

**Institute for Conflict Analysis  
and Resolution**

**Occasional Paper 6**

**Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution:  
A Decade of Development**

**By  
The Honorable Samuel W. Lewis  
President, United States  
Institute of Peace**

---

**George Mason University**

## **Contents**

About the Author . . . . .	i
About the Institute . . . . .	ii
Foreword . . . . .	iii
Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution: A Decade of Development . . . . .	1

April 1993  
Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

## About the Author

When he delivered the Fifth Annual Lynch Lecture on April 6, 1992, Ambassador Samuel W. Lewis was president of the United States Institute of Peace, an independent government institution established by Congress to promote peaceful resolution of international conflicts. In January 1993 he was appointed director of policy planning for the United States Department of State.

A *cum laude* graduate of Yale University, with a master's degree in international relations from the Johns Hopkins University, Ambassador Lewis was a foreign-service officer for 31 years. In his last post, he served for eight years as United States ambassador to Israel, first appointed by President Carter and then reaffirmed by President Reagan. He was a prominent actor in Arab-Israeli negotiations, including participation in the 1978 Camp David Conference, which led to peace between Israel and Egypt, and in United States efforts to bring the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 to a peaceful conclusion.

He has also served as assistant secretary of state for International Organization Affairs, as deputy director of the Policy Planning Staff, as a senior staff member of the National Security Council, as a member of the United States Agency for International Development's mission to Brazil, and in lengthy assignments in Italy and Afghanistan.

Ambassador Lewis retired from the State Department in 1985. Before assuming the presidency of the Institute on November 1, 1987, he was Diplomat-in-Residence at the Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Institute and Guest Scholar at the Brookings Institution.

## About the Institute

The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University has as its principal mission to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent human conflicts among individuals, groups, communities, identity groups, and nations. To fulfill this mission, the Institute works in four areas: academic programs, consisting of a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) and a Master of Science (M.S.) in Conflict Analysis and Resolution; research and publication; a clinical and consultancy service offered through the Applied Practice and Theory Program and by individual Institute faculty and senior associates; and public education.

The Applied Practice and Theory (APT) Program draws on faculty, practitioners, and students to form teams to analyze and help resolve broad areas of conflict. These three-to-five-year projects currently address such topics as crime and conflict, jurisdictional conflicts within governments, conflict resolution in deeply divided communities (Northern Ireland, South Africa, Beirut), and conflict in school systems.

Associated with the Institute are a number of organizations that promote and apply conflict resolution principles. These include the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED), a networking organization; the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR), offering a biannual conference for conflict resolution practitioners; Northern Virginia Mediation Service (NVMS), offering mediation services to Northern Virginia residents involved in civil or minor criminal disputes; and Starting Small, teaching conflict resolution and problem-solving skills to children.

Major research interests include the study of deep-rooted conflict and its resolution; the exploration of conditions attracting parties to the negotiation table; the role of third parties in dispute resolution; and the testing of a variety of conflict intervention methods in a range of community, national, and international settings.

Outreach to the community is accomplished through the publication of books and articles, public lectures, conferences, and special briefings on the theory and practice of conflict resolution. As part of this effort, the Institute's Working and Occasional Papers offer both the public at large and professionals in the field access to critical thinking flowing from faculty, staff, and students at the Institute.

These papers are presented to stimulate critical consideration of important questions in the study of human conflict.

## Foreword

In the decade since its founding in 1982, George Mason's Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution has become part of a ground swell of development of new institutions for addressing serious societal and world conflicts. Among the most significant of these new institutions is the United States Institute of Peace, established as a federally funded nonprofit corporation by Congress in 1984.

Guiding the development of the Institute as the only research and information unit in the United States government devoted solely to peace and peacemaking techniques has been its first president, Ambassador Samuel W. Lewis. Under Ambassador Lewis's leadership, the Institute has played a major role in raising the government's and the nation's level of awareness about the development of the field of peacemaking and conflict resolution.

The Institute has become a focal point for analysis and strategizing about conflicts facing the United States and the world. Its publications, conferences, consultancies, and public outreach—including a nationwide annual peace essay contest for high school students—have added immensely to our knowledge of peacemaking processes.

The George Mason Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution is honored to be able to present a review of developments of the decade of its existence in peace and conflict resolution by one of the major architects of that development.

*James H. Laue, Lynch Professor of Conflict Resolution*

## The Fifth Annual Lynch Lecture on Conflict Resolution

Address by

The Honorable Samuel W. Lewis  
President, United States Institute of Peace  
George Mason University  
April 16, 1992

### **Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution: A Decade of Development**

It is not only an honor but a little intimidating being here tonight, particularly after I looked at the program and realized that the previous lecturers in the Lynch Lecture Series were none other than James Laue, John Burton, Elise Boulding, Kenneth Boulding, and Richard Rubenstein. That is a powerful group to follow, and I am happy to say that two of them have been intimately involved with the United States Institute of Peace as well as with this Institute.

John Burton was one of our Distinguished Jennings Randolph Fellows for the better part of a year and did a good deal of work while he was with us on his epic four-volume treatise on conflict resolution. And Jim Laue's contributions to our Institute are well known to anyone who knows the history of the Peace Academy Campaign, which led to passage of the United States Institute of Peace Act in 1984. When I became president of our Institute in 1987, John Norton Moore, then our chairman, told me there was one person who could really educate me about the history of our unique institution, and sent me to Jim Laue. Had Jim not been around to give me some very sober, serious, and excellent advice in the early months of my tenure, I am sure that I would not be here tonight.

George Mason University, and all of you who founded and have nurtured its Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, should be extraordinarily proud of what you have achieved. It is clear that this Institute, now 10 years old, has been a real pioneer in developing innovative, new approaches to both the theory and the practice of conflict resolution and peacemaking. Some of the contributors who ornament your masthead are friends or ex-colleagues of mine, and there's no institution that should be prouder of those who have been associated with it than this institution.

What is particularly striking is the fact that the decade we are celebrating tonight at this Lynch Lecture, this decade of your Institute's de-

velopment, has coincided with the most extraordinary upheavals in the international state system since World War II. It could even be argued that these were the 10 most significant peacetime years in modern times. Ten years ago the world was locked in a Cold War of incalculable lethal potential. In 1992 the world looks incredibly different.

This century has been scarred by many violent international conflicts: World War I, World War II, Korea, the War in Vietnam and Cambodia, two India-Pakistan wars, nine major wars in the Middle East, and many other conflicts. The decades we have passed through have been decades of almost endless warfare in one or more regions, punctuated by brief moments of peace. The names remind us of a violent era: Afghanistan, Sahara, Somalia, Ethiopia, Angola, Yemen, and on and on. Many so-called minor wars have produced hundreds of thousands of casualties. The bloodiest war of the twentieth century—with the exception of the two great world conflicts—the Iran-Iraq War, dragged on for eight years of wholesale bloodshed. The 1991 Gulf War was the shortest war of the twentieth century, but it was also very bloody. And, of course, in the part of the Middle East where I have spent most of my last 20 years, the Arab-Israeli front, the record spans Israel's War of Independence in 1948-49; the Suez War in 1956; the major Six Day War in 1967; the 1969-70 War of Attrition between Egypt and Israel—somehow often left out of the record books but actually one of the bloodier of the Arab-Israeli wars and one of the longer—the 1973 Yom Kippur War, a surprise attack on Israel on the holiest of days for Israelis and Jews everywhere; and the 1982 Lebanese War, the first “war of choice” for Israel since the Suez Crisis. And outside the Middle East, the Associated Press once identified more than 300 “small wars” that were underway at that particular moment around the world.

Of course, the United States has not been at peace all this time either. We have not stayed at war for a long period of time since Vietnam. But during this decade of your Institute's existence, the United States deployed more than 500,000 troops against Iraq in Operation Desert Storm and was also involved in military operations of a “peacekeeping” or “policing” nature in Lebanon, Libya, Grenada, and most recently Panama.

Meanwhile, the dramatic changes in the last two years—the disintegration of the former Soviet Union, the renewed independence of Eastern Europe's nations, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the reunification of Germany—have now seemingly eliminated any likelihood of a nuclear exchange among major powers. Yet those events have also lifted the lid of long-festering ethnic and national conflicts, not only in Eastern Europe. The world seems to be entering an era of escalating interethnic,

interreligious, and internecine civil conflicts from Yugoslavia to Nagorno-Karabakh to Kurdistan to Somalia.

So while the Cold War is over, there is no “new world order” in sight. If anything, there is a world of newly revealed disorder, a world in which proliferating weapons of mass destruction, cheap and easily accessible technologies of death and destruction, and a diffusion of arms sellers all around the world make the prospect of widespread conflict more likely than ever. Such conflicts are far less susceptible to even the unsatisfactory restraint previously exerted by the Cold War deterrent structure, which kept a kind of uneasy peace in the world for generations. Weapons are getting cheaper and more destructive and more available. Newly revealed, newly listened-to demands for self-determination among peoples long suppressed by empires and by the international state system—those demands are now intersecting with newly reawakened ethnic, tribal, and religious demands for sovereign identity. Add to these demands the growing pressures of environmental degradation, escalating poverty and disease, and competition for scarce resources, as well as the fact that there are still many old-fashioned tyrants in many parts of the world motivated by old-fashioned greed for power, tyrants who seek nothing more complicated than hegemony over their neighbors—it all makes for a depressing prospect for any idea of a “new world order.” As we approach the end of this century, we can see that we have survived horrible upheavals and bloodshed. We have seen the end of a Cold War that threatened to extinguish mankind. And now we look around and see a thousand sword cuts on the peace of the world, drawing blood at every turn.

Yet this decade has also witnessed the development and refinement of both new international institutions and old ones, new approaches to peacemaking and traditional ones. Deterrence has gone out of style, but it is still relevant. Traditional diplomatic agendas have not disappeared just because the traditional standoff between East and West has disappeared. The international system remains in many respects a nineteenth-century state system, and some of the balance-of-power principles that have produced uneasy periods of peace in the past are still worth thinking about. Arms-control treaties and alliances for collective security like NATO, traditional forms of diplomatic mediation and negotiation—none have become irrelevant. I submit that all of this is still quite relevant, for we are in a world of transition that will go on perhaps for generations, from the traditional state system to something better.

Yet many new ideas have sprouted during this decade, and they are beginning to take root. One of them is actually an old idea: the idea embodied now in the United Nations and earlier in the League of Nations

that our old-fashioned state system could be transformed into an effective system of collective security by a charter and by adherence to that charter by all the major governments of the world. For much of the post-World War II period, the idea that the UN could serve successfully as a collective security instrument for keeping the peace has been totally thwarted. The Cold War made it impossible for the UN Charter and the UN Security Council to function in the peace and security area as it was intended to function. Now the Cold War is over, and one of the benefits certainly has been a refocusing of attention on the Security Council and the Secretary General, and their respective roles as peacemakers and peacekeepers.

One should also take note of the way in which international law is evolving in and around this newly rejuvenated United Nations. An impressive framework of international law already exists. It is embodied in many multilateral instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention, and, of course, the UN Charter itself, together with many other documents. In the last five years, with the Cold War no longer thwarting every effort to bring the weight of world opinion behind those norms, international bodies have been able to focus the spotlight on the transgressions of individual states. The instruments of international law are beginning to bite. One positive by-product of the Gulf War is a breaking of new legal ground about humanitarian intervention. The protective cloak thrown by allied forces and the UN around the Kurds may well be a harbinger of a new and much more effective role for multilateral organizations. The world community may be less likely in the future to stop at an international border while tyrants within countries massacre their own people. Humanitarian intervention by United Nations peacekeeping and peace-enforcing troops on behalf of the conscience of the world, in chaotic situations like Somalia, is now becoming a real possibility for the first time. We are just at the beginning of the evolution of new law and new doctrine, and the Gulf War and its aftermath have stimulated a process at the United Nations that should not be underestimated. It is not merely a process of cloaking United States power under the mantle of an international organization. Rather it is applying American leadership in a new effort to use the instruments of the world community for the good of the world community.

With an active American leadership role, it was relatively easy to reach agreement among members of the Security Council to oppose Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. Such leadership also enabled the Council to send a peacekeeping force of unprecedented size to Cambodia; indeed, to take on responsibility for rebuilding that country out of the

ruins left by the Khmer Rouge a decade ago. These are both precedents that the UN must build on, must understand, must not exaggerate. They are, however, the beginnings of a renewed dedication to the principles embodied in international law and expressed collectively on behalf of the world community.

But while these more traditional trends were evolving in the past decade, there was also developing a number of promising different approaches in the new fields of peace research and conflict resolution. Evidence of that is right here, in the birth and evolution of institutions like yours, dedicated to research and education and training in new approaches toward the age-old problem of achieving peace. The 1980s were fertile years for spawning new institutions, teaching techniques, courses, and scholars. Peace research, which focuses on the causes and the prevention of war, had earlier developed in academia during the 1950s and 1960s, along with new developments in the behavioral sciences, psychiatry, psychology, anthropology, economics, law, and so forth. The field of conflict resolution focuses on a variety of systems and techniques for resolving conflicts of many kinds. It owes much to methods first developed in dealing with labor-management disputes, as well as to the Civil Rights movement, which had produced certain techniques now employed for the nonviolent resolution of conflict. It also owes something to the "alternate dispute resolution" procedures developed by the American Bar Association and to those early practitioners in psychology, psychiatry, and family therapy. This decade has truly been extraordinary as, amoeba-like, new disciplines and new institutions have been spun off during a period of danger and fear in the international system and growing fear, poverty, and despair in our domestic environment. While the world was slipping backward, the discipline that this Institute symbolizes was leaping forward.

Let me tick off a few of the extraordinary institutional developments in the field during the 1980s. In 1982 there was the founding of this Institute. Also in 1982 the National Institute for Dispute Resolution, a major private funder in this field, focused on the domestic dispute agenda. In 1983 the National Conference on Peace Making and Conflict Resolution was born, based here at George Mason since 1987. It had its first conference in Athens, Georgia, in 1983, and subsequent conferences in St. Louis, Denver, Montréal, and Charlotte, with as many as 1,000 people from 37 countries in attendance. A direct spin-off, conceived at Montréal, will be the first European conference on peacemaking and conflict resolution scheduled for April 24th of this year, in Turkey. Between 1983 and 1991, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation launched a major effort to develop and support conflict theory programs,







