Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, And Settlement (3rd Edition)
Useful at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, Social Conflict has been the standard-bearer for brief, sophisticated coverage of all the key research on social conflict and its resolution from a psychological perspective. Dealing with interpersonal, intergroup, interorganizational, and international conflict, the new edition is thoroughly updated and offers additional content to address recent findings and world events. This text is a part of the McGraw-Hill Series in Social Psychology.
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**Customer Reviews**

The book `Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement`, by Dean G. Pruitt and Sun Hee Kim, is a text I used in a graduate course on conflict resolution. At the beginning of the text, the authors state, `Implicit in our definition of conflict is the deliberate exclusion of differences of opinion concerning facts and arguments over interpretation of objective reality.' They state prior to the quote at hand that they define conflict as the `_perceived divergence of interest_`, a belief that the parties’ current aspirations are incompatible.' (emphasis theirs) The problem here is that this probably will involve differences of interpretation, and this is because they use the idea of perceived rather than true divergence of interest (which they explain in the footnote on page 8 sets them apart from many other social scientists in this field). Perhaps what is really meant here is that they mean to exclude mere differences of opinion, upon which there is nothing at stake. One might think here of theological discussions about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin (the quintessential non-important question of medieval theology which was in fact never really asked and debated). Or
perhaps one might think here of conflicting views of what might have been the case had the elder President Bush not won the 1988 election, or had he won the 1992 election - perhaps of interest to some, but being hypothetical and having no real goods at stake in the outcome (since we don't have time machines to go back to change things) there's perhaps little applicability to discussing such moot issues. When I was studying the Supreme Court, one professor of mine made quite the point about how they do not decide moot points. Each case is presented and decided upon on its own merits.
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