CHAPTER- I
INTRODUCTION

Conflict Transformation Theory

"There is no way to peace."

"Peace is the way."
- A. J. Muste

Peace and Conflict

The last decades of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of a number of political and intellectual movements led by such diverse groups as the nationalities, ethnic communities, indigenous peoples, feminists, gay men and lesbians and the environmentalists, etc. These movements with different ideologies, cultures, practices, life-styles, views and ways of life represent a struggle for freedom, self-determination and dignity and against contingent, ideologically biased and oppressive views and practices claiming false objectivity and universal validity. These are movements for liberation. These movements have been waging for recognition of the inherent individuals' rights and collective rights as a whole. However, the struggle for freedom, self-determination, human rights and dignity is met with modern states' coercive forces and repressive measures. And it is true, the conflict between these movements and the modern states continued until today. Some of these world's conflicts have been resolved while several conflicts are yet to see peace, peace which are informed by the principles of human rights, liberty, equality, justice and truth.

The questions of conflict and peace have captured the world's political scenario for the past several decades. People have seen and experienced enough of bloodsheds and gun battles on the earth's surface. People of different national origins have suffered immensely because of continuing violence and gun shooting. Million of people around the world have become mere victims of power politics in the international political

affairs. Wars and violence had dominated the political system across the continents. How do we get out of this culture of violence and killings? We must seek out for a better option than this cruel acts and worse reality. The alternative to this violent situation is none other than peace itself and cooperation among nations and peoples. The quest for peace with justice and truth has to be made a forceful motive in the hearts and minds of the people. And, it is certainly true that the issues of peace and conflict have mounted in intensity and urgency with the passage of time and events. It is increasing felt that there are no sufficient mechanisms and remedial measures in rooting out all these conflicts around the world. The international community ought to have different policies and strategies to transform various kinds of conflicts happening at different context and scenarios. There is a need for all discipline of studies particularly the social sciences discipline to vigorously pursue and search out for a theory and practice which will transcend the present inadequacy in addressing these varied conflicts and violence in the world.

The euphoria over the end of the Cold War that began in the fall of 1989 which prompted Francis Fukuyama to announce “The End of History”, heralding a “triumph of liberalism,” and John Mueller’s thesis that major wars between nations are on the decline calling this prolonged avoidance of war since the days of the Roman Empire “History’s greatest non-event”. However, these understandings were not shared by peace researchers because many new types of conflict were emerging. This was conceptualised by Harold Lasswell in his Garrison-State Thesis early in the post Second World War. Despite the fact that East Timor-Indonesian conflict was resolved in 2002 where the right to Self-Determination of a struggling people is recognized by the United Nations, we are still faced with the hard reality of several unresolved protracted conflicts at different geographical locations. These old conflicts are different in nature. Some conflicts are over socio-economic transformation while some others are over cultural preservation and development. And yet, conflicts over political identities or the

contestations between minority nationalities and the states has become one of the most complex questions for all social science disciplines in particular and the international community in general.

Most of the scholars, academicians of various disciplines and policy-makers depict these protracted conflicts as internal or intra-state conflict. However, such ‘internalist’ accounts of state-related activities and problems have often been criticized for neglecting extra-state or international factors in the analysis of so-called ‘domestic’ issues, and the notion that identity-based conflict is a purely domestic matter has been dismissed as ‘simply one more statist myth’. The end of the Cold War left a vast number of researchers and practitioners struggling to understand why the world was not a more peaceful way. The ‘New World Order’ had not emerged as planned. In addition, conflict studies began to analyse and code a new class of conflicts; those referred to as ‘ethnic conflict’. When it became clear that this new class of conflict (Actually it is not new; rather, it is newly noticed) often incorporated identities not associated strictly with ethnicity, other classifications emerged, among them ‘ethnopolitical conflict’, ‘communal conflict’, ‘protracted social conflict’, and finally the new-common appellation identity-based conflict.

---


Indeed, these conflicts can be rightly "called inter-nations conflicts or what Rothman called identity-based conflict." The use of the terms inter-nations conflicts or identity-based conflict instead of ethnic or internal conflicts would be more appropriate for such conflicts as far as the conflicting parties, political histories and contexts are concerned. Indeed, many of these conflicts cannot be totally depicted as internal conflicts due to the fact that the conflicts transcend the internal boundary of a country or state, and the problems are not domestic issues. The conflicts are more to do with political and other related issues. Among other things, the Indo-Naga conflict is a case in point. This chapter attempts to study the Indo-Naga political conflict in a critical way. The nature of the Indo-Naga conflict transcends the internal boundaries of India and Burma because the Nagas have been living in both India and Burma (Myanmar) historically before the British colonialism. However, since the departure of the British in 1947, the Nagas have been resisting the occupations of 'neo-colonial India and Burma', and their totalizing agencies within nation state projects. The protracted conflicts of the Nagas’ struggle for their right to self-determination could be easily gauged if BBC news which periodically reports the struggle for complete political independence is any indication which it characterizes as "the forgotten war in Nagaland" and "the world’s longest running conflict."9

Citing a similar kind of conflicts attempted to absolve within the totalizing force can be enunciated through, in the Northern Ireland case, (the) early proposals viewed the conflict as merely an internal one; hence, the British attempt to establish an internal solution (e.g., the Stormont Parliament of 1973). When the British (and Irish) governments perceived the conflict as having not only an internal component but also an external one, the structures that they proposed became less "Consociational" and more incorporative of overlapping identities.10

---

The British-Irish Peace Agreement creates four new democratic institutions for Northern Ireland: a Northern Ireland Assembly, a North/South Ministerial Council, a British-Irish Council, and a British-Irish Intergovernmental Conference. Additionally, the text of the Agreement includes links to the European Union, the fifth institution in which sovereignty is pooled and promotes overlapping identities (cross-categories). Unlike the prescription of internal institutions for consociational governments, this agreement specifically has an international institutional component. Furthermore, Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish constitution have been amended to delete reference to the goal of complete unification of the island of Ireland. The British Government has also agreed to respect any free decision of the majority of the people of both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland as to the relationship between Northern Ireland and Britain.

The governments which are parties to these conflicts in different countries have applied varied mechanisms of constitutional autonomy, developmental packages and the age old tactic of counter-insurgency to solve the problems. Several attempts have been made to manage, resolve, and transform the conflicts at various levels ranging from regional to international system. However, various attempts at solving these conflicts have stooped to inaccurate analysis, poor definitions, and wrong perception of the conflicts in the various conflict zones. These unsuccessful stories of the conflict resolution attempts stemmed mainly because methods and models used are traditional in nature and practice. Traditional methods of conflict resolution tend to be ineffective in dealing with protracted social or political conflicts, because they do not deal the structural inequalities of the system or the deprivation of human needs that failed to focus primary roots of the symptoms. It is even argued that the use of traditional approaches, which focus on resources and power, politics, to resolve identity conflicts often has the effect of exacerbating or prolonging the struggle. It is clear that conflicts involving identity do, in fact, contain interests; however, as conflict theorist Kelman has written extensively with reference most specifically to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, 

11 Ibid. p. 589
bargaining over those issues without prior and adequate attention first to identity issues has the effect of further polarizing the parties. Ross further describes the need to sequence interventions in intractable conflicts by first beginning with methods that address the 'Psychocultural' dynamics of the situation prior to efforts to settle the more material and tangible interests at stake.

The field of international relations and dispute resolution takes insufficient note of these newer approaches dealing with identity-based conflicts, perhaps traditional methods of resolution which worked well in interstate conflicts where identity issues were not central, are not the best, or at least not the initial, tools to use in the types of challenging wars seen today, wars which are so centrally rooted in relatively non-negotiable issues of identity. It is, therefore, imperative that the study needs to identify suitable and workable approaches so that the people are emancipated from the repression, exploitation, subjugation, 'carrot and stick' policy, denial of the recognition of their identities, values and their historical and political rights.

Various Conflict Theorists and their Theories

Political scientists have long recognized that conflict and the effort to resolve it are at the heart of politics, and much ink has been spilled in attempts to explain it. In the literature of comparative politics, the reemergence of nationalism or ethnonationalism in the last twenty years has raised particular questions about the sources of identity-based conflict. Even more recently, international relations scholars have asked why "protracted" conflicts are so much more difficult to resolve than the more manageable ethnic divisions addressed by consociational theorists. Protracted conflicts take a very

---

15 Jay Rothman and Marie L. Olson, Ibid. p. 291.
different form from their milder cousins. They are bloody (the violence often involving paramilitary organizations); they signal the loss of authority and eventual breakdown of governing institutions; and they trigger a fragmentation of public opinion, the growth of radical counter-elites, and the evolution of a centrifugal political system. Moreover, protracted conflicts tend to be intractable, since resolving them requires warring identity/ethnic groups to make concessions they can not contemplate while under threat.

Though all the cases of protracted conflict cited in the new literature of international relations are rooted in ethnic divisions, there has been little attempt to integrate this literature and the older comparative research on identity or ethnic conflict. Seeking to synthesize these two perspectives, Elizabeth Crighton and Martha Abele Mac Iver proposed a model that explains the development and persistence of protracted identity or ethnic conflicts. They compare two cases, Lebanon and Northern Ireland, to derive hypotheses about the dynamics of these conflicts and to evaluate strategies for accommodation. Though Lebanon and Northern Ireland have been indirectly contrasted by Lijphart, who views them respectively as successful (until 1975) and unsuccessful examples of the consociational model, they argue that Lijphart's cross-sectional approach underestimates the underlying similarities of the two cases and fails to account for the continued failure of elites to reach accommodation. Their longitudinal study offers a more dynamic explanation and several promising hypotheses for further research.

They derived their explanatory model from the inductive historical analysis to follow, but in order to provide a conceptual roadmap for the reader they preface the analysis with a summary of the model. Both view protracted conflicts as "identity-driven" the result of an underlying "fear of extinction" that grows out of the

---

experience of being a vulnerable ethnic group living with memories of persecution and massacre. Identity-driven fears are not reserved to ethnic minorities but also motivate groups comprising a plurality or even a majority of the population in conflict. According to them, in cases of protracted conflict, these fears set in train two processes which ultimately destroy public order and make it very difficult to restore.

The first arises when one identity or ethnic group manages (often with the help of outside powers and creative gerrymanders) to establish its political dominance through institutions which protect its identity. The institutionalization of domination may take different forms, but it occurs most readily where a demobilized mass public offers no challenge to the political order. Dominant institutions tend, therefore, to control conflict in the manner of "coercive regimes," which enjoy high compliance but low support.21 Since they are tied to the primacy of one ethnic group or coalition, they can not accommodate changes in the distribution of power between social groups. The resultant inflexibility and exclusiveness (institutional underdevelopment) leaves them poorly equipped to cope with the second process common to cases of protracted conflict, social and political mobilization.

Mobilization spawns groups willing to challenge the traditional system of ethnic dominance, so it often triggers conflict by exacerbating preexisting social tensions. Mobilized by charismatic leaders within the context of changing social forces, newly politicized groups place great strain on institutions never designed to absorb such change so rapidly. As Huntington argues, such a situation is a recipe for political instability.22 Attempts by reform-minded leaders within the dominant ethnic group to address demands made upon the system by the newly mobilized usually succeed only in fragmenting the dominant coalition. Counter-mobilization by disaffected conservatives

Though "fear of extinction" may seem an extreme term to some. We agree with Horowitz that the deeply rooted fear of a loss of group identity does indeed merit such an expression. In the minds of many ethnic minorities, cultural "extinction" is akin to physical extinction. Elizabeth Crighton and Martha Abele Mac Iver, p. 127.

22 Samuel P. Huntington, Political Order in Changing Societies, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1968, in Elizabeth Crighton and Martha Abele Mac Iver, p. 128
within that coalition only fans the flames of ethnic conflict. Violence directed against the dominant group by aggrieved minorities adds fuel to the fire by intensifying the fears that gave rise to conflict in the first place. Public order may break down completely in the face of such a pattern of defensive mobilization. While intervention by outside actors, often motivated by irredentism, exacerbates such conflicts, it does not explain them. Ethnic conflicts become "protracted" because of failure to deal effectively with the underlying identity-related fears of dominant groups.

But what is this conflict? The term conflict has a variety of meanings. It is often used as a synonym for incompatible or irreconcilable. For example, we often refer to conflicting values, beliefs, or loyalties. A conflict starts when there exist two different sets of interests, aims, values, and beliefs. In other words, a conflict is a state of affairs characterized by the existence of incompatible aspect of relationship between people, groups and nations. While there is a vast and rapidly expanding literature on conflict, it is clear that research in the subject still suffers from two major shortcomings.23 First, apart from the efforts of scholars such as Johan Galtung and John Burton, relatively little attention is paid to the development of an adequate and integrated theory of conflict. This is a significant shortcoming of modern social science, particularly given the insights now being derived from research in several disciplines. Second, Western literature still pays scant attention to non-Western conceptions of conflict. Given the prevalence of conflict in the international system, it is clear that understanding the ways in which different cultures conceptualize conflict is vitally important. Clearly, it would seem, an adequate theory of conflict cannot be culture-specific.

The liberal will hold that the conflicts which arise within society come from competing interests and goals, and are not the result of conflicts between different groups, classes (whose existence is denied), etc., or generated by underlying structures and social inequalities. The individual and the individual's behaviour is the focus, not society; a focus on knots, rather than wed. Therefore, responsibility lies with the

Critical of the liberal, Marxian focuses upon the structures and relations which give rise to conflict. It opens the way for understanding systems, and explains social and economic inequalities as resulting from differences in control of the means of production; as long as those differences exist, conflict along class lines will exist. Marx’s concepts of alienation, exploitation and inequality emphasize ‘structural violence’, not just direct, personal.

Antonio Gramsci, a noted Marxian scholar, who rejected the excessive emphasis on economic determinism, introduced the theory of “ideological hegemony”, which is carried out not only through control over the means of production, but encompasses a whole range of values, attitudes, beliefs, cultural norms, and legal precepts. According to this theory, it is the ideological hegemony of the ruling class that when challenged, gives rise to conflict. Apart from these general liberal and Marxian definitions, some important definitions of various scholars are inevitable. In Max Weber’s classical formulation, a social relationship is in conflict when one actor carries out their own will against the resistance of another party. For Lewis Coser, conflict is a struggle over values, status, power, and resources “in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralise, injure or eliminate their rivals.” The definitions of Weber and Coser are traditional in nature of understanding conflict.

Burton has suggested precise definitions of the words dispute and conflict. According to him, a dispute is a situation in which the issues are negotiable, compromise is possible, and consideration of altered institutions and structures is not necessary. It is a normal and constructive feature of social life. In contrast, conflict is deeply rooted in

---

25 Ibid., pp. 259-260
26 Ibid., pp. 260
29 Lewis Coser, *The Functions of Social conflict*, Ibid. p. 64
human needs.\textsuperscript{30} It involves issues that are not negotiable: human needs that cannot be compromised.\textsuperscript{31} Burton regards the distinction between disputes and conflicts as vitally important even though the two are sometimes linked, as they are when disputes are symptoms of underlying conflicts.\textsuperscript{32} In his view therefore, conflict- including that which occurs in international system- is not over objective differences of interest that involve scarcity, although it is often defined in these terms by the parties themselves.

Conflict occurs over needs, including the needs for identity and security that are not in short supply, although the tactics used in any attempt to satisfy these needs, such as a demand for territory, may involve shortages.\textsuperscript{33} In short, according to Burton, traditional thinking led to the belief that conflict was about interests only and that for that reason the individual could be socialized and coerced. What both theory and practice reveal, however, is that protracted conflicts are over nonnegotiable human needs. Therefore, it is impossible to socialize individuals into behaviour that runs counter to their needs.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Changing conceptions of security}

Ideas about the meaning of security changed over the course of the twentieth century, especially in the last two decades.\textsuperscript{35} In the Cold War, the primary security referent was the state. When both sides had vast nuclear arsenals and large conventional armed forces at their disposal, the major threats to state survival were seen as external. As the Cold War drew to an end, however, it was recognised that threats to the basic values of a community were neither solely military in origin nor always external to the state, and that the state itself could be a primary source of threat to a community or

\textsuperscript{33} Robert J. Burrowes, 1996, Ibid., p. 67
individual. Indeed, far more people were killed by their own states than in inter-state wars in the second half of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{36}

This recognition led to the concept of human security, linked to the protection of human rights. In the 1990s, the idea that international peace and security depended on the prevention of wide-scale abuse of human rights was increasingly emphasised. The notion of sovereignty as authority over people and territory was modified to embrace the idea of sovereignty as responsibility, where a state has a recognised duty to provide for basic human rights in its own territory and to be concerned about the abuse of rights elsewhere.\textsuperscript{37} The concept of security places individual at the centre. The protection and safeguard of individual rights has become quintessential for global peace and security. Insecurity increased when human rights are sacrificed, and human security is enhanced where the rule of law and human rights are respected. It can be said that conflicts deepened because of the abuse and violations of individual rights at different conflict zones. In order to realise human security, coercive measures adopted by states need to be de-emphasised to pave the way for dialogue, interaction and cooperation.

For Azar, “Protracted Social Conflicts” arises from the historical context, and from the denial of basic human needs of access, identity and security, as well as through the role played by the state, international political and economic linkages and the military in politics.\textsuperscript{38} If the state and the minority nationalities choose suppression and armed resistance as their strategies, a conflict may then become destructive. Destructive conflict then results in a more dependent and exploitative pattern of development, a distorted pattern of governance and a militarized form of politics. According to Azar, this leads to the further denial of basic needs. The result is a protracted cycle of institutional deformation and destructive conflict. On the other hand, if there is sufficient capacity in governance and society, if politics is not too militarized, and if the international

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid. p. 118
environment is supportive, states may instead choose accommodation, and the identity
groups may choose political forms of confrontation. This can lead to a pattern of
constructive conflict that in turn promotes legitimate decision-making capacity,
strengthen autonomous development and sustains civil rather than military politics. For
Azar, all these are conducive to the meeting of basic needs. The model goes beyond
simple and behavioural explanations and suggests how pattern of conflicts interact with
the satisfaction of human needs, the adequacy of political and economic institutions and
the choices made by political actors.

According to Johan Galtung, conflict is much more than what meets the naked
eye as ‘trouble’, direct violence. There is also the violence frozen into structures, and the
culture that legitimises violence. 39 Direct violence will be in the form of real or
threatened military action against other parties whether provoked or not, whether to settle
conflict or initiate it. Structural violence or indirect violence comes from the social
structure itself-between humans, between sets of humans (societies), between sets of
societies (alliances, regions) in the world. The two major forms of outer structural
violence are well known from politics and economics: repression and exploitation.
Behind all this is cultural violence: all of it symbolic, in religion and ideology, in
language and art, in science and law, in media and education. The function is simple
enough: to legitimise direct and structural violence. 40

In fact we are dealing with violence in culture, in politics and in economics, and
then with direct violence. We need a concept broader than violence, and also broader
than peace. Power is that concept. Cultural power moves actors by persuading them what
is right and wrong; economic power by the carrot method of quid pro quo; military (or
‘force’ in general) power by the stick method of ‘or else’; and political power by
producing decisions. 41 For Galtung, the “conflict triangle” entails three elements: the
attitudinal aspects, the behavioural aspects, and the conflict itself. Moreover, conflict,

39 Galtung, Johan, Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilisation, PRIO,
40 Ibid. p. 2
41 Ibid. p. 2
according to Galtung, is incompatibility in a goal-seeking system. These goals include needs, values, interests, although basic conflicts involve basic human needs, such as, security, freedom, welfare and identity.\(^{42}\) Patriotism, as opposed civic nationalism, is one source of such an incompatibility as it fosters the myth or feeling of belonging rather than law or reason.\(^{43}\) In Galtung’s view, conflict resolution depends on correcting the steep Self-Other attitudinal gradient on both side, correcting the behavioural polarization and destructive machinery, and removing the goal incompatibilities.\(^{44}\) The incompatibility which arises between parties may be eliminated by transcending the contradiction, by compromise, by deepening or widening the conflict structure, and by associating or dissociating the actors.\(^{45}\) To fight against direct, structural and cultural violence, the strategy Galtung advocates is non-violent revolution.\(^{46}\)

According to Hugh Miall, Conflict Theories, if viewed narrowly, will be seen to concentrate overly on the conflict party level, focusing on parties, issues, goals and so on to the exclusion of the context within which the conflict is situated as well as of the factors which characterize the self-fueling of conflicts, e.g. markets and cultures of violence.\(^{47}\) It is possible, however, to add more representation of the background, for example building on Galtung’s simple triangular formulation of conflict. On to ‘contradiction’, we can build ‘context’; on to ‘attitudes’ ‘memory’ and on to ‘behaviour’ ‘relations’. This recognizes that the meaning of a conflict depends largely on the context out of which it arises. The attitudes the parties have towards one another are shaped by previous relationships. The behaviour they adopt is not purely reactive but is based on their memory of what has happened in the past, expectations of what may happen in the future.\(^{48}\)


\(^{46}\) Ibid. pp. 114-124


\(^{48}\) Ibid., p. 8
The context, according to Miall, of conflict includes the society in conflict and the wider international and regional level. Within the society, crucial background aspects are culture, governance arrangements, institutions, social roles, norms, the rules, and codes in place in a society, its path of development. For example, in conflicts involving ethnicity, minorities or challenges to the state structures, it is the very structure of the state that is at issue. As globalization proceeds, local conflicts are inevitably influenced by wider economic and political forces. These have tended to strengthen trade investment and technological networks in some areas of the world, but also to marginalize other areas such as Africa and the former Soviet Union. The result of weakening of states and economies in these areas and, in some cases, the creation of a real crisis of the state. Relationships involve the whole fabric of interaction within the society in which the conflict takes place as well as beyond to other societies while memories are part of each party’s socially constructed understanding of the situation, shaped by culture and learning, discourse and belief. The way groups remember and construct their past is often central to the mobilization for conflict, and thus a crucial matter to address in reconciliation and cultural traditions work. Context, relationships and memories are all part of the issue connecting the contradictions, attitudes and behaviours, within the wider background in space and time. He builds on Varynen’s approach of the five types of conflict transformation, such as, Context Transformation, Structural Transformation, Actor Transformation, Issue Transformation and Personal Changes of Heart or Mind within Individual Leaders or Small Groups

The human needs for identity, recognition, security (human security unlike state security) and personal development play a particular important role in the analysis of contemporary conflicts and in designing of strategies to transform them. In recent years, the suppression or the deprivation of the human need for identity has come to be seen as the primary source of identity-based conflict. In this context, the theory of threatened group identity points to the growing importance of identity consciousness in contemporary politico-armed conflicts. People are increasingly conscious of who they

49 Ibid., p. 8
are and are asserting their political, cultural, social and economic needs. As issues of identity have come to the fore, "people are increasingly realigning themselves on the basis of ancestry, religion, language, values and institutions, and are rejecting distant and alien rule."\textsuperscript{50}

According to Rothman, conflicts are basically the conflicts of identities. For Rothman, identity-driven conflicts are rooted in the articulation of, and the threats or frustrations to, people’s collective need for dignity, recognition, safety, control, purpose, and efficacy.\textsuperscript{51} Identity-based conflicts are deeply rooted in the underlying individual human needs and values that together constitute people’s social identities, particularly in the context of group affiliations, loyalties, and solidarity. Identity-based conflicts in parts of Africa, Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Sri Lanka, the Middle East, Naga national movement in India and Burma, and dozens of other conflict zones around the globe are characterized by longstanding, seemingly insoluble tensions.

While these conflicts may well be manifested in conventional ways, such as rivalries over territory or competition for scarce resources, these conflicts are often more deeply rooted in existential issues like cultural expression and survival itself.\textsuperscript{52} Rothman made a distinction between identity-based conflicts and resource-based or interest-based conflicts. Resource-based or interest-based disputes are obvious, observable, and tangible. They are usually concrete and clearly defined, and the outcomes each side seeks are bounded by the resources at stake: more or less land, wages and benefits, or military and economic power.\textsuperscript{53} However, many other conflicts like the identity-based conflicts are relatively intangible and deeply rooted in the more abstract and interpretative dynamics history, psychology, culture, values, and beliefs of identity groups.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p. 7
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p. 10
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p. 11
In fact such conflicts are so intangible and hard to define because they arise from the depths of the human hearts rather than the material world. Although theoretical distinctions between identity and interest conflicts may be valid, the differences are not so neat or clear-cut in practice. It is fair to say that all identity conflicts contain interest conflicts; not all interest conflicts contain identity conflicts. Conflicts that start primarily as interest-based, when ignored or poorly handled may evolve into identity conflicts; the longer a conflict continues, the more people connect their dignity and prestige with the dispute. Conversely, identity conflicts addressed as if they were primarily about resources may grow from bad to worse. Given the natural human disposition for the concrete and measurable, identity conflicts often are misidentified as resource-based disputes and approached inappropriately.

Conflict Theories in South Asia

In South Asia different people with different expertise have interpreted the Indo-Naga Conflict in their various ways. Though, the following definitions and understanding of conflict are applied to the Indo-Naga conflict, some of them could be applicable to other conflicts as well. Udayon Misra traced the Naga national movement from the historical and socio-cultural roots that could easily claimed to be the most protracted armed conflict in the Indian sub-continent since independence. For, right from the beginning of the Naga struggle the Naga National Council (NNC), the political wing of the Federal Government of Nagaland (FGN) has been consistently maintaining that the Nagas form an independent nationality. The NNC claimed that, accept for some 75 years or so of British control from 1880s onwards, the Nagas had never been subjugated or ruled by any other people and that they had never formed part of what today constitute the Indian Union. The historical roots cause of the Naga national movement is also shared by Lipi Ghosh.

55 Ibid., p. II
56 Ibid., p. 12
Most movement and their supporters in North east view their own societies or motherland as the ‘colony’ of Delhi/India. They want to “de-colonize” their societies and their dream of de-colonisation situates them against the mighty Indian State. Chandrika Singh is of the opinion that the denial of the demand of a Sovereign Nagaland of the Nagas by the Government of India has led to the Indo-Naga armed conflict. In P.K. Nehru’s thinking, basic cause of the Indo-Naga conflict is due to the sudden exposure of relatively primitive society to complexities of modern world, which they did not understand at all and from which they tried to protect themselves through their traditional and instinctive reaction of violence. The roots of Naga national movement for Maria Saifuddin Effendi should be viewed in two perspectives:

i) Socio-cultural and religious differences between the Nagas and Indian; and,

ii) The British policies of non-interference and isolation.

In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru: “...As Indian independence gradually approached, some of these British officials and Christian missionaries induced them to think in terms of ‘Naga Independence’. This had some effect on some sections of the Nagas.” For Sahadevan, the source of conflict in Nagaland, among other, is rooted in what may be called ‘feeling of betrayal’ or the legacy of the colonial rule. For Sushil K. Pillai, the conflict in Nagaland is rooted not in the classic factors of deprivation or social injustice, but in the deep fear of the loss of both Ethnicity and Identity. Ajay Sahni, on the other hand, categorized the conflict as low intensity war defined as conflicts in which fatalities are over 100 but less than 1000 per annum.

---

Persons like Ved Marwah viewed the conflict from the Indian national security perspective as it is evident from his observation of the situation of Nagaland in recent years when he says it has been a matter of great concern for India’s national security.⁶⁷ Galtung suggest that “conventional conceptions of security, focusing on the security of the ‘state’ and freedom from the threat or use of force, have proved inadequate to address the diverse range of challenges faced by the world community at the dawn of the twenty-first century.”⁶⁸ Although what is actually considered a ‘security’ issues varies widely according to the approach and perspective taken, the fact that the concept of security used during the era of the Cold War is no longer sufficient for the world of today cannot reasonably be denied. Security should not be limited purely to military aspect alone, as has been done in the past, but must be extended to include economic, political, social, cultural and ecological factors as well.⁶⁹ B.G. Verghese viewed the conflict from the material or developmental perspective. He had urged for the developmental aspect (Development of Infrastructural facilities) with human development, safeguarding the environment, raising the living standards and improving the quality of lives, employment generation and enhancing the security, taken together is not merely critically important in itself but central to the fulfillment of other aspiration.⁷⁰

B.K. Roy Burman talked about Schizophrenic alienation, which is a pervasive reality almost all over the North East.⁷¹ The Government of India and the media used different terms to describe the Nagas political struggle for independence. The conflict has been referred to as law and order problems, and insurgency or secessionist movement. This is a particular dominating perception across South Asia. However, the

⁶⁸ Johan Galtung and Carl G. Jacobsen, 2000, op. cit., p. 268
⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 269
Nagas political struggle has been often ‘misunderstood and misquoted’ by the Government of India and journalist writings, and ‘the question of secession from India did not technically arise because the Nagas never thought in lines of being an Indian’.  

Taking Kashmir as an example of conflicting interests between Pakistan and India, Diethelm Weidemann observed that Pakistan politicians and columnists sometimes seem to live in a world of their own perceptions, which is not always congruent with the reality. But at the same time the dominating Indian perception to assess the Kashmir question merely as a law and order problem or as unconstitutional attempt to secede from India, is explicitly narrow-minded, incorrect and full of grave consequences. The impression of the civil societies is that, it is true that the Naga question has always been perceived in the same fashion by the officials and the policy-makers of the Indian state for the last more than five decades.

Some people like Mr. K.P.S. Gill the ‘super cop’ and the publishers and editor of *Faultlines* and the founding President of the Institute for Conflict Management have dehumanized the Naga people by categorizing and branding the various Naga political organizations and the Naga resistance movement as ‘Terrorist’. However, the attempt of the ‘Institute for Conflict Management’ to systematically and venomously distort the historical facts of the Naga people, suppressing the Naga people experiences and denying recognition of their rights and the struggle of the Naga people for Self-Determination has exposed itself as an instrument of neo-colonial imperialism and forces of political subjugation. And branding of a whole people is not only medieval but reflects the feudal thinking and approach of the institute. In contrast to the policy makers of the Institute,
former Army General, Shankar Roy Chaudhary realised that the Naga movement is not terrorism nor can it be equated as such. He said, “Military solution is not possible. We have realized it. It is the time for India and the Nagas to talk across the table.”\textsuperscript{77}

Lt. General F.A. Vyas of the Indian army stated that, “Nagas insurgency never adopted terror tactics.”\textsuperscript{78} The former Indian Security Commissioner, A. Murkot Ramunny, in his writing said, “The Nagas do not kill civilians.” One of the earliest Indian Generals who recognized the Indo-Naga conflict as not of law and order problem but a political problem requiring political wisdom for a solution was General K.S. Thimmaya.\textsuperscript{79} Among the Indian politicians who recognize the Indo-Naga conflict as political issue are Jaya Prakash Narayan, Narasimha Rao, H.D. Deve Gowda, I.K. Gujral, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and Dr. Manmohan Singh etc.\textsuperscript{80} The military generals and the politicians who understands the issue as political one shows a paradigm shift of policy and understanding of the root cause and the issue of the conflict.

Protocol II of the 1949 Geneva Conventions defines an armed conflict as those conflicts “which take place in the territory of a High Contracting Party between its armed forces and dissident armed forces or other organized armed groups which, under responsible command, exercise such control over a part of its territory as to enable them to carry sustained and concerted military operations and to implement this Protocol.”\textsuperscript{81} The NSCN termed the Indo-Naga conflict as an armed conflict within the meaning of the Geneva Conventions because the organization is a well disciplined national resistance with an armed wing, under responsible command, exercising control over all Naga areas between India and Burma, and it is able to “carry out sustained and concerted military operations.”

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{80} See NPMHR, April 2002, op. cit., p. 9; Souvenir, 2005, op. cit., p.38 and See also Ao, A. Lanunungsang, From Phizo to Muivah, op. cit., p. 91.
\textsuperscript{81} The Legal Status of Naga National Armed Resistance: Right to Self-determination under International Law and Why and How the Nagas are not Terrorists, Published by, Oking: Publicity and Information service, GPRN, January 8, 2001, p. 4
operations." There are many other theories on conflict, but for the present endeavour the above mentioned theories may be sufficed due to the space and relevance.

Emergence of Conflict Transformation Theory

The Chapter intents to highlight the weaknesses of the traditional theories of Conflict Management and Conflict Resolution, and highlight the emergence of the Conflict Transformation Theory as an important shift from the conventional methods of conflict engagement. As such we shall use the term Conflict Transformation as an emerging distinctive theory as argued by Hugh Miall. Nevertheless, this new theory draws on many of the familiar concepts of conflict management and conflict resolution, and that it also rests on the same tradition of theorizing about conflict. It is best viewed not as a wholly new approach, but rather as a reconceptualisation of the field in order to make it more relevant for contemporary conflicts. The importance of this chapter lies in the fact that analytical and theoretical studies could contextually be done in the Naga situation by using various relevant conflict resolution/transformation theories.

Importantly, such analytical and theoretical studies such as this would be worthwhile if it could find a place in applying this research work in strengthening the hands of the conflicting parties in their search for an honourable and mutually acceptable political solution to the conflict. It would be advisable on our part to highlight the history of conflict resolution, early peace research, debate among theorists on the alternative approaches to conflict before we could venture into understanding the theory of conflict transformation and some important models of the conflict transformation. The objective is to contextualise these models and other available approaches in the Nagas and the Government of India’s search of resolution of the political conflict. The subsequent section is based on secondary information available on the internet and journal. Adequate referencing is being done accordingly.

82 Ibid., p. 4
83 Hugh Miall, Op. Cit., p. 3
History of Conflict Resolution

As an academic discipline, conflict resolution a la Western culture is an outgrowth of democratic liberalism. Emerging from the 18th and 19th Centuries’ discontent with Monarchies, democratic liberalism searched for an alternative ideology that would fulfill the aspirations of the emerging nation-states following the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.84 Conflict resolution as a defined specialist field has come of age in the Post-Cold War era.85 The development of the field started to accelerate in the 1950s and 1960s, at the height of the Cold War, when the development of nuclear weapons and the conflict between the superpowers seemed to threaten human survival. A handful of people in North America and Europe began to establish research groups to develop new ideas, part of which derived from experience with conflict management in industrial relation and from community mediations. These people’s efforts were not taken very seriously, but nevertheless, the new ideas attracted interest. The field began to grow and spread. Scholarly Journals in conflict resolution were created. Institutions to study the field were established.

By the 1980s, conflict resolution ideas were also increasingly making a difference in existing conflicts, such as in Northern Ireland, where groups inspired by the new ideas had set up Community-relations initiatives that were reaching across community divides.86 By the closing years of the Cold War, the climate for conflict resolution was changing radically, which had a huge impact on the field. As a result of improved relations between the superpowers and a sharp rise in the number of nation/ethnic and other types of conflicts, a climate arose in which the attention of scholars of international relations and comparative politics turned to exactly the type of conflict that had preoccupied the conflict resolution thinkers for many years. A richer

86 Ibid., p.71.
cross-fertilization of ideas developed between conflict resolution and the traditional fields.87

**Early Peace Research**

The failure of the variety of peace, socialist and liberal internationalist movements to prevent the outbreak of the First World War motivated many people to develop a ‘science’ of peace which would provide a firmer basis for preventing future wars. Prominent here were the early empirical studies of war and conflict conducted in the interwar years by researchers such as Pitirim Sorokin, Lewis Fry Richardson and Philip Quincy Wright.88 Other important pioneer like Mary Parker Follet’s works in the field of organizational behaviour and labour management relations also drawn upon to enrich conflict resolution theory. Advocating a mutual gains approach to negotiation, associated with what was called integrative bargaining, as against the traditional concession/convergence approach associated with distributive bargaining, she anticipated much of the later problem-solving agenda.89 Whereas distributive bargaining assumes concealment, inflated initial demands and Zero-Sum contexts, the integrative bargaining advocated in the mutual gains approach tries to redefine the negotiation as a shared problem to be solved.

One of the earliest conflict resolution writers Kenneth Boulding along with Anatol Rapoport and Herbert Kelman initiate the Journal of Conflict Resolution (JCR) in 1957, and set up the Centre for Research on Conflict Resolution in 1959. One of Boulding most influential ideas was with the concept of power. In everyday usage, the term ‘Power’ is ambiguous. On the one hand, it means power to command, order, enforce – coercive or hard power. On the other, it means the power to induce cooperation, to legitimize, to inspire – persuasive or soft power. Hard power has been important in violent conflict, but soft power may be more important in conflicts managed peacefully. Boulding (1989) calls the former threat power (‘do what I want or I will do

---

87 Ibid., p. 71.
89 Ibid., p. 3.
what you don't want'). Following earlier theory of management and labour negotiations, he distinguishes between two forms of soft power: exchange power, associated with bargaining and the compromising approach and integrative power associated with persuasion and transformative long-term problem-solving.

Herbert. C. Kelman, a leading Social Psychologist and Conflicts Resolution Scholar at Harvard University had specialized in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Kelman’s long-standing series of Arab-Israeli interactive Problem-Solving Workshop (1974-91) had an important influence on the eventual conclusion of the Oslo Accords in 1993. Harvard has continued to be at the forefront of the study of negotiation and conflict resolution. Principled negotiation approach was developed at Harvard. The programs on negotiation has had a fundamental impact on the study of negotiation in international conflict, introducing the win-win, problem-solving and mutual gain vocabulary of conflict resolution through the works of Roger Fisher and William Ury. This has been popularized through their best-selling title ‘Getting to Yes’ (1981) and more recently through the quarterly Negotiation Journal.

Individuals who have contributed strategically to the development of the theory and practice of conflict resolution includes Mahatma Gandhi among the precursors; Kenneth Boulding, Johan Galtung and John Burton among the founders; and Herbert Kelman, Roger Fisher, William Ury, John Paul Lederach, Edward Azar, Raimo Vayrynen, Kumar Rupesinghe and Elise Boulding among those who carried the subject forward thereafter.

Debates among Theorists on the Alternatives or Approaches to Conflict

It is helpful to distinguish Conflict Management, Conflict Resolution and Conflict Transformation as three separate schools while at the same time recognizing the
significant areas of overlap between them. All three not only articulate varying approaches to conflict intervention, but also reflect different conceptualization of conflict.

**Conflict Management** theorists see violent conflicts as an ineradicable consequence of differences of values and interests within and between communities. The propensity to violence arises from existing institutions and historical relationships, as well as from the established distribution of power. Resolving such conflicts is viewed as unrealistic: the best that can be done is to manage and contain them, and occasionally to reach a historic compromise in which violence may be laid aside and normal politics resumed. Conflict management is the art of appropriate intervention to achieve political settlements, particularly by those powerful actors having the power and resources to bring pressure on the conflicting parties in order to induce them to settle. For Miall, it is also the art of designing appropriate institutions to guide the inevitable conflict into appropriate channels. In the words of Bloomfield and Reilly:

"Conflict Management is the positive and constructive handling of difference and divergence. Rather than advocating methods for removing conflict, (it) addresses the more realistic question of managing conflict: how to deal with it in a constructive way, how to bring opposing sides together in a cooperative system for the constructive management of difference."

**Conflict Resolution**, defined in various ways over the years, is distinguished from a general category of conflict management—any attempt to curtail, contain, or resolve conflict. It is understood to be a field of study situated within peace research, and based on the works of Conflict Resolutionaries like John Burton, Edward Azar and others who noted that protracted violent conflict resisted the international community's attempts to control it and were looking for alternative means of resolving rather than merely settling disputes. Conflict Resolution, like peace research, evolved as a critique of

---

realism in international relations. In realism, states are in conflict over the proportion of
resources they control and, therefore, the power they wield in international community.

The Conflict Resolution theorists’ critique of realism is directed specially to its
settlement strategies seen in the practices of mediation, negotiation and arbitration. These
settlements are always Zero-Sum, that is, where one State gains the other loses, and
focus, exclusively, in divergent interest. From a conflict resolution perspective the best
we can hope from realist approaches to violent conflict is containment and control. As
such conflict resolution offers an alternative paradigm, another set of assumptions and
practices from which practitioners derive a different set of methodologies for dealing
with- in this case ‘resolving’- conflicts.

Critics of Conflict Resolution

However, in the past few years the field of conflict resolution theory and its
working method especially its problem-solving approach are being reviewed by a new
generation of Critical Theorists who assume that Conflict Resolution has originated and
rests on unchallenged assumptions of social order, thus perpetuating those structures that
had originated the conflict in first place. In the views of these scholars the resistance to
imagine and produce different structures (at an institutional and relational level) means
that instead of looking for radical resolutions, and almost fearing the change that these
would demand, conflict resolution is “stuck” with adhoc answers that reinforce this
unchallenged order.95

Fetherston and Parking comment on their paper “Transformation of Violent
Conflict: Contributions from Social Theory” that conflict analysis and conflict
management (the descriptive and prescriptive facets of Conflict Resolution) have serious
“Inadequacies and they consists of a “minimal grasp of the field reality” of violent

95 Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham and Tom Woodhouse, Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The
Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflict, 1999, pp. 75-78, as cited in Marta
Martinelli Quille, A Response to Recent Critique of Conflict Resolution, op. cit., p. 6.
conflict” thus they set to bridge the gap between abstract models of conflict management and the everydayness and “groundedness” of field reality.96

According to A.B. Fetherston, the most obvious shortcoming of the problem-solving approach is that it tends to focus on negotiable issues postponing the question of relationship and structural change to a later moment. It is liable to critique in that it can be seen as producing “negative peace” that is to say “absence of war” neglecting aspects of justice and resource distribution.97 It is an approach that has been forcefully criticized by Betts Fetherston. She says: “Problem-Solving Theory focuses on existing frameworks of institutions, social relations and social meaning which is often taken for granted, with the goal of sustaining this order to make it work efficiently.

Critical Theory starts by problematising this given framework or social order with the aim of considering its origins and how it might be changed, clarifying possible alternatives, and providing insights into ways of transforming it.”98 She states in her essay: From Conflict Resolution to Transformative Peacebuilding: Reflection from Croatia99 that “understandings of war implied in the definitions, researches and methodologies of conflict settlement and resolution lack connection to everydayness of the war zone. These kinds of description of war and its aftermath fail to catch its complexity and deep effects on social space and meaning.100 What she wishes for is that the conflict resolution sets to analyze networks of institutions, structures and social meanings in order to untangle the culture of violence, based on domination, which pervades the State system and affects everybody’s ways of life in a kind of self-feeding way. Conflict Resolution should aim to do not only at the site of war but in all localities

---

97 Ibid., p. 20.
98 See footnotes No. 40 in Quille, Marta Martinelli, 2000, Ibid., p. 20.
100 Ibid., p. 9.
which, broadly speaking, perpetuate a culture of violence and contribute to the re-emergence of war.\textsuperscript{101}

Nevertheless, she says, Conflict Resolution assumes that we can know, rationally and objectively, about violent conflict and thus master it and solve it. She goes further to suggest that “the modern project privileges the rational knowing subject and in doing so a world of “Other” is both generated and silenced.” “Rational” is legitimized at the same time that everything else, labeled “irrational”, is othered, delegitimised, and set outside the bounds of the discourse.\textsuperscript{102}

According to Marta Martinelli Quille, Fetherston’s criticism is born out of her consideration that is practice of problem solving workshop, which she sees as derived from John Burton’s analysis of conflict and further elaborated of his analysis especially by Loraleigh Keashly and Ronald Fisher, essentially consist of an objections process while the parties distance themselves from the real situation to grant them conflict as an ‘academic environment’\textsuperscript{103} they should be able then to see their own “problematic communication pattern and learn more appropriate ones... ultimately application of consultation or problem-solving leads to a resolution because the participants have been (corrected) (however, subtly) and armed with this new enlightened perspective, can together seek appropriate resolution.”\textsuperscript{104} In Fetherston’s opinion the outcome of the problem-solving exercise is to make participants reperceive their war experience as irrational thus rendering their “experiences and practices as illegitimate and irrelevant” and her conclusion is that one potential outcome is to delegitimise the particular practices of survival and resistance.\textsuperscript{105}

Social critical theorist Vivianne Jabri offers another Critical Practices in 1996 in her work \textit{Discourses on Violence} where “she emphasizes the importance of transformative counter-discourses on challenges the dominance of public space

\textsuperscript{101} Marta Martinelli Quille, 2000, op. cit., p.21.
\textsuperscript{102} A.B. Fetherston, April 2000, op. cit., p. 12.
\textsuperscript{103} Marta Martinelli Quille, 2000, op.cit., p. 21.
\textsuperscript{104} A.B. Fetherston, April 2000, op. cit., p. 12.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., p. 13.
exclusionist hegemonic discourses which legitimize violence and war."\textsuperscript{106} She suggests that the meeting of self and other relational and structural, personal and contractual allows for the creation of new meaning which challenge the dominant discursive and institutional frameworks. All the above can be qualified as the lack of holistic thinking in CR literature, which one can agree with Jabri, have helped to "legitimize negotiation and mediation as technical and bureaucratic enterprises."\textsuperscript{107}

Apart from the Critical theorists, Third or Fourth World or Indigenous Perspective scholars such as, Akum Longchari and Babu Ayindo, in their essay "\textit{From Cold War to Hot peace? The Politics of Conflict Resolution, 2002}"\textsuperscript{108} made a critical analysis of Western model of Conflict Resolution. They argued that Western model of conflict resolution abets the process of globalism. What appears as the evolution of a culture of peace, inspire by a "Universalised" Conflict Resolution Theory is shy about visiting the root causes of most conflict in the so called third and fourth world. Not only is current conflict resolution theory and practice generally ahistorical but it also tends to take for granted Indigenous culture, knowledge system and realities. In their words, "We are witnessing people's basic challenges of survival either being term into problems of ethnicism (or tribalism) or communication. They opine that there is a cultural invasion of the third and fourth world by the universalized Western culture. In their analysis, Conflict Resolution hardly focuses on the collective aspirations of self – determination and values because liberal democracy main focus is on individual needs and convenience.\textsuperscript{109} To a large degree peace building has followed the patterns of State building and this is predicated in ideal of violence.

In essence what has been missing is an imaginative approach that takes it as its starting points, the problematising of the given frameworks of institution and social


\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., p.24.

\textsuperscript{108} Akum Longchari and Babu Ayindo, \textit{From Cold War to Hot peace? The Politics of Conflict Resolution, Center for Just Peace in Asia, 2002, op. cit. pp. 1-10

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., p. 4
Conflict Transformation

Conflict Transformation can be understood in several different ways. The normative understanding stresses the need to create constructive, nonviolent solutions to violent conflicts or threats. In the best of the cases, Conflict Transformation can encourage the establishment of cooperative and just societies. This approach is most explicitly represented by John Paul Lederach who calls for a transformative practice in which unpeaceful relations are restructured over a long term by education, advocacy (nonviolent activism), and mediation. The ultimate purpose of Conflict Transformation is not only social change but also political, economic, and cultural change. Indeed, peace studies and Conflict Transformation should be informed by such principles as human rights, justice, freedom, recognition of identities and democracy.

An important difference is whether Conflict Transformation is supposed to have a specific end-state or whether it is an open-ended process. Both versions of Conflict Transformation reject the idea that the purpose of conflict resolution is the restoration of the status quo ante as it gave rise to war in the first place. Therefore, Conflict transformation aims at the promotion of a more peaceful reality embodying new social
relations, institutions, and visions. In that sense, Conflict Transformation and education have a strategic element: the goal of peace is sought through the redefinition and restructuring of a conflict situation. The normative approach to Conflict Transformation runs the risk of becoming a movement for the general improvement of society rather than just mitigating and redefining the conflict. If the normative view adopted is too long term, the focus on the mitigation of violence and its effects may have to take a back seat. Therefore, for Vayrynen, one needs an intermediate approach between 'technical' conflict resolution and the 'normative' transformation of conflict which he calls 'social' transformation of violent conflicts. In fact, Lederach's ideas are not far removed from such an approach.

The idea of Conflict Transformation stresses the dynamic and discontinuous nature of conflict unlike Contingency Theory which treats its basic features as linear and constant. It also recognises that for many conflicts there is no easy and obvious solution, especially if their asymmetries are embedded in national and international inequities. Therefore it is often more realistic to try to mitigate the violent aspects of the conflict by limited external interventions without trying to solve it once and for all. In the best of the cases, the redefinition of issues, actors, rules, and interests may transform the nature of conflict so that resolution becomes possible. Keashley and Fisher's Contingency Theory of conflict resolution stresses the need to match intervention strategies with the key characteristics of the conflict. It also emphasizes the importance of correct timing of intervention to de-escalate tensions. Finally, the Contingency Theory pays attention to the close interaction between objective and subjective features of conflict and notes that the impact of subjective factors tends to increase with the escalation of conflict.

Without going further into the debate, let us explore some of the important models of the Conflict Transformation suggested by various scholars and practitioners.
and make a critical analysis and assessment of their applicability to the Naga situation. The focus is to come out with certain workable and applicable approach keeping in mind the root cause of the conflict, history, socio-economic, cultural aspects of the people, identity issue, human rights, freedom, emancipation, justice, fairness and democracy. These root causes are common to all movements around the world though nature of aspirations and demands are different.

**Some Important Models of Conflict Transformation**

Mahatma Gandhi’s main approach to conflict resolution is through Non-violence and Satyagraha as the way of struggle. Gandhi consistently demanded non-violence of himself, as the way, and as the long-term goal. He rejects both direct and structural violence, since that would go against the whole idea of non-violence. Non-violence as a form of struggle against both kinds of violence, and an equally strong admonition not to use them in the struggle. The objective of Satyagraha was to fight oppressive social structures such as caste system, which were the basis for the perpetuation of a highly unequal society. A Satyagrahi tries to fight injustice, not to sweep it under the carpet. Like A.J. Muste, for Gandhi also, there is no way to peace; peace is the way; to be taken now.\(^{119}\) Modern conflict resolution theory owes much to his doctrines of struggle to overcome injustice while remaining faithful to pacifist values. Buddhism has also had an important influence on the theory and practice of conflict resolution.

Conflict resolution scholars such as Johan Galtung and Adam Curle have applied insights from Buddhism in their thinking about the transformation of violent conflict into peaceful social relations.\(^ {120}\) Although Gandhi was not a Buddhist, Galtung claimed that “his thought and action in rejecting the caste system were so utterly Buddhist that I (he) wonder(s) whether this is not an at least equally correct label”.\(^ {121}\)

---


\(^{120}\) See [http://www.bradford.ac.uk](http://www.bradford.ac.uk), op. cit., p. 3.

However, Mahatma Gandhi, a leading proponent and practitioner of non-violence, has been criticized by the scholars and practitioners of Indigenous Perspective because like current conflict resolution, many a time a noble peace and its espousal of non-violent means do not seems to address the right questions.\textsuperscript{122} In Mazruian terms "the prophet of non-violence, Mahatma Gandhi, helped to facilitate India entry into the global structure of power and war".\textsuperscript{123} Satyagraha had failed to evolve a sustainable and peaceful post revolution agenda. It would seem that Gandhi took it for granted that peace and justice for all would prevail within a State system [predicated on violence?].

Mazrui questions, whether this was not a betrayal of non-violence. Indeed many other successful revolution [peace and non-peaceful] conducted within the parameters of the nation-state have only led people to further misery and subjugation. When the post-independent State of India was challenged, it used the very same instrument of force, the very same the British used in suppressing liberation movements in British India – to suppress genuine democratic peoples movements. The Third or Fourth World’s Perspective concluded by saying that third and fourth worlds, conflict resolution and peace building must, ipso facto, begin with natural justice and human right. Otherwise we might experience peace, but it will be hot, very hot peace. They hope for creating a culture of Justpeace.

In his book (Making Peace 1971)\textsuperscript{124}, Adam Curle defines human relationship as peaceful and un-peaceful and as balanced and un-balanced. By un-balanced relations Curle means all those relations where one part has the power to impose condition on the other. And where this power is use by the advantaged party to exploit the disadvantaged one. Un-balance relations are not necessarily un-peaceful as he points out in the case of parents and children and local/national governments. Nevertheless, Curle notes that exploitative imbalance is particularly prevalent forms of un-peaceful relationship. It can

\textsuperscript{124} Adam Curle, Making Peace, Tavistock Publication, London, 1971
be readdressed by an increase in awareness on the exploited part which can lead in turn into a “[r] evolution of the underdog” generated by raised expectations; the confrontation that characterizes a growth in awareness of the un-peaceful relations marks the process towards a redistribution of power and a more equal relationship.

In *True Justice*\(^{125}\) (1981), Curle elaborates on the previous concepts of peace making and further adds that it consists “of manifesting the truth and applying it to the disordered relationships, relationship that are disorders specifically because they are not nurtured by the truth.” Peace-making should also consider as its ultimate goal the achievement of reconciliation but accept in the process, also the existence of immediate goals such as the resolution of the conflict and the removal of injustices. In *In The Middle*\(^{126}\) (1987) Curle attempts in systematizing the practice of mediation. In 1995 Curle published his works *Another Way: Positive Response to Contemporary Violence*.\(^{127}\) The book is divided into two fundamental parts (a third one representing a case study), one dealing with the roots and manifestations of modern violence and the second with contemporary peace making. It is especially in this second part best elucidated by the following case study that Curle departs from his idea of the third party as fundamentally interposing between two entities to move their relations towards one of agreement, and he introduces the idea of working at the grass-root level to build peace from below.

The idea of citizen peace-making is further developed in a previous article, entitled “*New Challenges for Citizen Peace-Making*” (1994) where he in fact uses words of disillusionment with the practices suggested by Conflict Resolution. “Since Conflict Resolution by outside bodies and individuals has so far proved ineffective it is essential to consider the peace-making potential of the conflicting communities themselves.”\(^{128}\)


Like Curle, Lederach believes in the positive action a mediator can perform to help the parties overcome communication problems and bargaining difficulties. Contrary to Curle, though he refers to third party as an "Insider Partial", someone from within the conflict context, thus knowledgeable about it and familiar to the parties and nevertheless trusted enough by the contendants, so that, he/she can act as an intermediary.\textsuperscript{129} His observation stems from his experience in Latin America where more value was placed on the idea of "Confianza" (trust) then on impartiality and distance from the conflict setting.\textsuperscript{130}

Like Curle, Lederach seems to believe that much of the modern conflict is due to an un-balanced distribution of the resources and similar to Curle his work is permeated by attention to developmental issues. Lederach's works also shows a more explicit concern with the impact that the cultural assumption of the third party can have on the people that are the reference of the intermediary action.\textsuperscript{131} He has developed two models of training in Latin America: Prescriptive and Elective. Lederach's approach to training is different from conflict resolution theory in that it is explicitly attentive to valuation of local capacities and resources. Lederach's most important contribution to the field of conflict resolution theory lies in his elaboration of the concepts of "Empowerment". In his works \textit{Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies} (1997), he suggests that conflict resolution moves from a prescription of answer and modalities to focus attention on empowering the resources, modalities and mechanisms for building peace that exists within the context.

Lederach maintains that there are three approaches to peace building:\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{129} Marta Martinelli Quille (COPRI Guest Researcher) 'A Response to Recent Critiques of Conflict Resolution', Op. cit., p.16.
a) The top-level approach is constructed around high-level leaders and intermediaries;

b) The middle-range approach is constructed around authoritative figures that do not officially represent any parties to the conflict but are generally highly respected as individuals or are formally engaged in the fields of education, health, agriculture, business or humanitarian organization; and

c) Finally the grass-root approach is constructed around people who are involved in local communities, members of indigenous NGOs, health officials and refugees’ camp leaders.

In essence Lederach’s contribution rest in stressing the necessities of dealing with all the above-identified actors in a conflict setting. In particular, he highlights the fact that Conflict Resolution theory has been lacking a systematized approach to middle-level actors he sees as providing a strategic, valuable link between the top and grass-root level in favour of external intervention oriented at top-level. However, according to the Indigenous Perspective researchers such as, Akum Longchari and Babu Ayindo, when Lederach talks of a “Middle-out” approach he is basically affirming the ideology of the civil society. In other words, he would like to see changes happen but within the realm of the existing nation-state. In this regard, statist diplomacy and alternative dispute resolution methods are heading towards the same destination: a situation of social order and not necessarily of Justpeace. To this we may agree with Ho-Won Jeong that, contrary to realist assumptions of a world order, idealist perspectives emphasized that peace can be achieved only through cooperation among nations designed to promote human well-being. The Indigenous Perspective Researchers are also equally critical to the NGOs because they serve the interest of mainly Western Governments.

These researchers further pointed out that, Lederach model of “Middle - out” is not clear on the criteria of categorizing “leadership in population” though it echoes Marxist analysis of society. In most Indigenous societies like Nagas in Nagalim {lim-

land) pyramidal categorization would not accurately represent the structure, power relation or leadership or the ontological worldview of the nation.\footnote{Ibid., p. 6} There are many societies where power and leadership are devolved. According to S.D. Nandi, community approach to dispute settlement perhaps, found its best expression in pre-modern Naga villages.\footnote{S.D. Nandi, 'Conflict Resolution in Naga Society-Past and Present' in Bimal J. Dev (ed.), \textit{Ethnic Issues, Conflict Resolution in North East India}, Published by North East India Council for Social Science Research, Shillong, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 2006, p. 124} The highest forum to adjudicate dispute within a village was the village council headed by its chief. He was assisted by clan chiefs and some important family heads. Complaints of serious nature were referred to it. The chief, on receiving the complaints, fixed a date for hearing. The disputants were asked to present themselves along with their supporters before the council on the date of hearing. The council heard both the parties, examined witnesses and assessed the evidence. A decision was arrived at in keeping with the "general feeling" of the village community. In arriving at a decision customs, conventions, traditions, social norms and values were kept in view. Any decision of the village council was binding on disputing parties and any dissent was punished.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 124-125}

Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse call for a Broad Approach to Conflict Resolution or Conflict Transformation.\footnote{Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham, and Tom Woodhouse, 'Calling for a Broad Approach to Conflict Resolution', in Paul van Tongeren, Hans van de Veen, and Juliette Verhoeven, 2002, Op. cit., pp. 71-76} It would be wise to include not only mediation between the parties but also efforts to address the wider context in which international actors, domestic constituencies, and intra-party relationships sustain violent conflicts. The implication of this broadening of scope and applicability of conflict-resolution approaches has been to see the need for a complementary range of third-party interventions. They should be multi-track instead of just track I (governmental) or track II (NGOs, Churches, Civil societies, etc.), and address both elites and the grass roots.\footnote{Ibid., p. 75}
In line with the necessity of a broad view, conflict resolution should concern itself not only with the issue that divide the main parties, but also with the social, psychological, and political changes that are necessary to address root causes, the intra-party conflicts that may inhibit acceptance of a settlement, the context that affects the incentives of the parties, and the social and institutional capacity that determines whether a settlement can be made acceptable and workable. In other words, a multi-track approach is necessary, relying on interventions by different actors at different levels.

In other words, the contingency model relaxes the omnipotence of the method and contextualizes the choice between different means of intervention. While the model’s link with Conflict Transformation is helpful, its view on the stages of conflict is simplified. The model assumes that all conflicts proceed from discussion through polarization and segregation to destruction. This model is also based on the assumption of linearity which does not hold in practice as conflict often moves back and forth between cycles and may well return to violence.

For Kevin Clements best approaches to conflict resolution and transformation includes the following promise and the essential ingredients.

1. Conflict resolution and transformation aim to channel the energy generated by conflict in constructive and non-violent ways rather than destructive and violent directions. Its aim is not to eliminate conflict but to utilize conflictual processes for generative and positive change. In this way, conflict transformation works to develop resilient personal and social systems where security is enhanced by the quality of community relationships.

2. Conflict transformation occurs when violence ceases and/or is expressed in non-violent ways, and when the original structural sources of the conflict (economic, social, political, military, and cultural) are changed in some ways. The propensity for violence is diminished by democratization, demilitarization, de-
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alignment, socio-economic development, and expansion of human rights, humanitarian law, and socio-cultural openness.

3. Conflict can be transformed by normal socio-political processes by the parties acting alone, by expert third-party interventions and parties acting together, or by judicious advocacy and political intervention. There needs to be multi-track involvement if good conflict transformation is sought.

4. Conflict transformation can take place at any stage of the escalatory cycle. If the conflict turns violent, its transformation may depend on some kind of crisis management or intervention. Later, it may require conciliation, mediation, negotiation, arbitration, and collaborative problem-solving processes. In the end, any lasting conflict transformation involves processes of resolution, reconstruction, and reconciliation.

At its best, argues Clements, conflict transformation is about personal and collective empowerment. It underlines the consciousness of the possibilities that lie in seemingly impossible and desperate situations. It is about generating options where there seem to be none, about radical dialogical engagement with those who seem to be enemies. It is about conquering threat-based systems of governance with institutions that rest on persuasion and consensuality. It is about generating socio-economic and political situations conducive to realizing the full potentialities of the human spirit. And more importantly, it explains how negative processes might be transformed into positive ones.

Vayrynen argues for a conflict theory based on the idea of transformation rather than settlement, stressing that it is too important to understand how conflicts are transformed in dynamic terms. His approach is primarily analytical and theoretical, but is also suggestive of types of intervention that peace builders should be considering. His four types of intervention that peace builders should be considering are:

143 Kevin Clements, Ibid., p. 88
i) Actor transformation – internal changes in parties, or the appearance of new parties;

ii) Issue transformation – altering the agenda of conflict issue;

iii) Rule transformation – changes in the norms and rules in governing and conflict; and,

iv) Structural transformation – the entire structure of relationship and power distribution in the conflict is transformed.


Conceptualising the “three worlds and conflict model”, Jayne Seminare Docherty sees human beings as existing, simultaneously, in three distinct yet overlapping worlds—the Symbolic, the Social World and the Material World. He argues that imbalances in human relationships in these three worlds lead to violent conflict. According to Jayne Docherty, “all conflicts involve material, social and symbolic elements and all conflicts must be addressed in all these worlds or dimensions.” The symbolic world refers to the worldview that individuals inhabit and speak from. This means that individuals from different symbolic worlds might use the same words and same language, but the meaning and reference might be very different: In such situations, attempts at communication become extremely complex and exacerbate. For instance, to the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) the word “autonomy” meant a separate homeland, while the Sri Lankan government defined “autonomy” as falling short of the carving out of a separate state. Traditionally, conflict resolution practitioners have tended to overlook the importance of the symbolic world with disastrous consequences for peacebuilding.

---
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efforts. It is particularly important to recognise the existence of the symbolic world, which plays an active role in the sustenance of violent conflict. 148

Critiquing the traditional approaches to negotiation and conflict management which focus essentially on interests-tangible and compromisable as a failure in transforming identity-based conflict, Rothman suggest an ARIA framework, designed to address cases in which normal negotiation is premature and its process serves to ripen the situation so the groundwork is laid for successful conflict management with special reference to Israeli-Palestinian conflict. 149 He argues that interactive dialogue must precede problem solving or negotiation, and should accomplish several important goals: the parties must learn to appreciate the gains of reaching an agreement; they must begin to look at their conflict in common terms, articulating shared concerns and aspirations; all sides must appreciate the advantage of reaching an agreement that the others find fair and acceptable; and finally, the parties must feel comfortable with the climate for negotiations that will result in mutual gains. In short the essential goals and motivations of all parties locked in identity conflict must be fully articulated and at least be accepted in principle prior to problem-solving. The ultimate goal of the ARIA framework is to foster harmony and resonance from adversaries' full and honest expression of the deeply felt human motivations that lie beneath their conflict.

Through a process of staged adversarial framing, when the focus is on what of the conflict-what resources are at stake and what solutions are being sought-antagonism is surfaced. An underlying sense of resonance is then fostered through reflexive reframing, when the questions are now who (not as categories but as persons) and why, and the core identity issues are articulated. This sets the stage for intervening joint solutions-the how-and finally agenda setting, that is, consolidating the what, why, who, and how of the previous steps and sustaining them through joint action. In sum, the ARIA framework

148 Ibid., p. 25
149 Jay Rothman, Resolving Identity-Based Conflict, 1997
fosters the articulation and development of four unfolding outcomes: Antagonism, Resonance, Intervention, and Action. 150

Each step of the ARIA method will not be able to discuss in detail in this chapter except a brief guide to the process which are as follows:

- **Antagonism surfaces the battle. It brings out festering angst and anger and puts them out for discussion. It is also useful later in providing a negative frame of reference such as, “We don’t want to do that anymore!”**

- **Resonance fosters a harmony that can emerge between disputants, a harmony growing out of a deep exploration and articulation of what goes on within them. It grows from an expression of the needs and values that have been threatened or frustrated by the conflict and the relations between adversaries. They may discover that “We are in this together.”**

- **Inventing is the process of brainstorming mutually acceptable, creative, and integrative options for addressing central and underlying aspects of the conflict. They learn that “We can get out of this together.”**

- **Action is then built upon the previous stages, implementing what should be done and why, by whom, and how.**

Rothman says that once intransigent identity conflicts are addressed in this way, conventional problem-solving and negotiation toward forging and implementing concrete agreements may become possible. When the groundwork is laid and there is an awareness of overlapping motivations and goals, adversaries can fully appreciate the possibility of cooperating to achieve those goals. He argued that too often identity conflicts are interpreted as resource conflicts and incorrectly addressed, and thereby is deepened and prolonged. For example, for decades the Arab-Israel conflict was defined and sustained in resource terms as a struggle between two nations over one piece of real estate. Efforts to redefine the conflict in terms of its human dimensions and break the barriers of fear, insecurity, and mutual non-recognition began at unofficial levels that later were consolidated in formal agreements.

150 Jay Rothman, 1997, Ibid., pp. 17-20
The shape of an eventual solution began to emerge in the early 1990s when the conflict was politically reframed in terms of the underlying human needs and values at stake for Israelis and Palestinians. As Palestinian leadership began formally recognizing Israel's right to security and sovereignty, many Israelis began to show a willingness to negotiate compromises over territory. Similarly, when many Israelis began recognizing Palestinian national aspirations as legitimate, growing numbers of Palestinians became willing to accept only part of Palestine as their state.\textsuperscript{151} According to Rothman, when the sources of insecurity that mark identity conflicts are brought to the surface and needs are addressed—at least in principle—some of the deepest conflicts begin to become negotiable. The ARIA process can help bring about this change. The ARIA approach, rooted in an analysis of threats and frustrations to identity needs, shifts to solution seeking by examining what interests (or means) should be cooperatively pursued to address the needs of all conflictants. These instrumental mechanisms, or means, may be summarized as \textit{functional interests}.\textsuperscript{152}

Rothman suggested integrative approach to problem solving which was formulated first by Mary Parker Follet as mentioned in the beginning.\textsuperscript{153} This approach refers to strategies and options by which parties can cooperatively solve their conflicts with each other. "There are three main ways of dealing with conflict: domination, compromise, and integration. Domination, obviously, is a victory of one side over the other.... Compromise [occurs when] each side gives up a little in order to have peace.... [Integration occurs when] a solution has been found in which both desires have found a place, [such] that neither side has to sacrifice anything."\textsuperscript{154} In the words of Rothman, the 1978 Camp David Peace Talks mediated by U.S. President Jimmy Carter provide a clear example of going beyond positions to integrating interests in order to fulfill [safety and dignity] needs of each side. This follows a collaborative tactics in conflict transformation when all the parties seek to undertake mutual accommodations and cooperative efforts in

\textsuperscript{151} Jay Rothman, 1997, Ibid., pp. 16-17
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., p. 56
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., pp. 58
\textsuperscript{154} Mary Parker Follet, in H. Metcalf and L. Urwick (eds.), \textit{Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follet}, HarperCollins, New York, 1941, p. 32 as quoted in Rothman, Ibid., p. 59
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good faith with a view toward ensuring the fulfillment of the underlying needs-identity, dignity, security, and survival- of all parties. It is a process by which perceptions of the outcomes has been shifted from zero-sum to that which is potentially positive-sum. In short, peace must be seen to pay.\textsuperscript{155}

Herb Feith and Alan Smith argue persuasively that there is an actual and growing need for the world community to develop mechanisms capable of ‘constraining and mediating the processes involved in what they called ethno-nationalist challenges’, in particular, procedures and criteria by which self-determination claims can be evaluated and the underlying conflict resolved.\textsuperscript{156} While some states may be able to accommodate ethno-nationalist aspirations by granting greater autonomy to specific groups, the authors point out that in others such arrangements will not be adequate and the United Nations will have to play a role.\textsuperscript{157} They suggest a process involving the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Security Council. The new UN process they envisage would have three main aspects.\textsuperscript{158}

1) The General Assembly would designate a body with which self-determination claims can be formally registered for preliminary examination.

2) The Secretary-General would initiate investigations, possibly by Experts Bodies, of

(a) the criteria for establishing which cases or claimants merit further action, which groups have prima facie case for self-determination; and

(b) an extended range of forms through which self-determination aspirations can be met.

3) The Security Council would authorize and facilitate the renegotiation of the relationship between particular states and claimant groups recognised as having a prima facie case for self-determination.

\textsuperscript{155} Rothman, Ibid., p. 55
\textsuperscript{156} Herb Feith and Alan Smith, ‘self-determination in the 1990s: Equipping the UN to Resolve Ethno-Nationalist Conflicts’, in Kumar Rupesinghe, (ed.), Conflict Transformation, St. Martin’s Press, USA, 1995, pp. 143-161
\textsuperscript{157} Herb Feith and Alan Smith in Kumar Rupesinghe, 1995, Ibid., p. 147
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., p. 148
Kumar Rupesinghe adds to this argument saying that although there are indications that more states are becoming, of necessity, increasingly receptive to the idea of international assistance in dealing with ethno-nationalist pressures, there remains a need for the non-governmental community to take an active and responsible lead in this area by beginning to develop an Independent Commission for Self-Determination to look further at the issues of definitions, alternatives and mechanisms.  

Feith and Smith have talked about the need for systematic exploration of three main aspects of how to think about quasi-state status and the borderline between states and autonomous entities of lesser status. The first of these has to do with constitutional form: federalism, confederalism, and association (including free association). A second aspect concerns the rapidly growing world of inter-governmental organisations which might provide guarantees of autonomy arrangements. These include not only global and regional organisations but also groupings like the (British) Commonwealth of Nations and the Islamic Organisation Conference. A third aspect concerns the expanding scope of international law, and the way it is coming to be concerned with an increasingly wide range of non-states entities.

They suggested a few of the directions in which exploration of these aspects might proceed. To them, one starting point is history. A second point of entry is the large literature on federalism, which has been described as ‘a device designed to cope with the problem of how distinct communities can live a common life without ceasing to be distinct communities... an attempt to reconcile the often conflicting impulses of self-determination and association.’ Thirdly, it would be valuable to explore association as it has existed in the past and exists now, usually in cases where small and weak states are contractually linked to states larger and stronger than themselves. Examples include Liechtenstein’s association with Switzerland and Bhutan’s with India. According to
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them, a recent argument about one form of association, free association, could be seen as a fourth way into this complex array of models. Free association as specified in UN Res. 1541 of 1960 is a type of association in which the weaker party maintains an internationally guaranteed right to opt out of the linkage. This currently exists in the cases of two New Zealand ex-independencies, the Cook Islands and Niue, and there is something close to it in Greenland’s relationship to Denmark.

A more common form of free association, which does not comply with UN requirements, so that the terms is sometimes declared a misnomer, exists in various territories and states associated with the USA, including the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the federated States of Micronesia. Finally, one might explore a range of cases where international guarantees have been provided, or planned for, to protect the integrity of small states and quasi-states. One might begin with the League of Nations’ guarantee to the Free City of Danzig, might consider the UN Security Council resolution of January 1947 proposing a guarantee to the Free Territory of Trieste, a resolution whose implementation was prevented by the onset of the Cold War, and examine various international safeguards applied to Cyprus.\(^{162}\)

Martin J. Dent suggested ‘Super-federalism’\(^{163}\) as a model of conflict resolution in Nagaland state including other 14 cases. He argues that the aspirations of the identity groups on land is very strong in their struggle for independence for which the governments have to declare the land as sovereign or ‘sovereign land’. But the ‘sovereign land’ has to be situated within the larger independence country. In his words, “we must fill the gap between ordinary federalism, which leaves too large an area, including unfettered control of the armed forces, under the power of the central government and independence, which the minority has been seeking, but which is not attainable.”\(^{164}\) To Dent, the ‘larger independent country’ is the proper focus for diplomatic activity, membership of the UN and existence as a separate sovereign state.


\(^{164}\) *Ibid.*, p. 2
with an international profile, while the 'sovereign land' should enjoy the privileges of a
developed home rule, subject only to necessary military powers for the defence of the
larger independent country. And some police powers to prevent the sovereign land
becoming a 'cave of Abdullam' where thieves and rogues and international conspirators
might collect to trouble surrounding areas.

Furthermore, the sovereign land will be given the opportunity, if it wishes, to agree voluntarily to put itself under the jurisdiction of governmental bodies operating throughout the larger country. This will be a kind of co-operative federalism, and will go beyond the rather narrow limits to the power on constituent states which are set by the central government in most federations, which impose a kind of top-down uniformity of provision in many areas. However, it is difficult to conclude whether his model will really serve the purpose of conflict resolution. We have observed vital anomaly in his case study in relation to the Nagas. He confines his analysis within the state of Nagaland which is incomplete as he has excluded the Nagas of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur and Nagas in Burma in his analysis. His model needs to be more comprehensive and inclusive.

The Indian State had applied the following models/strategies for the resolution of the
conflict. They are

i) Constitution and Law;

ii) Peace Processes and Political Negotiation; and

iii) Counter-Insurgency and Repression.

We will not discuss the state models here as they will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapters.

Some other Models

Many individual thinkers and scholars, administrators, politicians have also suggested different models for resolving the Indo-Naga conflict. T.H. Hutton, the then

165 Ibid., p. 3
Deputy Commissioner of Kohima from 1917-1935, had in a note to the Simon Commission recommended the gradual creation of self-governing communities, semi-independent in nature. In the following years, Hutton developed the idea of a Northeastern Province "embracing all the Hill Fringes from Lushai land on the South right round to the Balipara Frontier Tract on the North, embracing on the way to Chittagong Hill tracts of Bengal and Chins of Burma and perhaps the Shans States too."

In 1941, the idea was taken up once again by Robert Reid, the then Governor of Assam who was also responsible for the Naga Hills. Reid endorsed Hutton's idea of a Northeastern Province with Chittagong serving as a "Crown Colony" under the Chief Commissioners independent of the Government of India and Burma and directly accountable to Whitehall. The proposal was placed before Reginald Coupland, a Constitutional Expert from Nuffield College at Oxford and Bief Professor of History of the British Empire. Coupland examined the Plan and suggested that it would require treaty arrangements with the Governments of India and Burma for an effective administration as a "Trust Territory" directly under Whitehall. When the Nagas knew such a British scheme, the Nagas opposed it vehemently because they had no affection for any kind of British imperialism and colonialism in their land.

On December 20, 1964, the Peace Mission issued proposals running into 17 Paras appealing to both the Government of India and the Federal Government of Nagaland. Para 13 proposed the Federal Government of Nagaland (FGN) on its own volition to be participant in the Union of India. But it was not acceptable to the Nagas. In 1964, at the peak of the Indo-Naga political negotiation, the proposal of a Naga leader, R. Suisa called 'Uncle Suisa Proposal', agreed in principle by both the GoI and the FGN to be the basis for settlement of the Indo-Naga politico-military conflict. But the FGN backed out of the deal even after sending feelers to its President, A.Z. Phizo in London, perhaps
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due to the impression that the Proposal of Suisa was short of self-determination of the Nagas.\(^{169}\) Suisa’s Proposal had the following main features:

\[a)\] Permanent link between India and Nagaland has to be there;

\[b)\] Some subjects have to be selected to be subjects of common concern;

\[c)\] India and Nagaland has to form a federation (or call it by any name);

\[d)\] Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communication and so on to be subjects of common objects; and

\[e)\] Delhi or anywhere in India according to convenience to be location of seat of federation.

Suisa’s thesis was based on the line of the Puerto Rico Model.\(^{170}\) The concept was based on Estado Libre Associado- the Associated Free State. The Puerto Ricans demanded total independence in the 40s but by 50s a legislation to permit the creation of this State was moved through Congress and it became law in 1952. Puerto Rico then became a member of the “Union with the USA” and was linked by law. The associated States embodied four elements of relationship with the USA, which are advantageous to Puerto Rico. They are:

\[a)\] A substantial net inflow of Federal Funds,

\[b)\] Freedom from the Federal taxes,

\[c)\] Common market and common citizenship, and

\[d)\] Special treatment under Federal Laws and Regulations.

Incidentally, Noorani also gave suggestions for the possibility of solving the Indo-Naga problem based on the Puerto Rico Constitutional States.\(^{171}\) He wrote: “The constitutional status of Puerto Rico is a model which may have a lot to teach us. The Nagas are not averse to a treaty between India and Nagaland defining their relationship but as ‘Neighbours’. India, on the other hand, would like the relationship to be based on Nagaland’s participation as a constituent member of the Indian Union and Nagaland not
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by treaty but a law binding all.\textsuperscript{172} In fact some Indian scholars have been suggesting a broadly similar approach of the ‘Saami Council’.\textsuperscript{173} The Saami People are found in three Nordic Countries, namely, Norway, Sweden and Finland and also in a small number in the Kola Peninsula of Russia. Each of the three Nordic Countries has a Saami Parliament. Now these Parliaments coordinate their activities through a non-statutory Saami Council.

B.K. Roy Burman has also made his own Proposals. They are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a)] *The Naga People undoubtedly constitutes a nation. Historically they are not Indians;*
  \item [b)] *The Nagas on volition became part of Indians;*
  \item [c)] *Short-range Perspective:*
    \begin{itemize}
      \item [i)] *As a confidence-building measure (CBM), the GoI should take steps among others to repeal the draconian Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act and the Regulations that are being imposed in the Naga areas;*
      \item [ii)] *The GoI must assure the Nagas on the continuation of the traditional rights of the Nagas in respect of land based resources;*
      \item [iii)] *A non-territorial jurisdiction should be envisaged cutting across State boundaries within India with much more enhanced legislative, administrative, and judicial and development oriented powers to the existing Autonomous District Councils and Sixth Schedule by constituting coordinating bodies.*
      \item [iv)] *The Nagas should be allowed to have non-statutory trans-border coordinating bodies or the like to enable them to mix freely without restrictions in the de facto border of India and Myanmar.*
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

d) Long-range Perspective:

i) A non-territorial solution without ignoring the territorial nexus;

ii) A limitation of the role (authority and power) of the GoI (and Burma) for greater freedom of existence for the Nagas.

His suggestion for resolution of the conflict are confined to the non-territorial solution for which his critics would say that it is extremely doubtful whether such suggestion would be workable in the short or long term perspectives. It is felt by critics that at the most such suggestion would be workable as an interim arrangement before a final solution of the Indo-Naga problem is effective.\(^{174}\) Peace Mission Committee already made the suggestion of B.K.Roy Burman for voluntary participation of the Nagas in the Union of India, which was not acceptable to the Nagas. However, Roy Burman seems to suggest that the issue is a settled one and it should not be reopened. This could be a dangerous perception for the acceptance of the Nagas being Indian is still a disputed issue.\(^{175}\)

R. Vashum, also suggested that in his case, the main basis of the Indo-Naga Peace Talks have to be the question of Sovereignty of the Nagas, be it limited or otherwise. However, it will be necessary that certain subjects like Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communication be taken up for discussions for the mutual benefit and interest of India and Nagalim.\(^{176}\) For R. K. Satapathy, Mizoram has become a role model for conflict resolution not only for the other States in the Northeast, but for other parts of the world as well.\(^{177}\) The Mizo National Front (MNF), which was fighting for complete independence for greater Mizoram against the GoI, signed the Memorandum of Settlement or Mizo Peace Accord on June 30, 1986, through Insider-Partial Mediator.\(^{178}\) The Memorandum of Settlement incorporated some important issues in its provisions.


\(^{175}\) Ibid., p. 13.

\(^{176}\) Ibid., p. 13.


\(^{178}\) Ibid., pp. 57-73.
The MNF agreed to end underground activities, surrender all arms and weapons to the appropriate authority, come back to civil life and eschew violence within a stipulated time frame. It further agreed to delete its objective of “independence of Mizoram from the Union of India” from its constitution to confirm its faith in the Indian Constitution. The Government of India, on its part, agreed to rehabilitate underground MNF cadres with adequate compensation. It also agreed to upgrade the status of Mizoram from the existing Union Territory to a full-fledged State of the Indian Union. Further, the Government of India committed to establish a High Court and a University for the State. The Government of India duly recognized the socio-cultural autonomy of the Mizo people.179

However, Mizo Peace Accord of 1986 could not be a role model for the Indo-Naga politico-military conflict. The reason will not be difficult to mention here. We will discuss in the following chapters that the Shillong Accord of November 11, 1975 between the GoI and the FGN was a failure because the acceptance of the Constitution of India and surrendering of arms were rejected by the Nagas led by Isak Chishi Swu, Chairman and Thuingaleng Muivah, General Secretary of the NSCN.

Speaking out for the first time since a dialogue on the Indo-Naga Political Issue between the Representatives of the Naga National Movement and New Delhi resumed last December (2004), Thuingaleng Muivah, General Secretary, NSCN, told BBC World: Hard Talk India that,180 “Nagaland was never a part of India either by conquest by India or by consent of the Nagas. This is very clear.” On Sovereignty, which, he said, belongs “to the Naga people and to the Naga people alone”, he spoke about “a special federal relationship” with India but not within India: “Sovereignty of the Naga people belongs to the Naga people and to the Naga people alone. There cannot be otherwise. Nagas have a right to decide their future, to determine their faith also. So long as that is

179 Ibid., p. 7.
there adjustments can be made...So long as the national identity of the Nagas is recognized and honoured that (adjustment) is possible...When we say a special federal relationship it has to be on the terms of agreement that can be arrived at...It should be a federation of India and Nagalim. Within the Indian Union or within the framework of the Indian Constitution is not possible.” The “special federal relationship” as maintained by Th. Muivah is important in the sense that this proposal is one of the latest positions of the Nagas for a viable political solution.

Special Federal Relationship

Some of the main points the NSCN has put forwarded to the Government of India for a political solution within South and South East Asia includes Joint Defence, External Affairs, Communications, and Monetary Policies etc. In the external affairs the government of India should lead in handling the matters but in matters directly affecting the Nagas, the Naga people should represent themselves. Joint-defence would mean joint defence of Nagalim. With regards to matters such as, Communications and Monetary policies, both the entities will take policy decision bilaterally. In the course of the political talks it is learnt that the Nagas might have no problem of using Indian currency even though they are seeking for the right to self-determination. The “Special Federal Relationship” as proposed by the NSCN not only includes the above points but also for recognition of national identity of the Nagas, integration of all Naga areas, separate Naga Flag and a Naga Constitution.

With regards to the issue of a Naga Constitution, the world’s foremost constitutional lawyer, Yash Ghai who hold Sir Y.K. Pao Chair in Public Law in the University of Hong Kong, in his discussion with Union Minister of State, Oscar Fernandes in the Dutch capital after a similar meeting with Th. Muivah, General Secretary of the NSCN and his negotiating team on May 19, 2006, talked about the limits of flexibility of Indian constitution and suggested for a Naga Constitution. In the talk that was held in the Thai capital Bangkok, on July 29 to July 31, 2006, “Framework for Relationship” which was put forwarded by the Dutch NGO Kreddha, both the

181 The Telegraph, Calcutta, May 20, 2006; Yash Ghai is a Kenyan of Indian origin. He is a specialist in ethnic conflicts.
Government of India and the NSCN has agreed to study each other's Constitution.\textsuperscript{182} Now both the parties are studying each other's Constitution by forming Committee consisting of Constitutional experts from various countries.

However, the GoI has not come out with a concrete proposal. Therefore, the above issues still need to be discussed and negotiated between the GoI and the Nagas for a political solution. The political negotiations are still continuing between the GoI and the NSCN. The nature of the conflict calls for serious political will and commitment on both the conflicting parties so as to avoid mistakes committed in the past. Adhoc and temporary remedial measures so far have not worked and they should be discarded. The settlement between the Nagas and India can only be forged on the basis of a deep and sincere respect for the cultural, historical, and political traditions of the other side.\textsuperscript{183}

It is clear from the above discussion that various strands of theories, definitions, and models of conflict management, conflict resolution or conflict transformation, have their areas of applicability at different contexts and situations. It is understood that most of the above mentioned theories have been formulated for the inter-states and internal conflicts except some few theories and models like "Crown Colony" or "Trust Territory"\textsuperscript{184}, Rothman, Azar, NSCN's Model, Herb Feith and Alan Smith, indigenous perspective, Suisa's Proposal etc. Even though the present chapter and the whole thesis will make use of the conflict transformation theory including social critical theorists as a model, it is observed that these theories mostly talks about structural change and other transformation within the paradigm of nation-states discourse. In short, what has observed from the above discussion is that most of the theories on conflict and their way out hardly match the kind of the people's struggle for the right to self-determination or independence or sovereignty. It is to be noted that deeper theorizing and suitable models for such conflicts needs to be done and worked out by academicians, scholars, practitioners, policy-makers etc.

\textsuperscript{182} North East Sun, August 31, 2006
\textsuperscript{183} Ramachandra Guha, Reconciling the Nagas, in The Hindu, Magazine section, Sunday, May 27, 2007
\textsuperscript{184} This Model was suggested in the 1940s and now it will be difficult to use as a model because of the changed international politics.
Workable-transformative-roadmap

Nevertheless, the chapter intends to present a workable model by mixing or by combining of the above various strands of theories and models, which can be called as “Workable-transformative-roadmap” or WTR as a roadmap is a stepping stone for amicable conclusion of in the context of not only the ongoing Indo-Naga peace process which is a culmination of decades old conflict itself. Martin J. Dent’s model of “home rule” almost comes close to it. However, his model is lacking far behind in many areas and aspects from the WTR. Moreover, Dent’s model lacks political content and meaning which is contradictory to WTR. This “Workable-transformative-roadmap” is like a bridge connecting two mountain ranges or systems unlike adversarial severing of mutual relationship between two entities, in particular between the Nagas and the Government of India. The past and the present peace processes between the Indian Government and the Nagas are approaches towards establishing a mutual and friendly relationship unlike violent relationship. The Workable-transformative-roadmap or WTR envisioned a future relationship which is different from the present centre-state federal relations in India.

As the Second Indo-Naga Peace Process is based on the principle of unconditional dialogue, both the parties have been restrained from taking rigid positions i.e. the Indian Government will not insist on transforming the conflict within the framework of Indian Constitution while at the same time the Nagas will also not insist for a solution which is based on absolute Sovereignty. In this regard, the thesis has suggested a framework, i.e., Workable-transformative-roadmap or WTR which can be said as a meeting point between the two absolute or rigid positions between India and the Nagas. It needs to be pointed out that the past peace process of 1964 failed because there was no meeting point as the two entities could not come down from the rigid or absolute positions. The WTR in this sense is politically workable as a solution because it had not suggested for a rigid or absolutist formula. The WTR can not be worked out without inclusion of certain crucial elements of Sovereignty, national identity, various constitutional principles, territoriality, federalism, democracy, socialism, human rights, freedom, liberty, equality and psycho-politics and also psychocultural dynamics. The
roadmap is being suggested after taking into special consideration of the unconditional political dialogue which is underway between the Government of India and the NSCN.

The WTR has been formulated keeping in view the people's aspirations and desires of both parties. If the WTR could be implemented, both sides will have mutual gain and benefit, which means both the parties win. Therefore, the WTR is not a Zero-sum game (the gain of one party is a lose for the other party). It's a solution based on the principle of winning by both the parties. Neither of the party will be sacrificing anything. But, both parties meet their aspirations and desires through an integrative approach for an amicable peaceful political solution. Taking the present Indo-Naga political peace talks into consideration, the thesis has come out with this piece of framework so that the roadmap is relevant and indispensable.

It is to be noted that different kinds of conflicts should have different mechanisms to transform them. For example, economic problem should be dealt with such mechanism which will address the economic problem faced by the concerned people. Here, the point to be noted is that, proper and efficient diagnosis of various kinds of problems are required if researchers are truly searching for their remedial measures. This means an economic problem shall not be diagnosed as a cultural problem. If there is a wrong diagnosis of the problem, then, the mechanism applied to solve the problem will also go wastefully wrong and the result would be that there will be no redressal of the particular problem. And the problem will continue to persist.

In the same way, a political problem, in this case, the Indo-Naga issue should not be misinterpreted. The conflict between Indian Government and the Nagas has not been completely transformed due to the simple reason that the conflict has been wrongly defined and conceived. Different Governments of India since independence, academicians, policy-makers, military strategists and analysts, civil and military administrators, the media personalities, and other oppositional players for the past decades have defined and conceptualized the Indo-Naga political issue as an ethnic issue or law and order problem or insurgency movement or secessionist or separatist
movements. This misinterpretation, narrow perception and bias analysis of the issue have hardly transformed the conflict until today. This is one of the major shortcomings on the part of the Government of India and other actors while trying to solve one of the longest running conflicts in the world barring the one in Ireland.

The major mistake of the Government of India and the various so-called experts have committed is that the Indo-Naga issue which is political in nature and content has been consciously ignored and neglected. Such conscious policy has led the Government of India to approach the issue with measures such as constitutional formula, counter-insurgency and developmental packages. In the final reading, as the measures undertaken in the past hardly match the conflicting political point, the issue still remains untransformed and persisting. It means that correct mechanism and approach needs to be applied in such a conflict situation. Then, what would be the correct approach and mechanism to transform the political conflict? It is obvious that political mechanism and approach is the ultimate requirement if the parties are really willing to transform the conflict.

The WTR is a mechanism which could be applied to the Naga situation through mutual understanding and consent. This framework is a people-oriented design and democratic in content. This model is being devised for a long-term relationship between the parties. This means the parties should seek out for a politically transformative mechanism even today so that the conflict is substantially transformed and peaceful relationship take positive steps towards peace-building. The ongoing peace process can be said as one of the most opportune time for both the Government of India and the Nagas to find an amicable and mutually acceptable peaceful political solution. The hard-earned peace process should not only transform the Indo-Naga conflict but also a signal for a positive message of the authenticity of such peace process to various conflicts in the sub-continent in particular and the world in general. Once a political solution could be achieved through the peace process, the people will at last see the light of the day which will ultimately let the people think and realize that peace is achievable, transformable and practicable.
It is after due understanding of the political nature of the conflict that is being dealt herewith, and taking cues from the various models as discussed above, it can be rightly maintained that both sides need to think in terms of not only short-term solution but also in terms of long-term relationship. It is to be pointed out that the roadmap is suggested as a workable formula to transform the identity-based conflict or nationality-based conflict. As such the negotiating parties need to mutually recognise the fundamental needs of human being in its intrinsic values, such as identity, human rights, dignity, security, existential survival, Psychocultural dynamics, equality, positive peace as propounded by the thinkers like Rothman, Azar, Galtung, Elizabeth Crighton, Martha Abele Mac Iver, etc. For example, the recognition of the Nagas aspiration to preserve their “unique identity”\[185\] is a sine qua non for the new relationship (NSCN’s Model of a “Special Federal Relationship” and Rothman’s Identity-based Conflict Transformation Model, Azar’s Protracted Social Conflict Transformation Model etc.).

More efforts should be made for the preservation of the Naga democratic ethos, culture, arts, customary laws and usages (Ref. to Article 371 A of the Indian Constitution). While giving this effort, both the parties should make all out effort to strengthen the Indian democracy and the rule of law as well. The genuine aspiration and interest of the Nagas to restore the contiguity of the Naga geographical location which is hitherto separated shall be worked out cooperatively by both the parties as a means in seeking the solution. (NSCN’s Model and Conflict Transformation Theorists for Structural Change Models and Critical Social Theorists).

Martin J. Dent’s ‘sovereign land’, and not necessarily his ‘Super-federalism’, can be modified and deepened to suit the proposed “Workable-transformative-roadmap”. His ‘sovereign land’ which is limited to Nagaland state can be modified in such a manner as

\[185\] Karan Thapar used unique identity in his interview with Th. Muivah, General Secretary, NSCN, on 25th April 2005 that was Broadcasted on BBC World: Hard Talk India on 29th April and Re-telecasted on 1st May 2005.
to include Naga areas of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Manipur. Importantly, there is an ardent need to transform the overall political, socio-cultural and economic structures, as Kevin Clements, Vayrynen, A. B. Fetherston, Vivienne Jabri, Elise and Kenneth Boulding, John Paul Lederach, Adam Curle, Kumar Rupesinghe, Hugh Miall etc., propounded, which has engendered the conflict.

In transforming the structures, the Nagas should enjoy the full sovereign right over their land, natural and mineral resources, forest, oil, water, air (Suisa’s Proposal). Policing, judiciary, education, banking and financial institutions under the internal affairs of the Naga administrative set up are firmly to be incorporated in any future agreement (Suisa’s Proposal). However, in the areas of External, Defence, Monetary Policy, Communications and Transportations, there will be a joint-management by both Government of India and the Nagas though the Government of India will have a primary role in these areas (NSCN’s Model). It may be suggested that the Indian Currency could be a common currency for both parties. As far as Herb Feith’s and Alan Smith’s suggestions are concerned, the wisdom of the conflictants will decide.

A modernized infrastructure would be engineered to effectuate the opening and development of roads between neighbouring Naga territories as a part of the roadmap (included in Grace Collins’s Goodwill Missions Team Report, Unofficial White Paper Report of the Fact Finding Mission to Naga Areas May 16-27, 2005). Joint Economic Development Council should be formed to promote trade and investment (Grace Collins). Besides, Line of Control may be created to safeguard each other’s interest. A “No War” policy would be declared as part of peaceful relationship (Grace Collins). The continuation of the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, Restricted Area Permit, Disturbed Area Act, etc. in the Naga areas has always been hindering factors in the process of conflict transformation (B.K. Roy Burman’s Proposal). To this we may recall what Kevin Clements had to say, conflict transformation occurs when violence ceases and/or is expressed in non-violent ways, and when the original structural sources of the

\[186\] We are excluding the Nagas of Burma in this analysis due to the fact the present peace process is only in the Indian side. It does not necessary mean that we cannot include the Nagas of Burma in the ‘sovereign land’ as suggested.
conflict (economic, social, political, military, and cultural) are changed in some ways. The propensity for violence is diminished by democratization, demilitarization, de-alignment, socio-economic development, and expansion of human rights, humanitarian law, and socio-cultural openness (Kelvin Clements). 187 Ross’s suggestion is relevant as far as the Nagas’ assertion for recognition of their national identity is concerned. Psychocultural dynamics are complex and have multidimensional aspects which are deeply rooted in the hearts and minds of the people and not in the material world.

It might be added here of what B.K. Roy Burman’s proposition had to say, as a confidence-building measure (CBM), the GoI should take steps among others to repeal the draconian Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act and the Regulations that are being imposed in the Naga areas, though his non-territorial solution and the rest of his formulation in line with the Saami Council could not be fitted into our formulation in this chapter. The idea behind repealing the Act and other provisions is in keeping with the spirit of peaceful environment so that the real sovereignty lies with the people, and that they experience the true meaning of democracy and the rule of law. Here the emphasis is on the importance of reclaiming the shrinking of democratic space in the society. The principles and values such as rights, justice, liberty, freedom of expression, human security and well-being are all for the common good of the people. The two parties should also address the ‘psychocultural dynamics’ as Ross suggests that intransigent conflict results from a complex interplay between psychocultural dynamics and interpretations and substantive “interest”. 188 Ross’s suggestion is relevant as far as identity-based conflict is differentiated from resource-based or interest-based conflicts.

Many conflicts contain elements that are relatively obvious, observable, and tangible. A landlord and tenant struggle over value, that is, the tenant wants more


services, for which the landlord wants more rent. Several nations compete for a single economic market. Interest-based disputes are usually concrete and clearly defined, and the outcomes each side seeks are bounded by the resources at stake: more or less land, wages and benefits, or military and economic power. However, many other conflicts are relatively intangible and deeply rooted in the more abstract and interpretative dynamics of history, psychology, culture, values, and beliefs of identity groups. Israelis and Palestinians battle over issues of safety and control like the Government of India and the Nagas. Labour and management battle over issues of organisational survival and participation. Communities battle over issues of tradition and change. These are identity conflicts because they derive from existential and underlying psychological concerns that are perceived as threatened or frustrated as a result of, or resulting in, intransigent conflict. These disputes are usually, at their source, very complex, relatively intangible, and often hard to define clearly. Rooted as they are in complex and multidimensional psychological, historical, and cultural factors, identity conflicts are marked by a difficulty in clear determination of their parameters and boundaries. In fact such conflicts are so intangible and hard to define because they arise from the depths of the human heart rather than the material world.

It is important that democratisation of the peace process is crucial even at this juncture. Once an agreement is arrived at between the Nagas and the Government of India, peacebuilding at all levels from the grass-root to the highest is necessary in the course of conflict Transformation. The need of the hour is to take a concrete policy decision on the political issue. In this regard, former President of the U.S.A., Jimmy Carter’s letter written to Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India and the NSCN leaders on June 18, 2005 is noteworthy, which says, “I encourage you to move ahead with your conversations to present an acceptable solution that will assure the rights of the Naga people and the security of India.” There is a positive aspect of economic

---

189 Ibid. p. 11
191 Jimmy Carter’s Letter to Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India and the NSCN Leaders on June 18, 2005, in Appendix-2, in Nagas: Their Pilgrimage for Self-Self-Existence and Quest for Dignity and Peace, Published by Oking Publicity and Information department, GPRN, November 2005, p. 33
development and growth, socio-cultural revitalization and progress once there is a concrete political solution to the six decades old imbroglio. To do this Herculean task, the two negotiating parties need political will with utmost sincerity and honesty.

The world would be a witness to the changed political scenario that has transformed from adversaries to friends. This changed political scenario is indicative of Follet's integrative approach, that is, when a solution has been found in which both desires (aspirations) have found a place, such that neither side has to sacrifice anything as Rothman would suggest. Such a political solution will be a harbinger for other conflicts in the region as well as in the international system. In the future peace-building process, the assistance and intervention of the international community on the humanitarian and development activities would be needed in the efforts to transform the conflict.