A Conversation

Between Conflict Resolution and Social Movement Scholars

By Beth Roy, John Burdick, and Louis Kriesberg

September 2009

The problem

There are scholars of conflict resolution and scholars of social movements, and rarely do the twain meet. In this bifurcation, we are not unusual. Victim to academic apartheid, each specialty tends our own kitchen, meeting politely, perhaps, in a corridor here or there but rarely engaging in more than superficial cross-dialogue.

And why should we? Do these two lenses on the world have anything to show each other? What they have in common is that each examines a mode of action intended to make the world a better place: "better", of course, as beheld in the eye of the analyst. But each has territory to defend, regarding itself as the center of the universe, the primary remedy to social ills. In practice, conflict resolvers preach respect and kindness; social movement activists pride themselves on courageous confrontation. Thus, at least at first glance, a disconnect between these two approaches to world improvement seems inevitable, their strategies non-contiguous and irreconcilable. Not surprisingly, these differences track muddy footprints into scholarly kitchens.

Academics are generally genteel, and so the starkness of this characterization may be disputed – politely, of course. Each of the three authors of this paper works in

1

one of the two fields while having a strong interest in the other. Louis Kriesberg is a sociologist with roots in movements for social justice who theorizes conflict dynamics and their constructive resolution. John Burdick is an anthropologist who studies grass-roots movements and has for many years been associated with an academic conflict resolution program. Beth Roy is a sociologist who studies conflicts involving issues of identity (race and religion) and mediates conflicts within and among activist organizations. We started a dialogue in person, in a public forum at Syracuse University, and determined to continue it in text, looking at what the two fields of action and inquiry that concern us have to say to each other. Our purpose is two-fold: on the one hand to steel the spine of conflict resolution scholars to engage issues of asymmetry and domination, and on the other to open the minds of social movement analysts to the potential for discovering conflict resolution as a powerful tool for social change. Meanwhile but not incidentally, we forthrightly join long-standing claims to the value of multi-disciplinary scholarship, bolstered by urgent needs for social justice activism in the domains of both world and academy.

The two fields

The fields are not parallel, offering little overlap among participants and scholars. We start, therefore, by taking a look at three contexts in which to ground our dialogue: the histories of each field; their orientation toward the construction of knowledge, particularly the relationship between theory and practice; and the relationship between scholarship and subjects of attention.

Histories: The field of conflict resolution has evolved considerably since it began to emerge in the late 1950s and expanded greatly in the 1980s (Kriesberg 2008). Its early emergence was based on research and theorizing about the ways conflicts were waged and alternatives that are relatively peaceful and constructive. Lessons from practice were drawn from labor relations and international diplomacy. The great surge in conflict resolution practice began in the late 1970s. It took the form of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in which mediators helped solve local disputes; this alternative to judicial proceedings was in keeping with the societal changes that had been brought about by the social movements of the 1950s-1970s. Training and experience in negotiating and mediating began to be institutionalized and diffused in the society. Then the field expanded by giving attention to transforming conflicts and getting adversaries to the table, to achieving equitable and enduring agreements, and to building systems of conflict management. The practice of peacebuilding following terrible violence became particularly important following the end of the Cold War. The conflict resolution field is now highly diverse in the kind of work done in a wide array of conflicts. In our discussion here, we will give particular attention to conflict resolution scholarship that is still focused narrowly on the practices related to negotiation and mediation, but we will not ignore the much broader aspects of the field.

The field of social movements also has evolved greatly. Research and theorizing in the 1930s and 1940s drew on the earlier work pertaining to crowds and riots. Social movements were a form of collective behavior which was marked by emotions and irrationality. Such behavior was often viewed as disruptive and destructive. The field

changed greatly in the 1950s and 1960s as social movements came to be seen as the great

drivers of needed social change. In the United States this was first manifested in the

civil rights struggle and, in the colonial world, in the struggles for national liberation.

Many other movements arose in the United States and around the world, including the

student, anti-war, and women's movements. The nobility of the cause and the heavy,

repressive responses have sometimes been used to justify resorting to violence as a

necessary method of struggle (Fanon 1966). In recent decades, however, the

effectiveness of nonviolent action has been analyzed and demonstrated and more

frequently used (Sharp 2005).

Theory, practice, and knowledge: Conflict resolution researchers often combine

practice of some sort with scholarship, whether in the form of intervention work outside

their academic institutions or training new practitioners within their programs. Social

movement scholars, however strong their sympathies for particular movements, and

whatever activism individual scholars may take on, more often approach their subject as

analysts, the relations between theory/research and practice/experience being more

tenuous. Where it exists, training for activism is usually done outside academic

institutions, conducted by non-governmental organizations associated specific camps of

partisans.

These differing orientations toward action are reflected in approaches to the

construction of knowledge. Social movement activists generally do not read academic

analyses of social movements (Bevington and Dixon 2005). Self-defined conflict

resolution practitioners may read some of the literature in that field, but many people

engaged in conflict resolution privilege experiential knowledge, gained on the ground or through practical training, some of the materials for which may draw on academic research and theory (Polkinghorn 2008).

A key contrast between the scholarly fields of CR and SM is that the latter has a more varied, complex relation to practice. One may detect three main traditions. First, many analysts of social movements from the fields of history, sociology, political science and anthropology address primarily academic audiences, and are not interested in trying to generate practical recommendations for activists (e.g., McAdam, Melucci, Tarrow, Tilly, Polletta, etc.). While these writers do not publish with activist audiences in mind, and most activists do not read their works, they say many things that could be useful to activists. (For example, the three main categories of analysis in the classic political process model – political opportunity, social resources, and frames – map key elements of effective strategy.) Second, an important group of authors on community, labor, and social justice organizing write with organizers as an intended audience, by focusing on improving practical techniques for undertaking effective power analyses and pressure tactics (e.g., Alinsky, Sharp, Jurvich, Ganz (Reitzes and Reitzes 1987). Third, writers on participatory action, action-oriented and activist research explicitly embrace the goal of offering activists methods for understanding their contexts and constituencies that allow them to tap more effectively into popular power for social change (Freire 2000, Greenwood & Levin 2006, Hale 2006, Speed 2006).

<u>Scholar and subjects of attention</u>: Scholarly orientation toward the subjects of study also differs. In the conflict resolution field, scholars strive to devote equal

5

analytical attention to all parties to a conflict, while those in the social movements field tend to pay special attention to those actors dedicated to escalating the conflict. Often, the social movement organizations chosen for study reflect values of the researchers, most generally leaning in the direction of peace and justice.

Conflict resolution practitioners often conceptualize their role as neutral, impartially attentive to the concerns and interests of all participants. Social movement activists, of course, pursue a cause, advocating strenuously for a position and a particular outcome. While conflict resolution scholars and practitioners may harbor hope that their work will contribute to building a more just society, they see that end achieved by introducing just processes rather than fighting for specific constituencies. (To be sure, many social movement activists believe that doing good for their constituents also does good for the society as a whole.) People in conflict resolution seek to accord moral and political legitimacy to all sides in a dispute, striving to reach a mutually acceptable accommodation through respectful processes, while in the heat of battle some social movement activists may question the moral or political legitimacy of their adversaries.

Nonetheless, members of the two fields of scholarship and endeavor have some fundamental commonalities. Members of both fields construct their activities as being for the social good, and regard them as based in social relationships. Whether acknowledged or not, conflict resolution is never only about the settlement of conflict, nor are social movements only about the articulation of conflict. In both cases, power relations are key to the feelings and functionalities of the processes.

What social movement scholars can learn from conflict resolution scholars and practioners

We wish to begin by considering what workers in the field of social movements can learn from the field of conflict resolution from two perspectives: first, how dynamics within social movements organizations might be strengthened by conflict resolution ideas and practices, and second, how strategies of social movements for negotiating demands might be made more effective by conflict resolution skills. The first looks at internal dynamics of social movement organizations, the second at their external transactions with adversaries. While both speak directly to the actions of participants, we suggest they deserve more scholarly attention since both are phenomena affecting the course of social movement organizations in their struggles.

Organizational Dynamics: Social movement organizations are composed of people who wish to bring about social change but often aren't sure how to change the way they interact with their own colleagues, and may not even recognize the importance of increasing that awareness. Under the pressure of urgent dedication, and in a culture slim on training in effective social interaction, activists frequently weaken their own organizations and hamper pursuit of their own goals by perpetuating organizational and social hierarchies.

These problems show up vividly in the case of human diversity dynamics. How common it is for well-intentioned, predominantly white organizations, for instance, to bemoan the lack of social diversity in their ranks, without understanding the relationship between their homogeneity and their innocence of conflict dynamics.

Alliances and coalitions are similarly stillborn when people in dominant cultural groups find themselves stymied by dynamics of dominance unrecognized by them but all too familiar to those of subordinated social identities (Rose 2000). Often, people who belong to socially dominant groups assume that their way of doing things is normal and right. People from marginalized social locations are often more "bi-cultural". Accustomed to the necessity of accommodating their preferred styles of working to more mainstream versions, they frequently grow weary of the extra work, and resentful of the invisibility of their ways and means. Unaddressed, these problems often lead either to angry outbursts or other conduct that remains mysterious to socially dominant actors. (Roy 2002, Williams 1991)

Consider a comparison with organizations whose members are predominantly people of color. They are more likely to have chosen an identity-based constituency, for the sake of intensifying power to negotiate change (West 1993, Tatum 2003). Or, if unwillingly too homogenous, they may have a good deal more insight into the reasons why (Trujillo 2008). Ceding leadership to people whose interactional assumptions and styles differ from one's own is a familiar experience for most people of color, but an uncomfortably new one for members of a dominant social group. This kind of discomfort has been known to undercut dedication to a cause, such that "mainstream" participants drift away or never join, thereby perpetuating homogeneity. Awareness of these dynamics is likely to be well developed by those who experience versions of them on a daily basis, while they remain obscure to those whose everyday experience is one of social privilege (Trujillo 2008).

Examples of this dynamic occur in struggles of process versus product. Women, people of color, and working class people, frequently have more highly attuned antennae for relationship themes and a stronger desire to address them, while people enjoying more of the benefits of social dominance e often assume the right to drive agendas. Absent a means to articulate these differences, analyze them for the power dynamics of hierarchy and coercion they embody, and create new processes for getting the work done that are equally agreeable to all, things fall apart. In groups working on issues of social justice, participants are often unwilling to acknowledge that they have their own problems of inequality; cognitive dissonance is simply too great (Snyder 2003). Accusations of sexism or racism raise spleen and cause splits. On the other hand, when the needs of frequently marginalized people are discounted once again – and especially in a place where social justice is supposed to be the objective – the hurt is too great to be tolerated. In a truly just organization, where white approaches to the work clash with those more comfortable to people of color, for instance, it helps in building just relationships if compromises are shared just a bit unequally, with a little more accommodation by the white side (Chené in Trujillo 2008).

One more familiar dynamic of conflict in progressive organizations: the culprit in this case is dedication. Feeling in a minority, fighting against great wrongs, and believing that the cause can only be won by long, sustained, often frustrating effort, generates burn-out. Burnout very often takes the guise of internal condemnation. If I feel overwhelmed with work, and I perceive you as doing less, or doing things differently, it's a small step to judgment and a breach in relationship (Steiner 1974, Aldarondo 2007).

In all these cases – and many more, conflict resolution ideas well delivered can deal with dynamics of culture and power, building stronger cadres for making needed social changes.   This may include facilitated discussions of an organization's troublesome issues in general and systems of mediation for particular disputes.

Similar dynamics operate among different people working on the same side of a barricade (Woerhle 1992). Fragmentation of movements has historically led to weakening change potential. An ability to work through differences of approach and doctrine, in a manner that makes for stronger programs and greater effectiveness, is sorely needed in progressive domains. Conflict resolution procedures can aid in constructing a mindset and means for working through differences, not to homogenize them but to achieve clearer, more powerful movement agendas and strategies. New creative options may be discovered through such procedures.

Beyond Confrontation to Negotiation: The conflict resolution field has ideas and practices that are applicable to transforming entrenched conflicts, negotiating mutually acceptable agreements, and building constructive relationships after destructive encounters. Activists and social movement scholars alike develop skills and are trained, as it were, in the first two-thirds of constructive conflict process: the development of strategy and the escalation and articulation of conflict. They are less skilled and analytically attuned to the steps of de-escalation, negotiation, and crafting sustainable agreements. Any assumption that these things will take care of themselves once pressure has been exerted can lead to ineffectiveness and disappointment. Large-scale struggles consist of numerous campaigns that wax and wane, and each campaign may

include many confrontations that are settled, often by explicit agreements. Reaching

agreements that endure and that can be built upon in the future requires not only good

strategy and tactics, but also good conflict resolution skills. Social movements and social

movement analysis would be strengthened, we suggest, by increased attention to how to

"get to yes", how to translate pressure into durable agreements. Look at course syllabi

on social movements and you will see that the "negotiating agreements" section is

usually missing. Teachers need to be assigning not just Saul Alinsky (1971) and Gene

Sharp (2005), but Fisher and Ury (1991), Lederach (1997), and Galtung (2002). A good

deal can be learned from integrating this step into social movement analyses, about how

different kinds of pressure might favor different types of outcome. For example, note an

absence in Peter Ackerman and Chris Kreugler's theory of Nonviolent Strategic Action

(Ackerman and Kruegler 1994). They offer a brilliant list of twelve strategies, but only in

the final one is there mention that the opponent might convert, accommodate, be

coerced, or disintegrate. The idea of accommodation is presented – from Sharp – but

there is no discussion of what to do to move accommodation along, what steps to take.

Once one has exerted the pressure necessary to get an interlocutor ready to

accommodate, one must know how to turn that readiness into actual accommodation in

a new relationship.

    If the presumed weaker side will not enter negotiations until it is in a stronger

position, it may find that its position continues to weaken. There are many instances

when a challenging party refuses to settle for much less of what it seeks and then

discovers that it has lost much more than it might have achieved by a negotiated

accommodation. For example, this seems to have been the case of the Tamils in Sri Lanka, as represented by the leaders of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Ealam (LTEE) (Orjuela 2009).

A common failing by partisans who seem to be doing well in a struggle is to overreach, adopting more extreme methods as they expand their goals. As a consequence they may strengthen the resolve of the adversary, alienate their allies, and diminish internal support for continuing the fight. Settling earlier for more limited achievements would have been more beneficial. A conflict resolution approach would help avoid overreaching by increasing awareness of the responses of adversaries and constituents. Such awareness can be enhanced by maintaining or undertaking communication with members of the adversary's side and exchanging information about goals being sought and underlying interests. In addition, avoiding destructive consequences resulting from overreaching, as from frustrating rejection, often can be accomplished by recourse to outsider mediation. The mediation can take many forms, from quiet go-between message transmission to active mutual probing of options or highly engaged deal-making. Of course, every situation is unique. When an accommodative move or a heightened confrontational move will be more constructive and effective needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis. It depends on the nature of the adversaries' relations, their values, and likely future capabilities. We are stressing the value of reflective analysis and the consideration of a wide variety of alternative strategies. We also wish to stress the value of developing a large set of tools so that an appropriate one can be selected readily.

Additional general policies can be noted that help partisans avoid destructive overreaching. For example, in contexts where violence is already being used, the avoidance of indiscriminate, dehumanizing attacks reduce the likelihood of a spiral of violence. Furthermore, when members of one side proclaim and act so as to reassure the antagonists that their essential needs are not threatened, the possibility of a constructive conflict settlement is enhanced (Dayton 2009).

What conflict resolution scholars can learn from social movement scholars and activists

The field of conflict resolution is itself a sort of social movement (Adler 1987). Certainly, many of the people drawn to conflict resolution work are seeking the optimism of small group effectiveness, having experienced or anticipated the difficulty of making change on a systemic plane (Kriesberg 2007a). Like most actors seeking to make a difference, conflict resolution practitioners may, however, see their tool as more universally useful than it is. If all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail.

In the discussion that follows, we look at what social movements theory can teach conflict resolution people in three arenas: the analysis of power; the politics of voice; and the issue of violence.

The analysis of power: The analysis of social movements can help conflict resolvers make better judgments of where their interventions may be most effective. Many social movement effects (though not all) unfold as historical forces that change social and cultural relations and values, without a straightforward "negotiation" phase.

13

In many social movements, in fact, change occurs through an exchange of pressure and response, taking place not in face-to-face negotiations, but at a distance.

A helpful example is the Montgomery Bus Boycott. The impact of the Boycott did not unfold within a neat process of negotiation or agreement to which the boycotters were parties. In fact, the effort to negotiate with the mayor of Montgomery broke down in the first weeks of the Boycott. The effective action of the boycott unfolded not inside the walls of a negotiating room, but through the wider shift in standard operating procedures, norms, social rules, roles, and expectations. Here is a brief list of changes brought about by the Boycott that went "un-negotiated", yet would shape any future negotiation: The growth in the number of businesses in downtown Montgomery that called for an end to the segregation laws; the growth in new consciousnesses and identities of the boycotters, who were discovering themselves as human beings no longer willing to sit in the back of buses; the discovery that blacks were not the subordinate people whites thought they were; the decision by some whites to begin supporting and voting for leaders who would change the laws; the emergence of pressure felt by the Supreme Court to make the bus laws of the South unconstitutional. It is partly because of the proliferation of these kinds of effects that deliberate, guided processes of de-escalation may sometimes seem to social movement activists and scholars as having over-stated centrality. What all of these processes accomplished was to build the movement's power.

There is a good deal of discussion within the conflict resolution field about asymmetry and "negotiating across an uneven table," (Kriesberg forthcoming; Mitchell

1995; Rouhana and Kelman 1994); the point for many activists is how to go about creating a genuinely even table in the first place. The main premise of social activism is that some actors enjoy greater social power and privilege than others, and that tables that appear to be even are in reality quite uneven. In this view, when actors of different social power arrive at a negotiating table, the table is uneven. Actors with less social power cannot negotiate evenness into the table; to even things out they must do something to correct for their lesser social power. The reality or prospect of the less socially powerful actor to exert pressure through mobilization is, in the views of social movement theory, an essential precondition for realistic, respectful negotiations. "Respect" is not an attitude, in this view; it is the recognition of a certain real distribution of power. Negotiations can simply ratify an existing situation or modify it depending on how they are structured. They can be affected by the qualities, resources and skills a mediator brings to the table. They also can be affected by the presence or absence of various interested parties. The mediator and the presence of groups associated with the weaker party can enhance its bargaining position and thereby increase the symmetry of the negotiations. Power relations are complex, determined by structural, cultural, and political factors in dynamic interaction. (Roy in Trujillo 2008) But ultimately, how much power can be equalized "at the table" is limited by who "comes in the door".

Asymmetry in the relations between adversaries occur in varying ways and degrees, forming obstacles to equitable and enduring mutually acceptable conflict settlements (Kriesberg forthcoming; Mitchell 1995). Social movement analyses teach us

15

that what conflict resolution scholars call "asymmetry" is actually the heart of the conflict. If our aim is to advance justice as well as peace, we must seek to bring about fundamental change. Toward that end, people working within a social movement frame think in terms of gaining power, while practitioners of conflict resolution cannot work unless there exists reasonable trust among participants. Goals of gaining power and of establishing trust may be at odds with each other at a particular time.

We therefore don't assume that trust is always desirable. One party can be too trusting and be misled, exploited, and disadvantaged by an opposing side. Recognizing such developments can be a necessary step to achieving well-grounded mutual trust. Such trust may be the result of extended experience in dependable equitable exchanges (Axelrod 1984). It may result from negotiating agreements or establishing institutions that set rules for conduct in particular domains, and procedures to monitor and enforce compliance. The point is that trust is viewed not as a matter of sentimental niceness or as inherent in good actors, but as situational and dependent on conditions that are socially constructed (Hoffman 2006).

Because conflict resolution is both focused on the pragmatics of settlement and works in the intimacy of face-to-face dialogue, it tends to lack a deeply integrated analysis of power on institutional and systemic levels. While conflict resolution may help social movement analysts and activists address interpersonal conflict based in social identity dynamics, social movement analysis may help make conflict resolvers aware of those external power dynamics that tend to be unrecognized inside the room where processes take place. At best, there is some recognition of how social identity

16

inequities influence conflict processes and outcomes, mostly dealing with gender (Rifkin & Cobb 1991; Nader 2002; Gwartney-Gibbs 1994), but very few that go beyond superficialities when issues of race and class are in play, and even fewer offering effective means to integrate such analyses into practice. In a telling example of what James Scott calls "hidden transcripts" – those stories that members of oppressed social identity groups tell each other but not members of the dominant center – "minority" mediators relish opportunities to share shop talk about what they really do when the door closes and the work commences with others of their identity (Scott 1990; Coronel in Trujillo 2008). Within the conflict resolution field (as elsewhere, among police officers of color, for instance), verbal critiques abound of the superficiality of training in multiculturalism, with claims made that what is taught may compound stereotypes but not get at fundamental cultural differences at the level of worldviews (James Myers in Trujillo 2008).

These issues of culture become urgent in the context of the growing interest in conflict transformation in the conflict resolution field, which compels attention to large-scale structures, norms and societal processes. Such factors affect the contexts of specific conflicts and the relations among adversaries. Knowledge about the workings of social movements contributes to understanding changes in social structures, norms, and world views. This is evident in global changes in the status of women, the salience of human rights norms, the legitimacy of popular participation in governance, and the valuation of cultural diversity.

Beyond social identity and structural imbalances, power works through dynamics of culture, self-concepts, language, organizational roles, and so on. Both fields, conflict resolution and social movements, could benefit from more sophisticated understandings of how those various domains work in dynamic processes to construct moments of conflict and change. In particular, conflict resolvers might become familiar with the literature on how interpretations of actors, power, and justice are shaped by cultural schemata that are themselves power-laden and the outcome of prior struggles (Snow and Benford 1988, 1991; Poletta 2006).

The politics of voice. The prime tool of the conflict resolution trade is most commonly talk. Those who most often end up sitting at the table, therefore, are people who know how to talk – in the terms and languages that prevail for interveners and for the field (Trujillo 2008). Key leaders who are unschooled in such talk – fighters, charismatic orators, tough politicians – may end up excluded from, or disadvantaged in, a process that comes to command attention and power without adequately representing all voices. In the end, the bias is likely to privilege recognized elites, since forms of speech map and define social power (Moore 1996; Wing 2002).

This dynamic is very evident on a microterrain, in family mediation, for instance, where young children are rarely included. Adults speak for kids who might well be able to contribute crucial perspectives and articulate their own interests in languages other than verbal. Indeed, when adults know how to listen, verbal communication with participants as young as four can prove invaluable. Moreover, family interventions are rarely available to poorer people until agencies of the state become involved. They occur

in the context of child-protection actions, disputes with school districts over special

education, and other "services" that often show up in people's lives as coercive. Rather

than benefiting family members, too often they add layers of disadvantage to hardships

already taking place. Giving voice to those traditionally marginalized is the essential

process of social movements; to see the contribution of conflict resolution as comparable

holds us responsible for finding forms and languages that effectively provide

opportunities for those least heard to become central to collaborative decision-making

(Trujillo 2008; Wing 2002).

On community levels, voices from the grassroots may be missed when the

language of "the table" is legal and professional. Western Network, an agency working

in the southwest some years back, was hired to facilitate dialogue among federal Forest

Service officials and residents in local communities who had been banned from

pursuing traditional practices in the forest: collecting pinion nuts, for instance, or fishing

in especially fecund streams. Previous attempts at policy negotiations had failed when

villagers fell away from the process in the face of research papers and legal terminology.

This time, the Western Network facilitators began the "talks" by inviting officials and

villagers to map the forest. In the language of utility and forest knowledge, the villagers

excelled. The officials learned things about their domain that they hadn't known they

didn't know. The process concluded with changes to policy satisfying to everyone

involved.

On a macro level, as conflict resolution shades into peacemaking in national

domains, facilitators tend to rely on the people with whom they have easiest

opportunity to interact: academics, community leaders in recognizable organizational positions, and so on. John Paul Lederach promotes an elicitive approach to the work, meaning that the process itself needs to arise from the experience and wishes of the participants (Lederach 1995). Nonetheless, the participants he identifies are who we might call the "polite" grassroots. He speaks of middle-level leadership, with no particular screening for how representative those people are of the interests of people not present for dialogue.

In Sri Lanka, for instance, a European peace group initiated a series of conflict resolution workshops in the midst of brutal civil war. Participants promptly split, between those who wanted training for leadership in the discord broiling all around them with no prejudgment of what that meant, and those who agreed with the peace group's emphasis on non-violence.

There is a need to move down the hierarchy to the grassroots, counteracting any presumption that those who inhabit it lack the resources to participate. As social science analyses of indigenous peoples help us to understand, they often have the most relevant resources – their own leaders, collective memory, processes of dispute resolution – as well as the greatest stake in outcomes (Atashi 2009; Pouligny 2007). Some workers in the conflict resolution field as well as in the social movement field are sensitive to this reality. More generally, since the 1990s, a number of social movement analysts have sought a more genuinely collaborative relationship with popular grassroots theory-production, through which new theory is produced that is directly pertinent to the

priorities of non-state grassroots social change actors (Casas-Cortés et al 2008; Conway 2006; Tang 2008)

A fundamental problem in conflict resolution work among large-scale entities is tensions that leaders experience in their relations between their constituencies and their negotiating opposite numbers (Docherty 2005).   Internal rivals and mobilized constituents can greatly affect the readiness of leaders to escalate or to de-escalate a conflict and to accept or reject possible settlements (Colaresi 2005; Kriesberg 2007b). Indeed, conflict resolvers would do well to become more aware that negotiation is an activity of leadership cadres that have specific social qualities and relations to constituencies (Bob 2007; Gramsci 1971; Ganz 2000). This knowledge would help conflict resolvers become more aware of their own social status and of the possible structural limits on their own action. Equally important is the need for conflict resolvers to become more aware of the specific class character of their identities, profession, agenda, and trajectory, permitting them to see both the limits of their action (e.g., will they do anything that might risk their professional role?) as well as its hidden potentialities.

The issue of violence: In the modern world, it is a simple and non-controversial fact that the vast majority of violence is wielded by state actors. Despite exceptions that command the headlines, the majority of nonstate actors struggling for social change actually use nonviolent tactics. Still, violence is sometimes potentially or actually present in the tactics of non-state actors. Unfortunately, in conflict resolution work violence is often not dealt with in a very sophisticated way. People working on intervention in

21

domestic violence, for instance, eschew narrow conflict resolution. Here is a place where the framework within which power is understood works against effective action. Seeing that disputes between domestic partners cannot be resolved through talk when one person is being brutalized, change agents in this arena refuse mediation and work instead to protect the person being harmed. Usually, the only resources recognized for doing that is removing the victim from the home, an act that often results in her isolation from familiar resources and, in the context of a gender-biased economy, increased poverty. Paradoxically, domestic violence activists are increasingly recognizing that the very things they do to "empower" victimized women, given the existing institutional framework, actually land their clients in positions of greater weakness.

But if we can escape a conceptual frame of individualism and the nuclear family, there are alternatives. One agency working primarily with immigrant families from Asia seeks to leave both those doing harm and those harmed in the home by activating the extended community surrounding them. Training friends, relatives, neighbors and co-workers to intervene, they construct safety without the severe dislocations of shelters and separation. Having begun this program, they began also to seek conflict resolution skills, not for the purpose of negotiating between embattled domestic partners, but in order to create cohesion among community interveners.

Social movements by necessity frame things in terms of collectivities, while conflict resolution by practice sometimes tends to narrow frames to "parties", weighted down with assumptions of individualism and class bias. To be sure, people acting to make change on societal planes are not immune from such limitations of consciousness,

for they too are citizens of a common culture. But the nature of the actions they take lead them outward into greater community, while conflict resolution often further isolates people behind walls of confidentiality.

In more political domains, the world of conflict resolution has shied away from dealing with real-world issues of violence. For all the diverse efforts among conflict interveners to contribute to work in the Middle East, for example, rarely are Hamas and Hezbollah included as parties either to actual dialogue processes, or even to thoughtful discussion within the field. Because the work of conflict resolution assumes non-violent, collaborative behaviors, scholars and practitioners in the field need sufficiently nuanced understandings of violent actors to be able to address their role effectively. Social movements can make a major contribution in this regard.

As conflict resolution organizations have become increasingly involved in peacebuilding work after violent conflicts have ceased, issues of physical security and demobilization have become more salient. Indeed, in many ways and areas, the fields of conflict resolution and security studies have converged (Kriesberg 2002). One increasingly sophisticated literature has emerged that conflict resolvers would do well to become acquainted with: a literature that analyzes various struggles for social change in ways that treat violence not as a homogeneous phenomenon, but as a nuanced set of communicative actions that must be understood with sensitivity t o context (Aretxaga 1995/2006; Roy 1994). One step is to analyze the various culturally and socially differentiated meanings of violence (Parkins 2000). A second step is to recognize that historically, nonstate actors have engaged in physical violence far less often than have

state actors (Mayer 2002). A third step is to understand violence of larger structures including state terror and institutional violence (Varzi 2006). A fourth step is to place patterns of mobilization into nonstate violent action, including armed struggle and guerilla warfare (Goodwin 2001; 2006; Viterna 2006), in the context of various cultural, social, and psychological forces, including how violence fits into processes of collective and individual identity formation (Andriolo 2006; Fanon 1962; Roy 1999). It is likely that conflict resolvers who develop a more historical, culturally sophisticated grasp of violence will be more effective in understanding the motives and forces that generate it in its many forms and thus will be better equipped to strategize about how and when to try to reduce it.

Conclusion

The fields of conflict resolution and of social movement studies are distinctive, but they do overlap and have complementary possibilities (Schmelzle 2009). Indeed, work on some topics demonstrates some degree of synthesis, for example, in the case of work on constructive conflict escalation and on coalition formation in mobilizing support in a struggle.

Much more mutual borrowing and synthesizing would be useful for workers in both fields. Since 1987, the annual series, *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, initially edited by Louis Kriesberg and now by Pat Coy, attempts to foster such efforts. A more direct way to advance this synergy is for workers in each field to examine the writing in the other field. It might also be useful to arrange meetings and

workshops on particular topics to which some people from both fields are contributing. Finally, one or two persons from the two fields can join together in their writing or in other practices in their fields. The challenge is to articulate joint projects of research and action. It is important to develop a long time horizon, in which it becomes possible to focus on a variety of moments in a long-term process of change. Kriesberg's model of escalation and de-escalation (2007b) is a valuable point of departure.

But for the projects to bear theoretical fruit, we suggest at least two other strategies. First, a sponsored discussion of activists, conflict resolvers, and social movement analysts in which all are focused on a single conflict, in which the goal is to identify a common practical puzzle, would importantly strengthen cross-disciplinary dialogue. Perhaps scholars, practitioners, clients, and activists from each field could be invited to participate in a symposium devoted to the topic, followed by a series of forums at major conferences in each field. It is likely that only when a common stake has been identified – one in which there is an equal measure of practical necessity and analytical challenge – that deeper useful insight can be achieved.

Second, it is crucial that the very process of discovery involve not just academic participants in this process, but non-academic ones as well. Non-academic stakeholders need to become involved in the process of knowledge- and theory-production not just as bystanders, but as direct, active participants. Many of the intellectual and political bottlenecks we face today -- what counts as an effective, durable settlement? How can we achieve peace and justice together? What counts as useful theory? —may only finally be opened wide when all those with the greatest stake in their resolution are at the table.

References

Ackerman, Peter, and Christopher Kruegler. 1994. *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict*. Westport, CT/London: Praeger.

Adler, Peter S. 1987. "Is ADR a Social Movement?" *Negotiation Journal* 3, no 1:59-66.

Alinsky, Saul. 1971. *Rules for Radicals: a Primer for Realistic Radicals*. New York: Random House.

Aldarondo, Etiony. 2007. *Advancing Social Justice Through Clinical Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Andriolo, Karin. 2006. Karin. "The Twice Killed: Imaging Protest Suicide." Pp. 66-76 in *American Anthropologist* 108.1.

Aretxaga, Begoña. 2006. "Dirty Protest: Symbolic Overdetermination and Gender in Northern Ireland Ethnic Violence." Pp. 57-74 in *States of Terror: Begoña Aretxaga's Essays* (ed. Joseba Zulaika). University of Nevada Press.

Atashi, Elham. 2009. "Challenges to conflict transformation from the street." Pp. 45-60 in *Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding*, edited by Bruce W. and Louis Kriesberg Dayton. London & New York: Routledge.

Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Bevington, Douglas, and Chris Dixon. 2005. "Movement-relevant Theory: Rethinking Social Movement Scholarship and Activism." Pp. 185-208 in *Social Movement Studies* Vol 4 No 3.

Bob, Clifford. 2005. *The Marketing of Rebellion: Insurgents, Media, and International Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Casas-Cortés, María Isabel, Michal Osterweil, and Dana E. Powell. 2008. "Blurring Boundaries: Recognizing Knowledge-Practices in the Study of Social Movements." In *Anthropological Quarterly* vol. 81, no. 1

Colaresi, Michael P. 2005. *Scare Tactics: The Politics of International Rivalry*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Conway, Janet. 2006. *Praxis and Politics: Knowledge Production and Social Movements*. New York: Routledge.

Dayton, Bruce W. and Louis Kriesberg (Ed.). 2009. *Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding: Moving From Violence to Sustainable Peace*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Docherty, Jayne Seminare. 2005. "The Little Book of Strategic Negotiation." in *Center for Justice and Peacebuilding of Eastern Mennonite University*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Fanon, Frantz. 1966. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fisher, Roger, William Ury and Bruce Patton. 1991. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In, 2nd ed.* New York: Penguin.

Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. NY: Continuum

Galtung, Johan, Carl G. Jacobsen and Kai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen. 2002. *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND, 2nd ed.* London: Pluto.

Ganz, Marshall. 2000. "Resources and Resurcefulness: Strategic Capacity in the Unionization of California Agriculture, 1959-1966." Pp. 1003-1062 in *American Journal of Sociology* vol. 105 no. 4.

Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

___. 2006. " A Theory of Categorical Terrorism." Pp. 2027-2046 in *Social Forces* vol. 84 no. 4.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and edited by Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Greenwood, Davydd and Morten Levin. 2006. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. Sage Publications

Gwartney-Gibbs, Patricia. 1994. "Gender Differences in Clerical Workers' Disputes over Tasks, Interpersonal Treatment, and Emotion." Pp. 611-639 in *Human Relations* v. 47, n. 6.

Hale, Charles. 2006. "Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged Anthropology," in *Cultural Anthropology* Vol. 21. 1, pp, 96 - 120.

Hoffman, Aaron M. 2006. *Building Trust: Overcoming Suspicion in International Conflict*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kriesberg, Louis. 2002. "Convergences between International Security Studies and Peace Studies." Pp. 584-597 in *Millenial Reflections on International Studies*, edited by Michael Breher and Frank Harvey. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

—. 2007a. "The Conflict Resolution Field: Origins, Growth and Differentiation." Pp. 25-60 in *Peacemaking in Intrernational Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, edited by I. William Zartman. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

—. 2007b. *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution, 3rd Ed.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

—. 2008. "The Evolution of Conflict Resolution." in *Sage Handbook of conflict Resolution*, edited by Victor Kremenyuk and I. William Zartman Jacob Bercovitch. London: Sage.

—. Forthcoming. "Changing Conflict Asymmetries Constructively." *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict*.

Lederach, John Paul. 1995. *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

—. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Mayer, Arno. 2001. *The Furies: Violence and Terror in the French and Russian Revolutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mitchell, Christopher R. 1995. "Asymmetry and Strategies of Regional Conflict Reduction." Pp. 25-57 in *Cooperative Security: Reducing Third World Wars*, edited by I. William Zartman and Victor A. Kremenyuk. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Moore, Lucy. 1996. "Creating Dialogue between Decision-makers and Communities: Resource Mapping in Northern New Mexico." Pp 8-10 in *The Common Property Resource Digest* 39

Nader, Laura. 2002. *The Life of the Law*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Orjuela, Camilla. 2009. "Domesticating Tigers: The LTTE and Peacemaking in Sri Lanka." in *Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding: From Violence to Sustainable Peace*, edited by Bruce W. Dayton and Louis Kriesberg. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Parkins, Wendy. 2000. "Protesting Like a Girl: Embodiment, Dissent and Feminist Agency." Pp. 59-78 in *Feminist Theory* Vol. 1 No. 1.

Polkinghorn, Brian D. Haleigh La Chance and Robert LaChance. 2008. "Constructing a Baseline Understanding of Developmental Trends in Graduate Conflict Resolution Programs in the United States." Pp. 233-265 in *Pushing the Boundaries: New Frontiers in Conflict Resolution and Collaboration*, edited by Catherine Gerard Rachel Fleishman, and Rosemary O'Leary. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Polletta, Francesca. 2006. *It Was Like a Fever: Storytelling in Protest and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pouligny, Béatrice, Simon Chesterman and Albrecht Schnabel (Ed.). 2007. *After Mass Crime: Rebuilding States and Communities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Reitzes, Donald C., and Dietrich C. Reitzes. 1987. *The Alinsky Legacy: Alive and Kicking*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rifkin, Janet, and Sara Cobb. 1991. "Toward a new discourse for mediation: A critique of neutrality." Pp. 151-64 in *Mediation Quarterly* 9(2)

Rose, Fred. 2000. *Coalitions across the class divide : lessons from the labor, peace, and environmental movements*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Rouhana, Nadim N., and Herbert C. Kelman. 1994. "Non-official Interaction Processes in the Resolution of International Conflicts: Promoting Joint Israeli-Palestinian Thinking Through a Continuing Workshop." *Journal of Social Issues* 50:157-178.

Roy, Beth. 1994. *Some Trouble with Cows: Making Sense of Social Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

___. 2002. "For White People, on How to Listen When Race Is the Subject." pp. 3-15 in *The Journal of Intergroup Relations* Vol. XXIX No. 3

___. 1999. *Bitters in the Honey: Tales of Hope and Disappointment Across Divides of Race and Time*. Fayetteville, AK: Arkansas University Press.

Schmelzle, Beatrix and Martina Fisher (Ed.). 2009. *Peacebuilding at a Crossroads? Dilemmas and Paths for Another Generation*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sharp, Gene. 2005. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Snow, David, and Robert Benford. 1988. Ideology, "Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." Pp. 197-217 in *International Social Movement Research* vol. 1.

Snyder, Anna C. 2003. *Setting the Agenda for Global Peace*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Speed, Shannon. 2006. "At the Crossroads of Human Rights and Anthropology: Toward a Critically Engaged Activist Research" in *American Anthropologist* Vol. 108, 1, pp. 66–76.

Steiner, Claude. 1974. *Scripts People Live: Transactional Analysis of Life Scripts.* New York: Grove Press.

Tatum, Beverly Daniel. 2003. *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?"* New York: Basic Books.

Trujillo, Mary Adams, S.Y. Boland, Linda James Myers, Phillip M. Richards, and Beth Roy (Ed.). 2008. *Re-Centering Culture and Knowledge in Conflict Resolution Practice*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Trujillo, Mary Adams, and David Brubaker, eds. 1997. "Upheaval in Organizational Transformation: a Case Study." *Conciliation Quarterly* Vol. 14 Nos. 3&4.

Varzi, Roxanne. 2006. *Warring Souls: Youth, Media, and Martyrdom in Post-Revolution Iran*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Viterna, Jocelyn. 2006. "Pulled, Pushed, and Persuaded: Explaining Women's Mobilization into the Salvadoran Guerilla Army." Pp. 1-45 in *American Journal of Sociology* vol. 112 no. 1.

Wahrhaftig, Paul. 2004. *Community Dispute Resolution, Empowerment and Social Justice: The Origins, History and Future of a Movement.* Washington DC:NAFCM Press.

West, Cornel. *Race Matters*. 1993. Boston: Beacon Press.

Williams, Patricia J. 1991. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Woerhle, Lynne M. 1992. "Social Constructions of Power and Empowerment: Thoughts from Feminist Approaches to Peace Research and Peace-Making." in *Social Theory and*

Nonviolent Revolutions: Rethinking Domination and Rebellion, edited by Nancy Bell and Lester R. Kurtz. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin Press.