

HILAL AHMAD WANI, ANDI SUWIRTA & JOSEPH PAYEYE

Conflict Resolution and Conflict Transformation: Some Reflections

ABSTRACT: Human beings engage in conflict, aggression, warfare, and violence seemingly equate with the human condition. Equally, humans have sought, as long as there has been conflict, to handle conflict effectively by containing or reducing its negative consequences. This paper is an effort to understand some of the major theoretical perspectives of conflict resolution and conflict transformation. Since both the concepts are very important for giving us kind of understanding that how can we minimize the level and structures of conflicts and to create new avenues of cooperation and compatibility. This study tried to highlight the basic dichotomy between the two concepts. Any conflict can be resolved and transformed if the structure and relationship of the two conflicting parties are fully taken into consideration. Both theories diagnoses causes and sources of conflict and both can be used as methods for resolving and transforming different conflicts. Finally, this paper is the scholarly work for understanding the major differences as well as similarities between conflict resolution and conflict transformation.

KEY WORD: Conflict resolution, conflict transformation, causes of conflict, and conditions for peaceful resolution of conflict.

IKHTISAR: Makalah ini berjudul “Resolusi Konflik dan Transformasi Konflik: Beberapa Refleksi”. Manusia terlibat dalam konflik, agresi, perang, dan kekerasan yang nampaknya berjalan seiring dengan kondisi manusia. Pada saat yang sama, manusia juga telah berusaha, sepanjang konflik itu ada, untuk menangani konflik secara efektif dengan mengisi atau mengurangi konsekuensi negatifnya. Makalah ini merupakan upaya untuk memahami beberapa perspektif teoritis utama tentang resolusi konflik dan transformasi konflik. Kedua konsep itu sangat penting untuk memberikan kita semacam pemahaman tentang bagaimana kita bisa meminimalkan tingkat dan struktur konflik serta menciptakan jalan baru bagi kerjasama dan kesesuaian. Penelitian ini mencoba untuk menyoroti dikotomi dasar antara dua konsep tersebut. Setiap konflik dapat diselesaikan dan diubah jika struktur dan hubungan kedua pihak yang berkonflik sepenuhnya dipertimbangkan. Kedua teori mendiagnosa penyebab dan sumber konflik dan keduanya dapat digunakan sebagai metode untuk menyelesaikan dan mengubah konflik yang berbeda. Akhirnya, makalah ini adalah karya ilmiah untuk memahami perbedaan dan kesamaan utama antara resolusi konflik dan transformasi konflik.

KATA KUNCI: Resolusi konflik, transformasi konflik, penyebab konflik, dan kondisi untuk penyelesaian konflik secara damai.

INTRODUCTION

“Friends, comrades, and fellow South Africans. I greet you all, in the name of peace, democracy, and freedom for all” (Nelson Mandela on his release from prison, 11 February 1990, as cited in Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham & Tom Woodhouse, 1999:152).

“On my knees, I beg you to turn away from the paths of violence and return to the ways of peace. You may claim to seek justice. But violence only delays the day of justice. Violence destroys the work

of justice. Do not follow any leaders who train you in the ways of inflicting death. Those who resort to violence always claim that only violence brings change. You must know that there is a political peaceful way to justice” (The Pope, Drogheda, Ireland, 29 September 1979, as cited in Hugh Miall, Oliver Ramsbotham & Tom Woodhouse, 1999:152).

Conflict resolution refers to all process oriented activities that aim to address the underlying causes of direct, cultural, and structural violence. Structural violence defines

Dr. Hilal Ahmad Wani is a Post Doctoral Fellow at the Centre for Peace & Strategic Studies UOI (University of Ilorin) in Nigeria; **Andi Suwitra, M.Hum.** is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of History Education UPI (Indonesia University of Education) in Bandung; and **Dr. Joseph Fayeye** is an Associate Professor at the Centre for Peace & Strategic Studies UOI in Ilorin, Nigeria. They can be reached at: wanihilal@gmail.com, andisuwirta@yahoo.com, and josephfayeye@yahoo.com

the social, political, and economic structure of a conflict situation when unequal power, domination, and dependency are perpetuated; while cultural violence refers to the social and cultural legitimisation of direct and structural violence.

As John Burton and Frank Dukes (1990:10-51) have very much left their mark in the area conflict resolution approach, both as an academic and practitioner, their work will be taken as an illustrative example. Other scholar-practitioners working in the field of conflict resolution are Herb Kelman, Ron Fisher, and Louis Kriesberg (cited in Wallensteen, 2002:1-54). Conflict resolution attempts to use game theory in order to overcome the self-defeating dynamics of the zero-sum conflict management approaches and, thus, to reframe the conflict as a shared problem with mutually acceptable solutions.

John Burton and Frank Dukes (1990) have used models of game theory, cybernetics, and system theory, for instance, in *Systems, States, Diplomacy, and Rules*, in order to make it clear that most inter-state conflicts are the result of dysfunctional decision making. In contrast to the conflict settlement approach, conflict resolution begins by defining protracted conflict as a natural result of unmet needs. Consequently, the origin of protracted conflict can be found in the underlying needs of its participants.

This interpretation of conflict has been greatly influenced by John Burton and Frank Dukes's world society approach and their work on human needs theory. The latter points to the universal drive to satisfy basic and ontological needs, such as security, identity, recognition, food, shelter, safety, participation, distributive justice, and development. Conflict resolution then aims not to eliminate conflict as such; rather, it is held that conflict expressed in a non-violent manner is an essential catalyst for social change. The aim then becomes to eliminate the violent and destructive manifestations of conflict that can be traced back to the unmet needs and fears of the parties in conflict. The key is to make the parties aware of these underlying needs for identity, security, and participation; and then to use them to redefine both interests

and positions (Burton & Dukes, 1990; and Wallensteen, 2002).

While John Burton and Frank Dukes (1990) do not spell out under what conditions all needs might be satisfied at the same time, they do urge practitioners to deepen and broaden the analysis of conflict to better clarify both needs and relations. Two consequences emerge from this kind of analysis.

First, a broadened analysis of the conflict, with its emphasis on needs, will call for strategies that go far beyond the outcome oriented conflict settlement strategies with their focus on negotiable interests. Facilitation and consultation, pursued in this way, constitutes an effective third party attempt to facilitate creative problem solving through direct communication and in depth conflict analysis.

Second, the deepening of conflict analysis and the widening of strategies will also require that a greater number of actors become involved in the process. This can be drawn from the civil society groups, from academic institutions, and from all forms of civil mediation or citizen diplomacy groups, including local and international conflict resolution NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) operating at track II level (Tidwell, 1998:1-16).

Whereas conflict transformation refers to outcome, process, and structure oriented towards long-term peace-building efforts, which aim to truly overcome revealed forms of direct, cultural, and structural violence. The most significant scholar/practitioners working in this field are John Paul Lederach (1998) and the conflict/peace researcher, Johan Galtung (1965). Conflict transformation moves beyond the aims of both the previous approaches, while at the same time taking up many of the ideas of conflict resolution, and particularly of John Burton and Frank Dukes's notion of conflict prevention means deducing from an adequate explanation of phenomenon of conflict, including its human dimensions, not merely the conditions that create an environment of conflict and the structural changes required to remove it, but more importantly, the promotion of conditions that create cooperative relationships (Burton & Dukes, 1990; and Wallensteen, 2002).

There is very real need for the field of conflict management and conflict transformation to open itself up to wider debates on social and political theory, seeking especially to integrate approaches which attempt to bridge the dichotomous thinking and theorising by the use of insights drawn from feminism, critical theory, and social constructivism for a discussion of the likely success of a more gender-sensitive approach to conflict management.

Conflict transformation usually involves a broad range of actors, who make use of a wide repertoire of practices. These can, however, be categorised into four main groups of actors, who shape the development of contemporary practice: (1) States and inter-governmental organisation; (2) Development and humanitarian organisations; (3) International NGOs concerned with conflict prevention and transformation; and (4) Parties to the conflict and other relevant groups within the affected societies.

Conflict transformation is a comprehensive approach, addressing a range of dimensions (micro-to macro-issues, local to global levels, grassroots to elite actors, short term to long term timescales). It aims to develop capacity and to support structural change, rather than to facilitate outcomes or deliver settlements. It seeks to engage with conflict at the pre-violence and post-violence phases, and with the causes and consequences of violent conflict which usually extend beyond the site of fighting.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Human beings engage in conflict, aggression, warfare, violence seemingly equate with the human condition. Equally, humans have sought, as long as there has been conflict, to handle conflict effectively, by containing or reducing its negative consequences. Treaties, ceasefires, agreements, and handshakes are all symbols of human endeavours to reduce the negative consequences work better than others.

Why is it that in one instance a handshake and an apology may end weeks of enmity, whereas in another instance a handshake or apologies do absolutely nothing? The study

of conflict resolution seeks to come to grips with explaining why people engage in conflict, and identify ways in which conflict may be resolved?

Conflict resolution, as a defined specialist field, has come of age in the post Cold War era. It has also come face to face with fundamental new challenges. It started in 1950s and 1960s, at the height of the Cold War, when the development of nuclear weapons and the conflict between the superpowers seemed to threaten human survival (Hill, 1981:109-138).

Conflict resolution is now recognised as a legitimate, indeed important topic of academic study. Justifications for the study of conflict resolution appears daily rising levels of domestic violence in the post war era, the birth and growth of nuclear stockpiles, and the increasing level of dissatisfaction with the status quo at the national and international level. Because of the bad ramifications and repercussions of these nuclear weapons which had been used against humanity many times be it, First World War (1914-1918) or Second World War (1939-1945). These concerns serve to galvanize attention on resolving conflict by peaceful means without going to war. Even before these modern daily ills, however, humanity has been locked into patterned ways of dealing with conflict. The real world has constraints imposed by human nature, by history, and by deeply ingrained patterns of thought.

Conflict resolution, for some, appears to offer alternative to what seems an otherwise dangerous and threatening world. Much of its focus has been on techniques or methods by which conflict may be handled. The focus has been largely upon individual actors, or a small collection of actors, working to resolve interpersonal, organisational or community conflict. International conflict resolution has also been an area of keen focus, but has been left largely to the diplomats and practitioners of United Nations conflict does not occur within vacuum.

Conflict resolution texts emphasise the imaginative, creative generation of alternatives, empowerment of the weak, and the search for non-violent change. Conflict resolution has been defined as a

situation: “Where the conflicting parties enter into an agreement that solves their central incompatibilities, accept each others continued existence as parties, and cease all violent action against each other” (Wallensteen, 2002:8). This means, of course, that conflict resolution is something that necessarily comes after conflict. It also means that we first need to have concepts and tools for the analysis of conflict. This is what conflict theory is all about.

Let us now scrutinize key elements in this definition. The agreement is normally a formal understanding, a document signed under more or less solemn conditions. However, there can be more informal, implicit understandings worked out between parties. Such agreements may exist in secret documents, such as a crucial promise made as a precondition for the formal arrangements, or as deals about which the parties have been more or less explicit. Many cases are likely to see as much dispute around such informal understandings over the formalized documents. Furthermore, such informal pacts require considerable trust arrangement. Thus, the formal document is important for any peace process.

The definition talk about the parties accepting each other’s continued existence as parties. This is an important element as it distinguishes a peace agreement from an agreement of capitulation. An agreement of capitulation is the strongest agreed expression of victory and defeat. It means that one side lays down its struggle, dissolves its organisation, departs from the disputed territory and, in short, ceases to be an actor of influence and significance.

An example is a withdrawal agreement. This is an arrangement where one side agrees to remove its troops from an area of dispute and this is the only matter the agreement regulates. The withdrawing party is not likely, however, to see it as a matter of capitulation, although the essence of the agreement is to end that party’s participation in the conflict. An example is the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan that was agreed in 1988 and implemented in 1989.

However, the conflict resolution agreements of interest here are more complex than such arrangements. Peace agreements

refer to situations in which the fighting parties accept each other also as parties in future dealings with one another. It means that nobody wins all that is there to win, but no one loses all that there is to lose either. Such arrangements are difficult to maintain, no doubt, but they are more frequent than may perhaps be imagined. Of course, the word “accept” in the definition does not imply that the parties agree to everything or that they like each other. It only means that they accept the other as much as they need for the agreement to be implemented by the opposing sides.

The formulation that the parties “cease all violent action against each other” is the most important. Many times, it is part of the main treaty, but it can be treated as a separate understanding. Often cessation of violence is made public at about the same time as the peace agreement is concluded. To the public at large, it means that the war ends and the dangers of being killed are reduced. Sometimes, however, cease-fire agreements can precede the actual conclusion of the agreement regulating the incompatibilities between the parties. Thus, the agreements included as conflict resolution measures are those that solve incompatibilities and end fighting (Burton & Dukes, 1990:10-51).

It can be said that conflict resolution has a role to play, even in war zones, since building peace constituencies and understandings across divided communities is an essential element of humanitarian engagement. It can be argued that conflict resolution is an integral part of the work towards development, social justice, and social transformation, which aims to tackle the problems of which mercenaries and child soldiers are symptoms. It can be said that for a broad understanding of conflict resolution, to include not only mediation between the parties but efforts to address the wider context in which international actors, domestic constituencies, and intra party relationships sustain violent conflicts.

Conflict resolution or conflictology is the process of attempting to resolve a dispute or a conflict. Successful conflict resolution occurs by listening to and providing opportunities to meet each side’s needs, and adequately address their interests so that they are each

satisfied with the outcome. Conflict resolution aims to end conflicts before they start or lead to verbal, physical, or legal fighting. More common but not popular with practitioners in conflict resolution is conflict management, where conflict is a deliberate personal, social, and organizational tool, especially used by capable politicians and other social engineers.

Conflict resolution appears to offer a refreshing new politics. In a world fraught with conflict, competition, and violence, the field orients itself toward cooperation and consensus. Difference animates key conflicts of our time. Claims about difference breathe life into cultural, ethnic, religious, and values conflict. Difference is also often internal to dispute dynamics, including patterns of conflict escalation. The range and depth of difference challenges, then, are significant. Yet perhaps the key challenge for conflict resolution derives from difficulties in relating to and engaging difference. While conflict resolution has taken on transnational character and drawn from a number of traditions, it predominantly operates through Western knowledge frameworks, values, and problem-solving practices (Brigg, 2008:1-22).

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

The term “conflict transformation” is a relatively new invention within the broader field of peace and conflict studies. As a relatively new field, it is still in a process of defining, shaping, and creating terminology. During the 1990s, a number of theorists have assisted in solidifying what John Paul Lederach (1998:201) called “a shift” toward conflict transformation in the language used in the field and practice of peace research and conflict resolution. During the early 1990s, the term conflict transformation was not in common use among peace and conflict theorists. In fact, one can argue that the term has not been a core construct of the field for even a decade.

Meanwhile, it has accrued a number of meanings, including transformation of individuals, transformation of relationships, and transformation of social systems large and small. We will analyze conflict transformation as a newly minted core construct in the field and outline how this term and its relationship

to other terms such as conflict resolution is shaping our field. However, the idea of transforming conflict in order to mitigate or even end protracted social conflicts has now become an integral part of the lexicon used in the peace and conflict studies field (http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol8_2/botes.htm, 11/3/2013).

It can be said that, perhaps unintentionally, this term carries the connotation of a bias toward “ending” a given crisis, or at least its outward expression, without being sufficiently concerned with the deeper structural, cultural, and long-term relational aspects of conflict. In terms of its meaning and use a term does not really exist until it has a name, nor can it be utilized as a tool for meaningful communication within a discipline until the name, and its accompanying definitions, are broadly recognized and acknowledged as having efficacy.

The term conflict transformation has become relatively widely used – in other words, it has been named – but it would not be true to say that its attendant definitions have been universally accepted. However, while there is a definite movement afoot to make clear distinctions between the terms “conflict resolution” and “conflict transformation”, they are still often used interchangeably both in common language usage and in the academic literature. The abundance of different definitions and interpretations of conflict transformation creates semantic difficulties. It underscores the need for clarity regarding this term that is now used as a way to describe, explain, and put into operation the work of practitioners and theorists.

The classical doctrine of casual pacifism was intended as formulated explicitly by Alfred Fried in 1918 to establish “a new world order”, a new form of global governance. Casual pacifism was key the key term: “*If we wish to eliminate an effect, we must first remove its cause with another which is capable of creating the desired effect*”. This intention was not rooted in an eschatological goal but in manageable approaches which were “*inspired by a purposeful spirit of peace*” (cited in Austin, Fischer & Ropers, 2004:1-39).

This new world order was defined as the

outcome of the “*situation of states*”, a process which was already under way and which would culminate in a contract social, or social contract, between states. This would lead not to the abolition of conflict but to what, in current terminology, is known as conflict transformation: “*the reshaping of international relations in a way which will imbue conflicts with a character which frees them from violence and makes them entirely suitable for management by legal means*”. This conflict transformation – “transforming the nature of conflict” – is precisely what is meant by “civilizing conflict” in the current peace theory debate (Austin, Fischer & Ropers, 2004).

Conflict transformation is an open-ended, long-term, multi-track, and dynamic process, which significantly widens the scope of actors involved. As far as outcomes are concerned, conflict transformation aims to achieve a settlement of substantive issues raised by the needs and fears of the conflict parties. This has two elements: *first*, a process orientation approach emphasising the need to change mutually negative conflict attitudes and values among parties in order to increase cooperation and communication between them; and *second*, a change oriented approach stressing the political imperative to create a new infrastructure for empowerment and recognition of underprivileged, disadvantaged, and subaltern groups, thus fostering and enabling social justice.

In short, the satisfaction of basic needs on the personal and relational levels will not be sufficient. Rather practitioners must work to achieve equal access to resources and assemble the infrastructure that will make possible to address structural inequalities with the aim of longer-term social reconstruction and reconciliation.

If one is to consider conflict transformation as a conceptual and practical extension and a useful combination of the pre-existing models, it would make good sense to have some types of synthesis of game theory, rational choice, human needs theory, and non-violence action. An illustrative example can be found in the problem-solving workshops, which were inspired by different sources of non-violent action, such as those of Gandhi, King, and

Sharp, that all stressed the need for respect for the adversary and the search for mutually beneficial outcomes. Mutually beneficial outcomes in turn, one of the core concepts of and aims of most game theory approaches (Lederach, 1998:10-17).

However, the transformational approach addresses this situation somewhat differently. This is because conflict transformation is more than a set of specific techniques. It is about a way of looking and seeing, and it provides a set of lenses through which we make sense of social conflict. These lenses draw our attention to certain aspects of conflict and help us to bring the overall meaning of the conflict into sharper focus.

John Paul Lederach (1998) answers the “what” question of conflict transformation slightly differently and links it in a sense to “how” and “where” it gets done. He echoes some of the points in Väyrynen’s list, albeit with new terminology. The four dimensions that should be taken into consideration in order to transform systems can be summarized as follows: (1) *Personal*, or individual changes in the emotional, perceptual, and spiritual aspects of conflict; (2) *Relational*, or changes in communication, interaction, and interdependence of parties in conflict; (3) *Structural*, or changes in the underlying structural patterns and decision making in conflict; and (4) *Cultural*, or group/ societal changes in the cultural patterns in understanding and responding to conflict (Lederach, 1998:10-17).

The lenses of conflict transformation focus on the potential for constructive change emergent from and catalyzed by the rise of social conflict. Because the potential for broader change is inherent in any episode of conflict, from personal to structural levels, the lenses can easily be applied to a wide range of conflicts.

The main question is, then, how can conflicts be transformed? There are four basic steps to transforming conflict. Within each step, different methods can be used move the process toward a positive outcome. Remember, transforming conflict is a process, not a single event or activity.

In practice, it is not always clear as to which step you and your group may be in. You may spend a lot of time working on one step before moving to the next step. You and several others may be ready to move to the next step, but the rest of the group may not. When this happens, don't try and move ahead without everyone. Try and work together to figure out what is holding some of the groups back and what it would take to move forward together. The most important function of these steps is to provide you with a general framework and direction for your effort and to remind you of certain components that have to be considered during the process (http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/sub_section_main_1845.aspx, 11/3/2013).

The four basic steps to transforming conflict are as follows: (1) All groups that are affected by the conflict should acknowledge that there is a problem and commit to working together to deal with the conflict; (2) The root causes of the conflict should be identified, made explicit, and reconciled collectively by the groups; (3) The groups involved should develop a common vision for what they can do together and how they can do it; and (4) The groups should determine what they need in order to sustain their ability to continue to work together to manage or eliminate the causes of the conflict and to promote peace.

CAUSES OF CONFLICT AND CONDITIONS FOR THE PEACEFUL REGULATION OF CONFLICT

Some of the causes which generally create armed conflicts and incompatible situations in our society can be categorised as follows. *First*, poor economic conditions are the most important long-term causes of intra-state armed conflicts today. *Second*, repressive political systems are also war-prone, especially in the periods of transition. *Third*, degradation of renewable resources (specifically soil erosion, deforestation, and water scarcity) can also contribute significantly to the likelihood of violent conflict, but are in general not as central to the problem as political and economic determinants. *Forth*, ethnic diversity alone is not a cause of armed conflict, but parties to a conflict are often defined by their ethnic identities (Bercovitch, 1992:10-21).

Meanwhile, some of the essential conditions for resolving conflict peacefully, six

cornerstones can be identified in the light of European experience:

Firstly, it is a legitimate monopoly of force by the state, i.e. safeguarding the community based on the rule of law, which is of paramount importance for any modern peace order. Disarming citizens is the only way to force them to conduct their conflicts over identity and interests through argument rather than violence. Only when these conditions are in place can potential conflict parties be compelled to deal with their conflicts through arguments and thus through deliberative politics in the public arena. The crucial importance of this condition becomes apparent wherever the monopoly of force breaks down and citizens re-arm again, with the re-emergence of feuds and warlords – presently a common feature of military conflicts all over the world.

Secondly, such a monopoly of force also creates a need for control under the rule of law that can only be guaranteed by, and indeed, epitomises, the modern constitutional state without this control, the monopoly of force is simply a euphemistic way of describing the arbitrary behaviour of dictatorial rule. The rule of law provides “the rules of the game” for the shaping of opinion and the political will, as well as for the decision-making process, and the enforcement of law. Alongside the general principles that are set forth in catalogues of basic rights, these rules of the game are essential, precisely because in politicised societies serious disagreement on substantive issues prevail.

Thirdly, third major condition for internal peace is affect control, which arises from the range and wealth of many inter-dependence characterising modern societies. Such societies are highly ramified, and people within them play out a variety of roles that reflect their wide span of loyalties. Conflict theory and real life experience show that highly diverse social roles lead to a fragmentation of conflict and thus to the moderation of conflict behaviour and affect control: without affect control, in complex environments such as modernising and modern societies, peaceful social relations would be inconceivable.

Fourthly, on the other hand democratic

participation is essential, precisely due to indispensability of affect control. “Legal unrest” – *Rechtsunruhe* in the Sigmund Freud – will result from situations where people are unable to become involved in public affairs, either for ethnic or other forms of discrimination, and at worst a conflict will escalate and, in development, is not a luxury but a necessary precondition for the peaceful resolution of conflict (cited in Kataria, 2007:1-29).

Fifthly, however, in politicized societies, this approach to conflict management will only have permanence if there are continual efforts to ensure social justice. The great majority of modern capitalist societies are run on market lines, and social inequality is ever present. Unless efforts continually made to counter this dynamic of inequality, such societies will develop social fissures. Therefore, if the credibility of the constitutional state is not to be called into question by disadvantaged individuals or groups, on the grounds that the rules of the game are no longer fair, there must be an ongoing effort to ensure distributive justice. By contrast, genuine efforts to achieve social justice and fairness give substance to constructive conflict management, and also provide legitimacy to public institutions.

Sixthly, if there are fair opportunities in the public arena to articulate identities and achieve a balance between diverse interests, it may be assumed that this approach to conflict management has been reliably internalized and that conflict management competence based on compromise – including the necessary tolerance – has thus become an integral element of political action. The legitimate monopoly of force, the rule of law and democracy – in short, the modern democratic constitutional state – become anchored in political culture. The culture of constructive conflict management, thus, becomes the emotional basis of the community. Material measures (social justice) emerge as an important bridge between the institutional structure and its positive resonance in people’s emotions (public sentiment). What develops finally – to use Ralf Dahendorf’s phrase – are “Ligatures”, in other words, deeply rooted political and cultural bonds and socio-cultural allegiances (cited in Galtung, 1965:348-397).

CAN DEMOCRACY REDUCE THE CONFLICT?

Democracy is the better form of the governance, but it cannot be applied throughout the world due to difference of culture and values. For instance, Western life style is different from the other countries life style in terms of culture of values and culture. So, saying this that Western liberal democracy is the only solution to the all political systems of the world would be somehow wrong and it would be considered cultural imperialism in international politics.

Today, we find democratic systems are in war with other systems of the governance. Every country has its own history and value system which hardly can be changed. Multiculturalism is only the way-out to multicultural world. One has to respect the values and ethos of others political systems. For this purpose, Western model of the democracy has to respect others systems of governance. This could be achieved once, we will show our accommodative and tolerant attitude towards others.

America and her allies always consider Islamic world as a challenge and they always pretend fear and terrorism which is not true. Its best example can be cited when George W. Bush administration thought that Iraq and Afghanistan is problem for American foreign policy. Some scholars criticize the vision of George W. Bush administration in the countries of Iraq and Afghanistan. The Iraq was not having chemical weapons as it was described and discussed by the American foreign policy makers and it was highlighted by American media which was not based on truth. The American public opinion was against the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, whereas this mission had been carried out by George W. Bush administration by pretending Iraq and Afghanistan as challenge to American foreign policy.

They are considering other Islamic countries their enemies. West needs tolerant approaches towards Islamic world and other political systems of the world which are different than Western political systems. We can call it also inflation threat theory. Which is not actually threat but it is pretended by policy makers of Western world. Identity is the major issue

today's international and national politics, one cannot suppress any identity and culture; it may be Western identity or Muslim identity or any other identity and culture. Every culture has an equal right of survival and growth (Thrall & Cramer, 2009:1-13).

The proposition that democracies should be less war prone than non-democracies is part of the liberal perspective. According to liberal thought, in democracies, where opposition is legal and allowed and citizens can hold their leaders accountable for their actions through competitive elections, the multiple channels across societies are more likely to constrain leaders from conflict. Furthermore, based on the values of political tolerance, democracies supposedly reinforce preferences for nonviolent resolution of conflict.

The idea that democratic republics are peace loving has, in fact, a very long history, going back at least to the philosopher Immanuel Kant in 1795. The proposition that democracies are more peaceful has significant implications for global politics. Democratic states were among the most important and powerful nations in the world in the twentieth century and the number of democratic states in the world has grown significantly in recent years (cited in Wallensteen, 2002).

The consensus from scholarly research on the question of whether democratic states are less likely than autocratic states to become involved in international wars is that this is not the case: democracies are not peaceful than non-democracies. Juliet Kaarbo and James Lee Ray in their book, *Global Politics* (2011), stated that:

Democracies constraints, for example, did not prevent British involvement in the Falklands war, French military interventions in Africa, India's conflicts with China and Pakistan, and Israel's participation in numerous Middle East conflicts. The United States, one of the world's long-standing democracies, was involved in many military conflicts during Cold War and after Post Cold War (Kaarbo & Ray, 2011:151-156).

Conflict resolution and conflict transformation process can be used for changing and transforming the nature of conflict. The urgent need of the time is to understand the causes and sources of the

conflict and then try to solve those causes which give birth to conflict. No conflict is unavoidable rather all conflicts can be changed and mitigated once the stakeholders of the conflict will be ready to adopt democratic principles of conflict resolution and without going to war just use the deliberation, tolerance, accommodation, good governance, and peaceful negotiation as a mechanism to reach on the consensus.

War and force should not be considered as the primary instrument for peace-building process. It must be acknowledged that after war, we have to be prepared to see the bad consequences and bad ramifications. This will take hundreds of years for any nation to be a stable and prosperous after going through war. The best thing is policy of compromise and accommodation which will lead towards win-win solution for both the conflicting parties.

CONCLUSION

Conflict resolution refers to a range of process aimed at alleviating or eliminating sources of conflict. Conflict resolution is an umbrella term for whole range of methods and approaches for dealing with conflict: from negotiation to diplomacy, from mediation to arbitration, from facilitation to adjudication, from conciliation to conflict prevention, from conflict management to conflict transformation, and from restorative justice to peace keeping.

Conflict resolution, as a mechanism, is applicable over whole spectrum of societal relations usually referred to as the three levels of the personal, local or the community, and global. Conflict resolution are those activities undertaken over the short term and medium term dealing with, and aiming at overcoming, the deep-rooted causes of conflict, including the structural, behavioural, or attitudinal aspects of the conflict. The process focuses more on the relationships between the parties than the content of specific outcome. The aim of conflict resolution is not the elimination of conflict, which is both impossible and undesirable, rather the aim of conflict resolution is to transform actual or potentially violent situation into peaceful process of social and political change.

The lenses of conflict transformation focus on the potential for constructive change emergent from and catalyzed by the rise of social conflict. Because the potential for broader change is inherent in any episode of conflict, from personal to structural levels, the lenses can easily be applied to a wide range of conflicts. Conflict transformation places before us some big questions: “Where are we headed? Why do we do this work? What are we hoping to contribute and build?”

Increasingly, we are convinced that those in the alternative dispute-resolution field and the vast majority of people and communities who wish to find more constructive ways to address conflict in their lives were drawn to the perspectives and practices of conflict resolution because they wanted change. They wanted human societies to move from violent and destructive patterns toward the potential for creative, constructive, and nonviolent capacities to deal with human conflict. This means replacing patterns of violence and coercion with respect, creative problem-solving, increased dialogue, and non-violent mechanisms of social change. To accomplish this, a complex web of change processes undergirded by a transformational understanding of life and relationship is needed.

Bibliography

- Austin, Alex, Martina Fischer & Norbert Ropers. (2004). *Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict*. Germany: Vs Veralag.
- Bercovitch, Jacob. (1992). *The Structure and Diversity of Mediation in International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Brigg, Morgan. (2008). *The New Politics of Conflict Resolution: Responding to Difference*. UK [United Kingdom]: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burton, John & Frank Dukes. (1990). *Conflict: Practices in Management, Settlement, and Resolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp.10-51.
- Galtung, Johan. (1965). “Institutionalized Conflict Resolution” in *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.2, No.4, pp.348-97.
- Hill, Barbara. (1981). “An Analysis of Conflict Resolution Techniques” in *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 26(1), pp.109-138.
- http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/sub_section_main_1845.aspx [accessed in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia: 11 March 2013].
- http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol8_2/botes.htm [accessed in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia: 11 March 2013].
- Kaarbo, Juliet & James Lee Ray. (2011). *Global Politics*. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Kataria, Pooja. (2007). *Conflict Resolution, Conflict: Forms, Causes, and Methods of Resolution*. New Delhi: Deep-Deep.
- Lederach, John Paul. (1998). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Miall, Hugh, Oliver Ramsbotham & Tom Woodhouse. (1999). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management, and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. London, UK (United Kingdom): Polity.
- Thrall, A. Trevor & Jane K. Cramer. (2009). *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11*. London: Routledge.
- Tidwell, Alan C. (1998). *Conflict Resolved? A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution*. London: Continuum.
- Wallensteen, Peter. (2002). *Understanding Conflict Resolution: War, Peace, and the Global System*. London: Sage.