these directly always lead to conflict. Crucial here, is the degree to which certain minority groups are allowed access to economic, political and social needs and rights. Thus, a broader understanding of human needs is unearthed, and if unmet, these can become causal variables which have the potential to be linked to violence.

Government and the States' Role: the role of States, especially in the developing world is crucial in the presence or absence of protracted social conflict. The State has the functions and powers of ensuring the development of all groups in the land and providing access to basic human needs, however, in many cases, government is composed of one identity group, which uses its resources to maintain political and economic power over the other. To ensure that the power status quo is retained,

dominant groups often try and resist the entry of and participation of other groups. According to Azar, the already volatile competitive situations are exacerbated by such tactics, diminish states' ability to meet basic needs and lead to further crises. Regime type and legitimacy are thus, important linkage variables in the field of needs and protracted social conflict.

International Linkages: Azar describes how, apart from other factors at the state or domestic level that attributes to social conflict, internal policies dictated by the international linkages are also responsible for limited or unequal access to basic needs for different groups. He identifies two distinct forms in which these linkages may take place; economic dependency and client relationships. For economically weaker States that are dependent on the larger global economic system, autonomy is weakened as various economic policies are dictated by various external influences and governing bodies. This can conversely distort the domestic political and economic systems through various interplays of international capital, domestic capital and state, and lead to denial of access to certain fringe groups (Azar 1990).

Arrangements such as client relationships, where States are guaranteed their security by larger, more powerful States or group of States in return for certain degrees of adherence, or loyalty, are significant as such states can be more prone to conflict. Such States tend to be distracted from certain responsibilities, and can pursue policies both domestic and foreign that may be far removed or contradictory to the needs or wishes of its own public.

Process: The second phase in protracted social conflicts is that of process dynamics, which can result in active conflict, in case of fulfilment of the above conditions. Three important identifying factors include:

*Communal Actions and Strategies***:** For Azar(2002), certain triggers with the potential to activate conflict exists, and these once activated, result in outright violence. The trigger may or may not be trivial, but it tends to escalate into a situation where an individual is regarded as victimised, or presumed so collectively. This collective recognition of individual grievances has the potential to trigger collective protest and at times, collective aggression. In many cases, this could be met with repression of some form and as this escalates, the communal group on the receiving end starts to highlight

not only the event, but also to a wider range of grievances like historical deprivations, security, access and needs, poverty and other forms of inequality, etc. The momentum for organising and mobilising resources is accelerated by the event's spill over into various, multiple issues. Levels of communal organisation and mobilization rises, they formulate diverse strategies and methods, ranging from civil disobedience, protests, guerrilla warfare or even secessionist revolutions. Ultimately, the heights to which the movement reach and escalate depends on the organisational ability of the community, develop a strong leadership and most importantly, garner support and attention outside their boundaries. This often leads to the conflict becoming regional in nature.

*State Actions and Strategies***:** The State's response to such movements is crucial here. However, in most cases, especially in those characterised by weak and unstable institutions and government, the State tends to harshly repress these in order to ensure a cosmetic "resolution" of the same issue, to ensure that no outward signs of weakness or defeat are displayed. Much of communal dissent is handled this way in most developing or underdeveloped States. Conversely, such tactics by the State give way to more violent forms of retaliating by the oppressed group. Strategies of co-option are also viewed as efforts to fragment the opposition and tend to backfire.

*Built in Mechanisms of Conflict***:** This deals with the effects of long-term conflicts on the perceptions of the other, and in turn, affects the behaviour of warring, antagonistic groups. These are created through experiences and stereotyping, as well as fears and belief systems. Each side tends to attribute the worst expectations out of the other, especially in a situation of limited interactions (Azar 1990).Negative images of each other are floated around, with no or limited chances of these being dispelled and the vilification of each ensues. These add on to the situation that feeds into protracted social conflict.

Outcomes Analysis

Protracted social conflicts are regarded as negative-sum cases with no distinct end nor winner. These offer no solution to the issues of unmet needs. Azar states that such conflicts are detrimental to the proper functioning of society and compromises the effective workings of state machinery and institutions. It has devastating effects on the society as a whole, re-enforcing pessimism, and fragments society. Conflict thus become part of the 'culture' of the community and paralyses the entire population.

According to Azar,(1990) Protracted social conflict tends to create a situation of deteriorated physical security, institutional deformity, psychological ossification and an increased dependency and client-patron relationship.

Herbert Kelman: The Social psychological dimensions of international conflict

Herbert Kelman is considered as one of the leading scholars in the field of Social Psychology, Social Ethics and conflict resolution. He developed the interactive problem solving model, an unofficial third-party approach to the resolution of international and ethnic conflicts, constructed through social-psychological principles.

Herbert Kelman's social-psychological analysis deals with international conflict and is ideally a complementary approach to general International relations theory. According to Kelman(2007), there is an element or psychological factor that is pervasive in much of international relations and conflict. However, there needs to be a proper, contextual identification of the point of entry of such psychological analysis. This approach expands the way of looking at international conflict, offering certain propositions that differ to the traditional view. For Kelman(2007), international conflict is driven by collective needs and fears, as opposed to a product of rational calculation of objective national interests by political decision makers. It is an inter-societal as well as an inter-state or inter-governmental phenomenon. Conflict at the international level is multi-faceted with various levels of influence and not just about the exercise of coercive power. It is an interactive process with an escalatory, self-perpetuating dynamic and not just a sequence of actions and reactions. The socio-psychological perspective explores the subjective factors that restrains rationality and opens the 'black box' of the state as a unitary actor and analyses the processes between and within societies that influence state action. It views international conflict as a dynamic process shaped through varying and ever changing realities, interests and relationships between warring or adversarial parties. Kelman views conflict as a multi-faceted process of mutual influence, as international politics promotes own interests and shapes their behavior accordingly. Typical methods of influencing include threats and inducements. When it comes to incentives, there is the positive incentive that needs reciprocation, failing which, may

lead to escalation of conflict. Negative inducements may hurt both parties and bringing an agreement is farfetched. The fundamentals of conflict resolution requires that the fears and needs of both sides are addressed (Kelman 2010).

Further, conflict is an interactive process in which the parties change according to each other's actions and reactions. The interactions are guided by norms into escalatory and self-perpetuating processes. The main reasons for the escalation of conflict are the inaccessibility of the other perspective and reinforcement of 'enemy' perceptions. For Kelman, resolution of conflict thus requires skillful diplomacy, interaction and also third party interventions of some kind. Interaction would create possibilities for resolution and communication through various means are necessary.

For Kelman, two social psychological processes simultaneously help in explaining the nature of conflict and also offer ways to overcome the same. These include the normative and perceptual processes. These reinforce each other and create a dynamic that inhibits the perception and occurrence of change.

In the normative process, certain interactions take place between the elites and masses and evolves steadily into authoritative social norms that govern effectively the escalation or de-escalation of conflict. There is the formation of collective moods and mobilization of group loyalties.

Further, in the decision making process, such conflict norms imposes burdens on the decision making processes and create domestic strains. But, in intense conflict situations, adhering to such rules are the safest course of action and 'hawkish' opposition elements seem more effective than 'dovish' opposition elements. Decision makers operate within a framework of assumptions about the choices available and the effectiveness of different strategies available, and the expectations of various constituencies.

Kelman states that a negotiation and bargaining process can be possible when both sides view it as either a win-win or mixed motive game. These are based on the parties' recognition and both have competing and also cooperating goals. In a win-win situation, success depends on the mutual responsiveness, but often, in such negotiations, approaches can be dominated by zero-sum games. The processes of structural and

psychological commitment here to conflict are the vested interests in maintaining the status quo and in forestalling a compromise.

Regarding the perceptual processes, it plays a crucial role in the escalation and perpetuation of conflicts. Two important such processes that generally characterizes the situation in many conflicts are the formation of what Kelman calls 'mirror' images and the resistance to contradictory information. The mirror image formation was first noted by the social-psychologists who wrote about the US and Soviet relations during the Cold War. In this scenario, both parties tend to develop parallel and mutual images of each other, each portraying the other as 'bad' and themselves as 'good'. There is the general, mutual fear of national and personal extermination and a sense of victimization by the other. The mirror images are however, not empirically symmetric to one another.

The social-psychological approach also states that people, and thus conflicts are highly resistant to images of contradictory information, or information that challenges the seemingly 'known', or are different from the perceptions and ideas that they have ingrained. These perceptions and the rigidity to which the parties or party hold on to, makes it difficult for things to change and for conflict resolution, and thus the conflict perpetuates. The reasons for this resistance to new information and to change, are mechanisms such as selective choice of information, consistency of thought processes, attributes and the self-fulfilling prophecies, etc and these tend to be quite powerful in conflict situations for a variety of reasons. The in-built images of the 'enemy' and conflict related self-images are crucial aspects of national consensus and so called identity, and such images are typically resistant to questioning or disapproval, because understanding or identifying with the ideas and perspectives of the other are limited and the capacity to do so are quite less.

The enemy is often regarded as unchangeable, and this compounds the process or even possibilities of disconfirming the built in enemy images. Strong beliefs such as these are typically part of the mirror image in which the hostility and ideologies of the enemy are inherent and regarded unchangeable. Thus, Kelman's approach to the study of conflict contributes significantly by providing a framework for the conceptualization of a changed world system and perspective. For him, the social-psychological approach provides an insight into the causes and process of conflict and the means through which change could be promoted (Kelman 2007).

Crane Brinton:

Brinton was an American historian and scholar, best known for his work on the nature of conflict and revolutions. His work has been crucial in laying the foundations to the study of conflict resolution. His famous work titled "The Anatomy of Revolution" published in 1965 was a comparative analysis of the English, American, French and Russian revolutions. He assesses the similarities and differences between and among these landmark events of human history in order to come up with a fitting study of the nature of revolutions and its related aspects. He analysed the conditions, stages, types, uniformities and the effects of these.

Brinton defines revolution as a 'drastic, sudden substitution of one group in charge of a territorial political entity by another group hitherto not running that government' (Brinton 1965). In his analysis, he likens the revolutions to a fever that the human body fights off and is gradually restored to a situation similar to the earlier order or the earlier state.

For Brinton, the causes of revolution include economic crises, sense of government or ruling party/authority's injustice, emergence of pressure groups especially public intellectuals and the presence of class antagonism. This is noted as the first stage of revolution. The next stage he terms as the radical phase, in which there is chaos as there is a breakdown of unity after power is attained by the new order or group, and there emerges a tussle between the moderates and the radicals, especially as the moderates hesitate to change dramatically. Further, in most cases the radicals win and the next stage of terror ensues. There is the suppression of opposition, radical policies are announced and implemented marked by a deeply centralised rule. There is what Brinton terms as the reign of terror and virtue. Finally, there emerges the period of relaxation from the revolutionary policies or what he terms 'convalescence' after the 'fever; of radicalism. In many cases, there is the shift from a social transformation to economic progress and an effort to re-establish the stable status-quo.

Brinton's theory however, has been subject to much criticism by a number of scholars, including:

- **Louis Gottschalk (1899-1975),** an American historian and an expert on the French revolution, argued that the comparison between the revolutions is strewn

with an extravagant array of terms borrowed from the natural sciences. While he admired the fever metaphor, he argued that it fits better only with the French revolution than the other three, and hardly fits the American case. Gottschalk disapproves of Brinton disregarding the chronology, which according to him is "the only empirically verifiable statement that a historian can make".

- **Hannah Arendt (1906-1975),** differs with Brinton when she emphasizes that a revolution is a movement in pursuit of freedom from oppression or an unjustified restraint from a government. She insists that a revolution is not just the substitution of one group by another through violent means, and stated that the decrease of traditional and religious authority undermined political authority and sows up the seeds of destruction. For her, the leaders of a revolution came directly from the people and it was the people's united disdain against the ruling government or authority that mobilised them.

- **Oszkár Jászi (1875-1957)/Oscar Jászi,** social scientist, historian, and politician, was unconvinced that the four revolutions represent a common prototype. According to him, Brinton ignores or underemphasizes the many stark dissimilarities among these, including Cromwell's religious elements, the American Revolution as a struggle of colonies for independence as distinct from the fight for a new social order, and the Russian Revolution as essentially stemming from World War I and its repercussions.

- **Christopher Hill (1912-2003),** an English Marxist historian criticized Brinton's work as heavily inspired by Marx's writings. He points out the inaccuracies in Brinton's analysis and unscientific treatment of the Russian revolution, which was very different from the other three, and the modification of facts to encompass all the revolutions in his theory. He disagrees with the 'fever' metaphor as a fever, though causing drastic effects on the body, leaves no lasting or permanent effects on the body, unlike the paradigm changing effects attributed to revolutions.

- **Maurice Herbert Dobb (1900-1976),** British economist and scholar was appreciative of Brinton's realistic treatment of revolutions as unconventional and refreshing. However, he points out the limited elaboration on the economic and social structure of the societies where the revolutions took place. Like Hill,

he was critical of Brinton ignoring the differences between the proletariat and bourgeois revolutions. For Dobb, Brinton was too fixated on bringing out the uniformities, and ignores the fundamental differences in his study.

Quincy Wright:

Quincy Wright was an American Political scientist and was one of the leading scholars on the nature of War in international relations, Wright was active in the inter-war period where the balance of power, modern machinery and suspicion and use of force were tantamount. His writings on the nature of war and conflict were among the earliest foundations of the conflict resolution field. He conceptualised war in two senses; the broader one being the clash and contact between individuals, nations and animals, and the narrower sense as the legal condition which permits two or more hostile groups to carry out a conflict through violent means and armed forces (Deutsch 1970).

In most modern civilised settings, war is considered a problem and undesirable because of the growing inter-connectedness that shrinks the world, the acceleration of history, the fantastic progresses made in military intervention and the steady rise of democracy and rule of the people. For Wright, war as a phenomenon is not a constant factor, or a periodic recurrence, but one that varies in character and incidence according to the various conditions. Thus, war is contingent and depends on context, in the sense that primitive warfare is very different from animal warfare.

Wright identifies four stages in the history of war, which include that of animals; primitive man, which began with the development of communication and language, half a million years ago; civilized man, which began about three to four thousand years ago; and the modern age with men using the latest technology and weapons. Modern warfare is distinct because it is highly specialized and heavily mechanized.

Wright gives a four factor model for the origins of war and these are: Technology, particularly as it applies to military matters; Law, particularly as it pertains to war and its initiation; Social organization, particularly in regard to such general-purpose political units as tribes, nations, empires, and international organizations; and the distribution of opinions and attitudes concerning basic values. These four corresponds to the technological, legal, socio-political and biological-psychological cultural levels of human life (Deutsch 1970). At each level, conflict is likely to happen and violent

conflict is inherently probable when there is a breakdown or overloading of the mechanisms that control the inter-play of actors at any level that previously was responsible for the maintenance of some stability. Thus, for him, peace is the equilibrium of these four factors. Any major cultural, psychological, technological or legal change or shift tends to topple the balance and equilibrium and create a possibility of war. Thus, peace has to be reinforced and constantly worked upon, it has to come after much efforts.

According to Wright, "Wars arise because of the changing relations of numerous variables-technological, psychic, social, and intellectual. There is no single cause of war. Peace is an equilibrium among many forces. Certain relationships, however, have been of outstanding importance. Political lag deserves attention as an outstanding cause of war in contemporary civilization. There appears to be a general tendency for change in procedures of political and legal adjustment to lag behind economic and cultural changes arising from intergroup contacts" (Wright 1983).

His wide ranging body of work on the study of conflict has been the pioneer and stepping stone for much of later work and continued research for many scholars who have written for the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* and the *Journal of Peace Research* and has provided much base for important scholarly work including Kenneth Boulding's *Conflict and Defense* (1962) and Anatol Rapoport's *Fights, Games and Debates* (1960) and *Strategy and Conscience* (1964). His chapter in *A Study of War* on the balance of power discussed how a balance-of-power system may gradually transform into an international or supranational community. Further, his work on the nature and formation of supranational communities was influential in leading the stream of research and discussions that led to the work on international systems and on community formation of J. David Singer, Harold Guetzkow, Amitai Etzioni and Deutsch (Deutsch et al., 1957; Deutsch and Singer, 1963). Quincy Wright was also a pioneer in the diverse and concerted handling of different research methods and broadened and deepened the intellectual unity of the study of international relations in general.

Kenneth Boulding

In the field of conflict resolution, the name of Kenneth Boulding is a familiar one, apart from his wide ranging genius on economics, poetry, philosophy and social psychology. He was one of the pioneers of peace research and called for a steady withdrawal of violent conflicts and war. Among his best known contributions is his work on general systems theory. Boulding considered GST as a tool for effective understanding of world theories. A major role for any GST was to facilitate communication between disparate fields of interest i.e. to provide a common language with which to discuss systemic problems. The need for GST is accentuated by the present sociological situation in science – Intellectual war. For Boulding, knowledge is not something which exists and grows in abstract but it is a function of human organism and social organization. The 1950s were abound with apprehensions of a third world war with nuclear weapons and assured mutual destruction. There rose the necessity of developing a sustainable theory of peace and Boulding, along with Herbert Kelman and Rapoport started the publication of *The Journal of Conflict Resolution.* He identified two approaches to conflict resolution; the extension of knowledge with a focus on peace research to encourage long sightedness, and to establish that violence is inherently inferior to other, integrative systems. Next, he proposed an extension to an international system of a basic cybernetic mechanism, which would include the intervention of third parties and a minimal world government. He was an advocate of peace research, with peace being defined as a homeostatic or cybernetic property of conflict systems. It requires merely parties to recognize that violent confrontation or similar threats are expensive, dangerous and are an ineffective way of pursuing one's interests. For Boulding, other strategies that involve non-violent force, political and legal actions and cooperation, including the integrative system, were far superior than traditional methods of violent conflict. Thus, he emphasized on the importance of peace research and studies on integrative networks. For the effective shift towards conflict resolution and promoting peace, Boulding identified nine areas of Peace Research: These include International System, Crisis Research, Conflict Studies, Attitude Studies, Alternative path to peace, Integration, Economic and Disarmament Studies, International Law.

Critics however, have pointed out the shortcomings in his theory of conflict resolution. What is essentially theoretical and may not always be practical in actual

implementation. According to Ian Harris, peace has different meanings within different cultures as well as different connotations. Thus, identifying a common and unified definition and meaning of what constitutes peace is not always easy. Further, a basic 'cybernetic mechanism' or a minimal world government to mediate and resolve international disputes has witnessed limited success, namely The League of Nations and the United Nations. Power politics comes into play and a genuine commitment is severely lacking among several constituent parties.

Conclusion

As discussed in the chapter above, the field of conflict resolution has come a long way from its initial efforts to establish itself as a major arena of study not only in International Relations but in the broader academic environment of the social sciences. From its early beginnings in the era of the Cold War to the present day, the field has emerged as one of the most important disciplines in academics, bringing together a wide range of inter-disciplinary topics and related sub-fields. Its popularity may be witnessed in the number of courses and streams dedicated to the study of conflict and its related phenomena and resolution methods in various universities and institutions around the globe. The field owes its inception and consequent development to the number of dedicated scholars, academics and practitioners who tirelessly made significant contributions to its formation, expansion and institutionalization. The chapter above has studied the key concepts and ideas pertaining to the field of conflict resolution, as well as its evolution and the various scholars responsible for its development. The practice of conflict resolution tries to emphasize integrative outcomes with a shift from adversarial (win‑lose) to positive sum (win‑win) solutions and the willingness to address the concerns of both parties for peaceful mutual coexistence.

CHAPTER THREE

KEY THEMES IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION, THE MEANS OF SETTLEMENT AND EMERGENCE OF TRACK TWO

Introduction

Conflict is an all pervasive phenomenon and the procedures to respond to such conflicts, whether at personal, communal or international levels are diverse and varied. The established rules and regulations of the day may ease the processes of negotiation, mediation or other types of law suits in various social settings. Apart from mediation and negotiation, in cases of international conflict, governments may refer their territorial or other disputes to an international court system instead of engaging in direct fighting. These methods, however are usually relegated to the handling of interest-based disputes and in cases of other, diverse kinds of conflict such as ethnic or class conflicts, prove to be inadequate. The chapter examines the various ways of managing and resolving disputes resulting from the pursuit of incompatible and adversarial goals. Destructive conflicts tend to have huge costs and affects the lives of countless numbers, and hence a creative approach to problem solving and conflict resolution is essential. Most of the settlement methods discussed in the chapter are applicable in cases of intra-state as well as inter-state conflicts.

A wide range of theories as well as practices have influenced the development of Conflict Resolution methods and mechanisms. The management and regulation of a conflict process thus requires a comparison of various approaches, in terms of decision making, communication patterns as well as institutional roles. The chapter would also examine the roles played by intermediaries and the context of intervention in a discussion on adjudication, arbitration, mediation, negotiated decisions and facilitated group processes and the importance of communication among parties. Following this, it would bring in the theory and practice of Track Two Diplomacy as a means of

resolution of disputes, its evolution and practice, and the various aspects related to it. It would also look into the informal aspects of conflict resolution efforts and the processes involved.

From management of conflict to its resolution

Approaches to the resolution of conflicts emerged and developed as a result of the pressing need to facilitate the resolution, rather than the management of intractable conflicts. Contradictory to the management approaches which argue that conflicts are inherently present in the society and in the international system and these could best be managed, these approaches to resolution are based on the belief that such conflicts can be effectively resolved and ended. The dominant and popular theories of international politics and approaches to conflict reflect a state-centric and power-political leaning of high politics, which is essentially decried by the newer strands of conflict resolution studies. These stem from the grass-root movements that were opposed to the traditional forms of conflict management which failed in the prevention and escalation of various conflicts around the world.

At the state level, conflict is generally handled or mitigated through mediation, negotiation and tactical bargaining or coercive third party intervention, and kept in check by peace enforcement. The traditional realist perspective of international relations and politics relies on the state-centric framework characterised by the security dilemma and managed through balance of power mechanism. This governs the phenomena of conflict according to this line of thought. In the more liberal approach, conflict is also managed by the spread of free market economy and democracy. The presence of the individual, the sub-national or sub-state group has been delegated traditionally to the side-lines (Richmond 2001).

The modern conflict resolution approaches try to place the individual, in the assumed existence of participatory political structures, in a significant arena in the proper understanding and ending of conflict and also highlight the fact that at the diplomatic level, the consent of the individual is necessary for the resolution. Even as conflict management and conflict resolution initially had differing notions of peace and the probability of bringing about solutions, in recent times these two concepts have been commonly regarded as complimentary, or as a process in the making (Richmond 2001).

Conflict resolution approaches are based on the realist dichotomy of state and non-state, even as there has been an increased emphasis on the non-state elements and level. According to Edward Azar, conflict and its related outcomes were determined by human needs that are inherently inexhaustible but in most cases are not allocated evenly or correctly. Since these needs are generally not considered negotiable, though distinct from interests, conflict can be generated when these are supressed, for the pursuit of these are regarded as a common ontological drive (Azar 1986). Even as interests may be subject to negotiation, universal needs and cultural values cannot be treated the same. These keep reappearing no matter how these are suppressed, and the suppression of these tends to form the roots of protracted conflicts. The purpose of this study was to examine the wealth of literature that exists in the field of conflict resolution and identify the various means of available and possible settlement and resolution.

Means of settlement of conflict

 In the settlement of disputes, the means and approaches vary according to the primary focus of the initiative. This could be on the resolution of substantive issues or management of relationships. In settling differences in interdependent relationships, power contests may be subsidiary to the collective desire to preserve harmony. There are diverse procedural means that relate to decision making and other attributes, and the psychological orientations as well as the detailed characteristics of the conflict plays a role in the adequacy or inadequacy of each procedure. While inherently voluntary settlement procedures such as negotiation and mediation steer towards compromise, others like arbitration and litigation relate to the promotion of fair judgements of the rights and entitlements of the adversaries.

The variations in settlement methods are generally viewed in terms of the degrees of communication patterns, formality, along with the outcomes pursued. Intermediaries may have little decision making authority or to impose settlement of the dispute in cases of mediation and other facilitated processes. The importance of effective communication among the adversaries is paramount here. In such negotiated settlements, direct interaction between the primary disputants is necessary to keep up the effective communication process. In the case of arbitration or judicial proceedings,

there may be the inclusion of a third party decision that may well do away with the need for direct interaction between the adversaries. Such judicial proceedings generally tend to overlook relationship consequences, and deliver decisions accordingly. In some facilitated methods however, settlement of contending issues are considered with the creation of a stable and peaceful trust relationships. Formal decision making, at times, may have certain inadequacies due to the lack of control over the outcome and process by the adversaries. Based on the need for non-adversarial and collaborative solutions to conflict, informal procedures are developed. In the process of conflict management and settlement, the varying roles of the intervening parties, the temporal constraints as well as the means of influence have much weight. In cases of cooperative and collaborative parties to disputes, open discussions aided by facilitators may help result into agreeable solutions for both sides. Before parties can approach the negotiating table, it is necessary for the contending issues to be clarified and tensions reduced. Collaborations are of significance here as lower levels of cooperation in competitive situations may hamper the search for a mutually acceptable solution. The various means of settlement of conflict may include the following:

Judicial decisions

Judicial processes are generally characterized by making an award or decision based on the rules of evidence and supporting facts in conjunction with the evaluation of the merit of the claims made by each of the adversaries (Jeong 2011). However, judicial decisions as a means of settlement of conflicts seems characterised by a lot of uncertainties. This is due to the fact that the parties in dispute have little control over not only the process but also the outcomes. What actually happens in courtrooms have little or no bearing on the actual root cause of the problem. When the focus of courtrooms is to deliver outcomes and miniscule importance is given to the values and the needs of the disputants, where the arguments are guided by legal precedents and legal norms, one can discern that courtrooms are not effective ways to reduce or to deciphering the root causes of problems. As Lynch (2005) points out the heart of the legal system is the hierarchical relation between the judge and all the others involved in the courtroom scenario. However this is not to say that courts are headed for oblivion. They do adjudicate on matters on formal property disputes between individuals, an election result or territorial disputes between states. Formal outcomes of the courtrooms do not always represent immediate social concerns and human wellbeing. To fill the

lacunae created by formal decisions of courtrooms, mini trials can be used to predict the likely outcomes of courtrooms. These mini trials are conducted where private judges make non- binding decisions after hearing the evidences and the arguments. This will provide some sort of a picture as to how the proceeding will go in the actual formal courtroom. The predicted outcomes assist disputants in reaching a reasonable settlement without being exposed to the disadvantages of the formal courtroom such as high publicity and exorbitant charges. Thus the whole objective of the mini trials is to educate the disputants of the probable strengths and weakness of the suits. This mini trial allow for frank, open and confidential decisions without the fear of backlash or retribution (Ross and Conlon, 2000). The International court of Justice provides verdicts on a wide range of issues from territorial sovereignty, land and maritime boundaries and nationality to economic rights.

Arbitration

Arbitration, a form of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), is a way to resolve disputes, generally outside of courts. Disputes would be decided by the arbitrator who renders the award, that is legally binding on both sides and enforceable in the courts (O'Sullivan, Arthur; Sheffrin, Steven M. 2003).

It is another means of conflict resolution where the arbitrator hears all the presented claims of both parties thus giving them an opportunity to present their side of the story. To describe the proceedings, negotiations are characterised by both parties making arguments, answering to the arbitrators' questions at a hearing. Negotiations are characterised by fairness, impartiality, equity, good conscience and natural justice. Expert arbitration scrutinizes multifaceted questions of fact which are central to the dispute in terms of objective criteria. A problem of legal elucidation or methodological valuation of real-world problems can be more easily applied to such areas as property or other material damages as well as different interpretations of commercial contracts. In international trade disputes, the World Trade Organization has a wide range of authority to hear complaints and provide rulings for binding decisions. Most importantly, the Permanent Court of Arbitration has been involved in managing border disputes and other international conflicts. The Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) established in 1899 has responded to international dispute resolution needs of states, state entities,

inter-governmental organizations, and private parties. Tribunals and commissions under the auspices of the PCA have examined not only territorial and human rights disputes between states but also commercial and investment disputes (e.g., gold mine companies versus Krygyz Republic after the mid-2000s). Parties can select their own arbitrators, but the PCA can be called upon to designate or appoint them.

Negotiated agreements

Negotiation stages proceeds from defining agendas to reaching a consensus on bargaining positions. Depending on the nature of conflict, negotiation can take various forms and can be done in a plethora of variations. Negotiations involve canvassing possible resolutions, studying the feasibility of each such solutions and communicating to disputants and so on. It also involves an iota of compromise between the disputants. Decision making is supported by agreements on factual matters, reasonable overall objectives held by the disputants, clear definition of problems and issues. If the negotiation between the two parties prove fruitless, a third party intervention is also carried out. In multilateral conferences such as on treaty making, consensus among multiple parties can be forged through technical analysis of problems and trade off priorities (Menkel-Meadow, 2003). The exchange of specific, substantive proposals may necessitate demand, offer, bid and their counters. The ritualization of outcomes can be followed by formal affirmation, public announcement, or official recognition. Negotiated outcomes need to be affirmed and executed through the allocation and administration of rights and resources. One set of negotiations is accompanied by another series of discussions about the formal agreement terms. Therefore, more than a series of negotiating sessions constitute a complex settlement process, as is seen in Israeli–Palestinian negotiations. By relying on goodwill rather than threats, parties to a dispute can settle their differences via compromise. When parties have enough confidence and are strongly committed to settlement, third-party intervention may not be needed (e.g., the exclusion of mediators in negotiations on the transition to majority rule in South Africa). On the other hand, third party involvement is inevitable under circumstances of a high level of continuing uncertainty surrounding distrust and power imbalance as well as a lack of efficient, direct communication channels (e.g., Israeli– Palestinian peace negotiations for the determination of borders and the future of

Jerusalem). The intervention of multiple intermediaries is common in complex conflicts.

Communication Patterns in Negotiation

In the transition from pre-negotiation to main negotiation phase, there is the shortened distance in communication and the gradual transformation of informal links into more direct contacts. The full and proper utilization of reliable channels and accurate understanding of each side's goals, expectations, intentions and presence of mind regarding the situation are important factors for successful negotiation. The delivery of unclear and vague messages by one party, partly due to reasons like unnecessary competitive motives, may hinder the cooperative efforts. Taking advantage of the adversary's confusion does not always lead to benefits in the conciliation process. In the steps towards constructive exchanges, accurate interpretations of the other's messages are crucial.

Factors that matter in a structurally balanced communication process are respectful and attentive listening, knowledge and concern about deep-rooted feelings and beliefs. Such successful exchanges have been known to help thaw rigid standpoints among adversaries, especially with the increased knowledge and sensitivity about the other's experiences. Beyond normal bureaucratic channels, a reliable and timely information channel has to be established especially during critical periods in order to control the perceived stakes in the outcomes. Having a flexible position and willingness to look for alternative options in face of catastrophic situations are difficult, but necessary standpoints required for diffusing tricky situations. In the case of official channels, a sense of urgency and high stake situations may undermine reasoned and rational action in some situations. The presence of unofficial channels where parties may have time to consult the other and deliberate on the next course of action is thus important.

In the case of crisis de-escalation, governments' responses to their adversarial counterpart's demands need to be delivered through trusted channels between the leaders. The quality of communication may make or break the possibility of getting to the next phase of negotiations. In many cases, the confidence and trust levels created through personal relationships and enhance the chances of a win-win situation. Another important factor is the stability of the negotiating personnel, as counterparts tend to take a longer period to get accustomed to one another. In bilateral settings, when mistrust

and lack of mutual respect are rising, an imposition of complex communication networks may help in the stabilization of efforts. The involvement of multiple parties may also aid in the easing of tension between warring states or groups, and the creation of both direct and indirect linkages of communication, as seen in the talks between North Korea and the Bush administration. The crisis elements were more or less mitigated by the presence of the intermediaries such as South Korea, Russia, Japan and China.

Mediation

Mediation refers to a means of aiding the settlement of a conflict through the participation of neutral third party or parties that encourage the warring sides to come up with a compromise and ease tensions. Moore(2004) defines mediation as:

> "the intervention in a standard negotiation or conflict of an acceptable third party who has limited or no authoritative decision-making power but who assists the involved parties in voluntarily reaching a mutually acceptable settlement of issues in dispute"(Moore 2004)

At the heart of mediation lies the inherent desire of each parties' desire to meet the other's demand. The willingness to satisfy the other party's needs create a mutually successful pact which is highly efficient and leads to overall wellbeing of parties, nations and organisations. Thus this form of conflict resolution is often touted as the most amicable way of conflict resolution. When peoples' perception are blurred by the wave of emotion and when lack of communication further exacerbates the situation, mediation is more pertinent than arbitration. Since people do not comprehend the issues in contention in the same way or that the people's perception may be biased, mediated communications is an effective way to clear misconceptions and miscommunications. Active mediators tend to interpret information, make tentative suggestions (even at a limited level), inject opinions, make recommendations, evaluate preferences and demands of the parties and propose solutions and modifications (Bercovitch and Houston 2000). The sign of a powerful mediator is the adoption of active strategies to twist the arms of adversaries if the settlement is seen as essential to ending long drawn out conflict situations. For example in ending the Bosnia Herzegovina civil war, the US

mediation efforts led to a forced settlement. If an intervener has a fair sense of justice and does not have to appease one of the disputants, an intermediary can bring out a more balanced settlement.

One of the most vital facets of mediation is that the disputants make concluding pronouncements on the dispute along with a commitment to implementation in tandem. They are not, in principle, coerced to accept or reject the negotiated outcome from a fear of threats or force. Thus consent to a mediation process is voluntary and can be withdrawn if participants feel the process unfair to them. In addition, parties have a great degree of liberty to reject disagreeable outcomes. Since voluntary agreement is necessary for a settlement, all forms of mediation are more democratic in their nature than judicial or arbitration processes. Mediation has become more popular than the legal system due to the latter's deficiencies which lack flexibility. Mediation would not be suitable in the event of a potential for violence, abuse, or similar unacceptable behavioural conduct by one of the partisans (Stitt, 2004).

Facilitation

In resolving conflict among different parties effectively, reaching a common agreement or consensus is necessary, and this can be aided by facilitative methods. Mutual agreement and satisfaction comes from certain innovative and ingenious methods and solutions which is further bolstered by the large participation of people and through individual capacity building (Isenhart and Spangle, 2000). Facilitation, as a method has been applied to various issues in wide settings ranging from promotion of mutual understanding in protracted conflicts to reconciliation and peace building, especially because of its non-authoritarian and non-judgemental approach in decision making. In cases where official or track one negotiation processes have reached an impasse, unofficial modes of negotiation and dialogues have been initiated by informal groups and civil societies to help create a means of reaching out. This had been seen in the conflict areas of Israel and Syria, Russia and Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, to name some, to reduce hostilities and misunderstandings (Jeong 2010). For solving communal issues as well as creating contact between warring or antagonistic parties, facilitation is a reliable process. This in certain cases also opens up opportunities for official negotiations. In the Tajik civil war of 1996, people from various communities met and discussed the causes of the conflict and jointly pursued a discussion on possible

solutions. This displayed signs of possibility of dialogue that led to official negotiations and settlement and later on, the war was effectively ended. In the case of post-Apartheid South Africa, facilitative meetings helped in the improvement of policing and practical solutions for a variety of issues were generated through the same. By developing a mutual understanding of deeper issues in adversarial and conflicting relationships, resolution may be effectively brought about. Enhanced skills of participants especially in constructive interaction, could heighten the probability of positive outcomes in such settings. In the initial stages of dialogue process, things are more informal but these progress to a more organised structure after certain action plans are adopted.

Reconciliation

The residues of negotiations, i.e. negative emotions that still linger after the rounds of negotiations have ended and verdict has been announced needs to be properly dealt with otherwise the protracted rounds of negotiations will have been in vain. There is also the risk of igniting future hostilities. Therefore reconciliation aims to mend broken fence and build bridges between parties and cement fractured social bonds. (Daly and Sarkin 2007) But reconciliation is easier said than done. Remnants of deep discord between communities fuelled by fear and anger creates serious obstacles in mending relations. The situations in Cambodia, Sierra Leone and Bosnia Herzegovina allude to this fact. Emotional injury caused by the death of loved ones, the shock of being exposed to atrocious acts and the loss of property to boot. Difficulties in accepting others' mistakes and not letting bygones be bygones can further fuel the fire of vengeance and justice.

Social healing in war torn places is laden with priorities such as repatriation and reintegration. The main duty of reconciliation is to provide psychic, attitudinal and behavioural changes beyond the settlement of issues which have immediate consequences such as settlement of war.

The role of communication and informal channels in conflict resolution

Communication channels, especially ones that facilitate confidential issues, tend to make the conflict de-escalation process much more flexible and accommodative for

both parties. The presence of such a channel of transmitting conciliatory messages ahead of public announcement gives the autonomy from internal politics to make decisions. In some cases where the official diplomats and formal representatives are unable or unwilling to communicate in the open, indirect channels are required. The presence of a mutually agreeable and trusted third party that can 'shuttle' between the two contending groups and relay messages is of great importance. In the face of continued threats and violence, when the primary antagonists are unwilling to negotiate directly with the adversary, the third party communication takes on the responsibility. In the absence of reliable and direct communication mechanisms, various channels can have different levels of credibility and also conveniently deny responsibilities at times of failure. In case of the third party mediator, they are generally regarded as more credible because of their mostly direct and uninterrupted access to the policy and decision makers and are more trusted by the parties as they generally do not have a direct interest in the outcome of the conflict. As such, the non-official channels are designed to support the dialogue process for the de-escalation of protracted conflicts. It is here that Track Two diplomacy comes in the forefront as a supportive channel to the official Track One channels conducted by the official state representatives (Price and Price, 2002). Such non-official contacts may be created and made within the parties in private capacities by the concerned individuals. An important factor here is that psychological and political readiness and willingness as a necessity for success in talks may not always be required in such informal contacts. In fact, such informal talks might lead to the exploration of a viable alternative at the official level. As opposed to being presented directly by the leaders, proposals made by intermediaries may be a safeguard against domestic controversies and allegations of sell-out or surrender.

According to Kelman(2002), a preliminary period of back-channel and indirect communication can reduce each sides' doubts about the other's motives, and thus these can precede official talks to maximize the benefits of the outcome. The confidence acquired in the pre-negotiation contacts need to outbalance the possible downsides of appearing weak and soft to the other party during the conciliation talks. The pre-negotiation period could also be best kept confidential as not to lead to rising intolerance within one's own camp, regarding any contacts with the opposing side. As compared to official negotiations, the risks of uncertainty from unofficial talks are invariably lesser, especially if these are kept away from public scrutiny. In cases of

failure, these may be disregarded and tossed out. Any progress made in the pre-negotiations phase may also lead to higher levels of optimism during the actual talks in the full-scale negotiations.

Role of the intermediary

In the pattern of communication and delivering messages, various actions and functions carried out by the intermediaries are of a diverse nature. Difficulties in the exchange of messages may also slow down negotiations as observed in the Iranian hostage crisis of 1979, in which the Iranians refused to communicate directly with the Americans, prompting Algeria to step in as the intermediary (Houghton 2001). In that crisis, proposals and counter-proposals had to be translated into French first for the Algerians, and then to English or Persian before it was passed on to the other side. The communication between Washington and Tehran was thus creeping at a slow pace which slowed down the negotiations. In severe cases of mistrust and hostility, two or more intermediaries may be roped in, because one single intermediary may not always be able to gain the trust of both warring parties. A lower chain of intermediaries may be created at the initial stages in the conciliation efforts. For the effective and smooth delivery of contentious messages, the presence of multiple intermediaries provides for much required assistance. These cushion the pressure of the disputing parties, act as a communication buffer and deliver the messages from the concerned authorities from both sides. Communication lines may be sealed when the presence of too much antagonism on both sides result in them not even acknowledging the presence of informal contact between them (Pruitt 2003). For leaders interested in investing in the reconciliation process with a sworn adversary, the presence of these complex chains provides a useful political cover.

In the complex chain of the inclusion of more than one intermediary in the conciliation process, there is the option of avoiding direct contact with adversaries regarded as illegitimate, or terrorist groups, or keeping it secret. Governments may even choose to not publicise their efforts in dealing with hostile groups or their representatives by using a channel of trusted intermediaries. According to Burton (1969), the manner of integration of the decision-making that goes into informal exchange of views can be illustrated by a broad system of communication. In the case of the British-Irish conflict, the government officials from both sides served as intermediaries for various factions in

the Northern Ireland conflict. The Irish government aided in the extension of dialogue channels even as the hawkish parties refused to talk to their counterparts.

After the extremist group's concerns were delivered to the British government, the Unionist community was drawn in the consultation network. The pre-negotiation period was a long drawn one, starting in 1988 and continued on and off, indirect communication links supported the Northern Ireland peace process till the ceasefire in 1994. The communication was facilitated by the parallel but complementary contacts. To mark the beginnings of an official Northern Ireland settlement process, the high level communications paths was created through the meetings of the British and the Irish Prime ministers in 1985. Simultaneously, the gradual development of the connections between groups within adversarial groups of Northern Ireland was aided by the series of meetings between the moderate factions (MacGinty and Darby 2002).

 Message distortion, in the case of multi-party peace negotiations, is one probable hazard in the complex networks of delivering and receiving various proposals, even as synergy may be created. Details may be lost, preconceptions and wishful thinking are abound, even as the fundamental ideas of the messages are distorted. The potentials for misunderstandings and distortion are higher as the complexity of the network escalates. With the development of more optimism, the sequence in the middle is shortened and permits a more direct communication between the opposing camps from a distance (Pruitt 2003). The presence of the intermediaries may continue as neutral observers or as facilitators after the direct flow of communication is increased. For crossing the wide bridge between leaders of opposing sides, the exchange of views need to be expanded. In the South African case, various peace communities were in the picture even as negotiations went on between Nelson Mandela and F.W. de Klerk at the national level (Midgley 2002).

The dialogue process in conflict resolution

In conflict situations or violent military stand-offs, facilitation may take the shape of group discussion and dialogue which may be designed for a collective problem solving attempt based on a deeper understanding and analysis of the issues in contention. Especially in intractable and protracted conflict settings, a compromise or negotiation is

not possible or made extremely difficult because of the mutual refusal of both sides to sit down and discuss or talk. In such settings, facilitated meetings may be the first step towards a long and arduous but potentially resolvable conflict. Through the promotion of an ability to develop procedural changes, favourable circumstances are created through inter-group contacts. For such facilitative moves towards conflict resolution, it involves a variety of objectives and procedures, such as problem-solving workshops, especially with the involvement of socially prominent actors, empowerment of women and minorities, peace camps and informal conferences or camps for promoting different cultures and traditions. It is significant because such actions and activities can help in developing empathy for the other while reconsidering one's own agendas.

Group dynamics is also another important mode of communication that helps in the creation of an increased understanding of a wider range of issues and truths. These help in the understanding of mutual concerns, building solidarity, transitional moments, and develop transformative insights. In cases of shared communal decision making, relation building and strengthening in various war torn countries, such processes have helped a lot. A notable example could include the network of women's groups affected by war in Liberia(1992-1996) that organised a series of meetings and discussions that put pressure on the fighting warlords to cease hostilities. In the post-conflict transformational period, such activities strengthened the role of women in society.

Features of the dialogue process

The process of dialogue in conflict resolution tends to lean towards the informal side where developing understandings about each side's goals and reservations related to the conflict are important. These sessions do not involve bargaining sessions nor do they promise compromise. It is not based on the evaluation of ideas regarding a fixed idea or criteria. Instead of rigid position-taking, facilitation of dialogue or 'the art of the possible' is derived from getting the warring parties to create mutual understanding on certain specific issues (Lynch 2005). It can be said here that such processes are the precursors to formal negotiations in that these develop mutual understandings to satisfy the interests of all groups involved. Many such methods of facilitation or workshops depend on an analysis of the root causes of the adversarial relationships for the eventual development of lasting solutions, such as those problem solving workshops in Colombia, Guatemala, Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Tajikistan, Moldova,

Georgia, and other former Soviet republics. In such collaborations, a sufficient amount of time and high levels of commitment are necessary to build strong or at the least, proper working relationships. Emphatic listening is one mode through which moments of transition could be created through the sharing of each party's concerns. Such moments of transition can thaw rigid stances or polarised positions, thus promoting new insights and actions by the participants (Isenhart and Spangle 2000). Taking place in public or private, these transitions are necessary to promote changes in the adversarial relationships. The main concern here is to arrive at a framework to recognize a shared meaning and understanding along with the collective ownership of the process and the resulting outcome. Notable here could be the representation of diverse kin groups by elders and women in the communal meetings with hopes of finding a solution to end the violence that had been detrimental to normal living. Even as the power to put a stop to military warfare did not rest with them, they came up with the joint suggestions and requests for the intervention by international actors and the United Nations. The lateralization of power is important in the support of a collaboration process as solutions cannot be imposed unilaterally. Through shared authority and accountability, parties co-own information and knowledge, and the creation of a joint future solution and vision that positively affects both sides ensures that both are committed in the endeavour. In cases of conflict, facilitation helps in the creation of an environment conducive to flexible decision making. Outcomes here are not unilaterally or forcibly imposed as the process was one involving a number of participants from both sides. Thus, even in deeply divided communities, collaboration can prove to be promising, with a shift from control to learning mind-set. Simultaneously, the search for a joint solution does not dictate that one gives up their preconceived ideas about solutions in the group discussions.

Prelude to Track Two Activities through effective dialogue and communication

In various settings of international conflict, improved relations arise from new communication patterns that facilitate the mutual clarification of perceptions. The existence of various forms of dialogue suggests their multiple objectives and functions. These range from contact and confidence building to joint conflict analysis to explorative problem solving to pre-negotiations. Some are limited to mere acknowledgment of opposing views and positions, while others are oriented toward removing stereotypes (for perceptual changes in relationship improvement and

increased respect). Grassroots peace-building initiatives shed light on interacting constructively with one another, eventually leading to institutional, network building (inter-ethnic advisory boards, NGO networks). The dialogue methods have been applied to dissolving tensions in civil conflicts of Tajikistan, South Africa, and Northern Ireland as well as US–Soviet relations. The Dartmouth Conference established in 1960 achieved its objective by stimulating policy-relevant, citizen-to- citizen dialogue on relations between the US and the USSR. In Northern Ireland, cross-community NGOs working on dialogue and understanding between communities played a very important role in consolidating the peace process in support of an official negotiation. In particular, advocacy agencies such as the Belfast-based Community Development Centre built a bridge between a government agency and the community by establishing the Interagency Working Group for Displaced Families. Dialogue (i.e., confidential problem-solving workshops) is utilized as a pre-negotiation to inspire official negotiations. Various initiatives were taken in preparing steps for peace in Syria–Israel, Palestine–Israel relations (Sultan, 2006).

In the settlement procedures of conflict resolution, one method that stands out for its incorporation of the informal channels of diplomacy to achieve results that have been out of reach for official track one processes is Track Two or unofficial diplomacy. This may sometimes fall under the category of facilitation, even as track two itself is a rich and diverse means of conflict resolution.

The Conflict Resolution Field and Track Two Diplomacy

The discussion on Conflict resolution brings us to another aspect of the field, namely the evolution of newer methods, the focus being on the informal aspects of conflict mediation and resolution, popularly referred to as Track Two Diplomacy. The evolution of the idea and practice of Track Two is best placed within the development of the broader field of conflict resolution. In certain arenas, Track Two is best understood as a subfield of the larger all-encompassing field of Conflict Resolution (Jones 2005). This may have its practical usages, but certain variants of Track Two do not fall within the ambit of Conflict Resolution, such as the processes aimed at the promotion of regional security in various parts of the globe. In all, the majority of the field does relate to the resolution and management of conflicts, even as it has different implications in different settings.

In terms of international conflict, conflict resolution as a field of study as known today, emerged in the mid twentieth century. A group of social scientists influenced by inter-war theories of international affairs as well as newly developed theories of labour relations and other means of domestic dispute resolution attempted to apply these in international relations and international disputes(Jones 2005). During this period, International Relations as a newly emerging field was influenced strongly by Realism and the ideas set forth by the pioneers of the conflict resolution field were met with much scepticism and criticism by the mainstream academics and scholars(Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall:2011). In spite of the initial rebuffs and resistance, the social scientists proceeded with the development of their theories on the origins of conflict, its development and possible resolution. Gradually, over the years the field has evolved significantly in its understanding and discourse on the subject. The earlier focus of this field was on the international level of analysis, and inter-state conflicts and the issues of contention between nations. Through the 1960s and 1970s and after the end of the Cold War, the idea of intractable disputes between ethnic and other groups which went on beyond the state-to-state level of analysis came to be discussed and studied more, even as such conflicts were often accelerated by events at the state level. Concepts of social justice, gender and conflict, and the impact of good governance on conflict resolution were popularised and became widely understood and debated(Jones 2005).

During this time, new approaches to negotiations, notably the "Principled Negotiation" method developed by the Harvard Law School became to be known. This form of negotiation focused on the quality of the on-going relationship rather than the outcome. It is based on the four points of separating the personal from the problem, focus on interest and not position, mutual gain and use of objective criteria (Fisher and Ury 2011). The complexity and the impact of culture as well as history on conflicts were also important arenas that began to be discussed and studied, a change from the previous fixations on the cold war model of international relations. Much of what is presently understood as Track Two emerged and was refined during this period, further influenced by the wider developments and the understandings of the nature of conflict, and its related dynamics. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the end of Cold War had made significant impact on the field of Conflict resolution, which made various advances. Various conflicts that had been previously supressed by the super power rivalry emerged, and these were further studied and debated by the scores of scholar-

practitioners and NGOs that emerged during this period(Babitt 2009). This in turn, highlighted the need for more professional approaches, and techniques to evaluate the impact of interventions.

The dominance of Western concepts and thoughts were also criticised even as awareness grew on the nature of a wider array of issues such as the needs and intricacies of smaller and fragile states(Salem 1993). Furthermore, the debates related to the relationship between conflict resolution efforts at the political and military elite levels, and the ones at the grassroots have risen. The political and military approach focuses on the management of disputes, whereas the grass-root efforts tend to focus on peace-building and eventual reconciliation (Lederach 1995). The important point to be noted here is that Track Two and its development has been part of the larger field of conflict management and resolution, and did not develop in an intellectual vacuum(Jones 2005).

Understanding Track Two

The usage of the term "Track Two Diplomacy" was popularised in 1981 by Joseph Montville, an American Foreign Service Officer (Jones 2015). The term was used to denote unofficial conflict resolution dialogues as: "unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversarial groups or nations with the goals of developing strategies, influencing public opinion, and organising human and material resources in ways that might help resolve the conflict"(Montville 1991).

According to Ahmad (2014),

> Policy oriented discussions that are non-governmental, informal and un-official in nature, but which are quite close to governmental agendas and often involve participants close to governmental quarters and influential in policy matters, such as retired diplomats, retired civil and military officials, public figures, and policy analysts are the best known practices of Track Two. On occasions it may also involve the participation of government officials in their private capacities (Ahmad 2014).

Expanding scope and definitions

There emerged various concepts to describe the numerous unofficial diplomatic activities by different actors, such as Track-Two diplomacy (Davidson and Montville 1981), 'hard' or 'soft' Track-Two diplomacy (Agha, Feldman, Khalidi, and Schiff 2003), Track-one-and-a-half diplomacy(Nan2005), "semi-official talks" (Lieberfeld 2007), Multi-track diplomacy(Diamond and McDonald 1991), etc. Yet another extension of the track has been fielded as Track Three or transformation from the grass-roots(Jones 2015).

Existing literature on Track Two is diverse in its treatment of the theoretical aspects. There is an attention to processes and attributes, such as the participants involved and aims of these activities. The scope of Track Two thus has been vastly widened. According to Schiff (2010), different nuances have been added to expand the definition of, and participants of Track Two diplomacy. Participants have varying levels of influence, ranging from highly politically influential, mid-level to grass-root activities and leaders. Studies of the Middle East conflicts have also given rise to a type of Second track that deviates from tradition; participants who hold official positions yet participate in private capacities. Fisher (2008) also writes that participants need to have access to policy making circles and leadership even as they engage in unofficial workshops in their private capacities. Lieberfeld (2002) analysed the discussions in South Africa in the 1980s between the ANC participants who were officials, and the representatives of the Whites who had no official standing.

There is also a distinction between 'hard' Track Two and 'soft' Track Two whereby the former refers to activities that facilitate the negotiations of political agreements between governments; where participants can discuss the more sensitive issues that would be difficult in a formal setting. Soft Track two in the traditional sense refers to talks aimed at changing the relationships in the long run, and contribute indirectly to the resolution of conflict(Agha et al 2003). Scholars and practitioners are also divided on the actual targets of unofficial diplomacy, with some arguing for the transfer of results to official policy making while yet others advocate for the results to be aimed towards a lasting peace and transformation of the conflict as opposed to short term policy objectives and resolution of conflict.

Reimann (2001)writes that the distinction between Tracks One and Two calls for differences in strategies employed though these go hand in hand and are not mutually exclusive. In conflict settlement measures, such as mediation by Track One actors, these may be mirrored with conflict resolution strategies, such as the facilitation/consultation by Track Two actors. There is an overlap of features of both in theory and practice. Conflict settlement cannot necessarily be understood as a necessary pre-condition for conflict resolution. There are ample examples that assert that, if negotiations on Track One become embroiled in a deadlock, unofficial and informal communication in the form of facilitation and problem-solving workshops (Track Two) may not only be initiated or continued, but also accelerates the thawing of ice and fosters breakthrough. These integrative approaches not only shed a different light on the dichotomy between Track One and Track Two strategies, but also provide orientation and new insights into the various complexities of contemporary violent conflict situations and peace-building activities. It is crucial to make a more conscious combination of different actors with conflict management activities and strategies. These must be properly matched with the political and social priorities, which will arise at the different stages of conflict escalation and de-escalation (Reimann 2001).

Track Two in itself is complex and multifaceted. Its key concepts and ideas have evolved over time, and many kinds of activities go on within the broad frame-work covered by the term. While much of the literature is concerned with Track Two as a mechanism of conflict resolution, however there is also a literature on Track Two as a mechanism for regional security. The two bodies of literature are largely separate from one another. There are several key issues that are contentious and need much more detailed work and polishing. Much of the complexity associated with Track Two is generally unappreciated by those who understand the term "Track Two diplomacy" as a general idea of unofficial dialogues intended to help resolve conflicts, or lead to better regional relationships. Further, the field suffers generally from differences between the basic paradigm of international affairs on which most Track Two efforts are based (constructivism) and the paradigm in which most official international diplomatic activities are generally understood to take place (realism).

A lack of consensus as to what Track Two is and the different starting points in terms of basic approaches to international affairs, tend to complicate matters related to the same. The term can be applied to very different kinds of processes, with very different

objectives and methods, based on very different conceptions of the underlying causes of the dispute in question. Unless those using the term understand the differences between varying and different processes, they are likely to be confused and possibly frustrated by the multiplicity of methods and outcomes they will encounter, all under the single, all-encompassing term "Track Two"(Jones 2010). Officials associated with the government looking for policy relevance in the results of a Track Two project which utilizes a "circum-negotiation" approach to broader conflict resolution between societies in a larger sense, will be deeply disappointed if he or she understands the term "Track Two" to refer to what would actually be Track One and a Half, namely, exercises devoted to gathering influential actors in secrecy in order to develop a specific set of proposals which can subsequently be used by diplomats here and now(Jones 2010). Such miscommunications tend to reduce the field of track two as muddled and ambiguous. Conversely, a conflict resolution expert looking for a broader set of dialogues to promote societal reconciliation in order to promote peace and harmony may not understand the intricacies related to track two, such as the efforts of officials to create a Track One and a Half dialogue, by which to solve a pressing problem. For him, the resolution of conflict would require an understanding of the deeper causes of the conflict. Thus, track two involves a variety of differing situations and it would be unwise to club it within a definite set of definitions or a water-tight compartment. For the purpose of this study, the term Track Two would be used to denote the actions and activities by those actors not directly involved with the legal and policy framework of the government, including scholar practitioners, citizens and NGOs. Retired officials and those acting in a private capacity are also part of the working definition.

Theoretical perspectives of Track Two Diplomacy in conflict resolution literature

Track Two rarely follows any of the dominant schools of International Relations, be it Realism, Liberalism or Constructivism. It is less concerned with what works in theory as compared to what works in practice. The "realist" school tends to favour explanations of international affairs which stress interest based bargaining, the competition for power between states and zero-sum games. According to Jones(2010),

> "Realism does not look much into intra-state conflicts and tends to over-emphasize the role of Great powers. Social-psychological and constructivist theories tend to stress interpersonal relations, community building and the development of norms. Track Two tends to stress interpersonal, social-psychological dynamics aimed at increasing each side's understanding of the underlying factors motivating the other's position, and its own, as a tool to open up possibilities for cooperative problem solving and thus, leans towards the Constructivist tradition"(Jones 2010)

It is difficult to quantify such processes according to traditional academic research criteria. It talks about various worldviews to approach negotiation and thus it calls for an eclectic combination of elements from various schools of thought. The bulk of research on Track Two is about resolving conflicts between (usually) two parties. Thus, most of the terminological and analytical concepts used in the assessment of Track Two are rooted in the broader dynamics and traditions of "conflict resolution". Questions arise as to how much of this literature is relevant to the study of Track Two projects which are aimed at certain other objectives. For example, one field where Track Two has been underway concerns efforts to develop new approaches to regional security where there is not necessarily a specific conflict being addressed by the Track Two process in question.(Jones 2008; 2015).

Most of the theoretical literature on Track Two diplomacy that has been written in the last four decades focuses on dialogues organized and facilitated by academics and attended by (often politically) influential non-official individuals, from groups or countries in protracted conflicts (Burton 1969; Montville 1991; Kelman 1997; Azar 2002; Fisher 2005). Various processes include the workshops developed by Azar, Burton, Doob, Fisher, and Kelman and carried out in different places like Northern Ireland, Cyprus, or between Israelis and Palestinians. Other examples include the Community of Sant'Egidio's intervention in the Mozambique conflict, or the multiple NGOs that have attempted to mediate the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. In certain cases, States may also function as third parties, providing logistic support and advice, such as the Norwegian involvement in the Oslo talks in 1993, or the Swedish involvement in the Stockholm talks that took place in 1994 and 1995, both dealing with the Israeli–Palestinian conflict (Agha et al 2003).

Pioneering works by various scholars and practitioners such as Burton, Kelman, Fisher, and others around methods such as controlled communication, interactive problem

solving, and interactive conflict resolution represents the efforts of Social psychology theorists and practitioners in the field to develop a conceptual and theoretical basis to offer better understanding. In their study of the development of social psychology as applicable to inter-group conflicts, Cuhadar and Dayton note three theories coming from the Social-psychological tradition, namely the Social identity, Stereotyping and Prejudice, and Contact theory. These were instrumental in the better understanding of conflicts and the possible routes of intervention by private bodies or third parties.

Structuralism and Social psychology offers another view on the impact of existing IR paradigms in this field, from a study of third-party mediation and Track Two in conflicts by Crocker, Hampson, and Aall(1999). This is the preferred area of Track Two where a third party provides an arena to come up with alternatives away from the official negotiating table. These may be employed by official mediators who lack "muscle".

Many theories and paradigms exist and no single one fits exactly, nor are these discussed the same way. Much of Track Two is not explained by the existing theories of International Relations but it would be folly to assume that it has no theoretical foundation. There also emerge the "theories of change" which relates to attempts by many in the field of conflict resolution to develop and test the implications of different theories of how people in conflict situations change; how their perceptions of themselves, of the conflict, and of the other side undergo transformation. These draw from programme evaluation and identify theories as sets of implicit and explicit approaches to issues. Various theories had appeared in Conflict Resolution literature and these are frameworks upon which many Track Two practitioners operate, and how their efforts would influence the three levels of individuals, inter-group and broader society. Many of these theories characterize the objectives of Track Two into broad arenas of management, resolution or transformation (Jones 2015).

The development of Track Two in practice

The earlier instances of intensive and on-going Track Two can be traced to the Pugwash and Dartmouth Conferences between the superpowers during the Cold war. These facilitated dialogue on strategic stability and security, occasionally tacitly encouraged by both governments of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and

occasionally barely tolerated, but produced ideas which influenced to certain degrees, the arms control agreements(Jones: 2008). These further provided a mechanism whereby leading figures could meet to discuss broader issues (Schweitzer 2004). In the 1960s, the present form of Track Two apparently took root, when Professor John Burton, a former Australian diplomat, and few colleagues at University College in London and elsewhere convened a process to help resolve a dispute between Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia, labelled as "controlled communication." They believed that it constituted a new method consisting of informal workshops, chaired by a neutral third party who facilitated the protagonists' mutual analysis of problems with the aim of helping them to develop solutions not apparent through traditional diplomatic techniques. An active "scholar- practitioner" community has arisen after Burton's pioneering efforts. Herbert Kelman, a Harvard-based political psychologist and a leading figure in informal discussions between Israelis and Palestinians, ran one of the best known such projects and developed a refinement of Burton's "Controlled Communication," known as "Interactive Problem Solving"(Jones 2008).

Fisher's Interactive Conflict Resolution (ICR) was introduced as a refinement of the existing techniques in 1993 and has both a focused and a broad dimension: in a focused manner, ICR is defined as involving small-group, problem-solving discussions between unofficial representatives of identity groups or states engaged in destructive conflict that are facilitated by an impartial third party of social-scientist practitioners. In a broader manner, ICR can be defined as facilitated face-to-face activities in communication, training, education, or consultation that promote collaborative conflict analysis and problem solving among parties engaged in protracted conflict in a manner that addresses basic human needs and promotes the building of peace, justice and equality(Fisher 1993).

The "classic" approach to Track Two was thus developed through these concepts. Even as some characteristics and definitions vary, most emphasise on small, informal dialogues, which the literature refers to as "Problem Solving Workshops," between players and participants from opposing sides of a conflict, usually facilitated by an impartial "Third Party" generally comprising social scientist "scholar-practitioners". There appears to be a general expectation that the participants have access to policy and decision makers back home, and would influence the mind-set of the general audience as regards the conflict. The dialogues are unique in a way that the participants step back

from their official positions and jointly explore the root causes of conflict, debate on possible routes to resolution and look for viable alternatives to war and disputes. As opposed to occasional workshops, these are on-going processes where most practitioners try to address deep-seated psychological aspects and look for solutions. Most of these dialogues are conducted quietly in order to create a conducive environment where 'out-of-the-box' ideas not entertained in strict official circles are proposed and explored, without fears of misreporting.

Results from these dialogues include changed perceptions of the conflict and the "other"; opening new channels for communication between adversaries who had limited means of communication; the identification and development of new options for future negotiation; in cases of Track Two dialogues pertaining to subjects other than conflict resolution, such as regional security, it could lead to the creation of communities of experts conversant with possible new approaches to the issue under discussion; preparing the ground for the transition of ideas developed in Track Two to the official track and the development of networks of influential people who can work to change views in their countries and regions(Jones 2008).

Track Two or Unofficial Diplomacy approach upholds that such activities focus on improving the relationship between the parties through communication and understanding, by mitigating anger, anxiety, and misunderstandings (Davidson and Montville 1981). The assumption is that if the conflicting parties overcome their psychological obstacles to negotiation, they will consent to meet for official negotiations and will conduct such negotiations on the basis of shared interests, which is an essential element in conflict resolution (Burton 1969). The unofficial nature of the process allows the parties to raise and explore ideas and reactions concerning alternative solutions and approaches in a non-obligatory framework (Davidson and Montville 1981; Burton 1987; Kelman 1995; Azar 2002).

Third parties in Track Two Processes

Further, the issue of Impartiality and neutrality also comes into the picture. As mediators or facilitators, third parties cannot afford to bring in their pre-conceived ideas or notions of wrong and right. In fact, "impartiality" represents a "commitment to serve all parties" as opposed to a single party by being free from favouritism either by action or by word. Impartiality is important in prohibiting the implication of bias in any forum

which puts blame on one side or seeks to apply social norms in an arbitrary manner. The quality of conflict resolution is certainly improved by process-oriented fairness. Yet sustainable peace cannot be achieved by neglecting such concerns as abuse in power asymmetry and ignorance of common good for the community. There is also the question of Human rights, States' sovereignty, whether to negotiate with parties that committed atrocities, when to step in, etc.

The role of third parties or external actors in Track Two diplomacy is considered to be distinct from the role of third parties in official diplomacy. In contrast to official interventions aimed at achieving an agreement, third parties involved in Track Two diplomacy lack resources or means of coercion; therefore, their involvement assumes more of a facilitative or educational nature (Fisher 2007), although it may sometimes also include "empowerment, advocacy, and economic and social development activities" (Chigas 2005). Most of the theoretical literature on Track Two diplomacy that has been written in the last four decades focuses on dialogues organized and facilitated by academics and attended by (often politically) influential non-official individuals, from groups or countries in protracted conflicts (Burton 1969; Montville 1991; Kelman 1997; Azar 2002; Fisher 2005). Various processes include the workshops developed by Azar, Burton, Doob, Fisher, and Kelman and carried out in different places like Northern Ireland, Cyprus, or between Israelis and Palestinians. Other examples include the Community of Sant'Egidio's intervention in the Mozambique conflict, or the multiple NGOs that have attempted to mediate the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. In certain cases, States may also function as third parties, providing logistic support and advice, such as the Norwegian involvement in the Oslo talks in 1993, or the Swedish involvement in the Stockholm talks that took place in 1994 and 1995, both dealing with the Israeli– Palestinian conflict (Agha et al 2003).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has delved into the finer nuances underlying the phenomena of conflict resolution, the means generally adopted for effective settlement and resolution, and the turn towards more informal elements. The emerging trend of Track Two diplomacy as an effective means to aid the settlement of conflict, and the various theoretical as well as practical aspects to the same have been discussed and deliberated. There is the realization that apart from the popular and recognized activities that are

attributed to formal resolution of conflict, other activities that involve more levels of conflict. This shift towards informal modes of settlement emerged because of the limitations of purely official and government related activities. While both formal and informal activities cannot operate successfully in isolation, a collaborated and cooperative exercise seems to be the most promising in the field of conflict settlement and resolution. Thus, the study and practice of Track Two began to emerge and develop out of this realisation and necessity. It was an effort towards tying up the loose ends in contemporary conflict resolution.

CHAPTER FOUR

LINKAGES AND COORDINATION BETWEEN TRACKS ONE AND TWO

Introduction

This chapter examines the significance of the study and practice of Track Two Diplomacy as an activity in itself and as a means of resolving conflicts among parties. While a majority of the theory and practice of Track two is related to conflict resolution, its importance lies in its role as a link between conflict resolution in general and government actions and policy making in particular. The chapter would examine the inter-relationship between Track One, Track Two and Conflict Resolution within the ecosystem in which the various methods of conflict resolution, management and settlement exists. As official representatives are often engaged in formal interaction based on government instructions, Track One official diplomacy is inherently constrained by power politics. On the contrary, Track Two relies on non-governmental, informal, unofficial interaction between private citizens, and bypasses the formal government power structure. Its main goal is to lower fear and miscommunication among adversaries through improved communication and better understanding of the other's perspectives. In general, informal confidence-building processes invite multiple groups to a wide array of settings of contact and exchange, ranging from scholarly meetings to communal development. As a parallel process, the study will examine the hypothesis that Track Two is not a substitute for but is rather complementary to Track One. The chapter tries to identify the Tracks as often interconnected to each other in relation to the larger field of Conflict Resolution and policy making.

Overlap and coordination

In the field of conflict resolution, there has been the increased overlap and coordination between the various strategies of conflict intervention and conciliation. In a way, there is a steady deviation from the traditional diplomatic and state centric perspectives, as well as an increase in the numbers and variety of mediators and interventionists. In their study, Crocker, Hampson and All(1999) find that actors such as intergovernmental

organizations, national governments, retired officials and various non-governmental organizations are increasingly involved in the management and resolution of various conflicts around the world. These also have a presence in the humanitarian and developmental aspects of post conflict reconstruction. In order to ensure that their actions are beneficial to the over-all process and not prove to be detrimental to the cause because of the diversity in actions and numbers, there has to be a proper coordination and communication.

In the process of conflict resolution and peace-making, there is an increasing need to study the coordination efforts between the official, state centric and the unofficial actors and to reconcile their efforts and bridge the supposed or alleged gaps and address the perceived asymmetry. The joined efforts, in the best scenario can effectively help in the making of a mutually acceptable peace agreement. While conflict resolution, conciliation and peace-building is a wide and all-encompassing project that ultimately aims to remove the root causes of violent conflict and address all human needs (Fisher 1997), the chapter aims to look into the actual possibility and efforts made to reconcile the two tracks of diplomacy and their activities which could lead to the transformation of conflict and the inherent challenges.

Track One and Track Two diplomacy activities take place alongside each other, in a complementary if not integrated manner (Davidson and Montville 1981). Track-two activity is not designed to replace official government diplomacy, but rather to supplement it by generating inputs into each stage of the official negotiation process, "into the political debate and into the thinking of policy makers and publics" (Kelman 1992).

However, Fisher(2006) writes that the very issue of coordination is a tough one to deal with, especially in protracted ethnic and political conflicts even as the stakes get higher. In such cases, attempts made by Kriesberg and Nan to explain the same prove to be useful. However, there appears to be growing efforts in coordination among unofficial actors in resolving such conflicts. There still remains a lot to be done in order to further facilitate more coordination between official and non-official actors though, and reduce the structural limitations. This occurs mainly because of the separate over-all functions at the elite level and to maintain uniqueness and independence. In a real sense, the inherent relation between the two tracks is towards the adaptation of both to suit the

needs of the other and contribution to each, such as overcoming impasses and stalemate in negotiations through over-all sensitivity. Peace-building at the middle and grass-root level through effective synergy between the official and unofficial would thus lead to increased success. While the inherent limitations persist, the percolation of knowledge, especially from the unofficial proceedings to the official policy makers would ease out many a road-block. This also ensures the efficiency, while creating trust and differences in approaches, analysis and theories may be addressed. Role clarification is also important to ensure mutual respect and complementarity of tracks.

Earlier efforts at integration and coordination

Among the earlier scholars to engage with the ideas of a combined and coordinated effort in mediating conflicts was Louis Kriesberg, and he places particular emphasis on the complex ethnic, religious and communal conflicts as compared to traditional rivalries between states(Kriesberg 1996). He writes that maximum effectiveness in the constructive resolution of various conflicts would require a deeper understanding of the role of various intermediaries and their ability to coordinate (Kriesberg 1996). In the event of multiple interventionists in a conflict resolution effort, the risks of mixed messages that create different expectations, unnecessary competition among themselves over resources and recognition, and blame game in cases of failure are ever present. The aim here, is for the actors to instead coordinate and complement each other's efforts at the same time, or one after the other. Different actors may have different weightage at diverse points of time and the best way out is to exert one's weight in the conciliation process at effective and right situations (Kriesberg 1996) and (Crocker et al 1999).

John Burton initially applied techniques of the Problem Solving workshop in meetings which may have contributed to the 1966 Manila Peace Agreement between Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore (Jones 2005). Later on, he tried to coordinate the peace process in Cyprus in 1966. While these efforts did not lead to the restart of UN mediation projects which had reached an impasse in 1965, it contributed to the start of inter-communal talks under the auspices of the UN Secretary General's mission of good offices. Concrete results were not very successfully achieved, even though this was deemed by the parties to be less interventionist than UN mediation had been during 1964-65. The creation of a non-threatening atmosphere in which the disputants could mutually analyse their misperceptions about the conflict and each other with the aid of a

third party, and then jointly explore functional avenues toward resolution, was the grand aim of Burton. For him, deep-rooted conflicts were a result of the pursuit of fundamental human needs for identity, security and justice, which are irrepressible and non-negotiable. Burton later explored the idea that problem solving techniques can be applied not just for conflict resolution but also for conflict prevention, providing a human needs approach to political decision-making, which in turn may create long-term stability in political environments (Burton 1992).

Fisher and Keashley(1991) came up with the idea of sequential and complementary intervention by different actors in their contingency model of third party intervention. According to them, the different stages of conflict require different forms of intervention to be more effective. These can be followed by specialised interventions for the steady de-escalation of conflict until the adversaries are comfortable enough to deal with the conflict without the aid of a third party. The exchange of information and the relegating of required duties and providing assistance are very helpful here. They also assume that the third party, generally comprising unofficial NGOs or civil societies are better equipped to handle the dialogue process and organise problem solving workshops. Official actors, in the meantime, have the resources and luxury of power mediation or leverage.

Crocker et al(1999) came up with a study that linked the types of third party intervention best suited to different phases of conflict escalation. They elaborate on the nature and capabilities of such third parties, both official and non-official, and whether their actions are best carried out at the same time frame or in sequence. The chances and possibilities of improved coordination among these mediators are studied by the same (Fisher 2006).

For the understanding of the requirements of coordination among the third parties in the multi-level re-conciliation exercise, Harold Saunders(2001) drawing from a rich experience of unofficial and official diplomatic processes writes that a peace making exercise cannot simply focus on the official diplomatic negotiations between the officials, but it also requires a changed relationship among societies and peoples. Therefore, a series of activities before and after the official processes is of the utmost priority for a secure and lasting peace and reconciliation of differences, especially in

protracted conflicts. These are significant in the sense that there lies much grievances and issues of identity, dignity and historic mistreatments.

For Saunders, a successful peace process would entail four phases or stages, in which the following take place:

1. The political environment is reorganised and agreements are secured by official representatives of government or organisations

2. The official negotiations are supported by a quasi-official process in which unofficial groups closely related to the former engage in supportive roles

3. A period of sustained public dialogue process among the warring leaders, brought together by unofficial actors in order to analyse the conflict, generate will to challenge the same and formulate the next steps to further the peace process

4. The societal strands and relations destroyed by long periods of conflict are renewed and re-built through an open and facilitated exchange between civil society, the people and non-governmental organisations.

However, for these processes to be identified there is the need for a strategy built on the complementarity of the activities in each of the different phases or processes. Thus, the actors involved in the conflict resolution process have to coordinate accordingly in order to maximize benefits (Fisher 2006).

In her comparative study of the unofficial peace processes in the conflict zones of Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transdniestra during the 1990s, Susan Allen Nan(1999) brings to the fore, the coordination and cooperative elements between conflict interventionists. She defines coordination as "the variety of ways conflict resolvers consciously attempt to make their own individual efforts more effective together as interconnected pieces of a larger peace process" (Nan 1999: 3). Coordination aims towards improving the complementarity process and enhancing the impacts of the different intervention methods. Four types of coordination strategies are identified by Nan, including information sharing, resource sharing, collaborative strategizing and collaborative partnerships. In her analysis of the cases in her study, the efforts of

coordination increased the complementarity and yet the maximum effects were created through joint strategizing and partnering (Nan 1999).

Further, Nan elaborates on the sharing of information as shared access to the details of the intervention exercise among the actors so as to facilitate a more informed step by step process. For Nan, resource sharing includes the increased access to assets such as contacts, capital, transportation, etc that help actors in their intervention process. This shared analysis leads to an informed strategic collaboration where the interveners plan further engagements and also leads to an individual initiatives of increased complementarity. Collaboration through partnerships, as the highest involved form of coordination helps multiple actors engage collaboratively as team members the initiatives and action plans. Thus across a wide range of actors, Nan's work is regarded as one of the foremost that deals actively with the prospects of coordinated conflict resolution behaviour among actors(Fisher 2006).

The need for coordination between multiple tracks

In the common parlance, Track one refers to those official actions carried out by state or governmental representatives, as compared to Track two, which refers to informal efforts by a range of actors including private citizens, civil organisations, NGOs and retired officials. The coordination between these two levels of actors is necessary in order to get optimal results out of a conflict resolution exercise. The exercises in conflict resolution by the informal actors can range from mid to high levels of influence. As Joseph Montville (Davidson and Montville 1981) writes, track two involves unofficial interactions between representatives of adversarial groups or nations for a comprehensive tackling of various aspects of the conflict, social and psychological, for the speedy resolution of differences. As far as practical and popular form of track two goes, the most common and popular seem to be the problem-solving workshops, where various members of the adversarial groups are brought together to discuss possible solutions. The participants may be officials working in their private capacity, civil society, academics or well-known public personalities with a high degree of influence or following in their respective nations.

Montville further added that apart from the interactions that develop strategies of conciliation, track two is relevant for its role in influencing public perceptions favouring resolution of long standing conflicts and highlighting the positive aspects of a re-structured relationship with more positive economic, social and political exchanges. Many scholars have vouched for the complementary effects a track two dialogue could have on the pre-negotiation phase of resolution talks. The unofficial nature of interventions carried out by informal actors may also contribute to the pre-negotiation, actual negotiation process and the post-negotiation phase as well, according to Kelman and Cohen (1976). A pioneer of the problem-solving workshop model, Kelman stresses that this approach is significant in its ability to influence adversarial groups to lay down long-held prejudices and approach the negotiating table, reach a mutually agreeable solution and re-build relations. Contributions of the problem-solving approach are gained through the process of transfer, in which the ideas and strategies developed by and among the participants in the workshop are passed on the policy makers (Fisher 2006).

For Ronald Fisher (1989), the transfer process of the effects and results from the problem-solving workshops to policy making can aid in setting up the foundations for a successful negotiation phase, especially in situations of violent ethnic conflicts. For a successful transfer process, the workshop has to result in a series of results, such as changed outlook, attitude, increased trust among members and a shift in previously held images or perceptions, and a shift towards an increased support for negotiations. The representatives taking part in the workshop should be able to influence their respective leaders or be part of the negotiating exercise even as they take part in the workshop in a private capacity. In order to adapt to the changing nature of the conflict process, and to sustain the required shifts in perceptions, a continued series of the workshops are in order. This facilitates the transfer to the official processes and also to emphasize on continued talks with the other party. He further expands on his idea of the process of Interactive Conflict Resolution, which he defines as small-group discussions centred on resolving conflicts between unofficial representatives of states or identity groups that are involved in violent destructive behaviour of conflict, facilitated by unbiased third parties or party composed of social scientists and scholar-practitioners. In the broader sense, ICR could be defined as inter-personal activities in communication, training, education and consultation for the promotion of collaborative conflict analysis and

enhanced problem solving among parties to an intractable conflict. The focus of the ICR is to promote peace, justice and equality (Fisher 1997).

Official attitudes towards Track Two

The scholar-practitioner community including Burton, Fisher, Nan, Cuhadar, Jones, McDonald and others involved in track two and unofficial conflict resolution are of the opinion that their work has significant influence on official interactions and policy formations, and can effectively contribute to the formal processes. However, the official diplomatic community and practitioners have been wary of the former's ideas and actions. Proponents of the general prototype of Track two interactions, such as the problem-solving workshops have been rebuffed by officials of the UN and other diplomats on a number of occasions, regarding only proper and official UN Security Council resolutions as the "real deal"(Fisher 1997).

In the 1980s John Burton and Christopher Mitchell received lukewarm responses to their efforts in organising problem-solving workshop of a collection of the middle powers for resolution of the conflict there. There were strong lobbies for traditional diplomatic methods and alternative approaches were not very popular. Other scholar practitioners like John McDonald, known for his concept of multi-track diplomacy and who also served as State Department official, wrote about the general resistance in the government to unofficial efforts at resolving conflict (McDonald 2004). In her study on the perceptions of diplomats and government officials on track two efforts, Cynthia Chataway(1998) interviewed a number of distinguished former US diplomats and her findings tell us that initially a majority of them were not very receptive towards the actions of the track two actors and found their efforts as "meddlesome" and unwarranted, that would negatively impact on the actual processes. This perception, however was shaped by the pressures and intricacies of the Cold War drama and thus an air of grave sensitivity and secrecy was abound. The flexibility of diplomats was constrained and alternate methods were frowned upon. The scope for collaboration between the tracks were perceived as far-fetched and unrealistic. However, with the change of times and the US government's decrease of its foreign service personnel, and

increased autonomy of diplomats, assistance from non-traditional sources such as track two are being increasingly looked into with new awareness and curiosity.

Her study further shows that a number of officials were willing to acknowledge track two's potential in the dialogue, analysis and problem solving field before the onset of official negotiations, as well as its potential complementarity with track one. On the other hand, an unofficial track two exercise that operated alongside or simultaneously with track one wasn't very popular, because of the misgivings that these would create high and unrealistic expectations, generate miscommunications and adversely impact the official process. An interesting finding was that the officials/diplomats of the US were more interested in track two exercises in arenas or conflicts where the US wasn't involved directly, than in the ones where it was (Chataway 1998). Unofficial meetings can thus generate a series of psychological interaction, regarding fears, hopes, deep-set animosities, grievances, and the like that can be the basis for a sustained peace exercise. However, when it comes to actually drafting and construction of the peace agreement, the track one actors are the ones that play the significant role. Even as some collaborations may occur between the two tracks, most officials believe in maintaining a healthy distance and the initial outreach has to be made by the informal actors as most officials are constricted from drifting away from their official duties or appearing as favouring certain track two groups. In all, it can be assumed that coordination between the two tracks is of significance, and the field of conflict resolution would be witnessing more of the same (Chataway 1998).

The transfer process of the effects of Track Two to Track One

The interactions and efforts carried out by the Track two practitioners are intended to influence the existing events in some ways, and these discussions are not entirely restricted to the sphere of academics only. A major issue of importance is thus, the question of how to transfer the results and findings of Track two processes to actual official policy making spheres or to a broader audience in society. To influence the decision makers, there is the need for a strategy to gain the trust of those involved in policy making is necessary. These elite breed of officials would require a level of

secrecy to properly consider the newer methods of reconciliation. The secrecy is also important so that they have the luxury of thinking it through without being pressurised by the public, which sometimes may not be very receptive to radical methods in the dealings with long standing conflicts. If the Track two exercise is intended at influencing a larger and more diverse set of people, probably in order to pass on the task of forcing change at the elite level, a more thought-out strategy of reaching the grass-roots of the society or audience is required. A strategy involving the right and effective use of media and technology may be useful here (Jones 2005). The process of transfer is complex and risky. Rushing into it may erase years of quiet work, while postponing too long may result in the events overtaking any potentially useful idea. The actual possibility of such a transfer happening successfully at the right time and place calls for strategic and judicious planning and execution. A significant flip-side of Track two practitioners is that there is a lot of unwillingness to effectively try and initiate the transfer process until there is a lucrative idea or item to sell (Jones 2005).

Coming to the issue of the impacts of Track two, the inability to properly and accurately measure the impacts proves to be a major hindrance. There are concerns among proponents or contributors that at-least some results should be seen from the large amounts of time and resources put in. However, the point to keep in mind is that each track two project has a different context and significance, and the results have to be viewed keeping in mind the intended goals of the project and its structure. A common mode of measurement is thus not very feasible.

The initial efforts in transfer mechanisms

In the evolution of the concept of transfer of effects, early practitioners tended to draw from their personal experiences. In the case of Burton's first project in South-East Asia in the 1960s, he spent little time planning on the actual process of transfer because he assumed that it would invariably reach the official negotiating table. It could be because of the fact that he had included a number of officials in their private capacities participating in track two talks. Burton increasingly believed that Track one diplomacy was not properly equipped to deal with deep-rooted and long standing conflicts. He

would pass track one off as increasingly an administrative initiative, and focused more on people-to-people contacts through problem solving workshops and controlled communications. However, even as his first project managed to end well, it is not always the case. Esra Cuhadar (2009) notes that the earlier practitioners of track two assumed that their efforts would automatically reach the negotiating table, and put too much emphasis on the brainstorming sessions of hunting for alternative conflict resolution techniques. This assumption, however is too simplistic and does not effectively engage with the question of how to positively affect policy making in most conflict resolution workshops.

In the early 1970s, the issue of transfer was further discussed by scholars like Kelman and his team involved in the Interactive Conflict Resolution model, a major goal of which was to positively influence track one. They identified two elements that were significant; the changed perceptions of the participants and the effects these changes had on the larger policy making process. Kelman further came up with three key methods that may help in the process of transfer to track one. These included the education and influencing positively of a group of responsible people who may take part in future negotiations, providing a variety of substantive inputs to the negotiation process, and the development of a stable and congenial environment where negotiations may take place (Kelman 1995). There is also the issue of the internal and external effectiveness of the Problem solving workshop on the participants, in which an internal effectiveness would imply a changed attitude of the participant in the workshop itself, and an external effectiveness that of how much the results and effects of the workshop are actually relevant and influential on the wider set of people and public involved in the conflict.

Another point of confusion is the issue of how close relations to policy makers affect the participants of the workshops. Proximity to the ones in charge of framing policies and negotiators mean that there are greater chances of the participant's ideas and results from the track two work-shop being transferred to track one. Conversely, a great deal of proximity with those in power also suggests that after the track two process and the re-entry of the individual in his own society, chances of their conforming to the originally held ideas and the interests of those in power may rise. They may in turn start resisting far-reaching ideas that may be required in the resolution of deep rooted intractable conflicts. According to Kraft(2000),

> "the linkage between tracks one and two provides track two diplomacy with access to privileged information and a position from which it could directly influence official policy. At the same time, it affects track two's potential for critical thinking, and, consequently, the quality of analysis and discussion. This problem is becoming more evident as the distinction between the tracks becomes increasingly blurred"(Kraft 2000).

Thus, there is the added complexity of finding the right type of participant in the track two projects, a rare mix of willingness to think outside the box and receptivity to new ideas, plus having enough contacts or influence on the elite policy-making category of people.

Fisher also came up with a schematic model of potential transfer effects of Interactive Problem Solving, which could be a useful tool in the understanding of the dynamics of transfer. The flip side is that it would be applicable in reality only if there was a detailed knowledge of the individual parties and their features and possible asymmetries. A deep understanding of the fluid dynamics of the talks are also needed; and the flow of events and circumstances that constantly change over the duration of a project. The "transfer effects" would be adjusted according to the changes initiated. Looking at varied cases of transfer, Fisher identified significant factors that influence the possible extent of transfer. Notable among the factors include the kind of conflict (interest-based or needs-based); the power balance between protagonists; the phase of the conflict in the cycle; and the "culture of conflict" which the groups in conflict assign to their struggle (Jones 2005).

Evaluation of the effectiveness of Track Two

Fisher's findings on the mechanisms of transfer indicated that successful transfer takes place on a variety of levels and through a variety of means. Notable ones include personal contacts between Track Two participants and leading figures in Track One, often based on trust relationships developed over a long period; private briefings and messages to leaders and also to influential bureaucrats on each side; and speeches, interviews, op-eds, and other mechanisms catering to a public audience, wherever deemed appropriate and useful. Significantly, however, Fisher(1997) pointed out that

> "on a more sombre note, the evaluation of transfer mechanisms and effects is in an anaemic state....The most common measure of success were positive comments by officials from the parties or third parties who maintained that the unofficial work had made a significant contribution to the peace process, whether or not it had culminated in a resolution at that time....Overall the evaluative element of the work appears to be thin and in need of increased attention."(Fisher 1997).

A key question, however, is that of how to assess the contributions of the so-called transfer and Track two enterprise. The important thing to be kept in mind is that these take place privately, or the effects are incremental over time. In this regard, there is an inherent lack of a methodological rigour as observed by Rouhana, also in the structuring and assessment of various problem-solving workshops(Rouhana 1996).

Fitzduff and Church (2004) introduced a set of critical concepts to deal with the linkages between NGOs and the way these affect official policy framework. The transfer strategies have been categorised in two: insider and outsider strategies. The insiders try and influence the elites that are involved in the inside businesses, the decision makers or their close contacts. At the elite level, a majority of track two are aimed at these types of insiders. The question of autonomy, however comes up regarding such type of concepts. As for the outsider strategies, they are aimed at influencing civil society and the majority public opinion. The aim is to affect the policy making from the bottom up, especially as there is the belief that unless faced with immense pressure, elites cannot be pressed to change their ways. This type of transfer model has come up for deeper engagement relatively later in the day. Even as it is regarded as more difficult to quantify in terms of results than elite level transfer, it is increasingly recognized as playing a key role in some circumstances.

In the case of the Israeli-Palestine track two process as examined by Agha et al(2003), transfer effect was dependent on the participation of a significant individual or individuals, particularly those within government and were also able to act to a certain level, autonomously in order to provide the Track Two process with cover and support while simultaneously shielding political leaders from exposure. Çuhadar explored transfer in the context of specific Track Two projects between Israelis and Palestinians on the questions of water and Jerusalem (2009). Based on the body of work in this area, Çuhadar further states that transfer can generally occur in three directions: upwards (to policy elites); sideways (to others involved in conflict resolution or dialogue projects);

and downwards (to grassroots, civil society actors). In a sense, Çuhadar's upward transfer is akin to "insider" strategies, while her downward transfer is similar to "outsider" strategies. Çuhadar's identification of side-ways strategies is an interesting and previously neglected element of transfer and speaks to the fact that Track Two projects can influence each other, simultaneously as well as in sequence (Jones 2005).

Findings by Cuhadar indicate that Track Two is relatively poor at transferring specific policy proposals into official negotiations, especially if expressed in terms of "draft agreements." According to Jones, officials prefer to come up with written agreements themselves and tend to brush off documents or agreements drafted between non-officials, former officials included. They are more receptive to ideas or concepts that could later be documented and framed in their capacity. In a few cases, a Track Two will deliberately try to "negotiate" an agreement to make a point. The "Geneva Initiative" is an Israeli-Palestinian Track Two which has set out to develop a detailed version of a final Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement in order to demonstrate that it can be done—that acceptable solutions can be found. They have done this because they feel that some politicians and officials on the two sides are making too much of problems and using them as an excuse not to negotiate an agreement, which would require each side to take on powerful internal constituencies who do not want to compromise on certain issues (Jones 2005).

Capie (2010) presents a series of certain factors that have to be necessarily present for the unofficial discussions to bring a change at the official level. These include:

-Structural opportunity, or a moment when the regional system is open to new ideas and alternate policy proposals.

-Sound ideas, in the sense that certain ideas have to cater to the regional governments as realistic and feasible and appropriate for the moment.

-Influential proponents including those people who enjoy the trust and belief of governments and the ideas of whom would be taken into proper consideration.

It is further noted that these conditions occur rarely, and it is alluded that Zartman's concept of ripeness is referred to here.

For Jones (2005), for the evaluation of a track two project, there has to be a focus at the beginning of a project on the identification of a theory of change that could potentially underlie the project. The project could be measured against the same theory while keeping in mind that the operative theory may be constantly evolving along with the project, to be eventually evaluated in the final process. There is a tendency to thoroughly tie up the measurement of a project's impact to its influence on official diplomacy within a given time frame. While it is commendable in case of achievement of the same, but there cannot be a guarantee that it is going to occur within a given time frame. Further, the changes within the group may be taken into consideration and members should be willing to work for change even if it entails stepping beyond the group. The point to be considered here is whether the workshop or project has had an impact on the participants and if they are ready to influence others beyond the project process. The transfer if any, has to be tracked and measured to an extent possible. Lastly, it remains important to be flexible and hold on to any rigid mind-set, and partnering with the rest of the members, continuously revisit all the steps mentioned previously for an on-going evaluation of goals. Change can occur quickly and has to be tackled with effectively.

Conclusion

While Track One operates under the ambit of politics with those directly involved in the spectrum of politics, it can be seen as a little limiting in that it omits the other indirect stakeholders. Track Two tries to overcome this shortcoming as its main tenet is the involvement of other players and thus is more diverse. That being said, it should be kept in mind that the latter complements the former and is complementary to each other. Thus the crux of the matter is that Track Two has an indirect bearing on policy formulation through its varied, interrelated channels of functioning. For a strong peace building and conflict resolution initiative, strong coordination between Track One and Track Two, which almost overlap is crucial. Again the success of Track Two depends on the resilience of the communication and information sharing between the various intermediaries and the ability to connect. Track two's uniqueness lies in its detachment from the often debilitating entanglement with the political class. Its strength is in the close nexus it has with the people and societies. Again, its ability to thaw the hardened ill will of adversarial groups has been its core strength. While some scholars have

rejected the viability of Track Two as a means of conflict resolution and questioned the inability or difficulty in the actualisation into policy initiatives, it is irrefutable that a strong Track Two can successfully buttress Track One diplomacy given that the former has its amped up its repertoire of soft skills and the necessary paraphernalia.

Track Two in itself is complex and multifaceted. Its key concepts and ideas have evolved over time, and many kinds of activities go on within the broad frame-work covered by the term. There are several key issues that are contentious and need much more detailed work and polishing. Much of the complexity associated with Track Two is generally unappreciated by those who understand the term "Track Two diplomacy" as a general idea of unofficial dialogues intended to help resolve conflicts, or lead to better regional relationships.

In all, it is appropriate to state that Track Two Diplomacy is gaining popularity with the increased dissemination of knowledge on what it is exactly, what it incorporates, and what it does not. While official attitudes may take longer to completely warm up to it, there are signs that there might be possible collaborations in the future even as more and more scholars and practitioners raise awareness on the same. In the course of this chapter, it can be assumed that a number of officials related to the state and those holding formal positions of power are slowly realising the benefits of a collaborative track one and track two exercise, and many more have started to realise that official policy making may be benefitted through the incorporation of informal activities that focus on problem solving and innovative thinking. It is important to remember that the process of track two diplomacy best operates as a concerted and coordinated effort with multiple tracks, and that official policy making as well as scholar practitioners are all the more richer through this.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The present study has examined the theoretical proposition of the phenomena of conflict resolution and the emerging trend of Track Two diplomacy within it. It has also scrutinised the various aspects of the field, its development, leading theorists, concepts as well as the intricacies and questions relating to the unofficial model of conflict resolution. The goal was to review if the unofficial diplomacy and its characteristic models and actors had any role or impact upon the official policy making and whether it had made any significant dents in the massive literature and practice of conflict resolution. The study was an exercise in the examination of the process and phenomena of conflict, its related aspects, means of resolution and its evolution, as well as the discussion on the informal and more intricate parts of the field. It tried to locate the inter-relationship between the official policies and the more informal, grass-root level or track two elements in the wider environment of conflict resolution framework.

Rather than resorting to violent means, the establishment of proper, stable and functional relationships can be done through negotiated agreements (Jeong 2010). Verbal arguments and deliberations over the contentious issues may be used as a more effective means of resolution, rather than the use of brute force or violence. The conventional models of settling disputes relate to the management of such tensions and disagreements within the limits of the prevailing system. There has been the steady institutionalisation of various dispute resolution mechanisms in communities, corporations and government agencies for the promotion of a stable society and the disputes and complaints arising from opposing interests are sorted out. In cases of large scale and destructive conflicts the sources of conflict may relate to deeper social psychological elements or because of the fight over scarce resources. In such events, mechanisms of conflict resolution ranging from official governmental legal activities, to others like mediation, negotiations, facilitation and the presence of third party adjudicators may be brought in. The first and second chapters dealt with these aspects, along with the discussions on the theoretical aspects of conflict resolution, its evolution and the leading thinkers associated with it.

Chapter Three looks into the available means of dispute resolution, and discusses the various nuances associated with them. For a struggle to end, a collaborative search for mutually acceptable compromises are required and for this, a voluntary process to analyse interests and needs is necessary. However, there may be instances where few specific issues are settled but relations remain strained and contentious due to an unwillingness and lack of procedures to delve into the deeper causes. This can be tackled by introducing various reforms in a committed manner in the existing system, such as political rights, land reforms, social inclusion, etc. Settlement of conflict can happen without a satisfactory removal of deeply entrenched and contentious issues, and are different from resolution. Thus, the same conflicts are not systematically diffused and tend to recur. Without resorting to violent means, the way out seems to be dialogue, which may be facilitated by either government forces or non-governmental, private bodies. This would pave the way for resolution and eventual transformation. Conflict resolution thus refers to the process whereby conflicts are not only resolved but also their underlying roots are plucked out and a systemic change is ushered. For the effective resolution of conflicts, a variety of means and methods are to be employed. An improved environment can prevent the lapse into contention among the parties (Jeong 2010).

The chapter further engages in the study of Track Two diplomacy, and the strides this practice has been making in the field of dispute resolution and the increased awareness of the scholarly community towards it. Today, the field of conflict resolution has more NGOs, individuals, and scholar-practitioners active than even a few years ago. They are part of a general process of change in the field of diplomacy which is seeing the increasing empowerment of non-traditional actors and networks in international relations (Jones 2005). Even as there are certain negative feelings towards the dilution of the elitist diplomatic service, and an increased number of "conflict resolution" practitioners who are involving themselves in disputes around the world. It thus generates a feeling of interest and inclusion among all those interested in the field, and in international affairs arena, to understand Track Two—its possibilities and its limitations. And it is essential that those who practice it should justify themselves by demonstrating a serious approach to their business (Jones 2005).

Further along the course of the study, the fourth chapter deals with the linkage issues between the official and non-official tracks of diplomacy and the possibilities of

influencing governmental policy making. Transfer and the evaluation of Track Two are among the most difficult challenges in the field of Track Two diplomacy. They require Track Two practitioners, supporters, and participants to be honest about what they can achieve and how it can be measured. For a field which thrives on ambiguity and, for some, a certain hyperbole as to the importance and impact of their work, having to specify what has been accomplished—which is often far less than one set out to accomplish—and how much impact a process has really had can be disquieting. But this is necessary if the field is to realistically understand what it is capable of achieving, and if it is to be taken seriously by others. Practitioners and participants in Track Two projects must think about the problems of transfer and evaluation early and often, not merely as after-thoughts. The fluid and dynamic nature of Track Two means that situations can shift quickly. One needs the ability to flexibly adjust the methods of transfer and the basis for evaluation (Jones 2005).

The practice of conflict resolution has on occasion, been tenuous because of the occasional tendency of practitioners to treat participants as if they were guinea pigs in conflict resolution experimentation, and believed to be of such limited scope for academic, rather than practical, ends. Conflict resolution approaches are again detached from the wider conflict environment in an attempt to prevent citizen diplomacy from succumbing to the standard politicization which tends to take place in ethno-political, sub-state or intractable conflicts. It might be argued that this separation is necessary if citizen diplomacy is to reduce stereotyping and contribute to an overall settlement (Richmond 2001).

Among the scholar community, condescending attitudes towards those involved in the developing and managing of Track Two projects have been alleged, as well as the non-consideration of the same as traditional academic endeavours that deserve much credit. The requirements of Track two such as confidentiality, were resented by those involved in more traditional work in academics, and relegating it as not so serious are all the attitudes that the practitioners had faced (Nan and Avruch 2013). As a consequence, much Track Two work has been done outside of traditional academe, in think tanks or by NGOs. However, these do not negate the fact that Track Two as a practice and academic discussions has gained more popularity over the years, especially because of the efforts of various founders and dedicated scholar-practitioners.

In light of the findings, the hypotheses adopted in the beginning of the study stand verified on most counts. The first hypothesis adopted stated that complex and dynamic nature of intractable and protracted conflicts challenges the official, governmental routes to mediation and resolution. This has been tested and affirmed after due examination of the available means of official conflict resolution mechanisms, and the challenges it faced in tackling complex, unorganised and protracted conflicts. Official mechanisms turn out to be quite inadequate in dealing with issues of class, race, ethnicity, gender, social stratification and historic communal rivalries and the conflicts that stem from these. Thus, the need arose for the inclusion of other resolution mechanisms and actors that may effectively help mitigate the causes and effects of violent conflicts. Thus, there was the warming up of officials to the more non-traditional or informal aspects of conflict resolution and addressing the roots of contentious issues in order to get lasting results. The complex nature and dynamic nature of the types of conflict in the world had indeed created the need for an approach that goes beyond the traditional and governmental mechanisms of conflict resolution. When such official mechanisms are challenged because of the intricacies of the nature of conflict, a shift towards methods that emphasize on dialogue, communication and problem solving appear to be beneficial. The second hypothesis tested in the course of this study was the assertion that unofficial or Track Two diplomacy may best complement Track One and not replace it. The study has found that while unofficial diplomacy may play an important role in the mediation, settlement and resolution of adversarial issues and conflict, it cannot operate in isolation and there needs to be a proper linkage mechanism between the different approaches or tracks. The two tracks are best complementary to one another, a concerted effort would effectively result in desired effects. Finally the last hypothesis tested was that opening up of lines of communication and establishing humane relations can effectively aid in transcending rigid inter-state relations and foster faster resolution of conflicts. It was found in the study that by incorporating proper channels of communication, neutral intermediaries and also informal dialogue processes, adversarial sides may relax their rigid stances and become sensitive to each other's viewpoints and wishes. This accelerates the cooperation and coordination and thus increase the chances of speedy resolution of conflict and differences of opinion. At the point of termination of the study, all hypotheses stand validated.

There is the emergence of a new strand of scholars and practitioners who are devoted for the steady percolation of the unofficial methods in the mainstream. There are an increased number of institutions offering courses in the same and thus its popularity seem to be rising. In all, in the field of conflict resolution, the theory and practice of Track Two continue to be significant in many aspects. Governments are increasingly receptive to the ideas and contributions offered by the same. In the interest of the scholarship on Track Two, its implications on policy making and the linkages with official diplomacy within the larger field of Conflict resolution, there is a need and room for much more research and many more arguments to be refined and developed further. This linkage problematic appears to be an under-studied area and thus the future avenues of research are all the more open, and needs to be examined more in further research projects. The lack of comprehensive and detailed data on the process and effects of a number of Track Two activities and projects also prove to be a drawback in conducting intensive research. Even as quite a few scholars have studied and written about this particular field of study, the body of literature on explicit Track Two projects and its theorisation need refining and substantiation. The study was an effort to fill in the gaps that exist between the theory and practice of Track Two and its linkages with the larger field of conflict resolution and official policy making, and an attempt to open the doors for further studies in this arena.

References

Agha,Hussein, Shai Feldman, Ahmad Khalidi, and Zeev Schiff, (2003), *Track-II Diplomacy: Lessons from the Middle East*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ahmad, Samir, (2014)"Track-Two Diplomacy between India and Pakistan: A Study in Diplomatic Overture", http://postcolonialist.com/civil-discourse/track-two-diplomacy-india-pakistan-study-diplomatic-overture/ accessed 08-11-2017

Albin, Cecilia, (1999), "Can NGOs enhance the effectiveness of International Negotiation?" *International Negotiation*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 371-387.

Azar, Edward E, (1990), *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Cases,* Aldershot: Dartmouth

Azar, Edward, (2002), "Protracted Social Conflicts and Second Track Diplomacy", in *Second Track/Citizens' Diplomacy—Concepts and Techniques for Conflict Transformation*, eds John Davies Edward (Edy) Kaufman, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Babbitt, Eileen F, (2009), "The Evolution of International Conflict Resolution: From Cold War to Peacebuilding", *Negotiation Journal* 25, No.4 (October), pp.539-49.

Barbara, Julien, (2006) "Nation building and the role of the private sector as a political peace-builder", *Conflict, Security & Development*, 6:4, 581-594, DOI: 10.1080/14678800601066595

Bercovitch, Jacob and Jeffery Z. Rubin,(1992), *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management*, New York: St. Martin's Press

Bercovitch, Jacob, (1985), "Third Parties in Conflict Management: The Structure and Conditions of Effective Mediation in International Relations", *International Journal* 40(4): 736–752.

Bercovitch, Jacob, J. Theodore Anagnoson, and Donnette L. Wille,(1991), "Some Conceptual Issues and Empirical Trends in the Study of Successful Mediation in International Relations", *Journal of Peace Research* 28.1: 7-17.

Boutros-Ghali, B. (1995) *Agenda for Peace*, New York: United Nations

Botes, Johannes and Mitchell, Christopher, (1995), "Constraints on Third Party Flexibility", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 542,Flexibility in International Negotiation and Mediation, pp. 168-184, Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Brown, Michael E., et.al, eds.,(2000), *Theories of War and Peace,* Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press

Burton, John (1968), *Systems, States, Diplomacy and Rules*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burton, John (ed.) (1990), *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*, London: Macmillan

Burton, John, (1990), *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention,* London: Macmillan

Burton, J. W. (1997), *Violence Explained: The Sources of Conflict, Violence and Crime and Their Prevention*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Capie, David, "When does Track Two Matter? Structure, Agency and Asian Regionalism", *Review of International Political Economy*, 17:2, 291-318.

Chakrabarti, Shantanu, (2003), " The Relevance of Track II Diplomacy in South Asia," International Studies, 273 Accessed: 1/11/2017, http://isq.sagepub.com/content/40/03/265.citiation

Chataway, J, Cynthia, (1998), "Track II Diplomacy: From a Track I Perspective", *Negotiation Journal*, pp 269-287.

Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Eds.), (1999), *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela R. Aall, (2004), *Taming Intractable Conflicts: Mediation in the Hardest Cases*, US Institute of Peace Press.

Cuhadar, Esra, (2009), "Assessing Transfer from Track Two Diplomacy: The Cases of Water and Jerusalem", *Journal of Peace Research*, *vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 641–658, Sage Publications.*

Cuhadar, E. and Dayton, B. W, (2012), "Oslo and Its Aftermath: Lessons Learned from Track Two Diplomacy", *Negotiation Journal*, 28: 155–179.

Diamond, Louise and McDonald, John, (1991), *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace,* Washington, DC: Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy.

Dixon, William J, (1996), "Third-party techniques for preventing conflict escalation and promoting peaceful settlement." *International Organization* 50.4: 653-681.

Dupont, Christophe, (1996), "Negotiation as Coalition-Building," *International Negotiation*, Vol.1, Issue 1, pp.47-64.

Fisher, Ronald J, (1989), "Prenegotiation Problem-Solving Discussions: Enhancing the Potential for Successful Negotiation," in Janice G. Stein, editor, *Getting to the Table: The Process of International Prenegotiation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 206–238.

Fisher, Ronald .J,(1993), "Developing the Field of Interactive Conflict Resolution: Issues in Training, Funding and Institutionalisation," in *Political Psychology*,14.

Ronald J. Fisher (Ed.), *Paving the Way: Contributions of Interactive Conflict Resolution to Peacemaking*, published by Lexington Books, 2005.

Fisher, Ronald .J,(2006), "Coordination Between Track Two and Track One Diplomacy in Successful Cases of Prenegotiation,", *International Negotiation*.

Fox, Jonathan (2001), "Two Civilizations and Ethnic Conflicts: Islam and the West", *Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 38, no.4*

Gilboa, Etyan, (2001), "Diplomacy in the media age: Three Models of Uses and Effects", *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12:2, 1-28.

Homans, Charles, (2011), "Track II Diplomacy: A Short History", *Foreign Policy* no. 187: *Scopus®*, EBSCO*host* .

Hume,Cameron, (1994), *Ending Mozambique's War: The Role of Mediation and Good Offices* (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press), p. 25.

Jackson, Richard, (2005), "Internal War, International Mediation, and Non-Official Diplomacy: Lessons from Mozambique", *Journal of Conflict Studies*, [S.l.], v. 25, no.1.

ISSN 1715-5673. Available at: <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/JCS/article/view/194/338>.

Jackson, Richard, (2004), "The Social Construction of Internal War" in Richard Jackson, ed., *(Re)Constructing Cultures of Violence and Peace* (New York and Amsterdam: Rodopi).

Jackson, Richard, (2002), "Violent Internal Conflict and the African State", *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 20, no.1, pp. 29-52.

Jacob Bercovitch and Richard Jackson,(2001), "Current Developments in International Conflict Management: Assessing the Relevance of Negotiation and Mediation," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 14, no. 2, p. 14.

James Wall,(1981), "Mediation: An Analysis, Review and Proposed Research," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 25 , pp. 157-80.

James A. Wall, Jr., John B. Stark and Rhetta L. Standifer, (2001) ,"Mediation: A Current Review and Theory Development", *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 45, No. 3. pp. 370-391

Johnston, Douglas M, (1991), "Religion and Conflict Resolution", *Notre Dame L. Rev.* 67: 1433

Johnston, Douglas,(1994), "Looking Ahead: Toward a New Paradigm," in Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson, eds., *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press)

Lederach, J,(1997), *Building Peace: Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press), pp. 16-17.

Jones, P., (2015), *Track Two Diplomacy in Theory and Practice*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Jones, P, (2008), "Canada and Track two Diplomacy" in *A Changing world: Canadian Foreign Policy Priorities*, Canadian International Council, accessible at

www.canadianinternationalcouncil.org

Jones, P, (2008), "Filling a Critical Gap or Just Wasting Time? Track Two Diplomacy and Middle East Regional Security", *Disarmament Forum, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research*, 2.

Jones, P, (2005), "Track II Diplomacy and the Gulf Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone," *Security and Terrorism Research Bulletin*, 1 (Dubai: Gulf Research Center).

Jones P, (2005), "Arms Control in the Middle East; Is It Time to Renew ACRS?" *Disarmament Forum, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research*, www.unidir.org/bdd/fiche-article.php?ref_article=2278.

Jones, P, (2003), "Negotiating Regional Security in the Middle East: The ACRS Experience and Beyond", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 26, no. 3.

Kaufman, Stuart J, (2006), "Escaping the Symbolic Politics Trap: Reconciliation Initiatives and Conflict Resolution in Ethnic Wars", *Journal of Peace Research* 43.2: 201-218.

Kelman HC(2007), "The Social-psychological dimensions of international conflict" In I.W. Zartman (Ed.), *Peacemaking in international conflict: Methods & Techniques* (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace

Kelman HC.(2010), "Interactive problem solving: Changing political culture in the pursuit of conflict resolution" in *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*

Kremenyuk, Victor A, (1988), "The Emerging System of International Negotiations," *Negotiation Journal*, Vol.4, Issue 3, pp.211-218.

Kriesberg, Louis, et.al., eds.(1989), *Intractable Conflicts and their Transformation,* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press

Louis Kriesberg, "The Development of the Conflict Resolution Field" Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques, eds. I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen, Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997, pp. 51-77.

Kriesberg, Louis and Thorson, Stuart J., eds.(1991), *Timing and the De-escalation of International Conflicts,* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press

Kriesberg, L. (1998)*, Constructive Conflicts, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.*

Lederach, John Paul, (2004), *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Lieberfield, Daniel, (2002), "Evaluating the Contributions of Track-Two Diplomacy to Conflict Termination in South Africa, 1984–90", *Journal of Peace Research, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 355–372, Sage Publications.*

Mapendere, Jeffrey, "Track One and a Half Diplomacy and the Complementarity of Tracks", *Culture of Peace Online Journal*, 2(1), 66-81.

Martinez, Janet and Susskind, Lawrence, (2002), "Parallel Informal Negotiation: An Alternative to Second Track Diplomacy", *International Negotiation*,Vol 5, pp 569-586.

Menkel-Meadow, Carrie,(2009), "Chronicling the Complexification of Negotiation Theory and Practice," *Negotiation Journal* 25, No.4 (October), pp.415-29.

Migdal, Joel, (1988), *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World,* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Mitchell, C. (2002) "Beyond Resolution: What Does Conflict Transformation Actually Transform?" in *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 9 (1): 1‑24.

Montville, Joseph V. (1991), "Transnationalism and the Role of Track-Two Diplomacy", in *Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map,*edited by Thompson W.S. Jensen K.M..Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press.

Montville, Joseph, (1995), 'The Arrow and the Olive Branch: A Case for Track Two Diplomacy', in John W. McDonald & Diane Bendahmane, eds, *Conflict Resolution: Track Two Diplomacy*. Washington, DC.

Moore, Christopher, *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*, 3rd., (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2004

Nan, Susan Allen. (1999),"Complementarity and Coordination of Conflict Resolution Efforts in the Conflicts over Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Transdniestria," Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University

Nan, A. S. (2005), "Track one-and-a-Half Diplomacy: Contributions to Georgia-South Ossetian Peacemaking" In R. J. Fisher (Ed.), *Paving the Way* (pp. 161-173). Lanham: Lexington Books

Princen, Thomas, (2014), *Intermediaries In International Conflict*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, eBook Collection (EBSCOhost).

Putnam, Robert D, (1988), "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games", *International organization* 42.3: 427-460.

Ramsbotham, O., Wood-house, T., and Miall, H.,(2011), *"Conflict Resolution: Origins, Foundations and Development of the Field,"* in Contemporary Conflict Resolution, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press)

Reimann, Cordula, (2004), "Assessing the State-of-Art in Conflict Transformation-Reflections from a Theoretical Perspective," in *Transforming Ethno political Conflict, eds. Alex Austin, Martina Fischer and Norbert Ropers,* (Berlin: Berghof Research Centre)

Regan, P. M. (2002), "Third-Party Interventions and the Duration of Intrastate Conflicts", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(1), 55-73.

Regan, Patrick and Aydin, Aysegul,(2006), "Diplomacy and Other Forms of Intervention in Civil Wars", *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 50, No. 5, pp. 736-756, Sage Publications.

Richmond, P, Oliver, (2001), "Rethinking Conflict Resolution: The Linkage Problematic Between "Track I" and "Track II", *The Journal of Conflict Studies*, Volume XXI, No.2.

Richmond,P, Oliver,(2016), *Peace Formation And Political Order In Conflict Affected Societies*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Rouhana, N.N. and Korper, S.H. (1996), "Dealing with the Dilemmas Posed by Power Asymmetry in Intergroup Conflict," *Negotiation Journal*, Vol.12, No.4, pp. 353-366.

Rubin, J.Z. & Salacuse, J.W. (1990), "The Problem of Power in Negotiation," *International Affairs* (April), pp. 24-34

Rubin, J. *et al.* (1994) *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Rubin, J.Z. & Zartman, I.W. (1995), "Asymmetrical Negotiations: Some Survey Results that May Surprise," *Negotiation Journal,* Vol.11, Issue 4, pp. 349-364.

Salem, P.E. (1993), "A Critique of Western Conflict Resolution from a Non-Western Perspective," *Negotiation Journal*, Vol.9, Issue 4, pp. 361-369.

Saunders, H, (1985), "We Need a Larger Theory of Negotiation: The Importance of Pre-negotiation Phases," *Negotiation Journal*, Vol.1, Issue 3, pp.249-262.

Schiff, Amira, (2010), "Quasi Track-One Diplomacy: An Analysis of the Geneva Process in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict", *International Studies Perspectives*, Volume 11, Issue 2, Pages 93–111

Stein, J.G, (1989), "Getting to the Table: The Triggers, Stages, Functions, and Consequences of Pre-Negotiations," *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis*, Vol.44, No.2, pp.475-504.

Susskind, Lawrence E., et al. (2003), "Multistakeholder Dialogue at the Global Scale," *International Negotiation*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 235-266.

Takeshi, Ishida, (1969), "Beyond the Traditional Concepts of Peace in Different Cultures", *Journal of Peace Research*, No. 2

Tobias Bohmelt, Tobias, (2010), "The Effectiveness of Tracks of Diplomacy Strategies in Third-Party Interventions", *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2) 167–178.

Touval, Saadia, (1989), "Multilateral Negotiation: An Analytic Approach," *Negotiation Journal*, Vol.5, Issue 2, pp.159-173.

Volkan, V. D. (1987), "Psychological Concepts Useful in the Building of Political Foundations between Nations: Track II Diplomacy", *Journal Of The American Psychoanalytic Association*, *35*(4), 903. doi:10.1177/000306518703500406.

Wallensteen, Peter (ed.)(1998), *Preventing Violent Conflicts: Past Record and Future Challenges*, Uppsala University: Sweden: Department of Peace and Conflict Resolution

Weber, Thomas, (2001), "Gandhian Philosophy, Conflict Resolution Theory and Practical Approaches to Negotiation", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol.38, no.4, pp.493-513.

Zartman, I. William & Berman, Maureen, (1982), *The Practical Negotiator* (New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zartman, I. William and Rasmussen, J. Lewis. (eds.)(1997), *Peacemaking in International Conflict Methods & Techniques,*(Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace Press, 1997).

Zartman, I. William, (2001), "Timing of Peace Initiatives: Hurting Stalemates and Ripe Moments," *Global Review of Ethnopolitics,* available at http://www.ethnopolitics.org/archive/volume_I/issue_1/zartman.pdf.

Zartman, I. W., & Touval, S. (1985), "International Mediation: Conflict Resolution and Power Politics", *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*(2), 27-45.

Zartman I., W,(2011), "Mediation in International Relations", *International Encyclopedia Of Political Science*, Credo Reference, EBSCO*host*, viewed 21 September 2018