INTRODUCTION

The last chapter made a distinction between conflicts which are *settled* and those which are *resolved*, arguing that only in the latter can a conflict be regarded as having been concluded (or *terminated*) in such a way as to prevent a resurrection of the underlying issues in contention and recurrence of the conflict behavior between the adversaries. The case was made that *settlements* tend to be arranged or even *imposed* in situations characterized by successful coercion, either by one of the adversaries or, sometimes, by powerful outsiders. The post-settlement relationship inevitably therefore remains a fragile one, liable to be overturned at the earliest opportunity. By contrast, *resolution* of conflict provides durable, long-term and self-supporting solutions to conflicts by removing the underlying causes and establishing new, and satisfactory relationships between previously antagonistic parties. Writers on the termination of international conflict have suggested various characteristics by which a true resolution might be recognized, but most would agree that a genuine resolution of a conflict is characterized by a solution which is:

1. *Complete*, in that the issues in conflict disappear from the political agenda and/or cease to have any salience for the parties to the agreement.

2. *Acceptable*, generally, to all the parties to the dispute, not merely to one side, or to elite factions within the adversaries.

3. *Self-supporting*, in that there is no necessity for third-party sections (positive or negative) to maintain the provisions of the agreement in place.
4. *Satisfactory* to all the parties in the sense of being perceived as 'fair' or 'just' according to their value systems.

5. *Uncompromising*, in the sense that the terms are not characterized by the sacrifice of goals as part of a compromised, 'half a loaf' solution.

6. *Innovative*, in that the solution establishes some new and positive relationship between the parties.

7. *Uncoerced*, in that the adversaries freely arrive at the solution themselves without any imposition by an authoritative (but perhaps non-legitimized) outside agency.¹

Writers who discuss conflict resolution processes or solutions argue that a "genuine resolution" is one that enables the parties to achieve their "goals and values" without compromise.

Fundamental to this view of conflict *resolution* seems to be the idea that only arrangements that fully satisfy basic human needs can bring about any final resolution of the conflict-one which "deals fully" with the issues in dispute and establishes a new, self-supporting relationship between the adversaries. Conflicts are seen as arising and inflicting costs that are thus attributable to "ignoring, suppressing or failing to promote revealed, non-negotiable needs".² Human needs are thus "not for trading" and contrasted sharply with "interests that are negotiable".³

John Burton, one of the pioneers of the human needs theory, opines that "conflict is likely to be *caused by* the need for identity, recognition, security of the
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identity group and other such human, societal values", and so "facilitated" conflict resolution must aim at determining such human needs and values and then assisting parties "to deduce what alterations in structures, institutions and policies are required to enable the fulfilment of needs". In short, successful and final resolution of any conflict must involve satisfying those needs of the parties involved that are being frustrated by existing conditions and relationships. Expressed slightly differently, in contrast to other explanations about the causes of human conflict and war which center on the concept of "aggressive man", or "power-seeking man", or rationally calculating "economic man", or "Hobbesian," "Lockean" or "Freudian" man, Burton proposes "necessitous man" as that starting point. At every social level, man's natural and universal needs are the fundamental first causes of conflict and disputes, from the simple to the complex.

Some human needs theorists imply that the pursuit of human needs can, indeed, lead to disputes and conflicts in circumstances where there is a scarcity of goods, roles or other rewards to satisfy the sought after needs, and where no alternative "satisfiers" are immediately available. However, the implication is that it is the shortage of satisfiers and not the nature of the needs themselves that leads to conflict. If there are enough appropriate satisfiers, then the pursuit of human needs can take place without "social friction" and avoiding conflicts. Needs theory thus postulates that human development requires the fulfillment of basic human needs such as identity, security, recognition, creativity, control, belongingness, love, choice and self-actuation. At the very least, needs so described appear, in principle,
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fulfillable without strife so long as there are enough satisfiers available, perhaps including a range of appropriate alternatives. Such basic human needs could not appear to be conflict promoting in and of themselves.

**The Beginnings**

Traditional power theorists correctly hypothesized inherent human propensities, and conflict over scarce resources. Where they may have been wrong was in assuming that human behavior was determined mainly or solely by material benefits, and that the source of conflicts was over competition for scarce resources. Human behavior may be equally, and in many circumstances far more, oriented toward deep concerns of identity and autonomy.

Sites, in his book, *Control: The Basis of Social Order* (1973), meaning control by the person, not by authorities, argued that given the opportunity an individual will attempt, against all odds, to be in control of matters of human importance. “Control Theory” is based on “attachment.” “Attachment’ refers to the observation that “deviance is subjectively available [in other words, a likely response] to us unless we develop relationship with others who are then able to provide us with a reason for not deviating”. Attachment can, of course, be to authorities as well as to persons James MacGregor Burns looked for the “Wellsprings of Political Leadership” and found them in “the vast pools of human energy known as wants, needs, aspirations and expectation.” Sir Leslie Scarman asserted that “there is a natural law springing from man’s own humanity which must
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be incorporated into the positive law of the state." ⁹ Barrington Moore when trying to define the notion of justice was driven to observe that "it is obvious that human beings do have something that can be called innate needs." ¹⁰ He tentatively drew attention to non-physical needs such as needs for respect and recognition, for identity (which he called "distinction"), for the absence of boredom or for stimulus, for control (which he related to freedom of inhibition to be aggressive against dangerous targets). He concluded, "As a working hypothesis, I propose a conception of innate human nature, innate in the sense of being prior to any social influences but not necessarily immune to them, for which not only physical deprivations are noxious but also psychic ones; specifically, the absence of favorable human responses, boredom, and the inhibition of aggressions." ¹¹ In the field of comparative politics P. Peretz argued that the future of comparative politics as a study rests on the assumption that there are some wants that are constant across systems. ¹²

Needs and wants are sometimes used interchangeably. D. Pirages distinguishes needs from wants: "Basic human needs are physiologically determined while wants are socially determined." ¹³ If recognition, identity of self, and some measure of control over the environment are human needs, then the absence of their fulfillment will lead to adaptations that restrict development and perhaps create abnormalities in behavior, or lead to anti-social behavior.
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It is in this area that Sites has made his main contribution: "We have demonstrated the emergence of eight needs in the individual: a need for response, a need for security, a need for recognition, a need for stimulation, a need for distributive justice, a need for meaning, a need to be seen as rational (and for rationality itself) and a need to control. The relationship among these various needs is extremely complex. The last four needs emerge because the first four, which emerge out of the necessary dynamics of the socialization process, are not and cannot be immediately and consistently satisfied". 14

Sites argues that the concept of power is indispensable to all existing theories of social and political behavior. His initial proposition is that if individuals and groups attempt to control their environment, there must be a reason. He further hypothesizes that the reason is to obtain gratification of needs, including the need for survival. 15 The needs which he hypothesizes are independent of any particular culture or society; they are universal and genetically inherent in the individual. They are ontological. 16 This is not to say that the individual and group will not use, as tools, the cultural and other norms of their society to gratify their needs.

His belief, based on anthropological and other studies, is that the influence of individual needs is "many times stronger than the influence of the social forces which play upon man." 17 So strong are these influences that "individuals step out of the 'real' world into a world of their own in an attempt to find fulfillment of more
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basic needs or at least to escape their complete frustration".\(^{18}\) The individual's most fundamental drive is to attempt to control his environment in order to meet his needs. If not useful, more appropriate ones are invented; "if needs cannot be met by being honest, the individual tries something else."\(^{19}\)

"Rights" and "needs" are also sometimes used in contemporary literature interchangeably. However, rights are traditionally referred to within majority-minority constitutional relations, while needs are now more and more referred to in the evolving literature as universal requirements. The difference is important in relationships. No one culture or system can require observation by others of what it regards as "right;" but "needs" satisfaction can be regarded as a universally required condition for harmonious relationship.

In the 1960s there was a great interest in conflict in primate society, and the study of monkeys and apes in their competition for food and territory, and for rank order. This was the beginning of a conscious search for some theoretical framework in which to analyze conflict relationships.\(^{20}\) There was at the same time the beginnings of a theory of human needs, especially those identity needs evidenced in "nationalism."

These were the early beginnings. There were input into thinking about explanations of conflict, doubts cast on contemporary strategic thinking based on game models, and some consideration of problems of perception and interpretations
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of behaviors. At the end of the 1960s reports were being published on means of bringing parties to disputes together in an analytical framework.21

Whereas in the 1960s the focus was on the obvious conflicts associated with independence movements and great power rivalries, in the mid-1980s it became apparent that traditional law-and-order controls were not effective even at the domestic level, thus stimulating at least an interest in problem-solving as policy.

Reflecting a change in perspective Christopher Mitchell in 1981 made two contributions, "The Structure of International Conflict" and "Peacemaking and the Consultant's Role", falling well within a problem-solving conflict resolution framework.22 In 1987 Dennis Sandole and Ingrid Sandole brought together articles by those who had been contributing to the wider fields of conflict management and problem-solving in "Conflict Management and Problem Solving: Interpersonal to International Applications".23 A book in 1988, "New Approaches to International Mediation",24 also reflects these trends. In another important recent contribution Coate and Rosati have drawn attention to "The Power of Human Needs".25

Needs, Values, Interests

The distinction between interests that are negotiable, on the one hand, and values and needs that are not, on the other, is a recent one. It is an insight gained
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primarily from facilitated conflict resolution processes. These processes seek to be analytical and to reveal the underlying sources of conflict, rather than merely to negotiate from fixed positions of relative power. They reveal, therefore, these differences in motivations.\(^\text{26}\)

It is reasonable to assume that human motivations include some that are required for the development of the human species, some that are culturally specific, and some that are of a transitory nature, even merely wishful-thinking desires. We need a common language that at least differentiates those motivations that are socially and politically significant. Three categories appear to be the main ones from a practical policy viewpoint: those that are universal in the human species, those that are cultural, and those that are transitory. It is a distinction that was not part of traditional thought, and is not welcome in contemporary times to those who are in a majority or powerful position. It is a distinction, however, that must be made if there is to be an understanding of conflicts, and the formulation of policies calculated to avoid or to resolve them.

This study labels these as "needs", values" and interests.” They are separate phenomena, and the study endeavours to identify them as such.

**Needs**

Needs reflect universal motivations. They are an integral part of the human being. Abraham Maslow (Maslow’s Needs list is detailed later in the chapter) and many others have argued that in addition to the more obvious biological needs of

food and shelter, there are basic human needs that relate to growth and development. From the perspective of conflict studies, the important observation is that these needs will be pursued by all means available. In ontological terms, the individual is conditioned by biology, or by a primordial influence, to pursue them. It follows that unless satisfied within the norms of society, they will lead to behavior that is outside the legal norms of the society. The issue here is not whether behavior is determined genetically, environmentally, or both. The fact that there are behaviors that cannot be controlled to fit the requirements of particular societies is the main concern, rather than the evolutionary explanation of this phenomenon.

Values

Values are those ideas, habits, customs and beliefs that are a characteristic of particular social communities. They are the linguistic, religious, class, ethnic or other features that lead to separate cultures and identity groups. Values, which are acquired, differ from needs in that the latter are universal and primordial, and perhaps genetic.

In conditions of oppression, discrimination, and isolation, the defense of values is important to the needs of personal security and identity. In this sense they impinge on needs and can be confused with them. Preservation of values is a reason for defensive and aggressive behaviors. It is the pursuit of individual needs that is the reason for the formation of identity groups through which the individual operates in the pursuit of a wider ego, and of security and cultural identity.

Over periods of time, after a generation or two of social and economic integration and shared education, values may alter. Given conducive environmental circumstances, persons of different cultures can be assimilated into one culture,
which is likely to absorb some features of all. However, even in the best of circumstances this is a long process. It requires a sense of security, which in turn depends on an absence of discrimination, and on opportunities for development.

The more usual situation is one where separate customs, lifestyle, dress, religion and language are bases for discrimination, and also a means of defensive identity against the consequences of such identity. Leaderships emerge to defend them, and also to use them for political purposes.

Values, however, have a connotation wider than ethnic or national identities. Cultures exist even within such groupings. There are class cultures and social identities associated with the many different groupings to which individuals belong. Values include the preferences and priorities associated with these.

*Interests*

Interests refer to the occupational, social, political and economic aspirations of the individual, and of identity groups of individuals within a social system. Interests are held in common within groups in a society, but are less likely to be held in common nationally. Typically they are competitive, having a high win-lose component.

Interests are transitory, altering with circumstances. They are not in any way an inherent part of the individual as are needs, and as values might be. They typically relate to material goods or role occupancy. (Role itself may relate to needs when there are identity issues involved). Interests influence policies and tactics in the pursuit of needs and values.
The assumption has been that this interest motivation-material gain—because it is the driving force of the economy, is the dominant one in social and political life. The term “interests” has, therefore, often been used in a generic sense, to cover all motivations, including needs and values.

The relationship between interests and needs is an important one in practice. The absence of incentives, some of which can be defined as interests, and of a sense of role, can finally threaten identity and undermine the social cohesion and sense of sharing that are so necessary in a society planned to achieve equalities.

The outlook for societies that rest on the pursuit of interests is as dismal as the outlook for societies that restrict them. There are many examples in the developed and the developing world of societies that are in jeopardy just because interest groups are uncontrolled in their promotion of projects that endanger the environment and security, and in their exploitation of others. Such societies are characterized by gross inequalities and high levels of alienation.

A feature of interests is that they are negotiable: it is possible to trade an individual interest for a social gain (All functional laws, such as the rules of the road, involve this trading). In contrast, it follows from the definitions given above, that needs and values are not for trading. Needs, in particular, are inherent drives for survival and development, including identity and recognition. It is not within the free decision making of the individual to trade them. Needs for identity that are frustrated or denied may give rise to behaviors that are inconsistent with the normal behavior, and even with the interests of the individual.
The Lists of Human Needs

The variety of human needs postulated by different authors seems bewildering in its complexity. Michael Banks mentions three basic human needs that are relevant for conflict resolution: the need for basic resources, the need for self-determination and the need for association. 27 In a private communication, de Reuck talks of "legitimate" conflict resolution and lists six "supra-biological" basic needs that any agreement must fulfill if it is to count as a resolution: Identity, Resignation, Rationality, Respect, Autonomy, and Control. 28 One of the founders of needs theory, James C. Davies, who implies that human needs are not mere theoretical constructs but "organically, genetically programmed predispositions", lists them as (1) physical, (2) social-affectional, (3) self-esteem and (4) self-actualization needs. 29 And Johan Galtung writes of (1) security, (2) welfare, (3) identity and (4) freedom needs. 30

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs has had considerable influence in the fields of clinical and organizational psychology, and in the development of Needs Theory.

- **Self-actualization needs**: the ultimate motivation, involving the need to fulfill one's unique potential.

- **Esteem needs**: the need for achievement, competence and mastery, as well as motives for recognition, prestige and status.
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- **Aesthetic needs**: the craving for beauty, symmetry and order.

- **Cognitive needs**: the desire to know, to understand, and to satisfy one's curiosity.

- **Belongingness and Love needs**: needs that are satisfied by social relationship.

- **Safety needs**: needs that must be met to protect the individual from danger.

- **Physiological needs**: basic internal deficit conditions that must be satisfied to maintain bodily processes.\(^{31}\)

The ordering of the hierarchy is perhaps not so important as the supposition that the needs represent the basic requirements of human beings for survival and development in both physical and social terms. However, a number of sticking points have been expressed as criticisms of Maslow's model by several contributors to Needs Theory. Lederer, for example, in introducing a collection of seminal contributions on Needs Theory, notes that Maslow's hierarchy suggests distinction between more basic and less basic needs with respect to the urgency of satisfaction.\(^{32}\) In addition, more basic needs are equated with material satisfiers while less basic needs are related to non-materials satisfiers, thus creating a set of potentially confused priorities for international development, and parenthetically, conflict resolution. Similarly, Galtung sees the hierarchical conception of needs as dangerous since it limits the range of theoretical possibilities and could be used to legitimize the superior position of intellectuals or ascetics who specialize in dealing with the higher non-material needs.\(^{33}\) In addition, the normative specification that


lower needs must be satisfied before attention is given to higher needs could be used to justify deliberate inattention to non-material needs and for preserving an unacceptable status quo. Furthermore, Galtung points out that Maslow's theory, along with much other work on needs, demonstrates a strong Western imprint. He discusses this contention in relation to certain characteristics of Western society including a unilinear conception of time, an analytic conception of epistemology, a man over-nature stance, and a vertical division of labor. Setting the hierarchical nature of Maslow's model aside would satisfy many of these criticisms and would leave a list of needs that bears considerable resemblance to those identified in many other statements of Needs Theory.

A broad though not well known statement of needs by a humanistic social psychologist, Hadley Cantril represents a holistic attempt to specify universal elements of the human design which do transcend particular cultures, societies, or political systems.34

- Humans require the satisfaction of survival needs.
- Humans want security in both its physical and psychological meaning.
- Humans need sufficient order and certainty to be able to predict the effects of their actions.
- Humans continuously seek to enlarge the range and enrich the quality of their satisfactions.
- Humans are creatures of hope and are not genetically designed to resign themselves.

Humans have the capacity to make choices and the desire to exercise this capacity.

Humans require freedom to exercise the choices they are capable of making.

Humans want to experience their own identity and integrity.

Humans want to experience a sense of their own worthwhileness.

Humans seek some value or system of beliefs to which they can commit themselves.

Humans want a sense of confidence that their society holds a fair degree of hope that their aspirations will be fulfilled.

Although a human needs approach to theory has been a part of social science for quite some time, indeed has provided the foundation for the "Goals, Processes, and Indicators of Development" (GPID) project of the United Nations University, it is the name of John Burton that is most often associated with human needs theory when one speaks of conflict resolution.

Burton's human needs theory, what he has more recently called "collaborative problem-solving conflict resolution", draws on the humanistic psychology of Abraham H. Maslow, the sociology of Paul Sites and Stephen Box, and the sociobiology of Edwin O. Wilson, to formulate a theory of conflict.
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and conflict resolution based on the premise that individuals seek to fulfill a set of universal needs which, when thwarted, resulted in deep-rooted and protracted conflict.

In *Deviance, Terrorism and War*, Burton discusses nine distinct universal human needs:

1. *A need for consistency in response*: Only through consistent responses can there be learning and consistency in behavior.

2. *A need for stimulation*: This is the other side of the coin to consistency in response. The individual must be stimulated in order to learn.

3. *A need for security*: Without security there is a withdrawal from response and stimulation.

4. *A need for recognition*: Through recognition the individual receives confirmation that his or her reactions to stimulation are approved. Recognition also provides the encouragement factor in learning.

5. *A need for distributive justice*: Distributive justice provides an appropriate response or reward in terms of experience and expectations.

6. *A need to appear rational and develop rationality*: This follows from the need for consistency of response. Rationality is a function of the behavior of others. Inconsistent responses invoke irrationality.

7. *A need for meaningful responses*: Unless responses are meaningful to the individual they will be interpreted as inconsistent.

8. *A need for a sense of control*: Control is a defense mechanism; if the other needs are met there is no need to control. Since the other needs are never fully met, the ability to control rather than react to the social environment is consequently a need.
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9. A need to defend one's role: The individual has a need to secure a role and to preserve a role by which he or she acquires and maintains recognition, security and stimulation.

The first eight are taken from Sites and the last, role defense, Burton himself adds to the list.

The task of determining which is the more accurate list of Basic Human Needs appears a difficult one. However, if there is one universal list of basic human needs, then those involved (either through frustration or being malignantly played out) in one conflict may be very different from those involved in a second, parallel dispute. The implications of this possibility for a sound, general theory of conflict resolution need not be stressed.

Are all basic human needs equally necessary or important, or is there an order of importance (a hierarchy) from most to least, or from essential to peripheral? If a hierarchy of needs does exist, then resolutions might become a matter of satisfying the most important needs first, and dealing with the peripheral needs as a secondary consideration. If needs are equally important, then an agreement must deal equally thoroughly with all relevant needs in order to achieve a long term resolution.

On the particular issue of hierarchy versus equal importance, however, many Human Needs writers appear to agree, even if only implicitly, that there is, indeed, some kind of order of importance in the list of needs. In this they are, perhaps, following both Maslow's original formulation of the concept as well as Davies's clearly stated view that there is a clear set of priorities for needs running from the
physical to the self-actualizing. Other writers seem to elevate one or more need as paramount, and make others subordinate to or dependent upon the first. Burton, for example, argues that basic human needs such as security and identity will be pursued by individuals "subject only to constraints they impose upon themselves in their need to maintain valued relations", clearly implying that the last named need is paramount. In a different context, Oscar Nudler suggests a clearly hierarchical conception of human needs, and begins with the need for Identity "the first and most fundamental need of the person system." This is then accompanied by two other fundamental needs, the need to grow and the need to transcend, from each of which arises a set of derived needs (such as shelter, affection, security, self-esteem or meaningfullness) the exact nature of which depends upon each individual’s environment. In Nudler's hierarchy, the fundamental needs are invariable, but the derived needs differ according to the social system to which an individual belongs.

Critiques

Davies, Burton, Maslow, Sites, among others, share the assumption "that all these basic needs are organically, genetically programmed predispositions", that
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needs are universal, common to all humankind across time and space, although the means or "satisfiers" by which these ontological needs are met can differ across time and space. The actors will aspire to fulfill their needs one way or another: within the mainstream or in "deviant" ways, sometimes at great cost to themselves.

Human needs theory of conflict resolution has been criticized for its emphasis upon genetic determinism and its subsequent failure to take into consideration culture and social institutions. Avruch and Black for example ask: "where do these human needs come from? And why these particular needs and not others?" Although Burton originally saw these needs as genetically based, in a response to Avruch and Black, he modifies his position somewhat by accepting the thesis of Boyd and Richerson that humans have a "dual inheritance system," one cultural and the other genetic. According to Burton what is important "is that universal patterns of behavior exist".

Cultural relativity holds that any cultural pattern is vindicated by its cultural status—that is, a given pattern cannot be judged outside of the culture in which it is found. The basis of cultural relativity is located in the cross-cultural variations in human customs and institutions, which provide evidence for the plasticity of human behavior. Societies can fulfill human needs by the most disparate kinds of behavior.
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This leads the cultural relativist to the conclusion that because human needs (with the exception of basic bodily needs) can be met in such a variety of ways, there can be no universal standard by which to determine what is a basic human need.\textsuperscript{54}

Culture is obviously a value to be protected: empirical evidence is that the protection of culture is something for which peoples will make personal sacrifices.\textsuperscript{55} The active preservation of cultures is a driving force in all-ethnic conflicts in multi-ethnic societies. Culture has this vital importance because it is a satisfier—that is, a means by which to achieve and to preserve human needs of identity and recognition. For this reason culture and human needs must be differentiated, the latter being universal and the goal, and the former being specific to some identity groups and the means of attaining goals that are universal. There could be social conditions in which culture becomes less of a value because identity and related needs are satisfied by job opportunities, social status and other conditions that promote autonomy.

Different cultures typically have different means of dealing with conflict. In some there is resort to violence, in some there is leadership arbitration, and in some there is resort to traditional or legal norms. Where there are disputes within societies, especially disputes that have origins in clashes of cultures, it is important to recognize such differences as substantive issues in the conflict to be management or resolved. But it needs to be understood that cultural differences are part of the problem to be resolved. They are not, especially in a multi-cultural conflict, an inherent part of the management or resolution process. Culture, either as a satisfier


or a means of dealing with conflicts, should not influence the problem solving process, a process that must be capable of cutting across culture.

Culture is, by definition, acquired, and thus separate from what is termed the human dimension. It is specific to a particular society or group. They could change over time, and according to different circumstances. "Needs" refer to those goals that are ontological or universal in the human species, and which are probably genetic, and which, therefore are not subject to change even in changed conditions.

The link between the two is an intimate one. For example, cultural differences are associated with ethnic differences in cases in which religion, language, food and other cultural phenomena are associated with ethnicity. At the same time ethnic identity probably has its roots in the human need for security. It becomes difficult in practice, therefore, to make a clear distinction between the two, even though a distinction exists analytically.

Cultural values are important to most members of a community, even though the consensus values themselves are subject to change over time, and even though members of communities are able to adopt the values of other communities to which they may migrate. In some cases it may appear that they are so important that they are fought over just as are human needs.

It is in respect to process, however, that the cultural dimension promotes most confusion and there is a good reason for trying to find processes that cut across cultures. When dealing with deep-rooted conflict, that is conflict (that involves human needs), it is necessary to have a process that is capable of delving into human needs, despite different religions, languages concepts, habits, time-frames and other cultural or class differences.
Conclusion

When applied to international conflict and conflict resolution, a needs perspective focuses our attention on a set of collective psychological needs, including needs for identity, security, recognition, participation, dignity, and justice. Failure to fulfill these needs or threats to them contribute significantly to the causes of conflict, and perhaps even more so the escalation and perpetuation of conflicts. The profound resistance to change—despite changing realities and interest—that characterizes intense, protracted conflicts is typically rooted in the impact of such needs and associated fears on the perceptions and beliefs of the parties.

A needs perspective contributes not only to overcoming the barriers to a negotiated solution, but also to improving the quality of the solution achieved. Solutions that address the basic needs of both parties are likely to be more satisfactory and more durable. Furthermore, such solutions are likely to be more just and morally superior if we take the satisfaction of human needs—articulated through people's core identity groups—as the ultimate criterion for evaluating policies and practices within the international system.

Several versions of human needs theory exist. However, common to them all is the assumption of certain universal needs rooted in the biological conditions of man. True, the means of satisfying these needs are culturally conditioned or determined. But needs themselves are innate and form a part of the biologically transmitted framework within which personality develops. If these needs are not fulfilled or fulfilled in an unsatisfactory way individual development is distorted and mutilated and the personality becomes crippled. If this happens on a large scale,
society becomes conflict ridden; conflict marks relationships among individuals, groups, within nations and between nations.

There is a clear linkage between needs satisfaction and social harmony. First, it can be argued that if basic human needs are fulfilled, conflicts could be checked at source. Conflicts arise because certain basic individual needs are systematically frustrated or prevented for becoming manifest. Suppression or frustration of needs leads to attitudinal and behavioral distortions which, in turn, create conditions for conflicts. If these needs are satisfied, no conflict will arise. On this view, social institutional arrangements may be such that they either frustrate needs satisfaction, only unsatisfactorily fulfill them, or create alienating needs. As a result, distortion in individual development produce personality imbalances and disturb and disrupt social harmony. It is, therefore, necessary radically to reorganize society so that proper development of the individual as well as harmonious social existence can be assured.

Second, as Burton makes it explicit, it is the frustration of needs that produces disturbing consequences for the harmonious functioning of social institutions. Once needs are made the basis of analysis and planning, conflicts will be easier to identify and handle. They well be easier in the sense that, in a political system which is committed to satisfying certain given basic needs and has devised an appropriate institutional arrangement for this purpose, there will exist wider acknowledgement of and commitment to satisfying these needs. Conflicts may arise but needs will thus provide factual, objective and rational criteria for analyzing and evaluating an emergent social situation that may contain in its womb the potential of conflict generation and conflict escalation.
There is, finally, yet another interpretation of the linkage between needs satisfaction and conflict resolution, an interpretation which is a variant of the second. It is argued that every event of conflict incorporates within itself the issue of need satisfaction. Conflict arises because certain needs felt by a particular group have not been recognized—or, if recognized, have been frustrated or not satisfactorily fulfilled. Once the needs in question are identified and recognized as legitimate and requiring satisfaction, the way to the resolution of the conflict opens up. In this search for solution, needs theories can be of great help since these theories are objective, factual and rational. As such, they are instrumental in not only identifying the causes of conflicts but also in apprehending their solution.

Chapters Three and Four deal with two case studies respectively. In Chapter Three I look at Northern Ireland as the conflict. Apart from an analysis of the conflict from the human needs angle, I have focused in the latter half of the chapter on the peace processes that evolved to finally culminate in the Good Friday Agreement of 1998. Although I have not mentioned the processes involved, I have tried to see if the Agreement was reached within a conflict resolution framework, and made the case that the provisions took into consideration the human needs angle in implementing policy and structural changes to ensure a new set of confidence building relationships between the parties involved. By far it is the most comprehensive peace agreement signed.

Chapter Four deals with Tibet, an issue which has, comparatively seen hardly any serious peace procedures. I therefore have suggested an approach to the conflict prescriptively. Firstly, I have tried, again, to analyse the conflict from a human needs angle. Field trips allowed me to first hand understand the conflict as a typical case of
needs violation. It also allowed me to come to the conclusion that the conflict as it is today is more about needs frustration than any other considerations of strategy or other interests. Secondly, I have tried to apply the human needs theory in some possible resolution to a conflict that has been largely deadlocked since a little more than a decade.
The Twenty Six Counties of Southern Ireland (Eire) and the Six Counties of Northern Ireland (Ulster): towns and other sites of later Irish History, as Dublin, Tipperary.