

2-9-2017

An Examination of John Burton's Method of Conflict Resolution and Its Applicability to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

John Kenneth Steinmeyer

University of South Florida, jkseeker@tampabay.rr.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [International Relations Commons](#), and the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Steinmeyer, John Kenneth, "An Examination of John Burton's Method of Conflict Resolution and Its Applicability to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict" (2017). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/6666>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

An Examination of John Burton's Method of Conflict Resolution and Its Applicability to the
Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

by

John K. Steinmeyer

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Department of Philosophy
with a concentration in Social and Political Thought
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Earl Conteh-Morgan, Ph.D.
Abdelwahab Hechiche, Ph.D.
Joseph Vandello, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 7, 2017

Keywords: human needs, intractable conflict, Herbert Kelman, problem-solving workshops

Copyright © 2017, John K. Steinmeyer

DEDICATION

This thesis and the work that went into it are dedicated to all students, that they may seek the knowledge and insight that comes with the study of basic human needs and conflict resolution. They will be the leaders of tomorrow and we will look to them to bring equality and peace to the world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Professor Earl Conteh-Morgan for offering to help me finish this process after several misdirected attempts, and for helping me stay on-point.

I also wish to thank Professors Abdelwahab Hechiche and Joseph Vandello for their kind scrutiny and suggestions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Burton's Early Attempts to Analyze International Conflict	3
Introduction to Burton.....	3
Early Research Program	5
Invitations	5
Secrecy	6
Choice of Participants.....	7
Discussion Process.....	8
Perceptions	9
Analysis.....	9
Controlled Communication.....	10
Role of the Third-Party Panel	11
Communication to Principals.....	13
Second Group.....	14
Results of the Program.....	15
Improved Communication	15
Testing of Method Inconclusive	16
Other Burton Observations	17
Internal Disunity	17
Reasons Given for Not Participating	17
Summary	19
From Controlled Communication to Conflict Resolution	19
Introduction.....	19
Traditional Views of Conflict	20
Prevailing Views and the Nature of Man.....	20
Deep-Rooted Conflict	21
The New Paradigm of Conflict.....	22
Human Needs Theory and Conflict	22
Introduction.....	22
Modern Contributions.....	23
Maslow.....	23
Sites.....	26
Justifying Human Needs Theory	28
Human Needs and Conflict Resolution.....	29
Distinguishing Between Needs, Values, and Interests.....	30
The Problem-Solving Process.....	31

The Social Good	32
Valued Relationships	32
Goals of Society	33
Summary	34
Kelman's Contributions to Problem-Solving Workshops	34
Introduction to Kelman	34
Kelman's Workshops	37
Summary	48
Bar-Tal's Theory of Intractable Conflict	49
Components	49
Human Needs	49
Characteristics	50
Vested Interests	51
Fear	51
Major Information	52
Positive Factors	52
Ending the Conflict	53
Summary	53
Outsider Recommendations for Resolution	54
 CHAPTER THREE: DISCUSSION	 56
Outsider Recommendations	56
Insider Recommendations	57
The Value of the Burton Method	59
Kelman's Work	60
Conclusion	61
Further Thoughts	62
Intra-Party Conflict and Use of the Method	62
Hamas and Fatah	63
Israeli Extremists	64
Top Israeli and Palestinian Leaders	64
Israeli Cabinet and Creators of Geneva Initiative	66
Human Needs	67
Some Available Resources	69
Hope for the Future	70
Summary of Points	71
 REFERENCES	 73

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the interactive problem-solving workshops created by political scientist John Burton and applied to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by social psychologist Herbert Kelman, while not, as yet, resulting in a just and permanent peace agreement, are effective in resolving intractable conflict, and, if persistently used, can significantly help to produce such an agreement. This is done by closely examining two books of Burton and a series of articles by Kelman to describe their process; the characteristics of intractable conflict are also reviewed from the work of social psychologist Daniel Bar-Tal. It is then argued that the psychological elements of intractable conflict and the satisfaction of basic human needs are addressed in the interactive problem-solving workshops, exactly what is needed in intractable conflict. It is also suggested that the many outsider recommendations for the resolution of this conflict will not work because they do nothing to address the psychological elements.

Recommendations are made to use the workshops to resolve disputes between the Hamas and Fatah political parties and various elements on the Israel side of the conflict; the top leaders of both sides of the conflict are also urged to participate in a workshop.

This paper also notes that a fully completed peace agreement already exists in the form of the Geneva Initiative, assembled by Israeli and Palestinian persons exhibiting the qualities promoted by the workshops.

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

There are many conflicts in our daily lives; indeed, conflict is a necessary part of life. No two people look at all things in exactly the same way; being physically separate beings presents the possibility of seeing things differently, and having different life experiences assures different views on subjects. Conflict, therefore, is a constant companion and not in itself a bad thing; it can serve to help us understand the world better by considering other perspectives.

Like many things, conflict can be looked upon as being on a continuum. Two simple qualities of conflict might be time and complexity. In regard to time, at one extreme it can be short-lived and at the other extreme it can last for years, even decades; the latter are often labelled protracted. In regard to complexity, at one extreme it can be simple or at the other extreme it can be complicated with factors that seem irresolvable; the latter type is usually called intractable, and, by nature, is protracted as well. Our focus will be on this intractable conflict.

Bar-Tal describes intractable conflict as a term that has found some consensus among scholars in a basic form: “All of them agreed that these types of conflicts are resistant to peaceful resolution and therefore last a long time, as none of the parties involved in them can win or is willing to compromise order to reach in a peaceful settlement. They thus constitute a special type of conflict that is difficult to resolve” (Bar-Tal 2013, 36).

This form of conflict is usually also violent. Unfortunately, there exist today many such conflicts among nations and communal groups. Examples are the Kashmir conflict between India

and Pakistan (both of which possess nuclear weapons); the conflict between the Kurds and the Turks; the conflict between Chechnya and Russia; and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—all involving grievances over independence and autonomy. In the current era, we could add to the list of intractable conflict any “terrorist” conflict, such as those involving Al Qaeda or the Islamic State, because none of the adversaries seems willing to resolve it except by deadly force.

Generally, our purpose will be to explain a method with which intractable conflict may be resolved or at least moderated. We will describe the development of this method, then look into how this method has been practiced in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Since that conflict continues to resist resolution, we will decide if the method should continue to be practiced there.

Our objectives, therefore, will be: (1) to explain the conflict resolution method created by John Burton; (2) to review the results of its application to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict thus far by Herbert Kelman; and (3) to evaluate this conflict resolution method for the purpose of determining whether it is productive to continue its use in this conflict.

Our method will be to examine two major books written by Burton; examine various articles written by Kelman; and briefly review Bar-Tal’s book on intractable conflict.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

An approach to resolve deep-rooted or intractable conflicts has been created by the late Professor John Burton. It is designed as a pre-negotiation method, that is, it is to be used prior to the start of negotiations. We will begin the description of this method with some biographical information about Burton and then review the history of his development of the method.

Burton's Early Attempts to Analyze International Conflict

Introduction to Burton

Professor John Wear Burton (1915-2010) was born in Melbourne, Australia, the son of the Reverend John Wear Burton, a radical Methodist minister. He graduated in psychology from the University of Sydney in 1937, and began his career as an appointee to a junior position at Australia House in London. Later he completed his Ph.D. at the London School of Economics. He returned to Australia and worked in various governmental departments, eventually becoming departmental secretary to the Minister of Department of External Affairs. Burton represented Australia at significant international meetings, including the United Nations Charter Conference in 1945, and the Paris Peace Conference in 1946. At age 32, in 1947, he was named the youngest Secretary of the Department of External Affairs. He generated some controversy when he argued for the recognition of the Peoples Republic of China following its establishment in November, 1949. He later ran as a Labor candidate in the 1949 general election, but was defeated. He resigned from government, but in 1951, was appointed as Australian High Commissioner to

Ceylon. He resigned from this appointment to run again for the Labor party in the general election, but lost again.

Burton joined academia from 1955 to 1963 as lecturer in international relations at the Australian National University, where, in 1960, he assumed a fellowship in the Research School of Pacific Studies. During this time, he wrote his book, *Peace Theory*, which was later considered to have initiated the field of peace studies. In 1962, he obtained a grant to study conflict and its resolution in Africa and Asia by the Rockefeller Foundation.

From 1963 to 1978, he was lecturer in international relations at University College, London, during which time he wrote *International Relations: A General Theory*. Also during this period, he founded both the Centre for the Analysis of Conflict and the International Peace Research Association, and wrote two more books, *Systems, States, Diplomacy and Rules* and *Conflict and Communication*. In 1978, he moved to the University of Kent where he established another Centre for the Analysis of Conflict and served as its director from 1978 to 1982.

He then moved to the U.S., joining the University of Maryland where he founded the Conflict Resolution Project of the Center for International Development, and served as its director from 1982 to 1985. Then in 1985, he was appointed Distinguished Visiting Professor of Conflict Resolution at the Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. In 1989, he was named Distinguished Jennings Randolph Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace. Later he retired from George Mason University and returned to Australia, while maintaining a program of lecturing and writing. In 1997, he was regarded by the *Encyclopedia of Conflict Resolution* as “one of the most important scholars in the conflict resolution field today.” (http://scar.gmu.edu/Burton_career_summary.html. Accessed 12-15-16.)

Early Research Program

In 1969, while at University College London, Burton published his book, *Conflict and Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations*. He says that this book describes his findings from a research program in international and communal conflict. It will be used here to describe how Burton developed his method.

The research program arose out of a belief that then-current historical and other descriptive documents regarding conflicts could not adequately provide answers to many of the questions being asked about conflict. He believed that these questions could “be answered only by analyzing perceptions and misperceptions, interactions and features of state decision-making, which are best observed when the parties in conflict are in an interacting situation” (Burton 1969, x).

Invitations

In October 1965, Burton and his colleagues devised an experimental program to remedy the situation. Invitations were sent to three governments involved in a conflict, stating that an academic endeavor was planned in which discussions with political and social scientists would seek to define pertinent problems, and the governments were asked to participate. It was made clear that the purpose was not to settle the conflict, but to provide research data and enhance communication so as to possibly benefit all sides in areas such as “problems of race, the influence of great powers, consequences of underdevelopment,” and other such areas (Burton 1969, 4).

The invitation stirred enough curiosity that all three governments accepted. In December 1965, the governments’ representatives met with a Burton-established panel of scholars in London. Burton says “The government nominees were senior officials attached to London

diplomatic missions and other persons nominated by responsible Ministers” (Burton 1969, 4). The panel of scholars acted as a third party to facilitate discussion. In preparation for the conference, the scholars had visited the countries involved, studied their problems, and prepared a set of propositions and hypotheses that were related to current relevant social theories. It was hoped that discussions would help to test the validity of these hypotheses and propositions about the nature of conflict: “The scholars included two political scientists professionally engaged in the study of international relations, three social psychologists, two industrial relations specialists, an international lawyer, a regional historian, and a chairman with long experience in the conduct of small meetings” (Burton 1969, 5).

Secrecy

A rule was established to hold the discussions in secret. Nothing was made public at the time. Burton does not identify the governments or their nominees because of this rule. (Later publications identified them as Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore.) The purpose of this rule was to prevent media or other public pressure on the governments and any speculation or rumor as to what the governments might concede in the conflict. But, as Burton says, even if the fact of the discussions were discovered, “no great damage could be done since governments were merely cooperating in an academic exercise” (Burton 1969, 57).

In addition, no recordings of these discussions were officially kept presumably to avoid leaks. All participants could take notes; the scholars needed them to assist in their theoretical work, and the participants needed them to report back to their political superiors (Burton 1969, 231-232).

Choice of Participants

It was expected that the participants would be fully knowledgeable about the views of their political leaders and could fully defend them. Other key qualities desired among participants were their ability to analyze a situation and possess an attitude of flexibility. Flexibility, says Burton, was desired because it is not usually found in political leaders, so they were not chosen to participate at this point: “Politicians who have personally declared their positions, and whose reactions and perceptions are being analyzed, would tend to be rigid and to act defensively” (Burton 1969, 42).

Participants could, however, be lower-level officials who did not have major policy-making power but had access to those who did. Participants could also be academics who were well-versed in their government’s policies and stances on the issues. While they were expected to be open-minded, they were not to be seen as easily swayed; if so, they would not be effective in conveying ideas to major decision-makers (Burton 1969, 43).

Surprisingly, Burton says that even extremists were welcome, seemingly contradicting his desire for flexibility. He says that “persons are required who tend ... to be committed to more extreme attitudes. An official or person who does not identify emotionally with the values of the party he represents is not helpful: the underlying issues are not brought to the surface by an apologist, or by a disinterested person” (Burton 1969, 43). Presumably, he hoped to change attitudes so that “an atmosphere can be produced, by various means of control ..., that enables participants to treat the conflict, not as a contest, but as a problem to be solved” (Burton 1969, 42).

Discussion Process

Even though this process was a pre-negotiation process, there was the expected amount of tension when the parties first faced each other. But the academic atmosphere helped to ease it somewhat, and the parties had agreed to sit together to analyze a problem. To ease the tension, an introductory exposition was given by a third-party panel member about the nature of the planned discussion and the ways in which social science had developed theories regarding conflict (Burton 1969, 66, 71).

After this, the parties were invited to describe the conflict as they saw it, wholly uninhibited by diplomatic or other conventions, as is possible in an academic setting. Official presentations by each side followed, with the expected accusations and counter-accusations. Very little of this provided new information. After these expositions were complete, which usually took at least the first day, questions were asked by panel members and by the parties (Burton, 1969, 68). The control of the discussion was accomplished by interventions of members of the third-party panel. Eventually there emerged “a highly sophisticated seminar discussion as might take place among experienced staff members of an interdisciplinary university department” (Burton 1969, 67).

During discussions, it was observed that certain things were happening: participants “became less tied to formal positions, admissions were made that motivations were mixed, fears not usually expressed were explained and reasons given for them, and generally the background conditions of conflict, internal and external, came to be revealed” (Burton 1969, 6). After a while Burton says that the “fact of the conflict receded into the background as the problem to be solved was more clearly defined. Alternative means of attaining the same objectives without the costs of conflict and by various means of cooperation were finally discussed” (Burton 1969, 7).

Perceptions

In this environment, the modification of perceptions obviously plays a large role. The discussion focused on perceptions and how they can be faulty. Perceptions are important because they lead to judgements and judgments lead to attitudes and attitudes lead to further perceptions: “Parties ... have usually experienced many years of conflict and their selections from past history and their moral judgments justify, confirm and reinforce their attitudes” (Burton 1969, 73). Unless an observer understands the background of a phenomenon, judgments can be faulty. An example given by Burton is that: “Most people can make no sense of the policies, attitudes and responses of a foreign state, but once knowledge is available patterns emerge” (Burton 1969, 74). Participants were made aware that, in this regard, “all evidence must be tested by some means to ensure that it is being correctly interpreted” (Burton 1969, 83).

Analysis

In addition to the focus on perceptions, analysis of conflict is a major element in the process. It is stressed to counter the parties’ expectancy that they are required to bargain and negotiate: “Parties to conflict are so accustomed . . . to a negotiating framework, that they act on the assumption that in their discussions, one side will gain and another will lose. To control this, it is useful to stress that analysis is not concerned with examining the merits of alternative solutions. A resolution of conflict may be suggested as the result of analysis; but it is far more likely that altered perceptions and attitudes will lead to solutions quite different from those contemplated by any party.” An outcome is possible that both sides accept: “On the contrary, controlled communication ... assumes that analysis will reveal, after perceptions are corrected, that neither side may be required to compromise, and that solutions will be found by which all gain” (Burton 1969, 70).

In this process, then, the parties begin to see that perceptions affect conflict, and analysis not only helps to understand why something happened, but aids in discussion of what can be done (Burton 1969, 72). Analysis also helps the parties to estimate the costs of their actions in the economic and political aspects, which can be significant. All this helps to turn the discussion away from a contest of one against the other to a common problem needing solution. This is the process of what Burton calls controlled communication.

Controlled Communication

Burton describes controlled communication as “a technique by which political and social scientists exercised control of discussions between representatives of nations and states that were involved in conflict.” The key hypothesis of the technique is that “the conflict behavior of communities and states comprises alterable components such as perception of external conditions, selection of goals from many possible values, choice of different means of attaining goals, and assessments of values and means in relation to assessments of costs of conflict” (Burton 1969, ix).

The parties come to the discussion conditioned to a mindset complete with ideologies, attitudes, and positions. Burton says that certain psychological methods are needed to change those mindsets. This is the core of the controlled communication process. It is akin to the work of a social worker: “The strategies of control seem to be those of the clinical psychoanalyst, the caseworker, the industrial psychologist and the family counsellor.... The client is usually maladjusted in some way. It might seem a far cry from casework to resolution of conflict between states; states are not maladjusted individuals, and the representatives of states are invariably intelligent, aware and highly informed persons. Yet the experience of casework, and the ‘supportive’ approach of the caseworker, are most relevant ...” (Burton 1969, 68).

Techniques that work with individuals can also work with groups in keeping focus on the issues. These include those that are “used for lessening tension in the interviewee; for bringing or keeping the interviewee to the main issue; for helping the interviewee to make difficult admissions; for breaking defense mechanisms; for influencing the judgment of the interviewee.” The proper techniques used skillfully can broaden the minds of the participants: “Clarifications, the promotion of insights into the position of each party by the other, correction of perceptions, explanations of international processes of interaction, all require the techniques, skills and experience of the caseworker” (Burton 1969, 69).

The process, therefore, requires some psychological knowledge: “Psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, group therapy and resolution of conflict ... all have much in common; they all involve professional relationships, and invite the same kinds of professional behavioral patterns” (Burton 1969, 69).

With all the psychology involved here, the inclusion of psychologists on the third-party panel is a practical necessity.

Role of the Third-Party Panel

In the traditional practice of peace settlement, the third party, usually a mediator, can help clear up misunderstandings, reduce emotional levels, balance somewhat any power imbalances, and encourage alternative viewpoints for consideration (Burton 1969, 61). These are all important functions of the mediator. But in Burton’s method, the role of the third-party panel is somewhat different: “The third party ... is there to explain conflict, its origins, its escalation, sometimes by reference to other conflicts, sometimes by analytical means, but within the context of a continuing discussion between the parties” (Burton 1969, 61-62).

The difference between traditional third-party roles and that of Burton's arises out of a difference in objective. While traditional methods seek compromise and settlement, the third-party panel "endeavors to establish a condition in which the parties see their relationships as posing a problem to be solved." The objective is not to place blame: "Both sides are assumed to have been acting in ways which appear to them ... to be in their best interests. Neither is more right nor wrong than the other." The focus is on the problem, not the personalities: "Even if an aggressive initiative has been wholly with one side, even if there appears to have been a blatant case of unprovoked aggression, there is still a problem: the apparent aggression was stimulated by some circumstances ... The role of the third party [panel] is to establish a condition in which all parties join with it in defining, identifying and solving the problem" (Burton 1969, 62).

Members of the third-party panel bring their knowledge and experience to the service of the protagonists; they "have worked in the fields of conflict, including the related areas of decision-making, perception, deterrence, escalation, functionalism, and the very many other aspects that are now the subject of empirical research" (Burton 1969, 63). Their expertise is used to help the sides understand that their situation is not unique and to understand also that their behaviors result from conflict. This helps "in making the exercise a problem-solving one rather than a contest" (Burton 1969, 71).

The third-party panel refrains from making moral or other kinds of judgments, making it clear at the beginning that: "contemporary social science has moved away from the normative approaches of religion and law, in which behavior is designated as right or wrong ...; analysis of conflict is analysis of behavioral responses to circumstances, of possible alternative responses, of possible false perceptions, and the behavior of the parties is not being judged at any stage" (Burton 1969, 69-70).

Ultimately, it is not the third-party panel but the participants who originate the resolution; it cannot come from outsiders: “There are psychological reasons why resolution of a conflict must come from the parties themselves ...” It is only they, Burton says, who “can point to the relevant issues as they perceive them: the conflict is at least in part a perceived relationship, and only the parties can describe and explain some aspects of it” (Burton 1969, 63).

Communication to Principals

Any criticism of the process that says that the participants, not being top decision-makers, will not possess the sense of responsibility that elected top officials have is mitigated by the requirement of sending periodic reports back to superiors. The superiors will, obviously, evaluate the validity of any ideas and suggestions generated. So the process levies a heavy obligation on the participants. This is to convey ideas, concepts, values, and re-perceptions to their superiors. And in the end, the representative “is required to transmit a revised attitude, to point out sources of misperception, and evidence of irrelevant response to persons who have not had his experience of direct communication” (Burton 1969, 45). The representative must possess the ability to convince his principals to accept and internalize these changes.

Burton admits that this might not always happen: “The altered perception of the person around the table cannot always be conveyed to others who have not had the experience of the discussions. In these circumstances the exercise may have to be performed again in ways which involve the final decision-makers” (Burton 1969, 232). This statement points out a possibility that may be appropriate in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—to be discussed below.

Finally, there are two conveyances that need to occur. The first is that between representative and decision-maker. The second is between decision-maker and the people. Burton says that the second requires different strategies because it “raises problems of leadership

and the use of mass media” (Burton 1969, 214). Convincing the people to support great changes might not be possible, but getting them to consider and accept incremental changes might be easier, as well as considering objectives and goals not previously discussed (Burton 1969, 215).

In line with these statements, Burton then makes a somewhat contradictory announcement: “Controlled communication, because it sets out to help to discover possible new directions, does not necessarily require that the perception and value changes that take place among people around the table must also take place within the governments and communities in conflict” (Burton 1969, 215). He seems to be saying that it is sufficient for the top leadership to incorporate new ideas and implement them. Otherwise, the reader is led to believe that Burton is satisfied with the planting of the seeds in the protagonists in the hope that they will bear fruit through time. This result, it seems, is dependent upon the partisan political control of the communities involved. If opponents to this process of transformation prevail, the length of time for the seeds to bear fruit could be much longer.

Second Group

The program was tried again in 1966, when two parties involved in an internal communal conflict that had gained international concern were invited to participate. Each representative was nominated by the leaders of a party involved in the conflict. Again, Burton does not mention the parties to the conflict, but it was later revealed that it was the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Burton (1969, 8) does mention three scholars who participated on the panel, one of whom was Professor Herbert C. Kelman, social psychologist then at the University of Michigan (later at Harvard). Kelman subsequently worked to bring the program into the Middle East and to the Arab-Israeli conflict. This will be discussed below.

Burton relates that in this second conference, even though the level of hostility was higher than in the first, the general course of discussion was similar. He says that it was helpful that the general knowledge of the third-party panel of scholars was greater than in the first meeting. Still, it took almost 24 hours to establish control of communication (Burton 1969, 11).

During this session, Burton (1969, 11) observes: “Misperceptions, false interpretations of official statements, prejudice between national groups, unrealistic expectations about the policies of other states, and many other such relevant causes of misunderstanding and inaccurate calculation were revealed.” He says that it was necessary and “possible to bring to bear with greater effect than in the previous exercise research findings on conflict, conflict escalation and conflict resolution.”

Results of the Program

Improved Communication

With the parties actively involved in the process of analyzing the conflict, knowledge was gained that suggested the means for resolving it in ways that represented a departure from traditional practices. Burton says that “the experience suggested that an important technique might have been evolved, as it were by accident, for the avoidance of conflict, and for the resolution of conflict even during violence, because the parties themselves seemed to gain ... in some ways not possible from more traditional procedures of conciliation, arbitration and negotiation. Thus, the method came to have a second objective—the resolution of conflict” (Burton 1969, x-xi).

One of the most important lessons that Burton says was learned during this pilot project was that “in analysis and in resolution of conflict it was communication between the parties that was instructive and effective. The [panel of] scholars had an important role in injecting new

information, and in other ways helping the parties to stand back from their conflict so as to see it as a problem to be solved; but it was the controlled communication of the parties that was valuable” (Burton, 1969, 7). Burton, therefore, calls this process “controlled communication” because of the importance of that element of the process.

Testing of Method Inconclusive

Burton seems to back off when it comes time to assess whether his hypotheses were confirmed and whether any success was achieved in the actual resolution of conflict. But at the time of publication, 1969, the experiment was very new and he says that further practice was needed before any conclusions could be made (Burton 1969, 216-217).

Burton is honest enough to admit that the validity of his method is put into doubt when he cannot point to cases where conflict was resolved among the parties involved in his experiment. However, it does seem plausible when he claims that change did occur: “All that can be said is that communication was established where previously it did not exist, perception and attitudes of participants altered during the exercise, and events followed, some of which could have been directly or indirectly related, but which could have been due no less to many other influences that were operating on the parties simultaneously” (Burton 1969, 216-217). To confirm validity, therefore, would mean controlling for a variety of factors requiring extensive follow-up.

Burton suggests a high probability of success because of results in other fields that have used similar techniques, such as education, social work, and industrial relations. He states that “what is being studied are the consequences of learning by the parties themselves” (Burton 1969, 225). With an environment created to produce learning, it seems plausible that among intelligent participants, learning did occur.

Other Burton Observations

After arranging and operating these conferences, Burton could make some observations about the parties involved, and he shared some of them.

Internal Disunity

One of the points that Burton shares from these discussions is that it is common to have a division within each side on how the conflict should be resolved. No assumption, therefore, should be made that the parties are a monolithic whole in their goals, values, or strategy. Naturally, when violence starts and there is a threat to the group, the factions will come together to face the threat. But usually states are not unified internally. In fact, some governments express interests that do not represent the majority of their citizens, and thus lose what he calls “sociological legitimacy” as compared to legal legitimacy. Internal disunity can even result in escalation of conflict combined with attempts to blame the enemy for internal economic or political problems (Burton 1969, 20). One of the benefits of controlled communication, Burton says, is that, since it is a face-to-face discussion, it forces parties to clarify their own thinking and solve their own problems before there can be intra-party agreement (Burton 1969, 23).

Reasons Given for Not Participating

Some governments chose not to participate in Burton’s program for a variety of reasons. One such reason was what Burton calls a “constitutional” reason given for not participating. This relates to the political recognition of the other party, and usually involves communities rather than states. Insisting on legally legitimized status while ignoring “sociologically legitimized” status prevents communication. The real problem, he says, is not constitutional but relational. In controlled communications, the constitutional status of parties is irrelevant: “The parties to

communication must be those who are in fact in conflict, and it is not always or even mostly that these are governments” (Burton 1969, 124).

In some conflicts where larger states had intervened, there was a reluctance on the part of the states to give a reason for not participating. Burton surmises that his process “provides for a searching analysis of motivations and interests, and the intervention of foreign states in a local conflict cannot readily be justified in terms usually employed in official public statements” (Burton 1969, 122).

Another pertinent reason was that “practitioners in powerful states have difficulty in believing that their knowledge and perceptions might be faulty, or that their conflicts are not wholly due to the behavior of the less responsible smaller powers” (Burton 1969, 121). A simple case of egoism it appears.

Closely associated and a more common reason for not participating was the “resistance of professionals and traditionalists who take the view that matters of international politics are of no concern to anyone except the states involved. Traditional attitudes act as a resistance to cooperation with the United Nations, and they provide an even greater resistance to interventions by unofficial third parties” (Burton 1969, 121).

This last type of resistance is especially seen in regard to negotiations. Burton observes that the traditional means of peaceful settlement of conflict fall short when dealing with international conflict. States are not willing to concede settlement power to third parties such as international agencies or judicial authorities because they “remove the ultimate power of decision from states, and . . . this is usually unacceptable to states. Not only is the power of decision removed; it is transferred to an authority whose responses cannot reliably be forecast

and whose guide-lines are far from clear ...” (Burton 1969, 150-151). The Israeli-Palestinian conflict presents a good example of this.

Summary

In this book, Burton describes how his experiment in international relations led to developing a method of helping to resolve intractable conflicts. Representatives of governments involved in conflict were brought together under the guidance of an expert third-party panel, which used factual information, knowledge of conflict, and controlled communication to lead the participants into examining their perceptions, analyzing their conflict, and in the process changing attitudes, so that together they generated ideas toward resolution. In this pre-negotiation process, the representatives conveyed what they learned to their political leaders, who would then engage in detailed negotiations. This process of bringing together representatives from both sides who are not official negotiators became known as the “Track Two” process. The Track One process is one used between diplomats and other officials.

From Controlled Communication to Conflict Resolution

Introduction

In his book, *Conflict: Resolution and Provention*, published in 1990, Burton modifies his approach. While controlled communication is still emphasized with its objectives of changing erroneous perceptions, analyzing the conflict, and costing the conflict, Burton now refers to the process as “conflict resolution.” He still focuses on the problem-solving aspect, and the third-party panel is still critical. What is new to the method is his addition of a theory of human needs that not only provides a guide to the problem-solving process, but also acts as an overall standard to pursue in all intractable conflict resolution processes. It also helps to eliminate the danger of an agreement that is not sociologically legitimate.

The two major concerns are the same: the first is to explain conflict, and the second is to find a way to resolve it. He differentiates between what might be called ordinary, day-to-day conflict and deep-rooted intractable conflict. Resolving the latter type of conflict is quite different from that of the former (Burton 1990, 2).

The theory of human needs comes as the result of Burton's integration of the works of psychologist Abraham Maslow and sociologist Paul Sites. Burton calls the result a unified theory of human behavior that he applies to intractable conflict. He works to justify the validity and importance of this theory to counter any criticism that it might be seen as promoting a certain value judgment. Finally, to benefit from the insights learned from the practice of conflict resolution, Burton suggests a new process which he calls "provention," which he describes as "the promotion of an environment conducive to harmonious relationships" (Burton 1990, 2).

Traditional Views of Conflict

Prevailing Views and the Nature of Man

Burton says that the traditional and prevailing view of conflict is that it can be deterred or contained "provided sufficient coercion is employed" (Burton 1990, 13). Underlying this view is the concept of traditional power theorists that human behavior is motivated mainly by material benefits, and the source of conflict is competition for scarce resources (Burton 1990, 46).

Just as there is the theoretical construct of the "economic man" to fit the requirements of an economic theory, there is also a political-social-psychological construct to fit the political system. It envisions a person who is aggressive by nature or as a consequence of his desire to compete for and acquire scarce resources. This construct deals with evil, sin, and maladjusted personalities; the evil person justifies the use of authoritative power—from the parent to the

state—assuming that only power can control inherently anti-social human behaviors (Burton 1990, 30-31).

This traditional view includes the notion that socialization should be used to control individuals. The individual is expected to adjust to society and his “betters.” He exists to serve society, and society has no obligations to serve in the development of the individual. This traditional view treats all types of conflict similarly (Burton 1990, 31-32).

Deep-Rooted Conflict

However, many serious conflicts are not amenable to this approach. In serious types of conflicts, there are present some concerns and frustrations that are not easily negotiated away, adjudicated by the courts, or repressed through the use of power. If power is used to contain this kind of conflict, it can provoke future conflict (Burton 1990, 13-14).

This is deep-rooted conflict that includes cases “that arise out of demands on individuals to make certain adjustments in behavior that are unacceptable [to the individuals], and probably beyond human tolerance and capabilities ...” (Burton 1990, 15). Symptoms of such deep-rooted conflict are terrorism, hostage-taking, ethnic violence, gang warfare, public protest movements, and “other forms of intractable opposition to authorities at one social level or another” (Burton 1990, 15). These cases “require an analysis of the total situation and an appropriate remedy, rather than merely the containment of dissident behaviors.” They may even “require alterations in norms, institutions and policies to bring adjustment within the range of human acceptability and capability” (Burton 1990, 15). It is these types of cases for which, Burton says, conflict resolution is designed.

The New Paradigm of Conflict

In the study of conflict, “the main problem area is the finding of an adequate explanation of conflict from which to deduce remedies, and by which to avoid policies that could lead to dysfunctional outcomes ...” The traditional means of settling disputes and conflicts “attaches importance to the preservation of institutions, to the socialization of the individual into certain behaviors, to the role of power in relationships, and to the application of elite norms” (Burton 1990, 27).

Burton’s theory of conflict provides a stark contrast: “Conflict resolution ... processes are not pragmatic responses to situations, but are deduced from a generic theory of conflict.” They are based upon a different view of the nature of man and are “found in theories of behavior that were developed in response to empirical evidence of crucial failures in public policies ... The issue at stake is which or what theoretical framework is valid” (Burton 1990, 27).

Human Needs Theory and Conflict

Introduction

Burton says that recent insights from different disciplines and practical experience have conflated to where we can see the beginning of a ‘theory of human behavior that argues that the human being, ... has certain needs that are basic, that are not malleable, that must be satisfied if there is to be individual development leading to conforming behavior’ (Burton 1990, 33). These human needs are such that, if the socialization process is not compatible with them, frustrations will result, leading to anti-social behaviors. “Parents, teachers, societies ... have probably never fully appreciated that there are human needs more compelling ... than any possible external influences, and that these are easily frustrated by environments, sometimes seemingly caring family and social environments, that deny opportunities for development.” Even authority and

raw power are not enough to overcome these internal forces. “Deterrence theory, the basis of domestic enforcement and international strategic policies, is undermined because deterrence cannot deter in conditions in which human needs are frustrated” (Burton 1990, 33-34).

Human needs theory is not new to psychology. Deckers relates that needs were recognized early in the life of the science and seen as related to drives: “Whereas drive was often viewed as the result of deprivation of some incentive, need was considered to be an inherent characteristic of humans.” He mentions the work of Georges Le Roy (1764), who postulated “the existence of the need for food, clothing, shelter, love, external stimulation, and rest.” Later, psychologist Henry Murray (1938) “formalized the study of needs and concluded that they are a major source of human motivation.” Besides the “primary needs, or viscerogenic needs,” there are secondary needs, or “psychogenic needs, [which] are concerned with mental or emotional satisfaction and depend on or are derived from primary needs.” These needs will produce organic effects: “Once instigated, a need will persist as an electrical chemical process in the brain, which corresponds to a feeling of desire.... Needs can be evoked by an internal physiological process but also by environmental demands, which are either to be approached or avoided. To illustrate: a person’s need for affiliation is brought on by the presence of other people and causes him to seek out individuals to be with” (Deckers 2010, 33).

Modern Contributions

Maslow

This early work in the theory of human needs was extended by psychologist Abraham Maslow (1908-1970) who theorized a hierarchy of human needs. Burton credits the work of Maslow and sociologist Paul Sites for their seminal work: “The emergence of such studies of

human behavior that cut across separate disciplines was a prerequisite to the development of conflict resolution” (Burton 1990, 102).

Maslow postulated five broad categories of basic needs, which he says are part of human nature and could be universal to mankind. Most fundamental and of the highest priority are the physiological needs consisting of food, water, shelter, and those needs without which a human could not physically survive. These needs are the highest in priority in human motivation. When a man is starving, for example, all his attention and capabilities are focused on finding food (Maslow 1987, 17).

Once these needs are reasonably satisfied, new needs emerge in the form of safety needs. These include “security; stability; dependency; protection; freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos; need for structure, order, law, and limits; strength in the protector; and so on” (Maslow 1987, 18). To see examples of these need deprivations in real life, “we must turn to neurotic or near-neurotic individuals, and to the economic and social underdogs, or else to social chaos, revolution, or breakdown of authority” (Maslow 1987, 18). When safety needs are thwarted, “A common, almost an expectable reaction, is the easier acceptance of dictatorship or of military rule” (Maslow 1987, 19).

Once the physiological and safety needs are reasonably satisfied, a category of needs emerges having to do with love, affection, and belongingness. If these needs are unsatisfied, “a person will feel keenly the absence of friends, mate, or children... Now the pangs of loneliness, ostracism, rejection, friendlessness, and rootlessness are preeminent.” Maslow advises that: “Any good society must satisfy this need, one way or another, if it is to survive and be healthy” (Maslow 1987, 20). He also observes: “In our society the thwarting of these needs is the most

commonly found core in cases of maladjustment and more severe pathology” (Maslow 1987, 21).

The next set of needs to emerge after prior needs are satisfied are the esteem needs. These are expressed in individuals as a “desire for a stable, firmly based, usually high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others.” Again, Maslow warns that the “thwarting of these needs produces feelings of inferiority, of weakness, and of helplessness. These feelings in turn give rise to either basic discouragement or else compensatory or neurotic needs” (Maslow 1987, 21).

If all prior needs are satisfied, the last of the emerging category of needs are the so-called self-actualization needs. These needs focus on what the individual should be doing, “what *he* or *she*, individually, is fitted for. Musicians must make music, artists must paint, poets must write if they are to be ultimately at peace with themselves. What humans *can* be, they *must* be.” This is the level where individual differences are greatest, because satisfaction will vary from person to person (Maslow 1987, 22).

In addition to these basic human needs, Maslow sees certain preconditions that must be present for needs to be satisfied. These preconditions include “freedom to speak, freedom to do what one wishes as long as no harm is done to others, freedom to express oneself, freedom to investigate and seek for information, freedom to defend oneself, justice, fairness, honesty, and orderliness in the group ...” Maslow also notes their importance: “Danger to these freedoms is reacted to with emergency response as if there were direct danger to the basic needs themselves” (Maslow 1987, 22-23).

Maslow emphasizes the danger of denying basic human needs: “Thwarting of unimportant desires produces no psychopathological results; thwarting of basic important needs

does produce such results.... A conflict or a frustration is not necessarily pathogenic. It becomes so only when it threatens or thwarts the basic needs or partial needs that are closely related to the basic needs” (Maslow 1987, 30).

It might be noted that while Burton refers to the concept of human needs as a theory of human behavior, Maslow saw the theory of human needs as a theory of human motivation, which he regarded as one aspect of human behavior. Burton could presumably agree that human needs were but one aspect of human behavior, but they were, by far, the most significant.

Sites

Burton also incorporates the work of sociologist Paul Sites (1926-2010), whose pertinent ideas are found in his book, *Control: The Basis of Social Order*. He finds that Sites’ work parallels that of Maslow in that it argues that “given the opportunity, an individual will attempt, against all odds, to be in control in matters of human importance” (Burton 1990, 92).

Sites proposes eight needs in the individual: the needs for response, security, recognition, stimulation, distributive justice, meaning, to be seen as rational, and a need to control (Sites 1973, 43). Burton says that his initial proposition argues that the concept of self power is indispensable: “if individuals and groups attempt to control their environment, there must be a reason.” That reason, he says, “is to obtain gratification of needs, including the need for survival.” These needs are “universal and genetically inherent in the individual. They are ontological” (Burton 1990, 96).

Sites also reinforces what Maslow says when needs are not met: “the individual who is exposed to a high degree of inconsistency in response may develop schizophrenia. Other forms of psychosis can many times be traced to the early socialization process filled with inconsistency. These ‘illnesses’ may occur in any situation where the individual is not able to

control the situation from what he sees as a rational, i.e., means-ends consistency, point of view” (Sites 1973, 42).

The needs of the individual are carried forward to the group: “If we can assume that members of a group are concerned with such things as group survival and goal attainment over time, there should be little disagreement concerning the necessity of the group’s controlling or at least attempting to control the conditions which make these things possible. This being the case, the necessity of a control orientation on the part of a group becomes self-evident” (Sites 1973, 72).

In controlling their situation, groups will relate to other groups depending upon their various control orientations. “In one situation the most workable control orientation for one group might be cooperation with another group . . . , while in another situation the most workable control orientation might be the attempted destruction of another group or perhaps the co-option of some of the leaders or members of other groups” (Sites 1973, 72). In control theory, then, groups with a culture or history of violence may resort to it when problems are not initially solved; as Sites suggests: “war can best be understood within the framework of control theory, since war, by definition, is an attempt by one society to exert control over another society through the use of raw force” (Sites 1973, 166).

In summarizing the work of Sites, Burton says: “The insight that control theory provides is that external constraints, decisions taken by others, are not effective in controlling behaviors when human needs are denied” (Burton 1990, 92). He adds that recognition of the importance of human needs is inferred in the work of others: “Many scholars who did not adopt a needs approach consciously, yet rested on it by implication.” For example, in 1970, T. R. Gurr published a popular book with the title *Why Men Rebel*. Burton says Gurr “was referring to all

people, at all times, in all societies, with a strong implication that there are some basic human needs to be fulfilled” (Burton 1990, 94).

Justifying Human Needs Theory

Burton sees an alignment between social science and the physical sciences in searching for hidden reasons for things: “Behavioral science is, in these circumstances, no different from natural science. Both have universality, both are governed by empirically observable patterns of behavior, both require at some level of analysis hypotheses concerning the unobservable reasons for overt behavior, and these require experiment and testing” (Burton 1990, 94).

The way that non-observable behavior and needs must be specified is deductive. For example, “if learning and social development require consistency in response, security, identity, and recognition, and if human behavior is characterized by learning and social development, then humans pursue consistency in response, security, identity, and recognition as a condition of their learning process” (Burton 1990, 95). It is reasonable to argue that organisms have a genetic drive to learn, for their existence depends upon it. These learning needs must be fulfilled: “If recognition, identity of self, and some measure of control over the environment are human needs, then the absence of their fulfillment will lead to adaptations that restrict development and perhaps create abnormalities in behavior or lead to anti-social behaviors” (Burton 1990, 95).

The force of these needs, reinforced by anthropological and other studies, is many times stronger than the influence of outside forces: “The individual’s most fundamental drive is to attempt to control his environment in order to meet his needs.” If needs cannot be met by being honest, the individual tries something else. Sites’ control theory, Burton says, can be called needs theory because control theory “demonstrates how aggression can be created by circumstances,

thus pointing to the long-term costs and consequences of needs deprivation” (Burton 1990, 96-97).

Deprivation frequently leads to overreaction. “A person (or a communal group), deprived of rewarding relationships, recognition, or security and identity over long periods, will tend to have a chip on their shoulder, to perceive injustice and deprivation and to be aggressive even in circumstances that do not require it.” This condition creates a certain inclination: “Totalitarian and political and social leadership roles tend to attract such individuals. Or there may develop a personal paranoia that attracts persons to intelligence services directed toward possible enemies” (Burton 1990, 97).

Burton says that the theory of human needs can yield some important insights. It explains why, for example, a minority of Catholics in Northern Ireland could not be controlled by the army, nor could the conflicts in Cyprus, Sri Lanka, the USSR, and many others. A majority government in a society divided by ethnicity may become repressive if it does not allow for the satisfaction of the identity need of the minority. The theory explains why city gangs seek recognition, valued relationships, and opportunities for development in a society that allows them to receive less opportunities than other members of society. Burton thinks that women, because of the way they have been treated historically, have a better understanding of human needs theory and the consequences of denial of need fulfillment (Burton 1990, 33).

Human Needs and Conflict Resolution

Burton’s method of conflict resolution is, therefore, inherently tied to the theory of human needs. It provides a scientifically sound basis for the building of agreements. But in resolving conflict through the process of controlled communication, where the only relevant reality is that of the participants, presumably questions can arise as to whether the conflict was

resolved justly. Burton has recognized that in many instances the protagonists do not represent the majority of their constituents. This fact suggests that the agreement, if completed without the consideration of human needs, could benefit only an elite segment of a society. This could result in an agreement that eventually causes an uprising among the majority. To preclude this from happening, the theory of human needs provides a goal for a just and permanent solution.

Distinguishing Between Needs, Values, and Interests

In putting the theory into practice, Burton says: “It is reasonable to assume that human motivations include some that are required for the development of the human species, some that are culturally specific, and some that are of a transitory nature ...” (Burton 1990, 36). To differentiate between these forms of motivation, Burton labels them respectively, needs, values, and interests.

Needs reflect universal motivations and are integral parts of the human being. Besides the biological needs of food and shelter, Maslow and Sites have argued that there are basic needs that relate to growth and development. They are seen in the unsatisfied needs of individuals and groups engaged in ethnic and identity struggles; unless satisfied, these needs will spawn behavior outside the legal norms of society (Burton 1990, 36).

Values are those acquired “ideas, habits, customs, and beliefs” that are characteristic of social communities. They spring from “linguistic, religious, class, ethnic, or other features” possessed by various cultures and identity groups. “In conditions of oppression, discrimination, under privilege, and isolation, the defense of values is important to the needs of personal security and identity,” and can be confused with needs. “Preservation of values is a reason for defensive and aggressive behaviors” (Burton 1990, 37).

In contrast, he says, “Interests refer to the occupational, social, political, and economic aspirations” of individuals and identity groups. “They typically relate to material goods or role occupancy,” and can change with circumstances. They are not an inherent part of the individual as are needs or values (Burton 1990, 38).

Interests are negotiable and can be traded for social gain. In contrast, needs and values, such as those for identity or recognition, are inherent drives and cannot be traded. Conflict involving needs and values can easily become deep-rooted conflict. For example, individuals cannot be coerced to accept majority rule that denies their ethnic or cultural identity (Burton 1990, 39).

The Problem-Solving Process

Problem solving is the core technique of the conflict resolution process, and is much like that described in his earlier book. Burton tells us that four characteristics describe its scope. First, it is an ongoing process, not an end product. It establishes a new environment where new conflicts can arise, at which point the process is then repeated. Second, it frequently requires a change in conceptualization of a problem, new techniques, and a new synthesis of knowledge. Third, it deals with the total environment in which the conflict can affect outsiders, and outsiders can affect the conflict. Fourth, it addresses sources and origins of the conflict (Burton 1990, 204).

But within the process, its substance is personal. Burton reminds us of this when he says: “Let us note that the subject matter of a conflict resolution interaction is relationships, and the fundamentals of human behavior” (Burton 1990, 206). These fundamentals of human behavior are those comprised by the theory of human needs.

The problem-solving process begins with a review of perception in general and then an analysis of each side's perceptions of the other. The third-party panel guides discussion using their subject matter expertise. The result is that "the reality as perceived by the protagonists may alter as a result of increased knowledge." After this, the parties examine their tactics and what the costs and consequences of these tactics have been and could be. The parties are then in a position to "explore alternatives that are available once re-perception and reassessment have taken place" (Burton 1990, 204).

The third-party panel's main task is to provide a "filter" to "screen out false assumptions and implications from existing knowledge, cultural and ideological orientations and personal prejudices." If the participants use this filter, "they will be able to perceive realities accurately, assess available theoretical and empirical knowledge, and arrive at reliable conclusions" (Burton 1990, 208).

Burton argues that conflict resolution processes are not unique to any culture. There is a universal "human culture that favors reasoned attempts to contend with problems" (Burton 1990, 206). Problem-solving processes involve the use of the abilities of analysis and thought common to the human species, and are thus cross-cultural (Burton 1990, 211).

Burton says that this new paradigm brings with it a new challenge—to substitute analysis and problem solving for authoritative decision making and coercion at all social levels (Burton 1990, 118).

The Social Good

Valued Relationships

Burton says that his theory of conflict "argues that included in human needs is a particular need for valued relationships. This acts as a self-restraining influence on human

behavior. In the absence of valued relationships, there are no self-imposed restraints.” The effective approach for a society, therefore, is to “provide those conditions that generate valued relationships and ... self-imposed controls” (Burton 1990, 154).

Besides the self-control that valued relations enhance, they are a “satisfier of recognition and identity needs. The causes or sources of conflict between individuals and groups cannot be separated from the totality of relationships and the environmental conditions that promote relationships” (Burton 1990, 47). One might also argue that they are satisfiers of the affection need, since relationships are the core of friendship and intimacy. The problem, Burton says, is “institutional and social circumstances can deprive many people of them” (Burton 1990, 47).

Burton is saying, therefore, that valued relationships could help prevent serious conflicts.

Goals of Society

Burton suggests that we ask some important questions about our society, such as: “What are the ultimate goals of society, of civilizations, of people that must be reflected in any decisions taken in respect to a particular situation?” Questions like these will ultimately lead to questions about our own nature: “Are we able to get down to some fundamental assumptions regarding the nature of the human being, such as those implied in needs theory?” (Burton 1990, 199). Ultimately, the satisfaction of human needs provides the criteria by which to assess the quality not only of conflict resolution but also public policy. Burton helps us to understand that “there are objectively determined guides to policy, bases on which goals and policies can be assessed and predictions made as to success or self-defeating consequences” (Burton 1990, 97). This process of assessment and prediction is what Burton terms “provention.”

The human needs framework, therefore, provides us with criteria for the common good: The full satisfaction of basic human needs leads to the development of the individual, and this *is*

the common good (Burton 1990, 157). Individuals who live in an environment that aids in the development of their potential do not need to engage in deadly conflict.

Summary

In this second book, it appears that Burton's work in controlled communication showed him that while agreements could result using that approach, a long-lasting resolution would require a focus on the nature of human behavior. While the only relevant reality was that of the participants, this reality had to be based upon truth for any agreements to survive. If an agreement were based upon the interests of elite groups, further agitation could be expected. Modern social theories provided the basis for a new unified theory of human behavior that supplied greater insights into intractable conflict. Burton incorporated this new theory into his method to produce what he calls problem-solving conflict resolution—a method that seeks the satisfaction of human needs as the foundation for the resolution of intractable conflict. This “human dimension” cannot be adequately addressed by the traditional power framework.

One of Burton's early colleagues in the workshop process, social psychologist Herbert Kelman, became an advocate of the method, and used it for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His writings provide some of his observations and insights into what is needed.

Kelman's Contributions to Problem-Solving Workshops

Introduction to Kelman

Kelman was born into a Jewish family in Vienna, Austria in 1927. In 1938, Austria was annexed into Germany by Hitler. Shortly after this, he and his older sister joined a Zionist youth group, which he credits for giving him a sense of identity and self-esteem at a time when Jews were being mistreated. After hearing that a right-wing youth group suggested moving Arabs out of Palestine to make room for the Jews, he said that he thought the idea was not feasible to move

so many people out of their homes. So at an early age, he was sensitive to human concerns. In 1939, his family escaped to Belgium, then later moved to the U.S. At age 18, he wrote articles on international issues for student publications. In one article, he presented the pros and cons of nationalism, and in another he spoke of the need for cooperation in Palestine between the Jewish and Arab peoples (Kelman 2010, 362-363).

In the postwar years he became involved in civil rights, anti-war, and anti-nuclear movements, getting arrested several times. In the 1950s in Baltimore, he got involved in the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and co-founded the Baltimore chapter; after that he held an elected field representative position. During the Korean War he refused induction and went before a judge, where he was legally granted the status of a conscientious objector for the Korean and Vietnam drafts (Kelman 2010, 365).

In college, he decided to major in social psychology because “it was a discipline with great relevance to the issues of peace, justice, and social change, with which I was concerned.” His earliest research, he says, “focused on processes of social influence and attitude change—which remains a continuing interest to this day.” Another area of research interest has been group processes, including group psychotherapy, which foreshadows work on problem-solving workshops. But he points out that the workshops should not be confused with therapy or encounter groups: “Although my experience with the latter has influenced my practice in a number of ways, problem-solving workshops have a very different purpose and operate on a different level” (Kelman 2010, 366).

After getting his Ph.D. in social psychology at Yale, he taught at Harvard from 1957-1962. He was one of the early scholars involved in peace research, and in 1957, he and colleagues founded *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* at the University of Michigan. This group

became the core group that founded that university's Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, which Kelman joined when he came to Michigan to teach in 1962 (Kelman 2010, 366, 368).

Kelman fused the study of international relations with social psychology and in 1965 published his edited interdisciplinary work, *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*. He believes this book “significantly contributed to my credibility among international relations scholars who were prepared to accept me as a legitimate member of their guild” (Kelman 2010, 368).

Kelman became familiar with John Burton when Burton visited Michigan in 1966. Burton, who was working in London at the time and setting up his conflict workshops, invited Kelman to join his third-party panel for a “controlled communication” workshop with the participants in the Cyprus conflict. After that experience and the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, Kelman thought about applying the method to Arab-Israeli workshops, but had other responsibilities at the time. After moving back to Harvard in 1969 to assume the Cabot Chair in Social Ethics, he wrote an article, published in 1972, about the method, and used it in his social psychology seminars with colleague Stephen Cohen. Cohen suggested they set up a pilot workshop with students as members of the third-party panel. These panels turned out to be the first in a long series of panels conducted on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Kelman 2010, 369-370).

Kelman says that while the workshops are based on Burton's model, they have been modified to include more of a social psychological perspective. During the operation of the workshops, Kelman says that he learned three basic lessons:

- a) that the third party need not be neutral in the sense of disinterested, but in situations like mine—of a Jew dealing with the Arab-Israeli conflict—it is important to work with an ethnically balanced team;
- (b) that—although recognizing that conflicts are almost always multilateral in a variety of ways—interactive problem solving is most effective in achieving its purpose when there are only two parties around the table; and

(c) that one cannot meaningfully deal with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict without bringing Palestinians who are identified with the PLO into the process (just as one cannot do so without Israelis who identify with the Zionist enterprise) (Kelman 2010, 371).

These lessons affirm Burton's statement that those most affected by the conflict should be represented.

At the end of the 1972 academic year, Kelman suffered a heart attack, and while recuperating, the 1973 Arab-Israeli war broke out. It was then, he says, that he decided to commit his efforts to conflict resolution in the Middle East as his highest priority (Kelman 2010, 372).

Kelman has been a prolific writer, chaired several international professional organizations, and been awarded numerous commendations. He is currently Richard Clarke Cabot Professor of Social Ethics, Emeritus, Harvard University (<http://scholar.harvard.edu/hckelman/home> Accessed 1-19-17).

Kelman's Workshops

Kelman says he was influenced by Burton's work and his book, *Conflict & Communications*, to continue work on his own. He organized workshops in the Middle East with other specialists in that area, focusing first on the Arab-Israeli conflict and then the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. A chronological review of a selection of Kelman's many relevant writings will provide an overview of his process and his analyses of the conflict.

In 1982, Kelman wrote an article entitled "Creating the Conditions for Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations," which appeared at a time when negotiations were at a stalemate. It was written well before the Oslo Accord of 1993, when the parties finally recognized each other as legitimate negotiating parties. In this article, Kelman says that he and colleagues had been studying the Arab-Israeli conflict since the early 1970s using the Burton format of workshops, which Kelman

came to call the “interactive problem solving” (IPS) workshops. In keeping with Burton’s rule of secrecy, Kelman does not mention the names of any individual participants.

In his analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Kelman recognizes several obstacles to negotiations, the major one being the fear that each side has of recognizing the other: their thinking is that if one side recognizes the other, it delegitimizes their own standing since both sides are fighting for the same land. This obstacle is tied to perceptions that each side sees the other as wanting to destroy it. The importance of perceptions is what Burton stressed in his work, and perceptions here create the dilemma, Kelman says.

Kelman also recognizes the foundational importance of relationships. If negotiations are to succeed, they must “entail a process that helps to build mutual trust. And they must produce agreements to which the parties are and feel committed” (Kelman 1982, 44). Direct negotiations are necessary rather than as an adjunct to agreements with other Arab nations (Kelman 1982, 72).

In this analysis of the conflict, Kelman sees (1982, 62) the fundamental psychological problem to be that of each side representing a nationalist movement that requires the other side to recognize its national identity and legitimacy, but being unable to do the same to the other side because doing so would mean relinquishing their own identity and legitimate right to the same land. Both sides feel constraints to offer recognition but fail to see similar constraints on the other side. He says (1982, 63-64) both sides perceive the other side as out to destroy them in a zero-sum conflict. If either side’s leader were to publicly announce recognition of the other side, he would be seen by his constituency as “betraying the national cause.”

A pre-negotiation problem-solving workshop is an appropriate place for parties to discuss recognition and other matters using “a series of successive approximations” to build good will.

The workshop would be facilitated, according to the established format, by the third-party panel, whose task was “to create the context for and facilitate the process of constructive communication” (Kelman 1982, 72-73). At that time, Israeli law prohibited government contact with the PLO, so Israel would be represented in the workshop by private citizens; representatives of the Palestinians would be persons who were not PLO officials but were close to decision-makers. The aim of the workshop would be to explore whether there was a possibility for arriving at a framework for negotiations. If this proved successful, the political decision makers would be informed and an attempt made to gauge public opinion. If a favorable political atmosphere seemed to exist, political leaders would then be encouraged to appoint “quasi-official representatives to complete the prenegotiation process” (Kelman 1982, 73).

In a 1990 article entitled, “Applying a Human Needs Perspective to the Practice of Conflict Resolution: The Israeli-Palestinian Case” Kelman says that, while he believes in the concept of basic human needs, he doesn’t believe that they are necessarily arranged in a hierarchy, or that lower-ranked needs must be satisfied before higher-ranked needs. He says also that he doesn’t necessarily believe that thwarting of some needs will lead to deviancy. On the other hand, he says, “I view the large-scale frustration of basic human needs as a threat to peace and social order.” Regarding the universality of needs, he doesn’t think that all the needs posited by the various theories are universal, but “I do believe that certain basic needs are widely shared across cultures and societies.” (Kelman, 1990, 283)

The workshop process, he says, can be fairly described as “an application of a human needs perspective to the practice of international conflict resolution.” Human needs are related to the workshop through its definition, its structure, and its process. The workshop is defined as “an effort to find—through joint, creative problem solving—*solutions to the conflict that would*

satisfy the needs of both parties.” The workshop is structured so that “*the focus of conflict analysis and resolution is on the parties whose needs are at the core of the conflict.*” And the workshop’s process “*is specifically geared to enabling the parties to identify and understand each other’s needs and to take the two sets of needs simultaneously into account as they work on the shape of an overall solution.*” (all his emphasis) (Kelman, 1990, 289)

Kelman admits that, during negotiations, some issues may come up that are not amenable to a win/win solution, but many other issues are: “When parties probe beyond their stated positions and presumed interests into their underlying needs, they may find that these needs are in fact not incompatible ... and that an apparently intractable conflict can in fact be resolved.” The third party’s role is “to encourage such probing, while recognizing that the search for a positive-sum solution does not inevitably meet with success.” (Kelman, 1990, 291)

Some claims over land are zero-sum type claims, and they can only be resolved by compromise. But other important claims are open to resolution: “Paradoxically, focusing on the needs for identity and security and the existential fears associated with them may actually enhance the possibility of achieving conflict resolution.” He credits Burton with showing that ontological needs are not zero-sum in nature, so that, for example, satisfying the other’s identity need does thwart the satisfaction of one’s own security need; they may be complementary: “Thus, if Israelis can be reassured that Palestinian self-determination can be achieved without threatening Israeli security, and if Palestinians can be reassured that Israeli security concerns can be accommodated without denying political expression to Palestinian national identity, the two parties can move toward a historic compromise over the issues of territory and sovereignty.” (Kelman, 1990, 290-291)

Some claims over land are based on a position taken, rather than on needs. He gives an example in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict regarding their mutual struggles for land: “At the risk of oversimplifying the issues ..., let us propose that the Palestinians want it primarily to establish and express their national identity, while the Israelis want it primarily to safeguard their national security. Once the conflict is redefined in terms of these underlying needs, the parties may be able to invent solutions that would satisfy Palestinian identity needs and Israeli security needs without threatening the other’s existence.” (Kelman, 1990, 295)

In regard to human needs, he points out, as did Burton, the necessity of distinguishing perceived, false needs from legitimate needs, especially when one party “needs” to dominate the other: “When such [perceived] needs as domination or control over the other emerge in the course of a workshop, it is important to explore their meaning to the party expressing them. The third party might encourage participants to push more deeply in order to see what lies behind these statements of needs.” Probing into the reasons for the perceived needs may reveal insights, such as finding that “the need to dominate the other reflects a deeper need for identity, or that the need to control the other reflects a need for security. It may then be possible to redefine these needs and to identify different satisfiers that would provide the party the identity or security it seeks without negating the other’s needs in the process.” (Kelman, 1990, 291-292)

Kelman agrees with Burton that the collective human needs of the group originate from the human needs of individuals: “The terms we use to describe collective needs are identical to those used to describe individual needs: identity, security, recognition, autonomy, dignity, justice, development. And, indeed, what a human needs perspective ultimately refers to is the needs of individuals.” These needs provide the criteria, as it did for Burton, “for evaluating

public policies and institutional arrangements, including those that bear on the resolution of international and intercommunal conflicts.” (Kelman, 1990, 296)

Kelman suggests that the interactive problem-solving (IPS) workshops can be useful in a variety of ways beyond the pre-negotiation stage. They can be used during negotiations to provide a “non-committal forum” to discuss issues in stalemate; they can be used by parties to work out technical, political, or emotional issues; and they can be used in the post-negotiation stage to “help the parties explore patterns of coexistence and cooperative efforts and thus contribute to a transformation of their relationship.” (Kelman, 1990, 288)

In his 1992 essay, “Acknowledging the Other's Nationhood: How to Create a Momentum for the Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations,” Kelman reports that Arab-Israeli multi-party negotiations had begun in the fall of 1991 in Madrid, but produced no significant progress or momentum. Then, in June 1992, Israeli elections were held and the Labor Party came into power replacing the Likud Party. Kelman saw this change as offering new hope for negotiations.

For our purposes, three remarks by Kelman are significant in this article: 1) He describes how the U.S. government pressured Israel into participating in the Madrid negotiations. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir of the Likud Party saw no need to talk because he had no intention of making any concessions to the Palestinians. But, Kelman says, Shamir was pressured to participate “because Secretary of State James Baker left him no reasonable option, particularly after obtaining Arab agreement to the negotiations on terms that met virtually all of the Israeli procedural conditions.” (Kelman, 1992a, 19) This incident is an example of the U.S. using its power to pressure Israel into talks. 2) Kelman states that some of the negotiators from both sides had participated in a workshop, making them sensitive to the concerns of the other side. However, while many on both sides supported negotiations, Kelman says that public support was

not strong enough to provide the momentum needed to move forward. (Kelman, 1992a, 23) This point makes us aware that public support is crucial during the negotiation stage. 3) In order to facilitate negotiations, Kelman suggests drawing up a broad framework of principles during the prenegotiation process. This framework would help develop an atmosphere of trust and serve as a guide for the detailed negotiations. In this particular case, the framework of principles would recognize each side's legitimate nationhood. By agreeing to a set of overarching principles, a kind of moral commitment is established: "A defining characteristic of this kind of commitment is an attitude of reciprocity, which implies a recognition by each party that the other, too, has valid moral claims—without assuming that the two sets of moral claims are of equal validity." (Kelman, 1992a, 27) It should be mentioned that Kelman's arguments and persistence in urging mutual recognition bore fruit in the 1993 Oslo Accord.

In another 1992 essay, "Informal Mediation by the Scholar/Practitioner," Kelman says that he has implemented a "continuing workshop" relating to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, where the same group of participants meets regularly. The process has several advantages: it allows analysis and problem solving to be focused on difficult issues; it allows the benefit of reviewing actions taken, thus offering a feedback and correction process; and it allows ideas to be considered on how to disseminate its results.

An interesting side note is that Kelman warns that the number of scholars and practitioners in the world who are familiar with this process is inadequate for the work to be done. He recommends that principles and standards be developed. (Kelman, 1992b, 92-94)

His 1997 article, "Group Processes in the Resolution of International Conflicts: Experiences from the Israeli-Palestinian Case," was published after the signing of the Oslo Accords in September, 1993. Here he further elaborates on the IPS workshop approach, and

discusses the contributions it has made to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. With the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin and the coming to power of the right-wing Likud Party, he says it is possible that the Oslo agreement may not reach full implementation of its 3-year phase-in process. He was prophetic in that regard.

He explains how the Oslo Accord was produced by a group of Israelis and Palestinians working together in secret, and that the agreement incorporates a declaration of principles and the mutual recognition that he had long advocated. He also saw some defects in its phased-in approach that left the sticky problems until the last phase, the so-called “final status” negotiations. (Kelman, 1997, 213)

Kelman says that he and his colleagues, including Palestinian academic Nadim Rouhana, had a hand in creating the atmosphere for the Oslo negotiations: “A variety of unofficial contacts between the two sides played a significant role in creating this sense of possibility and the climate conducive to negotiations. It is in this context that the third-party efforts in which my colleagues and I have been engaged since the early 1970s contributed to the evolving peace process.” (Kelman, 1997, 213)

In a later article, however, Kelman admitted that neither he nor his teams had direct input to the Oslo process: “When the Oslo agreement was announced, various observers credited our work with having laid the groundwork for it I must admit that I found such observations gratifying and confirming, and after a while I persuaded myself that they were indeed true. Of course, I made it clear that my colleagues and I had no *direct* involvement in the prenegotiation and negotiation processes that produced the Oslo agreement.” (his emphasis) (Kelman, 2005, 11)

While Kelman and his team had no direct involvement with the Oslo Accord, he sees three areas where his workshops have made contributions. The first of these contributions is the

development of cadre to engage in negotiations: “Over the years, dozens of Israelis and dozens of Palestinians, many of them political influentials or preinfluentials, have participated in our workshops and related activities, including the continuing workshop in the early 1990s.” (Kelman, 1997, 215)

The second contribution is the sharing of information and new ideas that have been generated in the workshops over the years. These insights “included shared assumptions, mutual sensitivities, and new conceptions of the process and outcome of negotiations, all of which were developed in the course of workshop interactions.” (Kelman, 1997, 215-216)

The third contribution was the creation of new political atmosphere, which was also nurtured by other interacting groups: “Our workshops, along with various other Israeli–Palestinian meetings and projects, have done so by encouraging the development of more differentiated images of the enemy, of a deescalatory language and a new political discourse that is attentive to the other party’s concerns and constraints, of a working trust that is based on the conviction that both parties have a genuine interest in a peaceful solution, and of a sense of possibility regarding the ultimate achievement of a mutually satisfactory outcome.” (Kelman, 1997, 216)

Kelman says the workshop experience is also designed to ultimately produce “a coalition across conflict lines—as part of a process of building a coalition between those elements on each side that are interested in a negotiated solution ...” (Kelman, 1997, 218) This provides the “negotiating partner” that each side says is currently lacking.

Kelman highlights the psychological benefits that the IPS workshop provides. It offers insights that “are comparable to the ‘corrective emotional experiences’ that play an important role in individual and, particularly, group psychotherapy ...” (Kelman, 1997, 217) This statement

is reminiscent of Burton's description of sessions being similar to psychotherapy. The workshop stimulates fundamental psychological changes in resolving conflicts in that: "there are certain processes ... such as empathy or taking the perspective of the other ..., learning and insight, and creative problem solving—that, of necessity, take place at the level of individuals and interactions between individuals. These psychological processes are by no means the whole of conflict resolution, but they must occur somewhere in the system if there is to be movement toward a mutually satisfactory and stable peace." (Kelman, 1997, 217)

Accompanying this process of building empathy is the building of mutual trust. The participants "try to shape solutions that are responsive to the fundamental concerns of both sides. They search for ways of providing mutual reassurance." (Kelman, 1997, 219)

In short, the process serves to humanize each other: "Such ideas often emerge from acknowledgments that participants make to each other in the course of their interaction: acknowledgments of the other's humanity, national identity, view of history, authentic links to the land, legitimate grievances, and commitment to peace.... Thus, workshop participants can ... testify that a cooperative, mutually enhancing relationship is possible ..." Ultimately, then, the necessary ingredient in transforming intractable conflict is the transformation of relationships, and this is what the workshops aim to do: "Perhaps the greatest strength of problem-solving workshops is their potential contribution to transforming the relationship between the conflicting parties." (Kelman, 1997, 219)

In a 2005 article, "Interactive Problem Solving in the Israeli-Palestinian Case: Past Contributions and Present Challenges," Kelman recaps the contributions to the Oslo process that he feels were aided by his team's workshop efforts. In addition, he illustrates the effects of improved communications with incidents that occurred in two workshops in the 1980s:

The Israeli and Palestinian participants found that they were able to talk to each other, and developed a degree of working trust. There came a point in the course of the workshop when the Israelis told their Palestinian counterparts: ‘If only we could negotiate with reasonable people like you instead of the PLO, we would be able to find common ground.’ In response, the Palestinians insisted very strongly: ‘But we *are* the PLO,’ meaning that they identified with the PLO. In a subsequent session, an almost identical exchange took place in reverse, when the Palestinians said, in effect: ‘If only we could negotiate with reasonable Israelis like you, instead of the Zionists.’ And the Israelis replied, ‘But we *are* committed Zionists.’ (Kelman, 2005, 15)

He also points to two recently negotiated framework agreements created by two non-official groups in 2003. The first is a simple framework agreement called the “People’s Voice,” also called the Ayalon-Nusseibeh Statement of Principles, that suggests a two-state arrangement; it was created by Ami Ayalon, former Israeli navy commander and head of Shin Bet, the interior security agency, and Sari Nusseibeh, Palestinian President of Al-Quds University and former Palestinian Authority representative in Jerusalem. Kelman says that they have gathered “tens of thousands” of both Israeli and Palestinian signatures in support. He says the “purpose of their campaign is to mobilize enough public support for an agreement embodying the principles they have outlined to create both the legitimacy and the pressure for decision makers to negotiate such an agreement.” (Kelman, 2005, 20)

The second agreement called the Geneva Accord or Geneva Initiative was prepared by Israelis and Palestinians under the auspices of the Swiss government. It is a more detailed agreement created by many of the same people who worked on the Oslo Accords. Kelman says “The Geneva Accord takes the form of a draft of a permanent status agreement, embodying principles very similar to those outlined in the Ayalon-Nusseibeh initiative. The Geneva Accord, however, actually spells out the terms of the agreement on most of the key issues—borders, Jerusalem, refugees, security, and monitoring arrangements—in great detail, as they might be

found in an official treaty.” It is an example of what can happen when “mainstream Israelis and Palestinians” have mutual respect and trust for each other. (Kelman, 2005, 21)

Finally, Kelman believes that “initiatives need to be framed in terms of a *principled peace* [his emphasis] that represents not just the best available deal, but a historic compromise that meets the basic needs of both societies, validates the national identity of each people, and conforms to the requirements of attainable justice.” The elements of a principled peace include: “Acknowledgement of the other’s nationhood and humanity.... Affirmation of the meaning and logic of a historic compromise.... A positive vision of a common future....” (Kelman, 2005, 22)

Leaders from both sides need to create public messages by working together “to make sure that these formulations are responsive to the concerns and sensitivities of each side without unduly threatening the other side.” (Kelman, 2005, 23)

Summary

Kelman applied Burton’s workshops to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Early on, he saw the need for both sides to recognize each other’s legitimacy. This was attained in the Oslo Accord of 1993. He continued working as the Accord was being implemented, but a change in Israeli leadership slowed the implementation and eventually it stopped altogether. Kelman focused on affirming the psychological factors that could not only correct misperceptions, but also build relationships with which to break the intractability of the conflict and attend to the satisfaction of human needs on both sides. The workshop participants also produced a “framework” to be used as a guide to negotiations.

Burton and Kelman’s emphasis on the satisfaction of needs and attention to the importance of psychological factors are confirmed in the work of Israeli social psychologist

Daniel Bar-Tal. While Bar-Tal is familiar with the work of Burton and Kelman, he is an independent source of information concerning intractable conflict.

Bar-Tal's Theory of Intractable Conflict

Israeli social psychologist Daniel Bar-Tal (1946-) has studied intractable conflict for decades. In his book, *Intractable Conflicts: Socio-Psychological Foundations and Dynamics*, he places Burton's "deep-rooted" model in the category of intractable conflict along with the Arab-Israeli conflict and recognizes the importance of human needs in it. He also reports on surveys conducted among Israelis and Palestinians.

Components

Human Needs

Bar-Tal sees human needs as central to this type of conflict. He confirms Burton's notion that deprivation of individual and group needs can lead to intractable conflict. These needs include not only physiological but also "self-esteem and self-actualization (e.g., positive social identity, or self-determination)." If these needs are deprived, they lead "naturally to setting goals with the aim to satisfy them." He also affirms that individual needs are easily transferable to groups: "Although the needs are experienced on an individual level, at least some group members may share the same needs and be aware that they experience them because of their group membership." Frustration of these group needs can result in violence: "Among the most important collective needs are needs for security, positive identity, equality, justice, freedom, and well-being ... Deprivation of these needs by another group leads to attempts to change the situation by active behavior, including protracted and vicious conflicts ..." (Bar-Tal 2013, 65-66).

Characteristics

Bar-Tal lists seven characteristics as inherent in intractable conflicts. They are: total, protracted, violent, perceived as unsolvable, viewed as a zero-sum contest, central, and demanding great investments (Bar-Tal 2013, 37).

Being *total*, such conflicts are “perceived as being about essential and basic goals, needs, or values that are regarded as indispensable for the group’s existence or survival” (Bar-Tal 2013, 37). Being *protracted* they have not only “accumulated increasing amounts of prejudice, mistrust, hatred, and animosity” but also evolved into “a socio-psychological infrastructure that includes collective memory, ethos of conflict, and emotional orientations” (Bar-Tal 2013, 51-52). Since they are *violent*, they escalate the conflict and are burned into the society’s collective memory: “The collective memory of physical violence serves as a foundation for the development of a culture of conflict” (Bar-Tal 2013, 43). Such conflicts are perceived as *unsolvable* for several reasons, including “a long history of failed attempts to achieve a peaceful resolution or to subdue the rival party, mutual delegitimizing practices by both sides, the resistance of involved societies to changing their conflict’s goals and making compromises, or a lack of accommodating leadership” (Bar-Tal 2013, 47-48). Since each side believes it is unsolvable, their beliefs “often serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy, because both sides initiate acts of violence on the basis of this belief that provide a confirmation to the established belief” (Bar-Tal 2013, 48). This leads into the *zero-sum* condition, where the parties perceive “any loss suffered by the other side as their own gain, and conversely any gains of the other side as their own loss” (Bar-Tal 2013, 44). The conflict becomes *central* to the lives of the society, so that members of society “are involved constantly and continuously with the conflict” (Bar-Tal 2013, 45). In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Bar-Tal says that centrality is exhibited in a number of

ways, but overall: “Palestinian daily life is continuously affected by the state of the conflict (movement from place to place or the ability to work). On the Jewish Israeli side, service in the army greatly preoccupies the society members and sets priorities in many of the families” (Bar-Tal 2013, 46). Finally, both sides typically make large material and psychological *investments* to cope with the conflict. In addition to the material/military investments, psychological investments involve “building and imparting the epistemic basis that provides the justification for the conflict and the development of the will to maintain the confrontation ... An ethos of conflict eventually develops that serves as a basis for the development of a culture of conflict” (Bar-Tal 2013, 49). These investments are the costs that Burton and Kelman ask workshop participants to estimate and consider in their options for action.

Vested Interests

Adding to the motivation for conflict caused by unfulfilled needs are the vested interests of certain segments of the parties. Such segments include leaders, elites, and ideologues who use the conflict for their own purposes. Bar-Tal points to the Israeli settlers who “were able to settle in the space of the territory that Palestinians aspired to be their state, and then they got favored living conditions from the government to carry out and expand the Jewish settlements ... They constitute a powerful sector that objects to the compromises needed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict peacefully” (Bar-Tal 2013, 58). He could just as well point to politicians who promote fear and strong security measures to get citizens to vote for them.

Fear

Bar-Tal affirms Maslow to say that “all those psychological and social factors that increase fear cut impulse to know.” He points to recent social research that confirms that people motivated by fear tend to “stick to certain beliefs about the causes of threat, about the conflict,

about the adversary, and about ways of coping with the dangers.” They have “difficulty entertaining alternative ideas, solutions, or courses of actions” (Bar-Tal 2013, 228).

Major Information

A major ongoing problem, seen currently, concerns the public information about the conflict or the enemy disseminated by the group’s leaders that can have an important influential effect on the views of that society. Bar-Tal cites a pertinent instance: “It is hard to believe that Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak, who unsuccessfully negotiated with the Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, knew what would be the consequences of his framing the failure of the Camp David meeting in the summer of 2000. By providing the major information without any hard evidence about ‘exposing’ the motivation of ... Arafat to destroy Israel, he greatly influenced the severe escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict” (Bar-Tal 2013, 114).

Positive Factors

In contrast to these negative factors, Bar-Tal mentions the positive factors of trust, hope, and empathy that help deescalate the conflict, and mentions some pertinent studies.

Trust is one of the most crucial factors because it “denotes lasting expectations about future behaviors of the rival group that affect the welfare of one’s own group and allows taking risks in various lines of behaviors” (Bar-Tal 2013, 340). A study of Israeli Jews showed that “trust toward Palestinians lowers support for violating their human rights.” In another finding: “Trust ... increased as a result of contact with Palestinians.” To be effective, “trust needs to be developed in the initial phases of the peacemaking process, at least by a segment of the society, because readiness to carry negotiation toward peaceful resolution of the conflict is by its nature risky.” One way that trust can be developed is through “a sequence of carefully calibrated and

graduated unilateral initiatives that induce the other side to reciprocate with a tension-reducing action, which in turn leads to a sequence of reciprocations” (Bar-Tal 2013, 341).

Along with trust is the companion psychological factor of *hope*. In a study in Israel, it was found that “the less Jewish participants delegitimized Arabs, the more hope they had of peaceful relations with them; in addition, individuals who were less dominated by a central sense of Jewish collective memory, which emphasizes persecutions of Jews through centuries, were observed to have higher hopes.” Another study in Israel found that “hope was the most powerful emotional predictor of Israelis’ support for compromises with the Palestinians” (Bar-Tal 2013, 342).

Empathy is also important to peacemaking. He cites a study that found that “empathy felt for Palestinian suffering increased the readiness of Israeli Jewish participants toward reconciliation.” Another such study found that “empathy felt by Arab children toward Jewish children was negatively related to support for violence.” He recognizes that creating empathy is an aim of conflict resolution workshops (Bar-Tal 2013, 345).

Ending the Conflict

Intractable conflict can be reduced in intensity over time if the societies involved change their views or the nature of the conflict changes. But change is required in leadership: “Reduced intractability begins when parties (at least the leaders and some segments of the society) begin to define the conflict as solvable and begin to negotiate. But the psychological change has to be accompanied by reduced violence” (Bar-Tal 2013, 59).

Summary

Bar-Tal sees the frustration of human needs as a core problem in intractable conflict. He specifies the elements of intractable conflict and their consequences, and provides information

on how these factors have been seen in Israeli and Palestinian societies. He recognizes the psychological value of building trust, hope, and empathy if the conflict is to be resolved. And he sees that a change in leadership might need to take place. Bar-Tal's studies confirm much of what Burton and Kelman have said.

Outsider Recommendations for Resolution

There have been numerous suggestions, recommendations, and frameworks submitted for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The so-called Quartet, comprised of the U.S., Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations, has suggested a Roadmap for the parties to follow for an agreement. Former President Jimmy Carter is certainly qualified as a negotiator. During his presidency, he spent 13 consecutive days at Camp David in 1978 as chief negotiator working with Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat to produce the Egyptian-Israeli agreement, certainly an unqualified achievement, probably not to be repeated in the foreseeable future (Carter, 1982, p. 319 ff.). Carter has made suggestions for the present conflict and recommended the Geneva Initiative as a template (Carter, 2009). Former U.S. Senator George Mitchell chaired negotiations for three years in Northern Ireland and succeeded in producing the famous Good Friday agreement. He also served as U.S. special envoy for the Middle East under President Obama in 2009-2011 attempting, unsuccessfully, to produce an agreement. Since then he has published suggestions to use in this conflict (Mitchell, 2016). Both of these men are certainly aware of the psychodynamics of intractable conflict, but their suggestions and the Roadmap do not deal thoroughly with the psychological aspects involved, nor with the building of trust and valued relationships. Mitchell does suggest to "initiate parallel discussions with Israeli and Palestinian officials to urge that they agree on a series of procedural steps that would be intended to counter the paralyzing mistrust that has kept

them out of negotiations.” He says that a similar process was successfully used in Northern Ireland (Mitchell, 222-223).

CHAPTER THREE:

DISCUSSION

In our Introduction and Objectives, we set out to accomplish three objectives. The first was to explain the conflict resolution method created by John Burton; this has been done. The second was to review the results of its application to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict thus far by Herbert Kelman; this, too, has been accomplished. What remains is to meet the third objective, which is to evaluate this conflict resolution method for the purpose of determining whether it is productive to continue its use in this conflict. Before we do that, we might quickly evaluate some alternative proposals that have been suggested to resolve the conflict.

Outsider Recommendations

The difficulty with outside solutions is that, as Burton pointed out, leaders of sovereign states think that they know best the nature of the conflict and how they should respond to it; they are the leaders of their nation or community and it is their responsibility to act—no one else's. For outsiders to intervene is considered an insult to their intelligence. Mr. Netanyahu, for example, has made it plain that the UN Security Council does not need to tell Israel what to do. While he has not made a major point of it publicly, it is fairly certain that he feels the same way about the Quartet's Roadmap, the U.S. suggestions, and any other recommended plans. His suggestion is direct talks with the Palestinians, presumably without the use of a mediator (which would certainly favor Israel with its military and economic power over the situation).

Another concern with the outsider recommendations is that they do not prepare the negotiators psychologically for the task of overcoming years of hatred and mistrust. This problem has to be settled if work on detailed issues can be completed.

Since one side or both sides see these recommendations as intervention, it is unlikely these recommendations will succeed.

Insider Recommendations

If we agree that political leaders may feel justified in rejecting outsider recommendations, then what justification do political leaders have for rejecting frameworks or templates of agreements, such as the Geneva Initiative, produced by former Israeli and Palestinian officials working together?

Another such proposal has come recently from the Deputy Speaker of the Knesset and Labor Party Director General Hilik Bar. Bar is also the Head of the Knesset Committee on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. He presented his framework for peace with the Palestinians at the second annual conference of the Kelman Institute (mentioned below) at Harvard in September, 2015. He criticizes the Netanyahu cabinet for a lack of vision, leadership, and strategy. He says the right-wing Israeli government is trying to simply manage the conflict rather than resolve it, and he goes on to present a framework covering all the basic issues

(<http://kelmaninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Hilik-Bar-Mid-East-Seminar-and-Peace-Plan.pdf>). But he offers little in the way of resolving the lack of trust and valued relationships in intractable conflicts.

With the kind of criticism Bar presents, it is expected that Netanyahu will reject this proposal too even though it comes from inside the Israeli government. There is the matter of partisan politics, and in this case, a matter of keeping one's coalition together and retaining

power. For Mr. Netanyahu to agree to consider either the Bar proposal or the Geneva Initiative and discuss them with Mr. Abbas would be implying that other Israeli parties were able to handle the challenge and he was not—again an example of a leader determining that only he has the answers. (Note: An email sent by this author in December, 2016, to Netanyahu’s office asking why he has not taken up the Geneva Initiative has yet to receive a response.)

It’s hard to say what Mr. Netanyahu’s peace proposal is. A 2015 news report says that during his second government (2009-2013), Netanyahu offered a proposal to the Palestinians that made drastic concessions. But Netanyahu’s current administration says that proposal was never offered; any such proposal was probably the creation of the U.S.

(<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4634075,00.html> Accessed 2-21-17).

And earlier this year, a news report said that at a secret meeting held in February, 2016, in the Jordanian city of Aqaba, Netanyahu turned down a proposal that, among other things, had Arab nations recognizing Israel as a Jewish state in return for the pullout of the IDF from all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. Sources reported that Netanyahu said he could not get such a proposal approved by his coalition (<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4634075,00.html> Accessed 2-21-17).

This suggests another possibility that could offer a chance for peace negotiations: building a new coalition with the inclusion of more moderate parties. This was considered a possibility immediately after the 2015 elections. Allegedly, Netanyahu offered a unity government coalition with Issac Herzog, the Labor Party leader. That party had merged with the moderate Hatnua Party to run under the name of The Zionist Union. In the election, Likud won 30 seats, and The Zionist Union won 24, meaning that they would need only 7 more seats to form a majority coalition. However, Herzog refused, and Netanyahu went on to form his

coalition with smaller, more radical parties

(<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/25/israel-coalition-deal-hard-right-government-avigdor-lieberman> Accessed 12-12-16). The fact that Netanyahu offered that opportunity to Herzog suggests, however slightly, that Netanyahu might have been open to compromises in regard to negotiations with the Palestinians.

The Value of the Burton Method

The major obstacles in intractable conflicts are emotional and psychological, so persons trained in psychology are needed to offer guidance. The conflict resolution workshops provide attention to these matters. The third-party panel includes psychologists. And one of the first orders of business is to review and correct perceptions by each side. This exercise alone has an impact on the psychological mindsets of the parties, helping them to modify their view of the other side as the enemy. Understanding starts to build when they realize that they experience the same kinds of pressures and constraints, such that if they were suddenly put on the other side of the conflict, they would probably behave like the adversary. Cooperation begins when each side becomes aware that they have common unmet needs that, working together, can be satisfied for the benefit of all. They learn about the process of communication, rather than negotiate the individual issues. Through the building of trust, participants come to believe that there is a negotiating partner on the other side.

Since the method is sequentially pre-negotiation, it does not address each specific issue of the conflict, but instead builds the psychological and analytical bases to produce a framework with which to inspire and guide the negotiators who do tackle the specific issues.

The third-party panel of experts guides the discussions and provides a variety of knowledge and experience about conflict. This is different from mediation—it does not depend

upon a mediator to offer suggestions on how to solve a problem. Only the parties, after analysis, can offer suggestions and decide on them. This is key to each side's insistence to solve their own problems.

Kelman's Work

Kelman's IPS workshops that have been held with Israeli and Palestinian participants since the 1970s, are generally thought to have moderated the thoughts and emotions about this intractable conflict among the community of influential persons. While Kelman's work with representatives from both sides did not directly produce the Oslo Accord, it seems fair to say that: 1) the qualities that were exhibited by negotiators in the creation of the Oslo Accord, i.e., the mutual respect and trust of the parties, are the same kind of qualities that his workshops strive to generate in its participants; and 2) the qualities promoted by his workshops have been dispersed among the community of persons who have the ability to produce a just and permanent agreement; and 3) these qualities are also of the kind that have been responsible for the creation of the Geneva Initiative of 2003. It might also be said that the reason for the failure of the Oslo Accord was that more persons, especially political leaders, did not participate in workshops such as Kelman offered.

The workshops provide a standard in the form of the satisfaction of basic human needs so that the participants are aware of this important goal. This knowledge is conveyed to the negotiators, or the workshop participants can do the negotiating. During negotiations, there will still be interests that must be settled through compromise, and there may still be the urge to walk out of negotiations when things are getting tough; but the parties will know that they are doing vital work from which both sides will benefit, and they must complete it.

The process is a human and ethical approach, i.e., it promotes a method that does not harm anyone or cast judgment on them. It assumes that both sides are doing what they think they must do to protect themselves. It seeks to improve the conduct of relations between the parties to deescalate the conflict. Its aim is to improve the lives of both sides.

The IPS workshop qualities produced, plus the positive survey results reported by Bar-Tal, offer hope by demonstrating that there is a continuing potential for agreement. Perhaps future generations who are not imbued with the history of victimhood will decide that this conflict has gone on too long and put an end to it. One might even surmise that the peace process could have been completed by now except but for the lack of trust of certain leaders.

Conclusion

Our conclusion is that the IPS workshop is an effective, positive, and ethical method to help resolve this and other intractable conflicts. It should be supported for continued use in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and elsewhere. This conclusion accomplishes our third objective.

Even if an enlightened Israeli leadership were to embrace the Geneva Initiative, our recommendation is that the IPS workshops should continue, since they are a problem-solving and moderating force. As Burton implies, simply because an agreement is signed does not mean that conflict will stop; a new set of conflicts can emerge, especially as new leaders are elected, so a means of resolving each one will be needed.

The IPS workshop method offers the prospect of resolving conflict in a variety of situations, not just international or intercommunal conflict. It can be used to assess public policy, to negotiate with urban gangs, to handle labor-management relations—in any situation where human needs and values are in conflict.

The IPS workshop method or some appropriate form of it should be taught in all schools at a point where the students can understand its goals. This would help to bring about a more peaceful society and world.

Further thoughts are now offered for the use of workshops in this conflict.

Further Thoughts

Intra-Party Conflict and Use of the Method

Two of Burton's observations in conflict resolution were, first, that assumptions should not be made regarding the uniformity of views within each opposing party. In fact, the norm is that there is intraparty internal disunity. The existence of "sub-disputes" within each side can hamper or prevent an agreement. Another Burton insight is that all parties directly affected by the conflict should be involved in pre-negotiations and negotiations.

Both of these insights are applicable to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The failure of the 1993 Oslo Accords was largely the result of acts by those who, within each side, held different views from the negotiators and were not parties to its process. On the Palestinian side, the failure is attributed to the violence of Hamas, who refused to recognize the agreement. On the Israeli side, obstruction of the agreement can be attributed to the objections of the extreme right-wing parties that are said to have been responsible for the killing, by an Israeli settler, of 29 Palestinians praying in a mosque in February, 1994 and the November, 1995 assassination, by an ultra-orthodox student, of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, who approved the Accords (Bickerton and Klausner 2015, 304). Once extremist Israeli parties become part of any ruling coalition, as they are presently, they can make demands for more settlement building in the Palestinian West Bank, thus jeopardizing the peace process. There are, therefore, extremists on

both sides that can hinder an agreement. The conflict might even be said to be a “war of extremists.” They should be included in the workshops.

Hamas and Fatah

Since the workshop process can be used to negotiate resolutions to intra-party conflicts, it seems appropriate to urge the leaders of the Hamas and Fatah political parties to participate in an IPS workshop to resolve differences that currently prevent unification of the Palestinian government.

The on-again off-again Hamas-Fatah unity government problem impedes the peace process and Palestinian political development. The sticking point seems to be control of the various Palestinian security forces (<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/fatah-hamas-reconciliation>. Accessed 2-14-17). Initially, it might be thought that this is an interest in controlling power and is not subject to debate over human needs. But underlying the power-security question appears to be yet another issue of distrust in regard to one’s own physical security and esteem, which are human needs. This is an example of the kind of admission that might be revealed in the discussions of perceptions and analysis in an IPS workshop. Creative problem-solving could be used to find options on how to design the control of security groups so that no leader feels threatened by another’s security forces. If such issues could be resolved, then a stable unified front could be formed with which to enter negotiations with Israel.

If unity can be achieved, regardless of resistance from Israel or the U.S., the Palestinian side would be better represented and more stable in any negotiations. It could help to unify the Palestinian people so that violence by the Hamas militant wing would be discouraged. There is little doubt that many members of the international community would support the workshop

because it would offer the probability of a reduction in both the internecine warfare within the Palestinian camp and the “terrorist” activities against Israelis.

Israeli Extremists

On the Israeli side, the question is more complicated. Working with religious extremists would seem to be particularly difficult if their demands are based on religious documents that are thousands of years old. As Burton implies, such demands can be considered religious values that overlay human needs. Kelman has suggested that it might be possible to probe into these values to determine if there are unsatisfied needs, such as religious security, that could be attended to in order to reduce their demands for such things as Palestinian land. If their basic needs could be satisfied, any residual interests might be open to compromise, such as making changes to Israeli laws so that religious groups do not have to serve in the IDF (an ongoing issue).

This leaves the question about who these religious parties would participate with in any IPS workshop. The Likud Party would not seem to be motivated to participate since it currently has the ruling coalition and presumably wants to keep the structure the way it is. And it is doubtful that the extremist parties would participate with moderate Israeli political parties who are not in power. An option then might be to include them in a workshop along with the top leaders.

Top Israeli and Palestinian Leaders

It can be a challenge for workshop participants to convince their top leaders to be flexible. It is a long, arduous process trying to change the minds of persons who have been steeped in ideologies of victimhood and the use of military power to solve problems. That’s why Burton suggests having the top political leaders go through the workshop and why Kelman suggests repeating the workshops, if necessary, with the same participants.

Since some of the benefits sought in the workshops are to generate respect and trust between the sides, to understand the vital importance of the satisfaction of basic human needs, and to stop violent and intractable conflict, it seems essential to urge the Israeli and Palestinian top leaders to participate in a workshop. (This would be done after Palestinian unity had been achieved.) The leaders should be urged, even pressured, by the U.S. and the international community to participate in secret IPS workshops. If having the top leaders attend proved to be pragmatically unworkable because of other pressing issues, then officials close to the top leaders could be substituted.

Leaders may resist participation by claiming that they are being forced into negotiating when they do not want to be. The answer to this excuse is that the process is not negotiations but pre-negotiations, and they would not be committing themselves to new policies. They may further resist by claiming that media leaks would be detrimental to their positions because the public could get the impression that the leaders are weak and are making unnecessary concessions. But the sessions would be held in secret at a time and place not made available to anyone outside the small group of participants.

The pressure of the U.S. and the international community for such participation would be necessary in cases of refusal. It would be made clear to both leaders that anything less than full participation would have negative consequences, including restrictions on or loss of military and/or economic aid, not only from the U.S. but the international community.

As mentioned above, Kelman has pointed out that Secretary of State James Baker and President George H. W. Bush held back loan guarantees in 1992 to successfully pressure Yitzhak Shamir to stop building settlements in the West Bank and begin negotiations. Saadia Touval also

reports that Henry Kissinger held up aid to Israel in 1975 to get it to agree to concessions in what resulted as the Sinai II treaty (Touval, 241).

However, it must be admitted that currently such pressure tactics have little chance of even being considered. With the stranglehold on Congress by the American Jewish lobby and the election of a U.S. president who has expressed almost obeisant support of Israel, other members of the international community, some of whom have already shown strong support for Palestinian causes, would have to step up. One example of this support is the December, 2016, UN Security Council Resolution 2334 condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank—a resolution approved by a 14-0 vote that was passed with the abstention of the U.S. Another example is the meeting of some 70 nations in France in January, 2017, to demand a cessation of settlement building and a two-state resolution of this conflict.

https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/15/world/middleeast/missing-at-israel-palestinian-peace-conference-israelis-or-palestinians.html?_r=0 Accessed 2-7-17). And in August, 2016, it was announced that Russia was willing to host direct negotiations between Israel and Palestine (<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4844610,00.html> accessed 1-18-17). Such support could be motivated by, among other things, Israel's recalcitrance being seen as a factor in the recruiting of Islamist militants, which affects the international community.

Israeli Cabinet and Creators of the Geneva Initiative

One last consideration in the application of the IPS workshop is to use it for a discussion between the Israeli cabinet and the creators of the Geneva Initiative. The cabinet is currently made up of several ultra-religious parties and an ultra-nationalist party. Still, the hope is that within these parties there is a variety of thoughts about resolving the conflict.

An example might be that of Naftali Bennett, leader of the right-wing The Jewish Home party and Minister of Education in Netanyahu's current coalition. His November, 2014, op-ed piece in *The New York Times*, although obviously written to influence opinion of Americans who are not well informed about the conflict, did offer a four-step approach to increase Palestinian autonomy in parts of the West Bank and improve the economic conditions there. It did not, however, address the main problems of meeting the psychological needs of the Palestinians for recognition and their own state (Bennett 2014). Participation in a workshop could expose the ideas of people like Bennett to analysis in the light of new learning.

Human Needs

It is certainly intuitive that any living thing has needs that must be satisfied if that living thing is to survive. Burton's focus on human needs makes us aware of the characteristics of human nature that explain much conflict and confusion in the world. If human needs are not met, conflict, deviance, and crime can result. For example, if one is starving, one will have a tendency to get food in any way possible, especially if one's family is involved; theft is not only possible, but probable. If one's affection need is unsatisfied, one will attempt to find affection, or what passes for affection, anywhere. Since sex is associated with affection, one may resort to illegal sexual activities seeking to fulfill that affection need. If one is denied the satisfaction of the esteem need, one may resort to joining a gang to fill that need. If one is unable to find a satisfactory job to help satisfy the need for economic security, one may resort to crime. The satisfaction of needs may even take a form that is seemingly unrelated to a particular need, such as eating excessively to fill a frustrated need for affection or peer approval. So the study of human needs can help not only in resolving conflict but also in creating public policies to design a more fulfilling society; the latter practice is what Burton terms "provention."

Israelis and Palestinians both have human needs to be met, the most apparent being for security and stability, as well as identity and recognition. For the Palestinians, in many cases, even physiological needs for food, water, and shelter are not being met. This lack of satisfaction of their basic human needs has played a part in the frustration of some Palestinians. But so has the lack of satisfaction of the need for security for Israelis. Since the Israelis have the overwhelming military power, there is the tendency on their part, as Maslow and Burton describe, to assume dominating roles. With this vast military power, the question arises as to why Israel continues to feel so insecure.

Since security, recognition, and identity are basic human needs, and the act of military occupation prevents the fulfillment of those human needs, and since the frustration of unfulfilled human needs will most probably result in, by those denied, actions which may produce violent and intractable conflict, it appears that if the government of Israel cannot reach a peace agreement with the Palestinians, it can look forward to future costs of sporadic violence from the Palestinians, attacks from outside jihadist groups, attacks on Jews outside of Israel, and even to international disapprobation and sanction. So even with overwhelming military power, Israel can feel insecure. This is an example of the frustration of one peoples' needs affecting the frustration of another peoples' needs.

Burton's emphasis on valued relationships as a safeguard against conflict makes us aware of this missing element in the Israel-Palestinian conflict. The work of the third-party panel to control communication and engage in mutual problem-solving is critical to building trust and valued relationships. If the parties trust each other, conflict resolution can occur; without trust, as we observe in the present situation, resolution is not possible. Can we dare to imagine what would happen if Mr. Netanyahu and Mr. Abbas had a valued relationship?

Serious conflict seems to be on the rise in the world and in this country. Perhaps it is time to act on Burton's recommendation that conflict resolution becomes institutionalized and part of our political philosophy.

Some Available Resources

If the parties to a conflict wish to avail themselves of the workshop, how would they do it?

a. Professor Kelman turns 90 years of age in March, 2017, and is retired from active workshop activity. However, his heritage includes the Herbert C. Kelman Institute for Interactive Conflict Transformation located in Vienna, Austria. Its website describes itself as "engaged in civil society conflict transformation and peacebuilding in international and intra-societal conflicts. The objectives are to foster peace through violence prevention, peace mediation and historic reconciliation" (<http://kelmaninstitute.org/who-we-are/mission/> accessed 1-18-17). The Institute currently has a project to foster an ongoing intra-group dialogue about the Holy Esplanade in Jerusalem. The Institute will present its third conference on intractable conflict at Harvard University from March 16-18, 2017. One of the sessions will cover the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. However, the public is not invited. The Institute is also currently working on building an international network, including an American affiliate (email response from Wilfried Graf, Co-Director of the Institute, 2-18-17). Since the group continues the work of Kelman, support by all is highly recommended.

b. A cursory search finds two other organizations that appear to do similar work. The first is the Mercy Corps Conflict Management Group, which is the result of the merger of Mercy Corps and the Conflict Management Group (CMG). The former is primarily a short-term material aid relief agency while the latter focuses on conflict management. CMG was founded in

1984 by noted negotiation expert Roger Fisher, author of the book, *Getting to Yes*. (Fisher died in 2012.) The agency describes itself as having “close ties to Harvard University [where Kelman worked] and a reputation for innovative peace-building work in troubled regions worldwide.... CMG is an intellectual leader in conflict resolution with a track record of taking on the toughest peace challenges, from Northern Ireland to the Korean peninsula. CMG has a staff of conflict management experts whose work often involves facilitating negotiations in conflict-affected countries” (<https://www.mercycorps.org/articles/united-states/mercy-corps-conflict-management-group> accessed 1-12-17).

c. The other group is Search for Common Ground which describes its mission as: “Instead of tearing down an existing world, we focus on constructing a new one. We do this through a type of peacebuilding called conflict transformation. Meaning: we look to change the everyday interactions between groups of people in conflict, so they can work together to build up their community, choosing joint problem-solving over violence.” This group is currently involved in a project in Israel: “From our office in Jerusalem, we’re working to bridge the gap between Israelis and Palestinians through leadership development, multimedia, interfaith, and health projects” (<https://www.sfcg.org/the-need/> accessed 1-12-17).

Hope for the Future

A number of civic and religious organizations, too numerous to mention, are engaged in cross-cultural activities designed to increase friendly relations between Israelis and Palestinians. Many Jewish organizations, American and non-American, fully support the Geneva Initiative (<http://www.geneva-accord.org/mainmenu/supporters-worldwide> accessed 2-7-17).

There is hope that future, younger leaders on both sides will decide to stop this destruction of people and resources and come to an agreement. Perhaps it will take several

generations of those who were born after the Holocaust and are not imbued with the ideology of victimhood.

Mr. Netanyahu and Mr. Abbas have a rare opportunity in this era of world history. They can make use of it to demonstrate to the world a better way of resolving conflict and thereby uplift civilization, or they can follow the traditional path of violence to retard civilization. A critic might say that responsibility for every person who is injured or killed while there is no peace agreement falls on the shoulders of the leaders. They have the opportunity to avoid that criticism.

In a recent interview, Kelman was asked to complete the statement that begins “The Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be solved if...” He responded with “there would be some charismatic leadership, and creative problem solving” (Kelman 2009). So in conflict, like so many other things, leadership determines whether peace will prevail.

Summary of Points

Thesis: The conflict resolution method developed by John Burton and used by Herbert Kelman is an appropriate method to use on the Israeli-Palestinian intractable conflict.

1. All the outsider (and insider) recommendations deal with specific issues or provide a framework with which to guide negotiations. The political leaders involved in the conflict think that they know better than any outsider the issues involved and what they feel is needed to resolve them; they deem it insulting to be told how to settle the issues.
2. The outsider/insider recommendations do not prepare the negotiators psychologically for the task of overcoming years of hatred and distrust. This problem has to be settled before the detailed issues can be resolved.

3. The Burton-Kelman IPS workshop method provides what is needed to resolve intractable conflict. The process guides participants to change their perceptions of the enemy and understand his situation better, thus providing an improved atmosphere for cooperation. If the political leaders refuse to participate in the workshops or some similar type of process, chances are that the intractable conflict will not be resolved.
4. The IPS workshops provide a standard by which to assess negotiations and actions in the form of the theory of human needs. By focusing on human needs while analyzing and creating solutions, there is a much greater chance that a just and permanent agreement will be achieved.
5. The IPS workshop method is humane and ethical. It assumes that both sides are doing what they think they must do to protect themselves. It does not harm or humiliate anyone or cast judgment on them.

REFERENCES

- Bar-Tal, Daniel. 2013. *Intractable Conflicts: Socio-Psychological Foundations and Dynamics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett, Naftali. 2014. "For Israel, Two-State Is No Solution." *The New York Times*, November 6. Accessed March 17, 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/06/opinion/naftali-bennett-for-israel-two-state-is-no-solution.html?_r=1
- Bickerton, Ian J. and Carla L. Klausner. 2015. *A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. 7th ed. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Burton, John W. 1969. *Conflict & Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations*. New York: The Free Press.
- , 1990. *Conflict: Resolution and Provention*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1982. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. New York: Bantam Books.
- , 2009. *We Can Have Peace in the Holy Land: A Plan That Will Work*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Deckers, Lambert. 2010. *Motivation: Biological, Psychological, and Environmental*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kelman, Herbert C. 1982. "Creating the Conditions for Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 26, no. 1 (March): 39-75.
- , 1990. "Applying a Human Needs Perspective to the Practice of Conflict Resolution: The Israeli-Palestinian Case." In *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*, edited by John Burton, 283-297. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- , 1992a. "Acknowledging the Other's Nationhood: How to Create a Momentum for the Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 22, no. 1: 18-38.
- , 1992b. "Informal Mediation by the Scholar/Practitioner." in *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management*, edited by Jacob Bercovitch and Jeffrey C. Rubin, 64-96. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- , 1997. "Group Processes in the Resolution of International Conflicts: Experiences from the Israeli-Palestinian Case." *American Psychologist* 52, no. 3 (March): 212-220.

- , 2005. "Interactive Problem Solving in the Israeli-Palestinian Case: Past Contributions and Present Challenges." In *Paving the way: Contributions of interactive resolution to peacemaking*, edited by R. Fisher, 41-64. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. Accessed January 9, 2017.
http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/hckelman/files/Interactive_Problem_Solving_in_the_Israeli-Palestinian_Case.pdf. (Page numbers differ; numbers in text refer to online.)
- , 2009. Interview by Martin Wählisch. "10 Questions on Peace Mediation: Interview with Herbert C. Kelman" (text). April 4 in Berlin. Accessed February 18, 2017.
http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/hckelman/files/Interview_with_HCK_2009.pdf.
- , 2010. "Looking Back at My Work in Conflict Resolution in the Middle East." *Peace and Conflict* 16: 361-387.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1987. *Motivation and Personality*, 3rd edition. New York: HarperCollins. (Orig. pub. 1954).
- Mitchell, George J. 2016. *A Path to Peace: A Brief History of Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations and a Way Forward in the Middle East*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Sites, Paul. 1973. *Control: The Basis of Social Order*. New York: Dunellen.
- Touval, Saadia. 1992. "The Superpowers as Mediators." In *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple Approaches to Conflict Management*, edited by Jacob Bercovitch and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, 232-248. New York: St. Martin's Press.