CHAPTER II

CONFLICT AND CO-OPERATION: NATURE AND INTERACTION

Human conflict has existed ever since man made his appearance in this world and it would last through life. Hence the cause of disagreement, misunderstanding, incompatibility, dispute, tension, disharmony, conflict and war lies with the human nature or life. Whenever a decision would be taken on any issue relating to the parties concerned, there is the possibility of incompatibility or clash of interests and opinions. Thus the natural separation of master and slave, men and women, father and son, mother and daughter, ruler and ruled etc. etc., reflects itself in a conflict not merely in ethics, but in actual physical struggle. No one is completely free of conflicts or tensions in his or her personal life. We all have to adjust and accommodate our conflicts. Yes, conflicts of all sorts - personal, interpersonal, national, trans-national and international will always be with us. Therefore the fundamental question before any researcher is not the elimination or eradication of conflict from human society but the management, de-escalation and resolution of conflict, as conflict is a permanent feature and omnipresent reality of human existence.

It has well recognised that the basic notion of society leads inevitably to group decision situations involving
incompatibilities, clashes or conflicts of interests. On the one hand, the existence of society itself is predicated on the fact that in a number of important situations there exists co-ordinated or combined action, i.e., social actions, which are preferred by all to any collection of their individual actions. Further, the existence of differences among individuals give rise to a number of these situations to a clash and conflict of interests as to which of these social actions they should adopt. Hence our general setting is a group decision situation for society in which a number of social actions are possible where each is preferred by all participants to any combination of their independent actions, but where none of their social action is unanimously preferred to all other social conflictual situations.

Thus in every type of social interaction there are occasions for one or the other type of conflict, since individuals and groups are likely to have clash of interest of one type or the other. But social interactions differ in the way in which they allow expression to antagonistic claims. Some show more tolerance, reconciliation or accommodation of conflict than the others.

Conflict within a group may help to establish unity or to re-establish unity and cohesion where it has been threatened by hostile and antagonistic feelings *inter se* members. Yet not every type of conflict is likely to benefit group structure, nor that conflict is beneficial to internal
adaptation or not depends on the type of issues over which it is fought as well as on the type of social structure.

The closer the group socially, politically, culturally, economically, religiously, historically, geographically, the more intense the conflict. In such situations where members participate with their total personality and conflicts are suppressed, unfortunately if conflict breaks out, nevertheless, is likely to threaten the very root of relationship.

Conflict within a group frequently helps to revitalize existent norms, material base and social dynamics, or it contributes to the emergence of new norms fresh material base and social dynamics. In this sense, social conflict is a mechanism for adjustment or accommodation of norms, material base and social dynamics, adequate to new conditions. A flexible society benefits from conflict because such behaviour, by helping to create and modify norms, material base and social dynamics, assures its continuance under changed conditions. Such mechanism for readjustment of norms is hardly available to rigid system. By suppressing conflict the latter smother a useful warning signal, there by maximizing the danger of catastrophic breakdown. Hence conflict is an inevitable component of change and transformation dialectics.

Thus our discussion of the distinction between types of conflict and between types of social structure, leads us to conclude that conflict tends to be dysfunctional and
harmful for a social structure in which there is less or insufficient toleration, flexibility and institutionalization of conflict. The intensity of a conflict which threatens to "tear apart", which attacks the consensual basis of a social system, is related to the rigidity of the structure. What threatens the equilibrium and symmetry of such a structure is not conflict as such, but the rigidity itself which permits hostilities to accumulate and to be channelled along one major line of cleavage once they breakout in conflict.

As stated above, conflict is a social phenomenon of immense complexity and variety and is characterized by multiple causations both with respect to its origin and development.¹

Human conflict can emerge on anyone or numerous basic or primary issues, such as economic, political, cultural, social, historical, geographical, religious or ideological differences or incompatibilities of interests,

¹ Morris Raphael Cohen, and Albert Einstein highlighted this point, as follows:

Albert Einstein shared Morris Raphael Cohen's view that the roots of world conflict lay in the antagonism that exists between the social requirements of an age and the individualist.

which through the processes of proliferation and escalation, may become intertwined with a diversity of secondary and more emotional issues such as hatred and distrust.

Anthony Oberschall, has traced the rationale for the social conflict in his book "Social Conflict and Social Movement" as follows:

Social conflict arises from the structural arrangements of individuals and groups in a social system. Authority and division of labour are the fundamental dimensions within which conflict develops. Social conflict is an ubiquitous form of social activity to be understood in terms different than social stability, culminating from essentially rational considerations. Generally conflict arise over scarce goods, whether these be economic advantages, power, status, or other privileges. The very institutions that create the misery and suffering of some, contribute to the freedom and security of others --- freedom, rights, a greater share of material wealth, are not handed to negative privileged group on a silver platter --- the tenacity and determination of vested interests in resisting change, make social conflict a fundamental fact of existence. 2

In further support of this argument Dean G. 3

Prinitt's views are quoted as follows:

Conflict between people singly as an individual or collectively as a group, society or nation-state is the culmination of a clash of interest. It is a situation in which two or more parties perceive mutually exclusive values or goals. A conflict situation may

involve a physical or violent clash between the parties in an attempt to overcome the other and at international level to deter the opposite nation-state to accept the policy adopted by it. 3

Thus the social conflict is typically a mixture of the objective and subjective or the sociological and psychological variation.

Conflict appears inherently open to self-aggravating mechanisms which foster escalation onto a variety of dimensions. There is a strong tendency for conflict escalation moves to be reciprocated, often in the interest of defence, security and economic targets. On the other hand, conflict de-escalation or resolution actions are not reciprocated so readily.

The objective nature of conflict is especially evident in the basic areas of perception, cognition and communication. Objective factor in conflict also entails subjective evaluation, so that modification in tangible differences of interest are possible through bilateral consultation, negotiation and bargaining.

However, most of the aspects of conflict behaviour of social entities are predominantly understandable and modifiable reaction to a complex and difficult environment, rather than due to inherent and unchangeable properties of

the entities themselves or of their relationship. This is not to deny the significance of socio-structural determinants of conflict, but to pin-point that these and many other aspects can be dealt with and modified if the parties so desire.

Thus the complexity of social conflict is typically reflected in a mixture of functional and dysfunctional actions and outcomes. Hence it is over-simplified to characterize the phenomenon, one way or the other.

As analysed above conflict has its existence at individual, group and societal levels, it has its existence even at the international level, inter se nation-states. Nation-states in their search for security, welfare, prestige, self-identity and aggrandisement always pursued policies which brought them into conflict with each other. 4

However, we cannot exclusively assume that international conflicts are the product of misunderstanding, misperception, mistrust, apprehension or lack of confidence.

Because most conflicts involve real clash of interests and ideologies, centring around incompatible goals and structural commitments to the perception of the conflict. Conflicts arise partly as a result of contradictions in the goals pursued by two or more states. In certain spheres of activity states have co-operative values and common interests, in other both interests and values may differ. Although activity designed to increase equilibrium, international trade, or peace for one state will automatically produce a similar increment in them for others, an attempt by any state to increase its relative status, influence, popularity or power must bring a corresponding reduction in the same value for some or all other states. The degree of conflict between states thus depends partly on the goals and objectives. It depends also on the means chosen by states to pursue their goals and objectives. Whatever goals and objectives are chosen may adopt either coercive means for attaining them or concessive means. How often concessive rather than coercive means are chosen will depend partly on realism or understanding the difficulty of securing goals and partly on recognition of the rights and interests of others. In the modern state though goals often remain exclusive, means are more often concessive than before.

One of the striking points of international conflict is that each party thinks that because it regards some issue as unimportant so that it will be easy for the other party to
backdown on it. But it is the adversary's perception of what is important which controls their decision, not general perception or some objective standard. No matter how irrational they may be, if one wants to influence them, one should deal with them on their own ground,rationally.

Goals and objectives of nations are made incompatible by territorial claims, by the desire for power expansion and hegemonism. Incompatibility of goals lead towards perceptions of irreconcileable conflict and these produce an atmosphere where war is expected and accepted as the natural way to settle disputes. Legal obligations or international organizations are moderately effective at last in preventing war, because these strategies for peace do not reshape fundamental aspects of "nation-environment relations".

The traditional style of thinking about international conflict is in terms of a struggle for power with the possible ultimate outcome, being victory of oneside over the other, i.e.,"zero-sum game", and finds expression in the "Red and dead" formula which has such wide acceptability. The leap in our thinking which is necessary to resolve this dilemma is to recognize that it is possible for adversaries to compete with one another. Indeed in the process of competition both sides may even grow stronger. This implies an acceptance of co-existence which many people on both sides of struggle find extremely unpalatable. Yet the hard fact is that in the modern nuclear era, there is no other alternative but to
Johan Galtung has developed a systematic theory of conflict and co-operation, wherein he points to status differences as a major structural element that determines the evolution of a given system and is of crucial significance for the quality of the world order. Taking the two-fold conception of peace, as a starting point, he distinguishes international relations as follows:

(a) Symmetrical relations between top dogs;
(b) Asymmetrical relations between top dogs and under-dogs;
(c) Symmetrical relations between under-dogs.

This theory enables the observer to detect indicators for potential conflict without overt violence. It also follows that the strategy for a regional or global peace and co-operation does not succeed by simple transplant of the germs of violent conflict in asymmetrical relationships. If we realize for the moment the very difficult aspect of general empirical documentation of the presence and relevance of the components of inequality as structural violence, it is not an exaggeration to say that Galtung's approach in the systematic


Here "top dogs" according to Johan Galtung are the great powers and "under-dogs" the developing nation-states of Third World.
perspective is among the most fruitful suggestion for the analysis of conflict and co-operation.

II

DEFINITION

Kenneth E. Boulding defines conflict:

As competition with incompatible potential future positions in which each party's objective is to occupy such a position. The cultivation of an international environment for peaceful settlement of conflict among adversaries calls for better understanding of the processes that give rise to conflict. 7

Hence the real situation among nation-states is not a case of complete co-operation but of strong competition whereby each party is free to choose a strategy and form alliances which it considers to be more profitable in the competition. Thus the problem is one of opposing interests, when interests are opposed, it is a conflict situation. In this context conflict does not necessarily mean war.

Johan Galtung defines conflict as "a situation with incompatible goal states. These goals may be either subjectively defined values or objectively defined interests". 8

8 Juergen Dedring, op. cit., p. 130.
However, it is clear that in terms of structural thinking, the clash of antagonistic and incompatible objective interests are the most severe and most intractable conflict type.

Roger L. Ssion and Russell L. Ackoff defined conflict and co-operation in mathematical terms as follows:

One party 'A' is in conflict with another 'B', if 'A' affects the outcome of 'B's'behaviour and the value of this behaviour to 'B' is less than that of the outcome that would have occurred if 'A' had not affected it. If the value of the outcome of 'B' is increased because of "A's" intervention, 'A' is co-operating with 'B'.

The degree of "A's" co-operation with 'B' is the difference between the values to 'B' of the outcome "with" and "without" "A's" intervention, if this difference is positive, if it is negative it is a measure of degree of A's conflict with 'B'. Thus conflict is the negative of co-operation. 9

'A' may conflict with 'B' while 'B' co-operate with 'A' or they may conflict or co-operate with each other in different degrees. The difference between the degree of A's conflict (or co-operation) with 'B' and B's conflict (or co-operation) with A, is a measure of the amount of degree of exploitation in the interaction. There is nothing in this definition of conflict and co-operation that requires that

either party be aware or conscious of the conflict. Hence the emergence and increase of awareness of a previously undetected but existing conflict may be a major factor in its escalation. 10

It is not our intention to discuss in this chapter the definitional aspects of conflict and co-operation, but the main emphasis is on the nature of conflict and co-operation and its impact in international relations, analytical study of techniques and methods for the control, management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict, and the essence of co-operation and lasting peace inter se nation-states. However, briefly the definitional aspect also above covered.

III

NATURE OF CONFLICT

Conflict is desirable for simulation of human progress so long as it does not become destructive and catastrophic. An individual or a nation-state at perfect peace may not be capable of any concrete action and it is a historical fact that great works of art, great inventions, discoveries, and great work of benevolence are often made by people who are troubled. Progress in human life is motivated by conflicts.

10 Ibid., pp. 193-5. In these pages the authors defined the terms conflict and co-operation in mathematical terms under the heading "concepts and definitions".
However, conflict is benevolence as long as it is constructive evocative and creative. But when it turned to be destructive, and dysfunctional, it is necessary to de-escalate, manage and resolve through peaceful means and techniques, such as adjustment, mutual accommodation, conciliation, arbitration, moot, mediation, bargaining, negotiation, dialogues and mutual consultations, depending on the suitability of these techniques and methods.

It is generally accepted that conflict is destructive and a "bad thing" it should and can be de-escalated and resolved given genuine desire and goodwill on the part of the disputants. But theorists from George Simmel to Lewis A. Coser; Ralf Dahrendrof and Morton Deutsch; have stressed the usefulness of conflict in many aspects of social life, from preserving group cohesion to stimulating social change and solving problems.

According to Irving Louis Horowitz:

Conflict shunted to the side as incompatible with structure and that the incompatibility is spurious since conflict operates within the social structure and not outside it. To place conflict outside the framework of social structure, or to go beyond that and see conflict as necessarily destructive of the social organism is to place a definite premium on social equilibrium. 11

In further support of this argument Robert C. North's views are cited as follows:

By analogy human individuals or groups who interact, even conflictually and perhaps violently, are functioning somewhat integratively - more so than if they had no contact at all. The association is even more integrative to the degree that rules are agreed upon to regulate or govern the conflict to limit weapons, place or circumstances of bloodshed and the nature of interaction is crucial to human organizations that some interactive functions are unlikely to bring about unification, whatever the frequency; that other interactions lead towards particular organization around a specialised function such as commerce, social interaction, religious worship and so forth; and that state apparatuses differ from other specialized integrations in the degree to which they override the decision and control operations of other organisations. An individual will not respond to another individual until and unless stimulus claims his attention. Similarly, an individual will not enter into a new interactive relationship until the possibility of such a relationship has exceeded a certain threshold to claim his conscious or unconscious attentions. 12

Moreover, conflict *per se* is not necessarily evil. It may have, and often does have, constructive value. The mobilisation of energy toward conflict de-escalation and resolution can have integrative and creative value for a nation as well as for an individual. One of the challenges of a "warless world" is to enable people and nations to learn to engage in conflict without violence - to find in William

---

Jame's apt phrase: "The Moral Equivalent of War". 13

A great deal of evidence shows that conflict has many positive functions. One of the positive functions is that it brings two parties with different ideas into positive contact.

Herbert Read in an article, "Reflection on Violence" 14 concludes that we must accept violence and conflict and believe in their ultimate efficacy. Though this sounds startling on the face of it, we have already referred to the inevitability of conflict in human life in the preceding pages. Furthermore Read holds that violence is a component of the evolutionary process. But this does not mean that we should condone it. On the contrary, our attempt should be to control this force and harness it to our needs, so that we are able to preserve that non-violent mode of life which Read calls civilization. According to him, even Gandhi's non-violence is the recognition of the reality of violence. That is why Gandhi preached its control. Thus non-violent resistance in his view is nothing else but the continued control of violence and that constitute the explanation of its effectiveness. All this may be unpalatable. But the logic of the argument is not unsound. For if we recognise the reality of violence, we can perhaps work harder and make greater efforts for the transformation


14 Herbert Read, "Reflection on Violence", The Emerging World (New Delhi), no. 36, p. 173.
of evidence and to brighten the prospects of peace and co-operation.

IV

PEACE

The quest for peace and co-operation has been the central objective of human life from time immemorial. However, it has acquired greater urgency with the evolution of civilization.

Thus an important and most significant characteristic of the modern international system is the growing concern for peace, harmony, co-operative understanding and mutual confidence-building. This concern has also been reflected in the past whenever the world has faced with crises and challenges. But in view of the catastrophic nature of modern nuclear weapons and nuclear warfare the concern for peace has acquired greater significance. For instance, if the nuclear war breaks out, it would mean total annihilation or destruction. It is the realization of this potential threat to human survival that has led responsible decision-makers from all walks of life to evolve the ways and means to control and avoid war and to maintain peace and co-operation.


Advancement in science and technology and the human achievements in the field of nuclear technology, has enhanced the responsibility of man to evolve means, methods or techniques to check the nuclear war. A major nuclear war at the present time would certainly be a massive setback, and in view of our ignorance of its ecological consequences, it is at least possible that it might be an irretrievable disaster. Furthermore the process of nuclear research and development in weaponry which has created the present situation continued in spite of the nuclear test ban and if research and development in nuclear weaponry and the means of destruction will continue at the rate of the last twenty years, the process would almost certainly lead to the development of what Herman Kahn, calls "the Doomsday Machine", which will have the power to end all life on earth. Under such serious circumstances the search for stable and enduring peace takes on an urgency and an intensity which it has never had before in the history of mankind.

(a) Meaning

The problem of meaning of peace can be variously interpreted. In the words of John F. Kennedy, "Peace is

---

not a static but a dynamic process". Further it can in its simplest form be defined negatively as the "absence of armed hostilities". To some it may mean the state of the soul; to others an integrated world economy based on co-operation.

Broadly speaking, there are three distinct schools in peace research. They are Minimalist School, Middle School (Threat System), and the Direct Violence School. All these schools have a consensus on the simple definition of peace, i.e., peace according to them is the absence of violence. However, they differ on the detailed analysis of the term peace.

According to first school, "peace means absence of international war". However, the main controversial question here is whether huge militarization and existence of conventional and nuclear weapons of mass-destruction, could be consonant with peace. This is the question on which there is controversy among the protagonists of this school. It is a fact that for the maintenance of enduring peace in a

---


particular region or *inter se* nation-states, it is necessary that arms production and its deployment should be stabilised or there must be some over-all balance of strategic weapons. According to second school or middle school (threat system), peace means not only the absence of war but also the absence of a threat system. This school further argues that "peace is the absence not only of war, but also of instruments and institutions of war". 22

The third school gives a further detailed and comprehensive definition. According to it "peace means absence of all kinds of violence, actual and potential, direct and structural". 23

However, Adam Curle has attempted a definition of peace which can be related to political opportunities. According to him "peace is a condition from which the individuals, groups or nation-states concerned gain more advantage than disadvantage. Ideally it means something even more positive, harmonious and constructive collaboration". 24

But the meaning in this sense seems to be an outgrowth of the large problem of meaning in its relation to the levels in the organization of life. That is, peace can be achieved on an individual level, in the stoic sense

22 Ibid., p. 147.
23 Ibid.
of the term, without necessarily alluding to a community of peace-loving men. On another level, we can approach peace as a social condition, without necessarily implying the inner calm of an individual. Likewise, international peace does not causally imply the existence of peace within each nation. A religious war may be so confined to the boundaries of a single nation, that in general it can be said to offer no serious threat to the world peace. By structuring the problem of meaning it seems possible to achieve a clearer understanding of this aspect of the problem of war and peace.

According to St. Augustine:

Peace was not merely the absence of war, but tranquillity in order - not tranquillity under the yoke of the evil-doer, but tranquillity in justice through harmony and order. Thus peace is not broken by all violence, but only by violence which defeats justice. Peace became, not the absence of war, but the existence of justice and law. And law was necessary for justice. 25

And Quincy Wright defines:

Peace which means merely the avoidance of war in any circumstances is self-defeating, because it encourages injustice, which leads to war. Peace must have the positive meaning of international justice. International justice implies positive and orderly procedures

and a spirit of co-operation in dealing with international problems. 26

Albert Einstein conceived of war and peace in moral terms. According to him: "Peace was the highest expression of human values, because it alone made possible the attainment of other values. The martial spirit, quite to the contrary is the replacement of ethics by force." 27

However, peace signifies harmonious relation between man and the objects of his desire, it substitutes identification for alienation, while nations are locked in mortal conflict, the individual can nonetheless survive emotionally. Knowledge of the things at stake in a war may provide that inner serenity that no weapons can injure. That peace in this sense exists, and can play a role in both individual and social thinking, is hard to deny. In large measures, the nature of heroism involves the achievement of just a sublime emotional calm in the face of objective disorders. Individual peace by virtue of its changing forms cannot be shared, or fully explained commodity. Its essential worth remains incontestable. Experience indicates that those philosophies which have built in provisions for

26 Ibid., p. 170.


inner spiritual peace in the face of the mightiest conflagration are more likely to find adherents than those which have no such provisions. The identification of the individual with the historical future or heavenly future, that element in a philosophy that makes it not only a methodology, but a way of life for enormous number of people. 28

Nonetheless, since all life is essentially social, individual tranquility, if not impossible in an environment of intense conflict is for most of us infinitely difficult. For this reason, those philosophies which provide an appropriate analysis of the major social problems of our age, stand the widest chance of adaptation. It is hard to shake off the fact that individual peace is most secure when the peace of the world is assured. Peace even on this individual level encompasses and compasses as it were at every level of human existence. The individual is neither physically nor emotionally isolated. Man is part of a biological species, a historical class, a transient community, a world-wide religion, a racial strain, etc. etc. The individual compresses these levels of existence within his being. It is the orderly integration of all these external features of his existence that enables him, with any justice, to claim individual peace. The social nature of man does not negate the individual qua individual. It

28 For instance, Adam Curle has been associated with an effort to alter attitudes regarding peace through detailed examination of educational practices and developmental goals.
realises, however, that individual existence is brought to fruition through wider relations. For this reason, peace on the individual level is most meaningful when world peace is realised.

At the next level, peace implies the absence of aggressiveness within a family, clan or community, or to widen the circle of the organic unity of national, linguistic, or religious group. At this point, peace is externalised. It moves beyond the individual into a social framework.

The recognition of differences among people in their modes of life and culture is a paramount source of harmony at every level of peace. To speak about peace, implies the presence of diversity. The casting of humanity into a narrow, monolithic mold is a primary source of strife because it generates intense intolerance, cultism and authoritarian mentality. If on the individual level of the meaning of peace, a mature philosophy provides a way of life for the self, at the infinitely more complicated community level, philosophy in conjunction with science possess the ability to present a common ground among people who differ widely in their attitudes and values.

In Alfred Whitehead's opinion man can only achieve lasting peace when he is in possession of an intellectual sophistication corresponding to the needs of the historical

He says: "The history of ideas is a history of mistakes." But through all mistakes it is also the history of the gradual purification of conduct. When there is progress in the development of favourable order, we find conduct protected from relapse into brutalization by the increasing agency of ideas consciously entertained. In this way Plato is justified in his saying "the creation of the world - that is to say, the world of civilized order - is the victory of persuasion over force". 30

The futuristic approach to international peace and /is co-operation/ expressed by Kenneth E. Boulding in the following words:

If we are to have a conscious policy for stable peace on the part of any nation, its decision in regard to the international system have the following properties: in the first place, any decision involves a range of alternatives and it must be possible to rank these alternatives in order of their values in achieving stable peace and long-term co-operation. For this to be possible there must be an image in the mind of the decision-makers of a model of the international system in which movement in the direction of stable peace can be defined. That is to say, from any given position in the system, the decision-makers must define a movement towards stable peace as "up" and he must know which way is "up" and which out of range of possible decisions has the highest value in terms, shall we say, of its probability of moving the system in the upward direction. These are no easy conditions to fulfill, and it is not surprising that up to now no nation has had a very successful and

30 Ibid., p. 34.
conscious policy for stable peace, even though the desire for peace is professed by nearly every body. 31

For further explanation of this point Werner Levi's views are cited as follows:

For the reservation of international peace is required an international structure which tolerates conflicts and provides non-violent institutions for their resolution and that the interdependent groups should be sufficiently large. But at present the organization of force in international society does not correspond to this requirement. The two essential conditions of international peace, then are, the development of a behavioural pattern which denounces war and violence, and the peaceful organization of international force. 32

He suggests a comprehensive programme for the achievement of these conditions and emphasis that this programme should be followed in non political fields. This is a matter of all aspects of life and not only of the political aspect.

However, Gandhi's philosophy of war and peace also have its relevance in this respect. Almost every age in human history has developed a philosophy of pacifism to deal with the questions raised by the realities of power and violence in human politics. The new philosophy of

pacifism required in today's world has a greater chance of being successfully reconstructed on the basis of Gandhian Pacificism, because Gandhi made experiments of the application of non-violence in group life on a large scale. But the period following his death, posed, some problems of modern international politics to which Gandhi unfortunately did not or could not give serious thought. One such problem is the introduction of non-violence in all aspects of life on a world scale. Thus it is the responsibility of all those, who have firm belief and faith on Gandhian philosophy of peace and pacifism to work out an internationally acceptable operational framework to face the challenges of modern international system in the establishment of durable peace, co-operative understanding and mutual confidence-building.

Lewis Richardson in his book, "Arms and Insecurity: A Mathematical Model of Arms Control", suggests the substitution of "peace race" for "arms race". According to him positive peace measures like "elites communication" and "cultural exchanges" should be undertaken at the national and international level and he emphasised that as a matter

of fact, the theory of peace race is itself, based upon the realization of the need for an "effective communication system" because "peace race" can contribute to the prospects of disarmament and check "arms race" only if the intentions of those making a start in "peace race" are not misunderstood.

Kenneth E. Boulding highlighted the importance of the co-operative understanding among various nation-states, and its relevance in the modern society as follows:

The establishment of peace and co-operation is not only an intellectual achievement but spiritual and moral achievements as well, demanding a cherishing of the wholeness of human personality, the unmediated wholeness of feeling and thought, and constituting a never ending challenge to man, emerging from the abyss of meaninglessness and suffering, to be renewed and replenished in the totality of individuals' life. 34

Johan Galtung has coined the term "negative peace". The concept of this term is that conflict is the essential element of human existence and peace can be achieved only through the elimination of physical violence. Another social scientist and a bitter critic of Peace Research movement, Herman Schmid, pin-pointed like Galtung the dangers of negative peace, which according to him, a tautological umbrella term under which any researcher could group all things, he valued most highly, such as integration, racial harmony, population control, or economic development.

Thus the fundamental question before any researcher is, what should be the limitations of negative peace?

Apparently peace is a multi-dimensional concept, which has its impact on all human activities from man's birth to death. Hence peace cannot be simply achieved through the control of isolated elements or phenomena like arms control and disarmament. It can only be achieved when the world realises its significance and when world public opinion develops a strong and genuine desire for its achievement.

For instance, trade relations are likely to suggest a great deal about patterns of interaction between nation-states and issues of commerce may contribute to the co-operative process along with other functions. However, it may be a serious error to assume that increasing trade between states or an increase of various other types of interaction for that matter, is necessarily an indicator of a tendency of the states to merge under a single government. On the contrary, we might expect successful trade partners to continue their commercial give-and-take over several generations without contributing to their merger as a single political entity and would help the processes of long-term co-operation.

Anatol Rapoport had suggested the following measures for the achievement of mutual co-operation among different nation-states:

(1) Mutual co-operation is very likely with open communication channel, less likely with "agreed to" communication and unlikely with no communication.

(2) Mutual co-operation is likely after communication act.
(3) Mutual co-operation is more likely with an agreed to communication channel, than with a closed channel, even if communication does not take place.

(4) Domination is very likely under the low technology (weak weapons) - when either no communication is available or technology is low, mutual destruction is more probable.

(5) When technology is high: players tend not to communicate, even if they can and domination is the most likely outcome. 35

The techniques suggested by Ernst-Otto Czempiel, for the achievement of mutual co-operation are as follows.

According to him experimentally it has been proved by the game theory that the dilemma of resolving conflict and achieving co-operative understanding effected if the following strategy is applied:

(1) Interaction of co-operation;

(2) Continuation of co-operative tendencies, as long as the opposite side joins in;

(3) Immediate reaction if there is repeated or frequent refusal by the other side, but

(4) Partial insertion of a succession of two or three unilateral, co-operative impulses in order to give the opponent a chance to decide for a succession of mutual co-operative impulses. 36


This result has been confirmed in several variants by various game and simulation experiments. They have also demonstrated that the obstacle towards such a strategy is the desire to maximize profit. Adam Curle has rejected the definition of peace which is simply the absence of overt violence. He believes that there are variety of concealed or indirect violence which do as much disadvantage and harm as more open sorts and which may on occasions be employed in the name of maintaining peace, justice, and law and order. Simultaneously he rejects the view that peace studies can be based on a kind of sentimental attempt to make every one be friend, without correcting genuine injustice or conflict of interests. However, he does not satisfy with the concept of peace and has propounded an approach based on "peaceful and unpeaceful relationship" inter se nation-states. This concept according to him, enables to analyse the interaction among different nation-states at various levels, i.e., psychological, social, political, cultural, economic, diplomatic-strategic and human.

Peaceful relationship on a personal scale, means friendship and understanding sufficiently strong to overcome any difference that might occur on a large scale. Peaceful relationships would imply active association, planned

38 Ibid., p. 155.
co-operation and an intelligent effort of forestall or to resolve potential conflicts, whereas unpeaceful relationships are those in which the units or nation-states concerned damage each other so that in fact they achieve less than they could have done independently, one way or another harm each other's capacity for growth, maturation or fulfilment.

Thus peace research is concerned with approaches to reshape society in such a way that not only violence overt and covert eliminated but harmony and co-operation are established and maintained. According to him, peace is a cross-disciplinary, cross-ideological, theoretically oriented and concerned with applicability; hence it assists in understanding the problems and causes for confrontation, disharmony and tensions inter se nation-states and helps in their reconciliation, rapprochement and normalization of relations, irrespective of their ideological, politico-economic, socio-cultural, strategic-diplomatic and religious differences, and concentrate on phenomenology of war, necessary conditions of survival and future possibilities for the attainment of enduring peace and co-operative understanding.


41 Ibid., p. 154. Plus an in-depth discussion and exchange of views were conducted personally by Adam Curle during his visit to the school in February 1982, on these vital issues of peace, peace research, peaceful and unpeaceful relationship in the international arena in general and Indo-Pakistani relations in particular.
In the light of these arguments highlighted by Adam Curle it can be forecasted that for the establishment of peaceful relationship between India and Pakistan, it is not only necessary that the war psychosis should be prevented through the control of such measures as reduction in arms production, de-establishment of war institutions but such conditions should be created by restructuring social organization to bring harmonisation of interest at almost all levels and by creating opportunities for the free flow of communication and the possibilities for the greater interaction among the nationals of both the neighbours.

However, there are greater possibilities for the attainment of Indo-Pakistani rapprochement as the nationals of both the countries have shared experience of malign clash of interests and had ultimately realised the genuine necessity for enduring peace and co-operation between their countries to concentrate on other immediate and important problems facing by their countries. The Simla Agreement of 2 July 1972, between New Delhi and Islamabad is the main parameter and manifestation for the attainment of enduring peace and co-operative behaviour through bilateral processes which could lead to new kinds of linkages of political aspirations in both New Delhi and Islamabad.

42 Within the parameters of suggestions given by Herman Schmid, Werner Levi, Kenneth E. Boulding, Johan Galtung, Gandhi, Richardson, Anatol Rapoport, J. W. Galtung, Ernst Otto-Czempiel, and others as analysed in the preceding pages.
The basic question before us is, what are the techniques or methods for the control, management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict, since conflict is omnipresent reality and permanent feature of human existence?

Experts on conflict resolution studies have suggested numerous techniques and methods for the management, de-escalation and resolution of conflict, major and significant techniques are discussed in the following pages.

Since conflict often includes dysfunctional and destructive components, experts on conflict resolution

---

43 For illustrative purposes some of the work of the experts on conflict resolution techniques are cited as follows:

J.W. Burton, *Conflict and Communication* (London, 1969);

Johan Galtung, "On Peace Education", in Christoph Wolf, ed., *A Handbook on Peace Education* (Frankfurt/Main, 1974);

Kenneth E. Boulding, *Conflict and Defence* (New York, 1962);

Conn H. Paul, *Conflict and Decision-making: An Introduction to Political Science* (New York, 1971);
studies have explored numerous techniques or methods for its management, de-escalation and resolution.


Herbert C. Kelman, International Behaviour: A Social Psychological Analysis (New York, 1965);

Anatol Rapoport, Conflict in Man-Made Environment (Harmondsworth, 1974);

Evan Luard, Conflict and Peace in the Modern International System (Boston, 1968);

Judd Marmor, "Psychological Problems of Warlessness", in Arthur Larson, ed., A Warless World (New York, 1962);


Robin Clarke, The Science of War and Peace (London, 1971);

Thomas C. Schelling, The Strategy of Conflict (Cambridge, 1960);

It is assumed that certain essential similarities occur in most if not all kinds of conflicts. Therefore, it is feasible to conceive of a general method of conflict management, de-escalation and resolution, such as mediation, arbitration, mutual accommodation, regulation, bilateral negotiation, bargaining, adjustment, autocratic-decision making, etc. etc., on the issues that create international conflict. 44

As for the techniques and methods of de-escalation and resolution of international conflict is concerned they differ from nation-state to nation-state, according to the nature of conflict, and the environment wherein it exists but broadly speaking for the de-escalation and resolution of international conflict among various nation-states, one has to analyse and view the conflict in its genuine and real sense, only truth and genuine desire can help in de-escalating and resolving it. As citizens of a specific nation-state, we can sort out the wise from unwise policies and support the former by political action. "Public opinion" demands that conflicts within our own society be settled peacefully and amicably through mutual adjustment and accommodation of tension and disputes. Probably the "public opinion" of most of the nations of the world would like to resolve international disputes, tension and conflict in the similar fashion. But

44 Charles Fred Ikle, How Nations Negotiate (New York, 1967), and

F.C. Northrop, op. cit.
unfortunately, there is no powerful world "public opinion", which can make its contribution through a specific platform in the resolution of conflicts (in the sense of strong sanction).

However, the only way out for the de-escalation and resolution of international conflict, is through accommodation adjustment, conciliation, arbitration, moot, mediation, autocratic-decision making, mutual co-operation, regulation, bargaining and negotiation. Tho\[\text{\textsuperscript{45}}\] Though the peaceful means such as international law and international organization to a greater extent failed, in bringing world peace and co-operation. The only strong hope is the expected role of the "public opinion", at national and international level, which can orient the conflictual international relations, into peaceful and accommodative international relations. Tho\[\text{\textsuperscript{46}}\] Thus the problem of management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict depends upon many factors and the success of these factors depends in part upon how strong the disputants desire conflict resolution and the population intends to remain an integrated and peaceful system. The attitudes and predispositions of the population, affect whether conflict management, de-escalation and


resolution will be effective and whether it will be peaceful or violent. 47

To be able to propose a better technique for conflict management, de-escalation and resolution scholars and decision-makers need to know in full details, the bases of empirical analysis, how social, economic, political, military, ideological or strategic-diplomatic disputes are resolved by mutual agreement, by the decisive outcome of a limited battle in the confrontation without overall victory or defeat, by a concession of inferiority by the weaker party, or by mutual decision to follow the suggestions for the resolution from outside parties or organizations. Moreover, we should know how the end of a dispute in one sphere of interaction, e.g., in the military or economic realms, affects the situation in another, e.g., the political one, only if we have clearer ideas about the range and level of interrelationship between the various spheres of interaction, co-operative or conflictual, we will be able to recognise the long-range implications of the instances of conflict resolution for the establishment of regional and international peace. These sets of problems are surely a new parameter for peace and conflict resolution studies.

To analyse any conflict, total picture in the mind of the disputants must be considered. Therefore, the proper

47 F.C. Northrop. op. cit.
method of action is not to try to single out individual causes of conflict but to consider them in their totality. The proper means of resolving conflict is to let the participants reach their own agreement, without outside concern or constraint. To effect this the two parties in conflict must be brought into an active and prolonged discussion, negotiation or contact so that they can break down their "mirror images" of each other's position and reach an acceptable agreement.

In today's highly interdependent and interactive international society, the means and channels of peaceful conflict resolution are increasingly challenged. As the potential for conflict rises, so must our capacity to deal with its underlying causes. It is impossible to completely eradicate the conflicts, rather we must understand that inability to peacefully and sequentially deal with problems, means, that, at some time we may have to come to grips with many problems simultaneously, the magnitude of which may preclude peaceful settlement. Hence, we must understand both the interaction of factors which cause conflict and the institutional structures which can help to resolve it. We must be able to distinguish between conflict which is useful and simulating for the progress of a society and world, and conflict which can only exacerbate tensions and culminate into violence and bloodshed. This is the challenge of politics and it is with this that the analysis of political institutions and processes should concern itself.
In studying conflict at both the micro and macro levels among various nation-states, the first and foremost technique to be applied is the total study of system in which relations take place. Just, as relations among individuals are influenced above all by the conventions, norms and customs of the society within which they exist, so the relations of nation-states themselves are influenced by the conventions, norms and customs of their system. The principal and major factors to be considered in each system are the types of units involved, the number and nature of their contacts, their goals towards each other, their means of achieving these goals and the common institutions they establish.

Thus it is evident that the motives and objectives of nation-states are highly complex. They vary not only from nation-state to nation-state but from generation to generation. Even for the same state at the same time, they will be inconsistent and confused. It is thus no more meaningful of nations than of men to declare that they are "by nature" competitive or co-operative, power seeking or social. Nations may like individuals be capable of different natures. These will vary both according to their experience and history and their own immediate requirements. But they will be influenced above all, by the social environment within which they exist, the community of nations and its institutions. Therefore, the significant problem in both cases is not to
discover the "essential" nature of men or of communities, but to know the potential nature which the society inhabit may induce in them.

Experts on conflict resolution studies have suggested specific techniques and methods for the management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict, for specific situations, they are discussed in the following pages.

John W. Burton and his associates have propagated an approach called "conflict resolution through changed perception". To quote them:

*Experts have maintained* that in conflict situations the basic task and opportunity is to bring about changes in the perception of the antagonists; this is to be achieved through "controlled communication", i.e., a procedure in which messages, as they are transmitted, are checked for their veracity, accuracy and seriousness. This examination requires the presence of a third party. In Burton's scheme academic specialists—who thereby contribute to correcting misperceptions and to transforming predispositional ill-will into new values that enhance mutual understanding and co-operation, thus improving the prospects for a settlement of the conflict. Burton shows an overriding concern with perception for the past by rigidly claiming that the mediator should never suggest solution and that the parties should never be asked to accept solution by themselves in finding alternate goals rather than compromise. It is obvious that such a lopsided representation of the question of the technique of "controlled communication" stresses its basic defects and neglects its merits. The view is untenable that conflicts are primarily subjective; but this correction does not entail the opposite conclusion that there are no subjective conflicts. The best way of seeing it is to assume and search for the subjective and objective, the predispositional
and the structural, aspects of a conflictual interaction situation. According to the presence and the relative strength of these two antecedents, we can devise our tools for the challenging tasks of rectifying misperceptions and of laying the foundation for a new set of values and objectives that can be shared by the parties in conflict. 48

Further Burton, in his book "Peace Theory: Preconditions of Disarmament" 49 analyses the techniques and methods for the management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict. He emphasises that the study of peaceful international relations does not seek to prevent conflict from being resolved by warfare, that is, to make unnecessarily the employment of warfare as an instrument of national policy. It seeks, furthermore to ensure that conflict is resolved and not merely repressed; for the repression of conflict merely suppresses grievances, and unsatisfied grievances create a condition not of peace but of potential hostility. Therefore, the study of peaceful international relation is concerned, with the regulation of competitive rivalries in international relations in such a fashion as to secure for each nation the greatest possible satisfaction from competition without recourse to war.


Burton is of the view that a condition of peace cannot be brought about by international forces, nor by the domination of any national or international forces. It is, rather a function of national policies. It can be brought about only by the pursuit of policies which invite possible response and by national adjustment to changing conditions.

Luc Reychler had suggested "Pacifist Strategy", as one of the approaches and techniques for the de-escalation and resolution of international conflict. He defines "Pacifist strategy", as an approach to conflict resolution, which reduces or eliminates the threat of violence and the short or long-term use of violence, and will increase the likelihood of reaching a solution fair to the conflicting parties.

Dieter Ruloff discusses the relevance of "mediation" as one of the techniques of conflict resolution as follows:

There is after all a take-off point in conflict where inputs from outside will lead to the development of co-operation. In the case of strong dampening factors preventing the conduct of further hostilities for a short period, the development of a friendly attitude can reduce tensions and can lead to co-operative interaction. These dampening factors usually develop after serious crises with both parties expecting or actually experiencing severe losses. In this case a mediation effort will be of great relevance. To some extent, external pressure on both parties can serve as

a functional equivalent for a crisis. Generally speaking, mediation of factors have to take advantage of the dampening mechanisms which the system itself develops. Mediation should begin the very moment mutual hostilities have come to a standstill, either by pressures from outside or as a result of the crisis itself. During a crisis the best strategy would be to assure a balance of military power in order to prevent both parties from preventive actions. Complete submission as a result of a conflict, i.e., a topdog-underdog situation will prevent the outbreak of new hostilities for a short while, but is extremely appropriate to the development of longer term friendly relations. 51

Thomas C. Schelling, in his book "The Strategy of Conflict", 52 pinpointed "bargaining" as one of the suitable techniques for the resolution of international conflict. According to him there are enlightening similarities between say manoeuvering in limited war and jockeying in a traffic jam, between deterring the Russians and deterring one's own children, or between the modern balance of terror and the ancient institution of hostages. The essence of this book was that all these situations are part of the process of "bargaining". The feature they all have in common is that they involve two parties which have common interests as well as conflicting one - and by definition nuclear power, however


hostile, do have a common interest in avoiding mutual annihilation and destruction. To preserve these interests, players have to follow strategies - but not the strategies of military terminology, "winning" in a conflict, wrote Schelling, does not have a strictly competitive meaning; it is not winning in relation to one's adversary. It means gaining relative to one's own value system, and this may be done by "bargaining", "mutual accommodation" and by the avoidance of "mutually damaging behaviour". Schelling further says, strategy - in the sense in which he is using is not concerned with the efficient application of force but with the exploitation of potential force.

Much of Schelling's book is concerned with what happens to the bargaining process when two sides can "communicate" and when they cannot. In the latter situation there can only be 'tacit bargaining' but Schelling, with the help of intuitive reasoning and a few simple games, was able to show that even bargaining without communication can go further than might appear.

Johan Galtung had propagated an approach called "integrative and disintegrative", as an instrument of conflict management, de-escalation and resolution. He argues that in conditions of rank-equilibrium and symmetry between the parties the best way towards the achievement and

53 Juergen Dedring, op. cit., p. 195.
stabilization of peace is a policy of "association" i.e., the relationship between two top-dogs will be less exposed to the danger of violent and bitter conflicts, if the partners are linked together in a multiple network of interaction and interdependence leading to fusion. However, he argues that the same applies to underdogs with rank-disequilibrium and asymmetry with additional results that they would gain strength against the top-dogs. For situations of actual hostility or mutual violent hatred, the strategy of association would be most damaging, here the dissociation approach of separating the opponents seems appropriate. Moreover, if the parties in conflict are unequal in Galtung's terms, if one is a top-dog and the other underdog, dissociative measures are the only answers in the first stage of confrontation, because associative interaction in an asymmetrical or rank-disequilibrium condition would merely strengthen the dominant actor, due to its greater capabilities and impact. Once the weaker party has gained enough autonomy and self-respect and is able to maintain itself against the other party, it can initiate steps towards association and integration. This two fold process can involve conflict-provoking behaviour on the part of the underdogs, in the first phase in order to bring about the collapse of a system of rank-disequilibrium or asymmetrical dominance, e.g., colonialism, before co-operative-integrative measures are taken. Thus peace-making and peace-keeping might
require a whole range of policies from total isolation and separation to total integration and amalgamation, according to the nature of the conflict and the parties. Galtung holds that associative policies are likely to gain in importance due to the general patterns of political development, but he points out that in view of persistent large inequalities between many states and religions dissociative strategies, including increased conflict awareness and behaviour, will be employed, and have to be employed, to move closer to the goal of positive peace, social justice and equality within and among states.

Galtung further suggests that for the resolution of conflict, which arises from the incompatible objective interests, the conventional methods of peace-making are unlikely to bring about a successful resolution of the conflict. Under such conditions, he suggests "structural changes", as the most suitable technique for the resolution of conflict.

Stephen La Tour and others in an article "Some determinants of presence for the modes of conflict resolution" classified various social and environmental factors as the constraints in adopting the particular procedure for the management, de-escalation and resolution of international conflict. These factors are temporal urgency, availability

54 Ibid., p. 120.
or non-availability of standard existing model, correspondence or non-correspondence relationship inter se disputants.

However, the authors suggested the selection of specific techniques in the following sequence.

The primary necessity of the conflict resolution study is to examine the spontaneous preferences of individuals in conflict for different conflict resolution procedures arranged along a continuum of decreasing third party intervention in the decision-making process. By matching subject-preferences for the features of an ideal method of conflict resolution. It was found that while no method provides a perfect match, the average person would most prefer arbitration, followed in order by moot, mediation, autocratic-decision making and bargaining procedures. Arbitration was most preferable because it was not extremely discrepant on any of the eight dimensions and because it matched subject preferences particularly well in terms of time taken, certainly that the objectively correct decision would be made one way or the other opportunity for explanation and pleasantness. 55

Rajni Kothari, in his book, "Foot Steps into the Future: Diagnosis of the Present World and a Design for an Alternative", has put forward the following steps for the resolution of international conflict:

1. Important structural changes should be carried out in the distribution of power and resources.

2. Need to translate an intellectual model of a preferred world into a practical design for political action.

3. Solidarity among the third world countries, in the field of politics, economy and in socio-cultural fields, through international organizational bodies as UN, and its various agencies.

4. Regional co-operation.

5. The need for a world order based on the values of autonomy, justice and non-violence.

6. Efforts should be made to reduce the world disparities.

7. The strong step should be taken for the exercise of disarmament in the world and particularly among the super powers and great powers.

8. Autonomy and integration among the third world countries.

In some special conditions where no suitable technique and methods for the resolution of conflict, is available and conflicts are for some constructive purposes then it can be carried out in a non-violent fashion to achieve those constructive objectives. Judd Marmor in his article "Psychological Problems of Warlessness" discusses this issue as follows:

If conflict between nations persists, as it is likely to do over one issue or another, is it psychologically feasible that it can be pursued

without violence? There is an accumulating body of evidence to indicate that the non-violent pursuit of conflict between groups is not only feasible but can actually be very effective. Where traditional approaches of diplomacy, negotiation or mediation have failed, other techniques such as sanctions or boycotts are still available short of war. The active but non-violent techniques of carrying on conflict as practiced under the leadership of such men as Gandhi and Martin Lutherking are illustrative of the tremendous moral power inherent in such ways of dealing with an adversary; and although not directly applicable to the current East-West conflict, might become more relevant in a world in which the use of lethal mass weapons has been outlawed. Such methods of struggle not only tend to contribute to the restoration of the humanistic values upon which western civilization prides itself, but also serve to correct the distorted psychological stereotypes which exist concerning violence. For the non-violent fighter, resort to violence is a sign of weakness, while adherence to non-violence is a demonstration of inner strength and courage. Psychologically this has considerable validity. Psychiatrists have long known that the resort to violence stems more often from feeling of fear and inner weakness than from strength, and that the customary common sense equation of violence with strength and non-violence with weakness is often a false one in terms of unconscious psychodynamics. 57

Social scientists engaged in the development of the Future World Order Model Project (WOMP), aimed their scheme to move towards a truly polycentric world based on the principles of equality, mutual co-operation, and peaceful settlement of conflicts of interest and ideology. They all believe that it is only on the basis of such a structure of co-operation among autonomous units that the present

structure of dominance and insecurity can be brought to an end and larger settlements in controlling the terrifying instruments of war and violence be achieved. But in order that such an aim be realised, it is necessary to upset the existing status quo in the world. For this the countries of Third World individually and jointly on a regional basis, will have to play a major role.

Let us discuss, another important issue, which has its impact on "conflict-co-operation studies", i.e., military assistance by the super-powers and major powers to the developing and the underdeveloping countries and its impact on the behavioural pattern of these countries.

Effects of sharp increase in military assistance on international conflict and co-operation on the part of the recipient nation-states are investigated by Donald A. Sylvan, in his article "consequences of sharp military assistance, increases for international conflict and co-operation". Sylvan's study is based primarily on twenty five annual observations from 1946 to 1970, of fifteen Asian nations and the key findings of his study are as follows:

1. Sharp increase in military assistance tends to change decidedly the recipient nation's international conflict and co-operative behaviour.

2. In a substantial majority of cases examined the direction of that change is towards increased conflict and a decrease in co-operation; and
3. A two-year lag between military assistance and the behaviour change of recipient nations is statistically supported. 58

Thus in the light of Sylvan's above findings, it has been established that super powers and major powers, have significant role in governing the international relations among the developing and underdeveloping countries, either by the proliferation of military assistance and arms supply or by the non-proliferation of these materials. Further the relationship between military power and foreign policy has been subjected to detail examination in the case of the developed states, but more serious and technical efforts are required for adequately conceptualising the military-diplomatic transactions in the Third World. Closer scrutiny of standard explanation is needed to cope with problems like those which have arisen between India and Pakistan. Politico-military power by itself may not be able to create peace between these two South Asian neighbours.

This point has been further supported by Anatol Rapoport, in his book "Conflict in Man-Made Environment", and an analytical survey of history at international level, conducted by him, highlights that:

the development of local disputes, tensions and misunderstandings, into conflicts and hostilities is in large measure due to the influence or the intervention of super powers

and great powers, whether ostensibly for humanitarian purposes or in pursuit of economic or political interests. Furthermore, this intervention increases the danger of escalation of conflicts into major, even nuclear, hostilities. It appears that if the super powers and great powers observed their obligations under international law and the United Nation's Charter to refrain from the use or threat of force in international relations and from unilateral interventions in the domestic affairs of other states (Article 2, para 4 and 7), the underdeveloped and the developing nations usually be able to solve their internal and external problems without serious hostilities and mankind would enjoy a more peaceful and less dangerous world. 59

However, islands of stable peace have emerged in North America and Scandinavia, where the probability of war between the countries concerned is, so low as to be insignificant. If other countries like India and Pakistan, follow the same behavioural pattern, as North American and the Scandinavian countries, it is highly likely that a world with stable and permanent peace can be achieved.