CHAPTER – I

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS – CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND MANAGEMENT
Increasing interdependence and communication between societies, the continuing level of inter-state tensions, unsuccessful attempts by nations to resolve conflicts, rising significance of unconventional security issues like environment degradation, have all exacerbated the importance of the conflict resolution model in international politics. The most important cause and issue in international conflict is the issue of boundary control. The current debates on boundary management in international politics emphasize the role of modern interstate boundaries as effective tools that states can use to manage their sovereign territorial authority. The solutions posited by various scholars are varied but all are meant to optimize security and efficiency at state borders via top-down policies. The actual success of a border in facilitating economic exchange preventing the passage of extremists, or restraining escalation is a by-product of these deliberate policies from above. The disputes between India and China and India and Pakistan regarding the borders have been simmering for the past six decades and is again in focus in the latter half of 2009 after a renewed aggressive stand by the Chinese Government on the issue of the Line of Actual Control and the 2008, Mumbai attacks by Ten Terrorists of Lashkar-e-Taiba a Pakistan based militant group killing over 173 and wounded 308 persons and continuing
The normalization of relations becomes inevitable since conflicts among nations seem to be frequent and pervasive occurrence. One of the civilized methods of tackling conflicts is to delimit the area of conflict and to narrow down as far as possible and to allow normal activities on a scale as wide as possible. Normalization of relations may even being construed as a process undertaken to undo conflicts. When the question arises of whether conflicts are reconcilable or irreconcilable and manageable or unmanageable it can be answered through this civilized method in tackling conflict. To understand the nature and importance of normalization, the knowledge of conflict and various theories of conflict become necessary. The importance of normalization is due to the existence of conflict, without conflict there will not be any need for normalization of relations. Both are related. The pattern of conflict occurrence between India and China, India and Pakistan can be studies through understanding various theories of conflict.

The states engaged in rivalry for ascendancy in the power pattern of world politics are never fixed. In an international situation the power pattern is determined by the nature of distribution of power and by the degree of monopoly of power enjoyed by the states within the state system. Usually the states through their interaction come to establish a sort of equilibrium thus within the states system the distribution of power
may appear to have attained some form of stability but might not however be durable because newly emergent forces would perhaps suddenly rash out and disturb the status-quo altogether. The purpose of studies in International relations is to evolve general theory which suggests policy by which peace and security may be achieved. "A power approach is relevant to policy seeking in non-war conditions in a sense a study of power politics is one limited to particular objective."

The concept of conflict in International Politics

Two types of relations normally exist between states: conflict and collaboration, Conflict emerges from a particular combination of parties, incompatible positions over specific issues, controversies, hostile attitudes and certain types of diplomatic and military actions. Though the terms conflict and dispute are often considered synonymous, in the emerging literature on conflict resolution, these terms have different meanings. Disputes involve negotiable interests. Whereas conflicts are seen to entail issues that relate to ontological human needs and identities that can not be compromised.

Conflict has been defined in various ways in economic terms; it has been interpreted as a phenomenon that implies scarcity. It has been seen as incompatibility between the preferences goals of two or more parties or as the existence of incompatible activities. For some writers conflict is inevitable in human life, eliminating it is impossible at the international level. For some conflict is dynamic phenomenon, a
manifest conflict process' (MCP), characterized by phases of initiation, escalation, controlled maintenance, and management perhaps leading by some kind of termination reflective of settlement, resolution, or transformation.\footnote{5} Conflict involves not only the objective situation but also the way in which the participants understand and feel about the situation.\footnote{6}

Conflict is not necessarily negative. Deutsch notes that, conflict is an inevitable feature of all social relations.\footnote{7} It can take a destructive or a constructive course; it can take the form of enlivening controversy or deadly quarrel. Conflict resolution is not just about averting danger, of fixing things up; it is about finding and capitalizing on the opportunity that is inherent in the event. A completely new view of conflict has been given by Dudley Weeks, which perceives conflict as a complex phenomenon of human interactions which is prevalent all around us. In fact, conflict is almost universally perceived as a negative occurrence, a blemish on what most people expect should be the smooth operation of a well-ordered life.\footnote{8}

Different Approaches to Conflict Resolution

Depending on the interpretation of human nature and the goals of society there are different approaches to deal with conflict.\footnote{9} The following chart summarizes the major transformations needed in our perceptions of what conflict really is if conflict resolution is to become effective.\footnote{10}
Table – 1
A New View of Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Perceiving Conflicts As Always Being</th>
<th>To Perceive Conflict As Often Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A disruption of order, a negative experience, an error or mistake in a relationship</td>
<td>An outgrowth of diversity that might hold possibilities for mutual growth and for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A battle between incompatible self-interests or desires</td>
<td>One part of a relationship, a part that involves needs values, perceptions, power, goals feelings and so on, not just interests or desires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An isolated event we allow to define the entire relationship.</td>
<td>Occurrences that punctuate a long term relationship and that can help clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A struggle only between right and wrong, good and evil.</td>
<td>A confrontation between differences in certain aspects a relationship, but not to the exclusion of other aspects that are still there to build on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Answers to complex questions of war, come to paradox of man himself, Mark Twain, American philosopher had expressed – “Man is a queer animal, like the beasts of fields, the fowls of the air and fishes of the sea he came into this world without his consent and is going out in the same way.”

As an illustration of the range of relations possible between two nations in post war period, the following positions along such a
continuum denoting progressive loss of cooperation and increase in tension may be cited;

1. Mutual cooperation and support with national interests perceived to be congruent by both parties.
2. Mutual cooperation and support largely determined by fear of common enemy.
3. Support of nation to another largely dictated by the formers sentiment – a) Join my group against enemy, and b) humanitarian desire to help.
4. Peaceful co-existence when national interests are perceived to be not conflicting.
5. Cold war where national interests are perceived to be antagonized but not sufficiently so to risk wars.
6. Localized military conflicts where national interests clash strongly enough to lead to use of conventional weapons on a limited scale, and
7. Nuclear or total war where national survival itself is perceived to be in jeopardy.\(^\text{12}\)

The above classification is an attempt to rationalize the various types of international relations that have sprung up today. At one end there is high economic and political warmth; at the other extreme, political and military conflict. The position 4 may be regarded as the
point of psychological neutrality, level of interaction is low at this point but high at extremes.

International conflict not only varies in degree but is also not an uni-dimensional phenomenon. International relations are determined apart from the psychological factors, by geographical, economic, political, military and technological and also other related developments. For example how the first explosion which is the product of series of developments in all the four fields mentioned above, suddenly changes its international status and perceived role and at once brings about qualitative change in its relations with other nations particularly with its neighbours.\textsuperscript{13}

The existence of international conflict in the present day world can be assumed to be a fact. Psychologist looks it as a product of social and Psychological environment. In analyzing the dimensions of international conflict, attention should be given to the overwhelming importance of the international political environment itself. For eg., between 1850 and 1941 Britain fought twenty wars, the Japan nine, the Germany eight and United States seven.

The economic and political interests of British Empire rather than possibly greater frustrations of the Britishers as compared to the Germans were responsible for situation. Again it was new technology of navigation and ship building and their military and commercial
application that made possible the acquisition of large empires by small countries like Portugal, Spain, England and Holland. The American involvement in the two significant wars after 1945 may have more to do with her political and psychological characteristics of her population.¹⁴

1. How does conflict originates? To answer this question one needs to know and understand various theories of conflict among states – Mark and Snyder have provided an excellent summary of the nature of social conflict. “Conflict may take the form of competition or it the other extreme an acute form of a struggle between parities to attain goals that are vital even by injuring or eliminating opponents.”¹⁵

**Functional and Dysfunctional Conflicts:**

Conflict is ongoing and inevitable condition in functional value as far as it is adopted for social needs. A conflict may be violent and yet functional. The test of dysfunctional conflict is not violative in structure. Conflict is dysfunctional when it has no objective of value to the state, or is more costly to the state than the worth of relics to be required or is unnecessarily costly. The realm for dysfunctional conflict is miscalculation of costs.¹⁶

**Some Major Models of Conflict Resolution**

**The Deterrence Model:** It provides the basis of domestic enforcement and international strategic policies. Many government use coercive mechanisms to prevent challenges to dominant political and economic
interests, for only power can control antisocial human behaviour. In dealing with international conflict, this model suggests a state centric approach. Critics argue that this strategy does not appear to be an effective means to prevent conflict, since coercive approaches and deterrent approaches do not lead to the discovery or removal of causes of conflict and fail to stop to occurrences of similar events. Secondly, the cost of deterrent policy is too high given the level of destruction of weapon technology. Also in today’s modern war face, the majority of victims of the deterrence policy are the civilian populations. In this model conflict can be settled without the elimination of real causes of problems.  

**The Basic Needs Model:**

The basic needs Model as opposed to the traditional thinking of the deterrence model is that conflict is inherent in human nature. This model stresses that unfulfilled needs are the main causes of violence. These elements cannot be suppressed by socialization, threats or coercion. A conflict resolution model should focus on the redefinition of issues in broad social contest and the assessment of cost derived from repression of needs. Human development is a major concern in dealing with critical problems of conflict and survival.  

Power for many contemporary political scientists, is virtually identical with politics, "International Politics". Hans Morgenthau declares "like all, politics is a struggle for power". Such assertions however are
not anxious and often conceal more than they reveal. There is more than power in politics, just as there are powers that are not political power in the ability to achieve some result, to accomplish a work to reach an end. It is consequently, as complex as human ambition and aspiration and as variable as many paths lead towards the same goal.19

Mao Tse Tung's saying "Whoever has an army has everything for war settles everything ... political power grows out of the barrel of a gun, is far too simple. 20 War and powers are not identical; war is only a method of power. In fact since war always destroys resources it is less desirable than method that leaves the resources intact. If war is the "last reason" of states it is also a confession of weakness, and an acknowledgement that other methods either cannot exist or have failed."21

In all its form, conflict is a form of communication. The appearance of stability and peace, in international and domestic politics may be an illusion in which resentment is driven into silence by hopelessness. Paradoxically conflict is often a sign that the powerful have grown more responsive to the weak; shouts of resentment may reflect a new confidence that such cries will be heard. If the expression of conflict is a danger to any political order it also raised, the possibility that old injustices may be remedied, that mutual complaints may be adjusted, and a new and more stable order may result.22
Depending on the nature and sources of conflict, there are different ways to deal with conflict.\(^{23}\)

**Negotiation:** Negotiation is effective when both sides find a compatible range of points that they are willing to agree through compromise. Efficient and amicable agreements may be reached by using principled negotiation that emphasizes separation of emotions from interests, cooperation for maximization of mutual gains, and the use of fair procedure and standards.

**Adjudication:** The ruling of International Court of Justice has a better chance, than power-based negotiation, to yield a favorable result to a small country in its disputes with a strong neighbor.

**Arbitration:** This can be considered as an informal category of adjudication. Contrary to a court system, parties can choose arbitrators who determine the outcome. Arbitration can deal with practicable problems, including commercial disputes. In international trade disputes, the world trade organization has a wide range of authority to hear complaints and make binding decisions, but one must remember that arbitration is not effective in resolving value oriented conflict.

**Ombudsmanship:** The main idea behind this is the notion that all power is accountable and responsible to the public. Ombudsmanship may make recommendations and suggest new policy-procedure since they are not
in position to make changes in laws or politics by themselves their power is indirect. The procedure is normally objective informal, inexpensive, and quick.

Mediation: The assistance of a third party neutral in a negotiation can help to produce a mutually acceptable solution. Parties are allowed to express their concerns and feelings directly or indirectly at a meeting facilitated by the mediators. Mediators organize meetings provide clarity in communication and keep records. All forms of mediations are more democratic in their nature than the judicial or arbitration processes.

Problem-solving workshop: This aims at enabling the parties to identity and understand each other’s needs. Representatives of parties confidentially meet in the presence of a small panel of disinterested consultants in order to analyze the causes of conflict and examine conditions for its resolution. Compared with mediation that seeks an acceptable compromise, facilitators help participants to identify suppressed and hidden human needs. Problem solving workshops can prove effective in intractable conflicts with a history of intense hostilities. The successes of the workshops may be judged by the eventual transformation of relationships between long-term adversaries. For example in Western India, the Neemrana and the Balusa groups have organized various such workshops which have been as asset to the
Indian government in their policy making vis-à-vis their relations with Pakistan.

**Paradigms in Conflicts Resolution Literature**

There are at least four paradigms applied to conflict and conflict resolution in international relations literature.\(^{24}\)

1. **Political Realism (Realpolitik)**
2. **Political Idealism (Idealpolitik)**
3. **Marxism**
4. **Non-Marxist Radical Paradigm.**

**Political Realism**: Morton Deutsch refers to this paradigm as the competitive process of conflict resolution. This is a power-based, adversarial, confrontational zero-sum, win-lose approach toward conflict. Morton Deutsch refers to as 'competitive' process of conflict resolution: power–based adversarial, confrontational, zero-sum, 'win-lose' approaches to dealing with conflict. It has dominated the perceptions and behaviour of superpower decision makers during the Cold war, Serbs and Croats during their wars in Croatia and Bosnia–Herzegovina and of Armenians and Azerbaijanis in (and over) Nagornokarabakh, and continues to dominate perceptions and behaviour elsewhere (e.g. Northern Ireland, Palestine, Sri Lanka). It is not surprising, therefore, that Realpolitik and the correspondence competitive processes are associated with destructive outcomes.\(^{25}\)
Political Idealism: This co-operative process paradigm is non-adversarial, non-confrontational, non-zero-sum, win-win in its approach to deal with the conflict. It is associated with the constructive outcomes and the changeability of environment and behaviours. Proponents of political idealism (idealpolitik) are in agreement with 'Realists' about the alarming frequency and intensity of violence (Descriptive Realism) but disagree with them over the reasons for such (Explanatory Realism) and how we should respond to the problem (Prescriptive Realism). For 'idealists' violent conflict can be the result of many contributory factors. Including learned responses to frustrated goal-seeking behaviour. The range of responses to violence is fairly broad including 'counter-violence' (in self-defence), but also nonviolent means for bringing about change.

Marxism: Like realism, Marxism stresses on the inevitability of conflict between socioeconomic classes, and like idealism it emphasizes on the structural and behavioural change. Marxism is like idealism however in its emphasis on structural change. Especially in the system of ownership of the means of production as the way to bring about behavioral change. Hence, Marxism like idealism has a variable conception of human nature, which is dependent on environment in contrast to Realisms, fixed conception of human nature (irrespective of environment).
Non-Marxist Radical Thought (NMRT): This paradigm is like realism in recognizing the potency of the organic nature of conflict, and like idealism in stressing on the structural change to bring social, political, and economic and other institutions more in line with basic human needs. NMRT is also very much like Marxism in its recognition that the changes necessary to realign institutions with needs-environment, with ‘human nature’ are often radical and therefore, attempts to effect such change, coupled with the ‘role-defense’ response to such by supporters of a threatened status-quo are likely to generate and sustain violent conflict cycles.

With acknowledgement of study about various crises in international relations, it is important to understand the significance of Boundary conflicts and Boundary Management.

Three Influential Models of Boundary Management

Boundaries as defense lines in anarchy

Structural realist approaches to international relations begin with three major assumptions: the international system is anarchic, states are unitary, rational actors and states seek survived. However realism carries a set of equally important implicit assumptions and theories about the role and stability of international boundaries. Realist scholarship and security dilemmas cannot exist in the absence of linear, well defined boundaries. States are unitary actors precisely because they have clear unambiguous boundaries and such borders indicate
where the sovereign territory of one state begins, and where the territory of a neighboring state ends. Vasquez argues that a politically disputed boundary is the primary cause of war. Territorial disputes are more likely to prod states into conflict than any other issue and only then does the balance of power logic apply to state and border security.

**Boundaries as tools for managing exchange**

A third model cautions against treating international boundaries as enduring lines between states. Neo-liberal and constructivist approaches to international relations argue that anarchy and the level of cooperation in the international system are both variable.

Neo-liberals and constructivists differ on whether cooperation between states is the result of rationalist preferences or a socially constructed environment, yet both treat international boundaries as functionally efficient. In short, higher levels of interaction create the promise of greater economic reward, which states attain by deciding how much or how little to open up their borders. Constructivists, more often than not, assume a similar causal approach toward the de-institutionalization of state boundaries. Although work in this tradition has noted that higher levels of interaction may actually increase suspicions between states or international actors and lead to increasingly tight border controls. The overall trend is to demonstrate the emergence of economic integration and security communities which
post facto reduce the multiple functions normally carried out at territorial boundaries.31

**Boundaries as Institutions of Internal control**

Much of the Scholarship on state formation argues that the greatest threat to security often is not other states but domestic challenges that threaten a state’s ability to control its territory. In situations where the international environment is benign or relatively less daunting than domestic socio-political challenges, central states will manipulate and seal off their boundaries as a means of taxing, controlling and differentiating their populations.32 Border controls therefore, become a key in state-building strategies involving coercion. They regulate the movement of people, communication, and goods across frontiers where the authority of the state is most vulnerable.33 Borders unambiguously specify control over territories, indicate the limit of public goods provision, and increase the costs of secession. Indeed international relations theorists admit that the primary function of territorial boundaries may be to keep goods and people in, rather than out.34

In the present thesis a study is made on the pattern of the conflict between China and India and Pakistan and India especially regarding the border dispute. India and China are the only known neighbors not be separated even by a mutually defined line of control, with their entire 4057 km, frontier in dispute. In contrast the Indo-Pakistan frontier is an
international border, except in Jammu and Kashmir where a clearly defined and delineated line of control exist. Barring some strips of land, China has settled its land-border disputes with its neighbours other than India, even as it remains embroiled in serious maritime territorial disputes with several states and technically presses its irredentist claim over Taiwan. For one, its disputes with India involves larger tracts of territories than any other land-border problem China has had, if one takes China’s claim over Arunachala Pradesh at its face value and not as a rhetorical bargaining chip. For another, China has a track record of clinching land-border settlements with declaiming States (except with Vietnam). So that it can impose the majority of its claims, as it did with a rudderless Russia before Putin and with internally troubled Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

The border dispute between the two countries goes back a long way. India says that China occupied 38,000 square are kilometers in Kashmir region. Besides, under the so-called Sino-Pakistan agreement of 1963, Pakistan ceded 5,180 square km of Indian Territory in Pakistan–Occupied Kashmir to China. China on the other hand lays claim to 90,000 sq. kilometers of land in Arunchala Pradesh.

China is a major neighboring country of India, with whom it shares a long border. Right from Independence, India desired peaceful and cooperative relations with China. In fact, when the People’s Republic of
China was formally proclaimed in October 1949, India became the second non-communist country to recognize it. It also strove simultaneously to secure admission for it in the United Nations. Although the China’s armed action in Tibet in October 1950 leading to the veritable disappearance of Tibet as a buffer Zone caused disillusionment in India, India did not allow the incident to cast a shadow on its quest for friendship with China. The signing of the Sino-Indian Agreement of Trade and Intercourse, between India and the Tibet Region of China in 1954 marked the beginning of a new chapter in Sino-Indian Relations.35

The first white paper on Sino-Indian relations was presented to Indian Parliament in September, 1959. It revealed to a shocked Nation, that even before the ink had dried on the 1954 Agreement, Indian and Chinese Troops were confronting each other across the boundary line both in the Western and Eastern sectors. On November 14, 1962, the Lok Sabha adopted a resolution which condemned “Chinas invasion of India” and recorded “the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be”. Exactly a week later, China declared a ceasefire which India accepted. On September 7, 1973, India and China signed an agreement which freezes and, in a sense, legitimizes ‘the Line of Actual Control’ brought about by the war of 1962. The resolution has proved a headache for diplomats concerned with a fair solution to the
border question. This resolution has no binding force either in law or in morality. Although India strove to solve the border problem through peaceful negotiations; China steadily encroached into the Indian Territories throughout 1959-62. Chinese forces crossed the Mc-Mohan Line in NEFA on 8th September, 1962. On 20th October 1962, it launched a massive attack all along the border from forces, leaving China in control of major chunks of Indian Territory running into thousands of miles.36

On 21st November, 1962 when its advance was at its fastest, China dramatically declared a Unilateral ceasefire along the entire border, announcing its withdrawal 20 km behind the line of actual control. It, however, warned about striking back if India advanced to the line of actual control in the Eastern sector or refused to withdraw from the line of actual control in the middle and Western sectors.37 A detailed study is made in the foregoing chapters on boundary disputes between India and China and efforts of normalization of relations between these two nations.

**The case of India – Pakistan Boundary Disputes:**

India and Pakistan share much of their common geographic location and religious demographics yet diplomatic relations between the two countries are defined by numerous military conflicts and territorial disputes. The Partition of India in 1947 created two large countries independent from Britain; Pakistan as two wings in the East
and West separated by India in the middle. Millions of Muslims and Hindus were killed in Communal riots following the partition of the British Empire. According to the British plan for the partition of British India, all the 680 princely states were allowed to decide which of the two countries to join. Majority princely – states joined India. Soon after independence, India and Pakistan established diplomatic relations. Subsequent years were marked by bitter periodic conflict and the nations went to war three times.

**Junagadh Dispute**

Junagadh was a state on the south western end of Gujarat with the principalities of Manavadar, Mangrol and Babriawad. The Arabian Sea stood between it and Pakistan. The state had an overwhelming Hindu population which constituted more than 80% of its citizens, while the ruler of state was a Muslim. On August 15th, 1947 the ruler of the state, Nawab of Junagadh Mahabat Khan, acceded to Pakistan. Pakistan confirmed the acceptance of accession of September 1947. India did not accept the accession as legitimate.

**Kashmir Dispute**

Kashmir was a princely state, ruled by a Hindu, Hari Singh. The Maharaja of Kashmir was equally hesitant to join either India, because he know his Muslim subjects would not like to join a Hindu-based and Hindu-majority nation, or Pakistan which as a Hindu he was personally
averse to. Hari Singh signed a Standstill Agreement (Preserving Status quo) with Pakistan but did not make his decision by August 15th, 1947.

India on the other hand asserts that the Maharaja’s decision, which was the norms for every other princely state at the time of independence and subsequent elections, for over 40 years on Kashmir has made it an integral part of India. This opinion has often become controversial as Pakistan asserts that the decision of the ruler of Junagadh also adhered to Pakistan. Due to all such political differences, this dispute has also been the subject of wars between the two countries in 1947 and 1965 and a limited conflict in 1999.

Other Territorial Disputes

Pakistan is locked in other territorial disputes with India such as the Siachen Glacier and Kori Creek. Pakistan is also currently having dialogue with India regarding the Baglihar Dam being built over the River Chenab in Jammu and Kashmir. A detailed study is made in the accessible chapters on the boundary disputes between India and Pakistan and efforts made for normalization of relations.

Cessation or Reduction of Conflict:

The cold war and all other rivalries of our time are not likely to evaporate in our lifetimes. The major question of our time is not how to end those conflicts but whether we can find some way to conduct them
without resorting to weapons that will resolve them once and for all; by
wiping out the contestants.38

The work towards resolving conflict between conflicting states by
International organization like UNO (United Nations Organizations)
becomes important for study. In the Charter of UN - the principles are
enshrined – they are,

1. To maintain international peace and security.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for
the principles of equal rights and self determination of peoples; to
take appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international
problems of an economic, social, cultural and humanitarian
character to promote human rights without distinction of sex,
race, language etc.39

A code of conduct for nations in their dealings with other nations
necessary. Such a code of conduct for nations as enunciated by
Jawaharlal Nehru inform of Panchasheel or Five Principles of self
discipline. They are;

a. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and
sovereignty.

b. Mutual non-aggression.

c. Non-interference in each other's international affairs.
d. Equality and mutual benefit; and

e. Peaceful co-existence.  

Unfortunately nations have not reached degree of civilization where they can accept and adopt such a code on a voluntary basis without it being imposed upon it by a more powerful organizations. The panchasheel is not dangerous but the nations have not yet learnt self control and advantages of it. Even in the case of India-China and India-Pakistan the Panchasheel did not help much. The Panchasheel remains in principles and not practised.

UN and some of other significant Nations are taking necessary interest in the understanding of dynamics of prejudices and hostility and initiating steps to reduce them. Conflict is not although negative it has a positive side as well. It is designed to resolve divergent points of view. It is a way of achieving some kind of unity even if that unity is sought to be attained through destruction of one of the contenting parties. The conflict instigates innovations for social progress, social development hence our endeavour should not be towards total eradication of conflict from human society but rather keep it within permissible limits. It is said; indeed conflict less society is neither possible nor perhaps desirable.

How far conflict is permissible to the maximum is suggested in short term and long term measures. On short term basis the points that seem to be important area code of conduct for nations in their dealings
with one another (eg. panchasheel, the five principles proposed by Jawaharlal Nehru) and acceptance of broad humanistic ideology emphasizing the ideals of fellow-feeling and good neighborliness among men. Long term basis with presence of social tensions, UN whose task would be continuous survey and analysis of social tensions in different parts of world not only becomes important and important source of information on conflict. William James says, "if man must have an enemy in order to be able to live in peace with each other let him fight nature, fight diseases, fight poverty."42

Vietnam, Korea, Germany are examples of divided peoples not likely to resolve their differences, which each sides supported by other powers. In each case United Nations peace keeping would enable settlement provided these were disarmament in them first instance. The barrier to such intervention is the relevance of the great powers interested to allow settlement by the procedure.43

The divided Germany had entered into a new phase, by having unified into one, unified Germany on 3rd October 1990. Even the two Koreas moving towards closer relations and the Vietnam too follow in this direction. The ideal of cooperation than confrontation. In case of India and China and India and Pakistan the border problem had become crux of dispute, which had not been resolved, although there had been several rounds of talks. On the other hand, many other
problems like perceptions of leaders, Pakistan factor, China factor, US factor, Soviet factor fight for Asian supremacy which are domestic factors and international stand in way of harmonious relations. Today although we see there is no tension prevailed among the three nations viz., India, China and Pakistan the diplomatic relations being resumed and carried out. Except border disputes solution, in other bilateral fields there is remarkable improvement e.g. Trade, sports, science and technology etc. Though after 1962 crisis the normalization processes started in order to have harmonious relations. We can see only a partial normalization had been achieved so far, complete normalization had been not achieved. Same is the case with India and Pakistan since the 1971 war Pakistan and India have made only slow progress towards the normalization of relations. Further the future of India – China, and India – Pakistan relations are increasingly influenced by the US and Soviet factors and key issues that will determine the nature of India-China-Pakistan triangular dynamics. Further India, China and Pakistan should rethink and modify their policies which alone can bring about fuller normalization of relations.

An Overview

The significance of border disputes and conflict resolution models have occupied prime importance in International relations theory and practice. International relations scholarship tends to see modern territorial boundaries as efficient responses to the international system.
States are said to have a set of clear preferences on how to manage and control their borders as a means of protecting their sovereignty against other states, filtering out non-state threats, and managing the movement of goods and people to maximize economic gain. Yet, logically and empirically states facing uniform types of problems and conflicts at their borders have displayed a diverse trajectory of border control strategies.

The theoretical models discussed in this chapter regarding conflict relations and management see borders and boundary policy as efficient responses by states to their international or domestic security requirements. This efficiency is gauged by an assessment of the ability of borders to fulfill singular functions: deterring attack from a neighbouring state; or de-legitimizing secessionism; or enhancing economic exchange.

In overcoming boundary disputes and border conflicts, India and China and India and Pakistan should bestow attention on confidence building measures renewing bilateral discussions relating to trade and commerce, defense, military and various other issues for normalization of their relations in a triangular manner contributing to international peace and prosperity especially in south Asian region as discussed in the successive chapters.
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