

in the Lancaster House negotiations. These initiatives were put forward as critical points of reference in understanding the dynamics of successful third party intervention in conflict resolution.

### Discussion

David Leyton-Brown argued that regime concepts could, in fact, be quite useful in understanding the Rhodesian/Zimbabwean conflict. As well, the examination of this particular case study may help to illustrate the utility of regime analysis. The fact that there was a clearly identifiable regime in the 1965-74 period which did not persist prompted Leyton-Brown's observation that; "what regime theory does give us is not only a set of concepts and tools for comprehending the state of reality at a given moment ...it also gives us an opportunity and requirement to focus upon change. It forces us to examine why regimes not only are formed but why they decompose. What are the pressures that lead to the transformation from one regime to another?"

The influence of perception and re-perception in conflicts formed the basis for Ron Fisher's question of why parties in the Rhodesian conflict chose to enter into formal negotiations in 1979 rather than continue with the military option. Matthews responded that external actors such as the Commonwealth States and Mozambique (through its close relations with ZANU) applied considerable pressure on the Patriotic Front to enter into negotiations and attempted to convince the Patriotic Front that it had the most to win in formal negotiations. The ability of Lord Carrington to prod parties into agreement by playing off their fears and expectations was also noted as an important influence contributing to re-perception.