

October 8, 1999

**ABBREVIATED CEWS FINAL REPORT:**

The Conflict Early Warning Systems Research Program of the  
International Social Science Council, administered by the  
Center for International Studies, University of Southern California  
Grant B6806 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for "Concluding a Comparative  
Study of Conflict Prevention and Termination Successes and Failures."  
USC Account 53-4841-2040

By

---

Hayward R. Alker  
CEWS Coordinator and Project Principal Investigator

---

## Overview/Abstract

The Conflict Early Warning Systems (CEWS) research project rose from a vision of an informationally empowered, global network of reciprocally interacting early warning scholars in regular contact with local, regional and global governmental and nongovernmental agencies able to make a difference with respect to preventing inter-group violence. It was initiated by the General Assembly of the International Social Science Council (ISSC) at its December 1992 meeting upon the proposal of Hayward R. Alker (its Coordinator) and Kumar Rupesinghe (its Co-coordinator) as an international, multi-disciplinary, social scientific response to UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Gali's call, in his An Agenda for Peace, for input from Non-Governmental Organizations directed toward conflict prevention.

Under the guidance of a Scientific Steering Committee led by Alker, and in cooperation with the international Forum on Early Warning and Early Response (which CEWS joined in 1998, at a time when Kumar Rupesinghe was the Chair of its Executive Committee), its last year of activities has had three successful foci: the development of a publicly accessible website distributing a comparable variety of preventively-oriented conflict narratives and/or chronologies, as well as new tools for their analysis, for scholars located at different nodes of international early warning networks; a FEWER-linked conference of policy-oriented Early Warning scholars, governmental officials, and IGO/NGO representatives in which some of the project's most important results were presented; and the preparation of a book manuscript detailing the comparative analyses and policy-relevant research concepts, tools network-relevant lessons derived from project activities. As mandated by the December 1998 meeting of the ISSC General Assembly, on the recommendation of its Coordinator, the CEWS project and its Steering Committee terminated on the last day of its funding by the Carnegie Corporation of NY, May 31, 1999.

Going beyond the routine provision of new, comparative case studies on conflict management, the distinctive contribution of this project has been the synthetic development and illustration of internationally shareable conceptual frameworks and tools for representing and preventively analyzing both quantitative (event data) and qualitative (narrative) multi-phase conflict accounts. The book manuscript and the CEWS website present derivative graphical retellings of project-based conflict prevention histories, including the contested historicities proffered by different parties to such conflicts, as well as a new, historically-grounded way of computationally exploring ( via CEWSExplorer software) less violent alternative trajectories for inter-group conflicts.

## **Table of Contents**

Title Page.....	p. 1
Overview/Abstract.....	p 2
Table of Contents.....	p 3
Background.....	p.4
The current shape and state of the book manuscript.....	p.5
The CEWS-FEWER Hague Meeting .....	p 10.

Appendix 1: H.Alker et al., “Testable Understandings of Structured Histories,” Presented at the February 1999 meeting of the International Studies Association, Washington, D.C.

## Background

The Conflict Early Warning Systems (CEWS) research project rose from a vision of an informationally empowered, global network of reciprocally interacting early warning scholars in regular contact with local, regional and global governmental and non-governmental agencies able to make a difference with respect to preventing inter-group violence.<sup>1</sup> It was initiated by the General Assembly of the International Social Science Council (ISSC) at its December 1992 meeting upon the proposal of Hayward R. Alker (its Coordinator) and Kumar Rupesinghe (its Co-coordinator). It was portrayed as an international, multi-disciplinary, social scientific response to UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's call after the end of the Cold War, in his An Agenda for Peace, for input from Non-Governmental Organizations directed toward a more effective international practice of conflict early warning and conflict prevention.

Only the "information resources/information systems" part of the Conflict Early Warning network vision has been the responsibility of the CEWS Research Program/Project. The development of coordinated networks of scholars and preventively-oriented early warners has been a principal activity of International Alert (headed for most of CEWS existence by Kumar Rupesinghe) and, in the last year and a half of the CEWS project, FEWER, the Forum on Early Warning and early Response, the Carnegie Corporation's substantial efforts in this area, as well as those of other governmental and non-governmental efforts.<sup>2</sup> FEWER, an international non-governmental organization headquartered in London, was a principal achievement of International Alert during the period in which Kumar Rupesinghe, the CEWS Co-coordinator, was its Secretary General. During its existence from December 1992 through May 1999, CEWS worked cooperatively, in participant-observer fashion, with both of International Alert and FEWER.

CEWS coordinators have worked with the assistance of a Scientific Steering Committee which had two face to face meetings in June 1995 and 1996 and which was appointed upon recommendation of Alker and Rupesinghe, by the International Social Science Council. During the last year of its funding, the editors of its intended book product, Journeys Through Conflict, Alker, Ted Robert Gurr, and Kumar Rupesinghe, have been active leaders of CEWS efforts. The development of a website publicly distributing CEWS conflict prevention narratives and chronologies, has been the work of a team at USC headed by Professor Alker, working in close cooperation with contributors to the CEWS volume and its website. CEWS's most intensive effort at diffusing its preliminary findings was a meeting of scholars and early warning practitioners jointly organized by CEWS and FEWER, with Dr. Rupesinghe and David Nyheim, the executive director of FEWER, playing leading roles.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the first published project-related statements by the project coordinators, Kumar Rupesinghe, "Early Warning and Preventive Diplomacy," pp. 88-97, and Hayward R. Alker, "Early Warning Models and/or Preventive Information Systems?," pp. 117-123, in Ted Robert Gurr and Barbara Harff, editors, "Early Warning of Communal Conflicts and humanitarian Crises," special issue of The Journal of Ethno-Development, Vol. 4, No. 1 (July 1994), sponsored by International Alert, the Korea Foundation, and the International Social Science Council. The pioneering work of the Commission on Internal Conflicts of the International Peace Research Association must also be re-acknowledged. See K. Rupesinghe and M. Kuroda, eds., Early Warning and Conflict Resolution, Macmillan Press, London, 1992.

<sup>2</sup> Two especially helpful recent inventories of such activities – beyond those produced by FEWER and available to FEWER members, inter alia, are: Prevention and Management of Violent Conflicts: An International Directory, 1998 Edition, published by the European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation, Amsterdam, 1998; and John Davies, Preventive Measures: Building Risk Assessment and Crisis Early Warning Systems, Rowman and Littlefield Pubs, Lanham, Md., 1998.

The book, the website, and the presentation of CEWS results and findings at the CEW-FEWER conference and elsewhere were the “three prongs” of CEWS’s proposal to the Carnegie Corporation in the winter and spring of 1998 for “Concluding a Comparative Study of Conflict Prevention and Termination Successes and Failures,” a proposal funded by Carnegie at the level of \$74,000 for the period 6/01/98 through 5/31/99. Correspondingly, Alker and Rupesinghe recommended to the ISSC that May 31, 1999 be the terminal date for CEWS activities as an official program or project of the ISSC. Except for administrative arrangements and budget reallocations made last spring, activities in pursuance of CEWS project goals have been accomplished since that time by voluntary efforts, the completion of honoraria-supported obligations, and the personal and McCone Chair funds of Professor Alker.

### **The Current Shape and State of the Book Manuscript**

As the project was officially concluding last Spring, the editors agreed to a new title for the project’s principal book product, and an amplified book format. See Table 1 below. This new outline, refined further by Alker this fall, reflected exciting research developments in the Los Angeles working group last spring not fully anticipated at the beginning of the CEWS project. Not only did that group, with special inspiration from Thomas Schmalberger, develop a way of comparably graphing CEWS conflict case trajectories derived from either quantitative “event data” codifications of case chronologies, or the more traditional, qualitative narrative case descriptions; but also the Los Angeles/USC/CIS team have developed the CEWS website into a more ambitious “pilot” or “prototype” electronic database, allowing the downloading of case descriptions and graphs, as well as innovative computational software programmed by Dr. Schmalberger for exploring in a plausible, historically grounded fashion, alternative, either more or less violent, trajectories. The CEWSExplorer program partly realizes Alker, Gurr and Rupesinghe’s call in the original paper supporting Alker’s application to the Carnegie Corporation, for “the development of preventive information handling systems, that can be grounded in widely available and networked personal computers, or workstations.”<sup>3</sup> Including a new chapter on this project-based effort in the CEWS volume fulfills more of the promise of the “Conflict Early Warning Systems: An Initial Research Program” paper, which will form the basis of Chapter 1 of Journeys Through Conflict.

---

<sup>3</sup> H. R. Alker, T. R. Gurr, K. Rupesinghe, “Conflict Early Warning Systems: An Initial Research Program,” given at the February 21-24, 1995 Chicago Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association. The quote is taken from the abstract of that paper. The paper was never published, in large part because Carnegie never agreed to fund several parts of that proposal, only the volume of comparative case studies and some way of electronically diffusing the balanced mix of often invisible successes and the all-too-visible failures of conflict prevention efforts that that proposal also promised. Carnegie also never agreed on a regular basis to support face-to-face meetings of the CEWS Steering Committee. Alker obtained support for some of these ideas from the Annenberg Center for Communication at USC; he piggybacked the two face-to-face meetings of the CEWS Steering Committee on initial and interim meetings of CEWS volume co-authors. See, Adibi, J. H. Alker, M. Malita, L. T. Vest, Jr., “PARIS: A Prototype Action Recommender’s Information Support System for Conflict Prevention,” Romanian Journal of International Affairs, IV,1(1998), pp. 75-108. The idea of LISP-encodable grammars of conflict prevention trajectories or “data stories” (both successes and failures, actual or possible) is developed in Alker’s “Emancipatory Empiricism,” Ch. 10 of his Rediscoveries and Reformulations: Humanistic Methodologies for International Studies, Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge and New York, 1996, pp. 332-354. This article was an important basis for the Project Guidelines reviewed in the “Double Design” Chapter at the beginning of Journeys Through Conflict.

## **The Current Shape and State of the Book Manuscript**

If one were to compare the latest (October 1999) table of contents for the CEWS volume, given in Table 1 below, with the December 1997 Draft Book Outline contained in USC's Spring 1998 proposal to the Carnegie Corporation, the differences are suggestive of the most important **Journeys through Conflict: Narratives & Lessons**

Alker, Gurr, Rupesinghe (eds.)

Preface: The CEWS Vision and its Organizational Implementation

### **PART I: Building Conflict Early Warning Systems**

- 1 Conflict Early Warning Systems: The Challenge of Integrating of Multi-phase Narratives, Event Data, and Case Studies into preventively useful information systems for Global Early Warning Networks  
(Review of the variety of qualitative and quantitative research styles in early warning research; our focus on producing and sharing information across decentralized networks of scholars linked to states, IGOs, activist NGOs and others concerned with violent conflict prevention through timely action)  
*Alker, Gurr, Rupesinghe*
- 2 The Double Design of the Present Volume  
The commitment to internationally authored, yet comparable, multi-perspective, phase-structured conflict histories and their possible, less violent alternatives, joined to a call for more public narratives/chronologies of success/failure stories.  
*Alker, Schmalberger*
- 3 Rashomon Retellings as Ambiguity-Tolerant Early Warnings  
(The Rashomon story, Vietnam, Guatemala as interest-based retellings, and the possibility of ambiguity tolerant resolutions.)  
*Mushakoji and Alker*

### **PART II: Comparative Studies of Prevention Successes and Failures**

#### **A. The Search for Early Warning Indicators**

- 4 Could Humanitarian Crises Have Been Anticipated in Burundi, Rwanda, and Zaire? A Comparative Study of Anticipatory Indicators  
*Harff*
- 5 A Comparative look at Early Warning Indicators: PIOOM & the State Failures Project  
*Schmid*

B. Escalation Prevention Successes and Failures

- 6 Escalatory Dynamics in the Moldova-Dniestr and Chechnya Conflicts  
*Vorkunova*
- 7 When the Dogs Didn't Bark: Explaining Different Trajectories of Kin-Group Ethnic Conflicts in Post-Communist Europe  
*Lund*

C. Conflict Settlement Efforts

- 8 Avoiding Pre-Election Violence in South Africa but not Angola  
*Gounden, Hussein*
- 9 Non-Conventional Diplomacy: Experiences of NGO & People's Participation in Selected Peace Processes  
*Anderlini, Garcia, Rupesinghe*

D. A Multi-Phase Synthesis

- 10 Domestic and Transnational Strategies for Managing Separatist Conflicts: Four Asian Cases  
*Gurr, Khosla*

**PART III: A Prototype Information System for Early Warning Network Nodes**

- 11 An Integrative Conceptual Framework and Judgment Checking Methodology for Internationally Networked, Multi-Perspective Conflict early Warning Systems  
*Schmalberger, Alker*  
*Appendix: Excerpted parts of Padilla's Guatemala narrative and chronology*
- 12 The CEWSExplorer: A Computational Tool for Constructing Alternative Scenarios from comparable relevant histories  
*Schmalberger, Alker*
- 13 The CEWS Website  
*Adibi, Alker, Blum, Kaghazian, Schjolset, Schmalberger*

**PART IV: Sharing Informational Resources within Global CEW Networks**

- 14 Lessons from CEWS, FEWER & Other Early Warning Projects  
Rupesinghe, Nyheim, with Kahn

changes in project-related efforts over the last, funded year of the CEWS project, and the subsequent 3 months of efforts by USC CEWS research team members.

The intuition of all conflict prevention practitioners, including UN Secretary Generals, is that early warnings and early responses can sometimes diminish the violence and disruption that inter-group conflicts have historically shown. Both better research and better organizational responses are required, informed by that research. The Preface, based on the earliest statements of CEWS purposes cited above, rehearses the version of this vision engendering CEWS, and reviews the organizational implementation story sketched above. Part I, on building Conflict Early Warning Systems, now starts with the bulk of the early Alker, Gurr, Rupesinghe paper, emphasizing the challenge of integrating narrative and event data representations of conflicts in ways relevant to conflict prevention purposes. The key integrative notion is that of the “conflict life cycles” – the idea that there is an empirically discoverable grammar of possible conflict phase-sequences, where different, less or more violent paths or “journeys through conflict” are sometimes possible because of actions or circumstances discoverable by preventively-oriented practitioners and researchers. Key to the understanding of such alternative, or counter-factual, conflict histories, and the conditions of possibility and actualization for their less violent trajectories, is the historical sense of such possibilities held by the primary participants in such conflicts.<sup>4</sup> Of course, the possibilities of early warning relevant to violence prevention are shrouded in ambiguities, uncertainties which may or may not hamper conflict resolution. A new chapter in the current book manuscript, by Kinhide Mushakoji, grounds the appreciation of the roles of different participants’ partly divergent historical/narrative self-understandings of violent happenings in a Classical Chinese rereading of Kurosawa’s and Akutagawa’s Rashomon,

Part II of the book manuscript includes, with somewhat varying descriptions, comparative case studies by Barbara Harff, Alex Schmid, Olga Vorkunova, Michael Lund, Gounden and Hussein, Anderlini, Garcia and Rupesinghe. Gurr’s and Khosla’s especially impressive synthesis of narrative backgrounds, multi-phased chronologies, and phase-specific strategies for conflict management and violence reduction concludes this Part of the book.<sup>5</sup> Omitted from earlier outlines is the Latin American comparative chapter – never completed – and John Amoda’s comparative study of African conflict prevention success and failures, which

---

<sup>4</sup> Let me quote some epistemological guidelines from Alker’s “Emancipatory Empiricism” chapter, which was distributed to CEWS case study authors along with the research guidelines reproduced in Chapter 2 of Journeys Through Conflict. “Structured narrative accounts of conflict developments [including] resolution attempts... are especially valuable representations of the contradictory, yet social nature of political reality, including its emergent conflict resolution possibilities.” “[T]ake the best or the worst cases of conflict resolution outcomes and use them to uncover the practical grammars of action (and habit) making such outcomes possible. “[T]hink of conflict and cooperation case descriptions as ... executable programs, situation specific practical accomplishments that constitute the cases, analogous to ... the practical actions constituting the observed realities they refer to.” Their intentional/procedural actions, circumstances and non-intended consequences provide the “hidden unities, divergent meanings, and [multiple, alternative] possible futures.” “Otherwise historicities in the development of international society that point toward peace and community, rather than the renewal and extension of power politics, will never be revealed.” Alker, “Emancipatory Empiricism,” op. cit., pp.348-353.

<sup>5</sup> Noteworthy related studies focussing on the phase and context-specific character of successful preventive interventions include Bruce W. Jentleson, Opportunities Missed, Opportunities Seized: Preventive Diplomacy in the Post-Cold War World, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD, 1999, forthcoming; Janie Leatherman, William DeMars, Patrick Gaffney, and Raimo Vayrynen, Pursuing Peace in the Shadow of War: Strategies for Early Warning and Conflict Prevention, forthcoming; and the contributions of Michael Lund.

he didn't adapt satisfactorily to the CEWS project's violence-prevention-oriented framework. Nonetheless, all three of the Central American case narratives/chronologies are included in the website collection, as well as the Sudan and Algerian conflicts as recounted by Amoda. Because it served as an exemplary case for the comparative, graphical, network-friendly mode of analysis developed in Part III of the book, much of Padilla's account of the Guatemalan civil war and peace process is to be included as an Appendix to Chapter 11 in Part III.

If a set of publicly available, comparable and lesson-suggesting conflict narratives or chronologies, roughly balanced between successes and failures, was to be a principal product of the CEWS project, the website at <http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/ir/cis/cews> accomplishes this purpose, amplified and discussed in the Chapters of Part II. Part III focuses on the second aspect of the project's research design, the achievement and illustration of a framework for comparing, from a conflict prevention perspective, both narrative and event chronology based representations, of multi-phased, multi-perspective histories of these conflicts, including helpful and non-helpful<sup>6</sup> violence-diminishing efforts. Both goals are exemplified in the website presentation of CEWS results, which the reader is urged to consult. Methodological descriptions of the coding practices used there, and of the CEWSExplorer downloadable from the site are still being composed, however. A draft memo on the CEWSExplorer will form the basis for Chapter 12 of Part III. An illustrated tour, and rationale, for the website's use and further development will be the basis for Chapter 13.

Going beyond original expectations, the website has become a prototype for the portable, node-enhancing information resource systems envisioned at the beginning of the CEWS project. It is an electronic data base for the approximately 20 cases (18 now fully presented) encoded and graphed and revised by case authors according to the CEWS "contested historicities" framework<sup>7</sup> developed in the first two chapters of Part III by Schmalberger and Alker. It is not yet portable, and the size of its database is much too small for practitioners to be comfortable with, but already one can see, as in the post-mortem rehearsals of the Guatemalan conflict history and in contemplated discussion of the East Timor conflict management/prevention process, that the constitutive modeling approach developed by Schmalberger to incorporate conflicting parties differing and convergent perspectives on the issues and history of the conflict has demonstrated promise for further use and development, by scholars, teachers, students and perhaps even conflict management/prevention practitioners. At present, the basic framework for such synthetic comparisons, and alternative trajectory explorations, is available as Alker, Schmalberger, Blum and Schjolset, "Testable Understandings of Structured Histories," a paper given at the ISA meeting in February 1999, and distributed to all participants at the CEWS-FEWER Hague Meeting. It is included as Appendix 1 of the present report, which will serve as a basis for chapter 11 of the CEWS volume. Drafts of the relevant chapters are available to project sponsors either from the website, or in WORD files on computer diskettes.

---

<sup>6</sup> Putting successful and failed violence-diminishing efforts in the larger, strategically defined space which includes violence-enhancing or spoiler actions is the analytical contribution of Stephen Stedman. See Stephen John Stedman, "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes," pp. 333-374 in Susanne Schmeidl and Howard Adelman, eds., *Synergy in Early Warning*, Center for International and Security Studies, York University, Toronto, and FEWER, Conference Proceedings, March 15-18, 1997.

<sup>7</sup> Alker uses Olafson's conception of historicity as the time-ordered, shared self-understanding of a continuing human society; he and Schmalberger have sociologically re-specified this notion, adapting it to refer to cases where parties to a conflict may differ in their views about the historical identity, purpose, past and future of a particular society, but, as humans, are able in some circumstances, to re-specify, reinterpret and thus partially reconstitute their group, conflict and societal identities sufficiently to merit re-description as in Rupesinghe's terms a "conflict transformation" process.

Contact with Rowman and Littlefield has been established as a possible publisher for the CEWS volume; this Report will be submitted to them as a basis for a publication contract. Since they have established a reputation as a leading publisher in the conflict prevention/early warning area, and are publishing books in paperback form usable by students and practitioners alike, early CEWS project fears, based on Rupesinghe's failure to get St. Martins/Macmillan to publish his early warning volume in paperback format, seem now to be unjustified.

### **The CEWS-FEWER Hague Meeting**

The proposal for a final year of Carnegie Corporation support budgeted significant funds for public reporting on project results. A set of panels at the International Peace Research Association's meeting in Durban, South Africa were only a partial success, as Dr. Rupesinghe was able to present an overview of CEWS, International Alert and FEWER activities, but Professor Amoda, fully funded by our project, and present at the conference, found his ticket negotiations too daunting to be able to attend his scheduled panel and report on his case studies. Other project participants were unable to attend, except for Vasu Gounden, who was an organizer of the conference. Hence an anticipated CEWS Steering Committee meeting did not take place.

The budgeted travel funds were used, however, to pay for two presentations of CEWS results at other international meetings. Alker and Schmalberger presented the "contested historicities" framework and its illustration with Padilla narratives/chronologies and Harff's event data at the Washington meeting, February, 1999, of the International Studies Association (see Appendix 1). Alker and Mushakoji, with partial support from CEWS, attended and presented both parts of the CEWS overview paper in Appendix 1 and a draft of their chapter 3 at an international conference sponsored by the ISSC and UNESCO on Time in the Making, held at Candido Mendes University, May 10-12, 1999. Their paper, entitled "Three Times for Tomorrow," is available in draft form.

Long planned for an Oslo or London locale, CEWS Coordinators decided to hold their final conference in conjunction with FEWER meetings associated with the internationally visible "Hague Peace Appeal" in the beginning of May, 1999. A meeting on the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first Hague Appeal, this meeting drew thousands of peace activists and scholars and governmental practitioners, including Kofi Annan and the Dutch Prime Minister. Presentations of CEWS-FEWER work by Lund and Rupesinghe at the Hague Appeal were well attended.

A detailed Report of the CEWS-FEWER meeting, including its impressive list of 28 participants from Europe, Africa, North America, and various international and transnational agencies specializing in conflict prevention is available. The thematic focus on future directions in Conflict Early Warning was illustrated by a focus on concrete cases, Macedonia and the Democratic Republic of Congo; the former case was one of Michael Lund's "conflict prevention successes" in his comparative study, the other was a case where FEWER had rich contacts and practical experience. Visa problems prevented two African practitioners from attending, and thus weakened the FEWER emphasis on the crucial role to be played in conflict prevention activities by decentralized global networks of scholars and practitioners, but the other European and African scholars and conflict prevention specialists at the meeting ensured a lively and helpful discussion. Both Lund and Alker made presentations of their findings – Alker used slides from the ISA paper in Appendix 1, which was widely distributed at the meeting., but was deemed

too long to associate directly with the Report.

Perhaps the most important lessons to be drawn from the meeting was the need better to integrate European, East European, Asian, African, Latin American and other conflict prevention specialists into the regionally oriented networks of information gathering and analysis used by major and minor powers as well as global international and transnational conflict prevention institutions. Frequent divergences in institutional priorities and methodological preferences must be acknowledged and focussed on.<sup>8</sup> The European-African focus of many FEWER participants contrasted with, and complimented, the more North American centered activities of Carnegie funded specialists invited to the Hague Meeting. None of the Carnegie-funded scholars from North America (except for Alker) attended the Hague Meeting, with its global, UN focus; but many of the Europeans did. The prediction concerns of intelligence specialists, the policy needs of aid donors, and the institutional imperatives of different conflict prevention-oriented institutions, and the substantive and methodological priorities of differently trained scholars and bureaucrats were apparent around the table. Nonetheless, the contributions of both event-data and narrative-oriented approaches to conflict reporting and assessment were a theme in both the CEWS-FEWER meeting, FEWER Council deliberations (which Alker and Rupesinghe and Lund participated in). Only partial trans-continental networks of scholars and practitioners exist; the coordination of their information gathering and analysis activities is still rudimentary. FEWER is seriously continuing to discuss its information needs and the the imperative of empowering locally situated scholars and peace-makers. The ISSC does not have a successor program to CEWS, but UNESCO has begun modest funding various early warning network activities. The Carnegie Corporation is lessening its commitments in this domain.

---

<sup>8</sup> Particularly important methodological and institutional issues in networked-based conflict early warning activities have very recently been raised by Valery Tishkov, a Carnegie and UNESCO fundee, as well as a former co-author of Kumar Rupesinghe's in the IPRA Commission studies of Internal Conflict. See V. Tishkov, "Ethnic Conflicts in the Former USSR: the Use and Misuse of Typologies and Data," *Journal of Peace Research*, 36,5 (September 1999), pp. 571-591. This paper raises many of the issues that the CEWS project was designed to address. The final draft of *Journeys Through Conflict* will use Tishkov's important arguments to present both the successes and the limitations of CEWS-FEWER collaboration, as it relates to the original vision of the CEWS project.