CHAPTER - I

Dynamics of Conflict

Co-operation and conflict are the two important characteristics of every society. Conflict exists even in those societies, which are small, homogenous and cohesive. In fact, conflict is a universal phenomenon. It is inevitable and one of the important sources of social change. Social conflict emerges in a society due to various reasons or factors and is of different forms. Sociologists have explained causes and consequences of social conflict in different ways. No doubt, there is a conflict theory in sociology but it is advocated by sociologists of different schools of thought. Karl Marx, Ralf Dahrendorf, George Simmel and Lewis A. Coser are four main advocates of conflict theory. However, many differences of understanding and explanation exist among them.

1.a Sociological Perspectives On Conflict

A sociological perspective is a set of ideas, which understands and explains social phenomenon in its context. As the understanding of social phenomena differ from society to society and within a society from individual to individual belonging to different social classes or groups, multiplicity of sociological perspectives is inevitable. Functionalism, Marxism or conflict theory is some of the major perspectives in sociology. Every perspective explains social conflict in its own way. However, Marxism, functionalism and conflict theory are major perspectives in the area of social conflict.

Conflict theory has its roots in Marxian perspective, which adopts dialectical method for explaining social reality. Therefore, Karl Marx is an important thinker who considers social conflict as a driving force of society.
1.a.1. Dialectical Perspective:

It would be appropriate here to explain the concept of dialectics. According to G. Ritzer, American sociologist, dialectics is both a way of thinking and an image of the world that stresses the importance of processes, relations, dynamics, conflicts and contractions – dynamic rather than a static way of thinking. At the most general level, a dialectical perspective means a focus on the social totality^.

Dialectical method of inquiry was borrowed by Karl Marx from German philosopher-George Hegel. For Hegel changes occur in society due to changes in ideas. And, changes in ideas occur because of contradiction or clash and conflict of ideas. This theory of ideational dialectics of Hegel was borrowed by Karl Marx but replaced the word idea with matter. So changes in society, according to Karl Marx, occur due to clash or conflict of material forces or interests. Therefore, his theory is known as dialectical materialism or Historical materialism. In the context of social life Marx used this perspective in his class-conflict theory^.

Marx views conflict ubiquitous and inevitable in society. He says that permanent order and integration is not possible in a society, which is based on class structure, inequality and exploitation. So long as personal property and classes exist there will be conflict between have’s and have not’s over the distribution of wealth or material interests. Conflict, for Marx, is not a goal but a means to achieve an integrated social structure.

In class conflict theory Marx holds that the economic organization especially the ownership of property determines the organization of the rest of a society, the class-structure and the institutional arrangements like polity, religion, law etc; are actually the reflection of the economic base of a society. According to Marx inherent in the
economic organization of any society except communist society are forces inevitably generating revolutionary class conflict. Therefore, for Marx the source of conflict in a society lies in its infrastructure or the economic base of a society, where the unequal distribution of property and power initiates a sequence of events leading to revolutionary class-conflict. Such revolutionary class conflict is seen as bipolar, dialectical as well as occurring in periods, with successive basis of economic organization sowing the seeds of their own destruction through the polarization of classes and subsequent overthrow of the dominant class by the subjugated and the system is changed.

J.H. Turner, sociologist, in his book *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (1995) says that the Marx's "class conflict model" has been influential in the development of modern conflict theory – which has been most frequently used by contemporary theorists. He has formulated certain propositions given by Marx, which are as follows:

1) The more unequal is the distribution of scarce resources in a system, the greater is the conflict of interest between dominant and subordinate groups in a system.

2) The more subordinate segments become aware of their true collective interests, the more likely are they to question the legitimacy of the existing pattern of distribution of scarce resources. The subordinate segments become aware when they communicate their grievances to each other, develop unifying ideologies and when the dominant segment of the society bring social changes which disrupt existing relations among subordinates as well as create alien native dispositions among them.
3) The greater is the ideological unification of members of subordinate segments of a system and the more developed is their political leadership structure, the more likely are dominant and subjugated segments of a system to become polarized.

4) The more polarized are the dominant and the subjugated; the more violent is their conflict.

5) The more violent is the conflict, the greater is the structural change of the system and the greater is the redistribution of scarce resources.

Another important sociologist who is famous for theorizing on social conflict is Ralf Dahrendorf. Although Dahrendorf uses same method, dialectical, as was used by Karl Marx. Like Marx, he (Dahrendorf) thinks agreement and stability of a system is cut off from reality.

Dahrendorf holds that conflict is a social reality. The role of compulsion is more important than that of consensus in the unity of social structure. Thus, he argues that one-sided conflict model be substituted for the one-sided functional model. The model that emerges from his theoretical calling is a dialectical-conflict perspective. He views contemporary post-capitalistic society as a plurality of relatively discreet "Imperatively Coordinated Associations" (ICA’s). Each association (ICA) is composed of two groups one in authority and other out of it. There has been conflict over authority between these two groups. When their interests are latent, they are quasi-groups; when their interests become manifest, they are interest groups.

Accordingly to Dahrendorff, under certain specified conditions, ICA’s polarize into two conflict groups, which then engage in a contest over authority. The resolution of this contest or conflict involves the redistribution of authority in the ICA, thus making conflict the source of change in social systems. In turn, the redistribution of authority represents the institutionalisation of a new cluster of ruling and ruled ones that under
certain conditions polarize into two interest groups. Social reality is thus typified in terms of this unending cycle of conflict over authority within the various types of ICA’s comprising the social world. Therefore, for Dahrendorf, the dynamics of conflict lies in the institutionalized authority relations of ICA’s.

Some of the Dahrendorf’s key propositions on conflict are as follows:

1. The more members of quasi-groups in ICA’s can become aware of their objective interests and form a conflict group, the more likely is conflict to occur.

   (a) The more the technical conditions of organization can be met (like leadership cadre and charter) the more likely is the formation of a conflict group.

   (b) The more the political conditions of organization can be met (by permitting organization of opposed interests) the more likely is the formation of conflict group.

   (c) The more the social conditions of organization can be met (by permitting quasi-groups to communicate), the more likely is the formation of conflict.

2. The less the technical, political and social conditions of organization are met, the more intense is the conflict.

3. The more the deprivations of the subjugated in the distribution of rewards, shifts from an absolute to relative basis the more violent is the conflict.

4. The less the mobility between super and subordinate groups, the more intense is the conflict.
5. The more intense the conflict, the more structural change and reorganization it will generate.

6. The more violent the conflict, the greater is the rate of structural change and reorganization.

J. H. Turner writes, there are some similarities between both Marx and Dahrendorf:

1. Social systems are seen by both in a continual state of conflict.

2. Both presume that conflict is generated by opposed interests inherent in the social structure.

3. For both conflict is dialectical.

4. Interests are seen by both as tending to polarize into two conflict groups.

5. Social change is seen by both as ubiquitous feature of social systems.

While contradicting K. Marx, Dahrendorf argues that Marx' s conception of those who are dominant economically would be dominant politically has lost whatever validity it may once had. Although he argues that domination in one association does not necessarily involve domination in all others to which he belongs.

Thus, we see social conflict is inevitable and necessary condition for bringing about social change for both the thinkers. Karl Marx saw the conflict in a simplified way as it occurs between two classes of people i.e. have's and have-not's.

Dahrendorf differs from K. Marx and looks at social conflict in a more deeper and comprehensive way. For him conflict does not take place
between the two classes of people but in members of the imperatively coordinated associations (ICA) or between the two institutionalised authorities. More and more people know about their objectives and rights, greater would be the conflict.

1.a.2. Functional Perspective:

Functionalism views society as a system. A system is an entity made up of interconnected and interrelated parts. To understand any part of society, the part must be seen in relation to society, as a whole. From this viewpoint, it follows that each part will in some way affect every other part and the system as a whole.

Early functionalists did not pay much attention to the study of social conflict, which has become very important from the beginning of 20th Century. Therefore, sociologists like George Simmel and Lewis A. Coser have analysed social conflict from the functional perspective. Functionalists explore the causes of conflict in social structure and analyse its functions at various levels.

German scholar, George Simmel viewed conflict as ubiquitous and inevitable in society. He recognised that an overly cooperative, consensual and integrated society would show no life process. He says that conflict is a form of sociation i.e. need for hating and fighting among the members of society is mixed with others for love and affection. For him the dynamics of conflict lies in the innate biological make up of human actors.

It merits mention here that Simmel had given positive form to the concept of conflict by describing how it plays an important role in maintaining the social structure—mingling of associative and dissociative processes resolving dualisms and achieving some kind of unity in the society.
Moreover, Simmel's work on conflict reveals that conflict is a variable, which shows different states of intensity or violence. He developed some propositions for explaining the intensity of social conflicts. These are as follows.

1) The greater is the degree of emotional involvement of parties to a conflict, the more likely is the conflict to be violent.

2) The more that conflict is perceived by members of conflict groups to transcend individual aims and interests, the more likely is the conflict to be violent.

3) The more that conflict is a means to a clearly specified end, the less likely is the conflict to be violent.

Moreover, Simmel had also formulated propositions over the consequences of conflict. These propositions would be discussed in the later section of this chapter.

Another important sociologist who is known for his work on social conflict is Lewis A. Coser who is a functionalist, the perspective, which has been criticized for undermining the importance of conflict. In fact, classical functionalists did not give much attention to the study of social conflict. Unlike his predecessors he has not merely paid greater attention to the study of social conflict but has also treated conflict as a universal phenomenon. Coser views conflict as a process that under certain conditions functions to maintain the body social or some of its parts. He stresses that all social worlds can be viewed as a system which reveals imbalances, tensions, and conflicts of interest among its various parts. Under certain conditions, imbalances in the integration of system parts lead to the outbreak of the conflict, which, in turn, causes temporary reintegration of the
system. In fact, it is this reintegration, which increases the flexibility and adaptability of the social system in changing conditions. Thus, for Coser the source of conflict in society lies in or between the various parts of society.

He has formulated propositions concerning with causes and consequence of social conflict. Following proposition about causes of social conflict are formulated by Coser.

1- The more subordinate members in a system of inequality question the legitimacy of the existing distribution of scarce resources, the more likely are they to initiate conflict.

   a) The fewer are the channels for redressing grievances over the distribution of scarce resources by subordinates, the more likely are they to question legitimacy

   b) The more membership in privileged group is sought by subordinates and the less mobility allowed, the more likely are they to withdraw legitimacy.

2- The more deprivations of subordinates are transformed from absolute to relative, the greater will be their sense of injustice, and hence, the more likely are they to initiate conflict\textsuperscript{13}.

It merits mention here that all the four sociologists belonging to two different schools of thought have similarity on at least two points. Firstly, social conflict is universal and inevitable. And, secondly, sources of conflict lie in the social structure. However, they have certain disagreements on points concerning with nature of sources and consequences of the conflicts.
1.b Meaning of Conflict:

The word social conflict has no uniform definition. Different sociologists have defined the concept in different ways. Conflict is defined as an event in conventional usage. Here it means an overt act of clash between two parties at a given space and time.

Contrary to conventional usage, sociologists have defined the conflict as interaction condition or as a social process\textsuperscript{14}.

J. H. Turner defines; a conflict is direct and overt interaction between the parties in which the actions of each party are directed at inhibiting their adversaries attainment of goals\textsuperscript{15}.

Galtung defines conflict as a condition, “an action system is said to be in conflict if the system has two or more incompatible goal states”\textsuperscript{16}.

L.A. Coser defines it as a process, “a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals”\textsuperscript{17}.

Ralf Dahrendorf uses the world conflict in a comprehensive way as he includes competitions, disputes and tensions as well as manifest clashes between social forces in the definition of conflict. Dahrendorf's definition of conflict is consistent with his dialectical assumptions: ICA's reveal “conflicts of interest” among quasi – groups, which under technical, social, and political conditions become true conflict groups willing to engage in overt action against each other\textsuperscript{18}.

Clinton Fink, conflict is any social situation or process in which two or more entities are linked at least by one form of antagonistic
psychological relation or at least by one form of antagonistic interaction\textsuperscript{19}.

Robin Williams, Jr. defines conflict in one essay as \textit{"interaction} in which one party intends to deprive, control, or eliminate another, against the will of that other. Pure conflict is a \textit{fight}, its goal is to immobilize, neutralize, destroy, or otherwise harm an opponent. In the impure world of actuality, some overt struggles are conducted accordingly to rules and for limited goals; oppositional behaviour may then have the primary goal of winning rather than injuring the opponent, we then usually call the encounter a \textit{game}. Some games merge into \textit{debates} in which the primary aim is to convince or persuade opponents or others of the rightness or correctness or attractiveness of one’s views or claims\textsuperscript{20}.

Thus, we see conflict is a process in which two parties come into direct interaction and one of the parties attempts to resist the will of other in order to achieve its goal. Such an act takes place in a situation where does exist an imbalance between goals of people and opportunities or means for achieving these goals.

1.c. Classification of Conflict:

Like the definition of social conflict, there is no unanimity among the sociologists in the classification of conflict. Every sociologist has classified conflict in his own way. We find four kinds of classifications of social conflict. These classifications are based on the sources of conflict, goals of conflict, interests in conflict and area of conflict.

Francis Abraham has classified social conflict on the basis of sources of conflict into two broad categories: endogenous and exogenous conflicts.
He maintains that endogenous sources of conflict remain in – built or within a society and could be distinguished as: conflict over the distribution of desirables, values, authority and conflict between the individual and society. While exogenous conflicts are those conflicts, which occur from the out or between systems. These conflicts normally fall into three categories: wars, cultural invasions and ideological conflicts.

Lewis A. Coser has classified conflict on the basis of goals into realistic and non-realistic conflicts.\(^{21}\)

Conflicts, which arise from frustration of specific demands within the relationship and from estimates of gains of the participants can be called realistic conflict, in so far as they are means towards a specific result or goal.

Non-realistic conflicts, on the other hand, are occasioned by the need for tension release. Although non-realistic conflict too involves the interaction between two or more personal but it allows no functional alternative of means and are not aimed at the attainment of a concrete result.\(^{22}\)

Prof. R.J. Rummel classified conflict on the basis of interests into three categories.

1- Conflict of congruent/ positive interest.

2- Conflict of inverse interest.

3- Conflict of incompatible interest

1. Conflict of congruent interest occurs when both individuals desire for the same thing. This kind of conflict is often forgotten in the belief that similar interests and values avoid conflict.
2. Whereas, conflict of inverse interest occurs when the positive interest of one is the negative interest of another. For instance, one politician may want to increase social welfare payments, another to decrease them.

3. Conflict of incompatible interest occurs when the interest of the two parties are incompatible. For instance, one Indian may want to remain capitalistic while another may want it to become socialistic.

Another conflict scholar, Wilf. H. Ratzburg classifies conflict on the basis of area into three categories:

(i) Regional conflict

(ii) Centralist conflict

(iii) Revolutionary wars

(i) Regional Conflict involves struggle carried out between an identity group and the central authority of the state in which the group resides. When rebel groups are geographically and culturally separated from the ruling majority, their goal is often autonomy or secession. In other cases conflict may be over power and control over resources.

(ii) Centralist Conflict: When the purpose of the conflict is to overthrow a regime, it is said to be centralist. When minority groups are geographically intermixed throughout the territory of a state and were patterns of subjugations and domination are present, communal groups sometimes seek the “ousting” of a ruling elite in favour of leaders of their own kin.

(iii) Revolutionary war: It can be distinguished from the identity – based centralist conflicts, in this type of conflict the aim is to
overthrow the present system and replace it with one that is more just, pious, such as fully communist system or an Islamic system. In contrast to the revolutionary type, centralist conflicts focus less on redesigning society and more on political office.

There are many other ways of classifying conflicts. In fact we can classify conflict on the basis of parties involved in the conflict like individual conflict, ethnic conflict, social conflict or on the basis of locale of conflict like local conflict, national conflict, international conflict and on the basis of nature and consequences of conflict like feud, war etc. Thus, there is no definite way of classifying social conflicts.

1.d. Sources of Conflict:

How does a social conflict emerge in society? We have different answers of this question. Differences among sociologists emerge due to variation in their perspectives or logic of inquiry. Sources of conflict as conceptualized by sociologists may broadly be seen in three different ways. First, some sociologists see sources of conflict in individual interests and the biological make up of human actors as well as in the subjective meaning of social reality. German sociologist, George Simmel in his book Conflict and The Web of Group Affiliations postulates that an innate hostile impulse or a need for hating and fighting among the units of organic wholes are mixed with others for love and affection and is surrounded by the forces of social relationships. For Simmel, conflict is a reflection of not only of conflict of interests but also of hostile instincts. Such instincts can be increased by conflict of interests or mitigated by harmonious relations as well as by instincts for love. Thus, for Simmel sources of conflict ultimately lies in the biological make up of human actors.
Whereas R.J Rummel argues that objects or material conditions do not carry up potential for conflict, the potential for conflict remains latent in the culture that gives varied meanings to material objects. In his view opposing interests are subjective in origin and not the automatic result of objective facts, conditions or events. For example, for some people conflict may generate over the shape of a table because of the meaning a particular shape has for the parties involved as in diplomatic negotiations to end the Vietnam war, some may conflict over an old useless broken cup simply because of its religious significance and some may conflict over whose name should be first on a theatre marquee, simply as or matter of status. Therefore, in Rummel's view the social seat of conflict lies in the subjective realm of society, that is, in the matrix of meanings, values, norms and perceived status and class.

Contrary to other sociologists see the sources of conflict in social structure. Among the sociologists who see the social structure as the main source of social conflict, there are differences. For Marxists sources of conflict lie in material conditions of a society. While for functionalists the sources are in the total structure and its parts. Infact, for a functionalist like Lewis A. Coser the inherent structural imbalances in or between the various segments of the social structure constitutes the main source of social conflict. Whereas, Karl Marx in his Class Conflict Theory says that the potential for conflict is inherent in every differentiated society, since such a society systematically generates conflicts of interest between persons and groups differentially located within the social structure and in relation to the means of production. Therefore, for Marx it is the material conditions of a society where the sources of conflict lie.

While for another dialectical theorist Ralf Dahrendorf the sources of conflict lie in the institutionalized authority relations of Imperatively
Coordinated Associations (ICA’s). Under certain specified conditions ICA’s polarize into two conflict groups, one in authority and other out of it. There has been conflict over authority between these two groups. The resolution of this conflict involves redistribution of authority in the ICA’s. It is therefore, for Dahrendorf the dynamics of conflict lies in the authority relations of Imperatively Coordinated Associations. Thus, over the sources of conflict there are differences among those who follow dialectical materialism as a method of inquiry. The difference is between Karl Marx and Ralf Dahrendorf.

However, differences among Marxists and functionalists on sources of social conflict appear to be sorted out with the concept of relative deprivation, a concept that is equally used by functionalists and Marxists to explain the sources of social conflict.

W.G. Runcimen in his work Relative Deprivation and Social Justice (1968) defines relative deprivation as men’s perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities. Value expectations are the goods and conditions of life to which people believe they are rightfully entitled. Value capabilities are the goods and conditions they think they are capable of getting and keeping.

The concept of relative deprivation was first used in 1940’s by the authors of the American Soldier to denote the feelings of an individuals who lacks some status or conditions that he thinks he should have, his standards of what he should have generally is determined by reference to what some other person or groups have. In conventional sociological sense, relative deprivation means status discrepancy against a reference group.
Sociologists belonging to both functional and dialectical school of thought have proved in their contributions that relative deprivation is the necessary precondition to any violence or revolutionary upheavals in a society. Relative deprivation is related to frustration by Coser, and applied to the explanation of suicide rates.

Renowned functionalist, R.K. Merton in his famous essay “Social Structure and Anomie: continuities” popularized the term relative deprivation by saying it (RD) corresponds with anomie. As, in anomie, like relative deprivation, a situation gets created in which men’s ends (value expectations) remain constant while means (value capabilities) are severely restricted. Anomie, though a sociological concept, is a breakdown of social behaviour, or normlessness. The degree of anomie in a social system is indicated by the extent to which there is a lack of consensus on legitimate norms and insecurity in social relations. Merton suggested that anomie could lead to wide spread deviant behaviour and the establishment of alternative norms, which constitutes “rebellion”. When rebellion becomes endemic in a substantial part of the society, it provides a potential for revolution, which reshapes both the normative and the social structure.

Another famous sociologist John Galtung attributes aggression within and among societies to status discrepancy, or rank disequilibrium. He says if men or groups are high on one dimension of a stratification system, but low on another, e.g. if they have high power or education but low income, they are said to be disposed to use violence or aggression to attain a high or equilibrated position on all dimensions.

James A. Geschwender attributes the American Negro revolt of the 1960’s to relative deprivation, defined in its conventional sociological sense of status discrepancy against a reference group.
The anthropological literature on American Indian response to white conquest also makes use of the deprivation concept. Philleo Nash, for example, shows how deprivation may occur either through acceptance or rejection by Indians of white’s values and skills, and proposes that the aggressive components in Indian revivalism are a response to that deprivation.

Dialectical theoreticians Marx and Engels argued the inevitable growth of profound dissatisfactions in the proletariat as a consequence of absolute deprivations or oppressions the destruction of the workers pride through his subjugation to a machine and the market, economic deprivation because of minimal wages and job insecurity, the latter a consequence of crisis in the economic system and repressive measure of the bourgeoisie state.

Infact, Ralf Dahrendorf another dialectical theorist in his book entitled Class and Class Conflict attributes the occurrence of conflict in a society to relative deprivation. The more the deprivation of the subjugated in the distribution of rewards shift from absolute to relative basis, the more violent is the conflict.

Thus, seeds of relative deprivation (RD) lie in social structure. This may be experienced by an individual or group partly or wholly. It means an individual or group may feel relatively deprived if do not have adequate economic opportunity, social status or political power and all things in combined. When relative deprivation is experienced by a group, it generally gives rise to various kinds of conflicts. Sociologists try to seek causes of conflict or relative deprivation in the economy, polity, religion and in other social institutions. Thus, we have economic, political, religious causes of conflict as we have mentioned earlier the postulate of Ralf Dahrendorf that greater the relative deprivation, intense would be the conflict.
1.e. Consequences of Social Conflict:

Social conflict has far reaching consequences for a society. These consequences are conceptualized by functionalists as "functions of social conflicts". Consequences or functions of social conflict are positive and negative, advantageous or harmful for a society as a whole and groups within a society. Positive consequences of social conflict are seen in terms of promoting in group solidarity, giving rise to innovation or new set of parameters for social life, re-examining existing policies of society or bringing change in society. For example, Karl Marx saw a positive aspect in conflict as it drives society to change and establish rule of proleterate.

German sociologist, George Simmel has given positive form to the concept of conflict by maintaining that it has consequences for social continuity rather than change. He says:

"Conflict is thus designed to resolve dualisms; it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it be through the annihilation of one of the contending parties. This is roughly parallel to the fact that it is the most violent symptom of a disease, which represents the effort of the organism to free itself of disturbances and damage caused by them."

Simmel had conceptualized the consequences of conflict for the parties involved in it and for the whole society. His propositions regarding the consequences of conflict for the parties involved in it are as follows:

1) The more violent are inter-group hostilities and the more frequent is conflict among groups, the less likely are group boundaries to disappear.
2) The more violent is the conflict and the less integrated is the group, the more likely is despotic centralization of conflict groups.

3) The more violent is the conflict, the greater will be the internal solidarity of conflict groups^44.

While, Simmel has suggested certain important propositions on the functions of conflict for the social whole which are as follows:

1) The less violent is the conflict between groups of different degrees of power in a system, the more likely is the conflict to have integrative consequences for the social whole.

   a) The less violent and more frequent is the conflict, the more members of subordinate groups can release hostilities and have a sense of control over their destiny and thereby maintain the integration of the social whole.

   b) The less violent and more frequent is the conflict, the more likely are norms regularizing the conflict to be created by the conflicting parties.

2) The more violent and the more prolonged are conflict relations between groups, the more likely is the formation of coalitions among previously unrelated groups in a system.

3) The more prolonged is the threat of violent conflict between groups, the more enduring are the coalitions of each of the conflicting parties^45.

Another famous functional scholar L.A. Coser has written extensively on the positive functions of social conflict. He maintains that conflict allows expression of hostility and the mending of strained relationships. It leads to the elimination of specific sources of conflict
between parties and enables them to redress their grievances through the establishment of new norms or the affirmation of old ones. Hostility towards the out-group unifies the in-group. When the need for greater solidarity is felt, members of the in-group tend to exaggerate conflicts with other groups, and where such conflicts exist any deviation from the group norms is severely condemned. Social conflicts not only generate new norms and institutions but also new coalitions and alliances; they bring about technological improvements, revitalize economy, and lubricate the social system; they facilitate the release of tension and frustration and enable the social system to adjust itself.

According to Coser, the consequences of conflict on social structure vary according to the type of social structures. In flexible social structures or plural societies conflict that aims at a resolution of tension between antagonists is likely to have stabilising functions. As, it permits the direct expression of opposing claims and tries to eliminate the sources of conflict and with the result unity is established in the system. In such flexible societies, multiple affiliations of individuals make them participate in a variety of group conflicts so that those who are antagonists in one conflict are allies in another. The pluralism of associations in such type of societies leads to a plurality of fronts of conflict, which are likely to crisscross one another and thereby prevent cleavages along one axis. The intensity of any one of these conflicts is likely to be relatively low. This segmental participation in multiplicity of conflicts constitutes a balancing mechanism within the structure. In this way, conflicts may be said to sew pluralistic society together.

However, in rigid social structures or closed groups the impact of conflict is likely to be quite different. In closed groups conflict are likely to be more intense because such groups do not permit the
expression of hostility between the parties since they fear its disruptive consequences. These closed groups, moreover, tend to absorb the total personality of their members; they are jealous of member’s affiliation with other groups and desire to monopolize their loyalty. The resultant deep involvement of the members and the intimate association among them is likely to lead to a great deal of hostility to which the group denies legitimate outlets.

According to Coser, closeness of association and structural rigidity may lead to a high intensity of conflicts; they do not lead to a high degree of violence. Violence refers to the choice of means for carrying out the conflict. While, the intensity of conflict, they do not lead to a high degree of violence refers to the choice of means for carrying out the conflict. While, the intensity of conflict means the degree of involvement of the participants. Intensity and violence may vary independently of each other. The more integrated into the society are the parties to the conflict, the less likely will the conflict between them be violent. As, there is likelihood that the conflicting parties will choose less violent or institutionalized means for realizing their goals, such as, institutionalized strikes or regularized contests in those societies that permit the integration of lower classes or ethnic and other minority groups into the social order.

Lewis Coser says that social conflicts that do not attack the basic values or assumptions upon which the foundation of any society is based are positively functional or advantageous for the society. These kind of conflicts occur mostly in open or plural societies because these societies not only allow the contending parties to express their anger but also institute variety of institutional safeguards against the type of conflict that might endanger the basic values of the society. It is actually the presence of these institutional safeguards that help to minimize the danger of divergences to touch
the basic layer of consensus within flexible social structures. Here it is important to note that these institutional safeguards could also be in the form of bringing marginalized or excluded groups within the fold of mainstream society, that is, by increasing their shares of income, wealth, power or prestige. Although after getting these privileges they may still engage in multifarious struggles in order to increase their shares of income, wealth, power etc., however, these conflicts will be waged within the limits of a consensus. In fact, social conflict has positive consequences for a society when it is waged within the limits of consensus.

Social conflict has negative, disadvantageous or sometimes-horrible consequences for a society. Coser also says that social conflicts in which the contending parties in conflict do not share the basic values upon which the legitimacy of the social system rests are dysfunctional or harmful for the social system. Conflicts having negative consequences are rampant in closed social systems or in societies, which are plural by name but not in practice. In these societies chances remain high that if conflict occurs despite the effort to repress it, it (conflict) will reach down to the basic layers of societal consensus. For example, if major strata of a society's population are permanently excluded from participation in the society's benefits they will tend to reject the very assumptions or values of a society upon which the society is built. And, if the systems of legitimation no longer fully operate or solve the problems of the people they will attempt to attack the social order through revolutionary violence. In fact, conflict has horrible consequences for a society in which conflicting parties no longer share the basic values of the social system.48

Other destructive or harmful consequences of conflict are: it diverts energy from the real task, destroys morale, polarizes individuals and groups, deepens differences, obstructs communication and
cooperative action, produces irresponsible behaviour, creates suspicion and distrust and decreases productivity. Moreover, destruction of public property, innocent killings like women, children, genocide, migration and refugee problems their displacement, procurement and rehabilitation are other horrible consequences of conflicts like war, racial, ethnic and communal violence or conflicts between dominant and subordinate groups in or between the societies. In such kind of conflicts powerful groups frequently use force to suppress voices of powerless or marginalized sections and consequently result into extreme form of human rights violation. In fact, it is these horrible consequences of conflict with which social activists, planners and policy makers are concerned.

1.f. Conflict Resolution:

Although conflict is seen by sociologists as universal phenomenon and a force of bringing about change in society. No society can afford to live perpetually in a state of conflict. Order, stability, integration or cohesion should be established for the proper functioning of the society and, therefore, conflict is to be resolved. Indeed, twentieth century has experienced many ethnic, national and international conflicts. Some of these conflicts are resolved while others are still persisting.

Conflict could be resolved in two ways. One is a natural way without human efforts. There are scholars who visualize conflict like a human organism, which is born, grows and dies. Similarly a conflict emerges, flourishes and disappears over a period of time. This may be expressed in a popular saying “Time is a great healer”.

Another way through which conflict is resolved is by human efforts. Conscious and deliberate policies and programmes are devised for resolving or managing conflict. It is in this sense that the term conflict
resolution or management is used. Conflict resolution is the process of resolving a dispute or a conflict by providing each side's needs, and adequately addressing their interests so that they are satisfied with the outcome\textsuperscript{50}.

Conflict resolution aims at addressing and removal of those factors, which cause conflict\textsuperscript{51}. If we follow sociologist like Karl Marx then we can say that conflict cannot be resolved unless and until exploitative and contradictory situations in a society are removed or authority or roles are not redistributed in the society. Similarly, if the conditions of relative deprivation persist conflict cannot be resolved. Such sociological theorizing about conflict resolution is ideal and general in nature.

In empirical reality, there is no society in which ideal or egalitarian situation exist. Therefore, there is a need to identify the causes of a particular conflict or conflicts and address these conflicts for resolution in a specific way. There are no fixed procedures or tools for conflict resolution. Procedures or tools of conflict resolution differ from society to society and from one conflict to another. Scholars have identified certain methods or tools of conflict resolution which are: Avoidance, war, sanctions, negotiations and its various forms like Good offices and mediation, Inquiry and conciliation commissions, Arbitration, Adjudication etc., we shall discuss these approaches one by one\textsuperscript{52}.

Avoidance: Kenneth Boulding in his book ‘Conflict and Defense’ writes that the method of avoidance is the first approach of ending conflicts. In this method parties to the conflict simply remove themselves one from another and increase the distance between them to the point where the conflict ceases from share lack of
contact. Avoidance is the classical method of resolving racial, and political disputes.

War: Approach like war is used in a society where, common conviction is lacking and machinery of law enforcement is weak. In conflict resolution, an approach like war always proved unsuccessful whether its consent given by UN body or self-decision of a country. Resolution brought out by war is not durable because in war parties could not address their core issues to each other.

Sanctions: The term "sanction" in its widest sense means any measure taken in support of a social order regulating human behaviour. The purpose of sanction is to bring about a behaviour considered to be in conformity with goals and standards of a society and to prevent that behaviour which is inconsistent with these goals and standards. The international sanctions, envisaged, however, are not automatic, being left to the discretion of the Security Council. In cases of threats to peace or acts of aggression, Security Council may take decisions (under article 4d) requiring the severance of diplomatic relations, economic and financial non-intercourse, and action by air, seas or land forces.

Experiences with organized international sanctions in support of international order has been limited and does not give much encouragement to those who believe in the efficacy of such arrangements. Due to various political reasons like conflicting interests and purposes of the sanctioning powers and the unwillingness of some states to risk war, has made this approach highly undesirable and condemnable.

Negotiation: The term "negotiation" refers to the explicit process, with proposals and counter proposals. In the process of negotiation the parties may relate their conflicts and common interests explicitly or
tacitly. Tacit bargaining is of great importance in military confrontations, when negotiations may be difficult because of incompatible war aims, domestic opinion or lack of diplomatic relations. It can help to keep the area of hostilities limited, restrain the use of force and prepare the ground for negotiation to terminate hostilities.

Good offices and mediation: These are special forms of negotiation in which third party plays a role. Good offices and mediation may be offered by a state not involved in the dispute, international official or private persons. Good offices consist of helping the parties to the dispute to get into direct contact with each other and arranging direct negotiation. In some cases, the party offering its good offices may attend the negotiation. In 1965 then Soviet Union offered its Good offices to India and Pakistan as a result of which was signed the Tashkent Declaration concerning the settlement of the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. Mediation refers to active participation in the negotiation including the submission of proposals on various aspects of the dispute or on the dispute in general. However, a final agreement is arrived at only by the parties to the dispute through mutual agreement.

Inquiry and Conciliation Commissions: The purpose of these commissions is to resolve dispute by means of direct agreement between the parties to the dispute. Such commissions may be formed on the basis of parity with equal representation of all the parties to the dispute. Representatives from other states may also sit on the commissions and their tasks are determined by agreement of the parties to the dispute. The main task of inquiry commission is to determine the circumstances of the dispute. Whereas, conciliation commissions in addition to determining the circumstances of the dispute may also issue recommendations on its settlement.
Arbitration: Another method of resolving disputes between the states is the process of arbitration. In international arbitration, dispute is subjected to the arbitration court whose composition, range of activities, and choice of rules of law are determined by agreement between the parties to the dispute. Moreover, the court of arbitration can resolve the dispute, on the basis of a specific treaty between the parties.  

Adjudication: It is a method of settling controversies or disputes, and in it, parties in dispute participate by presenting proofs and reasoned arguments. Adjudication takes place at two levels: domestic and international. At domestic level, law courts of any country can adjudicate between private parties, between private parties and public officials and between public officials or public bodies. However, all adjudication does not take place in the courts. Parents can adjudicate disputes among the children. Facts that are object of inquiry at a hearing in adjudication are facts about specific parties. In contrast, legislative facts are general facts relating to broad questions of policy and law affecting the general population. Whereas, "international adjudication", in a more precise sense, is used to describe the settlement of disputes by permanent international tribunals, a new development of the twentieth century, and is, in effect, a synonym for "Judicial Settlement".

The above-mentioned techniques of conflict resolution may prove useful and effective in settling conflicts at smaller scale and those conflicts in which clash of interest is not very visible but these techniques are generally used in track one diplomacy – term used to describe official government to government negotiation among instructed representatives of sovereign states – cannot be effective in resolving protracted ethnic conflicts. Kashmir conflict is one of the examples of such conflicts. The common characteristics of protracted
Ethnic conflicts are the stereotyping or deionisation of others and massive violations of human rights particularly against civilians.

Ethnic conflicts at their root involve clashes, or perceived clashes of culture which can be defined as socially constructed identity and meaning shared by a community, strongly influencing relationships between individuals and how they interpret the world. Such conflicts are fuelled by notions of identity, a concept of security, and a feeling of well-being.

The protracted ethnic conflicts involve society-wide actors and are not a matter between governments. In most cases of ethnic conflicts track one alone will not necessarily identify, include, or allow a full and fair hearing for all of the antagonists in a conflict. This is because in ethnic conflicts in particular, one side or another often denies the legitimacy of the other side's existence, especially if the other side is a non-state actor such as rebel or seceding group.

Track one medication whether done by representatives of governments or international bodies are unsuited to deal effectively with protracted ethnic conflicts because, one, official interveners denies the legitimacy of non-state actors, partly, due to predominant law in international relations and partly to non-interference with national sovereignty. Two, in international diplomacy all official third parties have an interest in “who wins” an ethnic conflict. Third, another problem with track one interveners is that it is a geo-strategically manipulative activity, the aim of which is not long term conflict resolution but a self interested strategy of advancement by all individual parties in a conflict including the mediator. Therefore, the value of neutrality or impartiality is questioned or even somewhat negated.
Unless dialogue and reconciliation with the “enemy” is part of antagonists experience at many levels of society no official government will truly resolve an ethnic conflict\textsuperscript{59}.

Hence more approaches to conflict resolution are needed. There is much that non-governmental approaches – track two and multi-track diplomacy – can offer.

Track two diplomacy involves unofficial mediators who do not have carrots or sticks. They work with the parties or their constituencies to facilitate agreements, encouraging the parties to see their situation as lying along the lose – lose to win-win line and to find mutually satisfactory outcomes. The strength of track two approach on conflict resolution is based on the idea that informal negotiations allow the parties “to come together more easily to explore mutual fears, grievances and demands”. Track two diplomacy also provides the opportunity of tentative negotiation offers to be floated, policy linkages to be broached in ways that formal negotiations might preclude\textsuperscript{60}.

Official diplomacy and unofficial second track approaches may also be complemented by a range of multi-track solutions, Multi-track diplomacy is the application of peacemaking from different vantage points within a multi-centred network, reflects the different levels and variety of factors which need to be addressed. It has recently been described as a ‘web of interconnected parts (activities, individuals, institutions, communities) that operate together whether awkwardly or gracefully for a common goal, a world at peace. It is a new form of diplomacy, involving a strategic shift from purely state controlled diplomacy towards a greater division of labour between governments, NGO’s and other organizations.
Official diplomatic manoeuvres are often circumscribed by political interests, lack of trust concerning the intentions of the mediator, short-term domestic considerations. Second-track approaches may although stand greater chance of success if they are intended to complement official negotiations, but cannot sew on all the other areas of concern, which have affected the causes, and duration of the conflict. Non-governmental or unofficial diplomacy may be effective in creating dialogue, but does not have the necessary resources or political leverage to bring about change. Yet the combined force of these approaches can address the fundamental issues, and still bring the necessary political momentum.

The preceding discussion leads us to say that conflict is caused by multiple factors in a society and, therefore, its resolution requires various strategies. Strategies for resolution of conflict differ from one conflict to another. Although there are conventional methods for resolving conflicts. Scholars are of the opinion that protracted or ethnic conflicts cannot be resolved without involving people. Involvement of people in the form of the NGO's is popularly called as track two diplomacy, which play an important role in bridging the gap between the state and conflicting parties. Conflict in Kashmir is multi-dimensional and may be referred as protracted conflict. Therefore, we think this conflict cannot be resolved without, help of Kashmiris and involvement of reliable NGO's.

In the next chapter we would try to give a brief account of Kashmir's history, geography, economy and society in order to understand roots of Kashmir conflict.
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