Chapter 10
ALTERNATIVE THEORIES

10.1 Introduction

No theory or paradigm is final or complete and this is so because of the very nature of life, which is always changing. Moreover, paradigms and theories can be constructed to subserve a particular agenda. All explanations of life and phenomena are temporary and tentative. And even fallible! Because, reality is not only changing and complex, but sometimes stranger than fiction. Hence, all theories are merely attempts to explain some reality or situation through use of new paradigms and models. Each such attempt touches upon only some aspect of reality and sheds light only on a part of reality, full truth always remaining elusive, hidden behind the veil of ignorance and unknowing. Alternatives, particularly those which are realistic and honest, are thus imperative because they look at the same reality from different perspectives and in the process improve human understanding of that complex reality. The two concerns which continue to occupy the world even today are about order and conflict. Apart from Huntington’s thesis many other theories have been put forth to explain the nature of world order and conflict.

10.2 Theories about World Order

The onset of modernity, spurred by renaissance, protestant reformation, industrial revolution and emergencies of nation – states in Europe marked a watershed in the history of the world. It saw the emergence of Europe and the West as the predominant force on the world stage and gave rise to the age of colonialism and imperialism. However, from within it, also came the challenges to the ruling ideology of liberal capitalist democracy – from Marxism, Nazism and Fascism. The desire of Nazism and Fascism to dominate resulted in the World War II, in which the ideology of liberal capitalist democracy under the leadership
of America triumphed only to be challenged by the Marxist-Communist ideology represented by the Soviet Union, leading to the outbreak of the Cold War.

Once again, during the period of Cold War, the capitalist camp, led by America, struggled to overthrow communism and emerged victorious. Many scholars and thinkers of liberal capital ideology spearheaded the critique of Marxism-Communism and set the agenda for America and the West. This agenda was executed by the American political establishment through Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Reagonomics, and such other mechanisms, until it resulted in the collapse of the communist block and the disintegration of its leader, Soviet Union in 1990.

Once again America was faced with a new era, the era of end of Cold War and as in the previous era, its elites, scholars and thinkers took upon themselves the task of setting the agenda and strategic objectives for America, which was to be executed by the American political establishment. The late 1980’s and the early 1990’s was the period that anticipated the new world order and it set the stage for constructing a new agenda for the continuance of American dominance in the new world order. Thus began the race from the votaries of Americanism to set the agenda for America in the new era from 1990 onwards and it was in a stark opposition to those who advocated a new world order in which the world would be free, egalitarian and borderless.

The late 1980’s and early 1990’s witnessed an explosion in scholarly writings from the two camps - the non-American and the American. While those from the non-American camp visualized and fantasized for a more just and peaceful world, those from the American camp, excepting a few, went about setting the agenda for America to dominate the new era. It is in this context that, like many others, Huntington puts forth his thesis. It is certainly worth the effort to examine a few of these endeavours to establish the reality and truth of this context as it has a direct bearing on this study.
It would be incorrect and even dishonest, to say that the scholars, especially Western scholars, tried to honestly understand the emerging new world order. Rather it would be more appropriate to state that they started to set the objectives for new order. Thus, during the early 1990's writings or editing of books on post Cold War world order became a booming industry. It was almost a fashion to say something about the new world order, each author putting forward his own vision, setting new objectives or pursuing long standing agendas. The critique of all this was of course a logical consequence, and compounding of issues, the order of the age. Theories and paradigms which came to be presented during this period and subsequent to the 9/11 events can be classified under different categories. However, these different categories and list of theories, is certainly not exhaustive and is intended to paint a larger picture, in which the world and the happenings in it, can be understood or explained in several different ways depending on differing perspectives.

10.2.1. Theories from Idealist Perspective

A). Theory of Triumph of Liberalism or ‘One World’ Theory

One of the earliest efforts in this direction was of Francis Fukuyama, who, in his “The End of History and the Last Man articulated a scenario in the Post Cold War era- which he called as the end of history. According to Fukuyama, the new post Cold War era is the era of the end of the great ideological debate between democracy and totalitarianism, western liberalism and communist dictatorship as the Western model, of liberal democracy has triumphed over the authoritarian one of the communist world. He theorises that this defeat of the totalitarianism will lead to an end of conflict in the developed world, but also holds that conflict will continue to exist in the developing world still “mired in history”. Fukuyama, in this sense belongs to the ‘one world school of thought’. He believes that defeat of one, namely of totalitarianism symbolized by communism, will leave only one alternative, which is liberal democracy.
For Fukuyama, the triumph of liberal democracies, after the collapse of Soviet Union marks the end of threat of world war and hence a fulfilment of the Hegelian “end of history”. Fukuyama envisages the emergence of a universal homogenous state in the new age after 1990. He argues that this new age is an age in which there is end of negativities, end of war, end of revolution and hence end of history. It is, for him, an age of unchanging permanence of liberalism. Francis Fukuyama does not believe in recurring paradoxes of history, as most others are inclined to believe, but in the ultimate triumph of liberalism bringing an end to history itself.

Fukuyama’s idea of history links the empirical to the psychological reductionism as he tries to combine the idea of social change in time to the unchanging nature of human beings. In his work Fukuyama claims that he is describing the record of human history and the essence of human beings. He celebrates the triumph of democracy and liberal capitalist economy and asserts that the history has ended as there is no more change likely and that the present man (human being) is the last one who is unchanging and will continue to live and exist in this new permanent state when democracy and liberal economics will be a permanent feature. Hence Fukuyama, through his erudite philosophical exposition seeks to project that the American model as a universal model for all to emulate as it is the triumphant one and a permanent one. When Fukuyama speaks of linear or sequential history, he is making a case for equating American Liberalism as a natural outcome of human nature itself. And for this, Fukuyama has come in for scathing criticism from several critics, including Huntington, and those who have other alternative explanations to the post Cold War period. Subsequently, Samuel Huntington, following the same logic of Fukuyama, had sought to uphold American triumph and supremacy, by putting out a different thesis, the thesis of ‘clash of civilizations’. Thus, both the scholars, pursuing two different lines of thought and proposing two different theses, converge to the same point – American supremacy now and forever! They are almost the birds of the same
features. Fukuyama has been the strongest proponent of this school of thought, but he has later on tried to adapt to the realities of the post Cold War era which did not follow the course he had so convincingly predicted.

Many other scholars trying to explain the post Cold War scenario have not only disagreed with Fukuyama but have vehemently rejected his position. The greatest limitation of Fukuyama’s position was that it permitted only a single alternative to structure the world order, that is, on the model of western liberal democracy. Fukuyama’s thesis led to the revitalisation of the Democratic Peace theory in the post Cold War period. Huntington himself rejects the ideas of this school of thought as the “fallacy of the single alternative system”. Most of the scholars who have refused to accept Fukuyama’s thesis have argued in the same line, stating that liberal democracy of western kind need not be the only alternative to totalitarianism represented by communism, which practically collapsed in 1990. These scholars refuse to concede that the communistic totalitarianism can be replaced only by western type of liberal democracy and hence they do not subscribe to Fukuyama’s view that the end of communistic totalitarianism has heralded the end of history and that man is in his last epoch. Consequently these opponents of Fukuyama, including Huntington, do not agree with Fukuyama’s thesis that the post Cold War era will witness the end of conflict. Rather many of these opponents have proposed that the emerging world order would see the rise of new forms of authoritarianisms, nationalisms and ethnicisms, all of them leading to more conflict in the world. To a certain extent this has been borne out by the developments during the last decade and a half since the fall of communism. The post cold war period, instead of witnessing end of conflict has actually become an era of new forms of conflicts based on nationalism, ethnicism, sectarianism, etc. The opponents of Fukuyama argue that the demise of one alternative (communistic totalitarianism) has given rise to many new ones and that the liberal democracy alternative is just one of them.
Even after fifteen years it is not clear what has replaced the defeated communist totalitarianism. No one has been able to articulate clearly the post Cold War world and all explanations have continued to be ambiguous and wanting. Though the new world order has seen the death of one major ideology it has not heralded the end of all ideology. Probably this is an impossibility considering that human nature will always continue to invent newer ideas and ideologies. It is also unlikely that world would soon witness what Fukuyama wanted us to believe, the end of nations and the emergence of one world in which large national groupings would “subsume” their national sovereignties. In a way the “One World” school of thought spearheaded by scholars and thinkers like Fukuyama due to its very idealistic underpinnings and inherent weaknesses, provoked and challenged many others, including Huntington to think and put forward other possible alternative explanations about the emerging post cold war world order and herein lies the greatest utility of Fukuyama’s thesis.

It was Fukuyama’s thesis, attempting to explain the new world order that provoked a plethora of responses by several scholars putting forward other possible scenarios to explain the emerging world order. The idealistic arguments of Fukuyama led to the emergence of countering attempts by other scholars including Huntington, who put forward other paradigms and models to explain the new world order that was emerging after the collapse of the bipolar world order. Fukuyama’s idealistic assertion that the new world order would not witness dangerous conflicts comparable to the Cold War conflict actually spurred many scholars to look afresh at the question of conflicts at the international level and scholars like Huntington succeeded in recasting the whole question of conflict in totally new and different ways. The tragedy, however was that even the thesis put forth by Huntington suffers from same defect as that of Fukuyama, that of presenting only a single alternative explanation.

Fukuyama’s thesis, brilliant and fluent in its theoretical expression, but towing the American line, and labouring to carry forward the agenda of American
dominance, deserves the same treatment, that of rejection, for its unconvincing arguments and pretentiousness.

B). Theory of Globalism or ‘World Community’ Theory or ‘Transnational Network’ Theory

The paradigm of macrocosm or globalist approach came to be a strong contender during the early part of post Cold War period and still continues to hold sway. Mathew Horsman and Andrew Marshall (1) highlighted globalism and a borderless world. Justin Rosenberg (Justin Rosenberg 'The Empire 'of Civil Society: A Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relation', London, Verso, 1994) criticised the realist (power) approach to understanding international relations and consequently new order, and put forward what he called “an alternative history of international system” in which he concedes primacy and power to the civil societies.

Later, Amitai Etzioni (1a) took up the concerns facing the post September 11(as also post Cold War) world and argued that the clash of civilization could be avoided through co-operation and accommodation based on Eastern values of spirituality. Etzioni favours international communitarianism. He is neither in favour of conservative rightist approach nor of a liberalist approach but a communitarian one to bring order and peace at the international level. It is essentially a sociologist’s perspective on the emerging new world order which is between realism of power and ideal of liberalism.

He wrote this book primarily as a response to Huntington’s clash of civilization thesis and the ensuing debate and makes a case for “Dialogue of Civilizations”. He argues that the global trend is towards a synthesis of cultures and not towards westernization. He speaks about a new “global architecture” in which sovereignty of states will make way for respect to human and communitarian values and living. He outlines the growth in transnationalism and rise of transnational citizenship which has communitarian basis and values and not national basis or value. This vision is an idealistic one, of the establishment of a
Global Nation, of One World, through a process of networking. This approach falls in the category of idealist school of thinkers who, emphasise values, norms and ethnics as foundation for a global order. Etzioni takes the communitarian paradigm a little further with some unique insights into the nature of the evolving new world order. In his view the US is still at the head but not of monolithic empire but a communitarian enterprise and he says that the basis for this new global community is to counter terrorism. He offers a solution to world order in a centralized and unified global community, akin to a ‘world state’ as against the contrary view of decentralized transnational network of various groups.

Anne Marie Slaughter (2) presents another highly optimistic positive scenario of the new world order in which governments are co-operating through various transnational networks to cope with the challenges of the new world order – economic interdependence, terrorism, human rights, crime, trade, etc. In sharp contrast to well established principles of nationalism and national interests, Slaughter says that, the government and nations are manifesting global co-operative governance through decentralized informal inter-governmental channels. She maps these non-governmental and civil society networks that are shaping the new world and helping reduce conflict. Her attempt is to make a break from the usual pessimistic views on the new world order. Many other like Richard K. Ashley, R.O. Keohane, Joseph S Nye and J. A. Vasquez, have also supported a transnational network paradigm.

C). Theory of Gandhian World Order or ‘Peace’ Theory

R.S. Yadav presents an alternative to world order based on Gandhian Philosophy of Peace and Satyagraha. He calls for a Gandhian world order based on transformation of individuals (man-centric) instead of being a state-centric one. He suggests that alternative world order can be based on non-violence, instead of power. He calls for a non-Western Gandhian alternative to rid the world of its ills. He argues that Gandhi had clear ideas about human world order in his Philosophy though he did not give a clear theory of international relations. Yadav question the
use of terminology of 'order' and suggest that this 'order' can be explained in
terms of totality of norms, procedures and institutions. After all Gandhian
philosophy, being fundamentally anarchist, goes against the very Western concept
of order. He further argues that "Gandhian world under is based on the critique of
all existing western and non-western theories of war and peace and development".
(3) He further states that "After rejecting the materialistic and state-centric models,
Gandhi gave a non-materialistic and individual-centric view of the world" (4)
According to Yadav the basic tents of Gandhian world order are transformation of
individual, decentralized policy, self-sufficient economy and a non-exploitative
international order. He states that in Gandhi's view, these would ultimately
"facilitate the growth of a world federation in which individuals, states and the
international system will work in harmony with each other". (5) Hence, according
to Yadav, a Gandhian world order would have – a world federation, equality of all
states, voluntarism, humanitarianism, peace and non-violence, moral guiding
principles, satyagraha, small law and order force, total disarmament and
internationalism. Having enunciated the Gandhian world order as an alternative
paradigm, Yadav also admits that Gandhian world view has been criticized by
scholars who say it has great limitations and that Gandhian model is idealistic and
utopian vision. Yadav steadfastly holds that Gandhian world view and vision for a
world order based on peace is not only possible, it is also essential as it alone can
achieve a durable peace in the world.

D). Other Peace Approaches

Many others have supported this alternative theory for conflict resolution at
the world level and for establishment of a new world order. Several Indian and
Western scholars such as Braja Shankar Rath's article 'Gandhi and International
Conflict Resolution' (6), M.S. John in 'Gandhian Concept of World Order:- An
Evaluation' (7), R.S. Yadav in 'Gandhian World Order Model : An Alternative
Paradigm for Peace' (8) Richard Smith Beal in 'Faint light on an uncertain
Prospect : Gandhian Insights on World Order' (9) Ramjee Singh in 'Gandhi and
the New Millennium' (10) P.S. Muhar in 'Gandhian Approach to World Order'(11) and S.C. Gangal in 'Gandhi's Views on World Affairs' (12) have sought to present the Gandhian alternative to explain world order and conflicts in the world.

While conflict studies have focused more on causes and consequences of conflict, the peace studies have approached the same goal from the opposite direction. The post September 11 period has witnessed a rapid expansion of attempts to find ways to prevent conflict and usher in peace. Many scholars have thus written about the problems and prospects of peace in the new world order. Much of these works revolve around the UN's efforts at peace-keeping and on post conflict reconstruction and rebuilding. Some of these attempts are, *The Remnants of War* (13) by John Muller (2002), *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict* (14) by Poland Paris (2004), *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past* (15) by Kimberley Zisk Marten (2004), and so on.

Other authors and scholars like Henry Shue, Thomas W Pogge, etc, taking-off from John Rawls' idealistic approach to international relations and world order spelt out in his *The Law of Peoples* (1971), follow in the idealist footsteps of ethics, rights, laws, morality, peace as the basis for all international orders. Ian Clark in *The Post Cold War Order: The Spoils of Peace* (16) says that the new post Cold War world order is characterized by protracted peace settlements which involve distributory and regulatory aspects. His thesis is that the new world order is characterized by peace-making frame work in which the new realities of the world are recast by all the important players. He says that more than conflictive situations, the new world order is shaped by multilateral forms of co-operation which augurs well for continual stability and development in the world. The new alliance formations, under the aegis of the United States, he claims, are helping to contain and control conflicts. Thus last two decades which have witnessed many international conflicts and uncertainties have also witnessed many theories from the peace perspectives.
10.2.2. Theories from Realist Perspective

A) Theory of Power or 'Statist' Theory

One of the most effective approaches to understand and explain international occurrences, ranging from relations to conflict, has been the Realist approach. In the international affairs field there has been, for a long time this conceptual approach whose essence was to show a close interrelationship between power and ideology. This approach was the strongest during the reign of communism in USSR and during the entire Cold War period. This ideological power paradigm was based on using military power to push forward the agenda of ideology. Thus this paradigm believed in the idea that military power could be used to acquire global power and political influence on others.

The 'Power' theory enunciated by Hans J Morgenthau in the field of International Relations has been successfully used to analyse and explain a wide range of international events and occurrences, particularly of international order and conflict. Though this realist perspective has continued to remain highly relevant throughout the post Cold War era, it has been enunciated more in statist terms and not as a well formulated and precise theory.

M.S. John, an Indian scholar, (17) gives an overview of the realist and power paradigms trying to explain international relations. However he does not specifically try to posit any new or alternative theory or paradigm to explain to new world order or the conflict within it. He quotes extensively from the great proponents of the power paradigm, Hans J Morgenthau, Michael Foucault and others and contrasts it with the critical theories of scholars like Richard K. Ashley, R.O. Keohane, Joseph S Nye, J. A. Vasquez, etc who propose a transnational network paradigm. T. V. Paul, G. John Ikenberry and John A. Hall (18) take forward the statist position and pursue a more researched and balanced debate and discussions. The conclusion of this debate is that the states are not likely to disappear soon or lose their importance as global players.
The debate on statist position is carried forward throughout the post September 11 period, either highlighting the failure of state system or its success in the 'Age of terror'. Robert I. Rotberg (19) speaks of the serious consequences of the failure of the nation states in tackling the global terrorism and asserts that this has a direct bearing on the world order as well as conflict.

The cause of present global conflicts lies in the power struggle among the nation-states. Nation-states, to retain, and extend power resort to creating monsters in the backyards of competing rations, but once these monsters (fundamentalists, Islamic reactionaries, Talibanis, mercenaries, etc) have vanquished their immediate detractors, and having developed extreme confidence in their own ability and power to defeat their rivals soon turn their attention to their creators. This has often happened and becomes the driving force behind newer conflicts and the threshold of violence in such conflicts becomes extremely high and dangerous. Thus the creators of monsters to destroy the competing nation end up becoming the victims bearing the brunt of their own creations. The conflict between these non-state entities and nation states is a conflict still in the domain of nation state systems.

B). 'Polarity' Theory

i). Theory of 'Unipolar Moment' or 'Sole Superpower' Theory

The end of the Cold War catapulted the United States of America as the Sole Superpower in the world. This sudden development of USA as a dominant global power helped revive, in a new way, the Polarity paradigm. This perspective which was in vogue during the Cold War period and revolved around Bipolarity paradigmatic explanation of the world order now switched to explaining the world in unipolar terms. This approach which had earlier, during the Cold War period, successfully explained conflict in the world in bipolar terms, has not been a very useful tool to explain the rise of conflict in the newly emerging world order. While the proponents of this school have termed the new world order as a unipolar one, the fact remains that the collapse of the bipolar world has not resulted neither in
replacement by a truly Unipolar world nor an emerging multipolar world (and this has also been pointed out by Huntington himself).

This of course does not mean that scholars have not tried or are not trying to use this paradigm to understand and explain international order and conflict. The proponents of this paradigm have sought to combine the unipolarity perspective with statist perspective and have sought to analyse and explain world order and conflict by focusing on various doctrines put forth by USA such as “Intervention”, “Pre-emptive Strike or Pre-emption”, “Rogue States”, “Axis of Evil”, “War on Terror”, “Natural Allies”, “Regime Change”, and so on.

ii). Theory of ‘Multipolar World’

On account of the ambiguity in the international situation there has been a continuing confusion with regard to the “polarity” paradigm. It is almost out of fashion to speak in polarity terms in the post Cold War period with a still emerging world order, though some continue to do so for obvious reasons. While regionalism and regional powers have continued to grow, it has in no way brought about a multipolar world. Neither has the authority of the United States become so well stamped on the world that it can be called truly Unipolar. Huntington has himself highlighted this fact and taken advantage of it to put forward his theisis. In the circumstances, with the global situation continuing to remain ambiguous and fluid it is hard to explain the world order or conflict, strictly using the polarity paradigm. Also considering the fact that it is impossible to predict with any certainty whether the world will move in the direction of unipolar or multipolar world order, it becomes extremely difficult to explain the emerging world order or the present conflict in the world using this paradigm.

C). Balance of Power Theory

T.V. Paul, James J. Wirtz and Mitchel Fortmann. (20) carries forward the old theory and takes stock of current studies of Balance of Power theory. Most of the contributing scholars have attempted to understand the present world order in the ‘balance of power’ terms. Their contention is that the ‘balance of power’
perspective is still very relevant in explaining the relations between nations both in the post Cold War period and in the post 9/11 era. The theory of 'balance of power' continues to be used by many realists theorists to theorise about the many events and occurrences in the world.

D). Theory of 'Empire-Building' or 'Imperialist' Theory

This thesis is essentially an extension of the unipolar world thesis and though it focuses on the US, it comes within the ambit of the statist perspective. The debate on "empire" and "imperialism" has continued to rage in the post cold war era and has taken an entirely different shape, moving away from imperialism debate of Cold War or Bipolar context to one in the post Cold War "unipolar" context. This debate has raged between the votaries of imperialism on one hand and its opponents on the other. One group advocates American imperialism in the interest of the triumph of liberalism while the opposing group highlights the challenge posed to American hegemony leading to its decline.

Scholars like Chalmers Johnson (21), Nial Fergusson (22), Benjamin R. Barker (Benjamin R. Barker Fear's Empire: War, Terrorism and Democracy, 2004), Michael Mann (23), Emmanuel Todd (24) and many others have stoked this debate further. This debate is essentially aimed at making sense of the new world order-whether it is unipolar or not. The latest debate largely focuses on use of power, especially by the USA to dominate the world and the responses it evokes in retaliation- the European resistance, the Islamic backlash and the like. These scholars through their works have tried to analyse the reasons for USA seeking hegemony and empire, but fall short of providing any coherent and widely acceptable explanation or answers for many of the complex questions related to world order or conflict in it. Moreover, most of these scholars fit into the known stereotypes, of those who overtly or covertly advocate US domination for establishing a liberal world order while those who oppose US imperialism do so for a variety of causes ranging from exploitation, militarism, etc.
The Empire or Imperialist thesis is quite a misleading one, as there is really no true American empire in place as yet, and though a decade and a half has passed since it became the ‘sole superpower’ and is the mightiest military power in the world, the stark fact remains that the world is not totally dominated by the United States as many believe or would want to believe. The world order still operates on bargaining and reciprocity and this defeats the argument of a unipolar world in which the US is the imperial power. But, it is also true that US plays a pivotal role in the world— it dictates wherever it can, it bullies if possible, but it cannot impose its writ all the time and on everyone. The US is a pre-eminent global power with severely compromised authority and legitimacy. The US is an empire more in its pretensions and in the dreams of its votaries, than in reality. The debate, as one scholar has opined, is not about who rules the world but who makes the rules for the world.

One of the off-shoots of the ‘Imperialist’ perspective has been the ‘Interventionist doctrine’. This doctrine was formulated to give effect to the new role perceived by US as the ‘Global Policeman’. Many critics of the US have pointed out that, the US, having assumed the mantle of a ‘Global Policeman’, arrogated unto itself the right to unilaterally intervention anywhere it deems fit to protect its national interests. Thus, the interventionist doctrine was more for the purpose of achieving the national interests of the US than for any international pacifist objective. This doctrine, as many have pointed out, came as a reaction to a call, by some at the end of Cold War, for the US to pull out of the international arena under the ‘Withdrawal’ or “Isolationist” doctrine, a practice that US had resorted to, during the 19th century and after the World War I. The proponents of “Isolationist” doctrine wanted the US to withdraw so s to devote itself to solving its own internal problems, while the supporters of the “Interventionist” doctrine were demanding a pro-active American role in the emerging world order.

Dimitri K Simes (25) further examines the thesis of “Empire-building” or ‘Imperialism’ by America in the post Cold War world. He, of course questions this
thesis on the ground that, all that America signifies need not be correct or acceptable to others in the world. He questions the argument of the imperialism thesis, which says that America must triumphantly improve democracy everywhere and that democracy will bring about an end to conflict in the world. He does not accept the contention that democracies do not fight or go to war with each other. He argues that US is in a dilemma, whether to expand as an imperial power or to accommodate and compromise.

John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark who are Marxist analysts, pointing at an editorial in Business Week of 20th September 2004 titled “A new age of barbarism is upon us” have stated that these words were “clearly designed to stoke the flames of anti-terrorist hysteria.” They have take up the question of civilization versus barbarism. They analysed the Marxian concepts of “barbarism as leprosy of civilisation.” and “barbarism within civilization.”(26) According to them civilisation involves barbarism. They stated that “After the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, the empire could present itself as at war with barbarism and in defense of civilization.” (27) In Pox Americana: Exposing the American Empire these two writers have edited works of many Marxist thinkers like Noam Chomsky who have carried the debate forward

Deepak Lal (28) echoes Niall Ferguson’s ideas of US as a Colossus, and a necessity to have such an empire but it must spread capitalist modernization and not certain value systems.

10.2.3. Theories from Ethno-Nationalist Perspective
Theory of ‘Nationalism’ or Theory of ‘Ethnicism’ or ‘Ethno-Nationalism’ Paradigm

It is a well known fact that the post Cold War era witnessed a sudden spurt in ethnic nationalisms, especially due to the collapse of large multi-national, multi-ethnic; multi-religious and multi-racial states of the communist world such as
Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. The sudden weakening of the totalitarian machinery of these states provided an opportunity to the long cherished but suppressed aspirations of various ethnic groups to launch ethnic nationalist movements. It is a fact that territorial boundaries of the states seldom coincide with the ethnic contours thereby giving rise to ethnic nationalist movements. The sudden spiralling of ethnic conflict and violence in many parts of the world, often leading to genocide and humanitarian crisis and requiring urgent international intervention, led to the rise of ethnic-nationalist paradigm in order to explain the new developments and possibly find solutions to mitigate the problems. Thus many scholars in the immediate aftermath of the collapse of communism and end of Cold War attempted to spell out the ethnic-nationalistic paradigm to explain the rise of serious conflicts in the world in general and severest forms of ethnic violence in the East European theatre in particular. These attempts often came to be termed as 'post-communistic new world order' paradigms and generally pertained to the conflict in the former communist East Europe. Many scholars put forth ethno-centric or ethno-nationalist theories to explain the rise of conflict during the 1990s.

The nations as a basis for the global order and nationalism as a cause of conflict, is a thesis which has been around for a long time and continues to hold ground even in the post Cold War period. Much has been written and debated on this point to explain order and conflicts, especially regarding regional conflicts in former Soviet Republics, Yugoslavia (Balkans), Sri Lanka (Ealam) and even Japan Eugene A Matheus in “Japan’s New Nationalism” (28a) carries forward this trend and explores the new shape nationalism is taking in the world. He explores the threat to peace and cause of conflict that could result from an increasingly nationalist Japan, challenged by a bellicose North Korea testing missiles and developing nuclear weapons. The nationalism debate has been carried forward by others more recently like Anthony W. Marx (29)
10.2.4 Theories from Environmental Perspective

‘Green’ or ‘Ecological’ Theory of New World Order

Hazel Henderson (30) a proponent of the green movement, who has taken up the question of economics and technology more positively that most green writers argues, using the reference of Warren Bennis and Phillip Slater’s “Democracy is inevitable” idea, that due to sheer size and complexity of societies, hierarchical order cannot be sustainable and will be replaced with democratic and decentralized system in the future. She believes that the nation-state system is therefore doomed and will decline and will be replaced by an Age of Light in which human beings, using sustainable methods and technologies live in harmony with the natural world. She believes that, due to the process of globalisation, nation-state system will die out and replaced by an enlightened modern civilization with a new planetary culture based on earth ethics and sustainable society. She points out that the present system of economics which seeks to subjugate nature and harming the environment cannot sustain itself for long and will inevitably die and replaced by a new measure of individual and local productivity and the old national political paradigm will be replaced by a new interconnected global society based on hierarchical structures and complimentarity with nature. She portrays the future age as one in which “the march of democracy” through citizen movements will challenge and replace the existing authoritarian national system. She says that this new paradigm is still incomplete, is in progress and evolving just like nature because it is not only appropriate but also natural. In short, like many other proponents of the green or ecological or environmental perspective, Henderson visualises a new world order which would be saner, more equitable, gender-balanced, ecologically conscious and sustainable. This perspective is not just one of optimism but almost utopian.

Norman Myers (31) argues that though during the Cold War era security war understood in territorial-military context of the nation-states, in the new order of the future it will be dominated by non-military environmental conflicts. He
holds that the nation-state system will be in conflict due to the deterioration of the natural system and resources. For Myers, future conflicts will arise from environmental insecurity of the states. He also makes a case for a sustainable management of the world through good citizenship in the new order. Jyrki Kakonen, Aldershots, Hants (32) has many articles by different authors carrying forward the theme of green security in the new world order.

The green concern of the proponents of the world order based on environmental security are focused on notions like sustainable development, deep ecology, civil disobedience, ecocentrism, citizen movements, etc.

10.2.5 Theories from Religious-Cultural-Civilisational-Perspective

A). Theory of 'Clash of Civilisations' or 'Culture' Theory

The paradigms of “One World” (even though universally appealing) and “Ethnicity” (even though a universal phenomenon) were essentially euro-centric paradigmatic explanations of conflict in the emerging order, but could not be termed as truly global. Other scholars sought to explain conflict and the emerging international order in a global context. The civilisational paradigmatic approach, spearheaded, by scholars like Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington, attempted to make a total break from the prevailing approaches. Huntington totally repudiated the “One World” globalist paradigm, by terming it as the “fallacy of the single alternative” and sought to conceptualise ethnicity and nationalism in civilisational terms. This, of course came to be strongly contested by many scholars later on. His thesis which forms the main basis for this study has been already extensively dealt with.

B). Theories of ‘Religious Resurgence’

The debate on Rise or Fall of Islam has been one of the consistent themes during the last one decade. Just before 9/11, some scholars like, Bernard Lewis (33) and Gilles Kepel (34) argued that Islamist movement has largely come to an end. This trend by a few scholars is opposed by a large number of other scholars, some quite well known such as Gabriel Almond, R. Scott Appelby and Emmanuel
Sivan(35) The two divergent views indicate the continuing debate and discourse on religion particularly, Islam. The main bone of contention between these two groups is whether the present world order is characterised by religious resurgence or religious decline. The understanding of the world order is therefore in terms of religion, which is connected with culture and civilisation.

C). Theories of 'Cultural Power

According to Guo Jiemin, a Chinese scholar, cultural power, also called cultural hegemony, cultural imperialism and cultural colonialism, is generally referred to as imposed cultural values between states and between ethnic groups. Jeimin builds on the ideas of Gramsci who first put forward this concept in the 1930s and called it the "super-political veil" of the traditional concept of culture. Gramsci had held that cultural hegemony was an indispensable ruling form. In order to rule, the ruling class has to draw support from intellectuals and cultural institutions to make its ethics, politics and cultural values a universally accepted code of conduct and make the people not only agree with the social lifestyle of the basic ruling group but also practice it.

Jeimin points out that the "Western colonialists used cultural power as their powerful weapon in the international arena. Wherever they went, they recklessly destroyed local civilizations, denied or changed local moral norms and forcibly judged the destiny of other countries and ethnic groups by their own cultural values. History is developing, the times are forging ahead and peace and development have become the themes of the current age. But cultural power as a phenomenon contrary to the times has not yet disappeared from the scene. Though it has come by the barbarous and bloody means the colonialists had adopted, its essence remains as before" (36)

He says that "The end of the Cold War has entailed a softening of fierce military threats in international relations and a relaxation of ideological
confrontation between blocs. Many countries have begun economic reforms and contacts between countries and between ethnic groups have increasingly been strengthened, thus enhancing awareness of civilization. Whether a country is strong or weak is measured no longer only from the political and military perspective, but in terms of its comprehensive national strength. This includes not only such factors as economy and military affairs, science and technology, and natural resources, but also the essential spiritual factors of national culture, will, character and spirit. It includes also the integration and balance of those essential factors." (37)

According to 'Jeimin "This clearly enhances the importance of culture, which now becomes one of the main factors determining a country's strength, along with politics, economy, military affairs, science and technology. Because of changes in world political and military situations, countries with a strong "hegemonic awareness" have turned their attention to the cultural field and attempted to unify the world with their cultural values in order to achieve results they cannot reach through political struggles and military force. The modernized media have facilitated this enabling cultural power to emerge at this historical moment and become a very prominent post-Cold War cultural phenomenon between countries and ethnic groups." (38) Jeimin asserts that "At the moment when a new world pattern is in the shaping, the U.S. is stepping up pursuit of cultural power as part of its plan for acting as a "world leader". He further states "Cultural power is bound to accompany political power. For example, U.S. foreign policy has always included a plan of disseminating U.S. cultural values to the rest of the world, of which exporting the mode of U.S. political development is one of the major elements." (39)

And this, he says, is causing conflict due to clash of cultures. Hence this perspective seeks to combine the cultural perspective with the power perspective.
This has been attempted by Huntington and has already been considered in a previous section.

10.2.6. Theories with Negativist Perspective

A) Theories of 'Sheer Chaos'

Sheer chaos paradigm- made its appearance in early 1990s, and has continued to have impact in the intellectual and academic fields. This paradigm talks of a global break down of law and order, failed states, anarchy, crimes, civil wars, decline of family, gun culture, ethnic cleansing, crisis in governance, surging corruption, terrorism, mafia, a global dark age,

The prophets of the new world order in America have been Fukuyama, Huntington and Kagan and in Europe Robert Cooper, a former adviser to Prime Minister Tony Blair has been writing about the world in a different way. Robert Cooper focuses on the chaotic and breakdown being experienced in the world. Robert Cooper in The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century (40) sets out to interpret the chaos and conflict in the world. He puts forth the argument that the primary cause of conflict and chaos in the world is breaking down of the control of nation states over violence and the rise of small non-state entities or groups wielding the ability to procure weapons of mass destruction. Cooper vacillates between the statist position and identity position calling for a balance between the two. In trying to provide an answer to post Cold War period conflict Cooper explores the past successes of the West to cope with violence and conflict. In his analysis of the two western approaches to contain conflict, Cooper contrasts the American hegemonic methods using military force to effect changes in policies of threatening states to the European approach of accommodating other societies on its periphery through outward expansion, visible in the EU expansion. Cooper argues that both these approaches are not apt and calls for a synthesis of these approaches, in which Europe and America as a united West, together confront the threats of conflicts. Cooper, like all proponents of 'imperialist'
approach calls for Western imperialism tempered with human rights and cosmopolitan values.

Cooper deserves the same criticism that goes for all adherents of ‘imperialist’ approach to solve the problem of conflict and chaos in the new world order.

B). ‘Break-down’ Theory

Robert Kagan, one of the leading American analysts and thinkers of the new world order in the post Cold War era, has continued to debate and discuss the still unclear and still emerging world order in his article “America’s Crisis of Legitimacy” carrying forward his theme of “the differences that separate the two sides of the Atlantic” Kagan attributes the continuing debate on the lack of clarity to the fact most Americans having “not pondered the question of world order since the war”. The context in general is of the post Cold War world order and in particular of recent post Iraq War. Quoting Dominique de Villepin, French Foreign Minister in 2003 that the struggle between US and Europe was “less about Iraq than it was between two visions of the world” Kagan puts it thus “ Opinion polls taken before, during, and after the war show two peoples living on separate strategic and ideological planets. Whereas more than 80 percent of Americans believe that war can sometimes achieve justice, less than half of Europeans agree. Americans and Europeans disagree about the role of international law and international institutions and about the nebulous but critical question of what confers legitimacy on international actions. The diverging world views predate the Iraq war and the Presidency of George W. Bush, although both may have deepened and hardened the transatlantic rift into an enduring feature of international landscape” Thus Kagan’s thesis focuses more on “America is different from Europe” approach to explain the events at the international level and having a deep impact on the world order. Robert Kagan has put forwards a thesis that in the post Cold War world America has scant regard for EU and is increasingly going it alone, especially under George Bush.
Kagan in propounding this thesis actually hits at the very foundation of Huntington's basic assumption of a United West. To put it in Kagan's own words "Today a darker reality looms. A great philosophical schism has opened within the West, and mutual antagonism threatens to debilitate both sides of the Atlantic community. At a time when new dangers and crises are proliferating rapidly, this schism could have serious consequences. For Europe and the United States to come apart strategically is bad enough. But what if their differences over world order infect the rest of what we have known as the liberal West? Will the West still be West?" (41) The thesis of Kagan indicating that there probably is no such thing as a single united West deals a deadly blow to Huntington's assertion of a single Western civilization.

Kagan, at the end of the cold war, along with Fukuyama and many others had trumpeted the "end of history" and the "victory of liberal democracy" in which liberal democracy "would live in harmony". Kagan in his latest thesis, which is essentially a paradigm shift, woefully laments/admits that his earlier belief or reasonable assumption that liberal democracies "have no grounds to contest each other's legitimacy" has now "been thrown into doubt". His argument is that "for the first time since World War II, a majority of Europe has come to doubt the legitimacy of US power and of US global leadership" (42) He then goes on to state that "the struggle to define and obtain international legitimacy in the new era may prove to be among the most critical contests of our time", which in essence implies a portent of new kind of conflict likely to afflict the world, a conflict in which West is ranged against West.

Kagan quite successfully questions the idea of a unipolar world calling it "unipolar predicament". But he does not at the same time concede any signs of emergence of any multipolar world. He actually states "In their (Europeans) efforts to constrain the superpower, they might lose sight of the mounting dangers in the world, which are far greater than those posed by the United States. Out of nervousness about unipolarity, they might underestimate the dangers of a multi-
polar system, in which non-liberal and non-democratic powers would come to outweigh Europe" Kagan feels that, "Europeans might succeed in debilitating the United States this way. But, since they have no intention of supplementing its power with their own, in doing so they would only succeed in weakening the overall power that the liberal democratic world can wield in its defence, and in defence of liberalism itself." (43)

That America and Europe pursue different approaches to understanding and resolving conflict is agreed upon by many scholars. Kagan's thesis of emerging fundamental differences between Americans and Europeans, especially in the emerging global conflict scenarios has found many followers and supporters. However, many in the West, such as Phillip H Gordon and others want to abridge this American - European divide so as to assist resolution of conflicts in the world. While European approach to resolving conflict is banking more on diplomacy, that of US relies more on use of military force. Kagan believes that the experience of Europeans with wars and their subsequent integration has convinced them that dialogue and development are a better guarantee against rise of conflict.

But of course there are many who do not agree with Kagan's thesis. For instance, Timothy Garton Ash (44) counters the arguments of those, such as Kagan, who speak of decline of the West through parting of ways between US and Europe. He says that what divides the West is not as strong as what unites it and hence West is not doomed. He says that West must return to its old glory and triumph by re-advancing the Western cause of liberal democracy.

While both Kagan and Huntington differ on question of unity of the "Western civilisation", the desire of Kagan is the same as that of Huntington - that West must remain united and continue to dominate the rest. Their approaches and paradigms may be different but their underlying discourse is not too far apart and of course their agenda is the same- West must stick together to triumph.

Frightening as it may sound to Huntington, and factually true as it may be, the analysis of Kagan, still does not delve deep enough to find the essential causes that
lead to the differences among the peoples and nations, whether they be Western or Non-Western, Americans or Europeans and how these differences carry the seeds of conflict. A thorough analysis and a satisfactory explanation of the underlying processes of what differentiates peoples from peoples, communities from communities and nations from nations alone can shed light on true causes of conflict in the world and like most scholars, Kagan falls short of achieving this feat. An indepth analysis of what makes peoples different from each other, leading them to clash with each other at one time and to come together at other times, alone can help unravel the mystery of human drama at the global level. In all probability, the kinds of world order and the kinds of conflict that will ensue, have deep roots in the functioning of human psyche, which in turn is directly contingent on the underlying, inherent and fundamental processes of human evolution.

10.2.7 Theories from Terrorism Perspective

Theory of ‘War on Terror’ or “Age of Terror” Theory

The most talked about subject at the international level after September 11, 2001, has been of “Terror”. The discussions about international terrorism have been around since 1960s but terrorism has catapulted to the world centre stage only after 9/11 event. The impact of terrorism in the post Cold War period is said to be so far reaching that the present era is being increasingly referred to as the “Age of Terror”. While this perspective is one of the latest entrants to explain world order and conflict it has not been sufficiently articulated to be called a truly spelt out perspective or paradigm. While many scholars have been attempting to articulate the implications of the “Age of Terror”, none has yet succeeded in giving a clear and comprehensive “Age of Terror” paradigm. The lack of clear and systematic explanation by scholars propounding the “Age of Terror” thesis has led to the impinging upon this territory by proponents of other paradigms explaining conflict such as from ethnicity, nationalistic, civilisational and other such perspectives.
Michael Ignatieff (45) takes up the concerns of how liberal democracy can triumph by navigating through the Age of Terror and the world beset with conflicts and terrorism. Even though the “war on terror” started by the US and its allies targets the non state entities like Al Qaeda primarily, it is still taking place within the frame work of nation-states where nations are being re-categorized as those fighting terror and those sponsoring terror, the so-called ‘rogue’ states. The “war on terror” has not taken any characteristics of a civilizational conflict but continues to be conflict within the nation-states context.

The “war on terror” doctrine, consequent upon 9/11 attacks on America, has been also widely criticized. Graham E Fuller (46) questions it thus “But it is not yet clear whether the war will ultimately alienate or merely exacerbate the current tension in the Muslim world today.”

Political Islam or Islamism believes that the Koran and Hadith (tradition of prophet’s life) should determine the way society should be ordered and governed. Just like scholars hark back to Magna Carta, American Revolution and French Revolution to carry forward the political discourse, the Islamist fall back on Koran and Hadith which symbolize the high points in their socio-political history. The Islamist rely themselves on dynamism in Islam as much as the Westerners do in their own democratic history. The problem why this Islamism is resented by the West is primarily because it has come as a challenge to the Western liberal democratic model based on western history and western traditions. This is the cause of the problem leading to conflict between Muslims and the Westerners and this cannot be explained in simplistic civilizational terms, especially when the definition of what is a civilization and exactly how many civilizations, if at all they exist, is still disputed and contested. Political Islam, as a force to reckon with, is still being debated by many authors like Gilles Holding “Islamic Decline” and G. Almond “Rise of the Fundamentalism”

The ‘War on Terror” is the reaction of those wanting to continue dominance in the “Age of Terror” and hence terror is replied with terror, a vicious
circle of all engulfing violence. During the post 9/11 period many writings have focused on the question of terrorism and one of these early writings has been 'The Age of Terror: America and the World after September 11' (47) in which several writers sought to explain this new increase in global conflict following the same discourse of West versus Muslim world. Writers like Fouad Ajami Fareed Zakaria, Michael Scott Doran, Sandy Bergers and others have attempted to find explanation for the conflict between West and the Islamic protagonists.

Similarly, other writings in the same period, such as, 'How Did This Happen? Terrorism and the New War' (48) and “To Prevail: An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism” (49) undertook the same exercise of trying to understand the new developments in the field of global conflict. All these, and other similar works, by a plethora of authors and scholars, examined various aspects and consequences of this new conflict. These writers, apart from trying, to analyse the events of 9/11 and suggest solutions, also tried to critique many of the standard interpretations to explain conflict between West and the Muslims. Michael Mandebau (50) challenged the leftist interpretations of West-Muslim conflict. During the immediate aftermath of 9/11, many of the supporters of the clash of civilization thesis came out openly to suggest that the 9/11 attacks were a vindication of Huntington’s thesis. The internet as well as print and electronic media increasingly insinuated the ‘Clash of Civilisations’ thesis as the reason for Al Qaeda’s attack on USA. And some of the writers slammed this approach.

Niall Ferguson, a British historian and one of the writers on the “The Age of Terror”, strongly questioned the interpretation that the 9/11 attacks were the opening salvo of the clash of civilizations. He states that “one of the dangers of this (Huntington’s thesis) is that it exaggerates the homogeneity of Islam as a world religion”. Ferguson put forth an “empire – building” thesis in which, US will be on a hegemonic march due to its sheer might. In his “empire-building”
thesis Ferguson also deals a death blow to the "Isolationist" thesis circulating in the America circles.

In this same period, Joseph S. Nye., Jr. (51) questions the popular notion of American unipolarity and hegemony and tries to make a case for multilateral engagement by America to influence other powers and overcome the threats of conflict. Both Ferguson and Nye, continue to argue along 'statist' lines in the new 'age of terror' in the post 9/11 world.

10.2.8 Theories from Leftist Perspective

Noam Chomsky does not really put forward any new paradigm or vision for the new age or emerging world order but continues the criticism the capitalist system, the United States and western politics, culture and technology. He says "the basic rules of the world order remain as they have been: the rule of law for the weak, the rule of force for the strong; the principle of 'economic rationality' for the weak, state power and intervention for the strong. As in the past, privilege and power do not willingly submit to popular control or market discipline and therefore seek to undermine meaningful democracy and to bend market principles to their special needs". (52) According to the leftist the world and its situation can still be best explained using the Marxian analysis. For them, though communism as a political system has collapsed the world is still beset with class war, between the rich and the poor, between the advanced countries and the developing ones, between the strong and powerful and the weak and powerless and between the exploiters and the exploited.

10.2.9 Theories having a Combination of Perspectives

Combining Two Visions

Bassy Buzan (53), a leading scholar of the London School of Economics, in an illuminating analysis of world politics, concludes that the world does not exhibit a single coherent pattern but a mixed one which consists of "Pluralist"
vision on one hand and "Solidarist" vision on the other. Buzan argues that the world order is characterized by two alternate visions— one consisting of primacy of State (Statist) and other of universal cosmopolitan networking (non-statist). He holds that both these disparate visions co-exists and form the essential basis of the new world order. Buzan has attempted to harmonize state-centered vision with global network visions, thereby putting forward, in a more explicit terms, an idea or thesis which has been also suggested by many others. This theory of "two logics co-existence" is based more on the realist approach to undertaking international relations and emerging world order, but is also in the traditions of English thinking using Hobbesian (State power) and Grotian (shared interests) thought processes.

10.2.10 Theories from Economic Perspective

Economic Theory or 'Globalisation' Theories

"Globalization" thesis, in which economic interdependence, leading to globalization could be explained as bringing the two divergent thesis of "one-world" and "nation-states", the idealistic and the realistic, together. Akbar Ahmed (54) says that the rise of religion in the world cannot be separated from the narrative of globalization, and he tries to contextualize Muslim reactions to the West within the context of anxieties arising out globalization. He accepts that religion is an important part of the narrative of globalisation. He dwell on the concept of "honor" and "post-honor" societies to understand violence in the globalization era. He says that contemporary times are characterized by over identification with a specific group which may be ethnic, tribal, national, religious, etc. He says this is true of both "developed" and "developing" societies. Ahmed's methodology is based on the concept of group solidarity (or asabiyya in Arabic) developed by Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406) the renowned medieval Muslim scholar and father of sociology and social history. Ahmed's main thesis is that due to globalization, many people the world over are feeling as if under siege. He says
that the feeling of siege is expressed through the language of loss of honor. The groups defining themselves in ethnic, religious and other terms blame other contemporary communities who are linked to the past enemies or history. According to Ahmed such groups try to inflict violence upon the constructed "other" so as to recover that groups' honor. His contention is that group solidarity gives individuals a sense of identity and belonging to society and thereby serves a constructive purpose.

But due to the collapse of group solidarity conflict and violence arise in the society, leading to chaos and confusion with justice, compassion and balance becoming its victims. He says that group solidarity holds a society together but their exaggeration into hyper-group solidarity leads to rise of ethnic, tribal and religious loyalties which cause conflict and violence. Essentially Ahmed puts forward a fluid paradigm and does not try to resort to a single explanation. He explains diverse conflicts in the world from the globalization induced crisis of honor. His solution to the problem of conflict is called the Global Paradigm where he argues that peaceful global order can be established if both parties become inclusive in their thinking, and engage in a dialogue of civilizations.

Akihiko Tanaka presents a different economic perspective about causes for conflict in the world. Tanaka divides the countries of the world into three "spheres," for analyzing their interrelationships. The first sphere, also called as the Neo-Medieval Sphere, is made up of those countries in which industrialization has led to the rise to affluent societies with "thinning" national borders. He says the best example of this type are the OECD countries. The second sphere, termed as the Modern Sphere, consists of those countries where along with modernization, nationalism also persists. This group of countries, he says still lives in the world of power politics of the nineteenth century. The countries which fall under this category are most of the developing countries and the countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The third sphere, which he calls Chaotic Sphere, comprises of all other countries, which have not succeeded in becoming
nation-states and which exhibit to varying degrees chaotic condition. The countries in this category are sub-Saharan Africa, some parts of the former Soviet influence sphere, etc.

According Akihiko Tanaka, confrontation takes place between less developed members of the Modern Sphere who align with countries and regions of the Chaotic Sphere on the one hand, and the advanced countries of the Neo-Medieval Sphere on the other. For Tanaka conflict between these three different groups of countries is not linked to culture but to industrialization and economic development.

10.2.11 Theories from Neoconservative Perspective

Jim Lobe has said that “The clash of civilizations is not inevitable” (55) He is one of the recent writers who has tried to analyse along with some others the war on terror from the “neo-con’ ideology viewpoint. Contrary to most left-wing critics and as suggested in Michael Moore’s documentary, Fahrenheit 9/11, that the economic factor, particularly the interests of Big Oil or "the ruling class", must have been a decisive factor in US invasion of Iraq and its involvement in the middle east, Jim Lobe has written that according to some scholars the decisive factor has been ideological, namely the ideology of "neo-conservatives". (56) have given one of the best analysis of the neo-conservative movement and have shown how it is connected to Bush's "war on terror". Many such writings have surfaced in the aftermath of the Iraq war highlighting the neoconservative enterprise for America. Halper and Clarke said "We set out to demystify the neo-conservatives," and have set out to expose the neo-conservative foundations of the foreign policy pursued by the Bush administration.

According to Halper and Clarke, the neo-conservative world view revolves around three basic themes: that "the human condition is defined as a choice between good and evil"; that military power and the willingness to use it are the fundamental determinants in relations between states; and that the Middle East and
"global Islam" should be the primary focus in US foreign policy (57). Thus according to many recent scholars, once again the world is witnessing a strongly ideologically defined world in which there are neoconservatives who espouse the cause of the right-wing politics and economy and these are opposed to both the leftist as well as Islamist ideological causes. The world suddenly seems to becoming ideologically oriented once again. Many argue that the world had never really left the ideological battleground as Fukuyama and Huntington had seemed to have surmised. It was only hazily visible but has now become increasingly clear.

Piki Ish-Shalom (58) is one among many authors who has tried exploring the processes by which neoconservatives have absorbed the structural theory of democratic peace thesis, into their ideology, and thereby reconciling two conflicting theses of End of History on one hand and Clash of Civilizations on the other. The ideology of the neoconservatives characterised by structural theories provides them with both a political platform which is cautiously optimistic (Fukuyaman) and mildly relativist (Huntingtonian) and by this convenient merger the neoconservatives have constructed a grand strategy to promote structural democracy in the entire world, if necessary by use of force or war. In this scenario of neoconservative enterprise world order and conflict once again get inextricably linked but the world is not of multipolar kind neither fully unipolar but a mix of both and which Huntington, subsequent to the onslaught on his multicivilisational paradigm had reformulated into a neoconservative enterprise called as uni-multipolar world, which very much suits the neoconservatives and Huntington, who is deeply conservative. The reason of course is that the neoconservative theory about the world order even in the uni-multipolar terms still favours America.

Conclusions

There are several ways of understanding the world and order in it and many thinkers and scholars have put forward their own explanations about how they
view the world and how the world should be. Some of these theories are not only more closer to reality but are also more attractive than the one propounded by Samuel Huntington. Some theories attempt a genuine understanding of the world while others go about setting an agenda.

10.3 Theories about Conflict

Introduction

Though alternative explanations about world order and international conflict have existed from before Huntington's thesis and have continued to be offered after his thesis, the difference mostly has been with regard to theories, either explaining world order and international conflict in a connected manner or explaining them separately. Francis Fukuyama, John Lewis Gaddis and others spoke about the emerging world order in differing terms such as realist, statist, globalist, ethnonationalist, polarist, imperialist and such other terms which was in sharp contrast to Huntington's cultural-civilisational approach. Yet, all of them may not have accorded the same weightage to conflict as was done by Huntington and some others. While Huntington has succeeded in linking the two issues of world order and conflict in quite an effective manner, others have preferred to either take only a single issue, such as conflict, or take both with differing emphasis. Hence, clear-cut alternatives to Huntington's thesis have been hard in coming. Most alternatives to Huntington's thesis are piece-meal and in that sense fail to come up as a serious and comprehensive alternatives to Huntington's intellectual and theoretical endeavour on world order and conflict. Some of those that come nearest to posing a challenge to Huntington's theory are probably Stuart J. Kaufman's thesis of 'Symbolic Politics', Vamik Volkan, Demetrios A. Julius and Joseph V. Montville's 'Enemy System Theory', T. Clifton Morgan and Kenneth N. Bickers' 'Diversionary Theory of International Conflict', Bruce Bueno De Mesquita's 'Expected Utility Theory of International Conflict', R.J.Rummel's 'Conflict Helix Theory', and so on. However, it would be
worthwhile to look at some of the theories that have sought to explain the existence of conflict among and between societies and nations.

War and conflict primarily means violent armed combat between different groups or communities or peoples or nations. Conflict has been an inalienable part of human history and existence, and has its origins in primordiality and antiquity, though organised wars are considered a more recent development in human evolutionary history, probably since humans settled down and became territorial leading to the rise of the state. The causes of wars and conflicts have occupied the minds of thinkers, philosophers, religious founders, political leaders and academic scholars for a long time. There probably is no single cause for wars and conflicts but may be there is a single ground for it, the human nature itself. However, many have endeavoured to understand war and conflict and theorise about it. And this has been evidenced by large body of accumulated knowledge, many journals of war and conflict, many centres and institutes to study conflict and of course, many theories on conflict. Attempt to understand war and conflict dot the entire landscape of human existence from philosophy and religion on one hand to psychology and politics on the other. History of wars by far occupies a major part of human history. Conflicts have risen and wars have been prosecuted in all parts of the world throughout human history in different theatres, with several campaigns and battles both overt and covert, direct and proxy, small scale and large scale, strategic and tactical. The multiplicity of causes, the diversity of factors, and the range of issues involved in wars and conflicts have always rendered the subject extremely complex and consequently complicated the understanding of the phenomenon. In such a situation rise of large number of theories to explain war and conflict is but natural.

Most scholars, and particularly historians, have been generally hesitant to provide any comprehensive theories about war and conflict because of the surrounding complexity, though this has not stopped some others in providing sweeping explanations for all conflicts. Thus while some like A J P Taylor (59)
have considered conflicts and wars as accidents others like S.P. Huntington have ventured sweeping theories, in the process obscuring the truth about wars and conflict in human society. Political conflict is an undeniable fact of human life and in order to understand its nature conflict theories have competed to understand the nature of political conflict. Conflict theories explore various facets of war and conflict and belong to different schools of thought. These theories have attempted to look into the nature of conflict, particularly with reference to violence and warfare. But the problem has been about what approach to adopt to understand the nature of conflict.

Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff in their well known work Contending Theories of International Relations have highlighted this difficulty well by stating: "Social scientists are divided on the question whether social conflict should be regarded as something rational, constructive, and socially functional or something irrational, pathological, and socially dysfunctional." (60) The resulting polarity in the theoretical approaches has made the task of understanding conflict difficult. The conflict theorists have been divided into two competing approaches, one classical and other behaviourist. The older classical approach is primarily focused on macro level analysis of group interactions based on ethnicity, ideology, religion, nationality, class, caste and so on. It looks more at the conscious levels of group interactions leading to violence and conflict. These theorists take a broader generic view and therefore examine all the variable which could impinge on a war or a conflict. The more recent, behaviourist approach is mostly focused on the micro level analysis of individual unconscious behaviour rather than group behaviour and seeks to examine and understand the underlying motivations. These theorists adopt a more narrower view and analyse a far fewer number of variable for a wide number of wars or conflicts. Thus this difference in approaches engenders different kinds of results and consequently different kinds of understanding of the same phenomenon of conflict.
10.3.1. Micro Theories of Conflict

The micro theories of conflict which arise out of the behaviourist approach are premised on the assumptions that the fundamental causes of war lie in human nature and human behaviour; examine the relationship exists between intrapersonal conflict and social conflict. These theories hold that the root causes of social conflicts essentially lie within the individual and personal domain. These theories are primarily based on the stimulus - response hypothesis and seek to understand the consequence of individuals response to the environment.

A) Innate-Instinct or Animal Behaviour Theories

The early micro theories generally tried to explore whether biological or psychological makeup of human beings predisposes them to war and conflict. These theories tried to link intrapersonal conflict to larger group conflicts including international conflicts. A large number of micro theories of conflict have been proposed by scholars and most of these arise from the discipline of psychology, though some arise from biology. It was the psychologists who often hypothesised that the grounds of conflict lie in the biological and instinctual nature of human beings. Sigmund Freud in his “death instinct’ and “killer instinct” ideas provided the impetus to psycho-biological explanations for human conflict. The result was the formulation of the instinct theories of aggression and conflict. The theorists with behaviourist perspective, both biologists and psychologists had attempted to correlate animal behaviour to human behaviour on the grounds that humans are part of the animal kingdom. But these theories by psychologists and social Darwinists came under increasing attack and were discredited over time giving rise to theories based on grounds other than instinct. The early instinct-innate theories led to the development of more sophisticated psychological theories such theories of aggression, frustration-aggression theory, social learning theory, social identity theory and so on. Many psychologists like E F M Durban and John Bowlby have contended that human beings, especially men, are innately violent and prone to undertaking conflict and war.
B) **The Frustration-Aggression theory.**

The Frustration-Aggression theory holds that all aggression, interpersonal or group, arises out of the frustration over goal achievement by those involved and not because of some innate predisposition. According to this theory when goals and objectives of individuals remain unfulfilled it leads to frustration which in turn leads to aggression. This theory relies on the stimulus-response hypothesis because it looks at the basic question of demand and supply of needs which cause frustration. This theory holds that as the demand for basic human needs is always more than the supply, human needs remain unfulfilled and so leads them to conflict. But this theory has not been able to provide satisfactory answers to all kinds of conflicts by applying the frustration principle and hence has been rejected.

C) **Social Learning Theory**

Social learning theory arose to provide better explanations than the Frustration-Aggression theory. This theory also rejected the argument that aggression is instinctual. According to this theory conflict has its roots in the process of socialisation. The main hypothesis of this theory is that conflict is the product of learning about it in society and hence is acquired. Theorists of this school of thought hold that conflict is a response to the social environment and arises from the interaction in the society. Hence the main argument of this theory is that conflict and aggression is a learned behaviour. The learning including the idea of who is enemy is acquired in the society and depends on the nature of the society or group involved. This theory looks at group aggression as arising out of a learning process acquired by individuals in a given society. The theory focuses on understanding the relationship of the individuals to their environment and how this affects group aggression. Socialisation process is said to determine the level and extent of conflict that individuals and groups will exhibit in a society. This theory has merit but is not sufficient to explain conflict at the larger international scale.
D) Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory was originally put forth by psychologist Henri Tajfel. This theory postulates that human beings create their identity so as to make it easier for them to relate to their environment. These social identities, based on human need to identify with some group, invariably lead to viewing some as ‘us’ and some as ‘them’. In this process of identity formation groups get differentiated. Each group operates with an identity and it becomes part of their normal life. But these different groups being in close proximity have to interact with each other and this interaction is based on their social identities. Also the groups order their environment by way of comparison which results in the idea of in-group and out-group. Invariably the differing identities and comparative ordering causes these groups to come into conflict with each other. Social Identity Theory therefore by placing the individual in the group and at the same time placing the group in the individual successfully links the individual and the social and provides a better explanation of group conflict which is simultaneously based on the identities of the individuals belonging to a specific group. The problem with this theory however is that individuals do not have single identities but a multiplicity of identities which make it difficult to easily categorise individuals into ‘us’ and ‘them’. While a dominant identity does lead to exclusion of the ‘others’ in the complex human environment this is easier said than done. And even if done cannot be easily sustained and perpetuated for a long time. Thus while this theory provides a good understanding especially when dealing with ethnic conflict, it may not hold always good.

E) The Human Needs Theory

The Human Needs Theory was originally developed during the 1970s and 1980s, and is considered to be a generic or holistic theory of human behaviour. The main assumption of this theory is that human beings have basic needs that
have to be met in order to ensure stability of societies. The theory holds that human beings constantly try to gain the control of their environment in order to ensure the satisfaction of their needs and in this process come into conflict. The struggle for satisfaction of needs leads to aggression and conflict. One of the most basic needs of human beings, according to this theory is the need for identity and when it is threatened or not met, it leads to conflict. The theory contends that this struggle for satisfying needs cannot be curbed and therefore, instability and conflict are an inevitable outcome. This theory has been subjected to the same criticism as the other psychological theories.

Thus the micro theories following the behavioural approach are based on the importance of individual in the society, role of individual and group within the environment, role of the unconscious, role of motivation and stimulus-response mechanism. These theories try to resolve the gap between the individual and groups as actors in conflict on one hand and the nature-nurture problem on the other, though with very limited success. The theories however fail more miserably in explaining the conscious role of human beings in initiating and perpetuating violence and conflicts. The other set of theories called as macro theories or generic theories attempt to analyse the role of human consciousness in effecting violence, conflict and war.

10.3.2 Macro Theories of Conflict

Macro theories of conflict consider the bigger picture. They seek to understand the interaction of groups at the conscious level. These macro theories, also termed as classical theories focus more on intergroup relations and their exercise of power through use of violence in a conscious manner. The common assumptions of macro, or classical theories is that power relations underline all conflicts. These theories hold that the root causes of social conflicts essentially lie within group interactions and competition. These theories seek to understand how
and why groups involve themselves in violence, to what purpose or end and with what benefits or success.

A) Socio-economic Theories of Conflict

Sociologists, anthropologists, demographers and economist have been attempting to understand and explain the rise of conflict in society from their respective discipline point of view.

i) Sociological theories of conflict

Sociology and sociologists for a long time have been very concerned about the origins and nature of conflict seen to pervade all societies and all times. Many theories to explain conflict have been put forth by different sociologists either in their individual capacity or belonging to different schools of thought. Most of the sociological theories focus on multiple causes but primarily see politics as being central to conflict.

German sociologists have made remarkable contributions to the understanding of conflict in society and among nations through their different schools of thought. The ‘Primacy of Domestic Politics’ school of thought based on works of Eckart Kehr and Hans Ulrich Wehler, believes that conflict arises out of domestic politics and political conditions prevailing in the countries but leading to international conflict. Kehr was one of the first historians in Germany before the World War II to emphasize the importance of social structure and economic interests in influencing political decisions which lead to war and similarly Wehler who saw history as a social science, contended that social developments are often more important than politics. Wehler had advocated Historische Sozialwissenschaft or a Historical Social Science, which resulted from his attempt at integrating aspects of history with sociology, anthropology and economics to study in a holistic manner social changes and conflict in the society.
Another German school of thought is called as 'Primacy of Foreign Politics' and it focuses on the causes of conflict from the foreign policy point of view. According to Carl von Clausewitz and Leopold von Ranke decisions of political leaders and the geopolitical situations lead to conflicts. Clausewitz in his famous work Vom Kriege (On War) highlights the role played by the leaders in decisions to wage war. Leopold von Ranke similarly focuses on how leaders are instrumental in starting and waging wars.

These theories generally seek the causes of conflict in the economic, social, information and political situations existing inside the nations involved. The sociological theories of conflict have been criticised for their overarching approach and generalising tendency.

ii) Anthropological theories

The anthropologists consider war and conflict from primarily cultural point of view. Their studies of conflict in primitive societies have led them to conclude that conflict is the product of cultural learning and a product of the nurture process rather than natural process. They believe that human societies inculcate ideas of war and conflict in their members through various means, practices and rituals such as war dances, human sacrifices and so on. Also anthropologists tend to treat each form of violence or conflict differently and do not believe that they are all the species of the same genus. Anthropologists also focus on the role of political leaders in advocating and effecting wars and conflicts. Ashley Montagu is one such anthropologist who has focused on the instrumentality of leadership in waging wars through ideological justifications for violence. Montagu' in his work, The Nature of Human Aggression, (61) clearly states that, human beings, unlike animals, do not possess instincts and therefore possess no aggressive instincts or any innate predisposition to violence. For Montagu like many other anthropologists, human behavior is learned behavior. He holds that though human
beings have the potential for aggressive action, they also have an equal potential for a non-aggressive response.

Antropological theories with their emphasis on cultural differences and excessive focus on learned behaviour to the exclusion of innate predisposition have been a target for criticism for a long time particularly from psychologists and biologists.

iii) Demographic theories

Demographic theories consider conflict as arising out of population growth. They hold that with increase in population pressures built up for sharing the limited resources and culminate in conflicts and wars between groups trying to secure resources for their survival. In the field of demography there are two types of theories trying to explain conflict and war, the Malthusian theories and the youth bulge theories. According to the Malthusian theories, having their roots in the ideas of Malthus, increase in population leads to scarcity of resources such as food and brings groups into conflict with each other while seeking to secure their survival resources. Malthusian theories thus speak of resource wars such as water wars, wars for raw materials and wars over fertile lands. The Youth Bulge theory on the other hand links population numbers with capacity to wage wars. According to these theories there is a mismatch between the availability of opportunities or positions in the society and the number of people seeking those positions. This low supply and great demand leads to conflict among groups as there are large number of young men who are willing to fight to corner the few positions and opportunities available. The Youth Bulge theories have been put forth by French sociologist like Gaston Bouthoul, American sociologists like Jack A. Goldstone American. Political Scientists like Gary Fuller, and German sociologists like Gunnar Heinsohn. Samuel Huntington’s thesis also uses the demographic argument for rise of conflict in the post Cold War period due to
bulging human populations particularly in Muslim countries and Latin America. The Youth Bulge theories have been exerting tremendous influence on foreign policies in Europe and America in recent years and has led to many immigration policies and laws and this in turn has led to much protests, riots and conflicts on the grounds that demographic policies promote racial, gender and age discrimination. The demographic theories of conflict have been criticised for their potential to encourage racial, communal and class discrimination.

iv) Information theories

The role of information in causing wars has been another important focus in recent times. Scholars like Geoffrey Blainey, have argued that it is the lack of information about the outcome of war. This theory links the emergence of wars to the availability or lack of information. Advance information available through intelligence gathering decides whether a war will be waged or prevented. Full knowledge about the other side, its capability, plans and intentions as also the possible scenarios that can develop helps the nations and their leaders to decide whether to start a war or not to. The theories based on information examine the impact of knowledge and information on the outbreaks of war. The theories with information as the focus are relatively recent and have not yet attained as important place in the conflict literature but are becoming important in this age of information.

v) Economic theories

From Karl Marx to Woodrow Wilson and many more thereafter, political and economic theorists have believed that the causes of conflict lie in economics. Both Marx and Wilson held that conflicts and wars have their roots in the industrial and commercial society of the modern times. American President Dwight Eisenhower and many others have pointed to the commercialisation of war or war economies based on the military-industrial complex. According to
Theorists pursuing economic perspective on war and conflict pursuit for raw materials, limited supplies of natural resources, depleting resources such as oil, securing of markets, economic competition, unbalanced economic development, rise of powerful transnational companies, unemployment, economic exploitation, unequal distribution of wealth and large military budgets have the potential to culminate into wars and conflicts. Walter Russell Mead (62) argues that the present events in the world are shaped and driven not by civilizational differences but by economic transformation. He contends that disparities arising out of economic situation lead to conflict. His contention is that the September 11 attacks, made out by many as an evidence of civilizational clash, are in essence a result of hatred of “Made in America” globalization by the Muslims and others. Mead, in a way puts forward a thesis that global conflicts are caused by underlying economic transformations. He thus seeks to explain global order and conflict in economic terms.

The Conflict theories with economic perspectives have been criticised for their neglect of other factors causing conflicts and wars.

B) Political Science and International Relations Theories of Conflict

i) Power Theories of Conflict

Power as the cause of conflicts has been supported by a long list of scholars right from the ancient times. Focus on power as a cause of conflict has been noted in political theorists such as Thucidydes, Sun Tsu, Niccolo Machiavelli, and many others in the earlier times. During the nineteenth century German scholars like Carl von Clausewitz and others had focused on the political basis of war. In recent times theorists, especially from the realist schools of thought have undertaken detailed analysis of power as the cause for conflicts and war. Among the notable ones are classical realists like E.H.Carr and Hans Morgenthau (63).
According to Morgenthau, international relations are always characterised by conflict, and present day periods of peace are more of an exception than a rule. His key assumption is that nature of international relations is such that life for the states is a constant struggle for power. He holds that that states, even during period of peaceful relations, are involved in strengthening their capabilities, against other states. Thus according to Morgenthau international politics is all the time characterised by the rise of power on one hand and a condition of general conflict on the other. In other word politics among nations is power politics and has a constant potential for conflict and war. Antonio Gramsci states that individuals are fundamentally committed to the existing order because one dominant class compels acceptance of a given way of life by all people and makes them believe that it is inevitable and desirable one. Class domination and class struggle based on economic inequality is the cause for conflict in Gramsci’s markedly Marxist perspective. He uses the concept of hegemony to explain the rise of conflict in society. For Gramsci hegemony, a process by which a dominant class seeks to organize social life to its own interest carries the seeds of conflict in it. (64) Kenneth Waltz developed the structuralist realist approach and was instrumental in carrying forward the analysis of power as the cause of conflict. (65) Waltz, was also instrumental in developing and elaborating many of the important principles of neorealist international relations theory, with a structural perspective. Subsequently, neorealists like Jack Snyder, Randall Schweller, Thomas Christensen and others took up further structuralist analysis of conflict. John Mearsheimer, in response to Waltz’s defensive realism, developed offensive realism, a structural theory which, unlike the Morgenthau’s classical realism, considers conflict as a result of anarchy in the international system, not a result of innate nature of humans. For Mearsheimer states are never satisfied with the power they possess, but seek hegemony to ensure their perpetual security. Another well known realist Stephen Walt developed the theory which is called the ‘Balance of Threat’ where threat is defined in terms of aggregate power, geographic
proximity, offensive power, and aggressive intentions. Gene Sharp, a well known writer of non-violent action, also utilizes the power theory to explain the division between rulers and subjects. He says that though the rulers exercise power, the subjects have the power to withdraw consent and thereby bring about political change. Sharp's theory of power goes beyond the structuralist discourse and instead of focusing on violent conflict highlights the power of non-violent action to effect change.

For last five hundred years the 'balance of power politics' has been an important tool of analysis of relations between nation-states in the international system and it has profoundly influenced international relations. The 'Balance of Power' theory has been very popular during the Cold War period. However in the post Cold War period many scholars felt that the theory was becoming irrelevant. But contrary to this view many scholars continued to use this theory in the post Cold War period to explain conflict at the international level. The trend to examine the current positions and future balance of power dynamics in international politics has remained strong and is used to analyse many international conflict in the post Cold War period. (66) Another power based theory to explain conflict has been the 'Power Transition' theory. This theory was first expounded by A F K Organski in 1958 in his work *World Politics* This theory is essentially about the cyclic nature of war. The theory looks at war in terms of power in the world politics. This theory in its present form describes the world politics as hierarchical with four kinds of states(a single dominant superpower state, an alliance of great powers, dominant regional middle powers, and small or weak powers) and looks at the shifting or transition in power between these power centers. The theory focuses on the cyclic nature of wars, and tries to understand how transition of power takes place between state players. The theory attempts to study the likelihood of war and the stability of alliances among nations to wage and win wars. To a large extent this theory follows the 'balance of power' approach to
understand and predict when wars are likely. The ‘Power Transition’ theory has led to the emergence of long cycle theory of war which explains trends between warring nations since the international system emerged. According to this theory, once a state has achieved hegemonic power it is challenged by another great power and this leads to a war to effect transition in power. This has occurred previously and will keep on recurring.

Such wars are likely to be of longest duration, and great intensity states the theory because when a challenger to the dominant power has achieved an approximate equality of power with the dominant state it will not be willing to accept the existing system and thus this will result in a prolonged war for power and dominance. The main assumption of this theory is that balance of power is unstable and within it lie the causes of war to achieve hegemony of power by the contending states. According to Organski an even distribution of political, economic, and military power between contending groups of states is more likely to increase the possibility of war. He holds that peace is more likely to prevail when there is an imbalance in the power of the states because between disadvantaged and advantaged states; the aggressor comes from a small group of dissatisfied strong countries; and it is the weaker, rather than the stronger, power that is most likely to be the aggressor. More recently, Eugene R. Wittkopf in his work World Politics: Trend and Transformation has analysed the past wars in relation to Power Transition theory.

True to the macro theory approach, political theorists especially the structural realists, focus on the use and exercise of power in many domains such as economic, political, military, and cultural to find how conflicts emerge from them. These theorists take a historical view and analyse many individual cases to arrive at their conclusions about the causes of conflict. These theories try to see how conflict arises out of group competition and the pursuit of power and resources by
contending groups. Evidently there are many theories with power perspective which been employed to understand the rise of wars and conflicts and include realist power theories balance of power theories, balance of threat/terror theories, power transition theories, deterrence theories, decision making and game theories. Power theories have been criticised for their over emphasis on power to the neglect of other factors that also have a bearing on rise of conflict.

ii) Rationalist theories of Conflict

Decision making and game theories are based on the belief that apart from power considerations outcomes are a result of rational choices made by rational actors. Thus theories like decision making and game playing are essentially Rationalist theories. Originally the rational actor model was developed by economists to understand and explain human economic behaviour. The important presupposition of these theorists was that people make choices and decisions on a rational basis based on informed choices and by weighing the opportunities. The Game theory based on the rational actor model is one of the best known rationalist approach at understanding rise of conflict. The Game theory assumes that there is a rational decision making process underlying all human conflicts and wars. Thomas Schelling has been one of the most effective practitioners of this approach. He speaks of communication, negotiation, information, and irrationality as playing a role in rise of conflict. He highlights that conflict also has elements of cooperation and cooperative engagements in it. The game theories try to understand the complexities of inter-group relationships especially in conflict by using game playing methodology. According to the Rationalist theories of war all those involved in a conflict are rational, and are looking out for a best possible outcome for themselves with least possible loss of life and property on their own side. Rationalist theories therefore work on certain notions such as reciprocity of war (Carl von Clausewitz), bargain (Thomas Schelling), information asymmetry
(Geoffrey Blainey) and so on. The Rationalist theories of war have been criticised for many reasons. For instance the rational cost-benefit calculations do not hold good in certain genocidal conflicts and more over the belief that actors in a conflict are always able to make rational choices is questionable.

iii) Marxist Theories of Conflict

Karl Marx put forward the concept of class war in which opposing classes contend and conflict resulting in the remaking of the social order. The struggle between the classes is both historic and materialistic. For Karl Marx and subsequent Marxists conflict has its roots in the class differences and in the exploitation of one class by another. The Marxism is simultaneously a theory trying to understand war and conflict and also a praxis which advocates war to restructure society through revolution of the workers. For Marx and Marxists conflict arises from class struggles going on throughout history. And hence the Marxist theory of conflict is also a historical theory of conflict. Marxist theory views wars as imperialist ventures of the dominating classes to enhance their power over the others. For the proponents of the Marxist theories conflict and wars are a natural outcome of the free market and class system, and will persist till the victory of the working class through a violent revolution which will encompass the entire world. Thus the Marxist analysis provides a different understanding of conflict which brings the historical and the political in an entirely new way. However the Marxist theories of conflict have been subjected to severe criticism for being too deterministic and excessively materialistic in their conceptualisation.

iv) Bargaining Theory of Conflict

Bargaining theory is generic theory of conflict. This theory is based on mathematical modelling and goes back a century. The theory of Bargaining is directly connected to Game theory and is focused on choice making. This theory has evolved over a long time and has become very complex. It revolves around
terms like strategy, aspirations, discreteness, risk aversion, cost-benefit, impatience, signalling, bluffing, concessions, payoffs, negotiations, information, communication, time preference, non-cooperation, equilibrium, and so on. The theory of Bargaining has developed because of contributions of many scholars like Zarmelo (1913), Zeuthen (1930), Hicks (1932), Nash (1953), Siegel (1957), Bishop (1964), Stahl (1972), Morgenstern (1973), Osborne (1985), Haller and Holden (1990), Fernandez and Glazen (1991), Myerson (1991), and Remy (1993). Many more have continued to develop this theory but seminal contributions have come from Schelling’s *Bargaining, Communication and Limited War* and *Strategy of Conflict* (1957) and Rubinstein’s *Perfect Equilibrium in a bargaining model* (1982) and Synder and Diesing’s *Conflict Among Nations*. This theory views the origins, conduct, and termination of war as a bargaining process. Most recent scholars have drawn on Rubinstein’s work (1982) in which he did an excellent analysis of the bargaining problem. The Bargaining theory has helped the development of a model of the origins of war in which it sees conflict and war as a result of bargaining breakdown. But this theory has also come under tremendous criticism for its highly mathematical and technical approach. The theory is criticised for making the problem of conflict which is complex even more difficult to understand by making it even more complex.

v) Diversionary Theory of Conflict

Diversionary theory of conflict also has a long existence. The diversionary theory has also seen a gradual development and has resulted in many different lines of explanations for conflict especially at the international level. The theory has witnessed contributions from a large number of scholars since the 1920s and include Kondratieff (1926), MacFie (1938), Simmel (1955), Coser (1956), (Mueller 1973; Choucri and North (1975); Blechman and Kaplan (1978), Doran (1983, 1985); Ostrom and Job (1986); Russett (1987, 1990), Goldstein (1988); Mansfield (1988); Blainey (1988); James and Oneal (1991); Morgan and Bickers
Most of the theories of diversionary conflict argue that there is a direct link between the internal problems and emergence of conflict. Some hold that lower rates of economic growth increase the risk of international conflict. At the same time others hold that higher rates of growth lead to international conflicts. The plank of the Diversionary theory is that the leaders seek to divert attention away from domestic problems such as a bad economy, political scandals and other problems and initiate wars with other states. Some of the theorists argue that wars are started by leaders to gain or increase support before the elections. Their main contention is that political leaders divert domestic discontentment sentiments onto other nations by waging a war. These theorists hold that in order to curtail internal discontent and frustration leaders make other countries as scapegoats by using the in-group/out-group dynamics and rally-the people against an outside enemy. Internal discontent may stem from rising inflation, unemployment, economic crises like foreign debt and other reasons. These theories thus focus on the use of diversionary tactics by leaders to wage wars and engender conflict. These theories of diversionary conflict try to study the benefits of diversionary tactics, and also focus on the costs associated with such behavior. The theorists of this school of thought seek to connect internal strife and problems with diversionary conflict. These theories analyse motives for diversionary wars such as leaders desire to remain in office, desire to use military force, role of the economy and such other aspects.
The theorists thus try to piece together the whole diversionary puzzle in interstate conflicts. The theory also exhibits contradictory trends like on one hand viewing lower rates of economic growth as increasing the risk of diversionary war and yet on the other hand wars arising out of higher rates of economic growth due to increased military spending. The diversionary theories of conflict generally hold that economic hardship are a key factor leading to interstate conflict. Some of the theorists have attempted to provide deductive explanations about how and when diversionary tactics are or might be employed.

vi) Expected Utility Theory of Conflict

Bueno de Mesquita and Lalman (1992) have put forward the expected utility theory of war which has become one of the most important theories of international conflict in recent times. This theory is linked to the game theoretic. This theory also seeks to understand conflict in relation to the expected results by the players in the game. This theory focuses on the question of utility in dyadic conflict scenarios. It concentrates on the risk attitude scores and utility values for states which have been waging wars.

The theory attempts to understand the expected utility data and predicts the International Interaction game equilibrium in any given dyad-year. This theory has been developed by Bueno de Mesquita and his associates since 1980s. This theory's development has been highlighted in the works of Bueno de Mesquita which include An Expected Utility Theory of Conflict (1980), The Contributions of the Expected Utility to the study of international Conflict (1988) and War and Reason: Domestique and International Imperative. The theory has also been criticized for its complexity and technicality.

vii) The Enemy System Theory
The Enemy System Theory developed by American psychiatrists and scholars of international relations, rests on an assumption that human beings have a fundamental psychological need to divide themselves as enemies and allies. (67) It is said to occur both at individual and group levels. It is an unconscious need which underlines all conscious relationships in a group and is particularly at work in the formation of ethnic or national group identities and behaviour. Thus, the theory is centred on identity which leads to a sense of us and them, friends and enemies, in-group and out-group. The theory also centres around the feeling of victimization by the groups towards the in-group or allies and demonisation towards the out-group or enemies, leading to conflict and violence. Scholars like Joseph V. Montville, Peter A. Olsson and Demetrios A. Julius have contributed to the development of conflict theory to understand the nature of conflict at macro level. This theory is quite sophisticated and is being used to explain a range of serious mass conflicts including terrorism and ethnic conflicts. This theory combines developmental psychology with international relations theory and goes beyond the older realist paradigms in international relations theory. The theory's value lies in using communal or ethno-national groups as an important unit of analysis to understand large scale conflict and violence in the world.

(8) Chaos Theories of Conflict

Robert Cooper in The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century (68) focuses his attention on the chaos and conflict in the world, especially during the 1990s. He puts forth the argument that the primary cause of conflict and chaos in the world is breaking down of the control of nation-states over violence and the rise of small non-state entities or groups wielding the ability to procure weapons of mass destruction. In trying to provide an answer to post Cold War period conflict Cooper explores the past successes of the West to cope with violence and conflict. In his analysis of the two western approaches to contain conflict, Cooper contrasts the American hegemonic methods using military force to effect changes in policies of threatening states to the European
approach of accommodating other societies on its periphery through outward
expansion, visible in the EU expansion. Cooper's main argument is that the
conflicts in the world are a result of the inability of the nation-states to reign in
the many new non-state groups avowing violence for all sorts of causes.

Charles Tilly (69), a historical sociologist, analyses the causes of conflict
within collectivities and between them. He argues that conflict results due to the
latent political identities getting activated among people who otherwise have been
cohabiting peacefully for long time. According to him violence and conflict
among people and nations emerges not so much due to pre-existing hatreds but
due to sudden shifting of social conditions leading to uncertainties or chaotic
conditions. He cites the example of how people tend to become violent when the
law enforcement authorities become incapable of enforcing agreement or police
the boundaries among the contending groups. He also argues that liberal
democracies that permit greater freedom and participation for the contending
groups actually help to reduce collective violence or conflict.

ix) Terror Theories of Conflict

During the post 9/11 period many writings have focused on the question of
terrorism and one of these early writing has been 'The Age of Terror: America and
the World after September 11' (70) in which several writers sought to explain this
new increase in global conflict following the same discourse of West versus
Muslim world. Writers like Fouad Ajami Fareed Zakaria, Michael Scott Doran,
Sandy Bergers and others attempt to find explanation for this conflict between
West and the Islamic protagonists.

Similarly, other writings in the same period, such as, 'How Did This Happen?
Terrorism and the New War' (71) and "To Prevail: An American Strategy for the
Campaign Against Terrorism" (72) undertook the same exercise of trying to
understand the new developments in the field of global conflict. All these, and
other similar works, by a plethora of authors and scholars, examined various
aspects and consequences of this new conflict. These writers, apart from trying, to analyse the events of 9/11 and suggest solutions, also tried to critique many of the standard interpretations to explain conflict between West and the Muslims. Michael Mandebbaum (73) challenged the leftist interpretations of West-Muslim conflict. During the immediate aftermath of 9/11, many of the supporters of the clash of civilization thesis came out openly to suggest that the 9/11 attacks were a vindication of Huntington’s thesis. The internet as well as print and electronic media increasingly insinuated the ‘Clash of Civilisations’ thesis as the reason for Al Qaeda’s attack on USA. And some of the writers slammed this approach. Niall Ferguson, a British historian and one of the writers on the “The Age of Terror”, strongly questioned the interpretation that the 9/11 attacks were the opening salvo of the clash of civilizations.

x) Identity Politics as cause of Conflict

Olivier Roy (74) discredits the civilization and culturalist approaches which suggest that Islam is a discrete, coherent and single entity. For Roy, the rise of political Islam and Jihadist movements is not an expression of Islamic Civilization in conflict with the West but “a consequence of and a reaction to sociological changes” According to Roy the conflict between Islamists and the West is essentially political in nature and not religious. Roy attributes the rise of violence in the Islamic nations to a re-invention of the idea of Jihad for a political purpose and is meant to serve the community or the ‘Umma’. He points out that most contemporary Islamist ideologues are not the ulemas or the clerics but former socialists and leftists, who have hijacked Islam and repackaged it for political motives which they had failed to achieve in the earlier instance. The thesis put forth by Roy to explain the Islamist-West conflict contradicts the culturalist and civilizational views. His thesis, based more on a political foundation, succeeds much better in explaining conflict between Islamist and the West. This thesis is
able to explain why a cultural, civilizational or religious world view (fundamentalism) does not necessarily have a political corollary (terrorism).

But even this extremely convincing sociological analysis of Roy with its great insightfulness, does not give a complete explanation or go to the root of the underlying processes that shape the community formation, whether ummah or any other. His thesis of Islamism as a political construct stops short of going beyond and exploring the foundation that support it. Roy does not convincingly explain how Islamism or Jehadi Islam has come to occupy the centre state in recent years from being a marginal and peripheral notion earlier. Roy’s sociological-political analysis of Islamism is limited and incomplete but yet certainly deals a death blow to the more shallower cultural-civilizational analysis, as has been put forward by Huntington and Bernard Lewis. In conclusion, it can be said that Roy’s thesis falls short of the full understanding of the political nature of communitarian enterprise, whether they be traditional Islam, West or for that matter any other. His work begs a more radical and a new question - what is the fundamental process that underlines community formation? It is political?

xi) Love Need Theory

Franco Fornari an Italian psychoanalyst considers conflict and war as the paranoid or projective “elaboration” of mourning. (Fornari 1975). He highlights the idea of the nation as a ‘motherland’ and people as the ‘children’. According to him the idea of nation when understood as a ‘mother’ plays an unconscious maternal role in the feelings of the inhabitants of that country. People develop attachment and adoration for the nation when it is viewed as ‘motherland’ and it evokes strong feelings of filial love towards the nation. The roots of the ‘sons of the soil’ theory lie in idolisation of the nation or land as a ‘mother goddess’.

According to Fornari the viewing of the nation as a ‘motherland’ also evokes a strong desire in the citizens to preserve and protect their ‘motherland’
which in the welfare context is seen as the provider of welfare. Fornari believes that war and violence develop out of the “love need” of the citizens and from their desire to preserve and defend the ‘motherland’ which is revered as sacred object worthy of dying for. The close identification between the individuals and the nation brings about a strong bond between the two and viewing of the nations as a sacred objects leads to generation of warfare between the inhabitants of different countries when they perceive that the other is threatening their ‘motherland’. Willingness to sacrifice one’s life for protection of the ‘motherland’ becomes the highest virtue, born out of the love for the ‘motherland’. Thus Fornari focuses on sacrifice as the essence of war. He highlights the astounding willingness of human beings to die for their ‘motherland’ and to give over their bodies to their nation. It is the extreme form of patriotism for the nation born out of the consuming desire to protect the ‘motherland’. In view of this Fornari calls war the “spectacular establishment of a general human situation whereby death assumes absolute value.” In which “death becomes a demonstrative process.” Or a demonstration of love for the ‘motherland’ born out of the ‘love need’ of the citizens of the nation. This idea of ‘fatherland’ or ‘motherland’ pervades the political and war discourse in many countries like Italy, Russia, Germany and India where the nation is symbolised as ‘Bharatmata’ or ‘MotherIndia’ for which the nationals are willing to make the supreme sacrifice of their life through waging a war to protect the dignity of their nation and increase its glory. This theory attracts the same criticisms which go for ultra-nationalism and extreme patriotism born out of identification of individual with the state.

C) Ethnological Theories of Conflict

i) Theories of Ethnic Conflict

Theories of ethnic conflict had become a major part of macro theories of conflict during the 1990s when ethnic conflicts were on the rise. The ethnic theories generally look at the grouping of peoples on ethnic lines and how and
why they come into conflict. In the world, people generally categorise themselves as being distinct from others and view the others as out-group or enemy to be contended with, if necessary violently. One of the leading theorists of the ethnic theories of conflict has been Donald Horowitz. In his work Ethnic Groups in Conflict, he has analysed ethnic conflicts in the developing world, and attempted to explain the backdrop against which ethnic conflict occurs: Horowitz states that in the post-colonial period, world has witnessed rise of ethnic conflicts where contending ethnic groups have tried to acquire power and gain control of the state to perpetuate their kind and subjugate the others, often through violent conflicts and wars.

Thus according to Horowitz the main goal of ethnic conflicts is to take control of the state in order to achieve dominance and meet their needs generally at the cost of other contending ethnic groups. The result has been ruthless ethnic conflicts involving ethnic cleansing through organised genocide. The conflict of ethnic type is severe in highly divided and polarised societies, says Horowitz. He has studied how such conflicts lead to execution of ethnic political agendas in every aspect of administration and public life. According to Horowitz societies can be grouped into two categories or systems - ranked and unranked systems. He says that in the ranked systems type of societies one ethnic group has complete domination over another but in the unranked systems two ethnic groups exhibit stratification between their elites and masses. He then says that when ethnic conflict breaks out in unranked groups these ethnic groups seek political sovereignty by using violence to exclude or exterminate the other ethnic opponents. The main objective behind such ethnic conflicts he says is to bring about the establishment of a homogenous ethnic society. He says that such ethnic conflict is based on the zero sum game in which there is only one winner.
Walker Connor, another theorist of ethnic conflict school has also focused on the ethno-nationalist origins of conflict in many parts of the world. According to him, while religion, economic deprivation and such other factors have a bearing on ethnic conflict, the most important factor that contributes to ethnic conflict is the opposition of ethno-national identities. He says that ethnic conflicts are defined by the strong emotions of ethno-national identities of the contending groups. He says that the intensity of hatred and violence in the ethnic conflicts arises from the strong emotions linked to the 'enemy' discourse. Connor also holds that the driving force behind the ethno-national conflicts more than its leaders, is its masses. In other words, he says that ethnic conflict is not elite driven but mass driven. He says "The essence of nationalism is not to be sought in the motives of elites who may manipulate nationalism for some ulterior end, but rather in the mass sentiment to which elites appeal." (76) He holds that the leaders are not free to make choices but are restricted and even controlled by the feelings, emotions and desires of the ethnic masses. He thus concludes that the key to ethnic conflicts is not the leaders but the masses who make up the ethnic groups and who desire to dominate.

Some other scholars like Michael Mann (77) have also focused on ethnicity issue as the cause of conflict especially in democracies. He speaks of "danger zone" that result from clash between rival ethnic groupings fighting for the same territory. The ethnic conflict theories have also come under intense criticism for being too focused on the identity politics and ignoring other vital factors such as economics which tend to have contrary influences.

ii) Theory of Ethnic Hatred or Ethnic War

Stuart J. Kaufman (78) tries to understand conflict in the post Cold War world in a different manner. He points out, using the example of Russians and Tartars (Muslims) how civilizational paradigm does not explain the conflict. For Huntington this Russian – Tartar conflict is based on the civilisational hatred,
evidenced by historical events that had occurred from the thirteenth century onwards such as invasion of Russia by Mongols, attack on Tartars by Ivan the Terrible of Russia and Stalinist deportation of Tartars. He says that the conflict in Russia, between Russians and Chechens, has many causes: the collapse of Soviet federation, the end of authoritarianism, the re-emergence of old quarrels, the meddling of outside powers, political demagoguery, etc. Kaufman, in analyzing the conflict in the post communist world, which is also the post Cold War era, has thrown new light and ventured a new explanation to understand why conflicts arise in the world. First of all, Kaufman explains that the contemporary conflicts are not primarily due to the ancient troubles or even civilizational differences. In trying to demolish the myth of ethnic warfare or civilisational conflict, Kaufman asks “Given the fact that every ethnic groups has been hard done by, at some point in its history, why have only some of the aggrieved become aggressors?”

According to Kaufman, there are probably four reasons why conflicts arise — an ancient hatred among the ethnic groups, the power of unscrupulous and manipulative politicians who stand to profit from conflict, contests over economic resources between the poor and the rich communities and a security dilemma in which bereft of law enforcing authorities, survival becomes a self-help game, which in turn triggers a similar response in contending groups leading to conflict or war. However, Kaufman says that each of these four causes are quite insufficient in themselves to explain why conflicts or wars arise or have risen in the post Cold War period. He states that while people or ethnic groups do feel strongly about their ethnicity or religion or civilization, very few convinced ones go the extent of exterminating their rivals. What he says is that being had at one's neighbour is rarely enough to make people take up arms. And if at all they do so they do usually only to defend something they stand to lose than to get something they lack. He argues that it is the maniacal leaders who play an important role in civil wars or conflicts between different people or communities. Economic
grievances and security dilemma have a greater potential to cause violence and conflict but even these do not occur extensively, he says.

Kaufman puts forward an explanation for conflict, which he calls as the "symbolic politics" of conflict, which is about how existing beliefs about the other ethnic groups are used to justify violence, and when the violence really occurs these belief are sought to be confirmed and are used as a fuel for generating future conflicts.

Kaufman, basing himself on several empirical studies, argues that communal or ethnic violence results from three conditions — unscrupulous politicians using pre-existing ethnic myths about other ethnic groups to mobilise people on cultural lines, fear of being economically, politically and demographically swamped by other ethnic groups and a reasonably long period of mobilization and security building by a community or an ethnic group. Thus Kaufman postulates a mixture of causes leading to ethnic or communal conflicts in the post Cold War era— myths which can be manufactured and mustered, politicians unscrupulously using these fabricated myths to mobilize, economic fears and a weak state machinery to ensure law and order between the contending ethnic groups.

Thus Kaufman makes a case for ethnic wars using the idea of "symbolic politics". Kaufman uses the idea of suffering by the particular groups, myth of oppression and revenge dividing the groups on ethnic lines, coupled with fears of survival and security by the groups and willing politicians or leaders to take up the cause and organize the violence, as the underlying cause of conflict.

In appreciation, it can be said that Kaufman's 'symbolic politics' thesis offers an alternative analysis of communal violence and is in stark contrast to Huntington's civilization thesis to explain conflict in the world. Both approach the same problem but very differently. Of course, like Huntington's thesis Kaufman's thesis is also not free of flaws and has also been criticized.
Many scholars have questioned the whole concept of ‘ethnic war’. These scholars certainly concede that there are ethnic groups and that these groups do occasionally have conflicts with each other, but they do not agree that there are enduring conflicts among the ethnic groups. These so called ‘ethnic conflicts’ are relatively less frequent and far in between, hold these scholars. They therefore, question Kaufman’s thesis trying to explain the existence of a distinct category of conflict called as ‘ethnic wars’. The critics of Kaufman’s thesis hold that the idea of ‘ethnic wars’ is more contingent on thinking (within academic and political circles) in a particular place and time. The ethnic conflicts of nineties were of much shorter duration and resolved quickly than some other long raging conflicts in the world. Thus the critics opine that the rise of ‘ethnicity’ thesis to explain conflict is more a result of sudden interest in wars in post communist era in the Balkan regions (and hence determined by particular region and time) than out of any attempt at genuine theorizing about the fundamental causes of conflict in the world. The critics like Charles King, while accepting the long existing phenomenon of communal violence, refuse to concede that the so-called “ethnic wars” are discernible universal phenomenon. King says that “viewing such conflicts as essentially different from any other instances of large-scale violence within a single state can be misleading” (79)

The critics of Kaufman’s thesis challenge the very notions of ‘cultural myth’ and ‘symbolic politics’ put forth by him to explain the basis for conflict, on the grounds that the myths are manufactured in relatively short time and usually after the violence has already commenced. The critics therefore reject Kaufman’s thesis of ‘symbolic politics’ and ‘mythology’ to explain the rise of hatred among ethnic groups that leads to ethnic conflicts and wars. Their argument is that in most of the conflicts – ethnic, ideological or social, the groups involved have the capacity to manufacture and propagate their own inevitability. One of the most important criticisms levelled against Kaufman’s ‘ethnic wars’ thesis is that while ‘symbolic politics’ may be used to whip up the hatred in specific groups, the
violence inflicted or the resultant war cannot be sustained or perpetuated without the support of the leaderships and the state. Thus the notion that, symbol-manipulation or myth-generation leads to large-scale and, enduring conflict, as an explanation for conflict, is rejected by most scholars. The argument of the critics, who reject this alternative thesis to explain conflict in post Cold War world, is that this thesis is an afterthought or post occurrence analysis, rather than a reliable tool or thesis trying to explain the causes as to why large-scale violence of whatever kind breaks out. The critics hold that while out-break of conflicts may have different causes, among them being “myths, fear and opportunities”, the sustaining of the conflict over long period of time have entirely different reasons and which may be of the banal kind such as “clashing economic interests, politicians’ attempts to most opponents, lots of young men with nothing to do and easy access to guns”. In case of long draw out conflicts, the critics believe that, the ethnic myths and fears become largely irrelevant and cease to fuel the conflict. They contend that there may be other better explanations and reasons for this.

D) Communal Theories of Conflict

Pippa Norris, and Ronald Inglehart. (80) using extensive survey data from across the world, have concluded that the rise of religion and decline of secularism in politics throughout the world and the “expanding gap” between the secular and religious societies poses serious implications to the world and is likely to be the cause of future conflicts. The rise of identity politics and global religiososity is a recurrent theme among many contemporary scholars trying to explain the conflict in the new world order. Juergensmayer (81) holds that with the end of Cold War, many new international conflicts have risen with appeal to nationalism and religion. He contends that new conflict is between religious nationalism of mostly non-Western Islamic world and secular nationalism of the West. He seeks to combine the universalist religious claim to particularist nationalist aspirations and argues that this is the driving force behind new conflicts in the world. His line of
arguments and underlying discourse about religion driven conflict is apparently similar to that of Huntington except that instead of speaking of civilisational terminology he focuses on religious nationalism.

Similarly, Anthony W. Marx (82) highlights the fact that nationalism results more out of exclusion (of the others) than from inclusion (of the own) especially in the context of religious discord and conflict. He says that the state and its leaders strengthen their power through “turning religious passion into nationalism” The theories suggesting religious differences as the cause of inter-group conflict have been around for a long time and several scholars and thinkers have dwelt on this issue. These theories are criticised for laying too much emphasis on religion as a dividing factor and neglecting its unifying and pacifist tendencies. Also these theories are criticised on the grounds that in a world where many do not believe in religion or practice religion or believe that religion is something personal, religion may not sufficiently account for explaining rise of conflict between groups. Scholars have pointed out that religion has often been high-jacked by political elite, who are not necessarily religious and may even be anti-religious or former leftists and communists and hence attributing rise of conflict to only religion may not be fair and true.

Conclusions

Evidently, scores of theories about conflict have been put forward to explain the existence of mass scale group conflicts and international conflicts. While the micro or behavioural theories have examined in the light of the individual subconscious processes, the macro or classical theories have focused on the conscious interaction among groups. The generic classical theories of conflict have concentrated on understanding and explaining the exercise of power, the use of force in inter-group relations and have been useful in explaining acts and events which have often shocked the world. But the weakness of the classical theories has been that they do not answer questions about subconscious motivational
factors. Ethnic and communal conflict theories have proliferated during the last two decades in trying to explain the many conflicts and wars taking place in the world. Very limited attempts have been witnessed in synthesising both the behavioural and classical approaches to explain the phenomenon of conflict in the world and hence new breakthroughs have been rare.

There are many different ways of explaining conflict in the world and several scholars have put forward their own ideas to explain conflict in the world and some of these are much more convincing than the one proposed by Samuel Huntington. The problem is that there still is no cohesive and comprehensive theory on conflict in human society, especially at the inter-group level and no grand theory of conflict is anywhere in sight. This situation has led to contending approaches being offered by many scholars but none seems to have been able to address the complexity of human conflict. Though, some theories seem to offer better explanations for conflict than others, they are in no way wide-ranging and this leaves enough room for many others to venture newer explanations of conflict in the world and many have chosen to take that path, one among them has of course been Samuel Huntington.