Record Nr. UNINA9910826651703321 Autore Beardsley Kyle <1979-> Titolo The mediation dilemma / / Kyle Beardsley Pubbl/distr/stampa Ithaca,: Cornell University Press, 2011 **ISBN** 0-8014-6262-2 0-8014-6261-4 Edizione [1st ed.] 1 online resource (252 p.) Descrizione fisica Cornell studies in security affairs Collana Disciplina 327.1/7 Soggetti Mediation, International Conflict management Peace-building Diplomatic negotiations in international disputes Pacific settlement of international disputes Lingua di pubblicazione Inglese **Formato** Materiale a stampa Livello bibliografico Monografia Bibliographic Level Mode of Issuance: Monograph Note generali Includes bibliographical references and index. Nota di bibliografia Nota di contenuto The dilemma -- Negotiating mediation -- Why accept mediation? --Raison d'etre : short-term benefits of mediation -- The struggle for self-enforcing peace -- Mediation in intrastate conflicts --Implications, applications, and conclusions. Mediation has become a common technique for terminating violent Sommario/riassunto conflicts both within and between states; while mediation has a strong record in reducing hostilities, it is not without its own problems. In The Mediation Dilemma, Kyle Beardsley highlights its long-term limitations. The result of this oft-superficial approach to peacemaking, immediate and reassuring as it may be, is often a fragile peace. With the intervention of a third-party mediator, warring parties may formally agree to concessions that are insupportable in the long term and soon enough find themselves at odds again. Beardsley examines his argument empirically using two data sets and traces it through several historical cases: Henry Kissinger's and Jimmy Carter's initiatives in the

Middle East, 1973-1979; Theodore Roosevelt's 1905 mediation in the Russo-Japanese War; and Carter's attempt to mediate in the 1994 North Korean nuclear crisis. He also draws upon the lessons of the 1993 Arusha Accords, the 1993 Oslo Accords, Haiti in 1994, the 2002

Ceasefire Agreement in Sri Lanka, and the 2005 Memorandum of Understanding in Aceh. Beardsley concludes that a reliance on mediation risks a greater chance of conflict relapse in the future, whereas the rejection of mediation risks ongoing bloodshed as war continues. The trade-off between mediation's short-term and long-term effects is stark when the third-party mediator adopts heavy-handed forms of leverage, and, Beardsley finds, multiple mediators and intergovernmental organizations also do relatively poorly in securing long-term peace. He finds that mediation has the greatest opportunity to foster both short-term and long-term peace when a single third party mediates among belligerents that can afford to wait for a self-enforcing arrangement to be reached.