

in which they should be addressed. Should some issues be linked? These components can be combined in different ways at different times depending on the nature of the conflict being addressed.

The history of Soviet-American relations and the Arab-Israeli conflict were used as case studies to illustrate two examples of de-escalatory processes. Forty years ago, central Europe appeared to be an intractable conflict, whereas the Middle East appeared tractable ("the sand would settle"). The analysis of these two contrasting experiences can contribute to furthering our understanding of de-escalation processes. What lessons can be learned through a comparison of these cases? What were the "little settlements" through the transition of forty years that allowed for positive transformation in Central Europe? Conversely, what were the processes in the Middle East which precipitated the escalation of violence? Kriesberg speculated that the different ways with which refugees were dealt may partially account for the different outcomes in the two cases. A series of questions were posed to help focus analysis on the de-escalation process. How and why was the status quo accepted in one case, but not in the other? From whose perspective is conflict being considered? Does analysis adequately consider short, medium and long-term dimensions of the conflict and of conflict management? What is the ripe moment; ripe for what; ripe for whom; in what time frame; and for what purpose? Does stopping the prospect of escalation in itself lead to settlement?

### Discussion

Discussion began with the question "why isn't de-escalation simply escalation in reverse?" One reason put forward to explain why it is not simply a process of "climbing