CHAPTER 2
CONFLICT AND PEACE: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

In order to have a clear view of the root causes of conflict and its implication, it is important to discuss and analyze the subject in proper context. This chapter discusses the theoretical aspects of conflicts and peace. It also focuses on the different methods of conflict resolutions and its application in conflict situations. Above all, this chapter would provide a better understanding of the subject and means to address the issue analytically.

Conflict is prevalent at all levels, within and between individuals, communities, countries and cultures. Conflicts are natural experience by people of every background, culture, class, nationality, age and gender every single day. What is important is not whether conflict is good or bad, but how we deal with them.

Conflict has been described as existing whenever incompatible activities occur. There may be various situations which may lead to conflict as for instance, when two people wish to carry out acts which are mutually inconsistent, or when there is a state of tension between two actors irrespective of how it has originated or how it is terminated, or when there is an active striving for one’s preferred outcome which, if attained, precludes others from attaining the goal thereby creating hostility or when one individual/community/nation desires something that can be obtained only at the expense of what another individual or group also desires. Conflict takes place due to varied factors some of which may be economic, social and political in nature, it may occur as a result of scarcity of some resources such as money, time, space and position etc.

According to Peter Wallensteen (2002) there are three general forms of conflict: interstate, internal, and state-formation conflicts. Interstate
conflicts are disputes between nation-states or violation of the state system of alliances. Examples of internal and state formation conflict include civil and ethnic wars, anti-colonial struggles, secessionist and autonomous movement, territorial conflicts, and battle over the government. The international community, however, has become increasingly concerned with the rise in frequency and intensity of internal conflicts. (A glossary of terms & concepts in peace and conflict studies)

Nader and Todd have broken down conflict situation into three distinct evolutionary phases. First, there is a grievance or pre-conflict stage in which injustice or grounds for resentment are perceived by one party. This is followed by what they call the conflict stage where the aggrieved party opts for confrontation and communicates to the offending party, that is, both parties are now aware of antagonism. Finally, the conflict enters the dispute stage when it becomes public. For Machiavelli, conflict was a result of the human desire for self-preservation and power. For Hobbes, the three principal causes of quarrel in a state of nature were competition for gain, fear for security, and defense of honor. For Hume, the under-lying conditions for human conflict were relative scarcity of resources and limited altruism. For Rousseau, the state of war was born from the social state itself. (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Mial, 1999)

Whatever be the definition of conflict, we are referring to situations in which there is a break down in relationships and a challenge to authorities. It is a frustration against lack of opportunities for development and against lack of recognition and identity. Whether it is tension, conflict, or violence, it has origins in divisions in class, status, ethnicity, sex, religion, or nationalism.

It should be noted that a conflict is not bad or destructive per se. It can be an explicit way to resolve tension between parties, prevent stagnation, stimulate interest and curiosity; it can be the medium by which problems can be aired and solution arrived at; it can be the root for personal and social change. Conflict does not necessarily mean a breakdown of relationship or community
in which they occur. They are normal and indicative of the fact that real life processes continue. Coser has pointed to the possible political function and importance of social conflict when he observe that conflict can have a binding and stabilizing effect on the community by eliminating source of dissatisfaction, providing warning systems that change is required, and ushering in new norms. (Blake, 2009)

If the participants in the conflict can begin to recognize their conflict as a breakdown of relationships, and that there are fundamental similarities between the antagonists, then the process of abstraction will enhance their objectivity. The purpose of this process is to enable the participants to come to the understanding that all the participants have legitimate needs that must be satisfied in order to resolve the conflict. The other key here is to develop an analytical process to facilitate the changes required to create a political and social system in which these needs can be met.

Conflict Theories

Among the most important assumptions of the behaviorist school is the belief that the root cause of war lie in human nature and human behavior; and that intrapersonal conflict and conflicts pervades the external social order. This school seeks to examine whether humans possess biological or psychological characteristic that would predispose them towards aggression and conflict. It also seeks to explore the relationship between the individual and its existence in its environment. (Cunningham, 1998)

One important contribution of this School is the development of the frustration-Aggression theory. The basic assumption of this theory is that all aggression, whether interpersonal or international, has its root causes in the frustration of one or more actors' achievement. When people perceive that they are being prevented from achieving a goal, their frustration is likely to turn to aggression. This is to say that conflict can be traced to the unfulfillment of personal or group objectives and frustration as a result of such unfulfillment. All human conflict can be traced to an actors’ failure to obtain what it needs.
This theory rests on the basic stimulus-response hypothesis. The question that this theory raises is that, does all frustration lead to aggression, and can all aggression and conflict traced to some catalytic frustration? These questions, as well as the challenge of insufficiency of causal link to aggression of human behaviour have led to discrediting of Frustration-Aggression theory and the subsequent development of the Social Learning and Social Identity theory. (Ibid, 6 & 7)

Social Identity theory was developed by psychologist Henri Tajfel. It is based on the hypothesis that aggression is not innate or instinctual but actually learned through the process of socialization. Interaction in society helps to focus and trigger stored aggression onto enemies. This is an important concept, particularly when the conflict is ethno-national or sectarian in nature. Social learning theorist has tried to understand the relationship of the individuals in their environment and how this relates to group aggression.

This theory is based on normal psychological processes that operate under all circumstances not just under conditions of inter-group conflict. According to the author we create our social identities in order to simplify our excellent relations. Further there is a human need for positive self esteem and self-worth, which we transfer to our groups. We also order our environment by social comparisons between groups. The concept of in-groups and out-groups is important in this analysis. Social identity theory underlines the fact that individuals are different in groups and it is this difference that produces recognizable forms of group action. In other words, what social identity theory has done is to outline a process which places the individual in the group and at the same time places the group in the individual. (Ibid, 7)

The Enemy System Theory was developed in the late 1980s by a group of psychiatrist and international relations practitioners as a model to explain the complexity of group behavior, particularly with regard to antagonistic group relationships. The basic hypothesis of this theory is that humans have a deep rooted psychological need to dichotomize and to establish
enemies and allies. This phenomenon happens both at individual and group levels. This is an unconscious need which feeds conscious relationships, especially in group lives. This is important with regard to the formation of ethnic or national group identities and behavior. (ibid, 10)

Identification with ethnic or national groups largely determines how we relate to people within our ‘ingroups’ and with those of our ‘outgroups’. How the masses within each group perceive themselves and their relationships with groups that they are associated with helps to determine whether their relationship will be based on cooperation, competition, or conflict. This is also determined by historic relations between these groups. Consequently, the theory combines concepts from individual and group psychology, as well as international relations theory. (Cunningham, 1998)

The Human Needs Theory (HNT) was developed in the 1970s and 1980s as a generic or holistic theory of human behavior. It is based on the hypothesis that humans have basic needs that have to be met in order to maintain stable societies. According to John Burton the human participants in conflict situations are compulsively struggling in their respective institutional environments at all social levels to satisfy primordial and universal needs - needs such as security, identity, recognition, and development. They strive increasingly to gain the control of their environment that is necessary to ensure the satisfaction of these needs. This struggle cannot be curbed as it is primordial. (ibid, 17)

This struggle for primordial needs is theoretically related to the Frustration-Aggression theory which is based on the stimulus-response hypothesis. The frustration of not satisfying these needs leads to aggression and subsequently, conflict. What distinguishes Human Needs theory from the Frustration-Aggression theory is that the former is concerned only with absolute requirements (needs) while the later is also concerned with wants and desires. Burton further states that there are fundamental universal values or human needs that must be met if societies are to be stable. Unless identity needs are
met in multi-ethnic societies, and there is distributive justice, a sense of control
and prospects for the pursuit of all other human societal developmental needs,
instability and conflict are inevitable. These needs are non-negotiable.

Burton suggested the only solution is for the groups to work out
their problem in an analytical way, supported by third parties who act as
facilitators and not authorities. This is particularly relevant when the conflict is
over needs which cannot be bargained or compromised. (Cunningham, 1998)

Edward Azhar’s theory of Protracted Social Conflict (PSC)
suggested that many conflicts currently active in the underdeveloped parts of
the world are characterized by a blurred demarcation between internal and
external sources and actors. Moreover, there are multiple causal factors and
dynamics, reflecting in changing goals, actors and targets.

The term ‘Protracted Social Conflict’ (PSC) emphasized that the
sources of such conflict lay predominantly within and across rather than
between states, with four clusters of variable identified as preconditions for their
transformation to high levels of intensity.

First, there was the ‘communal content’ identity group-racial,
religious, ethnic, cultural and others.(1986:31) PSC focuses on identity groups
noting that it is the relationship between the identity groups and states which is
the core of the problem and how individual interest and needs are mediated
through membership of social groups such as security, identity, recognition and
others. Azhar links the disjunction between state and society in many part of the
world to a colonial legacy which artificially imposed European ideas of
statehood on to a multitude of communal groups on the principle of divide and
rule. As a result, in many postcolonial multi-communal societies the state
machinery comes to be dominated by a single communal group or a coalition of
a few groups that are unresponsive to the needs of other groups in the society
which strains the social fabric and eventually breed fragmentation and
protracted social conflict.
Second, following other conflict resolution scholars, notably John Burton, Azar identified deprivation of human needs as the underlying source of PSC. Failure to redress these grievances by the authority cultivates a niche for a protracted social conflict (1990:9) According to him these grievances resulting from need deprivation are usually expressed collectively and unlike interest, needs are ontological and none-negotiable, so that, if conflict comes it is likely to be intense, vicious and irrational. According to him these needs relate to security, development, political access and identity needs.

Third, in a system, where the state has been entrusted with authority to govern and use force where necessary to regulate society, to protect citizens, and to provide collective goods, governance and role of state are critical factor in the satisfaction or frustration of individual and identity group needs. Most states which experience protracted social conflict tend to be characterized by incompetent, parochial, fragile, and authoritarian government that fail to satisfy basic human needs. What happens in most part of the world, particularly in newer and unstable state, where political authority tends to be monopolized by the dominant identity group or a coalition of hegemonic groups, the state is used to maximize their interest of the power holders at the expense of others. The monopolizing of power by dominant individual elites and groups precipitates a crisis of legitimacy. Azhar notes how PSC tend to be concentrated in developing countries which are typically characterized by rapid population growth and limited resource base and also have restricted political capacity often linked to a colonial legacy of weak participatory institution, a hierarchical tradition of bureaucratic rule from metropolitan centers and inherited instruments of political repression.

Finally, there is the role of international linkages in particular political-economic relations of economic dependency within the international economic system, and the network of political-military linkages constituting regional and global patterns of clientage and cross-border interest. Modern states, particularly weak states, are porous to the international forces operating within wider global community: the formation of domestic social and political
institutions and their impact on the role of the state are greatly influenced by the pattern of linkage within the international system.

Many writers have pointed out that it is neither necessary nor desirable to attempt to encompass various type of conflict under one general theory. They argue that as different types of conflicts have different frameworks, a general theory is inapplicable; furthermore a special theory for a given kind of conflict can provide greater understanding of the relevant phenomenon. (ibid: 1)

**Understanding peace**

Peace has always been among humanity’s highest value and generally our understanding of peace is an absence of violence or war. Peace is also seen as a state of harmony and tranquility. It may even refer to an internal state of mind, of nations or to external relation. Many great scholars and leaders have tried to define peace in various ways, giving us different perspective of peace.

According to Federico Mayor, former director general of the UNESCO, Peace is increasingly seen as a dynamic, participate, long-term process, based on universal values and everyday practice at all levels-the family, the schools, the community as well as the nation.

Dorothy L Sayers a British playwright said, “Never think wars are irrational catastrophes; they happen when ways of thinking and living bring about intolerable situations”.

Another great profounder of peace Martin Luther King Jr. opined, “Peace is not the absence of tension but it is the presence of justice and brotherhood”

The formulation of peace by UNESCO includes:

- Respect for life and dignity & human rights of individual
• Rejection of violence
• Recognition of equal rights for men and women
• Support for the principles of democracy, freedom, justice, tolerance, acceptance of differences and
• Communication & understanding between nations and countries & between ethnic, religious, cultural and social group.

From the above it is understood that, the subject of peace is more than mere absence of war or violence. It is also about rights, justice and equality.

Peace studies are similar to health studies so far as the application of triangle diagnosis-prognosis-therapy. There is the common idea of a system of well-states and ill-states. The word-pairs 'health/disease' from health studies and 'peace/violence' from peace studies can be seen as specification of these more general labels.

Both these states are actually in need of diagnosis (or analysis) not only of violence and disease but also peace and health have their condition and contexts; different from the conditions for violence and disease, but they may also be related to them. According to Galtung a peace researcher must look for causes, conditions and contexts in various spaces, nature, human, social, culture etc. This transdisciplinary spectrum makes peace studies both challenging, difficult intellectually, and problematic in praxis. On the other hand, a narrow focus is doomed in advance. (Galtung, 1996)

**Gandhi’s philosophy of conflict and peace**

Gandhi’s principle of non-violence has lived on and influenced many people around the world today. Gandhi argued “not to believe in possibility of permanent peace amounts to disbelief in the godliness of human nature”. According to him non-violence is infinitely superior to violence and forgiveness is manlier than punishment. Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The practice of non-violence has proved to him as the greatest force in the world. It is the surest method of discovering the
truth and it is quickest because there is no other. It works silently, almost imperceptibly, but none the less surely.

_Gandhian Philosophy, Conflict Resolution Theory and Practical Approaches to Negotiation_ (Weber, 2001) pointed out Gandhi’s _Satyagraha_ as technique of nonviolent activism. The term has variously been translated as ‘passive resistance’, ‘nonviolent resistance’, ‘nonviolent direct action’, and even ‘militant nonviolence’ (Weber, 1991: 2). For Gandhi it was not only a method of conducting conflict, it was also a way of life, of living in Truth.

Galtung (1992:94-96), echoing Naes (1974:70-85), summarizes Gandhi’s conflict norms in such a way that at least parts of them could almost seem to have given rise to or been derived from the integrative conflict resolution literature. (Other parts go well beyond this literature into the realms of human transcendence.)

The first norm relates to goals and conflicts, and states that one should act in conflicts (now, here, for your own group, out of identity and out of conviction); define the conflict well (state your goals clearly, try to understand the opponent’s goals, emphasize common and compatible goals, state conflict relevant facts objectively); and have a positive approach to the conflict (give the conflict a positive emphasis, see it as an opportunity to meet the opponent, as an opportunity to transform society and as an opportunity to transform the self).

The second norm relates to conflict struggle and enjoins one to act nonviolently in conflicts (do not harm or hurt with words, deeds or thoughts, do not damage property, prefer violence to cowardice, do good even to the evil doer); to act in a goal-consistent manner (by including constructive elements, using goal-revealing forms of struggle, acting openly rather than secretly, and by aiming the struggle at the correct point); not to cooperate with evil (do not cooperate with evil structures, status, action or with those who cooperate with evil); to be willing to sacrifice (by not escaping from punishment and being willing to die if necessary); not to polarize the situation (one should distinguish
between antagonisms and antagonists, between persons and status, one should maintain contact with opponents and have empathy for their position, and be flexible in defining parties and positions; not to escalate (by remaining loyal, not provoking the opponent or allowing oneself to be provoked, by not humiliating or allowing oneself to be humiliated, by not expanding the goals of the conflict and by using the mildest forms of conflict behaviour.

The third and final norm relates to conflict resolution, and it directs that conflicts should be solved (do not continue the struggle forever, always seek negotiation, seek positive social transformation and seek transformation of both the self and the opponent); that one should insist on essentials rather than non-essentials (do not trade with essentials, be willing to compromise on non-essentials); that one should see oneself as fallible (be aware that you may be wrong, admit your mistakes, maintain consistency over time); that one should be generous with opponents (do not exploit their weaknesses, do not judge them harder than yourself, trust them); and finally that one should aim for conversion rather than coercion (seek solutions that can be accepted by both you and the opponent, never coerce the opponent, convert the opponent into a believer of the cause, or, as Galtung implies throughout this section, be open to being converted yourself ). Gandhi’s own statements readily reflect these principles: ‘A satyagrahi must never forget the distinction between evil and the evil-doer’ (Young India, 8 August 1929)

‘The Gandhian philosophy of conflict’ (Bondurant: 1965) analyses Gandhi’s campaigns and delineates a theoretical background that sounds similar to, and in some aspect goes well beyond, the conflict resolution literature. Bondurant points out that, the objective is not to assert proposition, but to create possibilities. In opening up new choices and in confronting an opponent with the demand that he makes a choice, a satyagrahi involves him in acts of ethical existence. The process forces a continuing examination of one’s own motive, an examination undertaken within the context of relationships as they are changed towards a new, structured, and reintegrated pattern.
Bondurant adds, this dialectical process is essentially creative and inherently constructive, its object is a restructuring of the opposing elements to achieve a situation which is satisfactory to both the antagonists but in such a way as to present an entirely new total circumstances through the operation of nonviolent action the truth as judged by the fulfillment of human needs will emerged in the form of a mutually satisfactory and agreed upon solution.

This line is clearly echoed in some modern conflict resolution sources that do not mention Gandhi. For instance, Burton (1997) sees conflict as inextricably linked with unfulfilled human needs, and Mitchell (1993: 79) sees the aim of problem solving exercise as providing alternative to coercion and new option for a generally acceptable and self-sustaining resolution, involving agreement and a new relationship between erstwhile adversaries. Among other western scholars Arne Naess was greatly influenced by Gandhi. His work include Gandhi inspired concept of structural violence (Weber, 1999). He also wrote a length on Gandhi and conflict resolution.

Over the years Gandhian philosophy of peace and non violence have influenced many scholars and activists Martin Luther king, Jr., achieved world acclaim for his advocacy of non-violence as a strategy for social change. He believed that violence in the struggle for racial justice is both impractical and immoral. Another well known figure who practiced Gandhian philosophy of non-violence was Nelson Mandela, who, despite 27 years of imprisonment by the apartheid regime of South Africa never answered racism with racism and became a force for reconciliation between blacks and whites.

Gandhi not only established the broader importance of this non-violence principal as a means of national struggle in general but also gave a fresh impetus to the elimination of violence as a means of settling differences between nations and social groups. He used this principal as a political weapon to arouse the people of developing countries to regain their lost freedom. It has
contributed a great deal to extend the area of peace in national and international spheres.

Positive and Negative Peace

It is stated that, the word peace is very often used and abused and that since it lacks an agreeable definition and difficult to conceptualize, it is unreal and utopian. The word peace conjures images of harmony and bliss in psychological, social and political sense.

Peace is also often defined negatively as the absence of war and physical violence. In order to define peace in a broader and more positive way, Galtung differentiated between negative and positive peace. Whereas negative peace is the absence of direct violence (e.g., people being killed), positive peace is the absence of structural violence (e.g., dying because of poverty), and cultural violence (e.g., factors that blind people to injustice)

Galtung in most of his work has sought to project positive peace as a higher ideal than negative peace. This is because according to Galtung, peace research should not merely deal with the narrow vision of ending or reducing violence at a direct or structural level but also seek to understand conditions for preventing violence. For this to happen, peace and violence need to be looked at in totality at all levels of human organization. So, inter-gender violence is no less important than inter-state violence and positive peace promotion has to address issues of violence at all levels. This requires an understanding of the civilizations, development, peace and conflict studied eclectically.

Galtung (1996) suggests a typology in answer to the question, what is the cause of peace? What is the effect of peace? The typology includes six spaces: Nature, Person, Social, World, Culture and Time. This gives rise to five-fold violence: nature violence, actor or direct violence, structural or indirect, cultural and time violence. Negative peace is then defined as the absence of violence of all the above kinds of violence. Positive peace includes
nature peace, direct positive peace, structural positive peace and cultural positive. Based on these Galtung comes to the conclusions that violence and peace breed themselves because of its causes and effects and that positive peace is the best protection against violence. (Grewal, 2003)

From the above it can be inferred that positive peace is feasible according to Galtung’s theory and that though negative peace is useful for a short term, the longer-term remedies are only achievable with the positive peace approach.

Galtung’s views on peace and violence has undergone changes since 1964 to a broadened focus on the causes and effects of violence and peace by relating violence to the structure of society. He moved away from the actor-oriented explanation of peace and violence to structured oriented explanation where the central idea was that violence exists because of the structure and that the actors carry out that violence. Galtung created a connection between peace, conflict and development research. The notion of structural violence is also relevant in conflict theory and development research because of its social justice connotations. Galtung goes even further to state that since personal and direct violence are often built into the social structure, it is much better to focus on the bigger picture revealed by structural violence as this would reveal the causes and effects of violence and conditions for peace. (ibid: 2)

**Conflict Resolution**

Gandhi’s way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution (Juergensmeyer: 2005) provides a case study of the conflict in Northern Ireland which suggests how Gandhi’s principles are applicable in conflict situations. The tentative peace reached in Northern Ireland was indeed, formulated only when two sides began to admit that each had just grievances against the other and that each side had legitimate goals that the other side unjustly denied. Both parties also realized that adherence to the rule of law deterred the peace process because both sides had committed atrocities and were reluctant to face a court
of law. Thus, part of the solution to the problem was to refuse to bring to justice certain criminals who had committed acts so harsh as to be virtually unforgivable. No doubt Gandhi had great respect for the law but he discouraged recourse to law as way to settle dispute because strict adherence to the law can obstruct a just peace process.

Juergeusmeyer explains that for Gandhi, conflicts should be resolved in a way that satisfies both sides equally. Both sides of a conflict cannot be satisfied equally unless the root of the problem is addressed. Law, however, does not address the root of a conflict. It is this reason Gandhi argued that law ‘seldom allow for a judgment which both sides can agree with equal satisfaction. The recourse to law tends to leave one side dissatisfied and that dissatisfaction will eventually breed another conflict.

This sort of solution is very similar to contemporary method of conflict resolution that incorporate a no-fault principle in which each side cease to pursue those who have committed criminal acts. This case study can also be analyzed in the context of the Indo-Naga conflict where both sides have agreed for a cease-fire in 1997 for peace talk after many years of atrocities committed against each other but however, the long ongoing peace talk between them seems to face a dead lock over the question of solution within the framework of Constitution of India as insisted by the Union Government to the Naga leaders who are strongly opposed to it. In such situation Gandhi’s method of judgment against recourse to law as it leads to dissatisfaction could well be noted by both the conflicting parties if they really want to resolve the problem.

In Peace-building: Theoretical & Concrete Perspective (Cawerc, 2006) Orjuela points out the necessity for civilians to be involved in working for peace which is also seen as a question of representative. This is critical given the fact that warring groups tend to assert that they) represent the people so they also need to participate in efforts to prevent and end wars. Similarly there is an awareness that if peace agreement is to be lasting and effective, all parts of community need to be involved including government, NGO,
professionals, private citizens, research scholars/academicians, activist, religion and media. McDonald coined the term “Multi-track Diplomacy” and he and Diamond argue that it is a system approach to peace. (ibid page 443)

Peace Architecture (Reychler: 2002) suggests that peace building is not only a science but also an art, where imagination and creativity are an essential part of the building process. He suggested six principles that should guide the design for building peace processes.

1. A clear and compelling definition of the peace to be built: This requires a reconciling of the competing needs of the owners and the concern of the stakeholders. The conflict behavior of the parties is strongly influenced by their respective expectation about their future; therefore the projection of a clear and attractive future could catalyst the conflict transition process significantly.

2. A contextual and comprehensive assessment of the available peace building capacity with appreciative inquiry and of what still needs to be done to build a sustainable peace building process: Special attention should be directed to the components of sustainable peace that need to be installed or consolidated.

3. The development of a coherent peace plan: Coherence refers to the achievement of good time management and of a synergy between peace building efforts in diverse domains, (political, diplomatic, military, humanitarian, economic etc) at different system-levels (internal and external-elite/middle/local) and layers (public behavior, opinions, perception, feelings) of the conflict and time factor is one of the vital and nonrenewable resource that continue to be wasted. Many violent conflicts are example of missed opportunities.

4. An effective implementation of the peace plan, coordination and effective leadership: This implies not only the commitment of sufficient time and means but also leadership and a good coordination of the peace building
activities of the parties involved. A critical mass of external and internal leadership, who motivates, guides, and who can raise hope, and generate ways and means to the peace building process, is needed for the success of the peace building because they are the highest representative of the people.

5. The involvement of the people who commission the peace building and the stakeholders in the whole process: The people who see their interest as deeply affected should be at the heart of the decision making process. Others who should be included, consulted or informed are those who could hinder the successful implementation; their advice or assistance is needed; and also those whose approval will be required to enable the project to proceed (Kraybill, 1995), and

6. Identification and dismantling of the sentimental walls that inhabit the peace building process: Peace building is not only about construction, but about deconstruction. To analyst and transform conflicts, more attention needs to be paid to political-psychological variables. This refers to concepts, theories, dogmas, attitudes, habits, emotions and inclinations that inhibit democratic transition and constructive transformation of conflicts. The existence of sentimental wall increases the chances of misperceiving the situation and would hinder the development of the peace process to resolve the conflict.

Techniques of Conflict Resolution

Gawere has opined that one of the greatest shortcomings of contemporary peace process is that they often fail to address the bitterness including the memories and images and the sources that generate it. What is the best way to address conflict? One group of scholars considers conflict to be structural and the other consider it to be psycho-social and psycho-cultural. The structuralists focus on the issues of rights, justice and political issues while those who adopts a psychosocial and psycho-cultural position emphasize on relationship and the need to work on eliminating the ignorance, misperceptions, fears, hostility between groups often through cooperative activities. (Hugh Miall
as quoted by Mahanta, 2008) We can look at various ways how Peace and Conflict Studies have attempted to address the issues of protracted conflicts by identifying the different techniques.

**1) Conflict Management**

The Conflict Management theorists see the violent conflicts as an ineradicable consequence of differences of values and interests within and between communities. The propensity to violence arises from the existing institutions and historical relationships as well from the established distribution of power. Resolving such conflicts is viewed as unrealistic – the best that can be done is to contain and manage them and occasionally to reach a historic compromise in which violence may be laid aside and normal politics resumed.

Conflict Management is the appropriate intervention to achieve political settlements particularly by those powerful actors having the power and resources to put pressure on the conflicting parties. It is also the art of designing appropriate institutions to guide the inevitable conflict into appropriate channels. Bloomfield and Reily have defined Conflict Management in the following manner – “Conflict Management is the positive and constructive handling of difference and divergence. Rather than advocating methods for removing conflicts, (it) addresses the more realistic question of managing conflicts: how to deal in a constructive manner, how to bring the opposing sides together, how to design a practical, achievable cooperative system for the constructive management of differences.”

Conflict Management is the mixture of both conflict settlement and conflict containment. Conflict settlement means agreement between parties to settle a political conflict ending an armed conflict. Conflict containment includes peace keeping and war limitation with an intention to terminate conflict at the earliest opportunity.
2. Conflict Resolution

Conflict Resolution theorists in contrast; reject the power political view of conflict, arguing instead that in communal and identity conflicts, people cannot compromise on their fundamental needs. However they argue that it is possible to transcend conflicts if parties can be helped to explore, analyze, question and reframe their positions and interests.

Conflict Resolution therefore emphasizes intervention by skilled but powerless third parties working unofficially with the parties to foster new thinking and new relationships. They seek to explore what is the root of the conflict and tend to find creative solutions that the parties may have missed. CR is about how the parties can move from zero sums destructive conflicts to positive sum constructive outcomes. The aim is to develop processes of conflict resolution that appear to be acceptable to parties in dispute.

3. Conflict Transformation

Conflict Transformation theorists argue that contemporary conflicts require more than the reframing of positions and the identification of win-win outcomes. The very structure of parties and relationships may be embedded in a pattern of conflictual relationships that extend beyond the particular site of conflict. Conflict transformation is therefore a process of engaging with and transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and if, necessary, the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflict. Constructive conflict is seen as a vital agent or catalyst for change. People within the conflict parties, within the society or region affected, and outsiders with relevant human and material resources all have complementary roles to play in the long-term process of peace building. This suggests a comprehensive and wide-ranging approach, emphasizing support for groups within the society in conflict rather than for the mediation of outsiders. It also recognizes that conflicts are transformed gradually, through a series of smaller or larger changes as well as specific steps by means of which a variety of actors may play important roles.
In the words of Lederach:

*Conflict transformation must actively envision, include, respect, and promote the human and cultural resources from within a given setting. This involves a new set of lenses through which we do not primarily 'see' the setting and the people in it as the 'problem' and the outsider as the 'answer'. Rather, we understand the long-term goal of transformation as validating and building on people and resources within the setting (Lederach 1995)*

A number of conflict theorists and practitioners, including John Paul Lederach advocate the pursuit of “conflict transformation” as opposed to “conflict resolution” or “conflict management”. Conflict transformation is different from the other two, Lederach asserts, because it reflects a better understanding of the nature of conflict itself. “Conflict resolution” implies that conflict is bad - hence something that should be ended. It also assumes that conflict is a short term phenomenon that can be ‘resolved’ permanently through mediation or other intervention processes. “Conflict management” correctly assumes that conflicts are long term processes that cannot be quickly resolved, but the notion of ‘management’ suggests that people can be directed or controlled as though they were physical objects. In addition, the notion of management suggests that the goal is the control of volatility more than dealing with the real source of the problem.

Conflict transformation, as described by Lederach does not suggest that we simply eliminate or control conflict, but rather recognize and work with its ‘dialectic nature’. By this he means that social conflict is naturally created by humans who are involved in relationships, yet once it occurs, it changes (ie.transforms) those events, people, and relationships that created the initial conflict. Thus, the cause-and-effect relationship goes both ways — from the people and the relationships to the conflict and back to the people and relationships. In this sense, ‘conflict transformation’ is a term that describes a natural occurrence. Conflicts change relationships in predictable ways, altering
communication patterns and patterns of social organization, altering images of the self and of the other.

Conflict transformation is also a prescriptive concept. It suggests that left alone, conflict can have destructive consequences. However, the consequences can be modified or transformed so that self-images, relationships and social structures improve as a result of conflict instead of being harmed by it. Usually this involves transforming perceptions of issues, actions and other people or groups. Since conflict usually transforms perceptions by accentuating the differences between people and positions, effective conflict transformation can work to improve mutual understanding. Even when people’s interests, values, and needs are different, even non-reconcilable, progress can be made if each group gains a relatively accurate understanding of the other.

Such transformation, Lederach suggests, must take place at both the personal and the systemic level. At the personal level, conflict transformation involves the pursuit of awareness, growth, and commitment to change which may occur through the recognition of fear, anger, grief, and bitterness. These emotions must be outwardly acknowledged and dealt with in order for effective conflict transformation to occur.

Thus the emergence of conflict transformation can be seen in the context of an understanding that conflicts do not end – they are seldom ‘solved’ and it may not be desirable to ‘stop’ a conflict if it is at the expense of justice and the best way to guarantee the durability of any agreement is to be proactive and allow for higher mutual participation by the conflict groups. The term conflict transformation has carved a niche for itself. Lederach suggests that transformation involves the recognition that conflicts can progress either in constructive or destructive ways and Hugh Miall et al argue that with its focus on transforming unjust social relationship and addressing the root cause of the problem, transformation is especially salient for asymmetrical conflicts.
Conflict transformation allows for a greater and more complex understanding of the multiple steps and interventions involved in the peace building process rather than seeing the accords as the culminating point.

**Third party mediation**

Christopher Moore defined mediation as “the intervention in a standard negotiation or conflict of an acceptable third party who has limited or no authoritative decision-making power but who assists the parties in voluntarily reaching a mutually acceptable settlement of issue in dispute”. (Research Consortium Book Summary, 1998-2005) Another scholar Susskind said, mediation is an assisted negotiation.

When impartial third parties intervene in a conflict situation, a new relational and possibilities for moderating the conflict are created. The issues, interest and needs of the contenders become clearer with the help of such third parties. More importantly third parties bring additional minds and skills for problem-solving to the conflict. (Paul Wehr, university of Colorado, USA)

Studies have shown that from 1980 to 1990, 60% of a total of 265 conflicts were resolved through mediation by third party intervention. Recent peace resolution such as the 1995 Dayton Peace Accord in Bosnia and Herzegovina, (both US and Russia played a key role as third parties) and the 1998 Northern Ireland Peace Accord (initiated by the European Union’s Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation) and the 1998 Wye Agreement, between Israel and the Palestine authority (mediator Bill Clinton, former president of US) all have demonstrate the imperative for third party mediation in conflict resolution.

The chapter discussed above as brought out a wide dimensions of conflict theories and resolution methods. From the analysis of these various theories of conflict and peace it can be pointed out that conflict of any kind has its own root causes and to resolve the problem, it is important to understand and address the root causes. It is also to be noted that in order to resolve conflict
both the party must realize and acknowledge that fact that there can be no win-win or loss-loss situation, both should be willing to win some and lose some. Powerful state can try to undermine the marginalised groups by suppressing their voice and demand but that ultimately does not help in resolving the real issue rather it would only aggravate the trouble and violence. India is a powerful state however it has recognized the Naga issue and agreed upon for a political dialogue to resolve the problem. The NSCN (I-M) wanted a third party role to mediate but the Govt. of India has not agreed to such proposal lest it might encourage other similar other groups to press for the third party mediation.

In 1964 when the first cease-fire was signed between the centre and NNC, Rev Michael Scot was unofficially a third party mediator in the dialogue but he was later expelled because the Centre felt that he was more sympathetic towards the Naga 'underground'. The present dialogue process has taken almost thirteen years and still it has not succeeded in bringing about a lasting solution. It is a truism that conflict resolution calls for a holistic understanding of the problem as today's problem may have its roots in the distant past. We will try to address this issue in the next chapter while discussing the history of Naga Conflict.

Conflict and Media

In the last decade or so we have witnessed a constantly growing role of the modern mass media in reporting conflicts, whether it is political in nature, ethnic crisis, religious controversy or war against terrorism from all over the world. The news media has become a central arena in almost every political conflict situation beginning with the Gulf War in the early nineties and more recently the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan. The Chechen conflict, the ongoing Sri Lankan conflict and the Iraqi war are other examples in which the media has played important role in providing information across the world. The role and impact of media in conflicts has become an issue that has received a good deal of public attention in recent years. Policy makers, social scientists and journalists all point to the important role of the media as each antagonistic group tries to promote its own frames of the conflict to the media in order to mobilize support for its cause.

_Media and Political Conflict_ (Wolfsfeld, 1997) presents a theoretical model called the Political Contest Model which might not be directly
useful in analyzing the problem under study as it focuses more on competition over the news media. However it provides an understanding of the significance of media’s role in conflict situation which are political in nature. The thrust of this model is to understand the role of the news media in political conflicts and to view the competition over the news media as part of a larger significant contest among political antagonists for political control. The model rest on five major arguments as discussed below:

1. Political process is more likely to have an influence over the news media because political decisions have a major influence on who owns the media and how they operate, therefore news media are much more likely to react to political events than to initiate them. Political realities also often determine how the antagonist uses the news media to achieve their political goals.

   The news media help set the political agenda, they can accelerate and magnify political success and failure. At the same time they can serve as independent advocates for victims of oppression, they can mobilize third parties into a conflict, and they are central agents in the construction of social frames about politics. The press serves as a powerful catalyst for political processes and it is therefore essential to understand better how this catalyst operate.

2. The authorities’ level of control over the political environment is one of the key variables that determine the role of the news media in political conflicts. Political conflicts are characterized by moves and counter moves as each antagonist tries to initiate and control political events, to dominate political discourse about the conflict, and to mobilize as many supporters as possible to their side. Those who have success in these areas also enjoy a good deal of success in the news media.

   The news media’s role in these conflicts is directly affected by the outcome of such struggles. When authorities succeed in dominating the political environment, the news media find it difficult to play an independent role. When, on the other hand, the authority lack or lose control it provides the news media with a much greater array of sources and perspectives from which to choose. This offers important opportunities for challengers to promote their own frames to the press.
3. The role of the news media in political conflicts varies over time and circumstances. When covering political violence and terrorism in wars such as Vietnam, and the Israeli war in Lebanon, the press was accused of being virtue saboteurs who undermine military effort through biased anti-government reporting. Social movements on the other hand, often accuse the press of being an instrument of government propaganda. Similar accusations were leveled at the press during the Gulf war and to certain extend in the Falklands and Grenada.

The role of the news media in conflicts varies along with such factors as the political contexts of the conflict, the resource, skills, and political power of the players involved, the relationship between the press and each antagonist, the state and public opinion, the ability of the journalist to gain access to the conflict events and what is happening in the field.

4. To understand the variations in the role of the news media one must look at the competition among antagonists along two dimensions: one structural and the other cultural. Antagonists compete over the news media along two major dimensions. They compete over access to the news media and they compete over media frames. The model will use two dimensions of analysis, each of which contributes an important perspective on these struggles. The structural dimension looks at the extend of mutual dependence between the antagonists and each news medium to explain the power of each side in the transaction. This offers important insights about which political actors are most likely to gain access to the arena. The cultural dimension of analysis focuses on how norms, beliefs, and routines all have an influence on the construction of media frames of conflict. This second dimension serves to remind us that political contest are also struggles over meaning in which success within the news media can lead to higher levels of political support.

5. While authorities have tremendous advantages over challengers in the quantity and quality of media coverage they receive, many challengers can overcome these obstacles and use the news media as a tool for
political influence. The literature on this topic presents mostly one side of the picture. It is a story of gloom and doom in which powerful government can exploit the dependence of the news media to drown out alternative frames agendas. Authorities have routine access to the news media and the staff, skill and resources to talk full advantages of that access.

There is however, another part of the story that is just as important to tell. Challengers can and do compete with the authorities in the news media. Some of these opportunities emerge from the political blunders of the powerful while others can be attributed to outside events. The news media keep a large stock of anti-authority frames for those antagonists who have the resources and the skill to use them.

**Media & Society**

Modern mass media plays a significant role in today’s society. It does more than entertaining the readers. They maintain flow of information that is central to our political system, our economic institution, the day to day life style of each of us. The dependency of contemporary societies on the mass media has prompted intense scholarly debate and study on the subject. It may be far important for us to know about the influence of mass communication on our individual and collective lives than many other issues studied by various sciences. It matters a great deal whether our daily behavior is shaped by what we read or see on television. This chapter discusses some of the relevant theoretical frameworks on the relation between the media and society. It would try to provide discussions to questions like: Do mass media cultivate common beliefs about the world or set an agenda for people? How do people use media and why? And so on.

The task of assessing the nature and influence of media includes more than simply trying to discover the ways in which message content disseminated by print, film, or broadcast media influences the beliefs, attitudes
or behaviors of audiences. It also includes the assessment of the impact of mass media on society.

Denis McQuail (1983) proposed an interactive perspective between the mass media and society, that mass media are primarily moulders and reflectors of society. According to him, society produces demands for information and entertainment to which media respond. Mass communication stimulates change by diffusing new ideas and innovations. According to Cultivation Theory (Gerbner, 1967), a long, persistence exposure to media is capable of cultivating certain beliefs about the world. This theory is based on assumption that mass media have subtle effects on audience who unknowingly, absorb the dominant symbols, image and messages of media. He also strongly suggested that the powerful effects of media act as moulders of society.

The Uses and Gratification Theory (Katz, 1959) focuses its shift from what the media do to people to what people do with the media. This theory discusses on the question of how people use the media and why? The uses approach assumes that audiences is active and are willing to exposed themselves to media based on their own held values, beliefs, perception and selectivity. While the term gratification here refers to the rewards and satisfaction experiences by audience after the use of media; it helps to explain motivations behind media use and habits by people. Similarly stressing on the relation between media and society, the Dependency Theory (Melvin De Fleur and Sandra Ball-Rokeach, 1976) suggest that both the media and their audience are integral part of the society. The surrounding socio-cultural context provides controls and contraints not only on the nature of media messages but also on the nature of their effects on audiences. In fact, communication in all forms has important role in holding society together. The need to belong to the society, to understand the society and to keep up with the society has increased our dependency on the media.

Thus, today the media plays a crucial role in forming and reflecting public opinion, connecting the world to individuals and reproducing
the self-image of society. It has a strong social and cultural impact upon society with their ability to reach a wide audience. Marshall McLuhan uses the phrases "the medium is the message" as a means of explaining how the distribution of message can be more important than the content of the message itself.

**Media and the Peace process**

Peace journalism begins with the idea that all too often news about conflict has a value bias towards violence. Peace journalism aims to correct for this bias. And through this allow opportunities for society at large to consider and value non-violent response to conflict. This involves picking up calls for, and articulations of, non-violence policies from whatever quarter, and allowing them into the public sphere. It also aims to shed light on structural and cultural causes of violence, as they impact upon the lives of people in a conflict arena, as part of the explanation for violence. It aims to frame conflicts as consisting of many parties, pursuing many goals, rather than a simple dichotomy, an explicit aim of peace journalism is to promote peace initiatives from whatever quarter, and to allow the reader to distinguish between stated positions and real goals.

Analyzing the role of the news media in the Northern Ireland conflict as had appeared in different studies such as, Curtis (1984) Schlesinger (1987) Miller (1994) Rolston and Miller (1996)., Spencer argues that much of the news reporting was preoccupied with the criminal consequences of terrorism and British state propaganda which sought to demonized those who perpetrated and supported acts of violence throughout the modern period, and until the development of the peace process, the submissiveness of the news media to elite interpretation of Northern Ireland gave credence and apparent validity to articulations and viewpoints that worked to delegitimize the motivations of the Republican paramilitarism, whilst functioning to provide a framework of condemnation which obscured the implication of British state policy. A political consensus developed based on criminalization of the Republican position which
served to help legitimize the British Government's containment and management of conflict. (Spencer, 2005)

However, this policy of legitimizing the state act vis-a-vis the Irish Republicans transformed with the development of the peace process, where attitudes began to shift from the politics of exclusion to a growing awareness of the need for inclusion. Representatives who were previously excluded from news reports because of affiliation with the paramilitary groups were now able to articulate their position quite openly and, as a result, the political arena became a subject to a broader range of discourse trying to contest various position and interests which are emerging in debates and negotiations about peace. Significantly, the peace process politicized the political sphere in Northern Ireland and the media's role became central in this politicization. By promoting contestations between parties, carrying dialogues and communications, and publicizing the dynamics and direction of talks, the news media became political participants in the peace process and produced expectations and pressures which were absorbed into negotiations. Notably, then, by asserting a range of influence and consequences on peace politics, the news media provided a space for dialogue and interaction to occur which impacted on negotiations and public opinion (Spencer 2001; 2003; 2004)

The Oslo Peace Process which sought to address the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis and which came to symbolize the possibilities for peace when Rabin and Arafat shook hands on the white House lawn in September 1993, provides an interesting case study about media's relationship with peace. Wolfsfeld's work on the media's role within the Middle East peace process provides an important analysis of the complex and changing role of news during the transition from conflict to peace process. When a peace process moves from secrecy to publicity, the media produces a range of influences which are subject to, and shaped by, shifting moments and circumstances within the political field. In relation to the initial phase of Oslo, Wolfsfeld notes how the media created problems by ignoring the more positive aspects (Wolfsfeld 2004: 75 as quoted in Spencer, 2005). Significantly, the media tended to view
problems in the talks as emanating from the Palestinians and became primary agents in spreading fear and panic among the public and in focusing the blame on the Palestinian leadership. But Wolfsfeld suggested this tendency for the media to act negatively in connection to the negotiation cannot be entirely attributed to the media. It is also a matter of political incompetence and disorganization when dealing with the amplifying impact of news coverage. As Wolfsfeld points out, 'the political environment was characterized by a lack of elite consensus in support of the process and a large number of serious and violent crises. The ongoing controversy provided journalist with two competing frames as pro-Oslo and anti-Oslo. Wolfsfeld also rightly points out that the media are a poor forum for public discourse because of preoccupation with violence and a professional interest in bringing it out. By reducing complex dialogue to a series of simplistic sound bites, the media act to narrow debate and inflate more sensationalist aspect of communications. Those dramatic aspects are invariably presented as threats, which are emphasized as more newsworthy than the message of peace and reconciliation which was treated to be abstract, general and distant.

Manoff emphasizes the constructive role of media in peace process. According to him news media should not operate as independent observers of conflict, but should actively seek to prevent it. The media should give attention to conflict in ways which bring pressure on the parties to resolve it or on the international community to intervene. To assist prevention, media should help establish the transparency of one conflict party to another and engage in peace building measures (Spencer, 2005). The media should work to encourage a balance of power among unequal parties where appropriate, or, where the claims of parties are not equally just, strengthen the hand of the party with the more compelling moral claim. His articulations are not merely concerned with the news media developing a greater receptiveness to voices that challenge dominant articulations; they are about developing an approach to reporting that prioritizes the value of peace rather than war.(ibid: 171)
The chapter above discussed and analyzed an understanding of the theoretical concept of conflict and peace, its root causes and implication. It dealt upon conflict resolution and techniques, as to how a conflict could be resolve between the parties involved. The chapter also analyzed the important role of news media in conflict and peace process, its impact on the society in framing opinion on important debates and issues. The following chapter will discuss a general introduction of the Naga people, such as their land, identity, its tradition and culture.
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