Persistent conflict and the resultant violence have always characterised the international system. This has been happening in a situation of growing complexity which has been brought about by the multiplicity of players in the international arena in the aftermath of de-colonization. Therefore, the focus of concern has come to shift from preservation of peace to management of conflict. At times conflict management has often been used as nearly synonymous with conflict mitigation, dispute settlement and conflict resolution. These are undoubtedly related terms and concepts. However, for the purpose of this study, conflict management does not denote the same concept or idea as dispute settlement or conflict resolution or even conflict control which is the chartered role of the United Nations. Given the fact of conflict, conflict management occupies an intermediate position between conflict and conflict resolution which either follows the settlement of the dispute that generated the conflict or is coterminous with

Conflict management, in a natural sequence, follows a conflict and precedes its resolution.

If at all there is going to be a resolution of the conflict, its management has got to precede it, and therefore, conflict management in the first place is inescapably essential for any conflict resolution. But what puts conflict management in the category of being something of cardinal importance is the fact that conflicts potentially and actually, have proved to be awfully bloody and inordinately expensive as well as risky all around. Therefore, in the first and foremost place there is a need to be able to manage a conflict and to keep it duly managed until its resolution is obtained. This is the overriding importance of conflict management.

This view of conflict management, on empirical considerations, can be corroborated by a number of examples of conflicts and their management. The central case study of the present work deals with the ongoing ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. In this case, the involved parties were tempted to manage and resolve the problem but failed to achieve success in either of the two objectives. A compelling corroborative example of the hypothesis presented here is the decade-long effort of the UN to manage the internecine conflict in Cambodia and its ultimate resolution. In any peace endeavour, it is a lesson of
history that one must keep hope and guard unrelentingly against despair. But, at the same time, realistically one has to wait and watch how enduring the Cambodian settlement proves to be. The most outstanding example is the recent accord reached between Palestine and Israel which shows the possibilities and scope of conflict management, even if the accord is hemmed in by any number of 'ifs and buts'. One's caution in this regard is rooted in the very nature of 'conflict' per se. Morton Deutsch has this to say in this regard:

Some conflicts appear to take on a life of their own. They continue even though the issues which initially gave rise to them have long been forgotten or become irrelevant. Other conflicts are like malignant tumour; they grow out of control and enmesh the conflict participants in a web of hostile interactions and defensive manoeuvres which continuously worsen their situations, making them feel less secure, more vulnerable, and more burdened.  

The fact of the matter is that there are both objective and subjective determinants of a conflict. The subjective factors or determinants have received attention in several


4. Peter A. Sorokin, wrote in 1937: "The periods of transition from one type of culture to another must be logically the periods of comparative conflagration of war". Social and Cultural Dynamics (New York, 1937), vol.3, p.375.
studies. But this is an area which in its complexity and in the chemistry of its interaction with the objective ones remains unmapped and is often not quite fully understood. Conflict per se is not a phenomenon to be wished away. And has come to be recognised as a part of human life and social existence. James Laue says, 'conflict is ubiquitous'. The ubiquity of conflict is such that it can be said to be the primary principle underlying the organization of human society which is the most impressive product of conflict management as it has moved from instinctive operation to conscious ordering of human social relationships in the evolution of human society over the millennia.

The end of the cold war and right now the Palestine-Israel accord on the one hand has presumably generated great optimism, in particular among those engaged in the task of furthering and strengthening peace. On the other hand, speculation has already begun about 'the next pattern of conflict' which has been titled 'The Clash of Civilizations' by Samuel P. Huntington. According to Huntington 'the conflicts of the future will occur along the cultural fault


lines separating civilization'. The use of the geological metaphor could be a frightening thought for some, as it conjures up the unpredictability of earthquakes and their intensity. But there is a consoling thought in the human sphere since men have not only managed conflicts but have also gone on to resolve them.

Before taking a look at the leading theories of conflict and conflict management, it will be a repetition to say that conflict management is the most important item on the contemporary peace agenda both as a measure of conflict mitigation and as a prelude to conflict resolution especially in view of what hell conflicts tend to be creating all around. Conflicts and their attendant consequences do exist. In fact, they abound and have become endemic to certain regions and there is no assurance on objective considerations that they will not become endemic to other areas as well. It is unimaginable that conflict is ever likely to be abolished or extinguished, hence there is the need for effective conflict management which may lead to termination or eventual resolution of conflicts.

THEORIES OF CONFLICT

In the past two decades there has been an enormous proliferation of approaches to the study of conflict and conflict management. The precise limits of this emerging field are rather difficult to draw since a number of writers have been distinguishing between sub-categories of the field. Scholars in the area of conflict study and the theories to manage it work at different levels, ranging from the interpersonal to international. They operate in different domains, such as the court system, public policy, labour-management relations, inter-ethnic relations and international diplomacy. They derive their ideas from a variety of sources, such as law, psychology, management theories, group dynamics, peace research, decision theory and sociology. Despite the diversity in level, domain and intellectual origin that characterizes the work in this field, there are certain common threads - shared insights and approaches to practice - that run through all of its manifestations. In the following pages an attempt has been made to explain the theoretical developments in the field of conflict.

Conflict is a multi-dimensional and complex phenomenon and the achievement of conflict resolution has to proceed via a multi-pronged approach. In earlier times there was a tendency to think of conflict and its resolution as a
somewhat logical process-resolution was found to emerge automatically as humankind saw the futility of violent conflicts. But more recently there is a definite reliance on theory to explain conflict and hence to identify the factors that can lead to its settlement. A first step would be to attempt a definition of the phenomenon of conflict. Conflict has four distinguishing properties:

I. Two or more parties are involved.
II. They engage in mutually opposite actions.
III. They use coercive behaviours designed to destroy, injure or otherwise control their opponents.
IV. These interactions are overt and can be detected and agreed upon by independent observers.

It is essential at this point to understand how various studies in 'conflict' have evolved from time to time. Among the initial studies in conflict, in 1924, Park and Burgess have offered a definition of conflict with the help of a sociological concept of conscious struggle for power.8 In 1956 Lewis Coser regarded it as a struggle over values.9 In 1959 Dahrendorf suggested that conflicts are present whenever people have differential access to power and

In 1971 Curle gave a wider interpretation by stating that conflict is present in any situation in which individuals are unable to realize their full potential.

Apart from the above studies the phenomenon of conflict has been studied by many social and political scientists as well. From the perspective of conflict management some major thinkers who have studied conflict from various angles are:

i) Jacob Bercovitch - his conception deals with narrow-wider and subjective-objective approaches to conflict.

ii) Peter Wallensteen - who has adopted an approach which tries to integrate conflict theory and conflict management into a composite structure.

iii) Schellenberg - has given the 'Perspective Theory' of conflict in which he gives three historical perspectives comprising the works of Charles Darwin, Adam Smith and Karl Marx.

iv) Miscellaneous approach-attempts to explain the works of important researchers like Anatol Rapoport and Michael Intriligator who use formal reasoning and borrow their concepts from mathematics e.g., differential equations, game theory, action-reaction models etc. They have


applied these models to study arms race, war initiation as well as termination and military strategy etc.

v) The last approach to be studied would be the Gandhian school of thought which emphasizes the ethical dimension and the moral principles in applying the nonviolent methods to study, manage and resolve the conflicts. The works of scholars like Margaret Fisher, H.J.N. Horseburgh and S.C. Gangal who belong to this tradition will be examined in brief.

Narrow/Wider Approaches

Jacob Bercovitch's\textsuperscript{12} conceptualization of conflict attempts to synthesize two different sets of approaches which he describes as (1) Narrow approaches and Wider approaches and (2) Subjective approaches and Objective approaches. The difference between the first set of approaches - narrow and wider - is obvious. The narrow approach puts emphasis upon the disruptive aspects of conflicts whereas the wider approach concentrates upon those dimensions of a social structure and social condition which are conducive to the emergence of parties with incompatible goals, thus directing attention to the latent problems of a situation. Among the advocates of narrow and wider

\textsuperscript{12} Jacob Bercovitch, \textit{Social Conflicts and Third Parties} (Colorado, 1984), p.5.
approaches, Bercovitch mainly considers Park and Burgess, Lewis Coser and Mack and Snyder. While Park and Burgess focus on the struggle for status.  

13 Coser focuses on the struggle for values which entails aggressive and violent behaviour directed at inflicting harm, damage or injury on the adversary. Mack and Snyder have not attempted a formal definition of conflict but have provided the following characteristics as distinct features of conflict:

1. the existence of two or more parties.
2. their interaction arises from a condition of resource scarcity or position scarcity.
3. they engage in mutually opposing actions.
4. their behaviour is intended to damage, injure or eliminate the other party.
5. their interactions are overt and can be measured or evaluated by outside observers.  

Conflict, within this approach, has been contrasted with cooperation: It denotes not only differences of opinion, but the demonstrable coercive means utilized by parties with a difference of opinion.  

-------------------

13. Park and Burgess, n.8, pp. 71-74.
Bercovitch points out that the narrow approach is not widely accepted by all researchers. Researchers who are concerned with the social systems and social conflicts adopt a wider approach and prefer to undertake an examination of such structures which give rise to mutually incompatible interests or goals, such as situations or structures within which people have differential access to power and authority. Dahrendorf\textsuperscript{16} emphasizes on the 'power and authority' approach. Curle with a still wider approach describes the presence of conflict phenomena in any situation in which an individual is not able to realize his full potential.\textsuperscript{17}

**Subjective Approach:**

The second set, which consists of subjective and objective approaches, essentially corresponds to the first set of narrow and wider approaches. The subjective approach to conflict asserts that, at the most basic level conflicts are about values and values are ultimately dependent upon perceptions. Hence, conflicts are subjective and the parties' perception of the values in conflict is, in the final analysis, all that counts. Burton adds that 'the parties' perception transforms a situation into a conflict

\textsuperscript{16} Dahrendorf, n.8, p.71.

\textsuperscript{17} Curle, n.11, p.9.
situation, and it can also transform a conflict from one of violence and coercion, into one with mutually 'beneficial outcomes'.\textsuperscript{18} Therefore subjective approaches to conflict are concerned with the parties' orientation and with devising tools and strategies for rectifying conflict producing misperceptions. Given this approach, a situation may be regarded as a conflict situation if, and only if, the adversaries perceive that they are in conflict.

**Objective Approaches:**

This approach asserts that conflicts exist whenever there are incompatible interests, irrespective of whether or not the actors are aware of these interests. Where subjective approaches to conflict emphasize motivational or attitudinal factors, objective approaches stress structural and pre dispositional factors. This approach takes on normative elements or implication. As such the analyst or observer defines, in his own terms, the existence of conflict situation. An 'objective' conflict is said to exist when actors find themselves in a situation which engenders mutually incompatible goals. Neither behaviour nor hostile attitude need be present. The existence of a presumed goal incompatibility is, according to this

approach, a sufficient reason for defining a social situation as a conflict situation.

**Conception of Conflict**

With these differing subjective and objective approaches and conceptions in mind Bercovitch offers a conception or theory of conflict based upon Galtung's conflict triangle,19 subsuming under it the three parameters of: (i) a specific conflict situation (ii) motives and the parties' cognitive structure, and (iii) the behavioural attitudinal dynamics of a conflict process. Instead of a simple definition of conflict, Galtung offers us a format of three inter-related conflict elements, which can be considered jointly or separately. The conflict triangle is visualized as:

```
Conflict
(Incompatible Situation)

Attitude
(tensions, hostility)

Behaviour
(violence, aggression)
```


Bercovitch's conception of conflict is a general theory of conflict which subsumes an entire range of conflicts under social conflicts including interpersonal conflicts as well. As such in his theory of conflict he has covered a large variety of political conflicts with or without overt violence, and because of its comprehensiveness it offers wider and multiple choices in the effort to manage a conflict.

Incompatibility Theory

Peter Wallensteen has adopted an integrative approach in his treatment of conflict theory which integrates into a composite structure both conflict theory and conflict management. Wallensteen\(^\text{20}\) focuses his theory on the basic incompatibility. He defines conflict as a social situation in which a minimum of two parties strive at the same moment in time to acquire the same set of scarce resources. Given the basic condition of scarcity, this definition of conflict yields three other cardinal elements or factors that form a conflict. They are (i) a serious challenge to life and property of actors, (ii) issues and (iii) actions. His own preference is for the term incompatibility in lieu of

'issues' in order to cover the possible asymmetries between parties or actors. He has used his definition to achieve a set of five concepts that formulate his theory of conflict. To these concepts he has provided the following functional representation:  

Diagramme 2  

CONCEPTS IN CONFLICT THEORY  

CONFLICT FORMATION  

INCOMPATIBILITY  

DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOUR  

CONSTRUCTIVE  

PEACE FORMATION  

COMPATIBILITY  


As he attempts to explain each of the five concepts, it can be seen that the concepts are fairly inclusive and subsume in themselves a number of separate categories or factors used by others in their respective pictures of conflict.  
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complex. The concept of conflict formation leads to an analysis of built-in contradiction of a society. Such an analysis makes available a clearer understanding of actor forming process through a knowledge of organizing of actors, their influence, structural positions such as topdog/underdog and acquisition of capabilities. Likewise, an analysis of incompatibilities in the pursuit of a goal between parties is expected to reveal the real incompatibility as distinct from pronounced stance or what could be only the 'apparent' incompatibility. Wallensteen has made behaviour a greatly comprehensive term through the application of double epithets - 'destructive' and 'constructive', the one forming and sustaining conflict and the other mitigating and possibly resolving the conflict. But a more striking and significant thing about his treatment of behaviour is the inclusion of a very realistic possibility and fact of behaviour being ambivalent, i.e., an action initiated as a friendly gesture by one party may be taken as unfriendly and interpreted as aimed at subversion.

The remaining two concepts - Peace formation and compatibility - in the lower half of the diagramme 2 represent the reversal of the process depicted in the upper half, upon which depends the possibility and prospect of conflict resolution. In the case of complex, protracted conflicts even the durability of conflict management would
depend in large measure on a search for the possibilities of compatibility. This is very relevant in the context of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka.

To sum up, it can be stated that Wallensteen's theory of conflict is rather inclusive and in a given context it is capable of subsuming a variety of other approaches and concepts in its treatment of a conflict phenomena, but its thrust and orientation is pragmatic, seeking to transform conflict theory into an instrument of conflict resolution, from an epistemological entity into being a praxaelogical one, or being both simultaneously through a natural linkage established between the ontology of conflict and the praxis of conflict resolution.

**Perspectival Theory**

Schellenberg has built up a systematic historical perspective in his conceptualization of conflict. In his historical perspective he spells out three strands comprising the works of Charles Darwin, Adam Smith and Karl Marx. In the first strand there is a theory of human aggressiveness based on the Charles Darwin's theory of 'species' struggle for survival in the evolutionary process. In the second strand, based upon the work of Adam Smith, is

---

projected a theory of individual interests and the inherent conflict of those interests. It is this conflict of interests, which is taken to form the basis of social conflict of which war is a variety and in which parties involved are politically determined. In the third, i.e., Marxian perspective, the basis of conflict is 'conflict of class' interest as historically determined by the course of society's growth through distinct phases as given by Karl Marx in terms of factors of production and the pattern of distribution. The correlation between Adam Smith and Karl Marx is antithetical and is historically very interesting, as the two primary sources of capitalist and communist economy appear to have suffered a defeat in very real terms, and after this phenomenon has been studied in detail, it could be very well be found that primarily the failure of communist social system has been due to failure of its economic system to render the goods that it promised. The immediate relevance of this historical development lies in the fact of the disappearance of the most potent source of international conflict, christened as the end of cold war era. However, conflicts persist and persist in acute forms of both violent and non-violent variety, and no one with certainty can say that in areas where there are no overt violent conflicts today will not have conflicts at some point of time in future, because the international system is
substantially based upon the nation-state structure and there is no foreseeable possibility of this system being replaced by a unified world order, or even comprehensive consensus on vital matters among the nation-states the world over.

**Analytic Approaches**

There is a sub-set of analytic approaches which have proved of great value in the formulations of conflict theory and different researchers have made extensive and important uses of these approaches in their study of conflict phenomenon. These approaches use formal reasoning and are borrowed from mathematics. Michael D. Intriligator\(^2^3\) has cross-classified eight analytic approaches under use in conflict studies with their applications in eight areas. The approaches are differential equations, decision theory, control theory, game theory, bargaining theory, uncertainty theory, stability theory, action-reaction models and organization theory. Their areas of application have been arms race, war initiation/war termination/timing of conflict, military strategy/conduct of war, threats/crisis/escalation, qualitative arms race/arms control, alliances, nuclear proliferation, and defence bureaucracy/budgets.

These areas of application give clear indication of the value of these approaches in arriving at better understanding of the crucial aspects of the conflict situation/conflict formation, with a direct bearing on its management as well as resolution.

A number of eminent researchers, such as Anatol Rapoport have made extensive use of analytic approaches, especially Games theory. Michael Nicholson writes about the game theory: "The tradition of rational choice modelling has delivered very considerable insights into the nature of conflict. The awareness of its weakness has provoked further investigations which are basic to an understanding of conflict and conflict resolution."24 A successful application of the games theory, as a specific instance of its usefulness, broadens the range of basic solutions of a conflict by freeing from them the restrictions imposed by the structure of the conflict and thus showing the possibility of alternative preferences.

(iv) **Non-Violent Theories of Conflict**

In conflict studies and theorization, there has lately been considerable interest in the Gandhian affirmation to

conflict. This interest already extends to the ethical tradition to which Gandhi belongs. A. Naess\textsuperscript{25} has attempted to systematize the hypotheses deduced from the philosophical approach and actions of Gandhi, one of the foremost proponents of nonviolent approaches to change. The hypotheses relate to three issues: management of confrontation, building cooperation, and opening communication. The primary strategy in Gandhi's peaceful confrontation ethics was to act in struggle in a manner conducive to the reduction of violence in the long term. While selecting strategies Gandhi stressed, that it is means that determine ends. It is better not to violate rules, if possible, and to resist passively when it is not possible. In creating programmes and in approaching confrontations it is important to stress constructive and positive elements while avoiding negative and punitive ones. Violence or attempts to deal from position of strength are seen as likely to increase rather than reduce violence.

Naess further adds while commenting upon Gandhi's conflict approach, that peaceful resolution of dispute and maintenance of stability requires trust and co-operation among the parties involved. Trust can be built by stressing

---

goals common to those involved and by treating opponents with respect. Similarly, negotiations should avoid humiliating or provoking opponents. Peaceful resolution of disputes is also facilitated by accurate communication of as much information as possible. Secrecy and distortion should be avoided. Secret moves should be avoided on the ground that they create mistrust. 26

However, one of the problems with propositions deduced from Gandhi's philosophy is that most of them remain untested in a wide range of confrontation situation. In the contemporary world order it becomes essential to put into use the Gandhian model to resolve conflicts. In fact the present talk and importance of confidence building measures are well covered in the Gandhian theory of conflict. S.C. Gangal, in his pioneering study in India, has given the substance of Gandhian technique for resisting aggression. 27

The treatment of the subject is pragmatic, which should make it possible for the contemporary conflict management and resolution studies to take it up as a starting point. The Gandhian structure of resistance to aggression is a consequence of Gandhi's perceptual orientation rooted in his

----------------------

26. ibid.
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native tradition. However, some sort of beginning has been made and those who are engaged in peace studies, as we have seen above, have begun to consider the possibility of Gandhian approach as an alternative mode of both conflict management and resolution.

Apart from these the other leading political scientists who have analysed Gandhian techniques of conflict resolution are Margret W.Fisher, H.J.N.Horsburgh and S.C.Gangal. Margret W.Fisher regards Gandhian Satyagraha as a basic human capacity to both display and respond affirmatively to moral courage. The traditional approach to the resolution of conflict is a 'science of struggle' which is devoid of any moral, ethical or emotional aspects of conflict except insofar as it seeks either victory or the denial of victory to the opponent. Satyagraha makes the same struggle a 'righteous struggle' by giving it a moral and ethical character and as Gandhi wrote, "there are no secrets to be guarded, no scope for cunning and no place for untruth".

-----------------------------

28. ibid, pp.49-57.


The objective of the traditional approaches of conflict resolution is the total defeat of the opponent by using whatever means may be expedient. Whereas the objective of the Satyagraha is to achieve an agreement with the opponent, acceptable to both sides, using only nonviolent means.

Horsburgh considers Satyagraha as a moral equivalent of war. He claims that nonviolence is much superior to violence in its effects upon the way of life to be defended. Gangal considers Gandhi a radical in the real sense of the term, asking for a "root and branch" transformation of the 'modern' world into a normal society at all levels. Hence Gandhian technique for conflict resolution consists of a strict code of a discipline for the individual and a thoroughgoing reconstruction of the political and socio-economic structure of the states internally. According to Gandhi, "arbitration is a civilized method of settling disputes. Differences we shall always have but we must learn to settle them all, whether religious or other, whether national or international, by arbitration."
It needs to be understood that Gandhi was not an academic philosopher. He was a pragmatist. Of course, a whole conflict pragmatics can be built up from what he said, wrote and practised.\(^{35}\) The core of this pragmatics would be a basic transformation in the concept of conflict and conflict resolution, because the essential implication of Gandhi is that he seeks a \textit{transcendence} of conflict by concrete means. The possibility of this transcendence is rooted in his native philosophical and ethical tradition in which consciousness is treated not merely as superior to 'X' and 'Y' of Schumacher but an entity, antecedent and hence capable of achieving much when harnessed to a goal.\(^{36}\) Human consciousness, i.e., chit, needs to be brought down from its metaphysical and mystic isolation. It is exactly this that was shown by Gandhi through what he practised and achieved. The very encouraging prospect of this thought is the possibility of creation of genuine peaceful world-order, a possibility which is underlined by Gandhi's example irrespective of the fact that India broke away from the

\begin{flushright}
\textbf{\textit{-----------------------------}}
\end{flushright}

35. Gangal, n.27.

'tradition' established\(^{37}\) by him.

**Theories of Statism, Populism and Pluralism**

In recent studies, an attempt has been made to synthesize different theories of conflict under three categories. They are statism, populism and pluralism.\(^{38}\) Statism is state-centric and belongs to the realist perspective which has been dominant in the study of international relations. Their basic assumption is that security is dependent upon military strength and de-escalation is made possible by a balance of power or by the overwhelming superiority of one party. Populism exists in two major forms - idealism and interpersonalism. The idealist approach considers the morality of means as well as ends as warranted. They focus upon the socially constructed nature of international conflicts and their transformation through changes in things. This makes them emphasize national self-determination, open diplomacy and collective security. Security in their view, means not the security of state alone, but of all and everywhere. Pluralism, the

\(^{37}\) The first public instance of this deviation in the international context was that of India taking possession of Goa by military means in 1961. At the time Indian action had come as a moral shock to many in the world.

third approach, too has two versions - globalist and multiple actor versions. From the globalist perspective global inequalities, principally economic and underlying conflicts that accompany them form the basis of overt conflicts. Quite a few analysts place, peace as dependent on high levels of integration and mutual dependence, and therefore they accord important place to transnational organizations, governmental and non-governmental. Its multiple-actor version includes subnational groups as participant in conflict and peace processes. They consider that both noncoercive and coercive inducements are important in international relations in view of a multiplicity of actual actors. They think that peace is fluid state and is a matter of accommodation induced by power, value and interest.

In the summing up of the theories of conflict above, no attempt has been made to evolve a new approach to conflict theory. A grasp of conflict theory forms an essential and natural backdrop of a study focussed up i.e, conflict management. Neither has there been an attempt to sketch in the evolution of conflict theory from a historical perspective. The overview mainly takes a look at the recent and leading theories of conflict with a view to obtain a critical understanding of them, which is mainly reflected in the explanatory comment and secondly in the choice of
theories for inclusion in this study. It is pertinent to mention here that the different approaches to conflict theory presented here are complementary to one another, and they do not present one with the problem of reconciling them. In fact, scholars appear to share the basic premises, even if their priorities and emphasis vary. There was a time when psychological approach was a favourite mode of explaining conflict phenomenon, especially one derived from Freud but those engaged in peace research make a very limited use of psychological input in the light of modern scientific psychology.39

The other approaches indicated in the overview suggest the scope of conflict studies, and also in how many different ways conflict can be approached and what are its inter-disciplinary affiliations. However, the immediate relevance of this overview is that it provides us with a perspective and a rationale for attempting a critique of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka, especially an assessment of India's role and the failure of its mediation and
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intervention in achieving the set goals.

**TYPOLOGY OF CONFLICTS**

There are multiple typologies of conflict.\(^4^0\) The underlying cause of this multiplicity is the ubiquity of conflict, as conflict pervades and characterizes every single human activity and human relationship with society being its matrix and context. The overt cause of multiplicity in typology is the diversity of academic disciplines to which the theorists belong,\(^4^1\) and from which they come. Either their discipline or their choice of field determines how they classify conflicts. The range of this variety can be sampled from the fact that there are fields as diverse as interperson/intergroup, social/role/status/class, economic, political, national/international. These fields have natural affinity with the corresponding academic disciplines. What makes the task of typifying conflicts complex is the fact that the fields often overlap and interlock in reality either overtly or otherwise. This makes the task of generalization difficult, but this difficulty has to be necessarily faced. For example, in

\(^4^0\) ibid, p.324.

political conflicts, both international and intranational, the personality dynamics of leaders and key agents appear to play a decisive role. Currently, for example, the personality dimension of Sadam Hussain could be said to be at the core of the Iraq imbroglio, or the role of the personality dimension of Gorbachev in the dismantling of the Soviet structure and abolition of its polity, as compared to the opposite personality of Brezhnev's. It should also to be borne in mind that a single factor may be decisive but it never acts in isolation. There are always a host of factors/forces operating simultaneously. In what has happened in the former USSR could be seen as the overall failure of Soviet economy of which the first glimpse was given by the ouster of Krushchev, as the basic factor, with the personality dimension of Mikhail Gorbachev as the precipitatory factor.

The choice of typology is also determined by whether the approach is descriptive or normative, that is, from the angle of the set goal that initiates in the first place, the work of typifying conflicts. The normative type specifically implies that the typology can be worked out from the angle of conflict management and conflict resolution. Alternatively a theorist may choose to operate at a very high level of abstraction and aim at the widest possible range of generalizations. For example, all
conflicts can be under either of the two types - fundamental and accidental. With a change in perspective the two types of conflicts can be replaced by another duo - routine and deviant. Such abstract categories are also likely to generate problems of uncertainty and perfect fit in their actual application. This difficulty has been noted by theorists. But in spite of these uncertainties such high level generalisations have much wider application than typologies based on more specific objectives.

Since the master perspective of the present study is conflict management, we shall principally take a look at two sets of typology of conflict. The first one is descriptive and the other is metaphorical i.e., at a higher level of abstraction and range of generalization. The following table given by Johan Galtung explains the types of action-system in conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual level</th>
<th>Collective level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intra-system conflict</td>
<td>Intra-personal</td>
<td>Intra-national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-system conflict</td>
<td>Intra-personal</td>
<td>Inter-national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. ibid.

The underlying assumption of this typology is that conflicts occur within action-system, the system being responsible for possibility, shape, course and outcome of the conflict as a mode of action. This entails that any effort to manage and eventually resolve the conflict must focus upon the action-system in order to understand the conflict situation and its possibilities, both positive and negative. Galtung's typology dates back to 1965. Kumar Rupesinghe, a Sri Lankan researcher at International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, points out that ethnic conflicts could be either international or intranational or even both. As a matter of fact, an intra-national conflict at the collective level, with its given degree of generalization subsumes a vast range of inter-group conflicts. It is the march of events in both intra and international conflicts in the last fifteen years, which has given sufficient importance to the type of conflicts having both intra and international dimensions. Their context has become ambivalent, and their intensity and destructiveness is such that international concern and intervention in some form has become imperative.

---------------------

Rupe Singhe in a later article\textsuperscript{45} has questioned the validity of hypothesis like "The End of History" by Francis Fukuyama and "The End of War" by John Mueller. Such hypotheses have been inspired by the end of the cold war and disappearance of the USSR. They also seem to betray an indifference towards likely developments in the countries that form the Third World, especially at a time when a good number of countries seem to be bedevilled by old and new conflicts of considerable intensities, with no solution in view. What makes the situation doubly painful for them is the implied branding of their inability to resolve the conflict as wrong-headed intransigence. Rupesinghe's contention that new types of conflict are appearing and that they need a new typology cannot be dismissed either on empirical or theoretical grounds. At the heart of his hypothesis lies the realization that boundaries are tending to disappear in the global order, with the result that the centres of gravity in old conflicts will shift, interstate conflicts on the present reckoning cannot be seen to disappear, intrastate or internal conflicts will assume core importance by virtue of their spread, frequency and destructiveness. In respect of internal conflicts which is his central

concern, he offers a typology based on the available data. The types are:

i) **Ideological Conflicts** in the form of insurgency inspired by social inequality among classes.

ii) **Governance and authority conflicts** over the distribution of power and authority in society.

iii) **Racial conflicts** which cut across the globe.

iv) **Environmental Conflicts** which relate to the sharing and use of natural resources.

The need for a new typology of internal conflicts suggests their growing importance. Otherwise, except for the Environmental conflict the other three are not new conflict phenomena. They were the principal types of conflict prevalent in Europe during the 18th and 19th century. In the changed circumstances of today they seem to acquire currency and relevance. Generally, familiarity with the concepts denoted by them is such that they fall into descriptive category. Galtung's typology which is abstract in conception and specific in details is such that these types can find suitable places within it. The difference between the two is that the contents of Galtung's typology are participant-oriented whereas the one suggested by Rupesinghe is issue-oriented. Yet it cannot be denied that existing typologies need to be capable of accommodating new types of conflicts that are truly likely to emerge or are in
the making in the changed context of the world. Samuel P. Huntington\textsuperscript{46} foresees a clash of civilization in the changed context and holds that the old categories of political or economic systems or the level of economic development are no longer meaningful. In his article he provides a matrix of a new typology meant for newer types of conflict. The possibility of what he predicts cannot be denied though it is yet too early to say anything much about it. To a great extent, the future in this regard is going to be determined by what the South is able to do for itself and what the North intends to do for it or to the others. The realm of economics as a matrix of conflict has not disappeared. Marxism may have been discredited as an efficient economic system but as long as poverty continues and grips the larger masses, the eruptions of conflict will remain imminent. Also, in spite of its triumph, there is nothing compelling which may be said to underwrite the continuity of the success of capitalism even if the challenge to it is not Marxism. It is very likely that with the disappearance of an overriding obsession with an external and alien psychology, the gaze of USA may turn inwards with the result that the sleeping contradictions may wake up and claim attention with an unprecedented force and

\textsuperscript{46} Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilization?", \textit{Foreign Affairs} (New York), Summer 1993, p.25.
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persistence. As it is, there is no Iron curtain that is likely to keep out the overflow of internal conflicts elsewhere which the countries of Western Europe and USA can put in place. The issues fought over in the Middle East and South Asia get extended to these countries tending to make them into secondary battle grounds. Also within these countries there are contradictions that get manifested in the form of riots and other violent activities. These developments are likely to change/modify perspectives creating a typology for a new generation of conflicts - conflicts arising from a different conceptualization of human rights between any two sets of countries or from environmental imperatives pushing two distant parties separated by a number of national boundaries into a bitter and violent conflict.

Besides the descriptive typology the other typology cast in metaphors has been derived from Anatol Rapoport. This typology contains three types. They are "fights", "games" and "debates". The three metaphors reflect an intrinsic difference and their choice has been prompted by a consideration of chances and modes of managing and resolving them. A brief description of each type is attempted below:

(i) "Fights": Fights are quasi-automatic type of conflicts.

Fights are characterized by rapid self-control and mutual control of the actor. This type of action gives rise to what may be called a mindless sequence of actions and counteractions like the growling begun by the first dog and picked up by the second. A somewhat similar phenomenon can be discerned in a great power confrontation in which moderate notes are followed by stiff notes, eventually giving rise to the movements of ships, troops, etc., building up a pattern of threat and counter-threat, retaliation and counter-retaliation going over to the brink of war and even beyond it at times. The entire process acquires an automatic aspect like a reflex with no effort to pause and take a critical stock of the situation or their responses to it. Mathematical models of its processes have been attempted which contain the two categories of "acceleration" and "deceleration". The latter happens when the rising costs, growing domestic opposition or decline in resources for carrying on the fight decreases. In such events 'mindless' processes are replaced by a growing self-restraint. The mathematical model is expected to indicate the span of conflict, its possibilities, acceleration and deceleration. It also shows factors that will lead to deceleration, and in that event make it possible to strengthen and promote those factors. The scenario of 'fights' is bleak but not entirely without hope. From the
perspective of conflict management and resolution, 'fights' are close to 'bitter-end' conflicts.

(ii) Games: Games are diametrically opposite to 'fights', because its players are characterized by a very high degree of rationality in their choices of moves. The underlying assumption is that players know how to play the game, and in fact they play and opt to play well. This means that they know what they can and cannot do and even if the outcome of the game being played is uncertain they endeavour to win or alternatively to avoid losing as far as possible within their competence and efforts. They also know the limits of their knowledge such as what is going to be the move of the adversary. The short and long sequences of moves are called tactics and strategy respectively. It is assumed in this approach that a player in all likelihood will choose a winning strategy. Once the veil of metaphor is removed it is clearly seen that the 'game' stands for 'conflict' and 'players' for the 'parties' to the conflict. The games (or conflicts) have been sub-typed as "zero-sum or fixed-sum games" and "variable sum games". The Game theory is still evolving and in spite of the pioneering work done by Anatol Rapoport in respect of two-party conflicts the

applicability of this theory as a mathematical model with its usual simplifications has not found extensive applications. Nevertheless, games model has provided a useful and encouraging insight for those engaged in the quest of conflict management and peace. Scholars like Duncan Snidal and T.C. Schelling, among others, are actively engaged in the task of making the model more workable, especially the work of Schelling on threats and deterrence as a mixed-motive game. Here we are mainly concerned with 'games' as a type of conflict and the insight in general that it may give us.

(iii) **Debates:** Some conflicts have been likened to 'debates' because parties to these conflicts affect and change motives, values and cognitive images of reality reciprocally. But 'debates' here are not meant to represent or resemble school debates which are engaged in the spirit of winning a game and not with a view to bringing about any change in the motives and perception of the adversary. It is also not like debates between lawyers in a court where the aim is to win the case not by impressing the adversary but either a Judge or a jury. When conflicts are said to assume the character of debates, they resemble debates in

legislatures. They also resemble negotiations in which each side endeavours to win acceptance for a case or stand-point but settles for something less through a process in which both sides mutually affect each other and bring about changes. An example to be cited is the Partial Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty between USA and the former USSR in 1963. The examples could be multiplied in this area. But a treaty or settlement arrived at even after a formal negotiation will not be said to be the outcome of a debate if there are covert super-impositions. The debate model has yielded useful insights such as the principle of 'mutually acceptable restatement' under which the party is made to see the issue from the angle of the adversary. This increases the possibility of positive and workable solution. A complementary principle is the "domain of validity". This enables the adversaries to see the extent of rightness or validity of respective views in some matter and thus renders the task of settlement easier for them. The relevance of these to conflict management and resolution is obvious.

A qualification needs to be made in respect of various typologies including the one above. The actual conflicts may principally belong to one type of conflict, but it is hardly ever possible that actual conflicts will be found to be purely of one type. The types tend to overlap and admixtures are natural. It was essential that conflict was
understood in its character and in its several forms, before a pointed treatment of conflict management could be taken up.

**THE CONCEPT AND THEORY OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

A general theory of conflict management is expected to cover a full range of all varieties of human conflicts and those who have worked on the development of a theory of conflict management have done exactly this. For example, Bercovitch has said that human society in view of the ubiquity of conflict, is the most impressive product of conflict management. Therefore a general theory of conflict management can be or should be ideally co-extensive with all human conflicts, and some of the typologies of conflict that we have considered here strive towards this objective. As far as the present study is concerned, a narrow concept of conflict management has been adopted which relates to violent, armed political conflicts, both intranational and international. It has to be remembered that today the boundaries that separate the intranational from the international are shifting and are blurred. But, in spite of this delimitation of the concept, the underlying

linkages among conflicts in different fields and spheres and therefore conflict managements remains. An awareness of these linkages is indispensable for those engaged in the task of conflict management. As a matter of fact an intimate knowledge of relevant linkages in a particular conflict management operation may be an essential requirement in the progress and eventually in the success of the conflict management.

A necessary consequence of the narrow concept of conflict management being employed in the study undertaken, is that in this study conflict management relates to violent conflicts at the manifest level with destructive and dysfunctional consequences. Such conflicts, as they move from confrontation to engagement, rapidly develop or deteriorate into armed conflicts. The costs and consequences of these conflicts are unacceptable and this has given an urgency to the need to understand the task of conflict management better and the necessity of continuously improving its mode. The present state of conflict management has grown out of the earlier modes and methods of conflict management under the pressure of circumstances. Bercovitch has identified three methods of conflict management:

---------------

51. ibid.
i) violence and coercion
ii) bargaining and negotiations
iii) the involvement of third party.
The first two methods are traditional with a very long history. Violence and coercion can have two sources. One of the two parties in a conflict may have such superiority of strength that it may seek to end the conflict through the use of its superior capacity for violence, or alternatively, in the given equation between the two parties, it can coerce the adversary to withdraw from the conflict by a mere show of its strength. Human history is replete with examples of this type of conflict management.

Bargaining and negotiation is also a traditional method in use. It is a mode in which the parties involved in a conflict themselves take initiative and make efforts to manage a conflict at some stage during its course. The success or failure of this method in the management of conflict depends upon the importance of the issues and their estimate of the cost of continuing the conflict. But in the first place what brings the adversaries to the bargaining and negotiation is their respective estimates of their mutual equations. This has been the dividing line in the choice between either of the two traditional modes of conflict management. The most recent example of conflict management by bargaining and negotiation are the India-China
agreements on the maintenance of peace and tranquility along the line of actual control. In fact the entire course of Indo-Chinese conflict to date contains an illustrative example of passage from the first method to the second. China resorted to violence for managing the conflict in 1962 with considerable success and the conflict remained managed without disappearing while at times seeming to hover between confrontation and conflict. Thus in the changed circumstances of today India and China have moved on to give a more stable form to the 'management' without either settlement or resolution.

**Involvement of Third Party**

The lineage of third party involvement can be seen in arbitration. Arbitration has become institutionalized through the growth of international regimes and the establishment of organizations for this purpose. The UN is a universal third party for conflict management and conflict resolution. Unfortunately the balance sheet of the UN in these two areas up to now does not inspire confidence. This is a consequence of the nation-state system of the world,

---


wherein conflicts have tended to proliferate and grow in intensity and duration. Moreover, there has been a tremendous increase in intranational conflicts of serious proportions. The failure of the international system to stem these developments along with the emergence of new perspectives of future conflict, have highlighted the importance of third party involvement as a method of conflict management. This has led to a change in the character and mode of third party involvement in the present generation, initiating research and study of this phenomenon with a view to imparting it a wider reach and effectiveness. In fact it has started assuming the dimensions of a movement. A proposal was sponsored jointly by the Harvard Negotiation Project and the Centre for Conflict Resolution of George Mason University, offering the service of a non-governmental mediator for assisting in arriving at an agreement among the parties to the Malvinas/Falkland dispute. 54 Unfortunately the proposal was not accepted by the parties involved. Behind such initiatives lie skills and techniques developed by those engaged in this field.

Jacob Bercovitch has developed a theory and a model of third party involvement in conflict management. His basic

assumption is that conflict management is a feeding of learning into the conflict process. It may be recalled here that his conflict theory has been developed through a synthesis of several approaches to the conflict phenomena. The learning relates to changing the perception of adversaries and generating a better understanding of the issues at stake. The aim of conflict management is to prevent destructive consequences of the conflict and to promote positive outcome. Positive outcome means that the benefits issuing from it are common and are mutually satisfying to both the parties.

The course and form of conflict management with the involvement of a third party depends on the type of conflict. Since conflict is a result of several factors, the management may focus on either one or more factors like an incompatible situation or attitude or behaviour. The distinction is important. If the focus is upon an incompatible situation, the content of learning needs to be fed into the process which will be different from the one in the case of conflict's manifest aspect, such as violence and aggression. Bercovitch has given the following figurative representations to these,(Diagram 3 and 4).55 His typology

of conflict management, is based on dual approach which makes it possible to give the typology greater generalization so as to be inclusive of other modes of conflict management as well.

Diagram 3: Conflict, Conflict Consequences and Third Party Intervention

**Sources of Conflict**

1. Limited resources
2. Different values
3. Incompatible objectives
4. Change

**Conflicts**

**Destructive Consequences**

1. Violence
2. Destructive behaviour
3. Hostility
4. Stereotyping

**Benefits Consequences**

1. Adjustment
2. Growth
3. Adaptation
4. Innovation

**Third Party Intervention**

1. Functions
2. Behaviour
3. Structure
4. Attributes

**Outcomes**

1. Domination
2. Conquest or imposition
3. Withdrawal

1. Settlement
2. Resolution
3. Other acceptable agreement
Diagram 4: Types of Conflict Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFLICT MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANIFEST LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Conflict management at the level of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Conflict management at the level of attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATENT LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDOGENOUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXOGENOUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation, arbitration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Third Parties**

A third party is one which is external to the conflict in which it has become a participant - its participation is voluntary. It can influence and help the adversaries but cannot direct them. Its intervention is a peaceful form of conflict management which 'develops' the conflict into a triadic process of interaction. In themselves third parties are individuals or representatives of states or international institutions. They may join the conflict process either in response to a call from one or both the adversaries or on their own initiative. Their success
depends upon their own disinterestedness, i.e., complete neutrality between the parties and their skill and preparation for assuming the role of a particular conflict management. A third party is likely to play a number of roles in this - as a fact finder, chairman, enunciator (control and interpretation of information), conciliator, mediator and leader. What role or combination a third party plays, will depend on how the cause of conflict management unfolds. As a matter of fact, the possibility that a third party intervention may exacerbate the conflict, like India's intervention in Sri Lanka, on examination can be found to have resulted in such a development. Of course, it is visualized as a possibility and not a conclusion.

**Alternative Approaches to Conflict Management**

There are a number of alternative theories and approaches to conflict management in the field. Some of these approaches are refinements of the earlier theories and approaches given here, with some special features and different foci of priorities and emphases. For instance, Track-two diplomacy is actually a variety of third party intervention where the third party is non-official and sub-
national. Its orientation is problem solving. Briefly stated, this approach is based on the assumption that thinking and behaviour are acquired through learning, and therefore it is possible to modify them. In a conflict situation communication generally fails or is distorted and the potential for mutual benefits which the parties share, is as such, obscured and its view is rendered opaque. In such a situation if the parties can be brought together to a meeting under an appropriate forum the clogged channels can be cleared to pave the way for an effective management and ultimately the resolution of the conflict. Crucial tools for this purpose were developed by a number of scholars. Among them John W. Burton's "controlled communication" is significant, and has been put to effective use. The unofficial and unstructured format of the meeting encourages the participants to express their views wholeheartedly without any reservations. As a consequence not only do the differences existing at a deeper level come out in the open but there also emerges a healthy possibility of tackling the


conflict much more comprehensively.

Besides this, several other approaches with their respective assumption are active like the "citizenship diplomacy, supplemental diplomacy, pre-negotiation, walk-in-the-woods,\textsuperscript{58} face to face diplomacy, problem solving workshop and back channel diplomacy."\textsuperscript{59}

However, an erroneous impression should not be formed that the traditional modes of conflict management and resolution have become obsolete and therefore defunct. In fact, they are as active as ever and are still being applied in a variety of situations. The newer modes are supplementary, and have been inspired by the multiplicity, virulence and protractedness of conflicts. Among the new modes there is a concern with, besides other things, the neglect of development needs which characterize protracted social and intra-regional conflicts in the Third World. But the old modes and forms like judicial settlements, arbitration, International regimes, and direct bargaining act as initial manoeuvres for achieving a final resolution. Judicial Settlement and arbitration put a check on the conflict and ultimately resolve it. For example, when the

\textsuperscript{58} Walk in the woods mode was used for bringing Palestinians and Israelis together, which eventually led to the accord, a crucial and a long stride towards the very solution of the conflict.

\textsuperscript{59} Azar, n.2, p.19.
Indo-Pak hostilities in the Rann of Kutch before the 1965 war was referred to binding international arbitration, the hostilities at once ceased. Official diplomacy is still the most pervasive mode of conflict management. United States, specially in the post cold war era has become very active on the international scene in this sphere while still practising bilateral and multilateral diplomacy. Above all, the UN remains the central agency of conflict management both with its moral and legal stature. It has a large range of tools at its disposal such as 'request' 'declaration' 'mediation' 'peacekeeping' 'sanctions' and ultimately, if the power game permits, even coercive intervention like the one exercised against Iraq. In fact, Holsti\textsuperscript{60} has highlighted the master plan of the Great powers behind the formation of the UN in which they themselves intended to play the role of global policemen much to the exclusion of all others.

**Peacekeeping**

Peacekeeping has existed as a major tool of conflict management, especially since the establishment of the UN. Often conflicts degenerate into the worst forms of violent and armed clashes over a protracted period of time. In such 

---

situations, either a third party or the UN has intervened to bring about a deceleration of hostilities and to reduce and control the destructive consequences of an ongoing conflict. Peacekeeping is different from peace-making which is a larger category than even conflict management.

The agency which has made the most frequent use of peacekeeping as a tool of conflict management is the UN. It involves the use of a mandated force for keeping the adversaries apart, either with their consent or by force. But agencies other than the UN, too, have used this tool for either management of conflict or for keeping peace. There have been a minimum of twenty-six peacekeeping operations undertaken by the UN with a view to preventing a conflict from escalating further, and in order to minimise the destructive consequences of a conflict.

Besides, the UN, a number of regional organizations have also started participating in peacekeeping. Initiatives of this kind are not precluded under the UN Charter,\(^1\) and they can be viewed as complementary to the efforts of the UN in the management of conflict. For example, in the current world scenario, UN's own initiatives in this area have been constrained by its acute financial difficulties. The situation has further been exacerbated by

---

\(^{61}\) See Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter.
the proliferation of conflicts of unacceptably large proportion in different regions including Europe as boundaries of state have begun to shift or melt in East Europe after the dissolution of the USSR. In the light of these developments, the realization that eventually new adhoc structures may emerge as agencies of peacekeeping is gaining ground.

There are instances of unilateral peacekeeping operations. For example, USA undertook peacekeeping operations in Grenada and Panama because it perceived the continuing escalation of conflict in the areas as detrimental not only to itself but also for the parties directly involved. In 1963, Yemen invited Egypt for peacekeeping operation in the face of an internal conflict. While Egypt responded to the request the other party to the conflict in Yemen called upon Saudi Arabia to come to their aid. Thus what seemed to have started as a peacekeeping operation developed into a quadrilateral conflict which ultimately led to a partition of Yemen. This could be cited as an example of maximum exacerbation of a conflict due to the participation of a third party with the outcome of a hundred and eighty degrees movement away from the goal of conflict management for which the peacekeeping had been undertaken.

Similarly, India undertook a peacekeeping operation as
a part of the larger scheme of conflict management and resolution which proved inconclusive in all its avowed objectives, especially with regard to those clearly stated in the agreement between India and Sri Lanka that formed the formal basis of the large scale Indian operation in its immediate neighbourhood. This particular instance of conflict management with peacekeeping as an essential component is the core of this study.

An attempt has been made to develop a typology of peacekeeping. This typology contains the following types of peacekeeping operations.

(a) Prevention of future conflicts or the eruption of old conflicts;
- Interposition by separating contestants and providing buffers;
- Restoration of a situation which has deteriorated, i.e., return to a status quo ante;
- Preservation of a tenuous and threatened peace;
- Facilitation of political resolution and conciliation, often by protecting the implementation of agreements;
- Protection of law and order, public safety and public services;

- Enforcement of the consensus of the security council;
- Punishment of violations of agreements and/or decisions of the Security Council (Armed Conflict between IPKF and LTTE).

(b) Types of missions for peacekeeping forces:
- Observation of relevant activity in the area of operations;
- Reporting of events in the area of operations;
- Prevention of incursion by people and equipment into the area of operation;
- Supervision of implementation of agreements inside the area of operations;
- Disarmament of contestants in the area of operations;
- Decompression of accumulated tensions in the area of operations, principally through reassuring presence.

Neither the typology of peacekeeping nor its missions can remain static in a fast-changing world. In the current international scenario the need for peacekeeping will continue as Henry Wiseman has observed: 'the structure and practice of peacekeeping are a sound basis for the management of conflict in the immediate future and for the eventual transformation of the system itself, while readily acknowledging that it can be only one component of the
multifaceted global management of conflict.63

'The transformation of the system itself' to which Wiseman refers, is the issue which the new generation of proponents of conflict management are required to address. Therefore a change in the mind-set in various spheres, especially political is essential, which means ultimately that conflict management is a kind of education. Bryant Wedge says the following in respect of conflict management:

There is a feeling among many people that a significant shift is occurring in orientation to, and processes of conflict management. One of the earliest to make that observation was Carl Jung who talked about the spiritual transformation in mankind. Teilhard de Chardin maintained that the slow convergence of events will lead ineluctably towards the transformation of our mind. I hear the same kind of message from others, that some major change in our perceptions is in process, and that it is a correction for our earlier habits of thinking which are no longer functional, a correction to accommodate some of the charges I mentioned earlier.

Regrettably, neither the state-system of the international order nor those who man it have displayed any signs of a change in their perspectives. Gorbachev may have been an exception and India may have to wait for Heaven knows how long for another Gandhi to appear. It is more realist and pragmatic to agree with Michael Banks64 who

63. Ibid., n.54, P.285.

64. Michael Banks, 'Four Conceptions of Peace' in Sandole and Sandole (ed.), n.54, pp. 259-274.
maintains that peace can be conceived as conflict management, because in the short and middle terms peace seems to depend on the success of conflict management initiatives and endeavours.

This introductory chapter has attempted to provide the conceptual framework of conflict management. In doing so it became necessary to divide the chapter into three sections. It began with a delineation of the current theories of conflict in the first section. In the second section, the typology of conflicts has been given. These two together have provided a general theory of conflict management which is the focus of this study in the last section.