

conditions a third-party role may be possible, but it remains to be determined whether such intervention is desirable. It is the perception that the situation has become intolerable that causes parties to change their costing processes and makes bilateral options or joint solutions conceivable. This realization often occurs when the weaker party begins to rise in power relative to the dominant party. The ripe moment is the point at which the process switches from track one (unilateral) to track two (multilateral) action. The question, in terms of meaningful intervention opportunity, is whether a third party has the skill to increase the attractiveness of the negotiation option.)

[Mandell felt that there was a need for an "early warning analytical capability" beyond an intelligence function. However, it was noted that even the identification of "the" ripe moment does not guarantee successful intervention. For example, overcommitment by third parties may compromise the success of intervention. Also, it was argued that the impact of intervening influences had to be accommodated in any strategy formulation. Furthermore, the mediator may mismanage its use of carrots and sticks, which points to the importance of synchronizing intervention efforts and sequencing initiatives. A final consideration mentioned, was the impact of interested versus disinterested third party intervenors in the conflict management and resolution process.)

[The work of Edward Azar, as well as John Burton, was cited as notable challenges to the Zartman type of analysis. In the context of their work, it could be argued that the analysis of a ripe moment focusses on the wrong problem because it concentrates on the role of the external intervenor rather than the root of social conflict, which, in Azar's analysis, is the neglect of human identity needs, values and interests. Within this framework, trying to exploit a ripe