THE INTERNATIONAL STUDY OF PEACE/CONFLICT RESOLUTION ORGANIZATIONS: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Benjamin Gidron
Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Stanley Katz
Princeton University

Working Draft

Do not quote without explicit permission by authors

I. INTRODUCTION - RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

The Conflicts Chosen
This study focuses on peace organizations in three highly conflicted parts of the world, namely, Northern Ireland, Israel/Palestine and South Africa. These were/are major international conflicts, violent and affecting entire societies.

Differences
The three conflicts were different in important respects:
- South Africa - the focus was on ending an oppressive regime.
- Northern Ireland - the question was whose region it was, and how two different communities could co-exist in it.
- Israel - the same question might be asked, but it is perhaps better to say that the question was (is) whether there should be two states for two people?

Similarities
But there were important similarities in the three political contexts:
- In each country/region, there were significant political breakthroughs (in the direction of peace/conflict resolution) in the early 1990s.
- Each country (with the possible exception of Palestine) reflected the growth in Third Sector activity internationally in practically all areas, including peace and conflict resolution.
- In each area, the 1980s witnessed the emergence and development of citizens'/grassroots groups and organizations at the height of the violence, in attempts to advance the cause of peace/just peace and end the bloodshed.
- In each, at the time we were selecting possible testbeds, there seemed the possibility of success - of resolving the conflict peacefully at a particular moment of time.
- Each conflict was occurring in the context of an ostensibly democratic political environment (though of course the conflict was in part about who belonged to the "democratic" political community).
- Each of the conflicts had some significant link to European political culture, and in each area the NGO sector was fairly well-developed.

One might also say that there were other common characteristics:
- Conflicts were among major social groups.
- The conflicts were long-standing, intractable social conflicts along religious, social and ethnic lines.
- Each conflict provided a stimulus for NGOs to emerge and act.
- Each conflict attracted major international attention, and significant international support for the NGO sector.
- Each conflict involved territorial issues.

Given the substantial differences among the 3 conflicts, we looked for situations in which there was sufficient situational comparability that we would be studying roughly analogous organizational behavior. It became clear rather early on that: "peace" was too broad and ambiguous a term and these peace organizations operated under very different social and political conditions than those dominating the empirical literature (PMOs). Hence we refer to our unit of analysis as a Peace/Conflict Resolution Organizations (P/CRO).

A review of existing literature on peace/conflict resolution organizations brings out the following points:

1. There are no empirical cross-cultural studies of such organizations, studies that take into account different political contexts, cultures and other local variables within which these organizations operate.
2. With a few exceptions, the studies which have focused on more than a single case or a small number of such organizations, have been conducted in countries or situations where these organizations dealt with a threat of war, not an active conflict, for example peace/ conflict resolution organizations to end the cold war or ban nuclear proliferation. Activists in such organizations did not encounter a 'live' conflict, namely, actual bloodshed, terror, administrative detentions, among others. These situations present a different type of 'peace-making'.
3. In the literature dealing with the assessment of P/CROs' contribution to end a conflict and the signing of peace accords, rarely is the emphasis on their contribution to the process of peace building. When seen from this perspective, P/CROs' involvement is composed of many activities around events such as violent attacks, police/army brutality, incarceration, etc., either before or after the fact (trying to prevent those or reacting to them in some form). They are often also active in getting the two feuding parties to work together on a variety of practical issues, not just the final political agreement.

Research Questions
Our project focuses on two major research questions:

A.   What are the salient organizational characteristics of peace/conflict resolution organizations (P/CROs) active in these three countries/regions?
B. How have these P/CROs contributed (individually and/or collectively) to progress towards resolution of their respective conflicts?

The project proceeds on two parallel levels:
    • The local/national level.
    • The international/comparative level.
The four country teams described below, are responsible for the local/national data collection and analysis. An international team is responsible for the international/ comparative analysis.

Importance of Study
We believe that the importance of this study is that it:
    • Documents, analyzes and assesses the role of citizens' organizations active in an area which is usually inaccessible to them, in the negotiation process over a new type of relationship between the parties in conflict.
    • Examines these phenomena in an international/comparative framework, which enables us to begin to understand the behavior of NGOs beyond individual country experiences. The large question here is whether there are universal attributes of these organizations.
    • Adds to international Third Sector discourse by focusing on a group of organizations engaged in advocacy, whose contribution and significance to society cannot be measured in quantitative terms. We hope we can begin to identify some of the parameters of organization and behavior that need to be addressed across the sector.

- Above all, we hope to develop conceptions and methodologies for studying advocacy organizations comparatively.

Finally, we want to stress that today's report is a *first cut at analysis*. The data are not yet complete. We have not had time either to digest the draft final reports (and they are still in the draft stage) - or to look carefully at the data collected by the teams. We are only just now beginning to apply theory to the data.

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

<u>Theoretical Perspectives</u>
The nature of the phenomenon we set out to study finds expression in four meta-theoretical perspectives.

Third Sector
The first, the larger macro-social domain of P/CROs is called the Third, or Nonprofit, Sector. It is within this public space, located between or beyond the market on the one hand and the state on the other, where voluntary civic associations, nonprofit, and nongovernmental organizations operate. P/CROs, nonprofit citizen-initiated entities, also operate in the public arena of the Third Sector. The character, size and functions of the Third Sector in a given country or society and its relations with the other sectors are presumed to be determined, to a considerable extent, by the particularities (e.g., type of rule, history, political culture) of that country or society (Salamon & Anheier 1996). From a socio-political perspective, one of the functions of the Third Sector is to link and alternately serve as a buffer between government and its citizens. It is this function that is covered by the notion of civil society, a term denoting the many political, social, religious and ideological associations mediating between the individual and state.   P/CROs, as conceived in Third/Nonprofit Sector theories, consagents of civil society. In their mobilization of resources to challenge power structures, they are, in essence, counterhegemonic agents (Routledge 1993).   Theories of the Third Sector then, address macro-economic and public policy implications of this domain's activity.

Social Movements
Second, because P/CROs are inherently political, in that they seek to alter or transform the prevailing set of socio-political conditions, they may be considered a form of social movement. Social Movement Theories examine the phenomenon of non-institutionalized collective action.   While the study of social movements has increased steadily in recent decades, relatively little of the discourse focuses on peace movements and their organizations - P/CROs (McAdam et al 1996; Jenkins & Klandermans 1995). The two analytical traditions that form the bulk of social movement literature are *Resource Mobilization* which looks at how surrounding evolving political and social opportunities influence a social movement's ability to mobilize resources, and *New Social Movements Theory* which focuses on ideology, collective identity, and attitudes of movement members, particularly with respect to prevailing power relations in society. The insights provided by the fruitful interaction between these two social movement perspectives illuminate three analytical levels for the study of peace movements and P/CROs in particular. The first, *political opportunity structures*, explains movement ascent and decline as functions of opportunities available in the political environment, especially the role that state structure and elite alignments play in a group's ability to mobilize resources (McAdam et al 1996; Tarrow 1996; Rucht 1996; Eisinger 1973). While the first level of analysis speaks about the political and cultural potential for collective action, the second, *mobilizing structures*, determines whether this potential can be realized in a sustained manner. Crucial to SM mobilization and survival is the existence of individual and organizational networks. These networks - also called "social infrastructures" (McCarthy 1987); "micromobilization contexts (McAdam 1988); "multiorganizational fields" (Klandermans & Oegema 1987); and "mobilizing structures" (McAdam et al 1996) - provide legitimacy, financial resources and members to SMOs. In contrast to the structural emphasis of the previous levels, the third level of analysis, *framing*, explores cognitive processes

influencing movement mobilization (McAdam et al 1996; Mueller & Morris 1992). This kind of analysis is helpful from a comparative perspective in that every society and every movement sector contains a specific and limited tool kit of legitimated beliefs, symbols, repertoires of contention, and templates of organization from which SMOs may draw and which limits the organizational characteristics they assume (Tarrow 1993; Zald 1996).

Organizational Theories
Third, attempting to understand P/CROs as organizational entities naturally directs one to the body of organizational theories which delineate endogenous and exogenous characteristics of organizational units. Organizational theories range from conceiving of organizations as rational actors to ecological perspectives which focus on organization-environment relations as a determinant of organizational behavior. The latter emphasizes the mutually influencing relationship between the unit and the larger inter-organizational systems, unlike the former which sees organizational vicissitudes as the result of rational, purposive choices. Ecological perspectives include: *institutional theory* positing that organizations, in their drive to attain legitimacy, adopt patterns common to the environment in which they operate (DiMaggio & Powell 1991; Jenkins 1987); and *political economy theories* which focus on the interaction of forces both within and outside organizations. This inside-outside dynamic struggle to define organizational values revolves around four main values: (a) a set of norms governing the system of incentives for its members; (b) the discretion and decision-making responsibilities of different positions; (c) the groups to which the organization is answerable; and (d) its operative goals and technologies (Scott 1992; Hasenfeld 1992, 1983; Meyer & Scott 1983; Pfeffer & Salanick 1978; Wamsley & Zald 1976; Benson 1975; Zald 1970).

Conflict resolution and Peace Studies
Fourth, the substantive issues of concern and the language P/CROs employ are usually covered in Conflict resolution And Peace Studies (CAPS). Much of the substance, language and philosophy of P/CROs are explored in the fields of conflict resolution and peace studies. Among students of conflict resolution, conceptualizations differ considerable regarding the nature of conflict. Most do agree that conflicts change over time and are not usually isolated phenomenon but instead are interlocked with other issues and conflicts with salience shifting according to internal and external environments (Boulding 1993; Mitchell 1993; Kriesberg 1992). Protagonists embroiled in conflict also frequently differ in their conception of conflict. They tend to view their conflicts as deriving from causes either endogenous or exogenous to the conflict (Fitzduff, 1995), subjectively (lying in the subjective relations between the parties) or objectively (tied to objective, issues of differential access to scarce resources or mutually incompatible goals) (Bloomfield 1995). Theories addressing peace are also of relevance to our study, for they help to shed light on the differing conceptions of what is ostensibly the ultimate goal of all P/CROs and the strategies employed to bring about its realization. Generally, peace studies literature identifies three broad and overlapping operational strategies for pursuing peace. *Peacemaking* strategies are reformative in nature, as they usually seek resolutions or the de-escalation of conflicts. *Peacekeeping* strategies tend to be more palliative for they generally are mechanisms to decrease the level of violence and maintain cease-fires, but do little to address the underlying causes of conflict. *Peacebuilding* strategies on the other hand, are simultaneously transformative in nature, and also construct positive structural and cultural mechanisms toward "positive peace" (Galtung 1996).

ISPO Structure

The study was initiated and directed by Benjamin Gidron, Ben Gurion University, Israel and Stanley Katz, Princeton University, USA and was managed administratively by the Nonprofit Research Fund of the Aspen Institute, in conjunction with ISTR. In each country/region a P.I. was chosen who headed a local team which was responsible for the conduct of the study in its locale.   In the Israeli/Palestinian case, because of the nature of the conflict and other considerations, two independent teams were appointed who collected data in their respective locales. They collaborated in studying joint Israeli/Palestinian organizations.

The ISPO local research team heads are:
- Northern Ireland: Seamus Dunn, Director, Center for the Study of the Conflict, Coleraine University, Northern Ireland.
- Israel: Tamar Hermann, Director, The Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Studies, Tel-Aviv University, Israel.
- Palestine: Manuel Hassassian, Department of Political Science, Bethlehem University, Palestinian Authority.
- South Africa: Rupert Taylor, Department of Political Science, Witswatersrand University, Johannesburg, South Africa.

The study has been accompanied by an International Advisory Board, composed of experts in the topic of the study or related subjects, and knowledgeable about the three conflicts. Members of the Advisory Board are involved in all stages of the study as readers of the material produced and participants in the meetings. Members included:
- Helmut Anheier, Rutgers and Johns Hopkins Universities, USA
- Musa Buedeiri, Al-Quds University, East Jerusalem
- Galia Golan, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
- Adrian Guelke, Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland
- Virginia Hodgkinson, Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA
- WilmoJames, Director, IDASA, South Africa
- Quintin Oliver, former Director, Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action, Belfast, Northern Ireland

Three meetings, one in each locale, involving the researchers and the advisory board members were held throughout the project in which decisions on content and methodology were made.

Definition

In addition to proposing a single conceptual framework to study peace/conflict resolution organizations around three major international conflicts, ISPO developed a common definition and a common methodology that enables a comparative analysis across countries/conflicts. At the same time it also allows each team to give expression to the specific nature of the organizations they study, based on the different political context, nature of conflict etc.

PEACE/CONFLICT   RESOLUTION   ORGANIZATIONS   (P/CROs)   Operational Definition:
Peace/conflict resolution organizations refer to non-governmental, citizen-initiated organizations advocating peace, reconciliation, and coexistence in these three countries/regions - on the basis of mutual recognition and/or the use of dispute-resolution strategies as a means of addressing their respective conflicts.

Organizations conforming to this definition performed one or more of the following functions:

- *Service provision* - mostly professional organizations providing medical, legal, social, educational and other services to those populations who are denied such services.
- *Advocacy* - mostly social movement organizations engaged in various forms of political pressure with the aim of policy-change from confrontation to some kind of reconciliation.
- *Dialogue* - organizations and groups engaged in a face-to-face dialogue and work on joint projects with the other side aiming to create a better understanding and awareness.
- *Consciousness-raising* - organizations that seek to educate or sensitize individuals and publics toward the negative implications of continued conflict and the possibilities offered by its peaceful resolution.

<u>Phases of the Study</u>
The collection of organizational data on the P/CROs was divided into three distinct phases (Table 1):
 1. In the first, using the operational definition, a scan of the field was conducted in each of the countries and, with primary and secondary sources, a basic description of these organizations was provided.
 2. Following that, a subset of that scan - approximately 30 organizations from each region - was examined in greater detail through the use of structured questionnaires administered to a single P/CRO respondent. It was decided that each of these samples in the 2nd phase, in addition to reflecting the salient features of the local P/CRO sector, would also include at least some P/CROs that: ceased to exist; were composed of women; embodied a religious orientation; and conformed to each of the four functional categories of *service provision, dialogue*, *advocacy*, and *consciousness-raising*. So for example, the sample from Northern Ireland included cases that conformed to each of these diverse varieties, but nevertheless exhibited a predomination of groups engaged in "cross-community" work, consistent with the prevalent tendency within that sector. The selection process for the project's 2nd stage yielded an international sample of 111 P/CROs (South African-36; N. Irish-36; Israeli-25; and Palestinian-14).
 3. In the final phase, the research teams reduced the sample of P/CROs polled in 2nd phase in order to ensure that expression would be given both to distinctive, local conditions and to internationally comparable organizational features. What resulted was a final sample of approximately 10 organizations from each country (Table 2). These *structured samples* from each locale were then studied in a comprehensive manner through the use of a semi-structured questionnaire outline. The outline guided the investigator in interviewing several respondents as well as using other data sources per organization. In an effort to assess the changes occurring over time, the question areas related to three distinct time periods: 1) early years (about 3 years after the establishment of the P/CRO); critical years (peak of the conflict, as determined by each researcher team); the present (or, in the case of defunct P/CROs, the period of organizational demise).

Data Collected
The data collected on the organizations studied may be divided into 3 sets of variables:
 1. Internal organizational patterns
     i) background of and processes/dilemmas underlying the P/CRO's formation
     ii) patterns of recruitment, participation and attributes of participants
     iii) formal and informal organizational structure and division of labor
     iv) patterns of leadership

v) decision making

vi) methods of generating funds and the implications thereof

vii) declared and implicit organizational goals and the means to ensure their support among participants; organizational *raison d'être* (perceived causes of the conflict and the nature, scope and intensity of its proposed resolution)

viii) nature of organizational outputs (tactics and activities) and the mechanisms used in their planning and execution

ix) risks (to both organization and participant) and means of coping with them

2. External relations patterns - The type of relations (i.e. cooperative and/or competition) it forms(ed) with different entities (other P/CROs, the media, political leadership, countermovements etc.).

3. The key events that took place during the period covered by the study and their relations to the organizational patterns and activities.

Data Analysis

This last phase of data collection yielded comprehensive reports on each of the P/CROs selected for the final sample. Though the format of all the reports conformed to that prescribed by the "comprehensive questionnaire outline," the research teams built upon this set of guidelines to provide rich, nuanced work that proves a useful portal through which to view the nature and functioning of these P/CROs. Indeed, given their descriptive depth, virtually all of these reports - narratives replete with quotes, anecdotes and case studies of P/CRO activity - are capable of standing on their own. While the research teams began submitting the completed organizational reports to the project co-directors, the latter simultaneously undertook preparations for laying the theoretical and technical groundwork for an international comparative analysis. On the theoretical level, this involved devising a conceptual framework for delineating the social, political, cultural and economic factors in each country which are brought to bear on the environment of local P/CROs. On the technical level, it was necessary to select a tool which would allow for the systematic entry, coding and organization of the qualitative data received. In the end, "Atlas", a software package used in analyzing qualitative data, was chosen as the preferred tool for assisting in the task of international comparative analysis. While the analysis presented at this conference is primarily descriptive, ongoing analysis of the wealth of data collected will ultimately explore in a more systematic fashion relationships among the many micro and meso-level variables incorporated in the research design of this study.

III. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The specific organizational variables we shall address in this presentation are: 1) P/CRO Structure; 2) Funding; 3) Membership; 4) Ideology and Activities; and 5) Risk. As stated earlier, these are preliminary findings which will be tested more rigorously in subsequent data analyses. They nevertheless offer some interesting insights into the behavior and dynamics of this phenomenon.

A. P/CRO Structure
The data on structure and structural change in this sample of P/CROs (table 3) indicates a clear process of institutionalization. This is reflected in the increase in the number of paid staff in most P/CROs over time, in the rate of "professional" organizations (based solely or primarily on paid staff), in the rate of formally registered organizations, and in the actual reports on more instiforms of decision-making. This trend of institutionalization was observed in all countries studied.

B. Funding
Most organizations studied in all three countries/regions have seen significant growth in volume of funding since the 1970's and 80's (Table 4). In South Africa and Israel most organizations studied report international sources as their primary funding sources. In Northern Ireland, British sources are the primary funding sources of half of the organizations studied (Table 5).   The international sources include: foreign governments, foreign foundations, churches, and others.

C. Membership
Members and workers in P/CROs in all three countries/regions tend to come from the middle and upper socio-economic classes (with the exception of Northern Ireland where some working class membership was also observed). In Israel and South Africa (until recently) P/CROs reflect a relatively homogenous religious/ethnic membership; in Northern Ireland organizations are more heterogeneous on this dimension. The political identity of members and workers tend to be "left and far left" (given the local differences attributed to these terms), except again in Northern Ireland where the their identity is "mixed." Finally in all three countries, members tend to have affiliations with several P/CROs (Table 6).

D. Ideology and Activities
Different P/CROs attribute different causes to the conflict and on this basis frame their solutions and design their activities. In most instances the organizations sampled cite several causes of a the conflict as well as various solutions to help resolve it. Even so, the organizations do cluster according to their *primary* focus or understanding about the conflict (Table 7). This may be thought of as being on a continuum between *person* locus of blame and *system* locus of blame.

Regardless of where these organizations fall along this continuum, they typically engage in more than one type of tactic and are strained if asked to identify the *most important* or *primary* tactic. Table 8 shows what percentage of organizations in each country use tactics which can be categorized as either Mobilizing Public Opinion, Service, Networking, or Lobbying.

E. Risk and Antagonism

An important characteristic of P/CROs is that their work involves risks, both to members and to the organization. The sources of risk differs in the organizations studied - primarily state controlled in South Africa, counter-movements in Israel and paramilitary in Northern Ireland. We also categorized organizations by the level of risk and degree of antagonism experienced by members and staff as a result of their association with the P/CRO (Table 9). Their distribution along the 3 levels of risk/antagonism differs by country: Half of the organizations studied in South Africa reported high levels of risk, 1/3 in Israel and only 1 in Northern Ireland.

IV. EFFICACY

Acknowledgment of the difficulty of assessing efficacy (or impact):

Difficulty of identifying "key" events leading to peace
- Assessments are biased by the current state of progress of the "peace" process at the time the assessment is made. The problem of writing "winners'" history (or "whig" history). Also the problem of the bias of interviewees (in the Efficacy Phase of data collection).
- The problem of causality is in itself always difficult - but we are not arguing for causality, but trying to identify particular roles and contributions (trying to tease related factors apart).
- Hard to disentangle the roles of individuals and organizations - can they really be separated? Query: do P/CROs provide an essential vehicle for charismatic leadership in the peace process? Are P/CROs a necessary, but not sufficient condition for the attainment of peace? Do they simply provide space for proponents of peaceful change?
- Peace movements are broad, hard to operationalize, and therefore to measure.

Methodology
During the third project phase, the methodological strategy towards investigating the second research question undergirding this study, namely assessing the influence of the P/CRO movement or sector in each country, was finalized. While the informants for exploring the first research question were P/CRO leaders and participants, for the efficacy question, those deemed best equipped to ascertain how P/CROs contributed (if at all) to the resolution of conflict were external to the P/CRO sector and may be divided among the following categories:
- Mass media representatives
- Political leaders involved in the conflict (formal and informal)
- Government officials (i.e. civil servants, state security) responsible for the management and handling of the conflict
- Academics and intellectuals
- Recognized leaders of the P/CROs
- Representatives of international organizations such as foundations, NGOs, or religious organizations

The research tool utilized in this portion of the study was the "Efficacy Protocol", a framework for the investigators designed to enable a comparative analysis of the efficacy of P/CROs across countries. Using this protocol, the research teams set out to interview 4 to 5 representatives of the above different categories of actors. The three loci of efficacy or impact we identified were:
1. Impact on the peace/conflict resolution
2. Impact on the peace making/conflict resolution process
3. Impact in defining the conflict and its resolution.

Impact on the peace/conflict resolution refers to key events, developments or negotiation that contributed toward the resolution of the conflict in which P/CRO sector played a role. Impact on the peace making/conflict resolution process may be understood as recognition accorded

P/CROs by mass media, parties to the conflict, government officials, etc., links forged by P/CROs [with any of the main factions in the conflict], and changes in the political process initiated by the P/CRO sector. Impact in defining the conflict and its resolution is exemplified by changes in public perceptions regarding the conflict or its resolution, new ways (or new vocabulary) to define and describe the conflict, and new set of strategies or activities adopted by others not directly involved in the P/CRO sector.

We organized the responses in five large categories: access of the P/CRO to governing elites, impact upon significant policies, impact upon public opinion/culture, creation of political space for positive action, and impact upon political/social process. We do not have enough data, nor is the existing data hard enough, to make any determinative assessment of efficacy. But we believe we have sufficient data of high quality to make some educated guesses about the efficacy of the P/CROs in our sample.

<u>Preliminary Findings</u>
The broad conclusions of our teams (quoting from their reports) were:
- In Northern Ireland, "it was the politically motivated violence which had produced the momentum for peace, rather than the activities of the P/CRO sector" (p.138). However, individuals working in their own communities had a "drip drip" effect which had more lasting impact than high profile work. "This work provided something tangible for people to work with, and was consequently more long lasting and valuable."
- In Israel the greatest impact of the sector was in "changing the discourse on peace and security matters and in transforming the former zero-sum interpretation of the Israeli-Palestinian relations."
- As our team in Palestine pointed out, the task of the P/CROs there was so distinctive, and the data so hard to assess, that it is difficult to generalize about the success of the Palestinian sector along the parameters used to evaluate the other national sectors.
- In South Africa, our team pointed out that it was not possible to talk about a South African "peace movement" because of the nature of the struggle in that country. The team therefore spoke of a network of anti-apartheid NGOs in which "peace and conflict resolution" work was situated. They concluded that the sector "weakened the Apartheid State in certain ways, in particular through creaand encouraging an oppositional culture in the 'white' community" and thereby assisting "in rendering apartheid unworkable."   P/CRO sector provided a model of an alternative order of a non-racial community - in the words of one participant, the sector "promoted change . . . within the context of democracy.... They helped to give democracy a soft landing." It also achieved at least some identifiable political successes, such as the Dakar meeting of July, 1987 between reform-minded members of the Afrikaner elite and the ANC.

Our teams frequently resorted to metaphorical explanations of the efficacy of P/CROs in their countries:
- South Africa: "Chaos theory says that the flutter of a butterfly's wings eventually ends up in a hurricane.... Does it cause a hurricane? No, but it was part of it."
- Northern Ireland: "A suitable metaphor might be that of watching the tide come in. At any one snap-shot in time, it is very difficult to determine whether it is coming in or going out as waves ebb and flow. However, after several hours you find that the water is up around your knees."

We can supply details of our analysis of the individual country efficacy reports in the discussion period, but I think this brief account will give you a good sense of the tenor of the reports.

- Our sense is that the P/CROs provided a legitimizing mechanism for those who sought peace and conflict resolution, although the mechanisms (and the analogous "spaces" for action created) were quite different in each country. Context made a crucial difference for NGO organization and behavior.
- Among the efficacy variables studied, two seem to have been most important: Public Opinion/Culture and Process. The NGOs we studied provided new metaphors, new language and a new level of trust in the process of negotiation as a realistic possibility. They presented alternative models of interaction, and examples of successful interaction. They helped empower people to "do the right thing." They dignified the role of the individual, and provided an alternative reality on the local level - proving a point to themselves as well as to outsiders.

Qualification

Having said this much, it is important to note that we have only just received the draft final reports and begun to analyze them - and what I have just said represents the first conclusions of the writers of this paper, not of the teams (who have not attempted to generalize across the countries).

REFERENCES

Benson, J. K. (1975). "The inter-organizational network as a political economy." *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 20:229-249.

Bloomfield, David (1995). "Towards complementarity in conflict management: Resolution and settlement in Northern Ireland." *Journal of Peace Research*. 32(2):151-164.

Boulding, E. (1993). "States, boundaries and environmental security" in *Conflict Resolution: Theories and Practice: integration and application*. Sandole, D.J.D., & H. van der Merwe (eds.) Manchester: Manchester University Press.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1991) "Introduction." in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Powell & DiMaggio (eds). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-- (1983). "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." *American Sociological Review*. 48:147-160.

Eisinger, Peter (1973). "The conditions of protest behavior in American cities." *American Political Science Review*. 67:11-28.

Fitzduff, Mari (1995). "Managing community relations and conflict: voluntary organizations and government and the search for peace." in *Voluntary Action and Social Policy in Northern Ireland*. N. Acheson & A. Williamson (eds.) Aldershot: Avebury.

Galtung, Johan (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Sage.

Hasenfeld, Y. (ed) (1992). *Human Services As Complex Organizations*. California: Sage Publications.

-- (1983). *Human Service Organizations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Jenkins, J.C. (1987). "Nonprofit organizations and policy advocacy" in *The Nonprofit Sector*. W. W. Powell (ed). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Bert Klandermans (1995). *The Politics of Social Protest.* Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Klandermans, Bert & Oegema, Dirk (1987). "Potentials, networks, motivations and barriers: steps toward participation in social movements", *American Sociological Review*. 52(August):519-31.

Kriesberg, L. (1994). "Conflict resolution" in *Peace World Security Studies*. M. Klare (ed). Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

-- (1992). *International Conflict Resolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McAdam, (1988). "Micromobilization contexts and recruitment to activism", *International Social Movement Research*. 1:125-54.

McAdam, D., McCarthy J. D., & Zald M. N. (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J.D. (1987). "Pro-Life and Pro-Choice Mobilization: infrastructure deficits and new technologies." in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*. Zald & McCarthy (eds). New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Meyer, J. W. & Scott, W .R. (1983). *Organizational Environments*. California: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, Christopher R (1993). "Problem-Solving Exercise and Theories of Conflict Resolution." in *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: integration and application*, 78-94. Sandole, D.J.D., & H. van der Merwe (eds.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mueller, C.M. & Morris, A. D. (eds) (1992). *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pfeffer, J. & Salanick, G. R. (1978). T*he External Control of Organizations*. New York: Harper and Row.

Ragin, Charles (1987). *The Comparative Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Routledge, Paul (1993). *Terrains of Resistance: nonviolent social movements and the contestation of place in India*. Westport: Praeger.

Rucht, D. (1996). "The Impact of National Contexts on Social Movement Structures: a cross-movement and cross-national comparison." in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*.. McAdam et al (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salamon, L. M. & Anheier, H. K. (1996). "Explaining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-National Analysis." Working draft prepared for presentation at the second annual conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research. Mexico City, July 18-21.

Scott, W. R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Tarrow, Sidney (1996). "Fishnets, Internets and Catnets: Globalization and Transnational Collective Action." Working Paper 1996/78.

-- (1993). "Modular collective action and the rise of the social movement; why the French Revolution was not enough." *Politics and Society*. 21:69-90.

Wamsley G. L. & Zald, M. (1976). *The Political Economy of Public Organizations*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Zald, M.N. (1996). "Culture, Ideology, and Strategic Framing." in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. McAdam et al (eds). New York: Cambridge University Press.

--   (1970). "Political economy: a framework for comparative analysis" in *Power in Organizations*. M. Zald (ed.) Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.