CONSORTIUM ON NEGOTIATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION
A Consortium of Georgia Universities for the
Advancement of Conflict Resolution Theory and Education

Working Paper Series #98-1
September, 1998

War and Reconciliation

Peter Brecke and William J. Long
Georgia Institute of Technology

Peter Brecke and William J. Long are professors in the School of International Affairs at Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332 (404/894-6599).

CONSORTIUM ON NEGOTIATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Executive Committee

Douglas Yarn
Executive Director
Georgia State University

Gregory Bourne
Georgia Institute of Technology

Linda Brady
Georgia Institute of Technology

Dorinda Dallmeyer
Director, International Program
University of Georgia

Michael Elliott
Director, Public Policy Program
Georgia Institute of Technology

Peter Shedd
University of Georgia

This working paper series is designed to share the results of research and to encourage the examination of new ideas related to negotiation, dispute resolution and decision-making. The Consortium invites your comments on this paper and asks that you direct your comments directly to the author.

If you would like additional copies of this paper, please write or call Carolyn G. Benne, Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution, Georgia State University, College of Law, P.O. Box 4037, Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4037. (404/651-1588). A nominal fee is charged for each working paper to cover reproduction and handling costs.

Please note: This paper, in whole or in part, should not be reproduced or cited without the written permission of the author.

War and Reconciliation

Peter Brecke and William J. Long

The Sam Nunn School of International Affairs

Georgia Institute of Technology

Atlanta, GA 30332-0610

fax: 404-894-1900

peter.brecke@inta.gatech.edu

william.long@inta.gatech.edu

ABSTRACT: Reconciliation between countries following a war or a series of wars has attracted little scholarly attention as a phenomenon to be studied even though it receives journalistic coverage and past cases of reconciliation have been extensively described. This paper uses four international events datasets to explore whether reconciliation events have a discernible impact on the relations between countries, and if so, the nature of that impact. The paper describes the objectives of this project, the hypotheses tested, the data used, and the results obtained. The results suggest that reconciliation events have an impact, at least in some cases. However, limitations of the data constrain what can be asserted. The paper then discusses how to continue this research by linking to other research questions and theoretical schools and by focusing our next study on eight cases.

The authors wish to thank Sara Jones for her research assistance with this paper, Rodney Tomlinson for making available the WEIS dataset, Phil Schrodt for making available his Levant dataset, and Doug Bond for making available data from his PANDA project. Of course, none of these individuals bears any responsibility for errors or omissions in the paper.

INTRODUCTION

Since the writings of Hobbes and Locke, a fundamental political question is why individuals enter into, and how they maintain, civil society despite competition and conflict among individual actors. A variety of formal and informal work acknowledges the tension between aggressive behavior and societal harmony and points to the importance of *reconciliation*—returning to peace, harmony, or amicable relations after a conflict—as integral to mitigating future violence and maintaining societal stability.

Consider three recordings of the role of reconciliation in very disparate "societies." The first incident is described by ethologist Frans de Waal (de Waal, 1989, p. 5). He recalls witnessing a fight in the chimpanzee colony of the Arnhem Zoo:

> It was the winter of 1975 and the colony was kept indoors. In the course of a charging display, the dominant male attacked a female, which caused screaming chaos as other chimpanzees came to her defense. When the group finally calmed down, an unusual silence followed, with nobody moving, as if the apes were waiting for something. Suddenly the entire colony burst out hooting, while one male worked the large metal drums in the corner of the hall. In the midst of the pandemonium I saw two chimpanzees kiss and embrace. . . the embracing individuals had been the same male and female of the initial fight.

A second observation comes from the seventeenth century letters of American author Samuel Sewall (Hendrickson, 1987, p. 90). He captured the following ceremony of native Americans of the northeast colonies in

1680:

> Meeting with the Sachem they came to an agreement and buried two axes in the ground . . . which ceremony to them is more significant and binding than all the Articles of Peace, the hatchet being a principle weapon.

Three centuries later, contemporary historian Hendrick Smith described the signing of a peace treaty and the public joining of hands between President Anwar Sadat of Egypt, Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel, and President Jimmy Carter of the United States (Smith, 1979, A1):

> The elusive, unprecedented peace treaty that Egypt and Israel signed today has enormous symbolic importance and the potential for fundamentally transforming the map and history of the entire region . . . the best diplomatic estimate here is that the treaty has markedly reduced the risk of a major war in the Middle East for a considerable time . . .

Notably, each description contains the implicit or explicit hypothesis that future violence is less likely to occur, and "societal" order more likely to be maintained, if the parties to a conflict engage in a formal, public process of reconciliation. This is a powerful, yet untested assumption despite pervasive references to reconciliation in popular discussions of intra- and international conflicts.[1]

This paper considers what effect, if any, the role reconciliation has at the level of "international society."[2] It asks, does public reconciliation between national belligerents reduce the outbreak of future conflict and lead to more amicable relations? If reconciliation matters in this context, can we refine our insight to say under what circumstances reconciliation is

more or less likely to occur and by what mechanisms reconciliation restores amicable relations between parties and impedes future conflicts?[3]

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The immediate research questions we wish to answer concerning how does a reconciliation event affect relations between former combatants are:

- Do relations between former combatants improve following the reconciliation event?
- Do relations between former combatants improve relative to their long-term relations before the conflict?
- When comparing across a number of post-conflict situations, do relations between former combatants that experience a reconciliation event subsequently exhibit less conflictual interactions than the subsequent (post-conflict) relations between former combatants that did not have a reconciliation event?
- Does the reconciliation event precede an improvement in relations or is it simply a stage in an already ongoing improvement?

As derived from analogous social science literature referred to earlier, we define a "reconciliation event" as one that typically includes the following elements: (1) direct physical contact or proximity between opponents, usually the senior representatives of the respective states; (2) a public ceremony accompanied by substantial publicity or media attention that relays the event to the wider national societies; and (3) ritualistic or symbolic behavior that indicates the parties consider the quarrel resolved

and that more amicable relations are expected to follow. Often the signing of a treaty incorporates these three elements, and, in practice, is the embodiment of a reconciliation.

HYPOTHESES TESTED

We intend to test the following hypotheses regarding the impact of reconciliation on international relations:

1. The relations between former combatants improve following a reconciliation event.
2. Relations between former combatants that have a reconciliation do *not* improve compared to their *long-term* relations before the conflict.
3. Those former belligerents that experience a reconciliation event subsequently exhibit better relations than those former belligerents that did not have a reconciliation event.
4. The reconciliation event is more than simply another step in improving relations. It is at minimum an inflection point at which the rate of change in the improvement of relations increases. In other cases it is an inflection point at which the nature of the relations changes from declining or essentially unchanging to improving.

Hypotheses 1 and 3 are straightforward given the research questions. Hypothesis 2 may seem unusual, but it is consistent with the theoretical proposition that reconciliation is an act to restore and, over the long term, maintain societal comity. We expect that reconciliation will not, in general, directly alter the long-term interests of the parties. For that reason we expect that relations following a reconciliation would at most only temporarily rise to a higher level than the long-term state of relations.

Hypothesis 4 also requires further explanation. We are positing that the reconciliation event can be recognized as a positive turning point in relations. This is a stronger hypothesis than hypothesis 1, which only asserts that relations improve following a reconciliation event. With hypothesis 1 a reconciliation event could simply be in the middle of a uniform trend towards better relations or could even be the point at which an improvement in relations slows down and the hypothesis would still be true.

PROCEDURE OF ANALYSIS AND DATA SOURCES USED

To test the hypotheses enumerated above, we combine three sets of information. The first is a catalogue of interstate wars from 1888 to 1991. The country dyads involved in these wars serve as the primary units of analysis. We obtained our list of wars and major participants—and thus dyads—from the Militarized Interstate Disputes (MIDS) dataset (version 2.10) that is available on the Internet at:
http://www.polsci.binghamton.edu/peace(s)/mid_data.htm
and whose nature is described in Gochman and Moaz (1984) and Gochman and Leng (1988). From that dataset we extracted a list consisting of 53 interstate wars. That list can be found in Appendix A. From that list we identified 114 country dyads for whom a reconciliation was—at least in principle—feasible. A listing of these dyads can be found in Appendix B. Dyad members had to have fought against each other in at least one war. In many instances dyad members had fought multiple wars in the time frame of the study.

We use the time period 1888 to 1991 to address time lags. The latter date is used because a war must have concluded before a reconciliation event becomes feasible and because our primary relationship datasets (discussed below) end in 1992. The time frame begins at 1888 because of

the combination of two factors. First, we need some upper limit in the time delay for what can reasonably be considered a reconciliation. That the participants need to be alive is a plausible criterion, and sixty years is a reasonable upper limit for participants in a war to still be in positions to make a reconciliation for their countries. Second, our relationship datasets begin at 1948; a sixty year delay puts us back to 1888.

The second set of information is reconciliation events. We sought to divide the 114 dyads into two groups, those that have experienced reconciliation following a war and those that have not. This categorization is necessary to test the hypotheses. Consequently, we assembled a dataset of reconciliation events between the countries in the dyads identified from the MIDS dataset. These data have been collected by the authors from historiographic study of each of the countries and their relationships with their dyadic "partners" subsequent to the wars between them. The list of reconciliation events is found in Appendix C. We then coded each dyad in Appendix B for reconciliation or its absence.

The third set of information is the status or condition over time of the relationship between the countries in the dyads. These are the relationship patterns referred to in the hypotheses. We obtained measures of this these relationships from four sources. The first two are the COPDAB and WEIS datasets (Azar, 1980a; Azar, 1980b; Davies and McDaniel, 1994; Tomlinson, 1993; Tomlinson, 1996). Both of these datasets are well known and have been used for a number of studies. They store in chronological sequence the history of reported cooperative and hostile acts directed from individual countries to other individual countries. COPDAB covers the period 1948-1978, and WEIS covers the period 1966-1992. While the datasets differ in many significant ways, they are broadly similar in how they track the behavior of countries towards each other (Reuveny and Kang, 1996). With the advent of the Goldstein scale (1992) for the WEIS coding scheme, both datasets now have numeric values for each

event that are a measure of the degree of "cooperativeness" or "hostility" of the event. Thanks to the numeric scales, it is a straightforward matter to generate comparable time series plots for the relationships.

We accessed two additional, similar datasets to obtain data more recent than 1992. The Levant dataset (available at http://www.ukans.edu/~keds/) contains a chronology of dyadic, interstate events in the Middle East from April 1979 to February 1997 (at the time of this writing) condensed to their WEIS code values (Schrodt and Gerner, 1997). An ancillary datafile has those events summed for each month and converted to Goldstein scale values. We used the ancillary dataset. In addition, we received data from the PANDA dataset pertaining to a number of dyads for the period 1984 to 1995 (Bond and Bond, 1995). These data for all but a small subset of events had been coded to the Goldstein scale. One of the authors converted that subset manually; the decisions made regarding the coding of those events are available from the authors.

From these datasets we selected the flows pertaining to the conflict dyads that we identified from the MIDS dataset. In combination with the reconciliation events data, the time-series of these flows provide information with which we can determine whether a reconciliation event corresponded with a change in the relations between countries. Table 1 identifies which bilateral relationships are addressed by any of the four chronological events datasets *and* the reconciliation events dataset.

Table 1

Dyad	End of Conflict	Reconciliation Event
1) USSR-W. Germany	5/45	8/70
2) W. Germany-Poland	5/45	12/70
3) USA-Japan	8/45	4/52
4) Japan-UK	8/45	4/52
5) China-Japan	8/45	4/52
6) India-Japan	8/45	4/52
7) France-Japan	8/45	4/52
8) Australia-Japan	8/45	4/52
9) Greece-Japan	8/45	4/52
10) New Zealand-Japan	8/45	4/52
11) South Africa-Japan	8/45	4/52
12) India-China	11/62	12/88
13) Honduras-El Salvador	7/69	10/80
14) USA-Vietnam	1/73	7/95
15) Israel-Jordan	10/73	10/94
16) Egypt-Israel	10/73	9/78
17) Ethiopia-Somalia	3/78	4/88
18) Cambodia-Vietnam	1/79	10/91
19) Uganda-Tanzania	4/79	2/81
20) Vietnam-China	3/79	10/91
21) UK-Argentina	6/82	3/90

We originally intended to perform three different types of analysis to test our hypotheses. The first type is simple visual analysis. The procedure is to plot the relationships over time that had a reconciliation,

demarcate the time of the reconciliation on the plot, and visually inspect the plots to determine if the plots change as posited in hypotheses 1, 2, and 4. Plotting those relationships that did *not* have a reconciliation and comparing them with the first set of plots would allow for a visual interpretation of hypothesis 3.

METHOD FOR GENERATING VISUAL ANALYSIS

One of the authors wrote FORTRAN programs to extract the appropriate data from three of the events datasets to generate time-series plots. (The fourth dataset, the datafile ancillary to the Levant dataset already had the data in the form needed for analysis.) The programs accomplished effectively two tasks. The first program extracted from the datasets those events that were directed from one selected country to another, (for the WEIS dataset converted those events to numerical values using the Goldstein scale[4]), separately summed the numerical values for the cooperative and conflictual events for each month, and then calculated a monthly weighted net conflict (conflict minus cooperation) measure. The result of running this program would be a datafile containing the monthly cooperation, conflict, and net conflict "flows" from one country to another for those months for which there were any events from one of the countries to the other.

The second program "padded" the datafiles with zeros for those months for which there were no reported events so that the plots would be linear from the first month of recorded events within the datafile to the last month of recorded events.[5] The padded datafiles were then imported into the JMP statistical analysis program on a Macintosh, and the time series were plotted. For those dyads for which we found a reconciliation event, a line was drawn on the plots demarcating the time of the event.

The resulting plots contain "spikes" that portray the level or intensity of cooperative, conflictual, and net conflictual interaction for each month for which interaction was reported. All figures used in this paper present plots of only the net conflict measure. The scale of the vertical axis of the figures is not as important as is any change in the nature of the spikes around the time of the reconciliation event.

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Unfortunately, only a limited number of cases offered clear visual evidence of the impact of reconciliation. The temporal span or "window" of the relationship data (mostly 1948-1992 with a few instances up to 1995 or 1997) was, in many instances, "in the wrong place" to allow for accurate comparisons between pre- and post-conflict relations. Of the 21 reconciliation events in the period 1948-1995, nine occurred in 1951-52 (cases 3-11 in Table 1), and two occurred in 1994-95 (cases 14 and 15 in Table 1); periods effectively at the end of the time series plots. In these cases we found it impossible to determine whether there was a change in behavior between pre- and post-conflict periods because there were insufficient observations between 1948 and 1952 or after 1994 to provide a sound reference point for comparison. See Figure 1 (Japan-United Kingdom) for illustration. Furthermore, of the ten remaining cases, two (cases 17 and 19 in Table 1) had insufficient data to create a meaningful graphic representation of the relationship.[6] See Figure 2 (Uganda-Tanzania) for illustration. Because of the limited number of workable cases, eight, we did not perform the second type of analysis, interrupted time series analysis, or the third type of analysis, analysis of variance.[7]

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS

We found through visual inspection of the eight workable reconciliation cases, five dyads where a reconciliation event signaled a subsequent improvement in bilateral relations (cases 1, 12, 16, 18, and 20 in Table 1). See Figures 3-7 (USSR-West Germany, India-China, Egypt-Israel, Cambodia-Vietnam, and Vietnam-China) for illustrations. The three remaining cases did not provide evidence that a reconciliation

had a positive impact. Figure 8 (United Kingdom-Argentina) serves as an example of this outcome.

On balance, these findings offer modest support for our first hypothesis, that is, at least in some instances, a reconciliation event appears to lead to improved relations between countries.

Likewise, our fourth hypothesis garners support from these graphs. In most cases the reconciliation event demonstrates that it is a meaningful event by marking an inflection point in the plots and thereby signaling a change in the dynamics of the relations between the countries. The results are not sufficient to make conclusions regarding our second hypotheses because the number of positive examples are too few. Hypothesis number three cannot be addressed because the subsample of usable reconciled cases is too small to be meaningfully compared with non-reconciled cases.

As a result of these findings, we believe that the effects of reconciliation on international relations remains an open question worthy of further investigation. The concluding section of this article offers one possible approach to exploring what factors give rise to a reconciliation event and why reconciliation leads to an improvement in subsequent bilateral relations in some cases.

THOUGHTS ON FURTHER INVESTIGATION

The results of our "large n" study have accomplished two things: (1) provided enticing but inconclusive support for the suggestion that reconciliation may lead to an improvement in relations between former national belligerents; and, (2) given us a set of cases with some apparent variance on the dependent variable: subsequent bilateral relations between the former belligerents. We propose, therefore, a comparative case study of the eight instances of reconciled conflicts that appear to confirm or disconfirm our first hypothesis to explore two questions: (1) what factors

are likely to give rise to a reconciliation event; and, (2) when and why does reconciliation improve subsequent bilateral relations.

An in-depth study of a small number of cases would provide certain opportunities to explore these questions and present certain methodological challenges. The major challenge, of course, is the problem of complex, multiple determinants of social phenomenon and spurious or invalid inferences drawn from a few cases where multiple causal factors may be at play—in short, the problem of "over-determinancy." To control for this problem, the case study investigation will be narrowed by the systematic use of theories and a within-case process tracing procedure. General hypotheses used to explain the factors that give rise to reconciliation and the reasons for reconciliation's beneficial impact on subsequent bilateral relations will be drawn from relevant literature in the social sciences and become the bases for structured comparisons between cases. Having used theory to establish the relevant independent variables, within-case process tracing will attempt to identify the intervening steps or cause-and-effect links between the independent variables and the outcome of the dependent variable (George, 1982). The controlled comparative method has certain distinct advantages as well: the problem of reliability and validity may be smaller than in large N studies because the analyst has a small number of cases to thoroughly consider and is less dependent on data s/he cannot properly evaluate (Lijphart, 1975).

Specifically, the literature on negotiated ends to civil conflict offers hypotheses that might be applied in an international context to identify the factors that invite reconciliation events. A phenomenon quite similar to reconciliation between countries is reconciliation *within* countries following a civil war. For example, terms such as 'government of national reconciliation' or 'government of national unity' have been used by political leaders to describe their efforts (at least ostensibly) to bring in all major political groups in order to heal the wounds of war. Recent

examples of these governments include South Africa, Nicaragua, Tajikistan, and Angola.

William Zartman argues that negotiated endings to civil conflict occur when there is a symmetry of power between the combatants such that the conflict has evolved into a mutually hurting stalemate, that is, neither side perceives that it can achieve its original desired outcome. A second condition for negotiated solutions is that the stalemate is not a comfortable place for either side. Both sides fear continued violence, and thus a continuation of the violence is not acceptable. In the jargon of systems analysis, the stalemate is an unstable equilibrium because both sides do not want to remain there, and one way out is to negotiate a settlement (Zartman, 1995a). Finally, he maintains that a negotiated settlement is more likely if both participants possess sufficient power and legitimacy to satisfy the minimum demands of their supporters (Zartman, 1995b). If they lack this capacity, any agreement, even if reached, is unlikely to endure. Extrapolating from civil conflicts to international conflicts, this study will consider whether these alleged preconditions for constructive rapprochement within nations also are those that accompany international reconciliations.

Two very different theoretical traditions generate hypotheses that respond to the question: "Why does reconciliation lead to an improvement in bilateral relations?" The first hypothesis derives from rational choice and game theoretic approaches to explaining cooperative outcomes. This approach stresses that the best strategy for breaking a pattern of hostile interactions is through the sending of signals that provide a measure of commitment to the pursuit of improved relations (Armstrong, 1993; Komorita, 1973; Swinth, 1967). Reconciliation events or gestures are particularly effective form of this type of signal because reconciliation is costly to the participants and *costly* signals are more reliable determinants of a state's true intentions.

Reconciliation events impose costs because of their "audience effect" (Fearon, 1990). Leaders do not conduct foreign policy in isolation, but before domestic and international audiences. Concern with adverse domestic political reaction to a reconciliation event with a former adversary or with domestic political humiliation should a leader decide to subsequently back down from an agreement are important domestic audience costs associated with a reconciliation attempt. Likewise, risking opprobrium from third states that may disapprove of the reconciliation or loss of international reputation should the party to a reconciliation event retreat from the agreement also imposes significant international audience costs associated with a reconciliation attempt. In sum, a reconciliation event is a costly signal that the other party is more likely to interpret as a genuine offer to improve relations and thus may break a deadlocked conflictual situation. Because of the associated costs of backing away from the reconciliation, it may also buttress initial attempts of the parties at cooperative interaction.

The case of the India-China reconciliation may illustrate some of these points. The decision by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Ghandi to visit China in December 1988 risked his standing in domestic public opinion and created a vulnerability in his subsequent relations with the Chinese. Likewise, China's decision to receive the visit and conduct a public reconciliation with Ghandi proved costly to its entente with Pakistan and constrained China's subsequent freedom in negotiations with India over issues in the bilateral relationship (Garver, 1996).

Philosophical, psychological, and legal treatments of reconciliation offer an alternative hypothesis. These approaches argue that important social practices are direct outgrowths—in institutional form—of deep human passions or emotions (Murphy and Hampton, 1988) not merely rational calculations. Reconciliation events, therefore, are evidence of "forgiveness"—the process of overcoming certain psychological attitudes

(mainly the overcoming of various forms of anger or resentment). More positively, they represent a change of heart toward a formerly perceived wrongdoer that opens the possibility of new beneficial relations. Forgiveness is not the condoning of the former belligerent's action; it is a revision in judgment of the former belligerent itself. The parties to a reconciliation come to understand themselves as something other than those incidents or traits which they do not approve.

According to this hypothesis, although cognitive judgments and strategy may be involved in the process of reconciliation, the process of reconciliation also represents the overcoming of collective emotions. Reconciliation requires: (1) regaining one's confidence in one's own worth despite the actions (aggression) that may have challenged it; and, (2) the repudiation of emotions of resentment toward the other and the willingness to see the other as someone other than "the one that hurt me" (Murphy and Hampton, 1988, p. 34).

CONCLUSION

Reconciliation is a pervasive and possibly important factor in understanding international and national politics. It has been, for example, integral to the experience of the United States. President Lincoln made it the basis for a strong federal state in his famous and eloquent Second Inaugural Address in 1865 when he declared a reconciliation with the Confederacy "with malice toward none, with charity for all." President Truman, likewise made it a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy after World War II in America's relations with Germany and Japan.

Reconciliation, however, has yet to assume a role in scholarly thinking about international politics. Perhaps because of the more traditional focus on generalizable circumstances associated with war, much less attention has been devoted to the factors that establish a successful rapprochement

between former belligerents such as reconciliation.

This article opens the door to thinking about reconciliation in world politics and offers a portrait of the impact of reconciliation that suggests it may be an important factor in improving relations between former belligerents. This finding recommends further investigation of the factors that give rise to reconciliation in international politics and a theoretically-informed search for the mechanism by which reconciliation leads to a subsequent improvement in bilateral relations. Finally, this study hopes to encourage other research that explores the ubiquitous, but seldom analyzed, political phenomenon of reconciliation.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, Tony, (1993), *Breaking the Ice*, Washington, D.C.:United States Institute of Peace Press.

Azar, Edward E., (1980a), "The Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB) Project," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 24, pp. 143-152.

Azar, Edward E. (1980b), *The Codebook of the Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB)*, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Bennett, D. Scott, (1996), "Security, Bargaining, and the End of Interstate Rivalry," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (June), pp. 157-184.

Bennett, D. Scott, (1997a), "Measuring Rivalry Termination, 1816-1992," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (April), pp. 227-254.

Bennett, D. Scott, (1997b), "Democracy, Regime Change, and Rivalry Termination," *International Interactions*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 369-397.

Bercovitch, Jacob, and Paul F. Diehl, (1997), "Conflict Management of Enduring Rivalries: The Frequency, Timing, and Short-term Impact of Mediation," *International Interactions*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 299-320.

Bond, Joe, and Doug Bond, (1995), *Panda Codebook*, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.

Bull, Hedley, (1977), *The Anarchical Society*, New York: Columbia

University Press.

Davies, John L., and Chad K. McDaniel, (1994), "A New Generation of International Event-Data," *International Interactions*, Vol. 20, Nos.1-2, pp. 55-78.

de Waal, Frans, (1989), *Peacemaking Among Primates*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fearon, James D., (1990), "Deterrence and the Spiral Model: The Role of Costly Signals in Crisis Bargaining," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, August 30-September 2.

Garver, John (1996), "Sino-Indian Rapprochement and the Sino-Pakistan Entente," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 111, No. 2, pp. 323-347.

George, Alexander, (1982), "Case Study and Theory Development," paper presented to the Second Annual Symposium on Information Processing in Organizations, Carnegie Mellon University, October 15-16.

Gibler, Douglas M., (1997), "Control the Issues, Control the Conflict: The Effects of Alliances that Settle Territorial Issues on Interstate Rivalries," *International Interactions*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 341-368.

Gochman, Charles S., and Zeev Moaz, (1984), "Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1976," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (December), pp. 585-615.

Gochman, Charles S., and Russell J. Leng, (1988), "Militarized Disputes,

Incidents, and Crises: Identification and Classification," *International Interactions*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 157-163.

Goertz, Gary, and Paul F. Diehl, (1993), "Enduring Rivalries: Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Patterns," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (June), pp. 147-171.

Goldstein, Joshua S., (1992), "A Conflict-Cooperation Scale for WEIS Events Data," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (June), pp. 369-385.

Hendrickson, Robert, (1987), *Encyclopedia of Word and Phrase Origins*, London: MacMillan Press, Ltd.

Komorita, S.S., (1973), "Concession-Making and Conflict Resolution," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 17, No. 4, (December), pp. 745-763.

Lijphart, Arend, (1975), "The Comparable-Case Strategy in Comparative Research," *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 8, (July), pp. 157-177.

McDowall, David, Richard McCleary, Errol E. Meidinger, and Richard A. Hay, Jr., (1980), *Interrupted Time Series Analysis*, Sage Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Paper #21, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Murphy, Jeffrie G. and Jean Hampton, (1988), *Forgiveness and Mercy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reuveny, Rafael, and Heejoon Kang, (1996), "International Conflict and Cooperation: Splicing COPDAB and WEIS Series," *International Studies*

Quarterly, Vol. 40, No. 2 (June), pp. 281-306.

Schrodt, Philip A., and Deborah J. Gerner, (1997). "Empirical Indicators of Crisis Phase in the Middle East." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (August), pp. 529-552.

Smith, Hendrick, (1979), "Treaty Impact Still Unknown," *The New York Times*, March 17, p. A1.

Swinth, Robert L., (1967), "The Establishment of the Trust Relationship," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 11, pp. 335-360.

Thompson, William R., (1995), "Principal Rivalries," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (June), pp. 195-223.

Tomlinson, Rodney G., (1993), "Monitoring WEIS Event Data in Three Dimensions", in Merritt, Richard L., Robert G. Muncaster, and Dina A. Zinnes (eds.), *International Event Data Developments: DDIR Phase II*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 55-85.

Tomlinson, Rodney G., (1996), *World Event/Interaction Survey (WEIS) User's Guide*, 8th Revision (Draft).

Vasquez, John A., (1993), *The War Puzzle*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zartman, I. William, (1995a), "Dynamics and Constraints in Negotiations in Internal Conflicts," in I. William Zartman, (ed.), *Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 3-29.

Zartman, I. William, (1995b), "Conclusions: The Last Mile," in I. William Zartman, (ed.), *Elusive Peace: Negotiating an End to Civil Wars*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 332-346.

APPENDIX A

Interstate Wars 1888-1991 from MIDS Dataset

This file contains the interstate wars that were fought in the time period relevant to our events dataset, which runs from 1948 to 1992, and the participants of those wars as catalogued by the MIDS dataset. The time period is 1888 to 1991, the latter date because the war has to have concluded before a reconciliation event, and 1888 because we need some upper limit for what can reasonably be considered a reconciliation. The participants need to still be alive is a plausible criterion, and sixty years is a reasonable upper limit for participants in a war to still be in positions to make a reconciliation for their countries.

1. France/Thailand of 1893
- France
- Thailand

2. Sino-Japanese War (1894-95)
- China
- Japan

3. Greco-Turkish War of 1897 (1896-97)
- Turkey
- Greece

4. Spanish-American War (1898)
- USA
- Spain

5. Boxer Rebellion (1900)
- China
- USA
- United Kingdom
- Japan
- France
- Russia

6. Occupation of Manchuria (1900)
- Russia
- China

7. Russo-Japanese War (1903-05)
- Russia
- Japan

8. Second Central American War (1906)
- Guatamala
- Honduras
- El Salvador

9. Third Central American War (1907)
- Honduras
- Nicaragua
- El Salvador

10. Spanish-Moroccan War of 1909 (1909-10)
- Spain
- Morocco

11. Italian-Turkish War (1911)
- Italy
- Turkey

12. First Balkan War (1912-13)
- Bulgaria
- Greece
- Turkey
- Yugoslavia

13. Second Balkan War (1913)
- Turkey
- Yugoslavia
- Bulgaria
- Greece

- Romania

14. World War I (1914-18)
- USA
- United Kingdom
- Germany
- France
- Romania
- Turkey
- Greece
- Austria-Hungary
- Belgium
- Russia
- Bulgaria
- Italy
- Yugoslavia
- Portugal
- Japan

15. Hungary vs. Allies War (1919)
- Hungary
- Romania
- Czechoslovakia

16. Russo-Polish War (1919-20)
- Soviet Union
- Poland

17. French Occupation of Cilicia (1919-21)
- France
- Turkey

18. Greek-Turkish War (1919-22)
- Greece
- Turkey

19. Lithuanian War of Independence (1920)
- Poland
- Lithuania

20. China Eastern Railway Dispute (1929)
- China
- Soviet Union

21. Manchurian War (1931-33)
- China
- Japan

22. Chaco War (1931-35)
- Bolivia
- Paraguay

23. Italy/Ethiopia (1934-36)
- Italy
- Ethiopia

24. Marco Polo bridge (1937-41)
- China
- Japan

25. Chankufeng War (1938)
- Soviet Union
- Japan

26. Nomohan War (1939)
- Japan
- Mongolia

27. Russo-Finish War (1939-40)
- Soviet Union
- Finland

28. World War II (1939-45)
- USA
- United Kingdom
- France
- Germany
- Soviet Union
- Japan
- Poland
- Italy
- Belgium
- Norway
- Finland
- Hungary
- Bulgaria
- Romania

- Greece
- Netherlands
- Yugoslavia
- China
- Brazil
- Ethiopia
- Canada
- South Africa
- Australia
- New Zealand
- Mongolia

29. France-Thai War (1940-41)
- France
- Thailand

30. First Kashmir War (1947-49)
- India
- Pakistan

31. Palestine War (1948)
- Egypt
- Iraq
- Isreal
- Jordan
- Lebanon
- Syria

32. Korean War (1950-53)
- North Korea
- South Korea
- USA
- China
- United Kingdom
- Canada
- Netherlands
- France
- Phillipines
- Greece
- Belgium
- Australia
- New Zealand
- Thailand
- Colombia
- Turkey
- Ethiopia

33. Sinai War (1956)
- Isreal
- Egypt
- United Kingdom
- France

34. Hungarian Revolution (1956)
- Hungary
- Soviet Union

35. Sino-Indian War (1961-62)
- China
- India

36. Vietnam War (1964-1975)
- USA
- South Vietnam
- North Vietnam
- Thailand
- Philippines
- Cambodia
- South Korea
- Australia
- Laos

37. Second Kashmir War (1965)
- India
- Pakistan

38. Six Day War (1967)
- Isreal
- Egypt
- Jordan
- Syria

39. War of Attrition (1967-70)
- Egypt
- Isreal

40. Football War (1969)
- Honduras
- El Salvador

41. Bangladesh War (1971)
- Pakistan
- India

42. Yom Kippur War (1971-73)
- Isreal
- Jordan
- Egypt
- Saudi Arabia
- Syria
- Iraq

43. Cyprus War (1974)
- Turkey
- Cyprus

44. Vietnamese-Cambodian War (1975-79)
- Vietnam
- Cambodia

45. Ethiopian-Somalian Ogaden War (1977-78)
- Ethiopia
- Somalia
- Cuba

46. Ugandan-Tanzanian War (1978-79)
- Uganda
- Tanzania
- Libya

47. Sino-Vietnam War (1978-79)
- China
- Vietnam

48. Unnamed conflict between Isreal and Syria in 1980-82 (1980-82)
- Syria
- Israel

49. Iran-Iraq War (1980-88)
- Iran
- Iraq

50. Falklands Islands War (1982)
- United Kingdom
- Argentina

51. Second Sino-Vietnamese War (1986-87)
- China
- Vietnam

52. Persian Gulf War (1990-91)
- USA
- United Kingdom
- Syria
- Saudi Arabia
- Canada
- Egypt
- France
- Italy
- Iraq

53. Armenia-Azerbaijani War over Nagorno-Karabakh (1991-94)
- Armenia
- Azerbaijan

APPENDIX B

Conflict Dyads 1888-1991

This appendix contains the country dyads whose members have fought at least one war against each other in the time period relevant to the events dataset. These dyads thus delimit the relationships in which we look for reconciliation events.

1. United States vs Spain
- Spanish American war in 1898

2. United States vs China
- Boxer Rebellion in 1900
- Korean War

3. United States vs Soviet Union/Russia
- occupation in 1918-19

4. United States vs Germany
- WW1
- WW2

5. United States vs Japan
- WW2

6. United States vs Italy
- WW2

7. United States vs North Korea
- Korean War

8. United States vs North Vietnam
- Vietnam War

9. United States vs Cambodia
- invasion in 1970

10. United States vs Iraq
- war in 1990-91

11. Japan vs China
- war in 1894-95
- Boxer Rebellion in 1900
- Manchurian war in 1931-33
- Marco Polo bridge war in 1937-41
- World War II

12. Japan vs Soviet Union/Russia
- Russo-Japanese war in 1903-05
- Chankufeng war in 1938

13. Japan vs Mongolia
- Nomohan war in 1939

14. Japan vs Germany
- WW1

15. Japan vs Great Britain
- WW2

16. Japan vs Philippines
- WW2

17. Japan vs Netherlands
- WW2

18. Japan vs Australia
- WW2

19. Japan vs Burma
- WW2

20. Germany vs Soviet Union/Russia
- WW1
- WW2

21. Germany vs Great Britain
- WW1
- WW2

22. Germany vs France
- WW1
- WW2

23. Germany vs Belgium
- WW1
- WW2

24. Germany vs Poland
- WW2

25. Germany vs Denmark
- WW2

26. Germany vs Norway
- WW2

27. Germany vs Netherlands
- WW2

28. Germany vs Portugal
- WW1

29. Germany vs Luxembourg
- WW2

30. Germany vs Serbia (Yugoslavia)
- WW1
- WW2

31. Germany vs Greece
- WW2

32. Germany vs Australia
- WW2

33. Germany vs New Zealand
- WW2

34. Germany vs Canada
- WW2

35. Germany vs Romania
- WW1

36. France vs Thailand
- war in 1893
- war in 1940-41

37. France vs China
- Boxer Rebellion

38. France vs Soviet Union/Russia
- occupation in 1918-19

39. France vs Turkey
- French occupation of Cilicia in 1919-21

40. France vs Egypt
- war in 1956

41. France vs Iraq
- war in 1990-91

42. Great Britain vs China
- Boxer Rebellion in 1900
- Korean War

43. Great Britain vs Turkey
- WW1

44. Great Britain vs Soviet Union/Russia
- occupation in 1918-19

45. Great Britain vs Italy
- WW2

46. Great Britain vs North Korea
- Korean War

47. Great Britain vs Egypt
- war in 1956

48. Great Britain vs Argentina
- war in 1982

49. Great Britain vs Iraq
- WW2
- war in 1990-91

50. China vs Soviet Union/Russia
- Boxer Rebellion in 1900
- Occupation of Manchuria by Russia in 1900
- China East Railway dispute in 1929

51. China vs South Korea
- Korean War

52. China vs Canada
- Korean War

53. China vs Turkey
- Korean War

54. China vs India
- war in 1961-62

55. China vs Vietnam
- war in 1978-79
- war in 1986-87

56. Soviet Union/Russia vs Austria(-Hungary)
- WW1

57. Soviet Union/Russia vs Turkey
- WW1

58. Soviet Union/Russia vs Poland
- war in 1919-20

59. Soviet Union/Russia vs Finland
- war in 1939-40

60. Soviet Union/Russia vs Hungary
- invasion in 1956

61. India vs Pakistan
- war in 1947-49
- war in 1965
- Bangladesh war in 1971

62. Turkey vs Greece
- war in 1897-98
- first Balkan war in 1912-13
- World War I
- war in 1919-20
- Cyprus war in 1974

63. Turkey vs Bulgaria
- first Balkan war in 1912-13
- second Balkan war in 1913

64. Turkey vs Serbia (Yugoslavia)
- first Balkan war in 1912-13

65. Turkey vs Australia
- WW1

66. Turkey vs New Zealand
- WW1

67. Bulgaria vs Serbia (Yugoslavia)
- second Balkan war in 1913
- WW1

68. Bulgaria vs Romania
- second Balkan war in 1913

69. Bulgaria vs Greece
- second Balkan war in 1913
- WW1

70. Czechoslovakia vs Hungary
- war in 1919

71. Hungary vs Romania
- war in 1919

72. Romania vs Austria(-Hungary)
- WW1

73. Austria(-Hungary) vs Serbia
- WW1

74. Spain vs Morocco
- war in 1909-10

75. Poland vs Lithuania
- Lithuanian war of independence in 1920

76. Italy vs Turkey
- war in 1911

77. Italy vs Ethiopia
- Ethiopian war for independence in 1934-36

78. Italy vs Austria(-Hungary)
- WW1

79. Italy vs Greece
- WW2

80. Italy vs South Africa
- WW2

81. Italy vs Iraq
- war in 1990-91

82. Armenia vs Azerbaijan
- war in 1991-

83. Israel vs Egypt
- war in 1948
- war in 1956
- war in 1967
- war of attrition in 1967-70
- war in 1973

84. Israel vs Syria
- war in 1948
- war in 1967
- war in 1973
- conflict in 1980-82

85. Israel vs Jordan
- war in 1948
- war in 1956
- war in 1967
- war of attrition in 1967-70
- war in 1973

86. Israel vs Lebanon
- war in 1948

87. Israel vs Saudi Arabia
- war in 1973

88. Israel vs Iraq
- war in 1948
- war in 1973

89. Iran vs Iraq
- war in 1980-88

90. Iraq vs Syria
- war in 1990-91

91. Iraq vs Saudi Arabia
- war in 1990-91

92. Iraq vs Canada
- war in 1990-91

93. Iraq vs Egypt
- war in 1990-91

94. Ethiopia vs Somalia
- war in 1977-78

95. Somalia vs Cuba
- war in 1977-78

96. Uganda vs Tanzania
- war in 1978-79

97. Tanzania vs Libya
- war in 1978-79

98. Bolivia vs Paraguay
- Chaco war in 1931-35

99. Guatemala vs Honduras

- war in 1906

100. Guatemala vs El Salvador
- war in 1906

101. Nicaragua vs Honduras
- war in 1907

102. Honduras vs El Salvador
- war in 1969

103. North Vietnam vs South Vietnam
- Vietnam War

104. North Vietnam vs Australia
- Vietnam War

105. North Vietnam vs New Zealand

- Vietnam War

106. North Vietnam vs Philippines
- Vietnam War

107. North Vietnam vs South Korea
- Vietnam War

108. North Vietnam vs Thailand
- Vietnam War

109. South Vietnam vs Laos
- offensive in Laos

110. South Vietnam vs Cambodia
- offensive in Cambodia

111. Vietnam vs Cambodia
- war in 1975-79

112. South Korea vs North Korea
- Korean War

113. North Korea vs Canada
- Korean War

114. North Korea vs Turkey
- Korean War

APPENDIX C

Coding of Reconciliation Events

Dyad	**War #**	**Reconciled (Y/N/P)**	**Date**
France - Thailand	01	Y	October, 1893

Notes/Cites: See Virginia Thompson, Thailand: The New Siam (New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corporation, 1967), p. 189; David K.Wyatt, Thailand - A Short History (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), p. 204.

China - Japan	02	Y	April, 1895

Notes/Cites: Senior representatives of each government met in Japan to sign the Treaty of Shimonoseki. See Jeffrey Dorwart, The Pigtail War: American Involvement in the Sino-Japanese War, 1894-1895 (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1975), pp. 85-86; See Denis Twitchett, ed., The Cambridge History of China, v.2 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 108.

Spain - USA	04	N	April, 1899

Notes/Cites: Representatives of senior officials from both governments worked to draft the Treaty of Paris, which was later ratified by the respective legislatures. See Joseph Smith, The Spanish - American War: Conflict in the Caribbean and the Pacific (New York: Longman Publishing, 1994), pp. 200, 208.

China - USA	05	Y	January, 1901
China - UK	05	Y	January, 1901
China - Japan	05	Y	January, 1901
China - France	05	Y	

January, 1901
China - Germany 05 Y
January, 1901
China - Russia 05 Y
January, 1901

Notes/Cites: See William J. Duiker, Cultures in Collision - The Boxer Rebellion (San Rafael, CA: Presidio Press, 1978), pp. 192-195; Christopher Martin, The Boxer Rebellion (New York: Abelard, Schuman Limited, 1968), pp. 210-211; Chester Tan, The Boxer Catastrophe (New York: Octagon Books Inc., 1967), pp. 184-186.

China - Russia 06 Y? -official died
March, 1902

Notes/Cites: See Denis Twitchett, ed., The Cambridge History of China, v.2 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 128-129.

Russia - Japan 07 Y
August, 1905

Notes/Cites: Aided by American mediation, senior representatives from each government met in Portsmouth, New Hampshire to work toward a peace agreement. The Treaty of Portsmouth brought an end to the conflict. See Richard Hough, The Fleet That Had to Die (New York: Viking Press Inc., 1958), pp. 204-205; See Peter Duus, ed., The Cambridge History of Japan, v.6 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 226.

Nicaragua - Honduras 08 Y
December, 1907

Notes/Cites: Ministers and representatives from all involved Central American states, the US, and Mexico met in Washington at the Central Amercian Conference. The Treaty of Peace and Amity resulted. See William S. Robertson, History of the Latin-American Nations (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1932) pp. 614-615.

Honduras - El Salvador 09 Y
December, 1907
Nicaragua - El Salvador 09 Y
December, 1907

Notes/Cites: Ministers and representatives from all involved Central American states, the US, and Mexico met in Washington at the Central American Conference. The Treaty of Peace and Amity resulted. See William S. Robertson, History of the Latin-American Nations (New York: D. Appleton and Company,1932), pp. 614-615.

Spain - Morocco November, 1909	10	Y

Notes/Cites: See Edmund Burke, Prelude to Protectorate in Morocco: Pre-Colonial Protest and Resistance, 1860-1912 (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 145-146.

Italy - Turkey	11	? - Turkey forced?

Notes/Cites: See Christopher Seton-Watson, Italy, From Liberalism to Fascism, 1870-1925 (London, England: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1967), pp. 378-379.

Bulgaria - Turkey forced? May, 1913	12	Y? -Turkey
Greece - Turkey May, 1913	12	Y?
Yugoslavia - Turkey May, 1913	12	Y?

Notes/Cites: After an armistice in December, 1912, a conference of ambassadors met in London to finalize a peace treaty. The Treaty of London was the result. See Alan Palmer, The Lands Between (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970), pp. 114-115; See Leslie Tihany,A History of Middle Europe (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976), pp. 185-186.

Bulgaria - Yugoslavia August, 1913	13	Y
Bulgaria - Turkey August, 1913	13	Y
Bulgaria - Greece August, 1913	13	Y
Bulgaria - Romania	13	Y

August, 1913

Notes/Cites: See Leslie C. Tihany, A History of Middle Europe (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976), pp. 185-186; See Alan Palmer, The Lands Between (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970), pp. 114-115.

Necessary Conditions For Participation in **World War I** Conflict:
* Participants must, of their own free will, have declared war upon other countries.
* Countries must have submitted military troops for participation in battle-like activity.

Dyad	**War #**	**Reconciled (Y/N/P)**	**Date**
Germany-USA	14	Y	August, 1921
Germany-UK	14	Y	June, 1919
Germany-France	14	Y	June, 1919
Germany-Japan	14	Y	June, 1919
Germany-Italy	14	Y	June, 1919
Germany - Rumania	14	Y	June, 1919
Germany-Russia	14	Y	March, 1918
Austria-USA	14	Y	August, 1921
Austria-UK	14	Y	September, 1919
Austria-France	14	Y	September, 1919
Austria-Japan	14	Y	September, 1919
Austria - Rumania	14	Y	September, 1919
Austria-Italy	14	Y	September, 1919
Bulgaria-UK	14	Y	

November, 1919
Bulgaria-France 14 Y
November, 1919
Bulgaria-Japan 14 Y
November, 1919
Bulgaria-Italy 14 Y
November, 1919
Bulgaria- Rumania 14 Y
November, 1919
Hungary-USA 14 Y
August, 1921
Hungary-UK 14 Y
June, 1920
Hungary-France 14 Y
June, 1920
Hungary-Japan 14 Y
June, 1920
Hungary - Italy 14 Y
June, 1920

Notes/Cites: See Donald Kagan, On the Origins of War (New York: Doubleday Books, 1995), pp.285-290; Sara Moore, Peace Without Victory for the Allies (Providence, RI: Berg Publishers, 1994), pp.125-127; Alan Sharp, The Versailles Settlement: Peacemaking in Paris, 1919 (New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 1991), pp. 11, 38-41.

Hungary - Romania 15 Y
August, 1920
Hungary - Czechosloviakia15 Y
August, 1920

Peace Treaty signed by representatives of each government at Little Trianon Castle, near Paris. Notes/Cites: See Ferenc Erdei, Information Hungary (Budapest, Hungary: Akademia Kiado, 1968), p. 274.

Soviet Union - Poland 16 Y
April, 1921

Notes/Cites: See Konrad Syrop, Poland: Between the Hammer and the Anvil (London, England: Robert Hale Limited, 1968), p.112.

Greece - Turkey 18 Y

August, 1920

Notes/Cites: The Turkish Sultan met with European leaders (Greece acting as a surrogate power for Western nations through this conflict) and signed The Treaty of Sevres. See Feroz, Ahmad, The Making of Modern Turkey (New York: Routledge Publishers, 1993), pp. 47-48; Emin Lengyel, Turkey (New York: Random House Publishers, 1941), pp. 377-378..

Lithuania - Poland 19 N

Notes/Cites: See Alfred Senn, The Great Powers, Lithuania,and the Vilna Question, 1920-28 (Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, Inc., 1966), pp. 232-234; See David M. Crowe, The Baltic States and the Great Powers (Boulder, CO: Westview Press Inc., 1993), pp. 5-7; Malibone W. Graham, New Governments of Eastern Europe (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1927), pp. 381-382.

China - Soviet Union 20 Y
December, 1929

Notes/Cites: In Khabarovsk, Russia, senior offiicials from China and the Soviet Union signed a protocol, ending the dispute. See Raymond L. Garthoff, Sino-Soviet Military Relations (New York: Frederick Praeger, Inc., 1966), p. 24; Aitchen K. Wu, China and the Soviet Union (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press Inc., 1967), pp. 210-211.

Bolivia - Paraguay 22 P
July, 1938

Notes/Cites: Treaty signed by senior officials from both governments, meeting in Asuncion, possessed both public agreements and secret agreements (involving territory and protocol). See Leslie B. Rout, Politics of the Chaco Peace Conference, 1935-1939 (Austin TX: University of Texas Press, 1970), pp.201-204.

Ethiopia - Italy 23 N

Notes/Cites: See “A History of Modern Ethiopia, 1855-1974,” by Zewde, Bahru, pp.158-160, Ohio University Press, Athens, OH. 1991.; See Chris Prouty, “Historical Dictionary of Ethiopia (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow

Press Inc., 1981) pp.103-104.

China - Japan	24	N

Notes/Cites: Marco Polo Bridge incident escalated, later merging with the bases of World War II. See Marius B. Jansen, Japan and China: From War to Peace, 1894-1972 (Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing, 1975)pp. 393-395, 425-427.

China - Soviet Union August, 1938	25	Y

Notes/Cites: See Michael T. Kikuoka, The Changkufeng Incident: A Study in Soviet - Japanese Conflict (Lanham, MD:University Press of America, 1988), pp. 133, 144-148; See Alvin D. Coox, The Anamtomy of a Small War: The Soviet - Japanese Struggle for Changkufeng - Khasan, 1938 (Greenwood, CT, 1977), pp.307-308.

Finland - Soviet Union March, 1940	27	Y

Notes/Cites: The Treaty ending the conflict was signed at the Kremlin by senior officials of both governments. See Yohanan Cohen, Small Nations in Times of Crisis and Coooperation (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), p.316.

Neccessary Conditions For Participation in **World War II** Conflict:
* Participants must, of their own free will, have declared war upon other countries.
* Countries must have submitted military troops for participation in battle-like activity.

Dyad	**War # Reconciled (Y/N/P)**	**Date**
US - Italy September, 1943	28	Y
UK - Italy September, 1943	28	Y
USSR - Italy	28	Y

September, 1943		
China - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
France - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Australia - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Belgium - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Brazil - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Canada - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Czechosloviakia - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Ethiopia - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Greece - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
India - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Netherlands - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
New Zealand - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
Poland - Italy	28	Y
September, 1943		
South Africa - Italy	28	Y
September,1943		
US - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
UK - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
USSR - Bulgaria	28	Y
Febuary, 1947		
Australia - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
Czechoslovakia - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
Greece - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
India - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		
New Zealand - Bulgaria	28	Y
February, 1947		

South Africa- Bulgaria February, 1947	28	Y
Yugoslavia - Bulgaria February, 1947	28	Y
US - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
UK - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
USSR - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
Australia - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
Canada - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
Czechoslovakia - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
India - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
New Zealand - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
South Africa - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
Yugoslavia - Hungary February, 1947	28	Y
UK - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
USSR - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
Australia - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
Canada - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
Czechoslovakia - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
India - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
New Zealand - Finland February, 1947	28	Y
US - Rumania February, 1947	28	Y
UK - Rumania February, 1947	28	Y
USSR - Rumania February, 1947	28	Y

Australia - Rumania 28 Y
February, 1947
Canada - Rumania 28 Y
February, 1947
Czechoslovakia - Rumania28 Y
February, 1947
India - Rumania 28 Y
February, 1947
South Africa - Rumania 28 Y
February, 1947
New Zealand - Rumania 28 Y
February, 1947
US - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
UK - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
China - Japan 28 Y
?Feb - April 1952
India - Japan 28 Y
?Feb - April 1952
France - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
Australia - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
Greece - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
New Zealand - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
South Africa - Japan 28 Y
April, 1952
US - Germany 28 Y
May 8, 1945
USSR - Germany 28 Y
May 8, 1945
UK - Germany 28 Y
May 8, 1945
France - Germany 28 Y May 8, 1945

Note: Reconciliation occurred with Germany through a surrender agreement, with senior representatives of the four major Allies meeting with executive German representatives for an official signing ceremony. Through this ceremony, reconciliation was officially implied to settle conflicts between Germany and all Allied forces.

Notes/Cites: See Amelia C. Leiss, et. al., ed., European Peace Treaties After World War II (Worcester, MA: Commonwealth Press, 1954), pp. 163, 250, 251, 272, 273, 297, 298, 321, 322, 341; Redvers, Opie, The Search For Peace Settlements (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1951), p. 179; F.P. King, The New Internationalism: Allied Policy and the European Peace 1939-1945 (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1973), pp. 48-51, 58-59, 76-77; Louis L. Snyder, The War: A Concise History, 1939-1945 (New York: Julian Mesner, 1960), pp. 440-443, 528-529.

France - Thailand March, 1941	29	?

India-Pakistan N/A(See above)	30	N

Notes/Cites: See #41 above.

Israel-Egypt September, 1978	31	Y
Israel-Iraq	31	N
Israel-Jordan October, 1994	31	Y
Israel-Lebanon	31	N
Israel-Syria	31	N

Notes/Cites: See #42 above. Regarding Lebanon, only brief cease fire in 1993, 1996. See Mariam Shahin, "Ending the Pain," Maclean's, v. 109, n. 19, May 6, 1996, pp.26-27; "The Guns Stop, Not the Anger," Economist, v.339, n. 7964, May 4, 1996, p.44.

USA-Korea	32	N
N.Korea-S.Korea	32	N

Notes/Cites: Agreement in 1994 between U.S.-DPRK on nuclear program. Some working level exchanges in 1992-93. Regarding North-South Korea, some exchanges in 1990-92 as high as Prime Minister. See Winston Lord, "U.S. Policy Toward the Korean Peninsula," U.S. Department of State Dispatch, v. 7, n. 14, April 1, 1999, pp. 165-68; Mel Gurtov, "South Korea's Foreign Policy and Future Security: Implications of the Nuclear Standoff," Pacific Affairs, v. 69, n. 1, Spring

1996, pp.8-31.

Israel-Egypt September, 1978	33	Y
U.K.-Egypt	33	N
France-Egypt	33	N

Notes/Cites: See #42 above. Nothing conclusive in UK-Egypt or French-Egyptian relations. UN solution to Suez, no formal declaration of war or rapprochement. Informally, ties between Egypt and West improve after 1978.

Hungary-Soviet Union	34	N(?)

Notes/Cites: 1956, Prime Minister Imre Nagy removed by invading Soviet forces, 1957 Janos Kadar installed, supports pro-Soviet line. Agrees to "temporary" installation of Soviet forces in Hungary. 1958, Nagy is hanged. Kadar is ousted in 1988. Democratic government elected in 1990. See Odd Arne Westad, Sven Holtsmark, and Iver B. Neumann eds., The Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, 1945-89 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994); Karen Dawisha, Eastern Europe, Gorbachev and Reform: The Great Challenge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Richard F. Staar, ed., East-Central Europe and the USSR (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991).

China-India December, 1988	35	Y

Notes/Cites: December 1988, Rajiv Gandi visits Beijing, Li Peng returns trip in 1991, pace of rapprochement increases in early 1990s. E.g., troop reductions on border, confidence-building steps. See Sandy Gordon, "South Asia after the Cold War: Winners and Losers," Asian Survey, v. 35, n. 10, October 1995, pp. 879-895; Wang Hong Yu, "Sino-Indian Relations: Present and Future," Asian Survey, v. 35, n. 6, June 1995, pp. 546-54; Mohan J. Malik, "China-India Relations in the Post-Soviet Era: The Continuing Rivalry," China Quarterly, n. 142, June 1995, pp. 317-55.

USA-Vietnam July, 1995	36	Y

Notes/Cites: See Winston Lord, "A New Phase in U.S.-Vietnam

Relations," U.S. Department of State Dispatch, v. 6, n. 28, July 10, 1995, pp.555-56; BrantlyWomack, "Vietnam in 1995: Success in Peace," Asian Survey, v. 36, n. 1, January 1996, pp.73-82; Warren Christopher, "The U.S. and Vietnam: Establishing Diplomatic Relations," U.S. Department of State Dispatch, v. 6, n. 33, August 14, 1995, pp.629-32.

India-Pakistan	37	N

Notes/Cites: See #41 above.

Israel-Egypt September, 1978	38	Y
Israel-Jordan October, 1994	38	Y
Israel-Syria	38	N

Notes/Cites: See #42

Egypt-israel September, 1978	39	Y

Notes/Cites: See #42

Honduras-El Salvador October, 1980	40	Y

Notes/Cites: Hostilities resume in 1976. On October 30, 1980 respective secretaries of state meet in Lima, Peru and publicly sign a peace treaty to resolve their territorial disputes. In 1986, the countries agree to submit their border dispute to the International Court of Justice. A Court decision is rendered in 1992. See "Honduras, El Salvador Settle Border Dispute--World Court Decides Contested Area," Facts on File World Digest, September 24, 1992, p.709 A2; "Honduras, El Salvador Ties Restored," Facts on File World Digest, November 14, 1980, p. 872 C3.

Pakistan-India	41	N

Notes/Cites: see George Perkovich, "India, Pakistan, and the United States: The Zero-Sum Game," World Policy Journal, v. 13, n. 2, Summer 1996, pp.49-55.

Israel-Jordan October, 1994	42	Y
Israel-Egypt September, 1978	42	Y
Israel-Saudi Arabia	42	N
Israel-Syria	42	N
Israel-Iraq	42	N

Notes/Cites: See Al Jarbawi, "The Triangle of Conflict," Foreign Policy, no.100, Fall 1995, pp.92-108; Bruce W. Nelson, "Waiting for the Holdout," Time, v. 144, n.6, August 8, 1991, pp.42-43; Jimmy Carter, Keeping Faith (New York: Bantam Books, 1982).

Turkey-Cyprus	43	N

Notes/Cites: See Celestine Bohlen, "Dividing Line Freezes Mutual Fears in Cyprus," The New York Times, August 19, 1996, p.A2.

Vietnam-Cambodia October, 1991	44	P

Notes/Cites: In August 1989, Vietnamese officials meet face-to-face with representatives of Cambodia's factions (Sihanouk, Sun Sen, And Khmer Rouge), no agreement. Vietnam voluntarily withdraws trrops from Cambodia in 1989. In 1991, Paris Peace accord Phase I agreed to by warring parties, election held. Khmer Rouge faction withdraws from peace accord, resumes armed struggle. Sihanouk elected, sharing power with Sun Sen (Vietnam's supported faction leader). See "Sihanouk Becomes King of Cambodia--Sun to Lead Govenment," Facts on File World Digest, September 30, 1993, p.475 E1; "Factions Agree to Partially Disarm," Facts on File World Digest, September 26, 1991, p.793 A1; "Vietnam Announces Cambodia Exit Date--Troops to be Pulled Out by September," Facts on File World Digest, April 7, 1989, p.231 D1; "Cambodia Factions Meet Face-to-Face, Talks Held in Indonesia," Facts on File World Digest. August 5, 1989, p.567 D2.

Ethiopia-Somalia April, 1988	45	Y

Notes/Cites: January 18-19, 1986 Ethiopian leader Mengistu Haile

Mariam and Somalia's Said Barre meet in Djibouti. Negotiations final in April 1988 with a peace treaty, withdrawal of forces, and agreement to repair diplomatic relations. See Jeffrey A. LeFebvre, Arms for the Horn (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1991), pp.245-47.

Uganda-Tanzania 46 Y
February, 1981

Notes/Cites: Overthrow of Amin regime by Tanzanian supported rebels. By May 1990, former President Obote returns from exile in Tanzania and is elected President. In February 1981, regional leaders in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania meet to agree torevitalize regional cooperation. See Robert I. Rotberg, Africa in the 1990's and Beyond (Alsanac, MI: World Peace Foundation 1988); Arthur S. Banks, Alan J. Day and Thomas C. Muller, Political Handbook of the World (Binghamton, NY: CSA Publications, 1996).

China-Vietnam 47 Y
October, 1991

Notes/Cites: See #51

Syria-Israel 48 N

Notes/Cites: See "Syria: Keep Your Distance," Economist, v. 338, n. 7951, Feb. 3, 1996, p.34; Stanley K. Sheinbaum, "Bring Assad Into the Fold," New Perspectives Quarterly, v. 131, n. 1, Winter 1996, p.72.

Iran-Iraq 49 N

Notes/Cites: See "Allies in Adversity," Economist, v. 335, n. 7918, June 10, 1995, p.15; Anthony Lake, "Confronting Backlash States," Foreign Affairs, v. 73, n.2, March 1994, pp.44-55.

U.K.-Argentina 50 Y
March, 1990

Notes/Cites: UN meetings, Madrid meetings; diplomatic exchange reestablished, will peacefully resolve territorial dispute. Sovereignty issue not yet resolved. See "The Falkland-Ending the Affair," Economist, v.

313, n. 7626, October 28, 1989, p.39; "Best of Friends Again Almost," Economist, v. 319,n. 7711, June 15, 1991, p.30.

China-Vietnam October, 1991	51	Y

Notes/Cites: 1991 Summit of premiers leads to 11-pt. communique normalizing relations. "America and Asia: New Friends, New Enemies," Economist, v. 336, n. 7923, July 5, 1995, p.24; Carlyle A. Thayer, "Sino-Vietnamese Relations," Asian Survey, v. 34, n. 6, June 1994, pp.513-28; Brantly Womack, "Sino-Vietnamese Border Trade," Asian Survey, v. 34, n. 6, June 1994, pp.495-512.

Iraq-USA	52	N
Iraq-UK	52	N
Iraq-Syria	52	N
Iraq-Saudi Arabia	52	N
Iraq-Canada	52	N
Iraq-Egypt	52	N
Iraq-France	52	N
Iraq-Italy	52	N

Notes/Cites: See Anthony H. Cordesman and Abraham R. Wagner, The Lessons of the Modern War, vol. 4: The Gulf War (Boulder: Westview, 1996); Peter Reuilherade, "Optimism From Baghdad," Middle East, n. 243, March 1995, pp.26-27; Avner Gidron, "The Road to Damascus," World Press Review, v. 40, n. 12, December 1993, p.35.

Armenia-Azerbijan	53	N

Notes/Cites: See " A Fearful Calm in the Caucasus," Economist, v. 337, n. 7940, Nov.11, 1995; "Russia's Caucasian Cauldron," Economist, v. 332, no. 7875, August 6, 1994, pp.34-40; Steven Shabad, "Nagorno-Karabakh: Obstacles to Peace," World Press Review, v. 41, no. 3, March 1994, p.35.

[1] For example, the term "reconciliation" often appears in the vocabulary of actors within states emerging from bouts of traumatic internal violence. Cases of of that term being used following intrastate violence include instances of state collapse (Chad and Uganda in the 1980s), civil war (El Salvador and Cambodia in the 1980s and 1990s), severe repression by military regimes following their coming to power through coups (Chile and Argentina in the 1970s),

and struggles that led to regime overthrows (Nicaragua in the 1970s and South Africa in the apartheid era).

2

The notion of international society (or society of states) we take from Hedley Bull (1977, p.13). According to Bull, international society "exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the workings of common institutions."

3

It is worth noting that this question dovetails with recent work on rivalries and, in particular, rivalry termination (Goertz and Diehl, 1993; Thompson, 1995; Bennett, 1996; Bennett, 1997a; Bennett, 1997b, Bercovitch and Diehl, 1997; and Gibler, 1997) in that reconciliation is one form or pathway of rivalry termination.

4

The Goldstein scale contains numeric values for 61 WEIS events. The version of WEIS we received in the Fall of 1996 contains 63 events. The two new events are 022 [COM2] Pessimistic comment on situation and 024 [COM4] Optimistic comment on situation. We gave event 022 a value of -0.5 and event 024 a value of 0.5.

5

The source code for the FORTRAN programs can be found on the Web site for Brecke (http://www.inta.gatech.edu/peter/reconcile.html).

6

There are, in our estimation, two possible explanations for cases with insufficient data to generate a post-reconciliation graph. First, cooperative events are not reported as much in the media as are conflictual events, and thus they are relatively poorly represented in the datasets, particularly COPDAB and WEIS. Improvements in the relations between countries manifested in trade or other business agreements, for example, often do not pass the threshold of "newsworthiness" for a newspaper such as *The New York Times* and as a result are not reported. If these events are not reported, an improvement in relations will not appear in the time series plots. This is particularly problematic for WEIS because it is based almost exclusively on *The New York Times*, and international coverage, especially of events like trade deals in Africa, by *The New York Times* has been declining in recent years (Tomlinson, personal communication in 1996). Second, the datasets, especially COPDAB and WEIS, suffer from unevenness in their coverage of different parts of the world, which results in a lack of reported events for certain dyads even though there was almost certainly interaction. For a number of dyads that experienced a reconciliation in the 1948-1992 time frame such as Tanzania and Uganda in 1981, there simply were not enough reported events, hostile or cooperative, between the countries such that one could assert relations had changed.

The second type of analysis consists of performing interrupted time-series analysis on the dyadic flows with reconciliation events being an intervention that "interrupts" a time series (McDowall, McCleary, Meidinger, and Hay, 1980). Specifically, if time-series estimation for individual dyads with an intervention representing a reconciliation event results in a better statistical fit than estimation of those same dyads without the intervention being represented, and if the mean value for the relationship following the reconciliation event is higher than it was before the reconciliation, that finding would support hypothesis 1. Obviously, this finding would need to occur for a high proportion of the dyads with reconciliation events for this form of analysis to be evidence for hypothesis 1.

The third type of analysis is to perform analysis of variance with the non-reconciliation dyads serving as one subsample and the dyads with reconciliation serving as the other subsample. If there is a difference between the non-reconciliation and reconciliation subsamples in their average increase between immediate post-conflict relations and relations at a later time (with that later time sufficiently long to enable all reconciliation events to be incorporated), and that the difference is such that the reconciliation subsample exhibits the larger increase, that would be evidence for hypothesis 3.

Similarly, hypothesis 2 can be tested by comparing the long-term pre-conflict mean value of a relationship against a comparable post-conflict mean value that begins sufficiently subsequent to the end of the conflict for reconciliation events to have taken place. If the subsample of reconciliation cases exhibits no difference compared to the non-reconciliation subsample, that is evidence supporting hypothesis 2.