

() Definition, Causes and Types of Conflict

Conflict has been variously defined by scholars though its' origin comes from the Latin word *confligere* which means to strike together, on the technical level it is defined as “opposition among social entities directed against one another” (Wright, 1990:19 quoted in Albert 2001:1 – 2). Albert (2001) underlines “opposition” as the keyword in this context when seen in contrast to “cooperation”. It therefore follows that when people in a social milieu are not cooperating, then opposition either physical or psychological may be lurking around. Even when men do not cooperate with the environment by taking care of it, there exists basis of environmental conflict. It can therefore be posited that anywhere human beings exist, conflict becomes inevitable.

Transformation of conflict is also very expedient for us to turn conflicts into basis of future cooperation among social entities. All the foregoing has informed the following objectives. At the end of the course the students should be able to possess good understanding, knowledge and application of conflict transformation. There are numerous, sometimes intertwined and sometimes seemingly conflicting definitions of conflict. Conflict can be explained as an adversarial relationship involving at least two individuals or collective actors over a range of issues such as resources, power, status, values, goals, relations, or interests. Expected outcomes include victory, defeat, domination, surrender, discrimination, neutralization, conversion, coercion, injury, or destruction and elimination of the opposite party real or imagined. It may also be the resolution, settlement, termination, stalemate or transformation of the conflict.

When deadly conflicts characterized by bestial physical violence are approved by a higher authority (state, party, and religion), the killings or destructions if done in appropriate contexts i.e. without violating established norms and codes of warfare, are not usually portrayed as criminal. The most important factor is a legitimating ideology. Below are some definitions of conflict to deepen the understanding, knowledge and application.

Conflict is the struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources, in which the aims of the groups or individuals involved are not only to obtain the desired values but to neutralize, injure, or eliminate rivals (Coser, 1956:8), quoted in Schmid (2000). Conflict is a social situation in which at least two parties (individuals, groups, states) are involved and who: strive for goals which are incompatible to begin with or strive for the same goal, which can only be reached by one party; and/or want to employ incompatible means to achieve a certain goal (Schmid, 2000).

Conflict is “contests, competitions, disputes and tensions as well as manifest clashes between social forces. Conflict is a situation of competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other. Conflict is a goal-directed activity designed to improve the position of one party at the expense of the other. Conflict is a state of incompatibility among values, where the achievement of one value can be realized only at the expense of some other values. Conflict may arise within single organisms pursuing multiple goals as well as between organisms striving at incompatible goals (Schmid, 2000). Conflict is a perceived divergence of interests or a belief that the parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously. Conflict is the intentional mutual exchange of negative sanctions, or punitive behaviour by two or more parties, which may be individuals, corporate actors or more loosely knit quasi-groups (Schmid, 2000). Conflict is an escalated competition between two or more parties, each of which aims to gain advantage of some kind - power, resources, interests, values, needs, for example. At least one of the parties believes that the conflict is over a set of mutually incompatible goals (Schmid, 2000).

Conflict is perceived incompatibility between two or more people or groups. The incompatibility can be about needs, interests, values or aims. It may or may not be expressed in behaviour. Defined in this way conflict, conflicts seems common, natural and unavoidable. It is simply one of the energies of life. It is how this conflict energy is expressed that can make or mar any relationship.

Conflict is present when two or more parties perceive that their interests are incompatible, express hostile attitudes or... pursue their interests through actions that damage the other parties. These parties may be individuals, small or large groups and countries. According to Lund, interests can contrast in many ways:

Over resources – territory, money, energy sources, food – and how they should be distributed.

Over power – how control and participation in political decision making are allocated.

Over identity – concerning the cultural, social and political communities to which people feel tied.

Over status – particularly those embodied in systems of government, religion or ideology (Lund, 1997: 2 – 2).

From all the above, it is evident that conflict cannot be wished away in our lives. Galtung (1996: 70 – 71) delineates conflict into two flip-sides.

The first one is dispute explained as two persons or actors, pursuing the same scarce goal. The other side is dilemma described as one person or actor seeking two incompatible goals. Most of us experience both from day to day. Conflict

generates resources, options and energy. The problem is how channel the energy and resources constructively.

The Chinese define conflict as ‘danger’ + ‘opportunity’. ‘Danger’ is near to ‘violence’ and ‘opportunity’ near to ‘challenge’, the foundation of creation. This implies that instead of denying or ignoring conflict, what we need is the apt understanding and analysis of conflict. This approach is based on the thesis that there is no viable alternative to creative conflict transformation (Galtung, 1996).

There is also a need to distinguish crisis from conflict. Williams (2006) opines that crisis transcends the overt manifestation of conflicts.

Although crisis cannot be said to exist without the earlier manifestation of conflict or violence, therefore crisis is usually the aftermath of violent conflict. It offers a turning point, either for good or bad, after series of conflict or violence. Francis (2006) while conceptually linking conflict to the concept of conflict resolution argues against the wholesale generalisation of recent conflicts in Africa as “mindless violence” and “senseless wars” because they typify continuation of politics and economics by other means.

(note two) **Conflict Theories from Sociological Perspective**

Karl Marx Theory

Marx the great social philosopher opines that the degree of inequality in the distribution of resources generates inherent conflicts of interest. He explains the contradictions in capitalist modes of economic production and how these would lead to conflict processes that would usher in communism via a revolutionary action that would be carried out by the proletariat (the ruled). Although, his predictions were wrong, perhaps because of some fatal errors in his logic, but his analysis is still very much useful, applicable and relevant to most of the conflicts and the desire for conflict transformation being experienced the world over.

Karl Marx views that the more the rate or degree of inequality in the distribution of the relatively available or the scarce resources in the society, the greater is the basic conflict of interest between its dominant and subordinate segments. The more the subordinate segments (proletariat) become aware of their true collective interests, the more likely they are to question the legitimacy of the existing pattern of distribution or allocation of scarce resources. Also the subordinates are more likely to become aware of their true collective interest when changes wrought by dominant segments disrupt existing relations among subordinates, practices of dominant segments create “alienative dispositions”, members of subordinate segments can communicate their grievances to one another, which, in turn, is facilitated by the ecological concentration among members of subordinate groups, and the expansion of educational opportunities for members of subordinate group. Marx also exerts that the more the subordinate segments at a system become aware of their collective interests and question the legitimacy of the distribution of scarce resources, the more likely they are to join in overt conflict against dominant segments of a system. The greater is the ideological unification of members of subordinate segment of a system and the more developed is their political leadership structure, the more likely are the interests and relations between dominant and subjugated segments of a society to become polarised and irreconcilable. The more polarised are the dominant and subjugated, the more will the conflict be violent. The more violent is the conflict, the greater is the amount of structural change within a society and the greater is the redistribution of scarce resources, i.e. transformation.

Max Weber Theory

Weber sees conflict as highly contingent on the emergence of “charismatic leaders” who could mobilise subordinates. He opined that subordinates are more likely to pursue conflict with super ordinates when they withdraw legitimacy from political authority when the correlations among members in class, status, group,

and political hierarchies are high, the discontinuity or degrees of inequality in the resource distribution within social hierarchies is high, and when social mobility and social hierarchies of power, prestige, and wealth are low.

Conflict between super ordinates and subordinates becomes more likely when charismatic leaders can mobilise resentment of subordinates.

When charismatic leaders are successful in conflict, pressure mounts to routinise authority through new systems of rules and administration. As a system of rules and administrative authority is imposed, the more likely are new subordinates to withdraw legitimacy from political authority and to pursue conflict with the new super ordinates, especially when new traditional and ascriptive forms of political domination are imposed by elites.

Conflict-Theory Model of Dahrendorf

Dahrendorf (1958) introduces to the theory of conflict the view of productive and constructive conflict. He sees conflict as necessary for achieving an end in the society or for realisation of social goals. He holds that social conflict produces change in the system which is necessary and good. Dahrendorf's attempt was to determine a systematic locus and a specific framework for a theory of conflict in sociological analysis. He contends for two different kinds of struggles in an organisation. He calls them "exogenous" and "endogenous" conflicts.

The endogenous conflict is the conflict that is generated with an organisation, system or a society. In this, he agreed with Marx that internal conflict comes from the present social structure. He went beyond the internal dynamics of conflict to allow for external factors, which he called exogenous conflict. This also influences social change.

In other words, exogenous conflict is brought upon or into a system from the outside. The theory asserts that certain conflicts are based on certain social structural arrangements and hence are bound to arise whenever such structural arrangements are given. Furthermore, the dichotomy of social roles within imperatively coordinated groups, and the division into positive and negative dominance roles are facts of social structure. Here are the assumptions

for the structural arrangement which could lead to conflict as Dahrendorf presents in his conflict theory model.

- In every imperatively coordinated group, the carriers of positive (status quo) and the negative (change of status quo) dominant roles determined two quasi-groups with opposite latent interest.
- The bearers of positive and negative dominant roles organise themselves into groups with manifest interests unless certain empirically variable conditions intervene.

- Interest groups who originate in this manner are in constant conflict concerned with the preservation or change in the status quo.
- The conflict among interest groups in the sense of this model leads to changes in the structure of the social relations in question through changes in the dominant relations.

Pluralist Perspective of Conflict

The advocates of the pluralist school of thought such as Hugh Clegg et al, holds a different view about conflict. The school views conflict as having a constructive contribution towards what is defined as healthy industrial order. Thus, given the appropriate institutions of regulation, the overt and active manifestation of conflict resolves discontent, reduces tension, clarifies power relation and adjusts the industrial structure. Accordingly, it creates as many solidarity groups as it devices and re-embodies the principles of self-determination.

The pluralist school emerged as a criticism to the political doctrine of sovereignty, the notion that in an independent political system, there must be a final authority whose decision is supreme. Contrary to this assumption, the pluralists believed that within any political system, there are groups with their own interests and beliefs and the government itself depends on their consent, loyalty and cooperation to survive. Rather than existence of a definitive decision by final authorities, this theory contends that there are instead only continuous (conflicts, antagonisms) and compromises.

In essence, a plural social or industrial relation has to accommodate different and divergent pressure groups in order to ensure that the differing group interests are harmonised such that social and political changes take place peacefully. Thus, to the pluralists, same is achievable through continuous negotiation, concession and compromises within and among these pressure (interest) groups and between the authorities.

Given these backgrounds, and based on expositions of the functionalist and the pluralist schools, and their identification of the place of effective communication in the prevention and management of industrial conflicts, as evident on the need for clear communication, understanding, continuous dialogues, negotiation, concession and compromises within and among the differing groups in the work place, institution or society.

Structural – Functional Theory

Talcott Parson (1960) champions the course of this theory after the World War II. The structural functionalist asserted/projected that individuals will adjust to a given structure in an organisation, institution or society. Any change in the structure of the organisation or institution causes conflict and it destabilises the organisation.

Conflict should then be minimised in order to maintain stability with both the individual as well as the institutions. The theory reflects a system approach where each part has one or more functions to perform. The theory sees conflict as dysfunctional, abnormal, and a disease which can be endemic to a society. It focuses on things that will maintain the state of equilibrium and collaboration in the organisation.

Assumption on Ethnicity and Conflict

According to Person, Novak, and Gleason (1982:1), the word “ethnic” was derived via Latin from the Greek *ethnos*, which means “nation or race”. Ethnicity has been viewed since the earliest times in terms of a group setting associated with the idea of nationhood. But in recent years, the instrumentalists’ view of ethnicity and ethnic conflicts in Africa and the rest of the world hold that “ethnicity is not a natural cultural residue but a consciously crafted ideological creation”, ethnic conflicts result from the manipulations of the (radical) elite who incite and distort ethnic/nationalist consciousness into an instrument to pursue their personal ambitions.

The problem with the theory despite the fact that it contains some validity is that, it almost ignores completely the core motives and elements in ethnic conflicts such as the roles of fear and group psychology and importance of symbolic controversies which are often less comprehensible to the “outsider”.

Thomson (2000:58) defines an ethnic group as “a community of people who have the conviction that they have a common identity and common fate based on issues of origin, kinship, ties, traditions, cultural uniqueness, a shared history and possibly a shared language.”

Toland (1993:3) basically agrees with Thomson in her conception of an ethnic group, but takes it one step further by adding a sense of longing on the individual level: “...(ethnicity is) the sense of people- hood held by members of a group sharing a common culture and history within a society.” Bamass argues the assumption “ethnicity and nationalism are not ‘givens’, but are social and political constructions. They are the creations of elites, who draw upon distorted and sometimes fabricated materials from the cultures of the groups they wish to represent in order to protect their wellbeing or existence or to gain political and economic advantage for their groups as well as for themselves... this process invariably involves competition and conflict for political power, economic benefits, and social status between the political elite, class, and leadership groups both within and among different ethnic categories” (Kruger 1993: 11).

In the light of the discussion above, it is important to note that mere differences in values or regional development, or between ethnic groups for that matter, do not as such promote ethnicity and ethnic conflict, according to Kruger (1993:12). Quoting

Brass, he states “... Ethnic self-consciousness, ethnically based demands, and ethnic conflict can occur if there is some conflict either between indigenous and external elites and authorities or between indigenous elites.”

Nevertheless, the assumption on ethnicity and conflict therefore, states that, “ethnic identity has a symbolic dimension which makes conflict arising from it more intense than otherwise. Ethnicity has the symbolic capability of defining for individual the totality of his existence including his hopes, fears and sense of the future.

Assumption on Culture and Conflict

Culture simply means the sum-total of all human existence which comprises norms, values, traditions, beliefs, customs, languages, patterns of behaviours, art music, food, mode of dressing and so on.

Cultures have been delineated along a number of dimensions by various writers such as: Glen Fisher, in an interesting book called *Mindsets* and in his chapter in Weaver’s book (1998:140) characterises two kinds of societies: those based on achievement and those on ascription. Those described as “achievement” emphasise doing, in contrast to being, which describes “ascriptive” societies. The former value changes and action, whereas the latter value stability and harmony.

Weaver (1998:72-74) likens culture to an iceberg, in which only the tip is seen above the water line. The part that is obvious is the external culture, which is explicitly learned, is conscious and more easily changed. The external culture includes many of the elements that we normally think of as “culture”: music, literature, drama, foods, dress, customs, and verbal communications. These are all aspects of “behaviour”. External culture may also include some of our beliefs, such as religion and explicit ethnics.

These aspects of culture are all obvious to a newcomer. However, there is also an internal culture, which is implicitly learned and difficult to change. That is the part which is below the waterline in the iceberg analogy. It includes some of our beliefs, our value

s and thought patterns, attitudes, non-verbal communication, and perceptions. Beliefs are interrelated and form “belief system”, which because they are learnt early in life, are difficult to change. It is also difficult to perceive and fully understand the internal culture of someone from a different group.

Yet it is this part of culture that defines who we are and what really is important to us. Because we are often unaware of these elements it is difficult to articulate them to others, even to those whom we love. And we most unlikely expose our inner-selves to someone with whom we are in conflict.

Geert Hofstede in Weaver 1998:148-158 describes four dimensions by which he placed a number of societies on graphs. Two are particularly relevant to conflict transformation (p.149):

- Power distance** – defines the extent to which the less powerful person in a society accepts inequality in power and considers it normal. All societies are unequal, but some are more unequal than others.

- Individualism** – opposes collectivism (in the anthropological sense). Individualist cultures assume individuals look primarily after their own interest and those of their immediate family.

Collectivist cultures assume that individuals – through birth and possibly later events – belong to one or more close “in-groups” from which they cannot detach themselves. A collectivist society is tightly integrated; an individualist society is loosely integrated.

Hofstede characterises American and Northern European societies as generally having low power distance and high individualism. Many African and Latin American societies have large power distance and low individualism. Some of the Southern European societies are in the middle with large power distance and medium individualism.

John Paul Lederach, probably one of the best known theorists and practitioners in the field of conflict transformation today, posits that “social conflict emerges and develops on the basis of the meaning and interpretation people involved attach to action and events. Social meaning is lodged in the accumulated knowledge, which is a person’s bank of knowledge” (1995:8). Conflict is related to meaning, meaning to knowledge, and knowledge is rooted in culture. People act on the basis of the meaning that things have for them. The symbolic interactionism,

Herbert Blummer (1969) emphasises the importance of symbols and meanings attach to them. Therefore, Lederach’s assumptions (1995:9-10) can simply be liberally summarised as follows.

- Social conflict is a natural, common experience present in all relationships and cultures.

- Conflict is a socially constructed cultural event; people actively participate in creating situations and interactions they experience as conflict.

- Conflict emerges through an interactive process based on the search for and creation of shared meaning.

- The interactive process is accomplished through and rooted in people’s perceptions, interpretations, expressions, and intentions, each of which grows from the cycles back to their common sense knowledge.

- Meaning occurs as people locate themselves and social “things” such as situations, events, and actions in their accumulated knowledge. A person’s

common sense and accumulated experience and knowledge are the primary basis of how he creates, understands and responds to conflict.

- Culture is rooted in the shared knowledge and schemes created and used by a set of people for perceiving interpreting, expressing and responding to social realities around them.

However the term “culture” is often linked with ethnicity, as both the external and internal cultures are often determined by our ethnic groups, along with influences from the larger world through socialisation, education, the media and exposure to a different way of thinking and behaviour. We talk about “the culture of violence”, “the culture peace”, “the culture of poverty”, “the culture of corruption”, “corporate culture” and so on as they pervade different societies in various or different forms.

The Role Theories of Turner

Role is defined as that set of activities associated with any given position in an organisation, which include potential behaviours in that position, and not only those of the incumbent in question. Although Turner accepts a process orientation, he was committed to developing interactionism into “something akin to axiomatic theory”. He recognised that role theory was segmented into a series of narrow propositions and hypotheses and that role theorist had been reluctant “to find unifying themes to link various role processes.”

Turner’s strategy was to use propositions from the numerous research studies to build more formal and abstract theoretical statements. He therefore, sought series of statements that highlight what tends to occur in the normal operation systems of interaction. To this end, Turner provided a long list of main tendency propositions on (a) roles as they emerge, (b) roles as an interactive framework, (c) roles in relation to actors, (d) roles in societal settings, (e) roles in organisational settings, and (f) roles and the person. The most important of these propositions to this study are examined below.

Role as an Interactive Framework

- The establishment and persistence of interaction tend to depend on the emergence and identification of ego and alter roles.

- Each role tends to form as a comprehensive way of coping with one or more relevant alters roles.

- There is a tendency for stabilised roles to be assigned the character of legitimate expectations and to be seen as the appropriate way to behave in a situation. (Tendency for legitimate expectations).

In these three additional propositions, interaction is seen as depending on the identification of roles. Moreover, roles tend to be complements of others as in

parent/child, boss/employee roles – and this operate to regularise interaction among complementary roles.

(Role in Societal Settings)

- Similar roles in different contexts tend to become merged, so they are identified as a single role recurring in different relationships.

(Tendency for economy of roles).

- To the extent that roles refer to more general social contexts and situations differentiation tends to link roles to social values.

(Tendency for value anchorage).

- The individual in the society tends to be assigned and to assume roles consistent with one another.

(Tendency for allocation consistency).

Many roles are identified, assumed, and imputed in relation to a broader societal context. Turner first argued that people tend to group behaviour in different social context into as few unifying roles as is possible or practical. This people will identify a role as a way of making sense of disparate behaviour in different contexts. At the societal level, values are the equivalent of goals in organisational settings for identifying, differentiating, allocating, evaluating, and legitimating roles. Finally, people tend to assume multiple that are consistent with one another.

(note three) Conflict Cycle and Stages of Conflict

Conflict tend to progress from one place to another when the stakeholders (the oppressed and the oppressor) become more aware of a conflict of interest, means to act and then mobilise to alter the prevailing situation to each group's advantage. In the course of altering the situation or addressing the injustice being faced by the oppressed, a sporadic violence can erupt if either party should fail to adopt positive approach of conflict management.

Stages of Conflict

A. The Formation Stage

This is the first stage of conflict whereby a problem emerges and acts or things, or situations that were previously ignored or taken for granted now turn to serious issues. The obvious antagonistic shifts in attitude and a behaviour patterns is a clear indication of the early warning signs of conflict formation, which need to be addressed if further escalation is to be avoided.

B. The Escalation Stage

This stage is characterised by the formation of enemy images. People begin to take sides, positions harden, communication stops, perception becomes distorted and parties begin to commit resources to defend their position, leaders begin to make inflammatory public statements regarding their positions and street demonstrations intensity.

C. The Crisis Stage

At this stage, parties in conflict now begin to use physical barricades to demarcate their territories. Attempts to defend or expand territories or interests lead to direct confrontation and eruption of violence.

Stockpiled weapons or arms are now freely used in an attempt to dominate or have upper hand leading to breakdown of law and order and essential. Services are virtually disrupted and people begin to experience discomfort due to lack of water, food, and electricity and other essential goods and services.

D. De-escalation Stage

This is the stage in which parties in conflict begin to experience gradual cessation of hostility arising from conflict weariness, hunger, sanctions or external intervention.

E. Improvement Stage

At this stage, stakeholders begin to have a rethink, shift ground and needs for dialogue are recognised and efforts are made towards attaining relative peace.

F. Transformation Stage

All causes of conflicts have been removed at this stage and reconciliation has occurred. This stage is the most difficult stage to attain in any conflict situation, though desirable, attainable and accomplishable.

MODEL 2

Conflict Cycle

It is now generally believed that conflict most times evolve in a cyclical pattern that are closely related.

i. Latent Phase

This is the first phase of the conflict cycle where a conflict is dormant and barely expressed by the conflicting sides that may not even be conscious of their conflicting interests or values.

At this phase, a conflict can easily be “nipped in the bud” through a preventive action on the basis of early warning in principle. Although, latent conflicts are difficult to detect with any degree of certainty – and their presence and absence may be hard to verify. Despite that, we can still identify various indicators of impending conflicts, such as inequality, growing poverty, frustrated expectation, unemployment, pollution and a growing tendency to view problems in “us versus them – terms,”.

ii. Manifest Phase

At this phase, conflicting parties express their demands and grievances openly, but only by legal means. It is easier to identify both problems and stakeholders, at this stage while preventive action can still be taken to prevent conflict escalation or degeneration into violent confrontation.

Despite limited time available, exhibit conflict behaviour and regroup themselves in opposing camps. Mediation efforts geared towards compromise solutions still stand a reasonable chance of success provided violence has not occurred.

iii. Violent Phase

This phase is characterised by direct physical attacks and confrontations leading to spilling of blood and loss of life of both conflicting parties and innocent people and thereby produce additional motives for struggle elongation, if only to “get even” or escape retribution for atrocities committed. Moreover, people having their various private agendas and that are personally benefiting or profiting from the continuing

crisis often usurped the initial/existing leadership structure in order to have influence and control over their groups.

iv. Escalation Phase

Under this phase, violence breeds further violence and it produces an escalatory momentum. Moreover, the longer the struggle has lasted, and the more destructive it has been, the more do the warring parties (and especially their leaders) have to lose by laying down their arms. Only victory can justify the preceding bloodshed; hence, the proclivity to struggle on as long as there is even a slight hope of prevailing, thereby attaining the power to set the terms. Neither the violence nor the escalation phases therefore leave much scope for peaceful intervention, mediation or negotiations. On the other, embarking on military intervention at this stage could be regarded as a risky enterprise despite the fact that it might make a difference.

v. Containment Phase

Escalation comes to a halt in this stage. This could be because the conflicting parties have temporarily exhausted their supply of weaponry, leading to lower intensity. At this stage, there appears hope for negotiations and mediation efforts by the intervention of a third party aiming towards a truce. Most times, peacekeeping forces can be introduced to protect each side against the possible breaches of the truce by either of the conflicting parties. The truce agreed upon allows for the provision of humanitarian aid to the civilian victims without supporting either of the warring sides.

vi. Mitigated Phase

Mitigated stage of any conflict is the period during which the basic causes of conflict remain in place, but the conflict behaviour and attitude has been significantly changed with reduced or less violence and more political mobilisation and negotiation. At this stage, the ray of post-conflict recovery can easily be read and felt in the minds of political leaders on opposing sides, while external factors are at the advantage of gaining new leverage, that is, serving as potential (but not unconditional) provider of aid.

vii. The Resolution Phase

This phase is the most perceived critical stage of all the phases, as success or failure of post-conflict peace-building will determine whether the conflict will flare up again. For a tangible and enduring or sustainable success to be accomplished, both the underlying causes of the conflict and its immediate consequences must be addressed. This include reordering of power relationships, bringing some of those responsible for the preceding blood shed to trial and facilitating reconciliation

between the opposing sides as a precondition of future coexistence. At this stage, the importance of external actors is very crucial in the following areas such as provision of various forms of assistance and support to the emerging civil society after the resolution of the conflict, and to support programmes for disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants, including child soldiers.

(note four) Conflict Handling Styles

These are various forms or ways by which individual, groups, societies or nations perceive and respond to conflicts arising from diverse/conflicting views, opinion, ideas, values and belief. The behaviours and attitudes of the parties concerned usually determine the success and failure of any conflict which can be described along these two basic dimensions namely:

a. Assertiveness

This describes the extent to which an individual attempts to satisfy his needs and concern.

b. Cooperativeness

This explains the extent to which a person attempts to satisfy his needs and concerns as well as the other person's needs. These two basic dimensions of behaviour can be applied to define or explain the following five conflict handling styles: dominating/competing; accommodating; avoiding; collaborating; communication and compromising.

i. Dominance/Competition

This takes place when an individual is very assertive and not cooperative. Such a person pursues his own concerns at another person's expense. It is a power-oriented mode. It is a position that states: "I have to win." It can also mean: "I have to stand up for myself, for my rights."

It entails defending a position by argument, by rank, or by economic advantage. This position connotes "you win, the other loses."

ii. Accommodation

You are unassertive and cooperative. It is the opposite of competing.

When accommodating, you neglect your own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other person; there is an element of self-sacrifice in this handling style. It can be selfless, generous; it can be yielding because of weakness or low self-esteem.

iii. Avoidance

You are unassertive and uncooperative. You do not (immediately) pursue your own concerns or those of other person.

You do not address the conflict. It can be a diplomatic way of handling conflict, postponing for a better time. It can also be a withdrawal, which could lead to worsening of a relationship.

iv. Collaboration

Under this dimension, you are both assertive and cooperative. It is the opposite of avoiding. You are working with the other person to find a solution that fully satisfies the concerns of both parties. It means dialogue, it means good listening, it means understanding your and the other person's needs and concerns and creating solutions to meet those concerns. In this case, both sides win - a win-win situation for all.

v. Compromise

You are partially assertive and partially cooperative. When you compromise you attempt to find an expedient, mutually acceptable solution which partially satisfies both parties. When you compromise, you split the difference, you make concessions, and you give up something, to gain something in return. You seek middle – ground position. You win a little, and you lose a little.

Model Two

This second model groups conflict handling styles into three major headings or classifications in as much as approaches to conflict vary from individual to individual. The classifications are thus:

1. Avoidance/Denial

This is a common way of handling or dealing with conflict. We may decide to avoid the other party/person or pretend that the conflict does not exist even though we are hurt or angry. We need to observe that this approach or style of handling conflict often leaves us feeling more hurt, frustrated, and annoyed. It can be likened to a house wife who keeps sweeping dirt under the carpet; the dirt will surely become a heap, which she will not be able to manage one day. This approach creates room for a win/lose option, an option where one person gets what he/she needs and the other person gets nothing. This style does not actually solve the problem but buries it for the time being.

However, this style is useful in some situations, for example, avoidance method can be a stop gap to reflect on what next line of action or step to be taken.

2. Confrontation/Fighting

In this approach, some people, group, nation or state might decide to slog it out with the other party in conflict situation. They threaten attack, yell, insult and tenaciously hold on to their point of view and disagree with the other party's point of view. This approach often leads to violence and it creates lose/lose option, an option where both parties lose.

Neither party gets what he/she needs. In some cases, confrontation might also lead to win/lose where the stronger party with bigger power wins while the weaker party ends up being the loser.

3. Problem Solving

This is an approach whereby the parties in conflict listen with the intent conflict and attack underlying elements in the conflict and attack the issues. The parties adopting this style normally show respect for differences and look for ways to resolve the problem. Furthermore, people using this style or approach are less concerned about who is right or wrong. They view conflict as belonging to both parties which require their mutual collaboration to resolve. This approach creates room for a “win/win solution”- a situation where both parties come out satisfied with the solution. They are both happy and satisfied because their needs and desires have been met and their relationship has been restored.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion, it is now crystal clear that it is important to know the stages or phases of conflict progression to enable you ascertain the step to be taken in the prevention of conflict escalation and management approaches to be adopted in managing conflicts that are at different stages or phases of conflict cycle

(note five) Peace Education and Peace-Building

The end aim of conflict transformation is the attainment of peace. Peace can be a state of harmony or the absence of hostility. “Peace” can also be a nonviolent way of life. “Peace” often depicts cessation of violent conflict, a state of quiet or tranquility or an absence of disturbance or agitation. Peace can also describe a relationship between any people characterised by respect, justice and goodwill.

Conception of peace as tranquility can also pertain to an individual’s sense of himself or herself, as being “at peace” with one’s own mind.

This is why Saint Augustine argued that peace and health go hand-in-hand. As he puts it: The peace of the body then consists in the duly proportioned arrangement of its parts. The peace of the irrational soul is the harmonious repose of the appetites, and that of the rational soul the harmony of knowledge and action. The peace of body and soul is the well-ordered and harmonious life and health of the living creature.

Following from the above, peace can pertain to an individual relative to his or her environment, because the use of the word peaceful could be to describe calm, serenity, and silence. This latter understanding of peace can also pertain to an individual’s sense of self, as to be “at peace” with oneself would indicate the same serenity, calm, and equilibrium within oneself-that is, a life devoid of worries, bitterness or pain. This probably explains why some people refer to death as a state of peace with one’s creator.

In most cases, when people mouth the word “peace”, they refer to an absence of hostility. However, the term also represents a situation where there is, among others, a healthy or newly healed interpersonal or international relationship; safety in matters related to social or economic welfare; the acknowledgment of equality and fairness in political relationships and, in world matters. Thus, peacetime represents a state where any war or conflict is absent. Whenever we reflect on the nature of peace, it is usually in relation to considerations of the factors that bring about its absence or loss including such critical issues like insecurity, social injustice, economic inequality, political and religious radicalism, and acute nationalism.

Words that signify peace such as the Hebrew word shalom, the Arabic word salaam, the Yoruba word Alaafia and the Igbo word ‘udo’ all signify many things that human beings desire such as safety, welfare, prosperity, security, fortune, friendliness. The personalised meaning is reflected in a nonviolent lifestyle, which also describes a relationship between any people characterised by respect, justice and goodwill. This understanding of peace can also pertain to an individual’s sense of herself or himself such as being “at peace” with one’s own self and having “rest of mind”. The term is also used in the sense of “quiet”, reflecting a calm, serene,

and meditative approach to family or group relationships that is devoid of quarrels among individuals and social groups.

Education and Peace

In view of mankind's experience with war and violence, a global movement has emerged which recommends discussion of issues of peace in education at all levels and in all its forms. According to this movement, education could be used to teach understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilisations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations; and increase awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations.

They also argue that education is capable of improving the abilities of people to communicate with others; lead to an awareness not only of rights but also of the duties incumbent upon individuals, social groups and nations towards each other; foster an understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and co-operation; and that education could be used to measure the readiness on the part of individuals to participate in solving the problems of their communities, their country and the world at large.

They also believe that education could remove the ignorance that is often associated with violence in human societies, which many people believe is an inherent part of human nature. Those who have disagreed with the notion that violence is part of human nature argue instead that although it is widespread and universal in occurrence, violence is a phenomenon that emerged as late as the last 10,000 years.

Those who advocate pursuing a culture of peace through education also believe that the institution of warfare and its associated culture of violence are cultural phenomena and not biological phenomena inherited from our ancestors, and that war is a social invention rather than a fatality determined by genes, violent brains, human nature or instincts. For this reason, it is essential to understand how and why the culture of war developed and has been sustained over time. To ask these questions, we then need to create understanding through education. The use of education for the pursuit of peace will thus involve:

- Training and practice of conflict resolution and mediation in school systems, among staff and students, and extension of such knowledge through community involvement to the rest of society;
- Linkage of school activities to ongoing activities in communities that promote participation by all in culture and development;
- Incorporation of discussions on social movements, peace and non-violence, democracy and good governance into school curricula;
- Extension of the sense of community to all peoples with the aim of preserving both the world's cultural diversity and its ecology for future generations;

- Systematic review of school curricula to ensure an approach to ethnic, racial and cultural differences that emphasises their equality and unique contributions to the enrichment of the common good;
- systematic review and renovation of the teaching of history, to lay more emphasis on non-violent social change as opposed to military aspects of history; and
- Teaching of science as a tool which can be used for war or for peace, for exploitation or for co-operative development.

On the basis of the above, use of education to promote peace (peace education) entails inculcating the need for positive response to diversity and conflicts with tolerance, imagination, flexibility into the minds of individuals, and fully exercising one's responsibilities to ensure that the rights of others and the freedom to exercise such rights are fully protected.

Peace Education

Peace education is a process of imparting specific skills, attitude and knowledge on people, thereby helping them to solve problems by building consensus, creating cultural awareness and showing empathy which is expected to build positive attitude about justice and respect for democracy. He further emphasises that through peace education, individuals would understand the dynamics of social conflicts, warfare, conflicts resolution and peace.

Briefly put, the aim of peace education is to help you understand the nature and origins of violence and its effects on both victim and perpetrator; to create frameworks for achieving peaceful creative societies; to sharpen awareness about the existence of lack of peace relationships between people and within and between nations; to investigate the causes of conflicts and violence embedded within perceptions, values and attitudes of individuals as well as within social and political structures of society; to encourage the search for alternative or possible nonviolent skills; and to equip children and adults with personal conflict resolution skills.

According to the peace education Working Group of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF, 2004) peace education is "the process of promoting knowledge, skills and values that will bring about behavioural changes that will enable children, youths and adults to prevent conflict and overt and structural violence; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive for peace, whether at intrapersonal, interpersonal, inter-group, national or international level." Peace education therefore covers such topics as anti-racism, conflict resolution, multiculturalism, cross-cultural training and the cultivation of a generally peaceful outlook (Salmon, 2002:7).

At the core of peace education is the consciousness and conscience of the human being. It seeks to develop persons with rational, ethical minds whose vision of the world and its inhabitants is that of unity. The values that animate this unity can be

expressed in different cultural connotations according to varying modes of life, but the unity does not imply that there is one conceptual vision of this unity. Diversity and differences are a natural expression of this consciousness; however, peace remains the underlying value and the instrument by which this unity is achieved through interdependence.

Peace education is about empowering people with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge to build, maintain, and restore relationships at all levels of human interaction; to develop positive approaches towards dealing with conflicts from the personal to the international; to create safe environments, both physically and emotionally, that nurture each individual; to create a safe world based on justice and human rights; and to build a sustainable environment and protect it from exploitation and war. Peace education is based on a philosophy that teaches nonviolence, love, compassion, trust, fairness, cooperation and reverence for the human family and all life on planet earth.

The Role of Peace Educators

Peace education is often described as a series of “teaching encounters” that draw from people their desire for peace, nonviolent alternatives for managing conflict, and skills for critical analysis of structural arrangements that produce and legalise injustice and inequality. Page, (2008) therefore suggested that peace education be thought of as involving a number of tasks such as:

- encouraging a commitment to peace as a settled disposition and enhancing the confidence of the individual as an individual agent of peace;
- informing the student on the consequences of war and social injustice;
- informing the student on the value of peaceful and just social structures and working to uphold or develop such social structures;
- encouraging the student to leave the world and to imagine a peaceful future; and
- caring for the student and encouraging the student to care for others

Traditional distinctions in peace education are couched in terms of negative and positive peace. These distinctions can be seen in peace through strength which uses peacekeeping strategies to deter violence, peacemaking which helps disputants resolve their conflicts, and peace-building which tries to motivate students to want to be peaceful.

Negative peace education tries to put out fires while positive peace education tries to stop fires (conflicts) from breaking out in the first place. Generally, people want immediate solutions to the problems of violence that they fear. Because peace education provides a long term solution, is not seen as necessary and is not grabbing the kind of support that conflict resolution which helps put out fires is getting.

Further distinctions in peace education come from the content of courses taught, the teachers' style, and the skills that students learn in order to become peaceful people. Peace education content started out by discussing the causes of war and the attempts of international systems to avoid war. In Japan, peace education was originally defined narrowly as 'anti-atomic bomb' education in line with their experience with the atomic bombs that were dropped on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. More recently, Third World perspectives on the variability of war and its causes has led to a broadening of the notion of peace education to include the study of the origins of Japanese militarism.

Peace educators around the world are dealing with other issues, such as structural violence, cultural violence, personal violence, racism, and environmental degradation.

Recent studies in the field that relate to the study of war places an emphasis upon developing a questioning attitude towards the violence of the status quo and a teaching style that relies upon a dialogue between teacher and pupil where both of them jointly seek alternatives to violence. Peace educators produce critical thinkers who question the emphasis upon the various forms of militarism found all around the world.

Peace educators seek to establish democratic classrooms that teach cooperation and promote positive self-esteem among their students.

Teachers serve as peaceful role models to help to counteract images of violent behaviour young people receive through popular culture (video, internet, games, music, and so on) and in their homes. Their teaching style will normally adjust to the developmental needs of their pupils, respecting the various identities and concerns about violence that students bring to the classroom.

Educators contribute to making a peaceful person by building in their students a certain orientation towards peaceful values, beliefs, and behaviours. A peaceful person should display a certain level of cool-headedness that implies not being in a constant state of anger and frustration. It is also the teacher's work to build the student's capacity in social skills and democratic participation.

The skills that peace educators often focus on teaching include verbal and non-verbal communication, active listening, understanding and management of different perspectives, cooperation, joint problem solving, critical thinking, decision making, conflict resolution, and social responsibility.

Methods of Achieving Post-Conflict Sustainable

Peace-building

Understanding Peace Building

It should be noted at the outset that there are two distinct ways to understand peace building. According to the United Nations (UN) document "An Agenda for Peace," peace building consists of a wide range of activities associated with capacity

building, reconciliation, and societal transformation. Peace building is a long-term process that occurs after violent conflict has slowed down or come to a halt. Thus, it is the phases of the peace process that takes place after peacemaking and peacekeeping.

Many non-governmental organisations (NGOs), on the other hand, understand peace building as an umbrella concept that encompasses not only long-term transformative efforts, but also peacemaking and peacekeeping. In this view, peace building includes early warning and response efforts, violence prevention, advocacy work, civilian and military peacekeeping, military intervention, humanitarian assistance, ceasefire agreements, and the establishment of peace zones.

In its narrower sense, peace building is a process that facilitates the establishment of durable peace and tries to prevent the recurrence of violence by addressing root causes and effects of conflict through reconciliation, institution building, and political as well as economic transformation. This consists of a set of physical, social and structural initiatives that are often an integral part of post-conflict reconstruction and rehabilitation.

It is generally agreed that the central task of peace building is to create positive peace, a “stable social equilibrium in which the surfacing of new disputes does not escalate into violence and war.” Sustainable peace is characterised by the absence of physical and structural violence, the elimination of discrimination, and self-sustainability. Moving towards this sort of environment goes beyond problem solving or conflict management. Peace building initiatives try to fix the core problems that underlie the conflict and change the patterns of interaction of the involved parties. They aim to move a given population from a condition of extreme vulnerability and dependency to one of self-sufficiency and wellbeing.

To further understand the notion of peace building, many contrast it with the more traditional strategies of peacemaking and peacekeeping.

Peacemaking is the diplomatic effort to end the violence between the conflicting parties, move them towards nonviolent dialogue, and eventually reach a peace agreement. Peacekeeping, on the other hand, is a third-party intervention (often, but not always done by military forces) to assist parties in transitioning from violent conflict to peace by separating the fighting parties and keeping them apart. These peacekeeping operations not only provide security, but also facilitate other non-military initiatives.

Some draw a distinction between post-conflict peace-building and long-term peace building. Post-conflict peace building is connected to peacekeeping, and often involves demobilisation and reintegration programmes, as well as immediate reconstruction needs. Meeting immediate needs and, handling crises is no doubt crucial. But while peacemaking and peacekeeping processes are an important part

of peace transitions, they are not enough in and of themselves to meet longer-term needs and build a lasting peace.

Long-term peace building techniques are designed to fill this gap; and to address the underlying substantive issues that brought about conflict.

Various transformation techniques aim to move parties away from confrontation and violence, and towards political and economic participation, peaceful relationships, and social harmony.

This longer-term perspective is crucial to future violence prevention and the promotion of a more peaceful future. Thinking about the future involves articulating desirable structural, systemic, and relationship goals. These might include sustainable economic development, self-sufficiency, equitable social structures that meet human needs, and building positive relationships.

Peace building measures also aim to prevent conflict from reemerging.

Through the creation of mechanisms that enhance cooperation and dialogue among different identity groups, these measures can help parties manage their conflict of interests through peaceful means. This might include building institutions that provide procedures and mechanisms for effectively handling and resolving conflict. For example, societies can build fair courts, capacities for labour negotiation, systems of civil society reconciliation, and a stable electoral process. Such designing of new dispute resolution systems is an important part of creating a lasting peace.

In short, parties must replace the spiral of violence and destruction with a spiral of peace and development, and create an environment conducive to self-sustaining and durable peace. The creation of such an environment has three central dimensions: addressing the underlying causes of conflict, repairing damaged relationships and dealing with psychological trauma at the individual level. Each of these dimensions relies on different strategies and techniques.

The Structural Dimension of Peace Building

The structural dimension of peace building focuses on the social conditions that foster violent conflict. Many note that stable peace must be built on social, economic, and political foundations that serve the needs of the populace. In many cases, crises arise out of systemic roots.

These root causes are typically complex, but include skewed land distribution, environmental degradation, and unequal political representation. If these social problems are not addressed, there can be no lasting peace. Thus, in order to establish durable peace, parties must analyse the structural causes of the conflict and initiate social structural change. The promotion of substantive and procedural justice through structural means typically involves institution building and the strengthening of civil society.

Avenues of political and economic transformation include social structural change to remedy political or economic injustice, reconstruction programmes designed to help communities ravaged by conflict revitalise their economies, and the institution of effective and legitimate restorative justice systems. Peace building initiatives aim to promote nonviolent mechanisms that eliminate violence, foster structures that meet basic human needs, and maximise public participation.

To provide fundamental services to its citizens, a state needs strong executive, legislative, and judicial institutions.

Many point to democratisation as a key way to create these sorts of peace-enhancing structures. Democratisation seeks to establish legitimate and stable political institutions and civil liberties that allow for meaningful competition for political power and broad participation in the selection of leaders and policies. It is important for governments to adhere to principles of transparency and predictability, and for laws to be adopted through an open and public process. For the purpose of post-conflict peace building, the democratisation process should be part of a comprehensive project to rebuild society's institutions.

Political structural changes focus on political development, state building, and the establishment of effective government institutions.

This often involves election reform, judicial reform, power sharing initiatives, and constitutional reform. It also includes building political parties, creating institutions that provide procedures and mechanisms for effectively handling and resolving conflict, and establishing mechanisms to monitor and protect human rights. Such institution building and infrastructure development typically requires the dismantling, strengthening, or reformation of old institutions in order to make them more effective.

It is crucial to establish and maintain rule of law, and to implement rules and procedures that constrain the powers of all parties and hold them accountable for their actions. This can help to ease tension, create stability, and lessen the likelihood of further conflict. For example, an independent judiciary can serve as a forum for the peaceful resolution of disputes and post-war grievances.

In addition, societies need a system of criminal justice that deters and punishes banditry and acts of violence. Fair police mechanisms must be established and government officials and members of the police force must be trained to observe basic rights in the execution of their duties. In addition, legislation protecting minorities and laws securing gender equality should be advanced. Courts and police forces must be free of corruption and discrimination.

But structural change can also be economic. Many note that economic development is integral to preventing future conflict and avoiding a relapse into violence. Economic factors that put societies at risk include lack of employment opportunities, food scarcity, and lack of access to natural resources or land. A

variety of social structural changes aim to eliminate the structural violence that arises out of a society's economic system. These economic and social reforms include economic development programs, health care assistance, land reform, social safety nets, and programs to promote agricultural productivity.

Economic peace building targets both the micro and macro-level and aims to create economic opportunities and ensure that the basic needs of the population are met. On the microeconomic level, societies should establish micro-credit institutions to increase economic activity and investment at the local level, promote inter-communal trade and an equitable distribution of land, and expand school enrollment and job training. On the macroeconomic level, the post-conflict government should be assisted in the efforts to secure the economic foundations and infrastructure necessary for a transition to peace.

The Relational Dimension of Peace Building

A second integral part of building peace is reducing the effects of war-related hostility through the repair and transformation of damaged relationships. The relational dimension of peace building focuses on **reconciliation, forgiveness, trust building**, and future imagining. It seeks to minimise poorly functioning communication and maximise mutual understanding.

Many believe that reconciliation is one of most effective and durable ways to transform relationships and prevent destructive conflicts. The essence of reconciliation is the voluntary initiative of the conflicting parties to acknowledge their responsibility and guilt. Parties reflect upon their own role and behaviour in the conflict, and acknowledge and accept responsibility for the part they have played. As parties share their experiences, they learn new perspectives and change their perception of their "enemies." There is recognition of the difficulties faced by the opposing side and of their legitimate grievances, and a sense of empathy begins to develop.

Each side expresses sincere regret and remorse, and is prepared to apologise for what has transpired. The parties make a commitment to let go of anger, and to refrain from repeating the injury. Finally, there is a sincere effort to redress past grievances and compensate for the damage done. This process often relies on interactive negotiation and allows the parties to enter into a new mutually enriching relationship.

One of the essential requirements for the transformation of conflicts is effective communication and negotiation at both the elite and grassroots levels. Through both high and community-level dialogues, parties can increase their awareness of their own role in the conflict and develop a more accurate perception of both their own and the other group's identity. As each group shares its unique history, traditions, and culture, the parties may come to understand each other better.

International exchange programs and problem-solving workshops are two techniques that can help to change perceptions, build trust, open communication, and increase empathy. For example, over the course of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the main antagonists have sometimes been able to build trust through meeting outside their areas, not for formal negotiations, but simply to better understand each other. If these sorts of bridge-building communication systems are in place, relations between the parties can improve and any peace agreements they reach will more likely be self-sustaining. (The Israeli-Palestinian situation illustrates that there are no guarantees, however.) Various mass communication and education measures, such as peace radio and TV, peace-education projects, and conflict-resolution training can help parties to reach such agreements. And dialogue between people of various ethnicities or opposing groups

(note six) CONFLICT ANALYSIS

It is a clear known fact that conflict exist at all levels of human interaction either at interpersonal, intra-group, inter group or at communal, national and international levels. Therefore, it has become imperative for a conflict management practitioner, intervener or a peace studies and conflict resolution student to acquire necessary knowledge and skills required to enable such a person gain an insight into the hidden issues in conflict. The issues ranging from the causes of the conflict, stages/phases of conflict, the stakeholders (parties in conflict), and the conflict analytical tools and techniques necessary for proper understanding of conflict analysis in view of proffering sustainable solution to the conflict. Analysis is usually accompanied by “conflict mapping” and “tracking” both of which are very important at giving the conflict management practitioner a clear picture of what is happening, what is at stake and what could be done to manage the “difficult” situation.

Meaning/Definition of Conflict Analysis

Conflict analysis is a critical review, interpretation and explanation of what is observed and recorded about the conflict situation. Alternatively, conflict can be defined as a process by which the root causes, dynamics, issues, and – other – fundamentals of conflict are examined, reviewed and unraveled through the use of various mechanisms for proper and better – understanding of the conflict from several perspectives.

Conflict analysis avails peace experts intervening in a conflict the opportunity of gathering necessary data or information that will facilitate bringing together of parties in dispute and reveal a dependable, reliable and effective direction on the choice of strategies and action to be adopted for a successful intervention and termination of conflict.

Categories of Stakeholders

A stakeholder is defined as those men and women, group or parties who are directly or indirectly involved in the conflict and have a significant stake in the outcome.

a. Primary Stakeholders

They are those whose goals are, or are perceived by them to be incompatible and who interact directly in pursuit of their respective goals. They are the direct investors in the conflict.

b. Secondary Stakeholders

These categories are affected directly by the outcome of the conflict but do not feel to be directly involved. As the conflict progresses, they may become primary and primary may become secondary.

c. Interested Stakeholders

These parties have an interest in the conflict. They stand to benefit from the outcomes whether peaceful or conflictual. The difference between interested and secondary stakeholders is that the interested stakeholders suffer no direct impact of the conflict in the short and medium term.

Criteria for Determining Primary Stakeholders

Determining where stakeholders should be put is both political and fluid. The following often determines the decisions of interveners in selecting the stakeholders to engage.

i. Functional

This suggests those who directly wage the conflict.

Their legitimacy on the negotiating table is their capacity and ability to perpetuate the conflict. They are the embodiment of the conflict.

Observers believe they have the power to end the conflict.

ii. Representation

This is political aspect of stakeholders' categorisation. Stakeholders are primary because they represent a large number of people who are directly affected by the conflict. These people also have the means to wage conflict or build peace.

iii. Moral Authority

Primary stakeholders can also be determined because their moral authority carries the vision of post-conflict society. These include religious leaders, civil society organisations including women's organisations and traditional leaders among others.

Earlier, this category was only confined to the secondary level.

Five Elements Required to Structure-Analysis of Stakeholders

i. Relationship -What is the interaction between the stakeholders?

ii. Agenda/Power-What are the agendas of key stakeholders for conflict and for peace?

iii. Needs - What are the needs of the different stakeholders?

Which needs are opposing and overlapping?

iv. Action-What actions are the different stakeholders undertaking to promote peace or conflict?

v. What is the cumulative power of actions for peace or conflict?

Pre-Intervention Conflict Analysis

Entering into conflict situations by a researcher or conflict management practitioner is often an unpredictable task which requires a critical careful conflict

analysis. It is not enough for him/her to just note the positions of the stakeholders (parties) in the conflict but s/he must have a thorough understanding of their interests, values and needs as well.

The following model suggests a way for the intervenor to gather data and increase the certainty that his/her entry will be constructive to the disputing parties. It is the responsibility of an intervenor to develop a comprehensive picture of the conflict by identifying its key element. The pre-intervention information gathered usually points the intervenor in a certain direction, suggesting ways to engage the parties to reduce tensions and work together to find solution to the problems that they face on one hand. Additional information or data collected during the course of intervention should also be incorporated into the conflict analysis. This may help you determine why an issue is so hard to resolve or it may suggest an alternative approach to conflict management.

1. History of the Conflict

It is important for a conflict analyst to understand the significant events that has happened in the past between the parties.

It reveals the genesis of the conflict and whether they have had previous disputes. History also enables the intervenor to ask the following questions. What has been the pattern of their relationship? Was there a recent change in the relationship? Did the conflict abate at one time before re-escalating?

What past efforts have been made to resolve it and why they failed?

Proffering answers to these questions might require visiting local, state and native archives for documentary evidence. Oral interviews might also be used to gather necessary information.

2. Context of Conflict

It is also necessary to know how the parties are currently trying to resolve their differences. What is the physical environment of the conflict? That is the social, economic and political environment of the conflict, as well as the dimensions of the external situations (state, sub-regional and global). How do the parties communicate and make decisions?

3. Primary Parties

It is necessary to identify the parties involved in the conflict. In doing this, you should ask such question as: “what are the parties’ positions and underlying interest? What are their values and perceptions of the other parties? Do the parties have settlement authority? And what interest, goals, or needs do the parties share in common?

4. Power Relations

This has to do with the ability to influence or control other events, which could be in form of physical strength, status, control of resources, persuasive ability, support of allies, and so on. There are two major types of power that can be exercised by either of the parties in conflict.

These are hard power, which is usually associated with violent conflict while the other is soft power that is identified with positive conflict. The following questions are usually being asked under power relation: Is there balance of power between the disputants? What is/are the source(s) of the parties' power? What resources are at the disposal of each party?

How often do the parties use their power and what are the consequences of such power? Are there any untapped power bases of the parties?

What method of peace process is suitable for the success of the intervention?

5. Other Parties/Stakeholders

Apart from the already mentioned primary parties, we also have secondary parties and shadow parties that must be considered. Their link or relationships with the primary parties ought to be carefully examined to understand the overall underlying problems associated with a conflict.

Secondary parties can easily be identified compared to shadow parties because most times, shadow parties hide their identities but supply primary parties resources required for the prosecution of conflict.

The roles these parties play in the conflict must be ascertained. You should know whether they align with either of the primary parties or neutral. When and how these parties can be involved in the peace agencies or organisations availability and involvement in the process of conflict resolution cannot be underestimated.

6. Issues

- a. What are the primary issues as identified by the parties?
- b. Are there hidden or secondary issues not stated by the parties that are needed to be identified?
- c. What kind of intervention procedures are necessary for the types of issues are identified?
- d. Is the conflict genuine in its own right or is it merely a symptom of other unresolved conflict(s)?
- e. If the latter or former, how much time and efforts must be expended on the conflict in order to reach or arrive at a reasonable and sustainable resolution?

7. The Immediate Situation

This involves ascertaining the present situation by asking such questions as: "What is happening now? (Should the first step be efforts to move towards negotiations,

or are short-term violence reduction strategies called for? It is the responsibility of the intervenor to determine the most effective and reliable conflict management strategy to adopt in accordance with the urgency and demand of the conflict situation. For example, if the conflict is at a violent stage, definitely, the intervener may be compelled to adopt some violence reduction strategies to reduce the rate of likely casualty that may arise.

8. Stages of Conflict

A. We have to ascertain whether the conflict is escalating or stabilising, and ask why?

B. If the conflict is escalating, what is happening? Are issues moving from specific to general? Is there an increase in issues or resources used to wage the conflict? Has disagreement turned to antagonism? Is there an increase in the level of power being used by either party? Are the parties polarised? Has extremist leadership arisen?

Is communication affected or being distorted? Are parties engaged in propaganda campaigns?

C. If the conflict is stabilising, what is happening?

Are safety-value mechanisms put in place? Is there a fear of escalation? Are there agreements on norms and values?

Are there social bonds, friendships, cross-cutting memberships among party members? Are there other third party interveners or external interference or threat? Are there time constraints or other limitations on the further use of resources?

9. Timing

Timing is important in pre-intervention conflict analysis for the following reasons.

- To ascertain the actual and right time of intervention.
- Determine the most profitable and successful time of the intervention.
- To know the party that is likely to benefit from immediate intervention.

10. Possible Options of Intervention/Settlement

- The level of knowledge and understanding of the parties' alternatives should be considered.
- Level of parties' awareness of each other's alternatives or option should be considered.
- Examine the efforts made so far by the conflicting parties in the accomplishment of their options.
- Evaluate the realistic nature of the parties.

Definitions of Conflict Mapping and Tracking

Conflict Mapping

Wehr (1979:18) describes conflict mapping or the first step in intervening to manage a particular conflict. Conflict mapping can also be defined as graphical representation of the conflict in which the conflicting parties are placed in relation to the situation on ground.

Maps are used for a variety of purposes to understand conflict situation better, to ascertain where power lies, to examine conflict clearly from one viewpoint, to look for openings (way out) or new strategies, to know where our allies or potential allies are placed, to find our own niche, to evaluate what has been done and for many other reasons.

Conflict Tracking

Conflict tracking is the process, which involves monitoring, observing and recording the trend of change and continuity in the conflict process. What to keep track of could include:

- conflict parties include internal leadership struggles, varying prospect for military success and the reading of general population to express support for a settlement; possible ways of re-defining goals and finding alternative means of resolving differences including suggested step towards settlement and eventual transformation; likely constraints on these, and how these might be overcome.
- it is important for the person keeping track of the conflict to pay careful attention to the minutest details about the issue and circumstances around him.

(note seven) Conflict Transformation

A Conceptual Overview of Conflict Transformation

If the right technical approach is not applied in handling the post-conflict situation, a relapse of conflict becomes inevitable. This is because most efforts to achieve peace in the post-conflict situation often provide at best stability or conflict containment.

This is usually the case when conflict transformation is not professionally undertaken. Therefore, what is conflict transformation?

Conflict Transformation

The fundamental objective of this latest concept is to transform unfair social interactions. The International Alert (1996:I:1-, II: 37) conceptualises conflict transformation as a particular approach which aims to recognise the grievances, needs and issues of all the parties. It focuses on the processes by which conflict develops into violence, rather than focusing exclusively on how to bring a violent conflict quickly to a cease fire for settlement. It addresses the structural reality of inequality, rights and injustice in the society involved, and offers alternative ways of addressing those matters. This approach aims to transform a conflict from violence and destruction into a constructive force which reduces social change, progressively removing or at least reducing the conditions from which the conflict and violence have arisen. The peace, which develops, can then be well-founded and sustainable.

Conflict transformation is essentially integrative conflict resolution orientation that aims at positively altering those perceptions, communication and root factors that instigate conflicts. This laborious approach is preferred because it focuses on:

- producing transformation in the whole conflict environment
- producing transformation in the relationship of the conflicting parties, or
- producing empowerment-based transformation in parties to the conflict (Burgess and Burgess, 1972: 285-286).

Conflict transformation is the aggregate of all efforts that concentrate on the developmental stages or processes of a conflict, rather than simply on its end point. In addition, it pays attention to how conflict transforms relationships, communication, perceptions, issues and social organisation. Based on this, conflict transformation aims to transform the conflict from violent manifestation characterised by armed conflict and war to constructive and peaceful expression.

Conflict transformation also focuses on transformation and sometimes the removal of all structures that impede sustainable positive peace. It also seeks ways of

involving all stakeholders including erstwhile combatants, local individuals, communities and external third parties in a concerted way.

Conflict transformation can also be defined as an improvement of the whole context of the conflict, a positive change in the disputants' relationships or complete behavioural and attitudinal changes of the disputants. Conflict transformation entails an informed reassessment and redefinition of the disputants to explore avenues for new compensations and appointments. The aim of this is to transcend zero-sum (win-lose) phase to arrive at a positive-sum (win-win) agreement. New mutually benefiting arrangements are proposed and worked out in which the hitherto contested issues become less or no longer relevant and other issues and values become more dearer to all the parties in the conflict.

An example is the Franco-German reconciliation after the Second World War.

Conflict transformation has also been defined as a particular approach that takes into cognisance the grievances, needs and issues of all the parties. It pays due attention to the degeneration stages of conflict to violence rather than solely on how to bring a violent conflict to a cease-fire or settlement. It confronts the structural reality of inequality, rights and injustice in the locales concerned and proposes alternative ways of addressing those realities.

Conflict transformation aims to transform a conflict from violent and destructive stage into a constructive force, which will lay the foundation for social change. This can be achieved by systematically and progressively removing and playing down the conditions that gave rise to conflict and violence. The objective is to have a well-founded and sustainable peace. In achieving the foregoing, due attention is paid to the actors, the issues, the rules, and the structures. In approaching conflict transformation, there are two broad approaches.

These are non-violent conflict transformation associated with Gandhi otherwise known as the Gandhi theory. The second though seemingly unscrupulous approach is a combination of approaches that does not pre-suppose resolution of the incompatibilities, but tries to freeze the conflict, negate it, protect it, through all kinds of devices, including structural and direct violence.

The non-violence theory or Gandhi theory is vehemently intolerant of the use of either structural violence or direct violence because it will contradict the spirit and letter of the non-violence theory. In addition, non-violence is an admonition to struggle against both direct and structural violence, and an equally strong admonition not to use them in the struggle. Non-violence or Gandhi theory will also not condone the fair protractive devices earlier mentioned because they are antithetical to the non-violence theory of conflict transformation.

For Gandhi; "there is no way to peace; peace is the way; to be taken, now." One of the chief proponents of conflict transformation is John Lederach.

In his analysis, Lederach distinguishes conflict transformation from conflict management and conflict resolution. Conflict transformation is desirable than the two because it emphasises a broader and deeper understanding of the conflict. “Conflict resolution” suggests that conflict is destructive like fire; therefore, it should be put out quickly. It also implies that conflict is a flash or spark that can be handled once and for all in a decisive manner through mediation or other intervention processes. “Conflict management” correctly posits that conflicts could be protracted in span, which makes it difficult to be swiftly resolved, but “management” implies that people can be directly or remotely manipulated, as they were physical objects. Furthermore, the notion of management implies that its goal is the mitigation or control of volatility without dealing with the real source of the problem.

Conflict transformation transcends simply eliminating or controlling conflict, but stresses making on the dialectic or dynamic nature of conflicts. In the context of social conflict, Lederach argues that social conflict is ordinarily created by humans who have relationships that suffer immediately there is a conflict. Therefore, cause-and-effect relationship goes both ways from the people and the relationships to the conflict and back to the people and the relationships. Conflict changes relationships in predictable ways often negatively; it changes modes and contexts of communication processes of social organisation, altering images of the self and of the other.

Lederach also opines that conflict transformation is a prescriptive concept. This implies that on its own, conflict can have destructive consequences. However, the consequences can be regulated or transformed in order to improve self-images, relationships, and social structures depending on the way it is handled. Usually this is done by transforming perceptions of issues, actions, and other people or groups. In as much as conflict destroys relationships by altering perceptions and emphasising on the differences between people and positions, efficacious conflict transformation can work to improve mutual understanding. Even when actors’ interests, values, and needs are contrasting or irreconcilable, a fair understanding of one another through contacts and communication can help. This has potentials or effects on the way conflict is expressed. This can make the expression of conflict aggressively or violently replaced by non-violent advocacy, conciliation or attempted cooperation.

For the success of conflict transformation processes have been evolved.

Although different writers emphasise different aspects, nevertheless, most of them seem to agree on the following for conflict transformation to be effective.

- Multi-level participation involving elements from all social levels of the involved parties, from top decision makers through middle range opinion leaders to grass

roots constituents, including those who would normally be excluded from the process and whose interests would not be represented in 'normal' negotiations.

- Efforts to empower the 'underdogs' in the struggle so that between parties that are more equal than they could otherwise be.
- Efforts to ensure that those directly involved in the conflict can control the transformation processes to their own satisfaction and thus make sure that any outcomes have the approval and support of those affected.
- Focus not merely on immediate issues but also on long standing traumas and on any deep-rooted sense of past injustices.
- Brokerage by appropriate intermediaries who understand the culture and social structures in which adversaries are embedded.
- Co-creation of a new understanding of the conflict, how it arose and what it needs to be changed in order both to resolve it and to ensure that other, similar dispute do not arise in future.
- An ability to create and put in place procedures that will maintain and continue the changes found necessary to resolve the current conflict and prevent others arising in future, or-when they arise – taking on a protracted and destructive form.
- The mutual, inter-active education of adversaries about the nature of the socio-political and economic systems from which the conflict arose and of the dynamics of that conflict; and their training in skills that will enable them deal with that conflict and other that may arise in future.

The above according to Mitchell helps to understand the concept of conflict transformation in three main categories. The first category comprises those dealing with personal changes, the second, those dealing with structural changes and the third those dealing with relationship changes.

Conflict transformation is geared towards positive peace and restorative justice. In theory and practice, it transcends conflict management and conflict resolution. It stresses the restoration of relationships to the status-quo-ante of the conflict.

Issue Transformation

In many instances, issues are often shaped by perception and the fear of its effects on parties concerned. These are some of the factors that impinge on conflict transformation. Schmid (2000) defines issue transformation as a change in the political agenda of the conflict, downplaying the importance of original conflict issues and emphasising shared concern for new issues. However, for issue transformation to aid any conflict transformation process the particular types of conflict must be accurately understood and analysed. Therefore, a modification of Schmid definition becomes auspicious because other than political issues or conflicts there are other types of conflicts with vexed and salient issues that must necessarily be transformed. Issues of identity, security, religion, ecology and others also often need to be transformed.

The main thrust of issue transformation is to make discordant tunes less salient while making concordant tunes better perceived and appreciated.

Issue transformation also entails the dexterous handling or manipulating of issue structure and contents to enhance the possibility of conflict transformation. Issue transformation calls for the expansion of the agenda rather than restricting it to maintain social coalitions and the convergence of disparate interests.

Politically, arrangements supportive of the previous agenda will have to change. Put succinctly, the transformation simultaneously encapsulates several actors and connects issues and actors with each other. In large-scale conflicts, this may entail significant political rearrangement within most of or all the countries involved. This has to be done continuously and mindfully so as not to be seen as prying into the domestic confines or precincts of actors to avert violence and instability.

Surrounding most issues that need transformation are the parties' needs, interests and values, which are not always accurately and explicitly expressed by their positional statements. Interests, needs and values are the concepts that underlie most conflicts, yet one often mixed up. The concept of "interests" usually refers to what people or parties in a conflict want. They may be material things as they often are or not. They are usually negotiable people are willing to trade more or less are interest for more or less of another. For the fact that conflicts are defined based on the incompatibility of interests, it is assumed that for things like (money, land, jobs etc.) the more one person or group possesses the less the other party possesses. Therefore, when conflicts are conceptualised in the context of interest the conflict becomes a fixed-sum conflict or zero-sum game.

Needs are also things people wants in a conflict. However, they are often immaterial things such as security, identity and recognition. Needs constitute an integral part of the human nature. Needs are different from interests in many significant ways. First, they are often non-negotiable.

Parties in conflict rarely want to trade away their identity, security or recognition. Identity especially ethnic and religious is so fundamental to human satisfaction, that people will go to any length to protect and preserve them. This may include the violation of fundamental norms, or reduce their ability to obtain their interests, in a bid to fulfill or protect their fundament needs.

A second fundamental difference is that needs are often inextricably linked together. While interests may be arranged or shared in such a way that only one side gets its objective, needs based issues cannot be so shared because of their intangible nature. Insecurity or denigration of one party's ethnic identity or the desecration of one party's religious symbols would likely trigger violence or aggression. It is, however, theorised that, if one's identity or security is secured, than the likelihood of threatening that of others is greatly reduced.

Values are also crucial to the social well-being of man. Values are fundamental beliefs that are non-negotiable. Values are the ideas, habits, customs and beliefs that are characteristic of particular social communities (Burton, 1990). Values determine how we understand the world and how we respond to it. Similar to needs, if one's values are questioned or threatened, one gets compelled to strongly defend one's values.

Since values and needs are non-negotiable, any attempt at issue transformation as part of conflict transformation process must pay due attention to the two. In order to transform issues values and needs must be extensively and dexterously handled. This is more expedient because of the increasing occurrences of intra-state conflicts especially in many African countries mostly based on ideological conflicts, which are inextricably linked to issues of needs and values.

Rules Transformation

As the popular saying goes, “rules are made for human being and not vice versa.” Among the Yoruba of south-western Nigeria, it is also opined that there can be no violation of rules or norms where none hitherto existed. Rule transformation as part of conflict transformation processes usually occur during intense conflict or after. Vanynen (1991) describes rule transformation as one of the measures to restructure a conflict. Rule transformation tries to redefine the norms which actors in a conflict are expected to follow in their mutual interactions. According to the structuralist approach, the rules of behaviour have been presumed to be dependent on the position of an actor in the structure and in that way on its relative power and interests. This implies that rules would only alter the behaviour of an actor in a conflict based on the interests of the actors and the relative power it possesses to achieve the interests. In recent times, scholars such as Vaymen, 1991 argue that rules can have independent impact on inter-actor relations. This is why it is opined that a significant transformation of rules can be expected to alter actor behaviour and hence create a new basis for managing the conflict. At this juncture, it becomes apposite to explain further that rule transformation also aims to change rules operation in a conflict setting or surrounding the issues in a conflict in a way that will at least meet the needs of the parties in conflict in order to reduce violent or destructive confrontation.

In most international conflicts or large-scale civil wars, an outsider that commands true respect of the parties may be in the best position to initiate and manage it. To achieve proper rule transformation, some conditions are necessary. These conditions may include the disappearance of legitimate authority institutions and law and order. Zartunan (2001) illustrates this with six different cases – Lebanon, Liberia, Somalia, Zaire (Congo), Haiti and Yugoslavia. The rules have to changed or transformed in the aforementioned conflict theatres based on the stark reality

that parties needed help to get out of the conflict web. The emphasis is on third-party diplomacy relying primarily on negotiation, not on military or other physical involvement although this may be involved ancillary. The six instances above confirm the efficacy of preventive diplomacy in initiating rule transformation.

The instances above show instances where the rule governing primary parties were altered or transformed by third-parties through acts of preventive diplomacy. There are empirical cases of rule transformation within the gamut of conflict transformation approaches.

Structural Transformation

A major distinguishing feature of conflict transformation is the transformation of necessary structures. This is one of the fundamentals of conflict transformation that makes it different from conflict resolution and conflict management. The explicit commitment to effecting structural transformation goes a long way in transforming any conflict.

This is even one area where consensus exists between conflict resolution theorists and practitioners on one hand and proponents of conflict transformation. This is because a durable peace can only be achieved with some level of structural change either political or socio-economic.

This is often reinforced when the implication of not effecting the structural transformation becomes imminent.

It will not be incorrect to state that one of the causes of many violent conflicts is structural imbalance, especially in plural societies. This structural imbalance could be in terms of representation in places like the army, civil service and other national or juicy (plump institutions) (Galtung, 1996). For example, the protracted and violent intra-state conflict in places like Liberia and Sierra Leone were not unconnected to structural imbalance in terms of who gets what in the highly centralised and seemingly unitary presidential systems of those countries.

Structural transformation also entails the influencing of structures officially to prevent any win – lose outcome or feeling in the post – conflict phase. The common concerns of the transformation school includes can be categorised into two. These are the need for sustainable structural and attitudinal change within society and institutions in order to address outstanding issues connected to the conflict. The second concern is an advocacy for the erecting or revival of indigenous and locale – compliant political, social and economic mechanisms and attitudes that discourage the use of violence in resolving or handling conflicts.

Before an effective process of conflict transformation can be implemented; there must be lucid understanding of structural conflicts.

As put forward by Galtung (1996), Structure conflicts can be well understood when compared with actor conflict. According to Galtung (1996) an actor conflict

involves an actor who is also the subject, conscious of what he wants, why he wants it, and how he feels about what is and what ought to be. Galtung (1996) argues that structural conflict is rarely recognised or articulated by individuals. This implies that for people identity and against a structural conflict, there must be a mobiliser or instigator examples of these include; Saro-Wiwa, and Martin Luther King.

Furthermore, Galtung posits that a situation of structural conflict implies structural violence, characterised by a vertical structure. This features the repression of freedom, particularly political freedom, and economic exploitation. A structural conflict is sustained through some ways; first, the prevention of consciousness formation and conscientiousness. This is done by using agenda setting as a tool or manipulation of information from above; second, by preventing mobilisation and organisation of those in the lower stratum of the society. Conscientiousness and mobilisation are often repressed by the entrepreneurs or lords of structural conflict and violence because they are the processes needed for people to identify and articulate their interests in the community.

This is why structural conflicts are not easily articulated because identifying or understanding them is often made difficult or impossible by the conflict entrepreneurs, sometimes the state.

Therefore, it can be deduced that a social structure or system that allows formation of consciousness, conscientiousness, mobilisation and mass organisation of people from below cannot be described as fundamentally structurally violent. In order to deal with structural conflict, Galtung offers four approaches based on the non-violence school of thought. These are confrontation, struggle, de-coupling and re-coupling.

Confrontation implies selecting and addressing an issue that is central and reflective of the conflict. This approach based on Gandhi's famous Salt March (to Dandi in Gujarat, 5 April 1930) entails stating the issue clearly and expressing the desired outcome.

Struggle for overcoming repression and/or exploitation is concerned about how the struggle is prosecuted or implemented. In the Gandhi line of non-violence this must be by the non-violence methodology, that is "peace by peaceful means." The non-violence approach posits that a violent struggle against structural violence will lead to more violence especially against a violent state that uses the carrot and stick or hard-power in handling conflict. The assertion in this context is for the peace researcher to emphasise that conflict can only be solved if all parties are convinced that they cannot force the other(s) to submit.

Decoupling empirically means getting the exploited or repressed empowered to depend less on the structure that is exploitative. The purpose is to build autonomy and the ability for self-reliance in the masses. This implies looking elsewhere for services hitherto provided by the state.

The purpose of recoupling is to reintegrate those who were hitherto alienated from the structure or restoring people's or citizens' confidence in the state. This is usually through having an horizontal structure based on human rights rather than repression, equity instead of exploitation, autonomy instead of penetration, integration instead of segmentation, solidarity instead of fragmentation and participation instead of marginalisation. While decoupling aims to erect positive structures from below, recoupling strives to build new ones that are more inclusive and less violent from the top.

Therefore, structural transformation implies profound changes in the entire structure of inter-actor relations in a conflict setting or formation.

Structural transformation is very central to conflict and its transformation especially social conflicts. The profound transformation of the structure that induced the conflict ensures the durability of the peace achieved in such circumstances.

Actor Transformation

Central to conflicts either at the inter-personal or community level is human being. The way human beings view and handles any conflict determines whether it will be destructive or constructive conflicts. Based on the assertion of Galtung (1995:53) that: "... conflicts are generally not solved... what survives after a conflict has disappeared from the agenda is conflict energy reproduced and produced by the conflict. Then energy does not die...it attaches itself to one or more conflicts, possibly also the old one".

Therefore, the need for man, the chief agent in conflict to be empowered to transcend the conflict has informed the concept of actor transformation in conflict transformation.

One of the main factors to be transformed in any conflict is man or the actors. Either at the inter-personal or inter-group levels there are actors involved. Particularly, conflicts at the inter-group, inter-community and inter-national levels have the common features of leaders and followers or primary and shadow parties. At the inter-personal level, a transformation of the actors or parties has direct and positive effects on the conflict. This can be achieved by strengthening actors' capacity to analyse situations and make effective decisions for themselves and to appreciate the views of others. It focuses on improving the actor's sense of empowerment or self-determination, and their abilities for recognition or responsiveness to others. This embodies the goal of the transformative approach to

a conflict, beyond just reaching an agreement about the issues that appear to divide the parties or even less desirably – having intermediaries construct a settlement to which the parties are then expected to stick to. In addition, at the inter-personal level, the potentials or advantages of transformational mediation cannot be ignored. Succinctly put, transformational mediation entails helping individuals to wriggle out of difficult circumstances and reducing human differences in the midst of conflict. This stems from the potentials of mediation to produce two useful effects, empowerment and recognition. Simply put, empowerment means the restoration to individuals on consciousness of their own value and strength and their own ability to handle life's problems. Recognition implies the reawakening in individuals of acknowledgement and empathy for the situations, problems and plights of others.

Transformational mediation at the inter-personal level also helps actors to define problems and goals in their own terms, thus validating the importance of these goals and problems in the parties' lives. In addition, transformational mediation can help the actors in being able to personally decide how or even whether, to settle a dispute and it can help the parties to marshal their own resources to address problems and achieve their own objectives. In short, the aim of transformational mediation is that it helps parties in conflicts to perceive it as opportunities for growth and transformation, not as problems that is, inherently and pathologically destructive.

The proponents of transformational mediation such as Bush and Folger also argue that transformation of society is an indirect result of individual transformation. Although they accept that this may need a long period of time to take place—especially in societies susceptible to violent and intractable conflicts like Cyprus, Sri Lanka or former Yugoslavia. It is nevertheless a desirable and worthwhile venture. This is because of potential to change the society through the individual. Although there is no fixed mode of achieving societal transformation through individual or actor transformation, it must however be based on the peculiarities of each case.

At the broader level, transformation of actors should include the general promotion of natural empathy and understanding between parties particularly among leaders, opinion makers and grassroots individuals, including a sense of shared responsibility for the origins and dynamics of the conflict in the first place. Furthermore, transformation processes should be targeted at erasing completely the sense of helplessness about the conflict among participants, especially those at the local and grass root levels of the parties and at increasing the sense of empowerment. This should be targeted at achieving some impacts on the way they conduct conflict; its resolution and the structures that hitherto gave rise to it. At

this level of actor transformation of conflict, emphasis should be on achieving major and widespread improvement in peoples.

- Framing and understanding of the issues in conflict.
- Acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the other party, its claims, concerns and hopes.
- Sense of responsibility for the origins of the conflict and the interactive manner in which it has inevitably been presented.
- Consciousness of the other party's perspectives and objectives, and reasons for their being held.
- Recognition of the need for short-term mutual re-assurance and building of longer-term trust between the parties.
- Sense of competence and capability in confronting the search for solutions to the conflict and undertaking actions to prevent repetition.
- Willingness to include the interests of those not morally represented in the search for solutions, including future generations.

- Acknowledgement of the existence of past grievances, injuries and traumas plus willingness to examine these thoroughly and to search for means of healing the damage caused through a variety of means, including reconciliation and mutually acceptable process of restoration and if necessary – redistributive justice.
- Acceptance of the need for a durable, inclusive and acceptable solution to a mutual problem, which may involve major structural change.

In another context, actor transformation within the ambit of conflict, transformation can include processes of disarming, demobilising and reintegrating of ex-combatants who usually constitute the primary parties in most violent conflicts. This is very plausible particularly at the phase of reintegration.

Actors are principal factors in conflicts whether at the inter-personal or inter-group level. The attainment and sustainability of peace depends largely on the extent of the transformation that has taken place within and amongst actors in conflict. Therefore transforming actors irrespective of the intensity of the conflict has a strong bearing on the conflict and relationships. The indispensability of actor transformation in conflict transformation has been stressed. The effect on conflict and relationship has also been highlighted coupled with a description of processes involved in conflict transformation. Appleby (2001) based on Lederach's thought on transformation proposes that actor transformation should involve the grass – root and mid – level players. These comprise well – meaning and respected leaders drawn from the community especially in cases of communal conflicts. This must however be done carefully not to inadvertently worsen the conflict situation by bringing people with veiled unscrupulous interest in the conflict or shadow parties.

Personal and Group Transformation

This option considers the prospects that certain positive changes exist in the heart of every person that could be harnessed to positively transform conflicts. Basically, reciprocal respect for one another must be harnessed to correct misrepresentations, mistrust, extreme dislike, deliberately distorted perceptions etc. It advocates the need for individuals to be willing to reach settlement with others with whom they had conflicts in time past. That is, people should be open minded about the idea of reconciliation rather than being rigid and deliberately prejudiced. Or, to state this principle more clearly, community-wide reconciliation efforts cannot result into any meaningful achievement in situations where individuals are blocking efforts to their personal transformation. It thus emphasises the need for individuals to embrace the idea of forgiveness and entertain the idea to start anew with their former adversaries or enemies. Therefore, it is significant for the community elites or opinion leaders to be persuaded by the personal transformation agenda in order to for them to run with it to appropriately manage the conflict.

(note eight) **The Meaning of Early Warning**

The concept of early warning will be viewed from multi-dimensional perspectives as thus: a warning at an early stage of an event or a set of circumstances that will have negative consequence (Gounden, V. 1996, pp 53 – 69).

Early warning (EW) can also be defined as the collection, analysis and communication of the relevant evidence and conclusions to the policy-makers to enable them make choices. Early warning is the systematic collection and analysis of information coming from areas of crisis for the purpose of: (a) anticipating the escalation of violent conflict; (b) the development of strategic responses to these crises; and (c) the presentation of options to critical actors for purposes of decision-making and preventive action. It involves any initiative that focuses on systematic data collection, analysis and/or formulation of recommendations, including risk assessment and information sharing.

Early warning is a complex system of indicators to predict the probability that a crisis is likely to happen so that preventive action can be taken on time. In sum, its task is (1) to collect and share information on possible or impending humanitarian disasters or conflicts in other states; and (2) to sound an alarm. Early warning is a complex set of indicators, which could be used to predict, with some degree of probability, the type, turning and extent of disaster or conflict.

Early warning is also seen as a proactive process in which networks of various institutions undertake systematic information collection and analysis together in a collective effort to generate information to help prevent likely disaster or unfavourable events from occurring or to reduce their outcomes.

In addition, early warning system helps to provide the knowledge to identify impending risks, determine their levels and potential impacts, both in terms of people and locations, and guide actions to avoid, reduce or mitigate the effects of those risks when they occur.

Importance or Benefits of Early Warning

- It is a crisis and disaster protection mechanism
- It promotes public-private partnership

- It introduces and supports services at the local level that directly enhance development
- It promotes increased development and application of scientific knowledge, including improved science and technology information dissemination
- It advances community participation for its own sake
- It creates the potential for increased utilisation of indigenous knowledge and values
- Effective early warning promotes improved environmental management and sustainable livelihood that are harmonious with the environment

- It reveals the causes of conflict
- It gives room or enables us to monitor the development process of potentially violent conflict continuously.

Security of vulnerable populations and endangered environments, therefore, the purpose of early warning therefore is not to confidentially inform the concerned authority that a problem is developing, but to create a national, regional and international will and momentum to do something about the deteriorating situation. This implies that early warning should not only point to the problem but also suggest action.

Early warning can be concerned with military conflicts, military coups, environmental, resources, political, economic, religious, family, conflicts, impending humanitarian disasters, such as famine/starvation, drought, flow of refugees, genocide and host of others.

It thus therefore become imperative for the government, agencies, organisations, or policy makers to show a disposition of one ready to act fast whenever such privileged information and patriotic campaigns by stakeholders of an impending early warning indicators in order to avert any form of disaster or destructive conflict.

The Meaning of Early Response (ER)

Early response refers to any initiative that occurs in the latent stages of a perceived potential armed conflict, man-made or natural disaster with the aim of reduction, resolution or transformation.

It refers to the process of consultation, policy making, planning, and action to reduce or avoid armed conflict, or to guide against, reduce or mitigate the effects of natural or man-made disasters on people or the environment.

According to the United Nations General Assembly definition early response is the process of using information gathered from early warning systems to design action aimed at preventing violent conflict.

This action could be the development of a policy or programmes. It involves the developing of strategies to prevent conflict at different levels using specific entry points.

It is therefore become imperative for the government or policy makers and each and every concerned citizens (direct and indirect) to show a disposition of being ready to act fast whenever such privileged information and patriotic campaigns by stakeholders of an impending early warning indicators in order to avert any form of disaster or destructive conflict.

Also, for early warnings to be effective, there must be new, short and more focused delivery of the principal conclusions to decision makers, governments, intergovernmental bodies, the media, NGOs and the general public. This cannot be

an afterthought, but must be given sustained attention by the responsible organisations, assisted by communication specialists.

Types of Early Warning

There are different types or aspects of early warning as earlier mentioned in the introduction section of this unit.

Only few will be briefly discussed or explained in this unit as they will be discussed extensively one after the other later. They are as follows.

(a) Conflict early warning:

This is the type of early warning information or system aimed at preventing an impending conflict that could take any form if not quickly prevented.

(b) Disaster early warning:

This is geared towards preventing or minimising an impending natural disaster that is inevitable or cannot be prevented such as earthquake, hurricane, tsunami, climate change, and so on.

(c) Hazards assessment:

It has to do with collection, analysis, and communication of evidence discovered at the scene of an accident or calamity with the aim of advising the necessary or concerned authority on the rapid and effective steps to be taken to alleviate the suffering or the impact on the victims.

Early Warning Indicators

The dictionary definition refers to indicators as those things which are pointers to a given condition. They may also be referred to as devices for exhibiting condition for the being time. The synonyms of indicator include among others, display, index, gauge, synopsis, symbol, and so on. (Chambers Dictionary, 1983:640; and The Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus 1988:511).

Among the things the analyst would cite to be indicators of conflict in Africa are armed forces and their deployment; the extent of tension within and between communities and groups, the absence of framework for resolving the conflict and/or where its existence is not recognised or respected by the parties in conflict etc.

Types of Indicators

The following are the various forms of early warning indicators.

1. Economic indicators:

It reveals the need to provide information on potential shortages, production problems, the distabilisation of a nation's currency, fiscal and revenue policies, the private sector and other economic indices, the consequences of which may affect a larger proportion of the population of a nation.

2. Environmental indicators:

This is a sensitive issue because of the health hazards and pillage of arable land in addition to ecological and marine problems such as gully erosions, environmental

pollution (oil spillage), and excavation of solid mineral, and so on. All these have brought some untold health hazards to the indigenes, while those whose primary occupations are crops production (planting), animal rearing and fish farming have been greatly affected.

3. Social indicators:

This provides data on the alarming state of unemployment and underemployment in several African countries. “A hungry man and an idle hand, is a devil’s workshop,” so goes the maxim. Jobless youths in the society have posed a great threat to the country and peace in most societies. The jobless youth could be used to perpetrate some social vices by the disgruntled elements in the society.

4. Political indicator:

A regular assessment of the domestic political arena in various African countries have revealed a lot of infringement on fundamental human rights of citizens by the ruling political class ranging from political exclusion, unlawful arrest and detention of perceived political enemies, killing of political rivals, election rigging and a host of others.

5. Security indicators:

The capacity of gathering information on development within the armed forces, the proliferation of arms and ammunition into official and non-official sectors of the society, the politicisation of the military and the militarisation of the civilian popular (ethnic militias), the relationship between the military and the civil society.

6. Individual security/safety:

Safety demands an assessment of the role of crime, urban and rural violence, the causes of insurrection and the militarisation of the rural areas. The incessant killing, maiming of innocent citizens by armed robbers, ritual killing; unnecessary killing of innocent citizens by policemen at road blocks/checkpoints in the course of trying to collect bribe also call for concern. All these have engender hatred, frustration, intimidation, molestation and protest from aggrieved citizens, thereby taking laws into their hands because of the inability of the state to protect and guarantee their safety and protection.

7. Rural indicators: Effective information gathering at the grassroot level helps to douse inter and intra communal strife.

The morass of conflict at border towns, villages, and in one country and the other, demands that a constant watch must be kept on the rural areas using media channels to maintain tranquility and peace.

8. Educational indicators:

A continuous decline in the quality of education despite increase in the standard is posing a great threat to the growth and development of our nation (Nigeria) and several other African countries. As has been established, education is the bedrock or backbone of science and technological advancement of any nation. And the

higher the level of technology of a nation the greater and faster is her human (labour) and economic growth and development. Poor educational funding and low salary compared to what is obtainable in other African countries, talk-less of western nations, have forced most Nigerian academics to the western nations in search of greener pastures. This ugly development still persists to the detriment of the present younger generation as well the future generations.

9. Demographic indicators:

This involves sudden demographic changes and displacement of people and increasing territoriality of groups/peoples. Demographic indicators involve migration, population explosion, aged/youth or children ratio, gender distribution and so on. In conflict situation, refugee movement and Internally Displaced People (IDPs) are to be monitored and reported in order to be able to determine when crises are looming.

(note nine) **Arms Control and Demilitarisation**

The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the former Soviet Union brought about easy access to highly lethal weaponry ranging from assault rifles to rocket launchers, facilitated by the opening of borders and the rapid expansion of free trade. Such weapons are increasingly falling into wrong hands and all categories of fighters, including children who eventually turn them against those whom humanitarian law is designed to protect.

Research findings have revealed that death toll from small arms and light weapons exceed the toll of the atomic bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki during the Second World War.

Small arms can now be referred to as “weapons of mass destruction” because of carnage they cause in the “trouble spots” all over the world.

One of the major efforts to preserve international peace and security in the 21st century has been to control or limit the number of weapons and ways in which weapons can be used.

Definition of Small Arms/Light Weapons

There are various definitions of what constitute small arms and light weapons, but we will only give one here.

Small Arms:

These are weapons or instruments that can easily be operated by an individual meant to cause harm.

Light Weapons:

Are weapons (with anticipated lethal effect) that are operated with a combined support of a crew of two or three individuals.

Types of Small Arms/Light Weapons

Small arms and light weapons conveniently fall into the categories below.

a. Types of Small Arms

- Revolvers and self-loading pistols
- Rifles and carbines
- Sub-machine gun
- Assault rifles
- Light machine guns

a. Categories of Light Weapons

- Heavy machine-guns
- Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers

- Portable anti-aircraft guns
- Portable launchers of anti-tank missile and rocket systems
- Portable anti-tank guns and recoilless rifles
- Portable launchers of anti-aircraft missile system
- Mortars of calibers of less than 100mm

c. Ammunition and Explosives

- Cartridges (rounds) for small arms
- Shells and missiles for light weapons
- Anti-personnel and anti-tank grenades
- Landmines
- Mobile containers with missile of shells for single action and anti-tank systems
- Explosives

Characteristic of Small Arms and Light Weapons

i. Simplicity and durability:

Compared to major weapons systems which requires regular upkeep and maintenance due to their complicated electronics, avionics and propulsion subsystems, small arms and light weapons have few movable parts, are extremely durable and require little upkeep or logistical support.

ii. Portability and concealable:

Individuals or light vehicles can carry small arms and light weapons; they can easily be transported or smuggled into areas of conflict; and they can be concealed in shipments of legitimate cargo.

iii. Military/police and civilian uses:

Small arms and light weapons often have legitimate uses for both military and police force.

They may also be held legally or otherwise by individuals who are afraid of their own personal security. However, in the case of major conventional weapons, only the military force generally procures them.

iv. Low cost and wide availability:

These weapons are usually supplied in large quantity or abundantly for military, police, and civilian use.

v. Lethality:

The increase in sophistication of rapid-fire assault rifles, pistols and machine guns, and their widespread circulation among sub-state groups and civilians promotes or encourages availability of firepower that matches or exceeds that of national police or even the military of a state or country.

Arms Race

An arms race is a situation in which two countries or group of countries are continually trying to get more and better weapons than each other. It is the

continuing competitive attempt by two or more nations to have available to it more and more powerful weapons than other(s).

It refers to competition between nations to have the most powerful armaments.

It is a race between hostile nations to accumulate or develop weapons; broadly: an ever escalating race or competition. Examples: Nuclear, chemical, biological weapons and several other forms of weapons.

Arms Proliferation

This refers to the easy availability or influx of illicit small arms and light weapons into wrong hands or unauthorised groups of people for use against the individuals or groups meant to be protected. It is a rapid increase or growth in number of deadly weapons.

Causes of Arms Proliferation

- Undemocratic governance
- Undemocratic electoral process
- Weak economic base of most countries engulfed with crisis
- Uneven distribution of basic infrastructure
- Military coups
- Ethnicity
- Weak stockpile and management of national arms and ammunitions
- Post-colonial or Cold War remnants
- Movement of refugees/dominant of refugees camps by armed groups
 - Corruption
- Failed state

Effects of Arms Proliferation

- Arms proliferation sustains and exacerbates arm conflicts
- It endangers peacekeepers and humanitarian workers
- It undermines respect for international humanitarian law
- It threatens legitimate but weak government
- It benefits terrorists as well as the perpetrators of organised crime
- It endangers the lives of defenseless individuals or citizens
- It threatens unity and peaceful co-existence of plural states.

Arms Control

Arms control is an umbrella term for restrictions upon the development, production, stockpiling, proliferation, and usage of weapons especially weapons of mass destruction. Arms control is typically exercised through the use of diplomacy which seeks to impose such limitations upon consenting participants through

international treaties and agreements, although it may also comprise efforts by a nation or group of nations to enforce limitations upon a non-consenting country. On a national or community level, arms control can amount to programs to control the access of private citizens to weapons. This is often referred to as gun politics, as firearms are the primary focus of such efforts in most places.

Aims of Arms Control

- i. Arms control is meant to break the security dilemma.
- ii. It aims at mutual security between partners and overall stability (be it in a crisis situation, a grand-strategy, or stability to put an end to an arms race).
- iii. Other than stability, arms control comes with cost reduction and damage limitation.

History of Arms Control

Arms control developed both in theory and in practice during the Cold War, a period between the late 1940s and 1991 when the two military superpowers, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), dealt with one another from a position of mutual mistrust. Arms control was devised consciously during the postwar period as an alternative to disarmament, which for many had fallen into discredit as a means of reducing the likelihood of war. Germany had been forced to disarm following World War I but became belligerent again during the 1930s, resulting in World War II.

Although Germany's weapons had been largely eliminated, the underlying causes of conflict had not. Germany's experience thus illustrated that no simple cause-and-effect relationship existed between the possession of weapons and a tendency to create war.

Following World War II, advocates of arms control as a new approach to limiting hostility between nations emphasised that military weapons and power would continue to remain a part of modern life. It was unrealistic and even dangerous, they felt, for a country to seek complete elimination of weapons, and it would not necessarily reduce the likelihood of war. Whereas disarmament had formerly been seen as an alternative to military strength, arms control was now viewed as an integral part of it. Arms control proponents sought to create a stable balance of power in which the forces that cause states to go to war could be controlled and regulated. The emphasis in arms control is thus upon overall stability rather than elimination of arms, and proponents recognise that an increase in weaponry is sometimes required to preserve a balance of power.

The development of arms control owes a great deal to the existence of Nuclear Weapons as well. By the 1950s, when both the United States and the Soviet Union possessed nuclear weapons, the superpowers became convinced that they could not safely disarm themselves of those weapons. In the absence of guaranteed

verification—the process whereby participants in a treaty monitor each other's adherence to the agreement—neither side could disarm without making itself vulnerable to cheating by the other side. The goal of the super powers and other nations possessing nuclear weapons therefore became not total elimination of those weapons, but control of them so that a stable nuclear deterrent might be maintained. According to the idea of nuclear deterrence, a state possessing nuclear weapons is deterred, or prevented, from using them against another nuclear power because of the threat of retaliation. No state is willing to attempt a first strike because it cannot prevent the other side from striking back. Nuclear deterrence is therefore predicated upon a mutual abhorrence of the destructive power of nuclear weapons. This idea has come to be called mutual assured destruction (MAD). Many experts see deterrence as the ultimate goal of nuclear arms control.

Because many civilians generally assume that arms control and disarmament is the same thing, there has often been public disappointment when treaties have resulted in an increase in the number or power of weapons. An advantage of arms control over disarmament, however, is that even states with a high degree of suspicion or hostility toward each other can still negotiate agreements. Disarmament agreements, on the other hand, require a high degree of trust, and their formation is unlikely between hostile nations.

Arms control is often used as a means to avoid an arms race - a competitive buildup of weapons between two or more powers. Such a race can be costly for both sides, and arms control treaties serve the useful purpose of limiting weapons stockpiles to a level that preserves deterrence while conserving the economic and social resources of a state for other uses.

Demilitarisation

It is an applied strategy for executing successful peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace-building operations, in a conflict zone or in a state or country that is emerging from crisis or war and is generally the strategy employed by all UN Peacekeeping Operations and state, continental, and regional organisations.

Types of Demilitarisation Methods

- i. **Disarmament:** Entails the physical removal of the means of combat from ex-belligerents (weapons, ammunition, and so on). Is the collection, documentation, control and disposal of small arms, ammunition, explosives and light and heavy weapons of combatant and often also of the civilian population. Disarmament also includes the development of responsible arms management programmes.
- ii. **Demobilisation:** It entails the disbanding of armed groups; or is the formal and controlled discharge of active combatants from armed forces and other armed groups.

iii. **Reinsertion:** Is the assistance offered to ex-combatants during demobilisation but prior to the longer-terms process of reintegration.

iv. **Reintegration:**

It is described as the process of reintegrating former combatants into civil society, ensuring against the possibility of a resurgence of armed conflict. Alternatively, it can be described as the process by which ex-combatants acquire civilian status and gain sustainable employment and income.

Reintegration is essentially a social and economic process with an open time frame, primarily taking place at communities at the local level.

A typical example of the above concepts is the Amnesty and Post-Amnesty operational activities extended to the Niger –Delta militant groups by the Nigerian government.

Objectives of DDR

The overall objective of the disarmament, demobilisation, and reintegration (DDR) are listed below.

DDR policy and programme is to reduce the size of the armed forces and the other organised services, and assist the ex-combatants in returning to civilian life and creating sustainable livelihoods.

Specific objectives of the DDR programme are to:

- to reduce the size of the armed forces and the other national organised forces
- to assist ex-combatants to socially reintegrate into their communities of return
- to increase livelihood opportunities for ex-combatants in communities of return
- to facilitate the release, return and reintegration of children associated with armed forces and groups into their families and communities of return
- to support social and economic reintegration of women associated with armed forces and group through community based programme in their communities of return
- to strengthen the capacities of RSSDDRC, line ministries. In South Sudan for instance, South Sudanese civil society and private sector to effectively support services delivery to the people of South Sudan.

Prerequisites to DDR

Disarmament, demobilisation, and reintegration (DDR) is somewhat different from the blanket term “peacekeeping,” in that DDR requires certain conditions to be effectively implemented. They include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Security- conflict in the targeted area must be completely or at least nearly halted, and a significant deterrent force must be in place to ensure no renewal of conflict. Without this guarantee of security, DDR cannot be effectively implemented, as trust between former belligerents - an integral part of the DDR process - cannot develop.

- Inclusion of all ex-belligerents- without cooperation between all armed groups, DDR cannot succeed. Unless all combatants and factions are disarmed, the potential for a resurgence of conflict is too great.
- Sufficient funding- without enough funding to be completed, DDR operations cannot succeed, as incomplete reintegration of ex-combatants leaves the possibility of a renewal of conflict.

Requirements for Successful DDR Implementation

There are six aspects to a successful DDR conversion:

- 1.Reduction of military expenditure
2. Reorientation of military research and development
3. Conversion of the arms industry
4. Demobilisation and reintegration
5. Redevelopment of troops
6. Safe disposal and management of “surplus weapons”

CONCLUSION

Enforcement of arms control agreements has proven difficult over time.

Most agreements rely on the continued desire of the participants to abide by the terms to remain effective. Usually, when a nation no longer desires to abide by the terms, they usually will seek to either covertly circumvent the terms or to simply end their participation in the treaty.

More recent arms control treaties have included more stringent terms on enforcement of violations as well as verification.

This last has been a major obstacle to effective enforcement, as violators often attempt to covertly circumvent the terms of the agreements.

(note ten) Definitions of Gender-related Concepts

Sex

The term “sex” refers to the biological characteristics of male and female. These characteristics are congenital and their differences are limited to physiological reproductive functions.

Gender

This is the term used to denote the social characteristics assigned to men and women. These social characteristics are constructed based on different factors, such as age, religion, national, ethnic and social origin.

They differ both within and between cultures and define identities, status, roles, responsibilities and power relations among the members of any society or culture.

Gender is neither static nor innate, but evolves to respond to changes in the social, political, and cultural environment. Gender is learnt through socialisation. Other definitions include the following.

- Gender refers to the differential social roles that define women and men in a cultural context- and to power relationships that perpetuate these roles.
- Gender refers to social attributes that are acquired or learnt during socialisation and define activities, responsibilities, and needs connected to being male or female and not to biological identity associated with masculinity and femininity.
- Gender is a socially constructed identity through which roles are assigned at different levels and which can differ according to culture and can be changed by circumstances such as conflict.

Gender Mainstreaming

This refers to a strategy to strengthen gender equality through policy and resource allocation that reflect the interests of both men and women.

Violence

This is a means of control and oppression that can include emotional, social or economic force, coercion or pressure, as well as physical harm.

It can be overt, in the form of a physical assault or threatening someone with a weapon; it can also be covert, in the form of intimidation, threats, persecution, deception or other forms of psychological or social pressure.

Abuse

This is the misuse of power through which the perpetrator gains control or advantage of the abused, using and causing physical or psychological harm or inciting fear of the potential to harm. Abuse prevents persons from making free decisions and forces them to behave against their will.

Coercion

Is forcing, or attempting to force, another person to engage in behaviours against his/her will by using threats, verbal insistence, manipulation, deception, cultural expectations or economic power.

Consent

This is when a person makes an informed choice to agree freely and voluntarily to do something. The phrase against her/his will is used to indicate an absence of informed consent. There is no consent when agreement is obtained using threats, force or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, or misrepresentation.

Perpetrator

A perpetrator is a person, group, or institution that directly inflicts, supports, and condones violence or other abuse against a person or a group of persons. Perpetrators are in a position of real or perceived power, decision-making and/or authority and can thus exert control over their victims.

Women and Armed Conflict

The Beijing Platform for Action recognised that peace was inextricably linked to equality between women and men and development, and emphasised that women's full involvement in all efforts for the prevention and resolution of armed conflicts was essential for the promotion and maintenance of peace and security.

The Platform for Action set out six strategic objectives.

- Increase the participation of women in conflict resolution at decision-making levels and protect women living in situations of armed and other conflicts or under foreign occupation;
- Reduce excessive military expenditures and control the availability of armaments;
- Promote non-violent forms of conflict resolution and reduce the incidence of human rights abuse in conflict situations;
- Promote women's contribution to fostering a culture of peace;
- Provide protection, assistance and training to refugee women, other displaced women in need of international protection and internally displaced women; and
- Provide assistance to the women of the colonies and non-self-governing territories.

Since the Fourth World Conference in 1995 there have been remarkable developments in terms of expansion of the international normative and policy framework on issues related to women and armed conflict, including in the United Nations Security Council. New issues, which were not specifically addressed in the Platform for

Action, have expanded the discourse and global implementation efforts have become centered around a broader agenda on women, peace and security.

The Commission on the Status of Women has considered the theme of women and armed conflict on a number of occasions.

In 1998, the commission adopted agreed conclusions on women and armed conflict that called for action in a number of areas, including: ensuring gender-sensitive justice; meeting the specific needs of women affected by armed conflict; increasing the participation of women in peacekeeping, peace-building, pre- and post-conflict decision-making; and addressing disarmament, illicit arms trafficking, landmines and small arms.

In 2004, the commission adopted agreed conclusions on women's equal participation in conflict prevention, management and conflict resolution and in post-conflict peace-building. These recognised that peace agreements provide a vehicle for the promotion of gender equality and that a gender-sensitive constitutional and legal framework was necessary to ensure that women fully participate in such processes. At its 52nd session in 2008, the Commission on the Status of Women reviewed implementation of its agreed conclusions on "women's equal participation in conflict prevention, management and conflict resolution and in post-conflict peace-building" adopted in 2004. The review revealed a number of gaps and challenges, including terms of representation and participation of women in peace-processes and decision-making; prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence, monitoring and accountability, and funding. The 23rd special session of the General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the 21st Century" reaffirmed the Platform for Action and called for the full participation of women in decision-making at all levels in peace processes, peacekeeping and peace-building. It also called for the protection of girls in armed conflict, especially the prohibition of forced recruitment. In 2000, the United Nations Security Council passed the landmark resolution 1325 on women and peace and security, the first resolution ever to address the impact of war on women, and women's contributions to conflict resolution and sustainable peace. The resolution calls for women's equal participation with men and their full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security. It reaffirms the need to protect women and girls from human rights abuses, including gender-based violence. The resolution calls for action to mainstream gender perspectives in relation to conflict prevention, peace negotiations and the aftermath of conflicts.

Since its adoption in 2000, the Security Council has held annual open debates on progress in implementing resolution 1325. Eight Security Council Presidential Statements provide further guidance on ways and means to fully implement the resolution. The council has increasingly recognised the inter-relationship between gender equality, empowerment of women and country-specific situations and other thematic issues, such as protection of civilians, children in armed conflict, peace

and security in Africa, maintenance of international peace and security and security sector reform.

The work on the situation of children in armed conflict has contributed to a deeper understanding and greater urgency on these issues, including through the development of a monitoring and reporting mechanism established by the Security Council through its resolution 1612 (2005).

In the 2005 World Summit Outcome, the world's leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the full and effective implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000). They stressed the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peace-building and underlined the importance of integrating a gender perspective and of women having the opportunity for equal participation and full involvement in all efforts to maintain and promote peace and security, as well as the need to increase their role in decision-making at all levels. Governments strongly condemned all violations of the human rights of women and girls in situations of armed conflict and the use of sexual exploitation, violence and abuse and committed themselves to elaborating and implementing strategies to report on, prevent and punish gender-based violence.

As an outcome of the World Summit, the Peace-building Commission was established in June 2006 as an advisory body of the General Assembly and the Security Council with the goal to marshal resources at the disposal of the international community, and to advise and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict recovery with a special focus on reconstruction, institution-building and sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict. The founding resolutions of the Peace-building Commission provide a mandate to mainstream a gender perspective in all aspects of its work. Gender equality issues were identified as cross-cutting peace consolidation strategies in Burundi and Sierra Leone – the first two countries on the commission's agenda – and in relation to new countries under consideration, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic.

In June 2008, the Security Council held an open thematic debate on “women, peace and security: sexual violence in situations of armed conflict” which culminated in the adoption of resolution 1820 (2008). In this resolution, the Security Council reaffirmed its resolve to eliminate all forms of violence against women, including by ending impunity. The council recognised sexual violence as a security problem requiring a systematic security response. The resolution calls for a number of concrete actions and measures aimed at eliminating sexual violence and addressing its impacts by the Secretary-General, United Nations.

This involves Member States (including troop and police contributing countries), all parties to armed conflict, regional and sub-regional bodies, and financial

institutions. It also calls on the Peace-building Commission to include strategies for addressing sexual violence in its work.

Post-Conflict Situation with Women, Peace Agreements, and Constitution Making

The bitter experiences of women in times of war often make them strong adherents of peace-building and constitution making for conflict resolution. However, women's roles in and contributions to conflict resolution are underutilised or wholly ignored in mainstream peace building and constitution making processes. Nevertheless, women all over the world are devising creative and effective strategies to ending wars and building peace.

Throughout history, men have designed constitutions and women have been invisible, both in the process of constitutional reform and in the content of the constitutions. A survey of the constitutions of the world will reveal that most, if not all constitutions, view women as gendered subjects, that is as wives, mothers and other categorisations. It is now an accepted fact that the law and legal processes are now being viewed as based on male norms and experiences, and that women's engagement with the law is vastly different than that of men.

We should therefore note the positive changes witnessed in the past decade, where women are now pushing at the envelope of constitutional law and striving to influence constitutional reform processes. Significant progress and achievements have been made in Somalia and East Timor, amongst others. Also, in Northern Ireland, women have successfully come together in forming their own political party and have effectively raised the profile of women in politics.

Post-Conflict: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction

Women often face severe obstacles and critical neglect to their needs in the rehabilitation and reconstruction process, as they struggle against discrimination at every level in trying to feed and house their families.

Moreover, international donor reconstruction programmes and the distribution of humanitarian aid often fail to take into account the new economic and social roles women must fulfill in the aftermath of war.

Their essential needs are thereby inadequately factored in.

We therefore, need to explore the practical needs and strategic interests that are fundamental to women in post-conflict reconstruction. Special attention will also be paid to the new economic roles women carve out for themselves, most often as heads of households.

Conversely, we should note the new challenges faced by women in their new employment, land and property rights, and the needs of ex-combatant women.

Striking examples in this area is reflected in the post-conflict experiences of personal accounts of female combatants during conflicts. Liberia and Sierra Leone are cases in point.

Women, Truth, Accountability and Reconstruction

Although rape and other gender-based forms of violence continue to be among the highest committed war crimes during times of armed conflict, they still remain the least condemned. This struggle against impunity must begin with the strengthening of the legal system and its responsibility in bringing perpetrators to justice.

Furthermore, addressing the victims' needs and providing proper medical treatment, psychological care and financial compensation is crucial and must be guaranteed. Fundamentally, these crimes must be recognised for what they are - crimes against humanity.

We need therefore to be conversant with the various roles of women in the institutions and strategies for post-conflict truth and reconciliation.

In addressing the specific needs of women in the aftermath of violent conflict, especially their need for accountability and justice, attention is called to the issue of comfort women and for example, the Japanese government's legal responsibility for crimes committed over 50 years ago, to the more recent tragedies such as Rwanda's genocide that is now answering to an established war crimes tribunal.

There is a recent report on "Women, War, and Peace," an independent experts' assessment by two remarkable women, Elisabeth Rehn and Ellen John Sirleaf. This report provided a wealth of information on the impact of conflict on women and gave the suffering a human face.

Equally important, it not only provided "ground truth" from Sudan and Liberia to Afghanistan and East Timor on the impact of violence, displacement, trafficking, and other social ills, but also practical suggestions for avoiding the stigma of victimisation.

Indeed, what comes through most clearly from this report is the need to view women as much more than victims, and to empower them to make their full contributions at the peace table and in post-conflict reconstruction. This is not just a question of equity or fairness. We know that bringing women to the peace table improves the quality of agreements reached and increases the chance of success in implementing, just as involving women in post-conflict governance reduces the likelihood of returning to war. Reconstruction works best when it involves women as planners, implementers, and beneficiaries.

The single most productive investment in revitalising agriculture, restoring health systems, reducing infant mortality, and improving other social indicators after conflict is in women's and girls' education.

Further, insisting on full accountability for actions against women during conflict is essential for the re-establishment of rule of law.

We know these lessons well, but too frequently, in the press of responding to the latest crises, issues related to conflict prevention in general – much less the role of women in this process – get lost in the shuffle. And yet, it is precisely in the midst of crises that these issues should take center stage.

From 1995 to 1998, Angola was the site of the world's largest UN peacekeeping operation. The UN Special Representative of the Secretary General was sensitive to gender issues, and there was an active UN human rights program that forced attention to these issues as well.

Still, when conflict re-emerged in Angola in 1998 and millions of displaced persons were in need of emergency relief programs, the priority was the urgency of getting food to displaced people. This outweighed the focus on women's participation in the peace process. It was later realised during a meeting of the Joint Peace Commission that brought together the Angolan Government (UNITA), the United Nations, and the troika nations of Russia, Portugal, and the United States, that there was not a single woman at the peace table. It was therefore recognised that a key component for post-conflict negotiation and reconstruction was missing by not bringing women to the table to plan for the emergency assistance. Using women's NGOs to distribute relief; assigning gender advisors to prevent domestic violence as ex-combatants returned to their homes; and ensuring women a seat at the table in the peace talks themselves were realised to be important.

These lessons were particularly useful during the political, economic and security reconstruction of Afghanistan. Well-meaning experts – both Afghan and international – told us that the benefits of involving women in this process were outweighed by the risk of alienating anti-Taliban forces and traditional Afghan leaders whose help was needed in the fight against terrorism.

Under President Bush of the US, women's issues were given a place at the top of the agenda in the efforts in Afghanistan as the full participation of women at the political conference in Bonn, the reconstruction conferences in Washington and Tokyo, and the Loya Jirga in Afghanistan was realised.

One area where we need to improve is insisting on full accountability for actions against women during conflict. Whilst the spirit of reconciliation and forgiveness after peace is welcome, but too often, amnesty means that men forgive men for atrocities committed against women. In Angola, for example, the government and the UNITA rebels provided 13 separate amnesties for each other. Whenever a mass grave was discovered, it was in large part the international community – including the UN Human Rights Commission and the embassies of foreign governments – that would go to the site to protect the evidence in anticipation of the day when the Angolan authorities could be persuaded into investigating the matter.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to transitional justice: whether it is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa, the Gacaca community court system in Rwanda, a human rights commission in Afghanistan under the Bonn agreement, or international tribunals where local courts are inadequate, ensuring accountability is essential to convince men with guns that there is impunity in acting against women.

But words alone cannot earn women a seat at the peace table, force financial institutions to provide capital to women entrepreneurs, or ensure adequate protection for women in refugee and displaced situations.

Humanitarian Intervention

Refers to a state using military force against another state when the main publicly declared aim of that military action is ending human rights violations being perpetrated by the state against which it is directed.

Threat or use of force across state borders by a state (or group of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory the force is applied.

There is no one standard or legal definition of humanitarian intervention; the field of analysis (such as law, ethics, or politics) often influences the definition that is chosen. Differences in definition include variations in whether humanitarian interventions is limited to instances where there is an absence of consent from the host state; whether humanitarian intervention is limited to punishment actions; and whether humanitarian intervention is limited to cases where there has been explicit UN Security Council authorisation for action. There is, however, a consensus on some of its essential characteristics.

- v. Humanitarian intervention involves the use of threat and military forces as a central feature.
- vi. It is an intervention in the sense that it entails interfering in the internal affairs of a state by sending military forces into the territory or airspace of a sovereign state that has not committed an act of aggression against another state.
- vii. Humanitarian intervention is in response to situations that do not necessarily pose direct threats to states' strategic interests, but instead is motivated by humanitarian objectives.

Types of Humanitarian Intervention

i) UN Authorised Interventions

Most states clearly would prefer to secure UN authorisation before using force for humanitarian purposes, and would probably agree that the UN Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, can authorise military action in

response to severe atrocities and other humanitarian emergencies that it concludes constitute a threat to peace and security.

The understanding of what constitutes threats to international peace has been radically broadened since the 1990s to include such issues as mass displacement, and the UN Security Council has authorised use of force in situations that many states would have previously viewed as “internal” conflicts.

ii) Unauthorised Interventions

In several instances, states or groups of states have intervened with force, and without advance authorisation from the UN Security Council, at least in part in response to alleged extreme violations of basic human rights. Recent examples include the intervention after the Gulf War to protect the Kurds in Northern Iraq as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation’s (NATO) intervention in Kosovo.

Under unauthorised intervention, four distinct attitudes or approaches to the legitimacy of humanitarian efforts in the absence of Security Council authorisations can be adduced as follows.

1. Status quo:

Categorically affirms that military intervention in response to atrocities is lawful only if authorised by the UN Security Council or if it qualifies as an exercise in the right of self-defense. Under this view, NATO’s intervention in Kosovo constituted a clear violation of Article 2(4). Defenders of this position include a number of states, most notably Russia and People’s Republic of China. Proponents of this approach point to the literal text of the UN Charter, and stress that the high threshold for authorisation of the use of force aims to minimise its use, and promote consensus as well as stability by ensuring a basic acceptance of military action by key states.

However, Kosovo war has also highlighted the drawbacks of this approach most notably when effective and consistent humanitarian intervention is made unlikely by the geopolitical realities of relations between the Permanent Five members of the Security Council, leading to the use of the veto and inconsistent action in the face of a humanitarian crises.

2. Excusable breach:

Humanitarian intervention without a UN mandate is technically illegal under the rules of the UN Charter, but may be morally and politically justified in certain exceptional cases. Benefits of this approach include that it contemplates no new legal rules governing the use of force, but rather opens an “emergency exit” when there is a tension between the rules governing the use of force and the protection of fundamental human rights. Intervening states are unlikely to be condemned as law-breakers, although they take a risk of violating rules for a purportedly higher

purpose. However, in practice, this could lead to questioning the legitimacy of the legal rules themselves if they are unable to justify actions the majority of the UN Security Council views as morally and politically justified.

3. Customary law:

This approach involves reviewing the evolution of customary law for a legal justification of non-authorised humanitarian intervention in rare cases. This approach asks whether an emerging norm of customary law can be identified under which humanitarian intervention can be understood not only as ethically and politically justified but also as legal under the normative framework governing the use of force.

However, relatively few cases exist to provide justification for the emergence of a norm, and under this approach ambiguities and differences of view about the legality of an intervention may deter states from acting. The potential for an erosion of rules governing the use of force may also be a point of concern.

4. Codification:

The fourth approach calls for the codification of a clear legal doctrine or “right” of intervention, arguing that such a doctrine could be established through some formal or codified means such as a UN Charter Amendment or UN General Assembly declaration.

Although states have been reluctant to advocate this approach, a number of scholars, as well as the Independent International Commission on Kosovo, have made the case for establishing such a right or doctrine with specified criteria to guide assessments of legality. A major argument advanced for codifying this right is that it would enhance the legitimacy of international law, and resolve the tension between human rights and sovereignty principles contained in the UN Charter. However, the historical record on humanitarian intervention is sufficiently ambiguous that it argues for humility regarding efforts to specify in advance the circumstances in which states can use force, without Security Council authorisations, against other states to protect human rights.

Responsibility to Protect

Although usually considered categorically distinct from most definitions of humanitarian intervention, the emergence of a Responsibility to

Protect (R2P) deserves mention. Responsibility to Protect is the name of a report produced in 2001 by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) which was established by the Canadian government in response to the history of unsatisfactory humanitarian interventions. The report sought to establish a set of clear guidelines for determining when intervention is appropriate, what the appropriate channels for approving an intervention are and how the intervention itself should be carried out.

Responsibility to protect seeks to establish a clearer code of conduct for humanitarian interventions and advocates a greater reliance on non-military measures. The report also criticises and attempts to change the discourse and terminology surrounding the issue of humanitarian intervention. It argues that the notion of a “right to intervene” is problematic and should be replaced with the “responsibility to protect.”

Under Responsibility to Protect doctrine, rather than having a right to intervene in the conduct of other states, states are said to have a responsibility to intervene and protect the citizens of another state where that other state has failed in its obligation to protect its own citizens.

This responsibility is said to involve three stages: to prevent, to react and to rebuild. Responsibility to Protect has gained strong support in some circles, such as in Canada, a handful of European and African nations, and among proponents of human security, but has been criticised by others, with some Asian nations being among the chief dissenters.

Protection of Children in Conflict

Both in international and non-international armed conflicts today there is tendency towards disregard for the most fundamental humanitarian rules which many times result in discriminating and horrifying attack on the civilian population, especially children.

As one of the most vulnerable in armed conflicts children are therefore more than ever in great need of protection.

Under IHL, children are entitled to the general protection for civilians in armed conflicts, but owing to their particular vulnerability they are also entitled to special protection.

International legal instruments are important tools to protect children in armed conflicts and there are several provisions in international conventions that grant children special protection adapted to their needs.

Some of the most important instruments are from the Geneva Convention of 1949 to the optional protocol to the Convention on the Right of the Child of 2000.

Geneva Conventions and Protocols

There are several principles as the protection of a child in armed conflict; already the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977 contain many children – specific provision. Two general principles are laid down in Article 77 in Protocol 1 and in Article 4 Protocol 4. They state that:

1. Children shall be the object of special respect and be protected against any form of indecent assault;
2. Children shall be provided with care and aid they require;
3. Children must be evacuated from besieged or encircled areas;
4. Children have a right to receive care and aid by the dispatch of medicines;

5. They have a right to the maintenance of their cultural environment to education and the preservation of family unity;
6. It is prohibited to impose the death penalty on children under 18 years of age;
7. If detained or internal, they must be held in quarters separate from the quarters of adults; and
8. It is prohibited to recruit children less than 15 years into the armed forces among others.

Older Persons in Armed Conflict

Older persons are weak persons who can hardly help themselves; thus, in armed conflict they need the help of others to survive. In armed conflict, older persons are exposed to great danger like other civilians but in addition to that, they have vulnerabilities and needs associated with ageing that place them at greater risk. However, their special situation has been insufficiently recognised and addressed by humanitarian intervention targeted to vulnerable groups generally. Moreover, lack of understanding, even prejudice towards older women and old men often results in devaluation of their unique capacities and contributions and of the role they can and do play in the care of dependents, the mitigation of emergencies and the recovery of war-torn societies.