



ICAR Newsletter

A Publication of the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution ♦ George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444, (703) 993-1300

Winter 1995 ♦ Volume 7 ♦ Number 3

ICAR Hosts First Regional Scholars Roundtable on Peace and Conflict Studies

Dimostenis Yagcioglu

A Scholars Roundtable on Peace and Conflict Studies, cosponsored by George Mason University's Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR), The American University's International Peace and Conflict Resolution Program, and Trinity College's Department of History, was held on October 18, 1995, at George Mason. The roundtable, designed to be the first in an annual series, was supported by a grant from the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area.

The roundtable brought together more than 50 academicians, administrators, practitioners, policy analysts, and coordinators of peace and conflict studies programs from institutions in the greater Washington area, with representatives of the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, Carter Presidential Center, U.S. Army War College, United States Institute of Peace, Institute for Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia, Center for Caucasian Studies of Moscow, and universities of former states of the Soviet Union, including Baku, Khazar, Tbilisi, Uznadze, and South Ossetian State University.

Designed to initiate dialogue between organizations and individuals



Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

engaged in peacemaking, peace studies, and conflict resolution, the roundtable identified current theoretical and practical challenges affecting the field and explored opportunities for cooperation and collaboration between organizations. Its overarching theme

was the relevance for today's generation of scholars of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, vision of the "beloved community" and the role of peace and conflict studies in developing communities based on caring, justice, and human solidarity.

Dr. Abdul Aziz Said of The American University's International Peace and Conflict Resolution Program expressed concern over the emergence of cultural ghettos and a widespread failure to accommodate diversity in the United States and abroad. He stressed the need to take the following steps toward building the global "beloved community":

- Recognizing and promoting a dynamic global system of checks and balances
- Forging and developing cultural and commercial linkages

(continued on page 4)

IN THIS ISSUE

Director's Column	3
The United Nations at Fifty	6
The Simpson Verdict	8
Institute News/Activities	13
Affiliated Organizations	17

THE INSTITUTE FOR CONFLICT ANALYSIS AND RESOLUTION

Mission Statement

The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University comprises scholars, practitioners, graduate students, and organizations in the field of peacemaking and conflict resolution. The mission of the Institute is to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent human conflicts among individuals, groups, communities, identity groups, and nations through research, instruction, and clinical and outreach activities.

Teaching Faculty

Juliana Birkhoff
Frank Blechman
Kevin P. Clements, Director
Michelle LeBaron
Christopher R. Mitchell
Richard E. Rubenstein
Dennis J.D. Sandole
Hamdesa Tuso
Wallace Warfield

Associate Faculty

Kevin Avruch
Johannes Botes
Peter Breggin
Daniel Druckman
Hazel McFerson

Staff

Mary Lynn Boland, Executive Secretary
Joan W. Drake, Administrative
Coordinator
Grace Morello, Secretary

Affiliated Organizations

Consortium on Peace Research,
Education, and Development
(COPRED), Barbara Wien,
Executive Director
National Conference on Peacemaking
and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR),
Linda Baron, Executive Director
Northern Virginia Mediation Service
(NVMS), Robert Scott,
Executive Director

Editorial Staff

Kevin P. Clements, Director
Joan W. Drake, Editor
Frank Blechman
Richard E. Rubenstein

Contributors

David Anderson
Kevin P. Clements
Christopher R. Mitchell
Richard E. Rubenstein
Cora Weiss

Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Advisory Board

James R. Hobson, Esq., Chair
Dr. Florence Tucker Parrish, Vice Chair
C. Douglas Adams, Esq.
Elizabeth C. Dahlin
Mr. Marino deMedici
The Honorable James H. Dillard II
Mr. Thomas Fee, Esq.
Ms. Drucie French
Ms. Linda D. Hale
Dr. Wendell Holloway
Brig. Gen. Charles Jiggetts (Ret.)
Dr. Michael R. Kelley
Ms. Mariann Laue
Ms. Sarah Lawless
Ms. Mary Ann Lundgren
Mr. Edwin W. Lynch
Ambassador John McDonald (Ret.)
The Honorable James M. Scott
Ms. Susan Shearouse
Dr. K. C. Soares
Dr. Marcia Sweedler
Mr. Robert E. Vey
ICAR Student Representatives to the Board:
Ms. Ilànà L. Shàpiro
Mr. Dwight Bashir-Elahi

International Council

Dr. Jose Octavio Bordon
Mr. James Boren
Dr. John W. Burton
The Honorable Dame Mary Eugenia Charles
Vice Adm. Daniel L. Cooper (Ret.)
Dr. Luigi R. Einaudi
Dr. Arun Gandhi
Mr. Gilberto Gil
Ms. Eirwin Harbottle
Brig. Gen. Michael Harbottle (Ret.)
The Honorable Elizabeth H. Haskell
The Honorable Barnard F. Jennings
Dr. R. Wayne Kernodle
Dr. William F.G. Mastenbroek
Ms. Betty Nathan
Dr. Saburo Okita
Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino
Her Excellency Sonia Picado Sotela
His Excellency Joao Clemente Baena Soares
Mr. B. Stephen Toben



Just before his assassination, Yitzhak Rabin stated, "It is violence which undermines the foundations of Israeli democracy." His death a few minutes later was a tragic confirmation of this message. The fact is that structural or direct violence undermines democ-

ocratic processes everywhere in the world. Such violence is the antithesis of "civil" society.

A natural affinity of interest exists between those interested in promoting true democratic processes and those committed to the nonviolent resolution of conflict and responsibility because both of these processes rest as much with citizens as with governments. Governments that act in arbitrary and violent fashions rapidly deplete their legitimacy, as do governments that generate structural inequalities. Similarly, citizens who pay little attention to civic responsibility and the public good gradually undermine trust and the social order on which state institutions rest (see Richard Rubenstein's article in this issue).

Peaceful politics and the nonviolent solution of problems both rest on shared concepts of public morality, mutuality, and trust, and a genuine willingness to balance private interests with public responsibilities. Where these elements are at a premium or are nonexistent, the potential for violence expands exponentially. In Israel, for example, deep divisions persist between secular and religious Jews over how to conceptualize their state and the society of Israel. How can a religious state, for example, serve secular interests (and vice versa)? These divisions have created polarization and antagonism between Jews and aroused the enmity of Palestinians. The perception of an external Palestinian threat (like the Soviet threat that unified the U.S. public against Communism during the cold war) fosters the illusion of unity within Israel while masking deep fissures within the political system. As the perception of the external threat diminishes, internal

differences become clear, and that is happening now in both Israel and Palestine.

At this stage of the process, moderate political rhetoric and behavior assume critical importance. If politicians wish to highlight real divisions and contradictions with hate language, they heighten the conditions for political violence. When negative rhetoric is added to coercive agency—an occupation army, arbitrary police and security forces, or guerilla movements—citizens seeking access to the political process may feel emboldened to adopt violent tactics. We see this phenomenon in Israel, Palestine, Nigeria, the United States, and other divided societies and communities around the globe.

Without strong traditions endorsing nonviolent political processes, state systems will rely increasingly on abstract legal formulas, adversarial advocacy, and coercion. Nonviolent political dialogue, on the other hand, is equally frank and critical but rests on relationships and institutions that enable individuals and groups to reveal their deep values and beliefs while avoiding enmity or demonization of their political opponents who also have political rights and human needs. Regrettably, this kind of politics is at a premium in the world's conflict zones. Rabin, the warrior, paid the ultimate sacrifice for adopting less violent strategies because those who advocate the politics of hate have little tolerance for those seeking to bridge political differences or live with ambiguity.

The important lesson of the Rabin assassination is that those fighting the viruses of racism, classism, and sexism must learn how to turn aside one-sided advocacy and apply problem-solving skills to the solution of these all-too-common political dilemmas. Successful conflict resolution requires that citizens and their states find new ways of doing politics and conceptualizing political systems.

Kevin P. Clements, Director of ICAR
Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch
Professor of Conflict Resolution

ICAR Regional Roundtable

(continued from page 1)

- Building a basic global agreement on international priorities
- Encouraging the establishment of a dedicated global leadership accountable to the peoples of the world and expansion of institutions of international law
- Building global educational foundations worldwide with the mission of identifying common values

Dr. David Anderson, George Washington University

Dr. David Anderson of George Washington University's Department of Philosophy asserted that America is "currently in a period of moral crisis—a crisis of violence and distrust of government, family breakdown and moral corruption, economic confusion and racial strife—a moral crisis which may in the end generate a new center." In his view, Dr. King's thought and approach to social change was influenced by Hegel's notion that growth in human societies comes through struggle. He agreed with King's observation that liberalism has failed to realize that reason by itself is little more than an instrument to justify people's defensive ways of thinking; reason devoid of faith, claimed King, can never free itself from distortions and rationalizations.

Dr. Anderson supported Amitai Etzioni's view of the communitarian theory of moral restoration and transformation holding that Americans have a moral responsibility to take on the task of restoring order to this society. In his view, a neoprogressive communitarian social movement, as envisaged by Etzioni, could be the means of building a much needed coalition between progressive and traditional forces today. Through such a collective effort, the field of conflict and peace studies could pursue King's goal of transforming American society, challenging and reconciling the oppressed and the oppressors on matters of race, class, and gender.

Mr. Thomas Porter, Former Director, King Center

Thomas Porter, executive director of the National Association of Blacks in

Broadcasting and former director of the Martin Luther King Center for Social Change, said that had Americans shared Dr. King's vision and acted on his message, to a great degree we might not be facing the problems plaguing our society today. But, said Porter, not even those closest to King continued on the path laid out by him before his assassination in 1968.

Focusing on King's campaign to end segregation, they abandoned his efforts to join opposition to war and racism with class issues of poverty and powerlessness. King, described as an "apostle" of nonviolence, made clear from the beginning that his commitment was specifically to nonviolent direct action and that ideas are nothing unless they are put into action; and he spoke to that commitment in his letter from the Birmingham jail. Porter said that while the nation championed King's call for brotherly love and integration, it disregarded the admonition given by King in 1966 to his Southern Christian Leadership Conference staff, that "power without love is reckless and love without power is sentimental."

No one on the contemporary scene, said Porter, has been able to mobilize the African American community to deal with the problems stemming from poverty, racism, and powerlessness that were addressed by Dr. King and that are considerably worse today than during his lifetime. Porter concluded by saying that, as a former dean and college departmental chairman, he is glad that academic programs and institutions are focusing on peace studies, but he feels that Dr. King would urge people interested in peace and conflict resolution to get on with the work of making peace, rather than being content with just studying it.

Dr. Kevin Clements, ICAR

ICAR director Dr. Kevin Clements, who chaired the morning session, examined the role of peace and conflict studies in building global community and reminded participants of the interconnectedness of national and international process and dynamics. Societal, economic, and political activities occurring in the United States, he said, directly affect the global transnational communi-

ty just as activities at that macrolevel affect our society. Given this mutuality, the United States cannot draw the blinds and pretend that the rest of the world does not exist. Moreover, said Clements, it is not logical to expect that King's vision can be realized here without being concurrently realized at the global level.

American society today is both violent and seductive; its citizens have enjoyed a lifestyle that they know in their hearts and minds is unsustainable. America, as King said, and the international community as well, must change their attitudes and undergo fundamental transformation. Peace and conflict studies can make an important contribution to this transformation, said Clements, offering new ways of conceptualizing and analyzing the nature of societal, political, and economic exchanges that constitute the basis of global order (and disorder), and the processes leading to the emergence of an alternative, post-modern world order.

Six elements, said Clements, underpin postmodern global social processes:

1. An increasingly clear division exists between emerging cultures of peace and cultures of violence. In the United States, it is the latter, unfortunately, that prevails over the former.
2. Global institutions are beginning to face the demand to be more representative of different cultures, opinions, and identities; for such institutions to maintain their integrity and function effectively, they must respect this call for diversity.
3. Nation-states worldwide confront a growing crisis of legitimacy.
4. Old inequalities (e.g., rich versus poor nations) persist while new processes generate new types of inequalities and hierarchies.
5. The emerging global community requires stronger emphasis on normative and ethical values and more vigorous efforts to find common ground and common values among diverse and distinct cultural groupings.
6. Global community is proving susceptible to the same decline and disintegration that we observe in national communities.

(continued on page 5)

The whole world, Clements maintained, must work together to construct a new global community able to deal with these challenges. Such a community must be inclusive rather than alienating; it must be participatory, encouraging, and promoting of the concept of "global citizenship"; it must be based on diversity and creativity; and it must seek nonviolent solutions to its problems. Such a community is the "beloved community" envisaged by Dr. King. Dr. Clements concluded, pointing out the similarities between his conception of the characteristics of this ideal community and the stated objectives of peace studies and conflict resolution. These two interrelated disciplines, he said, can play a crucial role in paving the way to the global "beloved community."

Plenary Session

Following these presentations, a plenary session was convened and facilitated by Dr. Clements and ICAR professors Wallace Warfield and Michelle LeBaron. Participants exchanged views and information on their programmatic efforts in three general areas: (1) curriculum development and resources; (2) intervention; and (3) research and practice.

Regarding curriculum development and resources, the discussion centered on four questions:

1. What are the essential elements of an effective peace and conflict studies program in the post-cold war era?
2. How much dialogue exists between peace studies and conflict resolution academicians?
3. How do we connect curricula to contemporary policy dilemmas?
4. How do we design peaceful pedagogy in relation to peace and conflict resolution curricula?

There was general agreement that peace and conflict studies curricula should do the following:

- Rest on some ethical base.
- Combine theory with practice, even though the emphasis may vary.
- Include experiential learning as a strong component.
- Develop a critical dialogue and analysis both of peace studies and conflict reso-

lution and the nature of the world they are examining and seek to intervene in.

- Build on the interdisciplinary base and historical traditions of both fields while including some new elements from the disciplines of history, geography, and developmental psychology.

Regarding intervention, participants tackled the following questions:

- How do we shape our academic programs so that they are relevant to the issues that we teach and talk about?
- How do we show that theory is applicable to situations that require some form of intervention?

Participants responded on the basis of their particular experiences, briefly describing their programs or plans for interventions.

Regarding research and practice, participants responded to the following questions:

- How do practitioners and researchers engage in meaningful dialogue?
- What are the successes and failures that they must examine as they seek to build an agenda for future cooperation?
- What are the ways in which research and practice are conducted that actually blur the boundaries between them?

Discussions on curriculum development and resources, intervention, and research and practice continued in more depth in small group sessions during the afternoon. Small group discussions on curriculum development and resources were facilitated by Dr. Clements, on intervention by Professor Warfield, and on research and practice by Professor LeBaron.

Next Steps

The closing plenary session was facilitated by Dr. Mary Hayes, a co-organizer of the roundtable, who is chair of the Department of History of Trinity College. Rapporteurs reported from each of the group sessions, with discussion of next steps and future directions, including the following:

- Follow-up small group meetings should be scheduled to deal with specific issues raised at today's roundtable.

- The Scholars Roundtable should be a regular annual event. To explore issues more extensively, next year's roundtable should be one week long.
- An e-mail listserv on conflict resolution and peace studies should be created to serve Washington area scholars and practitioners, linking members of the peace and conflict studies community and informing them of each other's programs and projects.
- Because different organizations are engaged in similar projects on the same issues (e.g., conflict in the Trans-Caucasus and in the Mt. Pleasant communities), more opportunities should be created for sharing information and collaborating between programs to prevent wasted resources and to provide additional mutually beneficial outcomes.
- A compilation of participating scholars' curricula vitae and of syllabi from participating educational institutions should be prepared and distributed to those who attended this roundtable to facilitate collaboration and cooperation.
- A network parallel and similar to the Washington metropolitan area's student-run CAPS (Capital Area Peace Studies) should be developed between roundtable participants.

At the closing plenary session and during the evening reception, participants expressed overall satisfaction with the proceedings. There was clear consensus that the roundtable had been a valuable experience. The seeds of cooperation and synergy between participating individuals, programs, organizations, and institutions had been planted with the expectation that they would lead to increased opportunities for collaboration and cooperation.

Retraction: The last issue of the newsletter incorrectly reported that Dr. John Burton would be accepting an award from the Indonesian government for his role in helping secure that country's independence. In fact, Dr. Burton declined the award to protest Indonesia's unwillingness to cede self-determination to identity groups within its own regional territory. My apologies.

The Editor

The United Nations at Fifty

Christopher R. Mitchell

Amid all the brouhaha about the United Nation's 50th anniversary, it is curious that nobody seems to have made the point that for the last few years the organization has been operating the closest it ever has to the intentions of its founders, at least so far as "the maintenance of peace and security" is concerned. It is difficult, now, to think back past 50 years to the arguments and debates in San Francisco that resulted in this post-World War II replacement for the League of Nations. However, reading accounts of those discussions and re-reading the charter (as it was probably meant to be read in 1945) leads one clearly to the conclusion that the system established by its "founding fathers" to deal with conflicts in the postwar world was one that abandoned the old League idea of "collective security," at least in its classic form, and substituted for it a Great Power police force—in effect, the five "victor" powers of World War II—controlled through the Security Council.

China, France, Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union all had a veto on when the United Nations could act against any other country that constituted a threat to or breach of "the peace" (read "became involved in a dangerous or destabilizing conflict"). The same five victor countries, it was anticipated, would provide the military force, organized through the Military Staff Committee that they also controlled, which could be used on recalcitrant members (or non-members) that became involved in a conflict disapproved by "the Big Five" or their allies and clients. In effect, under this system, conflicts were to be dealt with through the deterrent and coercive systems outlined in Chapter 7 of the charter. It was anticipated that those running the United Nation's military arm (the "Big Five") would remain in agreement about the use of that arm. However, differing views about the precise role and nature of the United Nation's military arm surfaced even in the early period (1944–45), and became part of the events contributing to and affected by the onrushing "cold war." On the one hand, there were those—mainly among the western Allies—who argued that to

be really effective a large U.N. force with many allied military units earmarked for potential service would be necessary for the Security Council to wield a credible and effective deterrent. On the other hand, the Soviet Union argued that a relatively small U.N. force would be all that was necessary, given that the veto ensured that the United Nations would never be used against any of the major military powers (or their allies and clients).

This controversy, together with differences about the composition of the United Nation's military arm and who should supply the major part of the branches (land, sea, or air) of that overall force, plus the growing Soviet suspicion that the West might intend some day to use a large and mobile U.N. military force against the Soviet Union (or its allies and clients) in spite of the veto, contributed to deadlock within the United Nation's "peace and security" system. This deadlock resulted in the impotence of the Military Staff Committee, which thereafter met once a year to set the date of its next meeting. It also ultimately resulted in the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of the General Assembly, the development of what became the United Nation's classic peacekeeping—as opposed to peace-enforcing—role, and, particularly under Dag Hammarskjöld, the enhancement of the role of the secretary general in dealing with world conflicts. In the early years of the United Nations, the only peace enforcement operation launched was that undertaken in Korea, an operation only made possible by an ill-judged Soviet absence from the Security Council when the Korean War broke out.

Since the ending of the cold war, however, the Soviet-U.S. rivalry has no longer been played out in the United Nations, and the possibility of agreement about the use of the United Nation's deterrent or peace enforcement system—against recalcitrant Somalis or Bosnians, for example—has become a clear policy option. Paradoxically, as its 50th anniversary approached, the United Nations found itself in a position envis-

aged in 1944 in which U.S. and Russian troops might well serve, side by side, in a peace enforcement role and where (so the theory went) the threat of such an eventuality might give pause to those parties threatening to aggress, break the peace, or provide a danger to "international security." The results of such a threat have not, so far, been encouraging. As with all coercive or deterrent systems, to be effective those who are deterring or coercing must demonstrate (and be willing to use) overwhelming capacity to do harm; that appears not to be a real possibility.

There are obviously many reasons for that but I will mention just two. The first is the reluctance of the one remaining superpower and the other major military powers to provide the costly troops and equipment required to present an overwhelming coercive or deterrent threat to parties engaged in today's violent and protracted conflicts. The second, interconnected reason is the (relative) equalization of armed force throughout the world compared with 1945. Then, the Big Five controlled most of the available military force and the capacity for generating more; now, after five decades of global industrial development in the arms business and lucrative arms trades and transfers, the arms-saturated world of the 1990s is much more difficult to overawe with U.N.-controlled military force. Moreover, many governments have a great reluctance to supply soldiers to the United Nations if they may actually be killed enforcing the peace in some distant land in which the country supplying them has little direct interest. That is hardly surprising. Now, it is the U.S. Congress that drags its heels about placing its servicepersons "in harm's way" in the former Yugoslavia; then, in the 1920s, it was the Canadian government that first pointed out to the League of Nations that it was unwilling to send Canadian soldiers to be killed in "collective security" operations carried out by a League army in places where there was no possible Canadian interest.

This situation does throw an interesting light on the debates of 50 years ago. Now,

it looks as if the western Allies were right in their contention that only a large U.N. military force would be sufficient to overawe potential breakers of the international peace. And given what human needs theory and the history of conflict (decolonization struggles, conflicts over ethnic identity, separatist movements) in the past 50 years tell us about the recalcitrance of those engaged in protracted and deep-rooted conflicts over security and identity, even a major U.N. military force might not work.

Fortunately, the United Nations has never had to rely solely on the doctrines of peace enforcement and deterrence

enshrined in Chapter 7 of the charter and focused on a Security Council dominated by its "Big Five" members of 1944—some of which now look a little moth eaten. Indeed, to talk about the "founding fathers" of the United Nations as though they were solely the five victors of 1945 is very misleading. At least two groupings of founders were in San Francisco in 1944; the second group of small and middle powers—India, Canada, Australia, many Latin American countries—disliked the idea of dealing with post-1945 conflict by deterrence and suppression. It is to them that we owe many of the alternative provisions for dealing

with conflicts that are now well established and used by the United Nations. If the coercive provisions of Chapter 7 look as if they are failing in the 1990s, as they did, for different reasons, in the 1950s, we still have the peacemaking and peace-building provisions of Chapter 6. Perhaps some of the classic peacekeeping practices developed during the 1960s and 1970s, and a renewed interest in exercising conflict resolution (as opposed to conflict suppression) principles to deal with the underlying causes rather than the violent symptoms of conflict, are what the United Nations should build on in its second 50 years.

Women and Militarism

Cora Weiss

"War," said Virginia Woolf, "is not women's history."

Thus in these days when women redouble our efforts for rights and peace, a struggle we should long ago have resolved, we are reminded of two factors: 1) women and children, not soldiers, have increasingly become the victims of war since the end of World War II; and 2) unless and until women gain equality and equal numbers in decision making at all levels of society—in governments, in delegations to the United Nations, in the U.N. bureaucracy, on negotiating teams—there will continue to be wars and women will be raped and tortured and killed and made refugees until the social fabric of entire societies is destroyed.

The Persian Gulf War was perhaps the last military conflict of armies against armies, where a nation state invaded another for the purpose of eliminating its military power. Since then, conflicts have not been about armies of men going to defeat armies of men, but rather, conflicts about destroying cultures, destroying the fabric of society.

Women and children bear a disproportionate burden of the consequences of this kind of war—from beginning to end. First, women are not involved in the decisions that lead to war—and don't tell me about Cleopatra, Golda Meir, or Margaret Thatcher. I am talking representation of equal numbers of women, of people who are caring and nurturing, people who use both sides of their brain. Women are not engaged in the appropriation of funds that make weapons and war possible. The number of women in national legislatures has dropped to only ten percent globally. Women are not engaged in the negotiations that might lead to resolving a war.

When conflicts arise, usually over resources and who will control them, women and children, who once waited to bury their heroes and martyrs, now become a new kind of victim. Today, women stay home to protect the family and resist the war while their men, taking guns, either go to fight or to flee, as we saw in Bosnia and in Chechnya. And the women become victims of rape and torture, of brutalities suffered in front of children and the elderly in an effort to remove the glue that holds the family—the society—together. The new wars are about destroying ways of life: mosques are bombed, libraries burned to remove traces of

history. When missiles and grenades are lobbed into a marketplace in Sarajevo, whom will they hit? Only women go to markets. Harvests are pillaged and crops burned. Starvation has always been a weapon. But new technology includes dioxins, Agent Orange and defoliants, chemicals which now prevent the reuse of healthy fields for many years and cause miscarriages and deformities in newborns as we know from Vietnam. War is no longer a matter of defeating an enemy and subjugating it to occupation but of trying to wipe out a people, as we saw in Cambodia, Guatemala, and El Salvador. As long as they have guns, men can hold up food aid, as in Somalia, or force women to become pregnant.

National military budgets discriminate against women. The world today spends between \$750 to 800 billion per year on the military while the worldwide need for basic child health and nutrition, primary education, safe water, and family planning could be had for a mere \$34 billion, according to the U.N. Development Program (UNDP). In the United States, only the military budget is a sacred cow and is, indeed, being increased while all social services are on the chopping block. Years after the Cold War is over, the world's military budget equals the income of the poorest half of the world's people. In some African countries military budgets are two to three times the budgets for health or education. While UNDP advocates a three percent reduction in military spending, some women's groups want to institute an across the board cut of five percent a year for five years of all national military budgets which will release, in the end, half a billion dollars per day that can be applied to human needs. At least one percent of those saved funds should be spent on needs defined by women.

Margaret Catley Carlson, the head of the Population Council, says that unless part of the \$2 million per minute that is spent on global armaments is diverted to women's reproductive health services the world's future will be bleak.

Cora Weiss is the international representative of Peace Action, USA, and vice president of the International Peace Bureau in Geneva. This article, first published in Disarmament Times, August 1995, is reprinted with her gracious permission.

The Simpson Verdict and the Crisis of American Criminal Law

Richard E. Rubenstein

The criminal trial has long been America's favorite form of popular drama. In each era, key trials have spotlighted the leading conflicts of the day: labor struggles in the Eugene Debs and Tom Mooney cases, religious conflicts in the Leo Franks case and the Scopes' "Monkey Trial," political conflicts in the Sacco-Vanzetti and Chicago Conspiracy cases, and southern racial strife in the trials of the Scottsboro Boys and Bryan De La Beckwith. The trial of O.J. Simpson for the murder of Nicole Brown Simpson and Ronald Goldman now joins this select list of national morality plays.

In some ways, the Simpson trial most resembles the 1924 prosecution of Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb for the "thrill murder" of little Bobby Franks. Brilliantly defended by Clarence Darrow, the Leopold-Loeb case titillated and fascinated the public while triggering a national debate over multiple issues of moral philosophy and public policy. In other respects, the case resembles those political trials—Sacco-Vanzetti, the Rosenbergs, and Alger Hiss come to mind—whose results intensified the conflicts they dramatized. The ex-football star's acquittal enraged those who perceived the verdict as an example of sexism (indifference toward male abuse of women) or a product of "rich man's justice." But the principal effect of the verdict was to exacerbate conflict between blacks and whites.

In national polls taken immediately following the trial, a substantial majority of white Americans expressed disapproval of the Simpson verdict while an even larger majority of blacks applauded it. Yet the salience of race to the Simpson case is not easy to explain. Many of those who celebrated O.J.'s acquittal believed that, whether he was guilty or innocent in fact, egregious police misconduct had hopelessly tainted the legal case against him. And many of those who called for a conviction were not down on O.J. because of his race or that of the victims, but because they found the evidence of his guilt compelling. Each side in this debate could



therefore claim objectivity for itself while accusing the other side of racial bias.

Writing in the *New Yorker*, for example, legal commentator James Offutt contends that Simpson's lawyers shamelessly played "the race card" to counter the "overwhelming" evidence of his guilt and that the mostly black jury responded by rendering an emotional, racially biased verdict. Offutt concedes that the work of the Los Angeles police on the case was tarnished by racism and poor investigative procedures, but insists, nonetheless, that it is virtually impossible for O.J. to have been "framed." Only if a juror's judgment were warped by racial prejudice could he or she possibly come to that conclusion.

Yet the Simpson jury was not instructed to determine whether O.J. had been "framed," or whether he might have murdered the victims, but whether the evidence established beyond a reasonable doubt that he did murder them. And that issue, as is so often the case, hinged on the credibility of police testimony. That is where the "black" perception of the case differs most strongly from the "white" view presented by James Offutt. The forensic evidence presented by the prosecution in the Simpson case seems overwhelming, indeed, until it is undermined by anomalies. What about the bloody glove discovered by a self-confessed racist and perjurer? The vial of blood with part of its contents missing? The Ford Bronco unprotected for days against tampering? The preservatives found in the blood samples col-

lected by a police trainee? The socks so oddly stained?

Given the evidence that some police procedures were sloppy and that one key witness, at least, was malicious, the Simpson jury did not have to be racially biased to harbor a reasonable doubt of O.J.'s guilt. What the jury "nullified," maintains *Nation* columnist Alexander Cockburn, was not the law against murder but the "propensity to believe everything the police swear to in court." But Cockburn understates the issue. Once one comes to believe that some evidence in the case was planted or manufactured and that some witnesses very likely perjured themselves, the question is how much of the remaining evidence, if any, can be credited.

James Offutt seems to think that jurors can subtract tainted evidence from the total and still come up with a verdict of guilty—but the difficulty of doing that sort of arithmetic is obvious. "Without me," Mark Fuhrman boasted, "there is no case." Strictly speaking, that may not have been true. But, if Fuhrman lied and if there is a good chance that he planted evidence, why should the jury give other prosecution witnesses the benefit of the doubt? Now the salience of race becomes clearer. The people most likely to "read" the Simpson case as a story of police misconduct are those who have been exposed directly to that sort of behavior themselves or who have close friends or relatives who have experienced it.

Because the "war on crime" is fought mostly in black communities, African Americans are far more likely than whites to have firsthand knowledge of police practices that many experts consider common: planting drugs and other evidence, stealing the proceeds of illegal transactions, shaking down potential defendants, terrorizing "uncooperative" witnesses, conducting personal vendettas, provoking gang fights, offering perjured testimony, and more. Whites, on the other hand, are inclined to focus on the evidence of the defendant's misconduct (the "objective facts") without giving credence to evidence that impugns

the honesty or impartiality of its police sources. They view public authorities as relatively impartial "third parties" rather than contestants themselves and thus, on the whole, as people lacking a motive to manufacture evidence and to lie.

Defendants like O.J. Simpson, on the other hand, they assume to be passionately subjective and self-interested: "private" parties all the way down. Neither that perspective nor that of most black people is based on simple race prejudice. Each is race based because of the persistent and increasing disparity in black and white experiences since the Kerner Commission declared almost 30 years ago that black and white America are "two societies, separate and unequal." Living as each group does, it is not surprising that African Americans tend to distrust the police and that whites tend to trust them.

What I am describing as the "white" perspective has long been that of most juries, white and black. Criminal lawyers know how difficult it can be to shake police testimony. Police officers and investigators are articulate, professional witnesses; they appear honest and businesslike; they keep notes and records that have an air of authenticity; they verify each other's stories; and they have facilities and funds for investigation and presentation of physical evidence that most defendants can only dream of. It is the apparent reliability of their testimony that generates the very high conviction rates that prevail in most American jurisdictions, despite the reasonable doubt standard used in criminal cases.

I have argued that the verdict in the O.J. Simpson case was not necessarily or even probably the result of simple racial bias on the part of the jury. Was the prosecution's case, then, motivated by race prejudice? That also seems unlikely. Of course, there are racists among the Los Angeles police (and on other police forces) and one of them—Mark Fuhrman—played a leading role in the Simpson prosecution. But police officers who are not racists manufacture evidence and give false testimony, too. Perhaps the most important reason for that is vigilantism. Many cops consider themselves the last line of defense in the war against crime, soldiers entitled—even obligated—to stop criminals "by all means necessary." Should they believe

strongly that a defendant is guilty but fear that the admissible evidence will not be sufficient to convict, even nonracist officers can plant drugs, "drop" a gun, or dip someone's clothing in blood.

Or worse. In December 1971, after Black Panther leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were shot dead in their beds by Cook County Sheriff's police, I told a friend in the Chicago Police Department that I believed the killing was a police assassination. "Of course," he replied, "but there was a reason for it. The police knew that the Panthers had gunned down a cop two weeks earlier, but there were reasons why they could never prove it in court. So they executed 'justice.'"

Police vigilantism has not slackened since the 1970s; on the contrary, as the "war on crime" escalates, vigilante practices become ever more common. Few people seem to recognize the extent to which those practices have already undermined the integrity of our legal system. Western jurisprudence presupposes a civil society, not a state of war between large numbers of lawbreakers and a militarized state. In war, almost anything goes—the vital question is which side you are on—but legality presupposes a mutual agreement to play by the rules. Thus, the criminal law's procedural protections for the accused; its reliance on juries, rules of evidence, presumption of innocence, and standards of proof are balanced, in practice, by the weight ordinarily accorded to police testimony. Loss of credibility by the police presents juries with a Hobson's choice: either adhere to traditional legal standards and acquit someone who may well have committed a crime or condone police vigilantism and convict someone who may well be innocent.

Already, some *soi-disant* conservatives are calling for "reform" of the criminal justice system to counterbalance the loss of police credibility with new rules favoring the prosecution. Down with jury verdicts! Down with the reasonable doubt standard! Down with the rules banning admission of illegally seized evidence! What these commentators fail to understand, however, is that no new rules can contain the undeclared civil war now raging in America's troubled streets. A genuine war on crime, like most other wars, tears up legality by the roots. It places the police themselves

in an impossible position—one in which they are invited to protect society against lawbreakers by breaking society's laws. Focusing on Mark Fuhrman's racism, therefore, has the peculiar side effect of obscuring his vigilantism. Heaven knows, we are all against racism! But are we also prepared to oppose Batman? Critics who fulminate against the prevalence of violence in our movies, music, and television programs should take a careful look at the latest media hero: the uniformed vigilante who breaks the rules at will to deal out "justice" to the bad guys.

At bottom, it seems to me, the dispute over the Simpson verdict reveals a growing conflict, not inherently racial but racially linked, between the partisans of order and the advocates of law. If nothing can be done to eliminate the causes of crime, the struggle is certain to escalate, as it has in many Latin American countries. On one side, police vigilantes, supported by a populace fed up with crime, increasingly take the law into their own hands—an activity that moves logically toward the formation of militias and "death squads." On the other side, lawbreakers, poor communities vulnerable to abuses of police power, and constitutionalists bemoan the collapse of civil society or form countervigilante organizations.

A no-win contest! Yet, at this writing, not one credible public figure in office or out has offered an analysis of the causes of crime in America or a program to eliminate them that makes sense. On the contrary, anyone who demands that the sources of lawlessness be identified and addressed is said to be "soft on crime"—a charge that is to the 1990s what being "soft on Communism" was to the cold war period.

It is time for those interested in conflict resolution to intervene in this discussion. To declare war on crime while refusing to confront its social and psychological causes legitimizes vigilantism, undermines legality, and further divides our people along lines of race, class, and gender. Moreover, it does not eliminate crime. The O.J. Simpson case may serve a useful purpose if it awakens us to the dangers of this approach and the need to construct a more humane and effective alternative. Could we help bring blacks and whites into dialogue about these issues? Surely, it is worth trying.

Elise Boulding, Global Citizen

On November 3, 1995, Elise Boulding was presented with the first Global Citizen Award by the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century of Cambridge, Massachusetts. ICAR director Dr. Kevin Clements offered the following introductory remarks at the presentation.

I am delighted that the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century has chosen to grant its Global Citizen Award to my friend, colleague, and mentor Elise Boulding. I can think of no one who matches the purpose of this award so completely.

Elise Boulding regards the whole world as her home and has devoted herself unstintingly to its care and nurture. Elise has a philanthropic spirit that transcends the narrow bounds of nation, race, and region; she knows that one of the fundamental roles of the peacemaker is to see and realize wholeness where there is fragmentation and division. To this end, she derives great joy and delight from building networks and weaving relationships between peoples of all races and religions.

Elise is convinced that one of the most important tasks of global citizens toward building a peaceful world is to deepen community relationships and to envision communities where none currently exists. To achieve this goal, futurists and peace researchers need to discern the incipient communities of the 21st century and facilitate their evolution. In this regard, Elise is a wonderful role model. She is an incorrigible networker and once told me that her most important books are her address books. It would take a very long speech to enumerate the many conversations, dialogues, and communities that she has catalyzed with who knows what short- and long-term consequences for world peace.

Elise worked assiduously to bring the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) and the Consortium on Peace Research Education and Development (COPRED) into existence. She helped establish the United States Institute for Peace and developed important global programs within UNESCO and in the United Nations University.

She has brought many scholars and activists together to resolve problems as elusive as peace in the Middle East and a wide variety of other issues. Elise's networks of women, scientists, sociologists, peace researchers, conflict resolutionaries, futurists, ecologists, Quakers, Catholics, Buddhists, Muslims, Jews, to name a few, have all made vital contributions to the generation of peaceful cultures and communities.

So who is this extraordinary person we are honoring tonight? Elise was born in Oslo, Norway; her family migrated to the United States when she was a child and she grew up in a small Scandinavian community in a factory town in New Jersey. From a very early age, therefore, she was sensitized to the particular dilemmas of being a stranger in a strange land. The lessons she drew from this have undoubtedly enhanced her celebration of diversity and established the roots of her global citizenship. She had a stable and secure family life and from a very early age was aware of the fact that she existed in both a material and a spiritual universe. In an essay about her childhood, Elise tells us that she had quiet inner spaces, listening spaces, that she would go to while "picking blueberries in sweet smelling meadows, or lying in the bottom of a rowboat rocking on the ripples of a small mountain lake." We know that her early experiences generated an openness to a lifetime of spiritual quest and adventure. We know that her soul journeying with Quakers and Roman Catholics generated a spiritually grounded person whose life, love, and courage derive from a profound awareness of a presence other than but imbedded within self, a presence which transcends the clutter and busyness clouding our everyday life.

We know that she met and married Kenneth Boulding and that their partnership was an exemplary combination of wit, faith, temperament, intelligence, wisdom, and vision. Individually and together they saw cosmic connections where many others saw only randomness or chaos; produced five children and experienced firsthand the challenges and joys of cultivating peaceful relationships in their own home. Always highly

attuned to the global implications of local action, Elise discovered universal peacebuilding dynamics in her own family. Long before it was fashionable she understood that local actions have global consequences and vice versa. This homemaking period generated a lifelong interest in children and childrearing practices, in the sociology of the family and in women's history.

Elise and Kenneth both have that rare gift of turning every moment into a learning experience. Both understand that the world is a highly dynamic and interrelated system and both have made many unique contributions to what we understand as systems theory. They shared a common interest in and can justifiably claim to be pioneers of modern peace and conflict research. Their perspectives on these topics while intertwined are different. Elise dedicated her life to understanding the social, psychological, and cultural ingredients which enable individuals and groups with different needs and interests to negotiate these differences in a nonviolent and peaceful fashion. Kenneth was often more preoccupied with the economics of war and peace and international relations more narrowly defined while Elise's primary concern is with what makes for successful collaborative problem solving or shared decision making. To this end, she has investigated cultures of war and peace, the contradictory impulses or strands within religious traditions, and all the diverse ways in which people learn to be peaceful.

In recent years she has encouraged the globalization of learning and action and has painstakingly documented the enormous growth in global transactions and the burgeoning numbers of international governmental and nongovernmental organizations. Fred Polak's *Image of the Future*, which she translated, fueled Elise's interests in the power of imagination to change behavior. Not content just to theorize, she has facilitated a large number of workshops aimed at promoting positive approaches to peace and delineating the powerful components of what she calls the image-action nexus.

For all who are dominated by time

(continued on page 11)

(continued from page 10)

(and who isn't in this society), Elise has researched different orientations to time and new ways of conceptualizing it. Her idea of a 200-year present helps all of us to situate ourselves in lengthier time spans, "remembering" both past and future while acting in the present. This concept provides important cautionary lessons for all public and private decision makers, especially for those based in Washington where, contrary to most laws of physics, sound always seems to travel faster than light.

I could elaborate the many other critical contributions that Elise has made to scholarship and different movements for peace and justice but I hope I have said enough to make you realize that we are not just honoring a scholar and an activist, we are honoring someone who takes delight in and sees the whole human enterprise as a constantly unfolding adventure. Elise enlivens individuals and groups with her love, optimism, knowledge, and wisdom. She cherishes all social relationships and gives herself

completely to them. She draws energy for this from her contemplative life which she shares with others but nurtures in solitude.

Elise loves and cares for this planet as few others do. She is a true Friend and global citizen. Duncan Wood, another Quaker, states, "The goal of understanding is to pierce first through the thin layer of superficial familiarity and then through the hard rock of differing customs, habits and beliefs to discover the real humanity that lies beneath... the things that really matter, life and death, birth and love, joy and sorrow, poetry and prayer, those elements which are common to us all." Elise understands and is very familiar with these real dimensions of humanity and humanity in turn has been much blessed by her distinctive vision of a whole and peaceful world. At the beginning of her book, *One Small Plot of Heaven*, Elise quotes Kenneth's "Sonnet for a Quaker Wedding":

Put off the garb of woe, let mourning
cease;

Today we celebrate with solemn mirth,
The planting in the ravaged waste of earth
Of one small plot of heaven, a Home of
peace,
Where love unfeigned shall rule, and
bring increase,
And pure eternal joy shall come to birth
And grow, and flower, that neither
drought nor dearth
Shall wither, till the reaper brings release.
Guard the ground well, for it belongs to
God;
Root out the hateful and the bitter weed,
And from the harvest of thy Heart's
good seed
The hungry shall be fed, the naked clad,
And love's infection, leaven like shall
spread
Till all creation feeds from heavenly bread.

Elise has lived that sonnet and spread love's leaven in a world bent on marching to quite different impulses. It is my great pleasure to introduce Elise Boulding, contemplative, homemaker, peacemaker, scholar, activist, and highly energized global citizen.

Scholars Roundtable

Remarks by David M. Anderson

George Washington University Department of Philosophy

I would like to raise three sets of philosophical questions concerning the relevance of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, concept of a "beloved community" to the project of transforming American society into a humane society. My remarks presuppose that America is currently in a period of moral crisis, a crisis of violence and distrust of government, family breakdown, and moral corruption, economic confusion and racial strife, a moral crisis which may in the end generate a new center.... I will restrict my remarks to domestic issues alone.

First Set of Questions

In his essay "Pilgrimage to Nonviolence" (1960), Reverend King said that his philosophy of nonviolent resistance reflected the influence of Gandhi and Jesus of Nazareth ... [with] the "Christian doctrine of love operating through the Gandhian method of nonvio-

lence." Less well known is the influence on his thought of both the personalists and Hegel. I will make a few remarks about the Hegelian influence. "Inspired by Hegel," John Ansbro writes, "King claimed that life at its best is a creative synthesis of opposites in productive harmony ... that Hegel was his favorite philosopher and that he adopted the Hegelian concept that 'growth comes through struggle' (Martin Luther King, Jr., *The Making of a Mind*, 1982). King saw the thesis-antithesis-synthesis dialectic of American racial history moving from slavery to segregation, from segregation to desegregation, and from desegregation to integration ... [and] said that the philosophy of nonviolence itself was an Hegelian middle position between the extremes of passive acceptance and physical violence.

Moreover, King's method of social change, though nonviolent, was mani-

festly designed to bring out conflict between whites and blacks. King understood that if blacks did not "dramatize" the gross racial injustice of our society through boycotts, sit-ins, marches, and freedom rides, racial oppression would persist ("Letter from a Birmingham Jail," 1963). This "aggressive spirituality" (in "The Power of Nonviolence," 1959) was not inconsistent with the philosophy of love which also motivated the social movement. King had a complicated mission.

The following questions arise:

First, since some of the most blatant injustices of the earlier generation have been overcome—for example, the segregated lunch counters and the Jim Crow laws—is there as great a need today to bring out conflicts between whites and blacks, or indeed between any groups of Americans on any topic of injustice? Or are the main conflicts clear to everyone?

(continued on page 12)

Scholars Roundtable

(continued from page 11)

Second, since King was most appalled by the complacency and “shallow understanding” of the “white moderate,” (“Letter from a Birmingham Jail”) and since much of the white moderate population is in crisis today, should the political strategy to transform white moderates and indeed all moderates be more inclusive?

Third, if King was right that anxiety and anger need to be harnessed and channeled in the direction of positive social ends, then how should we eliminate injustices against African Americans, women, and other minorities in light of the fact that so many white males and females have anxiety and anger too?

Finally, fourth, is King’s philosophy of nonviolent resistance itself dated in the light of the extreme complexity of the problems of oppression today? And if it is, are certain central themes of the overall method still quite relevant to the project of creating a human society?

Second Set of Questions

Consider a major dispute between two broadly progressive approaches to political philosophy; one, the dominant paradigm of democratic theory, Rawlsian liberalism, and two, the emerging paradigm of critical multicultural theorists, including Cornel West, Iris Young, and Nancy Fraser.... Progressive democrats essentially agree that value conflicts will be resolved only if we design situations in which persons can voice their interest in a fair setting. Indeed, liberal contractualist theory, whether it is used to define a *laissez faire* state (as it was by Locke and Kant) or a welfare state (as it is by Rawls and the German philosopher Habermas), is essentially a theory of conflict resolution.

Rawlsian contractualism says that political conflicts should be resolved by designing a hypothetical choice procedure in which the parties, who reflect pluralistic commitments of members of the reading audience, would determine what principles of justice are justified. This view is essentially a Kantian version of economic game theory and rational choice theory more generally.

But contemporary critical theorists

argue that liberal theories of justification conceal existing relations of oppression in American society by assuming that all parties to the hypothetical procedures of conflict resolution are free, equal, and rational. Critics often say that these hypothetical parties do not actually or ideally represent women and African Americans and other minorities who are currently exploited and manipulated in American society.

Therefore, critical theories argue for a model of democratic dialogue which explains the unjustified suffering brought on by class, gender, racial, and sexual relations of oppression in our major social institutions. Often these theories reject the justificatory structure of contractualist theories because a justificatory theory stabilizes the oppressive system rather than paves the way for liberation.

King’s critique of the liberalism of his day rings true of the critiques of critical theorists today. “Liberalism,” King wrote, “fails to see that reason by itself is little more than an instrument to justify man’s defensive ways of thinking. Reason devoid of the purifying power of faith can never free itself from distortions and rationalizations.”

Questions to consider:

First, are theorists of conflict resolution who question the rationalist-individualist-cognitive-adversarial structure of the American legal system working within the same general paradigm as the critical theorists of justice?

Second, to what extent should a concept of love be used to unite the social order? Is love perhaps better reserved for personal relationships, even though a central aim of a just society would be to eliminate existing impediments to realizing this aim? King was really talking about “love of God,” but the question still remains whether any notion of love should be used to help ground the national community.

Third, even if one rejects the Kingian idea of using love to ground the social order, are the related notions of compassion and empathy relevant to the task of creating a just society?

Fourth, what kinds of public policies and institutions would help solve the extremely difficult problem of ending

the exploitative and manipulative practices of those in power even as they are not humiliated but humanized in the transformational process itself? I have argued elsewhere that a national child care act encouraging fathers to share equally in parenting responsibilities would help reach this aim. This policy could be an ideal unifying theme ... providing needed assistance to the diversity of families across class, race, and family structure.

Third Set of Questions

The third set of questions revolves around the neoprogressive communitarian viewpoint of Amitai Etzioni, who in *The Spirit of Community*, has developed a unique approach to reinventing America that combines elements of a theory of moral restoration with elements of a theory of moral transformation ... his view might be regarded as occupying a middle position between Rawlsian liberals and the critical theorists. Etzioni criticizes the hyperindividualism of American society and liberal theory in both the libertarian and Rawlsian traditions and calls on Americans to take on the moral responsibility to restore much of the moral order that we have lost.

But Etzioni does not call on us to return to the 1950s. Indeed, his critique of the special interest system and his argument for corporate and government financing of parental leave are precisely the progressive elements that separate him from conservative communitarians. One question to consider is whether Etzioni’s call for a neoprogressive communitarian social movement might be used to build a coalition among a number of the progressive forces in our society today.

We might also discuss demonstrations, self-help groups, and volunteer efforts, especially since Etzioni believes that most of our problems can be solved independently of the law. The Million Man March is precisely the kind of event we might discuss in this context.

Searching for the means to transform our country by uniting the oppressed and the oppressors—on matters of race, gender, sexuality, and class—and searching in a way that will humanize but not humiliate anyone, is a project we can pursue in King’s name.

James H. Laue Memorial Scholarships

1995 Laue Scholars

The Laue Memorial Scholarship Award has been established by Jim's family to carry on the tradition of his work by providing support for outstanding minority and foreign students in their first year of study in ICAR's master's degree program. The first Laue Memorial Scholarship Award of \$1,000 was presented for the 1994-95 academic year to ICAR master's student Erica Martinez-Atabei. The 1995-96 academic year awardees, each receiving \$1,000, are ICAR master's student Albert J. Cevallos and Ms. Martinez-Atabei, who was awarded a second year of support. Congratulations to each of our honored awardees!

James H. Laue (1937-93), a pioneer in the field of conflict resolution, was a driving force and inspiration to all who knew him. From the 1960s until his untimely death in 1993 he worked tirelessly for peace and justice. Jim had an abundant faith in "working things out." As a member of the ICAR faculty, he was constantly encouraging and always generous, a mentor, teacher, and friend to all in the ICAR community and to those engaged in the emerging field of conflict analysis and resolution. Jim always took time to encourage others, especially students and those new to the field.

Contributions to this fund may be made to "GMU Foundation, James Laue Endowed Scholarship," and sent in care of Dr. Kevin P. Clements, Director, ICAR, MS 4D3, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, 22030-4444.

Laue Festschrift

ICAR is planning to honor James Laue with the publication of the *James H. Laue Festschrift*, which will contain articles of scholarly interest in the rapidly developing field of conflict analysis and resolution. Edited by ICAR professors Frank Blechman and Richard Rubenstein, the festschrift will

focus on Jim's principal interests: peace-making, third-party roles, and the ethics of conflict intervention. A number of distinguished scholars and practitioners have agreed to participate, and publication is planned for fall 1996.

Manuscripts may be submitted to Joan W. Drake, Editor, ICAR Publications Committee, GMU/ICAR, MS 4D3, Fairfax, Virginia, 22030-4444. Telephone: (703) 993-1310; e-mail address: jdrake@gmu.edu. Donations to defray the cost of publication will also be gratefully received; checks should be made payable to the GMU Foundation, for ICAR, and sent in care of Dr. Kevin P. Clements, Director, ICAR, MS 4D3, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, 22030-4444.

ICAR Announces New Publications

ICAR announces its latest publication, *The Annotated Bibliography of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. Edited by Juliana Birkhoff, Christopher Mitchell, and Lisa Schirch and compiled by Nike Carstarphen, this bibliography covers key theoretical and applied practice books, both classics and recently published works. It is a guide to basic literature in the field from Boulding and Burton to White and Zartman. Published in October 1995, it is available through the George Mason University Bookstore.

ICAR will step up the pace of ICAR publications with publication of the following ICAR Working Papers in winter 1995: "Conflict After the Cold War, and Power Politics and Conflict Resolution: Two Lectures," by Richard E. Rubenstein; "Religion, Violence, and Conflict Resolution," by Marc Gopin; "Sociolinguistics of Conflict," by Andrew Acland; and "International Accompaniment for the Protection of Human Rights: Scenarios, Objectives, and Strategies," by Liam Mahony and Luis Enrique Eguren.

ICAR's Student Editorial Board, headed by Dan McFarland, will produce the first annual collection of student papers in early 1996.

ICAR Conference on Local Zones of Peace

Christopher R. Mitchell

The institute's annual spring conference scheduled for April 1996 will focus on local "zones of peace," how they are established and maintained to mitigate the effects of being in an environment of combat or intense conflict, and how they might be increased in size and effect to contribute toward the development of a more general peace process. Originally, it was thought that the conference should concentrate upon gathering and systematizing knowledge on local peace zones in international situations of intense civil strife, such as Central America, the Philippines, or Bosnia, where a local population has successfully set about establishing a neutral or secure zone. The institute could invite a small group of practitioners and theorists to exchange ideas and experiences on the subject.

We later realized that the "zones of peace" concept had far wider applications, for example, to the establishment of violence-free zones in U.S. cities, weapons-free regions in Antarctica and the Pacific, and safe corridors for humanitarian relief work. All these zones are examples of a common endeavor to develop a so-called "peace" and all can be viewed as examples of conflict regulation. So the proposed scope of the conference has widened, although attendance will be kept small and by invitation so that there will be in-depth discussion and the outcome will result in a useful summary of ideas, perhaps even a handbook. ICAR is currently searching for funds to bring people with direct experience in establishing zones of peace to George Mason University in April, but we will go ahead with the conference whether or not we succeed in this fund-raising task. The topic is an important one; the sooner we begin to explore the wealth of practical experience "out there" and draw some general lessons from particular cases, the better we can help troubled communities at home and abroad.

(continued on page 14)

(continued from page 13)

ICAR's 1996 Summer Institutes

by Frank Blechman

ICAR will offer nonacademic short courses in the summer of 1996. These training programs will be conducted by ICAR core faculty. Participants will experience the cutting edge of conflict analysis and resolution theory and practice in interactive workshops designed to meet specialized needs. For more information about individual courses, call Frank Blechman at (703) 993-3653 or check out the latest information on ICAR's Web site (see back cover).

Introduction to Conflict Analysis and Resolution June 3-7, 1996, \$395

If you have no background in conflict analysis and resolution, this basic overview will give you the vocabulary and frameworks needed to take full advantage of the other summer institutes. This course does not provide the kind of focused skills training required to become a court-certified mediator but does give an understanding of the ideas behind negotiation, mediation, group dynamics, and public decision making. This course can help anyone assess how conflict-resolving approaches and systems can help you and your organization work better.

Designing College Conflict Resolution Curricula June 10-14, 1996, \$495

ICAR offered the first master's and doctoral degrees in conflict analysis and resolution in the United States, but we're not alone anymore. If you are interested in developing courses or including conflict resolution in existing courses, take advantage of ICAR's 15 years of pioneering experience. Learn how ICAR

and others have integrated theory, skills, research, and ethics to produce reflective practitioners and scholars.

Conflict Resolution for Diplomats and Nongovernmental Organizations June 17-21, 1996, \$695

Working in the international arena puts you in the middle of conflicts. But what can you do within the constraints of your organizational resources and mission? How can you bring skills and knowledge about conflict analysis and resolution to bear? This course will help you learn what others have done and explore how you can expand your ability to act creatively.

Conflict Resolution for Public Managers June 24-26, 1996, \$295

As a public official, you may be asked to manage a contentious public meeting, handle a "hot" issue, or proactively build public consensus around a divisive topic. How can you use ideas about conflict analysis and resolution to help you do your job? What kind of systems work best within public organizations? How do inclusive public processes change community political culture over time? How can you be more effective? This program will help you examine and answer these questions.

Conflict Resolution for Educators June 24-28, 1996, \$395

Conflict resolution in schools is a fast-growing area. Today, nearly one-third of all students learn some negotiation, problem-solving, mediation, or peer-helping skills. As an educator, you may find that practicing conflict resolution within a school system can create as many conflicts as you resolve. How can you reconcile conflict between the values and culture of conflict resolution and the values and culture of education? Joining other educators, you'll learn how others

have resolved these issues and consider which models might work for you.

Conflict Resolution for Communicators and Journalists June 25-27, 1996, \$295

Your professional life takes you to the middle of conflicts at every level from the personal to the global. Can your perspectives and understanding of conflict and conflict resolution shape the events you report? Can new understandings about the dynamics of conflict help you present more complete, useful, and accurate pictures to your audience? Led by scholars and professional journalists, this session will help you evaluate how conflict analysis and resolution can help you.

Want to bring a group or take several courses but concerned about the price? Inquire about reduced rates and scholarships by contacting Frank Blechman at ICAR.

ICAR's APT Program

ICAR's Applied Practice and Theory (APT) teams are deeply engaged in fieldwork in Arlington and Fairfax, Virginia, and in Washington, D.C. Working with communities affected by intergroup conflict, the teams are strengthening the ability of organizations by helping them integrate conflict analysis and resolution ideas internally and externally. With APT help, schools are involving parents and community leaders in programs to confront bias; police and youth gang members are talking about ways to avoid confrontation; leaders in immigrant communities are working to improve two-way communication with government agencies; and new ideas are being developed to bridge gaps between "straight life" and "street life."

FACULTY UPDATES



ICAR director Kevin Clements paid tribute to his friend and mentor Elise Boulding at the first annual Global Citizen Awards Ceremony of the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century in Cambridge.

Dr. Kevin Clements, Director

Dr. Clements presented a paper "Advocacy and Reconciliation" at the Second Conference on Forgiveness and Reconciliation organized by the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy in July 1995, and with Christopher Mitchell consulted with the United Nation's Department of Political Affairs on new frameworks for conflict resolution within the United Nations.

Dr. Clements gave the keynote address "Reform of the United

Nations" at COPRED's Annual Conference in Oregon in August. He served on a United States Institute for Peace (USIP) Research Review Panel and represented ICAR at USIP's Colloquium on International Conflict Resolution Training in September. With Chris Mitchell he participated in a conference on the Georgian/Abkhazian conflict held in Charlottesville organized by the University of Virginia and the Carter Center.

In November, Dr. Clements introduced and reviewed the life and work of Professor Elise Boulding at the

first Global Citizen Award ceremony organized by the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century in Cambridge in November (see "Elise Boulding, Global Citizen" in this issue of the newsletter). He presented an invited paper, "Affirmative Action and Conflict Resolution," at a conference in Israel organized by the Adam Institute on Education for Democracy. While there he consulted with partners at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Bethlehem University of Palestine about future work with ICAR. His most recent publication is "Carrots Were More Important than Sticks in Ending the Cold War," in *Why the Cold War Ended: A Range of Interpretations*, edited by R. Summy and M. Salla, Greenwood Press, 1995.

Professor Frank Blechman

Professor Frank Blechman was a featured speaker at the Wisconsin Association of Mediators, October 24-27. In September, he successfully completed work facilitating consensus among the members of the Fairfax Community Initiative to Reduce Youth Violence. The recommendations of that initiative have subsequently been endorsed by the Fairfax County School Board and Board of Supervisors.

(continued on page 16)

Upcoming Publications

Now available for order is ICAR's latest publication, *The Annotated Bibliography of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*, edited by Juliana Birkhoff, Christopher Mitchell, and Lisa Schirch and compiled by Nike Carstarphen. An order form is included in this issue of the newsletter. Upcoming ICAR publications include Working Papers by Andrew Acland, Johannes Botes, Marc Gopin, Liam Mahony and Luis Enrique Eguren, Christopher Mitchell, Richard Rubenstein, and the first annual compilation of ICAR student papers.

(continued from page 15)

Professor Michelle LeBaron

Professor Michelle LeBaron is writing and lecturing on training. Her most recent article, "Training Metaphors that Connect Us," will be published in the forthcoming issue of *Conciliation Quarterly*. She helped launch the new LL.M. in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) at Osgoode Hall Law School of York University, the first such program in Canada.

During September, Professor LeBaron and Dr. Louise Diamond (Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy) presented a weekend workshop at George Mason University, "Non-Linear Approaches to Conflict Transformation: The Role and Power of Myth, Story, and Metaphor." Professor LeBaron presented a paper, "Conflict Management vs. Resolution: The Limits of ADR in Federal Programs," at the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution's 23rd annual conference, and chaired the Commercial Sector Meeting.

In October 1995, Professor LeBaron presented the closing plenary address, "Beyond Cultural Sensitivity: Moving Forward in Partnership," and conducted a workshop, "Diverse Cultures At Play in the Workplace," at the Ninth Annual Conference of Family Mediation Canada held in Victoria, British Columbia. With Dr. Clements and Professor Wallace Warfield, she participated in the Scholars Roundtable on Peace and Conflict Studies, hosted by ICAR on October 18, and facilitated a group discussion on research and practice.

Professor LeBaron is teaching a new course, "Violence and Gender,"

through George Mason's New Century College. Taught from an interdisciplinary perspective, the course draws from the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts, using documentaries, feature films, literary texts, case examples, popular culture, oral histories, and service learning. To further her research on gender issues, Professor LeBaron participated in a roundtable discussion and consultation, "Gender Issues in Negotiation and Conflict Resolution," sponsored by Harvard Law School.

Professor Richard E. Rubenstein

Professor Richard E. Rubenstein completed his paper, "Conflict Resolution and Power Politics, and Global Conflict After the Cold War: Two Lectures," which will be published in fall 1995 by ICAR. He is continuing work on a book about social conflict in America during the 1960s and 1970s.

In October, Professor Rubenstein served as moderator of a panel discussion on "Faith and Fanaticism" sponsored by George Mason University's International Programs and Services Office. In November, he spoke on "What is Conflict Resolution?" to 700 elementary school students at the Mantua Elementary School in Fairfax (copies of this presentation are available through ICAR). He presented a paper, "Religious Conflict: Problems of Conflict Analysis and Resolution," at an ICAR Brown Bag Seminar on November 16, and in December at a joint meeting of synagogue men's clubs in the Fairfax area

he spoke on "Terrorism and the Middle East Peace Process."

Professor Rubenstein is currently working on three projects for which he is seeking foundation support: a research and intervention project with scholars and practitioners on the problem of religious violence; a proposal, with ICAR graduate Eleanor Greene, to incorporate conflict resolution theories and skills in high school history curricula; and a proposal to produce a series of televised interviews on the role of conflict resolution in the modern world.

Dr. Dennis J.D. Sandole

Dr. Dennis J.D. Sandole's chapter, "Changing Ideologies in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," is included in the November 1995 Special Issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: Flexibility in International Negotiation and Mediation*, edited by Daniel Druckman and Christopher R. Mitchell. The issue is available in the George Mason University Bookstore.

Dr. Sandole's article, "Simulated Violent Conflict and War: Implications for Ethnic Conflict in Post-Cold War Europe," will appear in *Simulation and Gaming* in spring 1996.

Dr. Sandole, Dr. Mitchell, and ICAR Ph.D. candidate Moorad Mooradian were interviewed on August 15, 1995, on Voice of America, Armenian Service, concerning conflict resolution and its role in dealing with conflicts such as those taking place in post-cold war Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

COPRED's 25th Anniversary Barbara Wien, Executive Director

Dear ICAR Community,

COPRED will mark our Silver Anniversary in 1996! Happy 25th to us!

It is doubtful that very many of the small group that gathered in Boulder, Colorado, in the spring of 1971 at the invitation of Elise Boulding, Kenneth Boulding, and Gilbert White would have projected that COPRED would survive a quarter-century.

Yet, survive we have and in many ways we have thrived. We have seen peace studies grow from a handful of programs offered by a few mostly peace church-related colleges to a recognized academic field with programs at more than 300 campuses in North America and around the world. Nor did COPRED sit idly by and watch this happen; we in many ways contributed to it. COPRED's national office was instrumental in the envisioning process for many of these programs, including ICAR, and many of the newer ones are led by scholars who cut their teeth at COPRED meetings. Most important, COPRED has helped programs at every developmental level retain links between theory, practice, action, and educational communities.

Yet, as with many nonprofit organizations in today's belt-tightening times, COPRED faces challenges. Our executive director works for an unacceptably low salary. *The Peace Chronicle*, our major communications organ, was cut back at the beginning of 1994 from six to four issues per year. COPRED now has slightly fewer than 500 members, down from 800 several years ago.

The COPRED board invites each and every member of the ICAR community to celebrate COPRED's Silver Anniversary by improving our standing as we enter our next 25 years. We seek to raise \$25,000 and gain at least 250 new members by the end of our anniversary year, December 31, 1996.

Please think about joining COPRED. Those of you who have access to friends and colleagues can help even more by recruiting two or more new members. Or you can send an end-of-the-year tax-deductible contribution to COPRED. Finally, look for an announcement of our 1996 conference in the next *ICAR Newsletter* and please plan to attend what promises to be a great 25th Anniversary celebration!

Sincerely,

The COPRED Board of Directors

NCPCR Linda Baron, Director

The next National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR) will be held at Duquesne University from May 23 to 27, 1997. This five-day biennial event consists of a two-day training institute followed by three days of workshops, seminars, and meetings of organizations and interest groups. The NCPCR conference brings together more than 1,400 practitioners, teachers, researchers, and policy makers in the field of peacemaking and conflict resolution. The Call for Participation in the Conference will be mailed in spring 1996. If you are not on NCPCR's mailing list or if you are interested in helping organize the 1997 conference, please write Linda Baron, Director, National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, MS 4D4, George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, Fairfax, Virginia, 22030-4444, Fax: (703) 934-5142, or phone (703) 934-5141.



Please send me the publications indicated below:

	Price	# Copies	TOTAL
<i>Alchemists of Revolution: Terrorism in the Modern World</i> (paperback), by Richard E. Rubenstein	\$ 8.95	_____	_____
<i>Conflict and Gender</i> , by A. Taylor and J. Beinstein	26.50	_____	_____
<i>Conflict Management and Problem Solving</i> (hardcover), edited by Dennis J.D. Sandole and Ingrid Sandole Staroste	45.00	_____	_____
<i>Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives</i> , by K. Avruch, P. Black, and J. Scimecca	49.95	_____	_____
<i>Conflict Resolution and Provention</i> , by John W. Burton	19.95	_____	_____
<i>Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution</i> , by J. Burton and F. Dukes	45.00	_____	_____
<i>Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application</i> (paperback), edited by Dennis J.D. Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe	24.95	_____	_____
<i>Deviance Terrorism and War: The Process of Solving Unsolved Social and Political Problems</i> , by John Burton	11.95	_____	_____
<i>Peace and Security in the Asia Pacific Region: Post-Cold War Problems and Prospects</i> , edited by Kevin P. Clements	40.00	_____	_____
<i>Dear Survivors</i> (paperback), by John W. Burton	6.25	<u>4</u>	_____
<i>New Approaches to International Mediation</i> (hardcover), edited by C.R. Mitchell and K. Webb	55.00	_____	_____
<i>The Structure of International Conflict</i> (paperback), by Christopher R. Mitchell	12.95	_____	_____
<i>Comrade Valentine</i> (hardcover), by Richard E. Rubenstein	24.95	_____	_____
Working Paper #1: <i>Conflict Resolution as a Political System</i> , by John W. Burton	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #2: <i>Group Violence in America</i> , by Richard E. Rubenstein	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #3: <i>Conflict Resolution and Civil War (Sudan)</i> , by Christopher R. Mitchell	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #4: <i>A Willingness to Talk</i> , by Christopher R. Mitchell	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #5: <i>The OAU and African Conflicts</i> , by Sam Amoo	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #6: <i>Conflict Resolution in the Post Cold-War Era: Dealing with Ethnic Violence in the New Europe</i> , by Dennis J.D. Sandole	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #7: <i>Personal Change and Political Action: The Intersection of Conflict Resolution and Social Movement Mobilization in a Middle East Dialogue Group</i> , by Amy S. Hubbard	3.50	_____	_____
Working Paper #8: <i>Microenterprise Development: A Tool for Addressing the Structural Conflict Between Rich and Poor</i> , by Eric Beinhart	3.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #1: <i>On the Need for Conflict Prevention</i> , by John W. Burton	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #2: <i>Negotiating Base Rights Agreements</i> , by Daniel Druckman	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #3: <i>Dialectics and Economics of Peace</i> , by Elise and Kenneth Boulding	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #4: <i>Prospects for a Settlement of the Falklands/Malvinas Dispute</i> , by Peter Willets and Felipe Noguera	3.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #5: <i>On Taking Sides: Lessons of the Persian Gulf War</i> , by Richard E. Rubenstein	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #6: <i>Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution: A Decade of Development</i> , by Samuel W. Lewis	4.50	_____	_____
Total this page			_____

	Price	# Copies	TOTAL
Occasional Paper #7: <i>Resolution: Transforming Conflict and Violence</i> , by James H. Laue	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #8: <i>Cities after the 1960s—Where Have All the Promises Gone?</i> by Roger Wilkins	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #9: <i>Negotiation Theory—Through the Looking Glass of Gender</i> , by Deborah M. Kolb	4.50	_____	_____
Occasional Paper #10: <i>Peace and Identity: Reflections on the South Asian Experience</i> , by Rajmohan Gandhi	4.50	_____	_____
CCAR Report: <i>Interpreting Violent Conflict: A Conference for Conflict Analysts and Journalists</i>	3.50	_____	_____
ICAR Report #2: <i>Frameworks for Interpreting Conflict: A Handbook for Journalists</i> , by Richard E. Rubenstein	14.50	_____	_____
ICAR Report: <i>Understanding Intergroup Conflict in Schools: Strategies and Resources</i> , by Frank Blechman and the APT Team	2.95	_____	_____
ICAR <i>Academic Programs</i> (Syllabi Book)	20.00	_____	_____
ICAR <i>The Annotated Bibliography of Conflict Analysis and Resolution</i>	5.50	_____	_____
November 1995 Special Issue of <i>The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: Flexibility in International Negotiation and Mediation</i> , edited by D. Druckman and C.R. Mitchell			
	(hardcover)	40.00	_____
	(paperback)	34.00	_____

Publishers' prices subject to change without notice

The charge for shipping and handling is \$2.50 for orders of \$20 or less; for orders more than \$20, add 20%. For orders outside the United States., add 30%.

Total other page _____
Total this page _____
SUBTOTAL _____
Shipping and handling _____
TOTAL _____

Please make checks payable to GMU Bookstore.
 Mail to GMU Bookstore, Fairfax, VA 22030-4444 U.S.A.

VISA/MasterCard/Discover/American Express accepted

Please fill out the information carefully to avoid any additional charges.

Card # _____

Expiration Date _____

Name (as it appears on the card) _____

VISA MasterCard Discover American Express (circle one)

Signature _____

Date _____

Mailing Address:

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

WE NEED YOUR HELP

How you can help ICAR update the mailing list and defray costs?

The cost of postage keeps rising as do the costs of producing this newsletter. Please take a moment to let us know (a) if you would like to receive the newsletter electronically instead of in printed form, (b) if you have moved, or (c) if you are receiving more than one copy. Please also consider sending a small donation to help us defray our costs.

Name: _____

Address (if different than on label): _____

Please check if you would like to receive electronically: _____

E-mail address: _____

Donation: \$10 _____ \$20 _____ \$50 _____ Other _____

Thank you!

CHECK OUT OUR HOME PAGES!

George Mason University: <http://www.gmu.edu>

ICAR: <http://web.gmu.edu/departments/ICAR>

George Mason University

Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (MS 4D3)
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

Return if not deliverable

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Fairfax, VA
Permit No. 1532



ICAR

Institute for Conflict Analysis
and Resolution