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ABSTRACT

This thesis uses an action research methodology to develop a framework for improving independent scholarly reporting about interventions addressing social or environmental conflict. As there are often contradictory interpretations about the causes and strategic responses to conflict, the problem confronting scholar-reporters is how to address perceptions of bias and reflexively specify the purpose of reporting. It is proposed that scholar-reporters require grounding in conventional *realist*-based social theory but equally ability to incorporate theoretical ideas generated in more *idealist*-based peace research and applied conflict resolution studies. To do this scholar-reporters can take a comparative approach systematically developed through an integrated framework as described in this thesis.

Conceptual and theoretical considerations that support both conventional and more radical constructions are comparatively analysed and then tested in relation to a case study. In 2000 Aboriginal people throughout South Australia deliberated whether their native title claims could be better accorded recognition through conservative court processes or a negotiation process to allay deep-seated conflict. The author, in a scholar-reporter capacity, formulated a report attributing meaning to this consultative process.

As such a report could have been formulated according to alternative paradigms, methodological approaches and theoretical frameworks, the analysis of the adopted framework highlights how different approaches can bias the interpretation of the process and prospects for change. *Realist*-based conservative interpretations emphasise 'official' decision-making processes where legitimacy is expressed through political and legal frameworks based on precedent. *Idealist*-based interpretations emphasise that circumstances entailing significant conflict warrant equal consideration being given to 'non-official' 'resolutionary' problem-solving processes where conflict is treated as a catalyst for learning and outcomes are articulated as understanding generated about conflict and how different strategies can transform it.

The developed integrated framework approach establishes the independence of scholarly reporting. Its purpose goes beyond perpetuating scholarly debate about alternative 'objective' understandings of conflict; it focuses primarily on communicating a more inclusive understanding of the contradictions inherent in a particular conflict. It increases the capacity to understand when, where, why and how conflict precipitates social change, and articulates possibilities for reconceptualising what might be the more sustainable direction of change.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I propose that, even though the complex and dynamic nature of social conflict inevitably creates blurrings between ways of understanding its causes, responses and counter responses, there is nevertheless a need to make more categorical distinctions between different purposes and applications of conflict theory. I further propose that there is a need to explore innovative uses besides those we have conventionally employed for defining and dealing with its profound contradictions.

In many cases the primary purpose of theory is to define a conflict, which can otherwise be described as problem-identification. In other cases the primary purpose can be to attribute meaning to strategic interventions to address conflict, which relate to problem-solving. However, more particularly, this thesis interrogates one specific application of conflict theory, by focusing on the question of why, how and for whom scholarly reports are constructed when the subject relates to the way communities are dealing with conflict. Such reports can be conceived as key mechanisms for generating and disseminating understanding about processes to address conflict.

It is inescapable that any conceptual or theoretical approach to explain how people are dealing with conflict will require scholars to constructively confront the issue that protagonists will perceive the circumstances from quite different viewpoints. Therefore any construction of ideas with respect to the inherent contradictions will inevitably maintain certain biases.

The crux of my argument is that this particular application of conflict theory, to serve as a basis for producing scholarly reports about interventions, is distinguishable from conventional scientific inquiry with regard to problem-identification and problem-solving. In this thesis the term scholar-reporter is used to describe this specific reporting role. The purpose of scholarly reporting can be described as generating a communicable form of knowledge about the way the contending parties involved appreciate the problem and strategies employed to settle, resolve or transform what is at odds. For a report to achieve this purpose it is necessary to establish the nature of the relationship between the scholar-reporter and other actors involved in the context in which an intervention takes place. Thus the scholar-reporter's role takes as its focal problem that of reflexively identifying what and whose knowledge and
authority affords the basis for the production of a report about an intervention. A critical issue with respect to this application of conflict theory is whether a distinction can be made between an 'objective' report and an 'independent' report.

Scholars who report about any type of interventionist strategy are likely to be confronted with the general problem of what the concept of 'independence' means, and what knowledge and authority derived through scientific study will serve as a basis for legitimating their asserted 'independence'.

Section 1 of this chapter will establish in general terms the sort of problems in contemporary society where the idea of developing a more integrated approach to scholarly reporting can be usefully applied. Section 2 will then discuss the methodology and outline the chapters of this thesis which proposes that an integrated framework is needed to constructively apply conflict theory for this purpose.

SECTION 1: CONTENDING WITH CONTRADICTORY IMAGES OF THE STATE OF THE WORLD

People have always had to contend with the paradox that profound problems are so nebulous they defy definition. Yet the need persists to at least try and grasp a sense of their constituent parts, even though some seem outside of our capacity to comprehend according to conventional thinking. Just as it is difficult to fully appreciate profound problems, it is similarly difficult to conceive what might be the most viable solutions.¹

Problems are relative, and depend on what people mean when they talk about 'our' problems or 'their' problems, and who we mean by 'we' and 'they'. Schön² has drawn attention to the fact that the loss of a stable state cannot necessarily be conceived only as the outcome of overt and apparent processes. In discussing problem-setting in social policy, he suggests that problems "are constructed by human beings in their attempts to make sense of complex and troubling situations. Ways of describing problems move into and out of good currency."³ Schön suggests that, despite a general tendency to strive to retain conventional institutional means to deal with profound problems, it is imperative that we also develop capacity to reflect on the possibility that stability does not endure and that social institutions themselves are in a constant process of transformation. This thesis responds to what Schön articulates as a need for ongoing processes of experiential learning to help us
understand the nature of and the influences on institutional capacity to deal with such problems.\textsuperscript{4}

A profound problem confronting the contemporary world, which is relevant in contexts ranging from the local to global scale, is that there are both optimistic and pessimistic perceptions of relationships between collectivities of people. Positive and negative perceptions of the social and material conditions required to sustain life tend to be relative, depending on criteria and standards set for determining levels of improvement or deterioration in their quality. The same conditions and ways of life could, for some, be defined as acceptable while others may consider them to be intolerable.

Western-oriented communities that derive the benefits of modern affluent lifestyles tend to take a positive view of social progress. Their own existences validate an optimistic outlook and tend to cast doubt on the validity of more pessimistic claims that social progress is not assured if it is assessed in global terms. Those who feel they have a progressive future are less inclined to feel responsible for the lifestyle problems and discontents of those living elsewhere. However, as local communities become increasingly aware of the phenomenon of globalisation, it seems more evident that the positive aspects of modernity are not benefiting everyone equally. Globalisation makes it increasingly difficult for people to remove themselves from a general awareness of profoundly contrasting lifestyles and the fact that more and more people's immediate needs for survival are directly threatened. This is reflected in the ghettoization of large areas of the world where deepening poverty and deteriorating social and material conditions marginalise entire populations and severely limit their access to the benefits of the global economy.\textsuperscript{5} It is also reflected in the emergence of the concept of failing states that are unable to recover from years of destructive conflict.\textsuperscript{6} Some societies have to contend with the legacy of the depletion of their natural resources, the breakdown of social systems and traditional modes of production, often accompanied by the militarisation of everyday life where civilian populations have been the principal targets of violence.\textsuperscript{7} For instance, during a period of three months in 1994 approximately 800,000 civilians were systematically executed in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{8} This number exceeds the combined total of Canadian and US casualties in both World War I and II.\textsuperscript{9}

A sense of identity amongst a growing number of people is shaped by their continuous engagement in warfare or by unregulated access through globalising
markets to armaments and other weapons used in violent conflicts, such as hand-held weapons and landmines. The availability of weaponry has also had an impact on the nature of organised crime, as well as feeding the emerging global security problematique. These phenomena suggest it is no longer certain that outcomes of social activity can be interpreted as being inherently progressive.

Some trends prompt a sense of pessimism that the risk of social conflict is increasing rather than decreasing but that nevertheless there are no conceivable means of changing the trends in patterns of competition and warfare. This can be expressed as a general deterioration of local and regional societal systems as a result of the high incidence of warfare during most of the twentieth century. Weakened and divided societies tend to be both more vulnerable and volatile. They are crisis-prone, and negative change can occur relatively quickly. One facet of this general trend has been the concentration of health, wealth, and power in the zones of peace and markedly reduced life chances in zones of disorder. Another troubling trend has been the rapid development and proliferation of weapons and military technologies with a global reach.

In an era of globalisation the sense of the interdependence of individual nation-states is giving way. Highly centralised societal wars have transformed into decentralised applications of violence and other antisocial activities that operate in ways resistant to conventional conflict management strategies. Diverse groups in civil societies respond and seek to protect themselves against certain cross-border flows and the institutions that encourage them. This change not only limits the capacity of states and international organisations to manage conflicts, but also to monitor and analyse trends in social conflict. It makes it difficult to weigh up our capability to be destructive compared with our capacity to maintain communities that foster a collective sense of stewardship and obligation to forge a sustainable future, in part by confronting significant disparities of wealth, power and privilege.

One outcome of the ambiguity as to whether threats to social security should be perceived to be internal or external in character is reflected in massive population movements, whereby people lose their former identity and status and become defined as refugees. These movements are mainly attributable to crises defined and responded to as identity-based conflicts that tend to precipitate political persecution. The movements can also be an outcome of environmental decline and harmful governmental policies within sovereign states. However, international law, which can
be conceived as a framework for addressing cross-border issues, has limited capacity to deal with these issues because it is founded on the precedent that nation-states have mutually exclusive jurisdiction over segments of territory and clusters of population. The difficulties for dealing with massive population movements are thus exacerbated by the issue that sovereign states rarely allow external interference in what are perceived to be domestic affairs.

In the Cold War era, the trend was for people to resist authority through attempts to influence the power of nation-states. These counteractions made it feasible to conceive of claims, targets and protest actions being undertaken within specific national contexts. Protest was organised through more or less hierarchically organised groups who could draw on community support. Lichbach terms this the old paradigm of Cold War or state-centric protest. While this trend still exists, the bi-polar political framework has changed, and many of the re-organisations of power are now defined in terms of globalisation. This contemporary stage of modernity reflects that markets, cultures and politics operate not only within countries but also between them. More than ever we can conceive of common and complementary sets of global interests expressed in terms of multinational markets, identities expressed in terms of Western values, and institutions that promote political democracy, predominantly defined in terms of US hegemony.

Scholte writes that in a territoralist world the length of territorial distances between places and the presence or absence of territorial (especially state) borders between places tend to heavily influence the general frequency and significance of contacts that people at different sites might have with each other. Globalisation as deterritorialisation replaces these territorially bounded social relations with a proliferation of social connections that are often substantially detached from a territorial logic. He maintains that this has somewhat rendered obsolete methodological territorialism that requires us to rethink social theory. Neoliberalism is driven by economics, and therefore protest tends to stem from those with grievances with respect to their material and economic interests. Dissent is often expressed at the national level by groups who seek to resist perceived threats to their existing or future economic well-being.

There is uncertainty as to whether anti-globalisation protest will continue, and whether new and unlikely coalitions of diverse collectivities will be brought together. It is also unclear whether networks will replace hierarchical organisations and local
communities as bases of protest. In the contemporary world it is evident that former ways of defining the characteristics of peace and conflict now have to take account of anti-globalisation protests because they reflect contradictions in the New World Order.22

Changes in human activity have had a profound effect on regional environments of the earth. The changes include large-scale deforestation, the drainage of wetlands and the irrigation of arid lands, all of which impact on the way that social systems interrelate with environmental systems. An increased use of fossil fuels and hydroelectric power has created a revolution in lifestyles, transport, communications and industrial production. It has generated a dramatic growth in the spatial extent of cities and the way people living in them relate with those living in rural environments.23 These lifestyle changes have brought a dramatic increase in human population and marked divisions of labour.24 They have been accompanied by a drastic change in lifestyle for tribal peoples who have traditionally engaged in shifting cultivation or pastoral nomadism.25

Concerns about social conflict are played out in the light of a further uncertainty concerning the degree to which people should be heeding the warning that certain material resources of the earth are finite. Doubt is emerging as to the possibility of reversing current trends in the way apparently non-renewable resources are being consumed. Thus there are contradictory images of threats to the integrity of the physical world that are posed by human activity.26 Environmental, like social security issues, are complex and need to be understood in terms of the threats they pose to local ecosystems as well as the way they interact within broader ecosystems.27 Brown has advocated that environmental problems relating to the availability and distribution of natural resources and environmental degradation are becoming sufficiently important global concerns to warrant a redefining of "national security" issues. He advocates the concept of "extended security" as a way of defining environmental and social security.28 Even if environmental degradation does not lead directly to violence, scholars reviewing peace and security issues in relation to environmental issues, such as Homer-Dixon, recognise that environmental degradation is likely to increase tension at both national and international levels. This increases the likelihood of conflict that impedes the development of cooperative solutions.29 Zebich-Knos expresses in the following terms how, in recent years, there
has been a shift to perceive environmental issues to be as significant as social issues when defining the concept of security:

The end of the Cold War era has opened a Pandora's Box of environmental concerns that, heretofore, took a back seat to superpower struggles. Today, conflict is no longer played out within a Cold War conceptual framework. Imperfect, and at times, inconsistent as the Cold War framework was, it nevertheless provided decision makers with a recipe for action - or inaction. Since conflict is no longer structured within this framework, the two former superpowers - the United States and Russia - no longer possess clear yardsticks for action. With superpower interference in "proxy" conflict(s) no longer the definitive factor in the international arena, I postulate that global conflict will increasingly take on an environmental character. 30

The limitations of our present capacity to address profound environmental problems is reflected in a call from environmentalists to revolutionise our thinking and to bring about a greater sense of collective responsibility to define what it is meant by maintaining and sustaining the environmental integrity of the earth. Speth describes it in the following terms:

Over the course of the twentieth century human population has increased more than threefold and gross world product perhaps twentyfold. Such expansion has placed increasing pressure on the ecology of the planet. Everywhere we look - in the atmosphere, oceans, watersheds, forests, soil, etc. - it is now clear that rapid ecological decline is setting in. Faced with the frightening reality of global ecological crisis, many are now calling for a moral revolution that would incorporate ecological values into our culture. 31

Distinguishing World-Wide Problems from Global Problems

A key idea developed in this thesis is that certain social and environmental problems can be conceived to require a global conceptual frame of reference while others may be expressed in world-wide terms.

Global problems are long-term, persistent, and pervasive and affect many people so that a sense of ownership of such problems is difficult to establish. 32 Consequently potential solutions will be equally difficult to conceive, particularly given that their implementation may require people to consider new ways of relating to one another. 33 Problems can be conceptualised as global when they preoccupy many people and well-established constituencies and move them to act, individually or collectively, on the basis of their perceived importance, even though the existence of the problem or the validity of their claims can be challenged by others who take a different viewpoint. 34

In contrast to global problems which can be conceived to affect the world in its entirety, some problems can be conceived in world-wide terms because they are experienced in many countries without there necessarily being an assumption that
they have a transboundary effect. Problems framed in this way are not necessarily
defined as having significance on a global scale. It seems more straightforward to
determine 'whose problem' it is.\textsuperscript{35}

When applying these general ideas to the substantive topic of conflict, it is necessary
to consider that different qualitative interpretations may need to be conceptualised at
different scales. As a general social phenomenon it can be defined in the following
terms: "A conflict arises when parties disagree about the distribution of material or
symbolic resources and act on the basis of these perceived incompatibilities."\textsuperscript{36} In
contemporary Western usage, the term tends to have negative connotations and is
often closely associated with and is used interchangeably to mean the same as
violence.\textsuperscript{37} Thus it tends to be conceptualised as the opposite of cooperation,
harmony and accord. When it is conceived this way conflict tends to be equated with
aspects of life that are destructive and undesirable, social aberrations to be avoided,
contained or eliminated. However, when the term is conceived in a more value-
neutral way as an integral facet of human experience at both personal and societal
levels, it can be regarded as a significant force in shaping personal identity and inter-
group relationships. This broader conceptual view of conflict emphasises that people
can plan and organise to deal with it in many different ways besides basic instinctive
responses such as fighting, taking fright or taking flight. Thus, while there is a
general trend to associate conflict with destructive behaviour, this can overshadow an
appreciation of it as a phenomenon that can equally be dealt with in constructive and
creative ways.

In this thesis I propose that our understanding of the phenomenon of conflict as an
essential and universal aspect of a great deal of social activity can be accommodated
within a world-wide paradigm. The reason is that conflict can manifest in different
ways in a range of contexts world-wide and these manifestations are inevitably
culturally and socially determined. Conflict can be expressed in a range of ways that
are as diverse as human cultures and social systems themselves.

However, I further propose that the social phenomenon of \textit{violent} conflict that is
perpetuated through hostile attitudes and destructive behaviours warrants
accommodation within a global paradigm to reflect that its contemporary forms pose a
more general threat to the entire global community.
The Role of Science in Defining How Communities can Deal with Conflict

Scientific inquiry relating to the natural and the social world helps us attribute meaning to profound problems and how we might look for solutions. The development of scientific methods, institutions, and means for research and discovery has made it possible for many people to transcend their present spatial and temporal circumstances and develop a wider understanding of our ever-changing world. However, there are markedly different interpretations of the way social forces shape our ideas about ourselves and how we relate with each other as well as how we relate with the natural world.

Science has directly or indirectly guided many people's thinking in order to grasp a sense of how we have developed and applied new technologies and created complex bureaucratic organisations that shape our built environments and our use of natural resources. Scientific inquiry, and the technologies that it has made possible, have contributed significantly to our capacity to conceive of broader horizons and new possibilities. In one sense they have emancipated people from a reliance on one immediate local worldview. However, these same scientific and technological developments also heighten our awareness of how individual attitudes and behaviours can have far-reaching consequences in the more extensive global context. This increased capacity to think about events taking place elsewhere triggers a need to review the extent to which we have moral and ethical obligations in terms of the way communities relate to one another. While a broader outlook helps us to appreciate the impact of human activity in the world as a basis for making predictions about our future, it is increasingly harder for people to conceive of an imagined future for themselves without also taking account the community-at-large framed in global terms.

Wallerstein defines modern science as the child of capitalism. He claims that science has been dependent upon it, not only for its advancement, but also for the direction in which it can advance.

Scientists received social sanction and support because they offered the prospect of concrete improvements in the real world, wonderful machinery that would foster productivity and reduce the constraints that time and space seemed to impose, and greater comfort for everyone. Science worked. A whole world view was created to surround this scientific activity. Scientists were said to be, adjured to be, "disinterested." Scientists were said to be, adjured to be, "empirical." Scientists were said to be, adjured to be, in search of "universal" truths. Scientists were said to be, adjured to be, the discoverers of the "simple." They were called upon to analyze complex realities and establish the simple, the simplest, underlying rules governing
them. And finally, perhaps most important of all, scientists were said to be, adjured to be, uncoverers of efficient causes and not of final causes. Furthermore, all these descriptions and adjunctions were said to form a package; they had to be taken together.\textsuperscript{39}

Wallerstein further claims that modern social science was born as the intellectual pendant of liberal ideology. He frames the problem of the future role and purpose of social science being a matter of whether it remains tied to the concept of liberalism. If it does so, it will become obsolete in the same way that he predicts liberalism will be transformed into another ideology dictated by the changes within the world-system itself. According to Wallerstein:

Social science built itself upon the premise of social optimism. Can it find something to say in an era that will be marked by social pessimism?\textsuperscript{40}

Wallerstein sees the need for social scientists to make a transformation or become socially irrelevant. He holds to the belief that the key element for making the transformation to serve the needs of a changing world is to return the concept of substantive rationality to the centre of our intellectual concerns. He suggests that to do this it will be necessary to acknowledge that:

...science is not and cannot be disinterested, since scientists are socially rooted and can no more escape their minds than their bodies. It must recognize that empiricism is not innocent, but always presumes some a priori commitments. It must recognize that our truths are not universal truths, and that if there exist universal truths they are complex, contradictory, and plural. It must recognize that science is not the search for the simple, but the search for the most plausible interpretation of the complex... It must finally accept that rationality involves the choice of a moral politics, and that the role of the intellectual class is to illuminate the historical choices that we collectively have.\textsuperscript{41}

Irrespective of whether people take an optimistic or a pessimistic view of the way globalisation requires shifts in conventional thinking, it is likely that most of us will be required to change our image of world events. We will be required to make certain re-evaluations about where we are placed, the degree to which we feel secure, what creates our sense of security, and how we see that the security of other people influences our own. Deudney, for instance, writing about linkages between security and environmental issues, asserts that in the "conventional national security mentality" others are the enemy while in the environmental arena, "we" not "they" are the enemy.\textsuperscript{42}

Constructions in the social sciences have come up against the problem of developing sufficiently broad generic frameworks for scoping profound problems. It is necessary to examine whether, in keeping with Wallerstein's explanation, conventional scientific approaches are constrained by standards as to what is satisfactory science, and
whether it is the standards which are themselves becoming outmoded. In our rapidly-changing and increasingly interactive world, it is necessary to pose the question as to whether precedents from the past, including our former approaches to scientific investigation, necessarily serve as an adequate basis for assisting communities to understand how to institute processes which focus on achieving a sustainable future.

How Realist and Idealist Paradigms Influence Scientific Explanations About Profound Problems

This thesis explores prospects for developing innovative theoretical means to conceptualise and generalise about problems at different scales of understanding. The point is to try and establish bases that allow for a greater degree of optimism about our capacity to find solutions. Two aspects of this idea are discussed at this stage. The first concerns the way paradigms establish the frame of reference governing scientific inquiry about problems entailing conflict. This aspect is particularly concerned with the way problems are expressed in terms of scale and what should be an appropriate frame of reference in which to situate ideas about the way locally determined problems have a cumulative impact on larger systems. The second aspect concerns the way paradigms influence the methodological approach to understanding conflict as a subject of scientific inquiry. This second aspect is more concerned with the way the nature of conflict and responses to it are qualitatively defined. This thesis takes a comparative approach to explore the significance of paradigms described as realist and idealist approaches. Ideas about the way we scope and frame profound problems reflect the need to question whose understandings matter and, particularly with regard to reporting processes, what considerations are included and what is excluded.

The paradigm of political realism, or realist paradigm, has a predominant influence on the way we conceptualise contemporary problems at broad scales of analysis. It is most notably employed in scholarship relating to international relations or the internal dynamics operating within individual nation-states. In contrast, the idealist paradigm, which scopes and frames conceptual ideas in terms of the autotelic value of individual and societal health and well-being, has most notably been elaborated in contemporary peace research and conflict resolution scholarship. I argue that realist approaches are more inclined to frame ideas about conflict, including violent conflict, within a world-wide paradigm whereas the idealist approach is more inclined to frame ideas about conflict, particularly violent conflict, in global terms.
Realism tends to conceptualise social and political entities in direct relationship to the way in which we conceptualise physical entities. For many, the Western world political map has been somewhat superimposed onto a geographical understanding of the world. This leads to a tendency to treat natural as well as social entities in terms of certain boundaries where activity takes place in a relatively independent way.\textsuperscript{45} However, treating sovereign nation-states as fully independent entities can constrain the way we conceptualise social and ecological problems.\textsuperscript{46}

The need for what Speth calls a 'moral revolution' has resonance with my argument for developing a comparative approach and considering when and how to systematically integrate ideas generated according to an \textit{idealistic} approach in relation to those expressed in the prevailing \textit{realistic} paradigm. The trend toward globalisation suggests that frames of reference defined in terms of a system of nation-states no longer necessarily serve as useful bases for defining many of the world's common problems and whose interests and values scientists need to take account of. I propose that a 'moral revolution' has limited usefulness unless it is accompanied by an 'intellectual revolution'. This can only be achieved by exploring the validity of ideas founded on alternative conceptual bases. The concept developed in this thesis of integrating an \textit{idealistic} paradigm at least makes allowance for taking equal account of values as a basis for attributing meaning to conflict compared with the primary stress on interests that applies in the \textit{realistic} approach.\textsuperscript{47}

The comparative approach is taken primarily to demonstrate that there are different ways of approaching the topic of \textit{violent} conflict and that it is not constructive to think about its impact on the present or the future solely in terms of just one paradigm. Political \textit{realism} maintains such a predominant hegemonic influence in the contemporary world it follows that this has a profound influence on the development of scientifically constructed arguments about the way people understand the concept of conflict, and the significance of \textit{violent} conflict. According to Ling:

\begin{quote}
Feminists and other critical theorists have led the charge against such realist 'one-worldism'. First, they have identified this perspective as precisely that. Neither an objective law of nature nor an intrinsic element of the human condition, realist one-worldism is but one representation of the world. Its longevity relies on a deceptively simple self-justification: that is, because realists believe that the world is nasty, brutish, lonely, poor, and short, they behave accordingly, thereby ensuring that the world is, indeed, so, which, in turn, affirms their belief that the world is nasty, brutish, lonely, poor, and short. Meanwhile, realists proclaim loudly their goal of averting a global holocaust by entrenching us further into this one-world logic - of which the latest manifestation is rational choice theory.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}
If we are to broaden our framework of understanding to consider agency defined in terms other than nation-states, identify interests in terms other than national interests or identify values in terms other than political or economic values, we have to first clarify what underlying paradigm is guiding scientific inquiry. Guzzini makes the point that paradigms have a significant influence on the language used in scholarship for defining both problems and their potential solutions:

.. the feedback from the language of practitioners, in which the opposition between idealism and realism still prevails as the foundational dichotomy, makes such attempts difficult indeed and seems to undermine one of the alleged strengths of realism classically conceived: the closeness of the academic with the practitioners’ language.... This leaves us with the cost in terms of communicability, or shared experience, with regard to the world of practice. This is perhaps the deepest issue the discipline of IR [International Relations] is facing today... Reflexivity is hence not only a characteristic of the scholarly observer. Rather, the double negation and the concomitant acceptance of a self-observing component which problematises the idealism-realism divide, has been already part and parcel of world politics. Indeed, this reflexivity has arguably been at least an important factor in shaping the end of the Cold War in Europe...Refusing to admit this does reify a language about world politics which does not necessarily hold. If consciously done, it is not a historical statement, but a normative argument about how world politics should be thought of.\textsuperscript{49}

Guzzini describes realism as being, on the one hand, anti-ideal, on the basis that those who support it see its role to be that of defending the status quo.\textsuperscript{50} However, he stresses that realism can also be considered to be anti-apparent, on the basis that its role is to look questioningly or even suspiciously at alternative voices in order to determine what is hidden behind the smokescreen of ideologies. He describes this as a reluctance to treat beautiful ideas as what they claim to be. This second way in which realism justifies itself actually puts what is allegedly self-evident into the limelight of criticism.\textsuperscript{51}

Whether ideas are scoped in world-wide or global terms influences the scale we apply when conceiving conflict as a problem as well as conceiving potential strategies for addressing it. Our conceptual approach to the matter of scale inter-relates with and has a consequent bearing on methodological treatments we employ, which influence our framing of conflict in qualitative terms. The conceptual approach has a bearing on whether conflict is treated as an essential element of normal social living or whether certain elements relating to the impact of violent conflict on social life are singled out for special treatment. The comparative approach taken in this thesis is used to critique the way that underlying paradigms have a bearing on how conflict is treated. Some treatments emphasise a concern with maintaining social cohesion while others emphasise a concern about the capacity for hostile attitudes and violent behaviours to escalate and profoundly destabilise social relations.
When the prevailing *realist* conceptual approach is employed, it is more likely that questions will primarily be posed, and answers sought, through the employment of normative and functionalist theories.\(^{52}\) They are generated to develop capacity to understand the ordering of social experience. However, they tend toward a world-wide approach because social problems are generally framed in terms of one or more national contexts that collectively comprise the international system.

Normative approaches identify core socialisation experiences in order to indicate how they are responsible for the creation and reinforcement of accepted attitudes and behaviours, particularly those that contribute to maintaining social cohesion. However, the validity of normative theory is limited by the number of people who recognise that the understandings generated through such frameworks are relevant for them.\(^ {53}\) This is because the implicit purpose is to provide readers with guides as to what choices are actually available, and to help people make the most appropriate decisions. This tends to be based on understanding derived through systematic investigation of certain norms and values embodied in certain political institutions, social practices and theoretical reflections that are meaningful within a particular social context, usually a national context. Thus normative theory tends to serve as a guide as to which norms or standards of behaviour ought to be followed, or conversely, what behaviours are being enacted and whether they should comply with particular norms or standards.\(^ {54}\)

On the other hand, functionalist theories emphasise the interdependence of different parts of a social system.\(^ {55}\) The implicit purpose in this theoretical approach is to enable readers to conceptualise how components of a system can either be integrated or differentiated from one another. This helps us understand how society is ordered and how it functions. Functionalist theories thus tend to emphasise the social cohesion that holds societies together.\(^ {56}\) Structural-functionalism\(^ {57}\) takes this idea further and draws on insights about broader structures in societies that are inherently resistant to change and thus they contribute to our understanding of broader longer-term social continuities.

The purpose of normative and functionalist approaches to scientific investigation is to help us understand whether people take for granted the same ideas and accept their present roles and functions in society and whether they are willing to comply with certain values and social norms. They also help us understand whether people share
a common belief that social order will be achieved through certain processes of socialisation, education and sanctions and the extent to which there is consensus that the anticipated direction of change is actually the desired direction of change. However, it is questionable whether normative and functionalist approaches to scientific investigation have the capacity to address issues that are global in scale. They can be construed to be relatively uncritical props that serve the purposes of the status quo, primarily at the national level of social life. At the same time they can be construed to actually inhibit a more critical concern with regard to broader social dynamics operating beyond national boundaries that can equally be conceived as driving forces that precipitate change.

As a counter to the criticisms of the theoretically constructed categories that normative and functionalist theories have taken to be most valid, postmodernism has shifted the focus away from theory seeking grand universal explanations about human activity and more toward a focus on local knowledge, diversity and difference. Thus there is a trend for the fragmentation of theory with a tendency to make the role of individuals the locus. Postmodernism challenges the notion of human certainty in moral, scientific or political aspects of social life. It thus serves as a valuable means of critiquing modernist ideology. However, it can also be construed to be nihilistic because it does not offer a coherent alternative to modernism in terms of how we confront and address profound collective problems that can be appreciated as problems about which we need to expand and share our understanding.

The theoretical approaches outlined above help to understand and explain the nature of conflict in everyday social life. However, it is questionable whether it is sufficient to rely only on these conventional realist-based approaches developed within mainstream disciplines when it comes to understanding and explaining the more pressing problem of inter-group conflict that has become significantly violent in character. It is necessary to explore different methodological approaches that help to understand and explain social dysfunction and instability. For instance, constructions that take a Marxist approach maintain a concern with the role of conflict to precipitate change in social structures. However, they do not necessarily encompass a sufficiently broad spectrum of ideas about the nature of conflict itself because they are less inclined to evaluate its positive and negative elements in relation to one another. Conventionally accepted studies of conflict tend to foster an essentially negative view of social relations because the defining purpose is more often to
identify social dynamics that perpetuate inequality and injustice in society. There is a strong emphasis on social pathologies, how systems create elites who use their social position to foster particular views and protect particular advantaged positions through the exertion of force over the disadvantaged. This approach is not necessarily balanced. While problems such as inequality and disempowerment are identified, there is relatively little exploration as to whether there are alternative strategies beyond certain accepted mechanisms or forms of agency for bringing about transformational change. For instance, in response to the question of what mechanisms might bring about a more sustainable distribution of wealth, power and capacity for self-determination, answers tend to focus on either gradual reform through conventional governing mechanisms, or otherwise radical coercive revolutionary change. Such approaches primarily frame social activity in terms of political and economic interests and frame explanations about the role of conflict primarily in terms of coercive power. This thesis reflects a need to think in terms of a general framework of understanding in which a third mechanism, mediated negotiation, is conceived as an equally viable strategic option to gradual reform or revolution.

One major shortfall in conventional approaches is that insufficient attention is given to analytical processes whose purpose is to review and critique widely accepted concepts and terminology. Terms such as 'conflict', 'peace' and 'violence' are the intellectual tools that underpin the development of a more generic understanding of conflict as a social phenomenon. However, these very terms are often applied in a relatively unscientific, limited or uncritical way so as to leave their specific meanings ambiguous. This shortfall is reflected in the way studies concerning conflict generated in mainstream disciplines remain relatively disconnected from those generated in peace research and conflict resolution studies. The lack of integration of these different theoretical approaches limits opportunities for critical review and refinement of accepted terminology fundamental to this field of inquiry. The issue that is left most ambiguous through this lack of convergence in scientific discourse is the relationship between what could be construed to be the negative and positive spectrums of understanding embedded in essential terminology.

One theorist whose approach incorporates both the positive and negative dimensions in order to analyse conflict more constructively is Boulding, who attributes meaning to 'three faces of power' as illustrated in Fig. 1. Besides theorising about political or authoritative power as power 'over' and economic power as power 'to', he gives equal
attention to integrative power as power 'with', to represent the aspect of power maintained at the personal level of social interaction. Boulding argues that the positive and negative dimensions of integrative power have a significant influence over the way people generate and maintain their own individual attitudes and behaviours. The positive aspects are reflected in how people maintain a sense of their own worth as well as their capacity to respect, love and care for other people. The negative aspects are reflected in a sense of alienation and individual capacity to feel enmity or hatred toward others. Giving equal attention to this third form of power highlights that human agency is not only directed through political or economic activity. Boulding has deconstructed the notion of power and created a model that allows for a range of aspects to be taken into account simultaneously.

![Fig. 1: Three Faces of Power (Boulding, 1989)](Image)

Although *ideal*ist approaches tend to emerge through scholarship concerned with actual or potential violent conflict, they necessarily have to be equally concerned with ideas about the continuance of or the attainment of social cohesion. The tendency is to situate a range of ideas about cooperation and conflict within a health model to allow ideas about social well-being to be related to ideas about social pathologies. The way that Boulding develops his conceptual ideas about power relations is a good indication of this inclusive approach. It reflects a tendency in peace and conflict research to take equal account of both the positive and negative directions in which conflict can be channelled. The use of a health model allows for the development of relatively abstract conceptual understandings about particular pathologies that in some way threaten what could otherwise be described as a healthy state. An analogy can be drawn between an illness where the pathology is to excise the cause of diminishing well-being. Conventional health science models promote the
development of scientific understanding of particular pathologies that in some way threaten the health of individuals. Pathologies are represented as the dysfunctional state of an organism, one that compromises its normal adaptive evolving functioning. This approach makes it possible to explain why an organism cannot do what it is supposed to do. Peace and conflict research has sought to apply the health model to develop scientific understanding about pathologies that threaten the health of the world we inhabit as an adaptive evolving functioning system.

An idealist approach where the purpose is to explain social cohesion and social pathologies in terms of the value of health at different societal levels provides a basis for critiquing how these concepts are treated in conventional realist-based theoretical constructions. A process of comparison can reveal whether certain conceptual understandings and terminology can be seen to differ. The idealist approach provides a basis for critiquing different understandings about the management of social conflict, who should be managing it and for what purpose.

This idea can be applied, for instance, to explanations concerning the social pathology of terrorism. Conceptual understandings in the health model would most likely differ from those developed through political realism. To identify its causes explanation would focus on the underlying factors that allow the pathology to occur. This would provide the basis for speculating how it might be excised, not only by averting the actions of actual terrorists but also by alleviating the root causes so as to make it less likely to re-emerge and recur in future. The Peace and Conflict Report, 2003 states:

A study of terrorism covering the ten years prior to the September 11, 2001, al Qaeda attacks in the US found that “distant-international” terrorism, that is, attacks by terrorists in countries that do not share a border with the terrorists’ home country, accounted for only about a half of one percent of all terrorism-related deaths. Curiously, the general trend in international terrorism shows a substantial decline in both the number of incidents and number of deaths from the 1980s to the 1990s (up to the September 11, 2001 attacks). Terrorism, as a form of rebellion, lives and breeds from the attention it receives. The real danger posed by terrorism is its potential for instigating the polarization, radicalization, and escalation of conflict. The transformation of the “global war on terrorism” to a “clash of civilizations,” a transformation which has already gained prominence in war rhetoric, would most certainly lead to a major reversal of established trends in warfare, democratization, and prosperity.

This thesis argues that there is another emerging field of research that calls for the application of the health model in this way. Given that global problems are increasingly conceptualised as sustainability issues, the proposed approach constructively integrates the framework of peace and conflict studies with that where
scientific knowledge is developed by maintaining the concept of sustainability as much as peace as its source of legitimacy. This is feasible because most definitions of sustainability suggest an aspiration to promote development that improves the quality of life in such a way that the actual life-support systems on which all life depends are sustained. There are parallel objectives in these fields of research because both are exploring how to foster a communal sense of stewardship to safeguard individual and communal needs for well-being.

Understandably scientists tend to view the world through the lens of their own society. Nevertheless, there are common global interests as well as local interests or the interests of individual nation-states that need to be served through scientific inquiry. If part of the role of science is to consider the prospect that our future will be based on different conceptualisations of reality from those that have applied in the past then scholars are now obliged to confront the need for shifts in perspective in order to grapple with large-scale changes in the global social system. They will be required to identify how locally determined issues cumulatively contribute to broader trends.\textsuperscript{68}

We rely on more conventional theoretical constructions and approaches to attribute meaning to social cohesion, the way social life is ordered and structured within particular national contexts that make up a world-wide system. However, the trend toward globalisation will increasingly require us to think in terms of the cohesiveness of social systems conceived in global terms. Scientific explanations about the way violent conflict and unsustainable practices create and perpetuate instability have to be framed within a theoretical domain of relative uncertainty. This suggests that alongside ideas about social cohesion and a prevailing set of norms and values there is a corresponding need to recognise and acknowledge the possibilities of social instability and the emergence of more extreme radical attitudes and behaviours.

This thesis argues that there are cases where a comparative approach is needed to review and critique ideas derived according to different conceptual frameworks. However, it also acknowledges that attempts to legitimate 'alternative' conceptual and theoretical approaches that are not solely reliant on conventional state-centric political realism tend to be criticised for a lack of an encompassing definitive framework. Cox points out that a problem with advocating an alternative critical perspective is that the very nature of "alternative" is diversity and non-conformity. Thus he highlights:

There can be no single "alternative perspective" nor any "alternative school". "Alternative" is a residual category for all who are not considered to be "mainstream". It has a clearer exclusionary meaning for those who consider themselves to be "mainstream" than it does for those who are so excluded.\textsuperscript{69}
The lack of a definitive framework can in part be attributed to the fact that normative social science theory is implicitly biased to assume that processes of problem-solving, that is, prescriptions to address conflict, will be undertaken primarily through the agency of predominant realist institutions, that is, through the mechanisms of the conservative status quo. However, this assumption does not take full account of more radical approaches both to explain conflict, such as those developed in peace research, and attribute meaning to responses to deal with conflict, such as those developed in applied conflict resolution studies. I argue that realist framings tend to emphasise the role of 'official' strategic responses to conflict but that there is a valid need to integrate idealist framings particularly because they offer important insights about the role of 'non-official' mediated or negotiated responses.

**Comparing Conservative Processes Instituted to Maintain Social Cohesion with Radical Processes Instituted as Responses to Conflict**

In Western-oriented thinking, there is a strong reliance on conventional political and legal models that serve to establish what behaviours are sanctioned and to describe how certain behaviours need to be enforceably controlled. Within this framework social policy and judicial processes represent formal attempts within national contexts to define distinctions between individual freedoms and social restraints, and determine a balance between social disorder and authoritarian social control. However, serious social or environmental conflicts represent challenges to existing political and legal models and our understanding of them cannot necessarily be encompassed within existing nationalist-based frameworks. When conflict takes on an overwhelming significance, it becomes much less certain how interpretive distinctions should be made between norms and deviances from norms, particularly when problems are conventionally defined in the arena of administrative policy-making.

Modern forms of globalisation employ technologies that increase the speed at which information can be transferred through communication networks and this in turn increases the speed at which change can occur. This also increases the demands placed on existing formal institutional structures and bureaucracies to accommodate change and make adjustments and modifications. In widely diverse situations around the world, people are finding it increasingly difficult to make sharp separations between the political, economic, legal, social and environmental aspects of complex problems. Schön notes increasing difficulties with problem-solving perspectives when social situations have turned out to be more complex than was supposed. He
suggests that a sense of inadequacy has begun to spread among practitioners of social policy and among the public at large. According to Schön, it becomes increasingly doubtful in the case of social policy that we can make accurate temporal predictions or design models that converge upon a true description of reality.74

This tendency is reflected in the way Hannigan75 analyses how societies construct ideas about, and deal with the matter of environmental risk. He suggests that functionalist approaches tend to conceptualise environmental issues within existing power structures. They are thus readily identifiable, distinctive and visibly objective conditions that require the application of scientific methods to locate and analyse what are deemed to be moral violations, and for scientists to advise policy-makers on how best to cope. However, he suggests that despite the contributions social scientists have to offer, "far too often they end up as 'underlabourers' in this endeavour, being viewed as supporting actors in a cast dominated by natural scientists and environmental policy-makers".76 His proposal that political economy is not enough to explain how debates are formed and transformed has resonance with the ideas developed in this thesis. He suggests that social scientists need to take a more constructionist approach when explaining how issues are assembled, presented and contested in order to emphasise that the production of knowledge needs to be undertaken within a framework that is realistic about its fallibility.77

These ideas can be appreciated as reflections of the tension between positive and negative perceptions of problems, which leads in turn to different perceptions of the efficacy of strategies to deal with them. This thesis brings together ideas about problems and the potential for finding enduring solutions by examining perceptions of conventional 'official' processes in relation to ideas about negotiated 'non-official' processes. Findings in the Peace and Conflict Report 2003 indicate a trend to use mediated negotiation more and more. It is increasingly being used in well-regulated societies as an alternative to judicial processes, as well as in situations of greater social instability as an alternative to problem-solving initiatives predominantly controlled by 'official' political entities:

..mediation characterized only 30% of earlier crises, but was used by the international community in attempting to bring about a resolution in 60% of post-Cold War crises. This parallels other evidence on the general move in recent years toward mediated management of social conflicts. Mediation appears to be particularly prevalent when territorial issues are in contention, when crises are characterized by multiple issues, when ethnicity is involved, when crisis actors are geographically contiguous, when crises occur at the sub-system rather than the dominant system level, and when extreme violence, usually at the level of fullscale war, has occurred.78
This trend toward the use of 'non-official' mediated negotiations, which in this thesis are described as 'resolutionary' processes, reflects a growing recognition that formal political or judicial processes are not the only strategies people are willing to try to move beyond intransigent, polarised and hostile attitudes and behaviours.

It is proposed that it is becoming increasingly important to critique the way that different types of interventionist processes are explained in terms of the influence they bring to bear on conflict. This analysis takes into consideration a second shortfall in mainstream approaches to the study of conflict, which concerns the relationship between descriptive conflict theory and applied conflict theory. It is argued that there is a need to take a comparative approach to show that there are differences in the way the relationship between descriptive theory and applied theory is developed in realist and idealist approaches.

During the Cold War era there was a tendency for scholars in the field of international relations, such as Morgenthau, to take relatively little heed of theoretical developments in the field of peace research and applied conflict resolution studies. The tendency was to play down theoretical ideas concerning the nature of conflict and potential strategies for resolving it that have been legitimated in terms of their relationship to the concept of peace by scholars such as Galtung, Azar, Burton and Boulding. In part this can be attributed to the fact that their more radical constructions do not fit within the parameters of conventional realist discourse, which is more inclined to frame and scope ideas about conflict and change primarily in terms of political institutions and political solutions. The underlying implication is that it is naive to draw conclusions that do not take primary account of present realities in terms of hegemonies and hierarchies of political power as a basis for dealing with conflict. However, like other terminology, concepts such as ‘naivety’ or ‘wishful thinking’ themselves require critical review. Consideration has to be given to the context in which they are being applied before construing that certain understandings of present realities are more significant, and that certain ideas about present realities are more valid as a basis for speculating about future realities.

With regard to the use of descriptive theory to explain how conflicts are played out, I argue that to understand the trend toward 'non-official' mediated negotiations, it is not enough to rely solely on realist-based frameworks. The role that 'resolutionary' processes play in changing a conflict may not be adequately explained within its
parameters, which are inclined to focus on the capacity of 'official' political or judicial processes to find solutions or settlements. Sole reliance on realist-based explanations about the role of 'resolutionary' processes poses the problem that they can simply be described as quasi-political processes. They will still only be explained in terms of national interests and, implicitly, contextualised within the broad framework of the world-wide international system. This framing does not make allowance for the possibility that the outcomes of mediated processes of negotiation reflect a trend toward thinking in terms of different types of confederations or coalitions. A different set of explanations is likely to be generated if the role of 'resolutionary' processes is described according to an idealist framework as generated through peace research and conflict resolution studies. This is because the purpose of such processes is often expressed as a way for protagonists themselves to be assisted to look for the most mutually acceptable outcomes and the processes are often legitimated in terms of the value given to the parties' ongoing health and well-being.

I argue that in order to be able to satisfactorily describe the third party role played by mediators and the way that 'resolutionary' processes are conducted it is necessary to appreciate that many of the essential ideas are generated through applied conflict resolution theory. They emerge through a particular type of relationship between theory and practice generated through a scholar-practitioner nexus that is elaborated in this thesis. When scholars become directly involved as third party mediators, they are in a unique position to articulate the characteristics of 'resolutionary' processes so that they can be clearly differentiated from those of 'official' political or judicial processes. Both can be represented as interventionist responses to address conflict, yet they differ in their practices, and correspondingly they differ in terms of the way supporting theory is generated.

The comparative approach developed in this thesis highlights that integrating different conceptual and theoretical approaches is likely to be most crucial in circumstances where finding sustainable solutions will require some degree of complementarity between 'official' and 'non-official' strategies.

The Role of Social Scientists as Scholar-Reporters to Explain Interventionist Strategies - By Whom and for Whom?

This thesis further proposes that it is increasingly important to critique the way that different types of interventionist processes to address conflict are reported on. Reports can be generated and disseminated through many channels, including
'official' institutions, non-government organisations and the popular media. However, there is particular focus on those situations where scholars are assigned to compile reports to explain an intervention. It is thus assumed that such reporting is based on knowledge and authority upheld as legitimate within scientific discourse. It will reflect particular ontological considerations, inherent assumptions about the nature of reality, as well as epistemological considerations, the actual learning process through which particular theoretical approaches are developed. These considerations become most critical and problematic when reports relate to circumstances involving conflict that challenge previously accepted practices and conventions. In the light of previous discussion relating to global trends, a key issue will be: to whom are scholar-reporters who compile reports or accounts of social processes involving conflict accountable in a globalising world? An important aspect of this problem is how scholar-reporters will indicate their capacity to make discernments with regard to terms such as 'objective', 'impartial', 'apolitical' or 'independent' that are used to describe the purpose of reports so that they can reflexively indicate their own particular approach to reporting.

**An Integrated Framework as a Bridge toward a Paradigm Shift**

Scholar-reporters are likely to be increasingly confronted with the problem of deciding when it no longer seems appropriate to scope and frame contentious issues in a conventional way and then what approach might offer another meaningful perspective. Circumstances could suggest that understandings that are reliant on mainstream normative or functionalist approaches have limited applicability when pre-existing social norms are being seriously challenged or where there is a perception that circumstances either entail or could lead to a profound degree of dysfunction. The approach that is taken will depend on whether interpretations of present realities are inclined to view particular conflicts as an aspect of normal social living or otherwise whether they reflect a state of affairs that cannot be characterised according to a pre-existing set of social norms and values.

Kuhn suggests that 'normal' science is governed by paradigms, or "universally recognised scientific achievements that... provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners." Accepted paradigms tend not to be questioned or criticised even when contradictions seem apparent. On the other hand what he terms 'revolutionary' science tends to develop when scientists are confronted by increasingly perplexing anomalies, which call into question the existing paradigm, and the possibility of employing a new paradigm emerges:
Like the choice between competing political institutions, that between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life. Because it has that character, the choice is not and cannot be determined merely by the evaluative procedures characteristic of normal science, for those depend in part upon a particular paradigm and that paradigm is at issue. When paradigms enter, as they must, into a debate about paradigm choice, their role is necessarily circular. Each group uses its own paradigm to argue in that paradigm’s defence.82

Thus new paradigms do not gain acceptance through a process of critical argument that takes place between proponents of competing paradigms. Kuhn suggests that paradigm shifts are conversions requiring sociological and psychological categories for their explanation, rather than the more conventional process of rational reconstructions of ideas, which are still subject to the same accepted standards of scientific rationality.83

This could suggest that the purpose in generating alternative theoretical explanation is to develop criteria to support a claim for abandoning the prevailing predominant approach. However, Feyerabend poses that, even if explanations derived through conventional theory seem to be increasingly contradictory, there is still the problem of articulating why at one particular stage rather than another an assertion should be made for abandoning the prevailing paradigm. To overcome this problem he suggests the adoption of a ‘principle of proliferation’.84 In this way alternative theories are generated in order to shift the focus away from recurrent testing of the dominant theory, and thereby fulfil the broader purpose of proliferating counter-evidence to that which is conventionally derived. He thus views proliferation as more beneficial for science than uniformity, which impairs its critical power.85

It is unlikely that a Kuhnian paradigm shift86 will necessarily come about in a timely way through which to re-frame the significance of contemporary social and environmental conflicts and their potential impact on the global community. Therefore, more in keeping with Feyerabend,87 it is proposed that scholarly reporting about the interventionist processes that people employ to deal with significant conflicts requires an integrated framework that develops capacity to generate counter-evidence derived according to different conceptual and theoretical constructions. In this way explanations generated through peace research and conflict resolution studies based on an idealist framework do not have to be put forward as a wholly alternative set of explanations at the expense of those generated through more mainstream disciplines based on a realist framework. Adopting a comparative approach in scholarly reporting means that conventional approaches do
not have to be relinquished. However, it helps to establish that, despite the prevailing hegemony of realism, it cannot necessarily be implied that there are no other viable approaches that are equally worthy of consideration. Allowance is made to acknowledge firstly that different scientific approaches have their own strengths and weaknesses and secondly that each approach makes its own valid contribution to our understanding of the role that conflict plays in social life. An integrated framework can be used to develop a basis for challenging whether predictions and outcomes based solely on more conventional theoretical constructions entail contradiction and inconsistency.

One of the most compelling reasons for developing the concept of an integrated approach through which to comparatively review different approaches and highlight distinctions in the way they scope and frame issues is to acknowledge and explore the prospect of complementarity between conservative and radical theoretical approaches.

**SECTION 2: METHODOLOGY AND CHAPTER OUTLINE**

The purpose of this section is to outline the methodological approach applied in this thesis and concurrently outline the chapter content. The methodology draws on principles developed in action research. As the term implies, action research is developed when social scientists assume the roles of both researcher and actor in such a way that human reasoning as well as behaviour becomes the basis for generating a theory of action. The methodology involves processes of experiential learning that are both cyclic and emergent, where the purpose is to improve on an understanding of practice. In this case it relates to the practice of producing scholarly reports about interventions. Argyris and Schön propose that there are two significant theories of action, each of which requires cycles of planning, acting, reflecting and responding. The first is described as theory-in-use, which involves a single-loop cycle of learning, while the second is described as espoused theory, which requires a double-loop cycle. Single-loop learning tends to pose problems within a particular framework and focus on what should or could happen within certain preset understandings of the governing variables. The single-loop approach is applied as a basis for reflecting on how techniques could be made more effective or efficient. However, in this thesis the double-loop learning approach is applied because the problem that is posed is as much concerned with subjecting the
framework itself and its governing variables to critical scrutiny and questioning whether conventional understandings constrain capacity to consider potential improvements in practice. The underlying assumption is that there is a need for a shift in the way the practice of producing scholarly reports is framed.

The methodology is described in terms of five stages that are outlined below, namely, compiling the case study report, clarifying the research topic, developing theoretical propositions, using the case study to test the credibility of the theoretical propositions and summarising the outcomes.

Stage One – Compiling the Case Study Report
The initial stage in the cycle developed when I was commissioned to produce an independent scholarly review that I have termed the case study report (included as Appendix "A"). The report relates to a consultative process that involved representatives from all Aboriginal native title claimant groups throughout South Australia. In 2000, I was appointed by the Native Title Unit (NTU) of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement of South Australia (ALRM) to participate in, and report on this process. Its general purpose was authoritatively established by native title claimant group representatives at a preliminary meeting at Port Augusta, South Australia, in February 2000. At the meeting, the South Australian Attorney General indicated that the government he represented was serious about negotiating native title on a statewide basis rather than having each individual claim determined through the courts. He indicated that it was necessary to hear what Aboriginal people themselves had to say with respect to this proposal. Therefore his state government was willing to financially and practically support consultations in order that claimants had an opportunity to consider the proposal in more detail and hopefully come to a decision through consensus. Claimants authorised the NTU to organise meetings that would allow each of the claimant groups' Native Title Management Committees (NTMCs) to be consulted. This authorisation reflected the purpose of the process undertaken between July and November 2000.

In my role as a scholar appointed to produce an independent review of the process I established with the facilitation team, working under the auspices of the NTU, how they conceived their role. It was to assist claimants develop their understanding about, and make distinctions between, alternative processes through which it is possible for native title rights to now be granted in Australia to Indigenous communities. The facilitation of this process was to serve the purpose of allowing
claimants to make an informed decision as to whether, as an alternative to having individual claims determined through the courts, they would collectively accept the proposal to negotiate.

I already had grounding in theory about interventionist processes for addressing conflict and I sought to apply these ideas in practice in the production of the report. I maintained a participative role in the actual process as well as having been commissioned to report on it. I could therefore directly relate with the way that those involved, both the facilitative team and the participants in the process, came to develop a partnership.

I consciously treated my role as a scholar-reporter as the first stage in an action research methodology entailing sequential stages of planning, reflecting and responding in a double-loop learning process. I did so because I intuitively recognised that there were tensions and fundamental problems that were difficult to articulate and resolve within the nominated timeframe in which I was required to produce the report.

Stage Two – Clarifying the Research Topic
The subsequent stage of the methodology, after submitting the report for publication in January 2001, required me to reflect on and more clearly articulate those tensions that had formerly been too ambiguous to allow me to develop a precise research question. This required me to give consideration to the relationship between the intended purpose of my report and my own capacity as a scholar-reporter to accomplish that purpose.

For example, one aspect of the problem was whether the consultative process in South Australia should be characterised as an 'official' or a 'non-official' process. Another aspect was whether I should alternatively take a conventional or a more radical conceptual and theoretical approach as a basis for constructing the explanations in the report.

On the one hand, the facilitation team who commissioned its production envisaged that it should transparently reflect how the process addressed a certain aspect of a much broader cross-cultural social conflict in Australian society. One indication of this conflict is reflected in the formal recognition in 1992 by the High Court of Australia that at the time of settlement Indigenous peoples' values, rights and interests were
discounted through the fictitious legal doctrine of *terra nullius* (land of no-one). This ruling meant that henceforth in certain cases native title rights could be accorded recognition within the Australian common law. The report had to be relevant and meaningful for groups representative of the status quo that are used to reports following accepted convention. Thus it was important to bear in mind reporting styles that are constructed using normative and functional theoretical frameworks that accord with the norms, values and interests that are predominant in Australian society. However, sole reliance on a taken for granted *realist* conceptual framework of reporting would have forsaken its usefulness and meaningfulness for other groups involved whose social norms, values and interests were in a large number of cases at odds with those of the status quo. I was equally beholden to them to provide a meaningful report. I therefore sought to incorporate ideas based on an *idealist* frame of reference rather than reliance on just one basis of interpretation through which to convey ideas about the process. The fact that the process did not follow prescribed status quo precedents and rules and those participating were not required to follow accepted convention made it ambiguous as to how it should be characterised. It evolved and worked toward generating outcomes primarily through elicitive processes (rather than those that are more prescriptive and determinate) and thus it began in a relatively uncentred way. It was significant to highlight those aspects of the process that were indicative of a radical approach so that, by comparison, it could be appreciated as different from one that is more conservative.

The fundamental differences meant there was uncertainty as to what criteria would be appropriate for both explaining and assessing the efficacy of the process and the competence of the consultative team to facilitate it to best effect. It was the more radical features of the process that enabled recognition and consideration to be given to the norms, values and interests of the Aboriginal communities involved. I would therefore have actually forsaken transparency and accountability if I had simply framed the evolving ideas about the different means through which to deal with native title in a reporting format that simply mirrored those relating to conventional status quo processes.

I sought a frame of reference through which I could treat the consultative process as one that was a catalyst for social learning as much as it was a catalyst for social change. This was a significant feature of the way in which the process itself was initiated and developed. It was exemplified in the way the various stakeholder groups, the facilitation team and the claimant participants gradually developed their
understandings about its characteristics and purpose. The process itself went through stages involving planning, acting, observing, reflecting and responding. Thus each stage was a learning process that influenced how subsequent stages evolved. I intuitively recognised that there had to be a parallel between the way this dynamic participatory process itself developed and the way my ideas evolved in order to attribute meaning to it in the report.

Reflection on the inherent tensions at the time of actually compiling the report contributed to my capacity to identify the key considerations that would have a bearing on my research topic. The first of three major considerations is a reporter’s capacity to take an inter-disciplinary approach so as to draw on a broad range of conceptual and theoretical understandings. This would be necessary to attribute meaning to an intervention dealing with highly contestable social and environmental issues and difficult cross-cultural relationships. The second consideration is a reporter’s capacity to confront the inevitability of bias and the way that perceptions of bias would affect perceptions of the reporter’s commitment to fairness, transparency and independence. The third consideration is an apparent lack of research focusing on the development of clearer indications as to what constitutes credible scholarly reporting. I was confronted with the problem that I had no proven basis for gauging my own practical capacity to systematically assemble and structure the ideas that would contribute to giving meaning to an unprecedented process dealing with diverse and sometimes contradictory perceptions and ideas.

However, to arrive at a more precise research topic, there was a further aspect of this stage that followed on from the prior action in the double-loop methodological process. As well as reflecting on and more categorically identifying particular problems, it was also necessary to plan how to respond by giving consideration to where there is scope for prior action to serve as a basis for improving future practice. Argyris and Schön describe this as the stage in which consideration is given to change in the field of constancy, or convention, itself.\textsuperscript{90}

This stage is indicative of the descriptive element in this cyclic action research methodology, the emergence of a clearer articulation of the research topic. Section 1 of this chapter, the Introduction to this thesis, is an outcome of reflecting and planning how to respond to the problems that I identified with regard to the compilation of the case study report. It is an indication of why it is considered significant to seek improvement in the practice of producing scholarly reports. Thus previous stages
informed the next stage of the methodology, which is developed in Part I of this
thesis. This represents my prescriptive responses to those problems, the particular
propositions I develop to specify why certain improvements are required and how
they can be achieved.

Stage Three – Theoretical Propositions
Part I of this thesis contributes to the development of a broad framework of
understanding that can serve as a basis for critiquing the construction of scholarly
reports about interventions relating to significant social conflict or contentious
sustainability issues. The framework is developed for a purpose that goes beyond
simply critiquing the substance of reports. Its purpose can be described as
developing greater capacity to appreciate that there are different ways in which
scholars can undertake their reporting role, and that this will have a bearing on the
type of report that is produced. In this sense, the framework is developed to better
understand the purpose that a report is intended to serve. I further propose that it is
particularly useful as a basis for scholars to reflexively indicate the characteristics that
give a more precise meaning to the concept of an 'independent' report.

I have responded to the first consideration, concerning a reporter’s capacity to take an
inter-disciplinary approach when reporting about issues entailing significant conflict, in
Chapters Two and Three.

Chapter Two provides an indicative outline of theoretical approaches attributing
meaning to the causes and characteristics of conflict, which is more representative of
problem-identification. This chapter highlights variability in the way conflicts can be
framed and whether they are conceived to have a positive or a negative impact on
social life. The major contrasts are framings generated in mainstream behavioural
science disciplines and those generated through peace research. This chapter also
highlights variability in the way conflicts can be scoped. Some approaches attribute
meaning to conflict as it manifests within one immediate context directly in terms of
human agency while others represent it in more abstract general terms to depict the
way it has a bearing on social structures and systems. Realist approaches are more
inclined to contextualise conflict within the international or world-wide arena whereas
idealist approaches are more inclined toward a universalist or global view.

Chapter Three then outlines theoretical approaches attributing meaning to
intervention as a specific type of response initiated due to a perceived need to settle,
resolve or transform a conflict. It highlights the need to appreciate the differentiating characteristics of certain types of intervention. 'Official' forms are described as conservative because they are initiated through the institutions of the status quo and they are conducted in accordance with prescribed rules. Their purposes are likely to be relatively self-evident, because they are expressed through political and legal frameworks that are most meaningful within a national or an international context. This form has to be compared with 'non-official' interventions that can be described as more radical. A key consideration is that the characteristics and the defining purpose of 'non-official' interventions cannot be as self-evidently articulated as 'official' processes. In this thesis it is proposed that 'non-official' strategies can take two primary forms, 'resolutionary' or 'revolutionary'. 'Resolutionary' strategies are initiated to address conflict through voluntary, non-coercive engagement in processes facilitated by third party intermediaries. On the other hand, 'revolutionary' strategies employed by groups to impose settlements or resist the imposition of settlements are likely to involve significant force, coercion and violence. In this thesis, primary emphasis is given to the relationship between, and the differences between, 'official' conservative strategies and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' strategies. However, both necessarily have to be considered in the light of the potential risk that interventions can shift toward the more violent 'revolutionary' type, which carries a greater risk that circumstances will spiral toward increasingly polarised attitudes and destructive behaviours.

Chapter Three also highlights the need to distinguish between different scientific approaches through which theoretically constructed ideas about interventions are generated. Scientific approaches can have a conservative, or mainstream, orientation or otherwise a more radical orientation. It is proposed that conservative scientific approaches are more reliant on normative or functionalist frameworks reflecting the social norms, values and interests of the status quo. Ideas are more likely to be founded on a realist conceptual frame of reference because interventions are understood in the context of national interests situated within the broader context of the international or world-wide arena. On the other hand, It is proposed that understandings about the 'resolutionary' form of intervention are mainly generated through a scholar-practitioner nexus that is specific to applied conflict resolution studies. It is made possible when practitioners who undertake this type of intermediary role maintain a link with an academic institution. I propose that their ideas are as likely to be underpinned by an idealist conceptual frame of reference. This paradigm reflects a primary emphasis on the value of health, improvement in
individual and communal well-being and the realisation of sustainable development expressed in universal or global terms.

These two chapters draw attention to the breadth of theoretical ideas that need to be taken into account to achieve an inter-disciplinary understanding of conflict as a subject of social inquiry. Both chapters take a comparative approach to emphasise fundamental ontological and epistemological differences in approaches. The purpose is to highlight that comparative analysis of alternative approaches generated within different scientific disciplines and schools of thought is a constructive and useful way of addressing the high degree of ambiguity within the broad field of conflict management. It also highlights that an inter-disciplinary approach can overcome the inference that one stream of scientific knowledge is more appropriate as a basis for explaining conflict and means to address it simply because it is more widely accepted.

In Chapters Four and Five I respond to the second consideration concerning the way that scholars who are assigned to produce 'independent' reports to do with conflict can constructively confront the inevitability of bias.

Chapter Four outlines the concept of an integrated framework, which brings together key considerations raised in earlier chapters. It is proposed that a particular type of comparative analysis can be usefully applied to compare understandings generated through alternative conceptual and theoretical approaches. The action research methodology employed in this thesis has been instrumental in allowing me to more clearly articulate and formalise the integrated framework as a conceptual idea. Fig. 2 provides an indication of the way in which key considerations are identified and then developed to articulate the concept of an integrated framework.

Section 1 of Chapter Four concerns the way scholar-reporters structure ideas to do with determining whether circumstances entail significant social conflict and thus it focuses on matters that are more to do with problem-identification. Section 2 addresses the structuring of ideas about an intervention whose purpose is to address the conflict and thus it focuses on matters that are more to do with problem-solving. This separation stresses that, despite inevitable blurrings between causes, responses and counter-responses, scholar-reporters will need to treat these two components as relatively discrete aspects of a report. Making the distinction helps to articulate the relationship between ideas governing the way a conflict is defined and ideas
CHAPTER TWO: IDEAS ABOUT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Differences</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framing Present realities</td>
<td>Constructive elements (part of normal social living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destructive elements (destabilising social living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Particularist (Human Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist (Broader Social Structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Paradigm</td>
<td>Realist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER THREE: IDEAS ABOUT INTERVENTIONIST RESPONSES TO CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Differences</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Conservative (based on political/legal precedent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Intervention (unprecedented, innovative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Resolutionary' (Non-coercive, voluntary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Revolutionary' (Coercive, forceful, often violent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Definitions of the Characteristics of Intervention</td>
<td>Conservative (mainstream, status quo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical 'resolutionary' (applied conflict studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Definitions of the Purposes and Outcomes</td>
<td>Conservative (mainstream, status quo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical 'resolutionary' (applied conflict studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Paradigm</td>
<td>Realist (mainstream, status quo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealist (concept of capacity to transform negative to positive social relationships)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER FOUR: COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF APPROACHES USING AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK

SECTION 1 - PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION
Interpreting Present Realities: Conservative and Radical Explanations About Intervention

- Section 1 Conceptual Worldview or Paradigm - Realist and Idealist
- Section 2 Methodological Approach - Conservative and Radical Approaches
- Section 3 Theoretical Construction - Conservative and Radical Approaches
- - Particularist Level (Human Agency)
- - Generalist Level (Social Structure)

SECTION 2 - PROBLEM-SOLVING
Characteristics of Intervention: Conservative and Radical Explanations About Intervention

- Section 4 Conceptual Worldview or Paradigm - Realist and Idealist
- Section 5 Methodological Approach - Conservative and Radical Approaches
- Section 6 Theoretical Construction - Conservative and Radical Approaches
- - Particularist Level (Human Agency)
- - Generalist Level (Social Structure)

Fig. 2: Outline indicating how key considerations in Chapters Two and Three are brought together in Chapter Four to develop an integrated framework.
governing the way meaning is attributed to the actual intervention, particularly the extent to which the same criteria and bases of interpretation are applied in both components. For instance there could be competing claims as to whether a set of circumstances should be characterised as functional and tolerable or otherwise dysfunctional and intolerable to the point where drastic change through intervention is required. These interpretations will have a profound influence on all sequential theoretical ideas that a scholar will draw from to support the way they attribute meaning to the purpose of an intervention. This suggests that an integrated framework is likely to be most useful for scholars confronted with a degree of uncertainty as to how they should characterise the circumstances that trigger an intervention. Rather than a scholar necessarily having to relinquish a conventional basis of interpretation in favour of one that is far more radical, an integrated framework can be applied as a basis of comparison to validate whether the conventional basis is still adequate or sufficient.

Both sections give consideration to the way ideas in a report can be framed. This aspect of the comparative analysis shows that realist and idealist conceptual frames of reference, methodologies and theoretical bases of analysis and assessment are likely to frame ideas in markedly different ways. Employing only one approach would be adequate for producing a purportedly 'objective' report but it does not address or overcome the fundamental problem of bias. It would not necessarily provide a sufficiently reflexive indication of the extent to which understandings of past and present realities privilege the perspective of particular parties, such as those representing the status quo or otherwise a group whose values and interests are at odds with the status quo. Comparative analysis can reveal biases by showing that different approaches take different data into consideration and do not necessarily apply the same criteria as a basis framing ideas about what is at issue. Consequently there will be variability in interpretations as to what sort of changes an intervention is actually attempting to bring about.

Sections 1 and 2 also give consideration to the way ideas can be scoped. This aspect of the comparative analysis highlights different levels of interpretation. The term particularist is used to stress that some ideas need to be scoped in subjectivist terms in order to give significance to human agency, the particular attitudes and behaviours that individuals bring to bear on their environment. The term generalist is used to similarly indicate that some ideas need to be scoped in broader, more abstract objectivist terms to depict the way that a conflict or an intervention can be
appreciated within the context of broader social structures or social systems. The use of these terms helps to stress that there are markedly different ways of scoping a set of circumstances. Each makes an equally significant contribution to the capacity of those ultimately reading a report to comprehend the set of circumstances precipitating an intervention as well as the impact of the intervention itself. There are two reasons for applying this type of comparative analysis. In the first place, it is necessary to identify the extent to which there is a coherent integration of particularist and generalist features. Secondly, it is also necessary to identify the extent to which explanations underpinned by different conceptual frames of reference at the particularist level are consistently applied when ideas are expanded to the more generalist level. For instance, interpretations may incorporate an idealist-based approach at the particularist level, while at the generalist level it may be that only a realist-based approach is emphasised. If ideas are only scoped within a national context or the international arena due attention may not be given to other ways of scoping trans-boundary problems and strategies to address them.

In summary, the theoretical propositions developed in Chapter Four represent ways that I have responded to the key problems identified in the second stage of the action research methodology. One concerns the need for scholar-reporters to take an interdisciplinary approach and draw on more than one stream of scientific knowledge. However I further propose that scholar-reporters assigned to produce an 'independent' report about particular interventions to address conflict also have to give consideration to different underlying paradigms. This idea has been exemplified by considering differences between realist and idealist approaches and the fact that presently alternative conceptual and theoretical approaches are not sufficiently critiqued in relation to one another. The second key problem is the need to constructively address the inevitability of bias in alternative approaches. Thus it is proposed that comparative analysis is useful for identifying whether particular approaches maintain inherent ambiguities, inconsistencies or contradictions. 'Independent' reports relating to contentious issues and how they are being addressed have to maintain a rigorous and consistent interest in hierarchies and hegemonies of power, and one significant element of them is cultural domination, or capacity to control the way ideas are framed and scoped. The process of integrating different viewpoints inevitably adds a significant level of complexity to an 'independent' report. However, I argue that the validity and legitimacy of this type of scholarly reporting will become more widely accepted. One reason is that it confronts the potential for cultural domination in reporting processes. Another is that it
improves capacity to provide readers with a coherent and comprehensive understanding of the way that a state of affairs is being changed through intervention.

The purpose of Chapter Five is to highlight the distinguishing characteristics of three different types of 'resolutionary' process, namely, alternative dispute resolution (ADR), conflict resolution and conflict transformation, and show that an integrated framework can be employed as a basis for comparative analysis in relation to them. This is in contrast to the purpose of Chapter Three, which is to highlight the characteristics that 'resolutionary' processes share in common.

Comparative analysis in this case highlights that either realist or idealist conceptual frames of reference can underpin the training through which third party facilitating intermediaries develop their practical skills and supporting scientific knowledge. This means that, by degrees, 'resolutionary' processes can maintain conservative or more radical orientations. Therefore, it is equally useful to employ an integrated framework to make comparisons between their conceptual and theoretical bases of explanation with regard to problem-identification, the circumstances precipitating the intervention, as well as problem-solving, the actual intervention itself. Indications of the type of comparisons that are significant when an integrated framework is applied for this purpose are shown in Fig. 3.

An integrated framework is used in this case to compare explanations and assessments as to what type of 'resolutionary' process is regarded as the most viable to institute in a particular set of circumstances. Given that they are all voluntary and self-determining processes that will most likely differ considerably from the processes with which the protagonists have more familiarity there is consequently a greater risk that a process that is initiated in an inappropriate way will not achieve its intended goals. In fact a key idea developed in this chapter is that problem-identification may suggest the circumstances are indicative of a conflict that is so deep-seated and intractable it may not necessarily be immediately resolvable, either through an 'official' conservative intervention or a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' intervention. It is primarily through the theoretical explanations generated in applied conflict transformation studies that a basis is developed for asserting that, in certain cases, direct engagement between the parties could be premature and that the constructive purpose that could be served by a 'resolutionary' process could be undermined. Intervention in such cases involves trained practitioners first offering capacity-building
programs to the protagonists to assist them to be able make informed decisions as to the type of process that they would be prepared to voluntarily enter into.

**CHAPTER 5 : COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF DIFFERENT 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES**

(The purpose of Chapter Four is to emphasise marked differences between realist-based explanations that are generally used to attribute meaning to 'official' interventions in comparison with idealist-based explanations that are generally developed to attribute meaning to 'non-official' processes. This chapter now proposes that it may be equally significant to use comparative analysis to identify the degree to which theory relating to different 'resolutionary' interventions has a conservative or a radical orientation. These differentiations could be equally critical because the theoretical orientation concerning problem-identification becomes the basis for asserting what might be the more viable 'non-official' problem-solving strategy to institute in specific situations.)

**SECTION 5.1 – CHARACTERISTICS OF DIFFERENT 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES**

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)
Conflict Resolution
Conflict Transformation

**SECTION 5.2 – THEORETICAL ORIENTATION OF INTERMEDIARY TRAINING**

ADR ➔ Deals with disputes, only requires normative,functionalist approach
Conflict Resolution ➔ More complex, can take normative,functionalist or radical approach
Conflict Transformation ➔ Highest risk, requires a more radical orientation

**SECTION 5.3 - CONCEPTUAL FRAME OF REFERENCE**

ADR ➔ Realist (generally conducted within a national context)
Conflict Resolution ➔ Realist (when a conflict is framed in nation/international terms)
Conflict Transformation ➔ Idealist (when a conflict is framed in regional or global terms)

**SECTION 5.4 – NEED FOR PRE-NEGOTIATION CAPACITY-BUILDING**

ADR ➔ Intermediaries mainly guide the way parties participate based on widely accepted professionalisation of mediation practice
Conflict Resolution ➔ Intermediaries can sometimes guide the way parties participate but the parties may challenge mediator's suggested procedures
Conflict Transformation ➔ Processes are predicated on a need to initially heighten parties' capacity to find acceptable procedures prior to engagement

Fig. 3: Outline of Chapter Five

**Stage Four – The Case Study Used to Test the Credibility of Theoretical Propositions**

The subsequent stage of the methodology involves further processes of reflection, planning and responding. The outcomes are articulated in Chapters Six and Seven that make up Part II of this thesis. The research topic emerged as an outcome of identifying certain tensions and problems encountered at the time of producing the case study report. Therefore this further stage of the double-loop methodology can be described as that of testing the credibility of the additions to knowledge put
forward in Part I. This is achieved by deconstructing and critiquing aspects of the case study report to show how an integrated framework could have been applied and the reasons why it would have improved the report. I thus use the case study report to exemplify and articulate where there is scope for improvement. I have been able to demonstrate how this type of reflective learning process served as a basis for establishing more definitive standards and criteria.

Ideas are discussed in these chapters primarily in terms of six discrete reporting roles. The first role reflects the need to provide substantiating indications that the circumstances in question warrant the employment of conflict theory. The second role is to define the characteristics of an interventionist strategy. The third is to define the asserted purpose of an intervention. The fourth is to describe how a process is conducted and what substantive issues are dealt with in the process. The fifth is to define the outcomes of the process. The sixth is to provide explanations to qualify the outcomes as a basis for making evaluations and recommendations. The first four are primarily the subject of Chapter Six and the latter two are the primary subjects of Chapter Seven.

One reason for taking this approach is that it provides a structure that can accommodate wide-ranging ideas in a systematic way. In some cases the purpose is to describe the complexity and significance of inter-relating substantive issues and considerations, all of which contribute to a relatively comprehensive understanding of the circumstances and the issues at stake that feature in the problem-identification component of the report. However, as well as the need to describe what issues are at stake, the six reporting roles also provide a structure through which to discuss considerations relating to how the process evolved through different stages and was able to generate particular outcomes that are more representative of problem-solving. This latter type of explanation is more concerned with how the facilitation team guided and supported the process and dealt with a complexity of practical issues that were more to do with the way it was actually instituted. Both aspects, that is, what issues were significant, and how the issues were dealt with, were equally valid considerations that had to be conveyed in the report. Both contributed to comprehensively describing what changes were being sought and the agency through which it was anticipated that the sought changes could be realised.
Stage Five – Summarising the Outcomes of this Thesis
The last stage of the methodology, which specifies the outcomes, is developed in Chapter Eight. Although the object of all research is to develop the clearest possible outcomes, those generated through action research are not necessarily based on the same criteria or expressed in the same way as outcomes developed through theory-driven or experimental research where the goal is to test a hypothesis and contribute to knowledge primarily through recourse to an extant literature that can be extended, refined and challenged. Action research makes allowance for the possibility that in some cases the evidence from which conclusions will be drawn may not be obtainable through a more conventional methodology based on preconceived expectations or assumptions. Dick describes the process as one where conclusions tend to emerge more gradually over the course of a study. This study begins with one particular activity, the compilation of the case study report, where it is conceived that changes in the way of carrying it through could lead to improvement in the practice. It involves sequential testing of both the data generated with regard to the initial activity as well as the assumptions guiding each subsequent stage. The research component can be described as the process of critical reflection with regard to previous actions in order that findings contribute to the development of a more systematic way of understanding and explaining the activity.

Two ideas developed by Dick are significant in relation to the criteria required for evaluating action research. Firstly, he suggests it is not necessarily constructive to frame outcomes in terms of a difference between qualitative and quantitative research. He proposes that it is as important to recognise that different types of outcomes can be achieved depending on whether research takes a theory-driven or a data-driven approach. This thesis can be described as taking a data-driven approach in the sense that each sequential stage of the methodology, while drawing on a wide range of theoretical propositions developed within the general field of conflict studies nevertheless stems from the initial activity of compiling the case study report. In other words, it is the activity rather than the literature that can be conceived as the starting-point. Thus the criteria for making assessments with regard to outcomes will be to do with the extent to which the research has been able to pursue the prospect of change in relation to this particular practice.

Secondly, outcomes of action research emerge through each of its sequential stages whereby each leads to a greater degree of precision in terms of the way that the research topic can be explored. This means that the purpose in generating outcomes
in this approach varies considerably from those in methodologies where the goal is to develop research outcomes that draw overall conclusions. The concluding chapter thus frames outcomes in terms of the extent to which each of the stages contributes to a further refinement with regard to both the method and its outcomes, which together can be conceived as steps toward better practice and better research.98

Section 1 of Stage 5 firstly identifies the outcomes of each particular sequential stage of the methodology that contribute to the development of a guiding basis for considering how to improve the construction of 'independent' scholarly reports. Section 2 expresses another category of outcomes developed by bringing together general themes developed throughout the thesis. They are expressed in terms of seven types of distinctions that need to be reflexively considered in order that a scholar-reporter can explain why this type of reporting role is undertaken in a particular way. Section 3 articulates the general proposition developed in the thesis that scholarly reporting needs to be appreciated as an application of conflict theory requiring its own guiding framework and that it can be conceived to be an important aspect of risk communication.

Experiential research usually poses the problem that it is not necessarily feasible to generalise or make claims about the universal relevance of research outcomes beyond one specific context. Conventional scientific methodologies tend to caution against reductionism, that is, drawing assumptions that action appropriate in one set of circumstances will necessarily be equally relevant and applicable in another. Nevertheless I argue that certain problems identified in the production of the case study report and the proposals for improving on this practice are additions to knowledge that can be applied in a wide range of cases. This makes it warrantable to suggest a degree of generalisability. While the circumstances, the substantive issues and the type of interventionist process being reported on might vary considerably, the actual process of reporting requires a degree of consistency, generalisation and shared understanding in terms of the way reports themselves are constructed.

The thesis overall reflects the way that I have responded to the third consideration initially identified in Stage Two of the methodology, which concerns an apparent lack of research focusing on the development of clearer indications as to what constitutes credible scholarly reporting. Comparative analysis is used extensively to reflect the type of tensions and uncertainties I encountered when compiling the report. This approach has
been used to reflect that the case study report could have been constructed in markedly different ways. At every stage of the thesis comparative analysis has allowed me to show that I could have favoured realist or idealist paradigms, methodological approaches and theoretical frameworks. In the actual report I intuitively attempted to incorporate both approaches, although they were not explicitly articulated. It is in the development of theoretical propositions in this thesis that I demonstrate that if only one approach had been the sole basis of interpretation and evaluation, the report could be characterised as 'objective' but it would not necessarily have come closer to the concept of an 'independent' report.
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PART I: DEVELOPMENT OF THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS
RELEVANT WITHIN THIS THESIS
CHAPTER TWO: OUTLINING A RANGE OF THEORIES ADDRESSING THE CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CONFLICT

This chapter overviews diverse conceptual and theoretical approaches to the study of the causes and characteristics of conflict which can occur in different contexts and at different scales of social interaction. The purpose is to indicate that certain concepts and ideas applied in particular approaches may require qualification in relation to others in order to bring about more precise understandings. Analytical processes that are employed to comprehend the causes and characteristics of conflict are described in this thesis as relating to the component of problem-identification. The variability of approaches indicates that it may not be possible to think in terms of a broad generic theory. However it is proposed that it is nevertheless possible to conceive that a more general framework of understanding about conflict as a multi-dimensional social phenomenon is required, particularly to identify where there is a need to develop more precise terminology and refinement of definitions.

Conflict as a term has many connotations and thus in general usage it is prone to ambiguity. It can be described as a fight, debate, contest, disagreement, argument, dispute or quarrel, and, in wider contexts a struggle, state of unrest, turmoil, chaos or war. Thus conflict has different characteristics in different social settings, ranging from inner emotional or psychological processes to relationships within or between different social groups in families and collectivities of people through cultural, ethnic, ideological or political affiliation. Interpretations vary because conflict permeates all aspects of life experience, but inevitably it is a social phenomenon of human interaction, irrespective of whether it arises in physical and psychologically familiar territory or in new situations.

Some conflicts are fleeting, while others have their origins in childhood development and other life experiences. Many others prompt individuals to confront, assess and deal with unexpected developments which either reinforce prior understandings or otherwise bring about degrees of change in understanding. In some it may be managed and explained through sophisticated theories and procedures while in others, it can be through means such as proverbs, stories or cases recalled. People have created an extraordinarily broad repertoire of behaviours to deal with conflict.

Section 1 outlines a range of theoretical approaches to explain the causes and characteristics of conflict. Section 2 then discusses theoretical approaches that have
emerged within the fields of peace research and conflict resolution studies. It contrasts this field with more conventional studies in the behavioural sciences, even though there are inevitably theoretical borrowings, overlaps and interrelationships between them.

SECTION 1: CONVENTIONAL THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS ABOUT THE CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CONFLICT

This section first considers the way scholars' vantage points shape our understanding of conflict as it is embedded within a particular social context, such as a national context. The purpose is to show that explanations vary depending on the way social structures are interpreted according to a particular frame of reference. It then outlines theoretical approaches offering explanation framed in terms of proximate and immediate causes or events that trigger responses so that they relate more directly to human agency.5

Theories That Explain Conflict in Terms of Social Structures

Structural approaches help us conceive how diverse elements can be appreciated as a unified system of interacting parts, with input deriving from the entire surrounding environment.6 The concept of a system in relation to its environment is applied in the social sciences to develop ideas about the way that social organisation itself can be described as a system. Systems approaches, which emphasise how things function and work together to maintain the system, are reflected in sociological and anthropological functionalist studies of family and group social arrangements, studies of specific formal organisations, small-scale societies and more complex social structures. These studies help us conceptualise the role and significance of various parts of a system and the extent to which they are compatible or harmonious with one another.7 Therefore, to some extent they also have to give attention to the issue of conflict. Nevertheless, studies more often have a focus on determining how parts of a system actually work together and maintain its integrity and cohesion. The functionalist approach tends to be less useful for explaining how social systems cope with crises or explaining how they become profoundly dysfunctional. This is particularly the case if the factors creating the uncertain conditions have not formerly been components of the system but still bring influence to bear upon the direction of change.8

Structural theories are useful for identifying certain phenomena and general responses that follow from them. In the social sciences they are applied to describe social dynamics and forces which create the conditions for certain actions to emerge.9 In contemporary usage there is a tendency for structural theories to emphasise enduring, constitutive social formations. Structural frameworks are useful as a means for conceptualising the degree
to which the organisation of society actually creates specific conditions for conflicts and the way in which they are played out.

Marx conceives that the entire apparent and observable features and norms of social life, the political and ideological superstructure, is based on and can be explained according to the underlying economic base. He describes the manner in which individuals relate to one another in their continuous struggle to secure the necessary material resources from nature in the following terms:

Legal relations as well as the form of the state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum total of which Hegel . . . combines under the name of 'civil society.' . . . The anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy.\(^\text{10}\)

In this theoretical approach societies can be differentiated in terms of means of production, or how human labour produces material objects that create the relations that exist between people and give meaning to the social order. It is through analysis of sociocultural systems that the dependency upon the underlying economic arrangement is revealed. The way societies organise to meet material needs profoundly affects all other social structures, including government, family, education and religious institutions.

'Historical materialism' is the term used by Marx to depict a movement from societies that maintained relatively simple means of production to those that are more complex and, correspondingly, develop more complex forms of social organisation. The latter require divisions of labour that manifest through more complex class divisions.\(^\text{11}\) According to Marx, people in different classes have different economic interests, irrespective of whether they consciously perceive this to be the case. He claims that a broader understanding of the forces of society, which go beyond particular perceptions held by individuals, can be conceptualised within a theoretical framework. The purpose is to reveal how the general structure of economic relations, based on the material forces to produce goods and services, determines individuals' perceptions of what they can and cannot do.\(^\text{12}\) Marx's comparison of the dynamics operating between classes in pre-capitalist societies was a basis for comparing them to the class struggles operating in capitalist societies.

Rather than conceiving society to be based on consensus, Marx claims that social conflict is at the core of all historical processes, defined in terms of struggles between the economic interests of different social classes, which determine how and who controls the means of production. The material conditions of life, considered crucial for understanding social relationships, are explained primarily by making the distinction that some people
derive their living by virtue of owning property, while others do so by giving their labour for benefit. What can also be determined is that their labour is controlled by the privileged class.\textsuperscript{13} According to Marx:

\begin{quote}
..the economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter sets free the elements of the former.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

The development of capitalist relations and a gradual increase in technological developments created the more complex industrial means of production. People who provide labour to maintain industrial production come to serve a similar purpose to that which peasant classes served in agriculturally based societies. In modern capitalist social relations a business class maintains a dominant role in society similar to that formerly held by landed aristocratic classes.\textsuperscript{15}

Marx conceives that there are inherent contradictions in the capitalist system between forces of social development in terms of their relationship to the economic base. He predicted that this would ultimately make it so susceptible as to bring about its own demise.\textsuperscript{16} He envisaged that the change would be toward socialism, with social ownership and control of the means of production. This would entail the overthrow of those who controlled capital and, as they would be unlikely to relinquish their economic and political power voluntarily, Marx anticipated that violent political revolution would inevitably be part of the process.\textsuperscript{17} He took a negative attitude to forms of ‘idealism’, such as religion, which sought to promote goodwill as a means of bringing about improvement in relationships within capitalist societies because, in his view, the basic structure of society was governed by its own rules of development.

The theoretical approach taken by Marx to explain how modern societies are arranged and how they change can be contrasted with the approach of the sociologist Durkheim\textsuperscript{18}. The focal issue for Marx is how and why resources come to be distributed in a certain way, and how exchanges set up conflicts that create social divisions. However, the focal issue for Durkheim is social integration.\textsuperscript{19} In his view social structure rests on a cultural base of norms and values developed through family and community life. They maintain the solidarity that holds a society together. The sociology which derives from the ideas of Durkheim through theorists such as Coser\textsuperscript{20} stress the normative structure and values of a social system, while theorists such as Parsons\textsuperscript{21} and Merton\textsuperscript{22} stress the way social systems function.

Weber agrees with Marx that class conflict and economic forces are important determinants, particularly in modern complex societies. However, in Weber’s view,
economic forces offer only a partial explanation about conflict and cohesion within society. He broadens Marx’s idea about the role of material forces in shaping social organisation to include a number of other key social institutions that inter-relate to provide the complex framework through which society is reproduced. Weber claims that “Marx had unduly emphasised one particular causal chain, the one leading from the economic infrastructure to the cultural superstructure”.23 As well as economic property and power being the basis of class relations, Weber suggests that social reputation and prestige form the basis of status groups and political power forms the basis of political parties and interest groups.24 Thus Weber gives weight to other non-economic factors that have the potential to work independently from economic factors and does not attribute social change entirely to economic forces. He gives equal standing to distinctive ideological, religious and ethical views as being the basis for modern capitalism. For Weber, the power of brute force has to be compared to the generally accepted or given legitimacy that is relevant in social processes. Weber conceives the bases for legitimate authority to be threefold. They incorporate legal authority, founded on the formal norms and established offices carrying out and maintaining the norms and rules, traditional authority, founded on traditional usage and ideas from the past, and charismatic authority, founded on the personal appeal of leaders.25

Thus Weber views power in society as manifesting from a capacity to maintain authority. This is based on the general degree to which a society grants and accepts the rational authority of legal institutions and the capacity of bureaucracies to coordinate action, and the traditional and emotional appeals that can sway that authority.26 He maintains a concern with the meaning that people can assign to their actions and how this allows understanding to develop with respect to the drift of historical change. Weber sought to explain the causes of the shift from traditional to rational action in modern societies by examining religious and economic systems operating in different societies. He claims that several pre-industrial societies had the technological infrastructure and other necessary preconditions to begin capitalism and economic expansion, but that nevertheless capitalism failed to emerge. The only forces missing were the positive sanctions to abandon traditional ways. "By such a comparative analysis of causal sequences, Weber tried to find not only the necessary but the sufficient conditions of capitalism".27

Weber came to the hypothesis that, following the Reformation in Europe the Protestant ethic28 broke the hold of tradition because it encouraged individuals to apply themselves rationally to their work.29 Weber elaborates on this idea in the following way:
Waste of time is thus the first and in principle the deadliest of sins. The span of human life is infinitely short and precious to make sure of one's own election. Loss of time through sociability, idle talk, luxury, even more sleep than is necessary for health . . . . is worthy of absolute moral condemnation. 30

While Weber does not claim that the Protestant ethic was the only cause of the rise of capitalism, he takes it to have been a powerful force in fostering its emergence. 31 He claims that rational action within a system of rational-legal authority is at the heart of modern society and that, compared with societies where traditional authority predominates, bureaucracies are maintained which generate a much greater degree of unregulated and often unperceived social power. Bureaucracies tend to become oligarchies whereby those holding influential positions come to control social, political and economic power. In turn they have the capacity to perpetuate their form of control by promoting others who are more inclined to share their views. In turn, this has a subtle yet profound influence on the quality of life of those who are dependent upon bureaucracies. Weber depicts that, through the bureaucratic imposition of negative and positive sanctions, there is less freedom and capacity for individuals to participate directly in the decision-making processes that influence the general goals and purposes of bureaucracies. 32

Weber envisages increasing contradictions arising through the advent of formal rationalisation in modern bureaucracies and its capacity to override a more substantive rationality based on an understanding of the broader impact of specific actions. He depicts that, increasingly, individual officials have specialised and limited responsibility and authority within complex organisations. 33 The outcome is that individuals are often disengaged from a capacity to fully consider the underlying moral and ethical implications of their roles and a sense of their participation in a common social purpose. Despite being the epitome of rationalisation, the actions invoked by bureaucracies can be defined as the irrationality of rationalisation, or the irrationality factor. 34 This is exemplified when service bureaucracies, designed to provide care for vulnerable members of society, are at the same time perceived to be inconsistent in the way they carry out their duty of care. It is also exemplified when economic bureaucracies are perceived to pursue profit through actions that deplete and pollute their supporting environment, or when political bureaucracies, established to promote participatory processes, can equally be perceived to override them. Weber argues that social change grew out of social conflict but that society could ultimately function and develop in spite of having to cope with severe underlying conflicts. 35
Dahrendorf's more contemporary theoretical approach represents a school of thought called ‘neo-Marxism’. Neo-Marxist scholars do not necessarily share Marx' political views but they do acknowledge that his conceptualisation of social structure as something more than just the product of the actions of particular individuals makes a significant contribution to the development of modern sociological thought. While Dahrendorf agrees with Marx that social classes are a key basis of social structure, and that conflict within the structure itself is an engine of social change, he asserts, more in keeping with Weber, that social conflict does not necessarily always have an economic foundation.

He takes a particular interest in the way that social difference, framed in terms of power, can serve as a basis of conflict, either within or between groups. Power differences, like economic differences, can be conceptualised as being structurally based, but with wealth and property representing only one means through which power can be obtained. In Dahrendorf’s view, studies of the organisation of societies require consideration of the way power operates to create interest groups through which interests are politicised. Identifying the conflicts of interests between groups is taken to be the means to account for ideas about leadership, group, and sub-group formations, which contribute to identifying how and in what way groups maintain both shared interests and conflicting interests. Dahrendorf describes group formations as ‘quasi groups’ because they can hold both shared and diverse interests, not all of which are necessarily made explicit.

He explains this in the following terms:

That there are interest groups in contemporary society can be affirmed immediately. There are, for example, trade unions and employers’ associations, progressive and conservative political parties. It is not difficult to show that all these organizations are interest groups in the sense of our definition. Quasi-groups, on the other hand, may be assumed to exist wherever there are authority relations and imperatively coordinated associations. Is it necessary to prove that there are such associations and relations in contemporary society? The state, the industrial enterprise, the churches -to mention only a few - are imperatively coordinated associations which exist in all modern societies and which, if our theory is right, justify the assumption that there are quasi-groups with conflicting latent interests within them.

In Dahrendorf’s analysis, the way particular conditions call attention to particular conflicting interests can be studied to discern degrees of self-conscious identification with particular organisational units in terms of how interest groups promote particular interests. He classifies types of social units that can have superordinate-subordinate conflicts, and asserts that to take a broader account of different types of social conflict requires examination of (1) roles, (2) groups, (3) sectors of society, (4) societies and (5) suprasocietal relations. He claims that only the middle three, that is, groups, sectors and societies, generate class conflict.

He takes issue with trends in American sociology whereby structural-functionalist approaches overstate the significance of the social
system, systemic needs, functions and consensual values that hold societies together, or at least he claims that they understate broader historical influences on social structures. He considers this leads to a relatively closed and static way of conceptualising social systems. Unlike Marx, Dahrendorf asserts that class conflicts are capable of regulation, but not actual resolution. This assertion is founded on the idea that the structural basis of social conflict is unlikely to be entirely eliminated or transformed. Therefore, at times when those involved recognise the nature of a conflict itself, and can systematically organise and accept procedures for the manner in which to pursue their oppositional interests, they can create conditions under which conflicts can be most effectively regulated. In this respect, he does not consider that it is possible to resolve class conflicts through some form of violent revolution. He holds that, rather than violent revolution resolving incompatibilities of interests, revolution merely temporarily changes positions of power and, ultimately, the actions are more likely to exacerbate conflicts rather than make them manageable.

It is significant to note Dahrendorf's vantage point in terms of the way that he describes the "society in which we live". He asserts that his approach to social conflict is fruitful because it incorporates sociological analysis that is relevant to a number of societies in general terms. However, his focus of research is primarily limited to certain "advanced industrial" or "post-capitalist societies", namely Britain, USA, and Germany, which represent democratic countries of the West that underwent industrialisation in the 19th Century. He questions whether derived conclusions would equally apply to French, Italian, Japanese, or Russian society. These comparisons tend to indicate that Dahrendorf's frame of reference remains Eurocentric and state-centric. His analysis focuses primarily on the internal relationships within those societies. He does not necessarily accord complementary significance to changing hegemonic external political and economic relationships that Western states maintained with less developed states or colonies that increasingly were being drawn into two-way trading relationships with regard to manufactured goods and raw materials. Therefore his studies do not go so far as to articulate the relative influence changing dynamics of exchange have on social conflict within and between interest groups and quasi groups operating simultaneously in both industrialised societies and small-scale societies. The distinctions tend to be masked by the modern view that the social organisation of society is best understood in terms of modern nation-states of the international system, even though 'less developed' neocolonial states were created as an outcome of European expansion. Keesing explains as follows some of the problems of transferring the Marxist theoretical framework to non-industrial societies.
Neo-Marxists such as Godelier (1978: 766), seeking in Marx's own work a more viable basis for anthropological economics, reject economic determinisms. Godelier notes that in the societies, past and present, that anthropologists have mainly studied, there is no clear separation between economic institutions and the institutions of kinship, politics or religion. If there is any distinction to be drawn between the base and infrastructure it must be drawn on the basis of functions. If kinship relations or religious rituals serve to organize production and distribution, then in these respects they are elements in the economic system. Kinship relations and religious rituals seem, on the surface, to function as part of the superstructure of a social system. That is, they sustain a prevailing system of social relations, or in Marxist terms reproduce the means for the existence of the system. Kinship, by regulating marriage and descent, reproduces the labor force. Religion, through the eyes of the participants, sustains the cosmos - the seasons, the fertility of crops, the powers of magic - without which human productive effort could not be realized. But, Godelier argues, in a tribal society kinship does more than physically reproduce the labor force through birth, nurturance, and subsistence, a function kinship serves in an industrial society or feudal system. In a tribal society, kinship provides the system through which production itself is organized, and through which distribution takes place.46

Keesing highlights that certain conceptual and theoretical separations that compartmentalise political, economic and social activity in order to explain the functioning of complex societies are not necessarily always adequate to explain relationships that develop amongst collectivities who identify with complex societies and those who identify with small-scale societies. Consequently, their scope may not be adequate for explaining the role of conflict within the context of relationships that have developed between Eurocentric colonisers and traders and local communities that have increasingly come within their sphere of influence.

Approaches specifically concerned with power and conflict operating both within societies and between societies attempt to give a structure to systems that are larger than any one particular society. These ideas first began to emerge through the writings of theorists such as Adam Smith. They were generated in the climate of the Enlightenment driven by the need to conceptualise political and economic affairs and relationships in a world that was larger and more complex than merely a European context.47 While the emphasis in these broader structural theories vary, they share a common concern to identify how divisions of wealth, resources and power between nations as well as within nations can be represented as a system with inherent tensions and conflicts impacting on a world-wide scale.

In contemporary 'political realist', or realist48 approaches, the central players within the larger system, at least in the post-colonial context, are nation-states, whereby each independent state can claim a monopoly of legitimate sovereignty with rights to apply power within national territorial borders to maintain order. The sovereignty of states is also defined and reciprocally recognised in terms of the international system itself. Those holding state power attempt to maintain control over people and resources within the
state’s territorial boundaries through a variety of expressions of power. Control can be demonstrated through a capacity to maintain order. This could either be through appeals of persuasion, such as processes whereby elected representatives hold office, or otherwise by coercion, such as the imposition of physical force through militarism. At the same time, nation-states, legitimated in terms of the power that can be maintained internally, also seek to realise a position in the larger inter-national system, on the basis of the cooperative and competing relationships they maintain with other states. The foundation for conceptualising realist international politics is the political interests of individual states. In this approach the structure of the entire international system can thus be appreciated in terms of the political realities that bring influence to bear within it.49

The concept of realism derives from extensions of the ideas of Hobbes. He poses that in a state of nature social life is nasty, brutish, short and characterised by a continual war of all against all.50 Hobbes’ image of an otherwise anarchical world was applied to justify the way in which international relations were a means of providing checks on anarchistic tendencies in human nature. Cooperation, according to this realist view, is only possible to the extent that it can maximise the self-interested goals and minimise risks to sovereignty and the integrity of individual nation-states. Conflict, which takes on features of excessive violence as an outcome of excessive competition, is regarded as capable of only being contained.51

Thus causes of conflicts within the realist paradigm can be attributed to a scarcity of resources, or attempts by states to maintain control over the distribution of resources. From this perspective, conflicts can be explained in objective terms.52 This tends to assume that they are knowable and measurable in terms of the interests of the actors involved. Therefore, explanation can be reduced to objective considerations, outside of and separate from protagonists’ subjective considerations.53 The approach suggests that means applied to minimise the worst excesses of violent conflict tend toward settlement strategies. The strategies are instituted by states seeking new agreements with regard to the division of resources that could return excessive forms of competition, generally construed as war, to some status quo. Such settlement strategies usually entail a zero-sum, whereby the degree to which one state gains is reflected in the extent to which the other loses. Thus assumptions about interactions according to a realist framework focus on divergent interests, interpreted predominantly in terms of the interests of nation-states. Any apparent deviance, which challenges ideas maintained through the realist paradigm of international relations, can be attributed to an inherent aggressiveness in human nature or problems inherent within the structure to do with how particular interests can be
realised. Given that coercive power is taken to be the ultimate arbiter through which to deal with interests in the international system, the required response is for states to concertedly seek to apply coercive power to restore the status quo through containment and control.\(^{54}\)

**Realism** is exemplified in the approach taken by Morgenthau.\(^{55}\) He characterises international politics as being inherently a world of opposing *interests* and of conflict or competition in relation to those opposing *interests*, in which it is not possible to fully realise general moral principles.\(^{56}\) According to Morgenthau politics is taken to be

```
.. an autonomous sphere of action and understanding apart from other spheres, such as economics (understood in terms of interest defined as wealth), ethics, aesthetics, or religion. Without such a concept a theory of politics, international or domestic, would be altogether impossible, for without it we could not distinguish between political and nonpolitical facts, nor could we bring at least a measure of systematic order to the political sphere.\(^{57}\)
```

Morgenthau's approach suggests that at best moral principles can be approximated through the ever temporary balancing of interests and the ever precarious settling of conflicts:

```
We cannot conclude from the good intentions of a statesman that his foreign policies will be either morally praiseworthy or politically successful. Judging his motives, we can say that he will not intentionally pursue policies that are morally wrong, but we can say nothing about the probability of their success. If we want to know the moral and political qualities of his actions, we must know them, not his motives. How often have statesmen been motivated by the desire to improve the world, and ended by making it worse? And how often have they sought one goal, and ended by achieving something they neither expected nor desired?\(^{58}\)
```

**Political realism** is the means of portraying dynamics operating between states as a system of checks and balances in which there are appeals to historic precedent rather than conceptual abstractions expressed as principles or ideals. The aim tends to be to maintain the realisation of lesser evils rather than aiming for an absolute good. **Realist** approaches to power relations amongst nation-states take for granted that there will inevitably be significant power differences, and that the effective reduction of violent conflict depends on obtaining a working balance of power among them. Thus the underlying assumption is that conflict is a pervasive and permanent feature of world politics and that force is an integral and inevitable feature of a basically anarchistic system of international relations between sovereign states. The direct use of coercive power is accepted to be a necessary mechanism to control and maintain the overall interests of the system and force, or the threat of force, is the ultimate arbiter of control.

In the 1960's and 1970's behaviourist theoretical movements began to emerge in disciplines such as social psychology and challenged the perceived simplistic
shortcomings of conventional realist frameworks. Even though the realist paradigm maintains a tendency to avoid evaluating the system overall in terms of relative ideological and ethical considerations, scholars such as Fisher began to argue that realism nevertheless does acknowledge an intermix of ideologies, framed predominantly as state ideologies, as evidenced in the US-Soviet superpower ideological confrontations of the Cold War. They advocated a more pluralist approach in order to acknowledge that states were not the only actors in the international system, and coercive power, defined and applied through formal political processes, was not necessarily the only motivating force.

There was as well a need for political theorists to take a more accurate account of the capacity of informal processes of assisted dialogue between protagonists to serve as a viable strategy for addressing violent conflict. When formal diplomatic solutions were unlikely to work, alternative processes, often instituted under the auspices of non-government organisations rather than political institutions, could achieve outcomes that reduced the destructive elements of conflict. Studies where scholars participate directly as practitioners in actual ‘resolutionary’ processes was conceived to be one means of widening the theoretical framework for explaining world events because they showed how a multiplicity of actors influence the way societies understand and attempt to address conflict. In doing so they had to take account of diverse collectivities such as ethnic communities, business firms, contending political parties and emerging transnational social movements concerned about social and environmental security issues that have to be conceived on a global scale. They recognised that many of these actors would not necessarily be well accommodated or represented within accepted realist models that explain conflict primarily in terms of relations between state actors.

Studies in the field of social psychology have increasingly been drawn to examine conflicts that transcend national boundaries and to assert the theoretical significance of the subjective aspects of conflict. Such studies make a significant contribution to structural theory because they articulate the need to recognise that, while causes of conflict will inevitably have objective substantive features, subjective features have a fundamental influence on perceptions of those objective features. Fisher and Keashly describe conflict “at least partly and at times predominantly as a subjective social process. This rationale does not deny the objective approach to conflict, but it does accept the tenets of realist explanations about conflict that real differences in interests cause inter-group conflict.” Their approach implies that attitudes or perceptions of incompatibility are as significant as the actual behaviour that conflict sets in place and therefore that the purportedly objective features of a conflict are likely to be obscured or exacerbated by its psychological features. It also emphasises that people’s perceptions of each other and
their perception of the issues at stake are subject to modification and change as conflicts move through different stages. Mitchell expresses this idea in the following terms:

While a conflict may be objective at a particular point in time, changes in the parties' objectives, preferences and evaluations, and calculations that occur over a period of time render it a changeable and hence an intensely subjective phenomenon. Conflict may be described as subjective, then, in the sense that changes occur within the parties themselves (and in their orientations to the dispute forming part of their environment), rather than in the "objective" situation external to them from which the originally mutually incompatible goals arose.

Such approaches have led to a trend to appreciate conflict as having three essential interacting aspects, often represented as a triangle, made up of behaviour, attitude and contradiction, the latter point representing the context in which perceived contradictions are operating, as depicted in Fig. 4.

As conflict is a dynamic process in which structure, attitudes and behaviour change as they influence one another, each component could be perceived to be the original source of the conflict, and could be the primary focus in different theoretical approaches. Johan Galtung's purpose when initially developing the triangle model was to clarify that escalations or de-escalations in the degree of violence inherent in a conflict would be dependent on changes in all components.

This suggests that at least two levels are involved when attributing meaning to conflict. The psychological level contributes to identifying and understanding perceptions that are incompatible. The ontological aspect in this approach serves the purpose of objectively defining the 'blocks' to parties' communication that contribute to the perpetuation of conflict and inhibit concerted consideration of how contradictions could be overcome. There is, as well, a requirement to take an ontological approach to objectively define the deeper core structural causes of conflict.
While the argument that there is a subjective element to conflict poses a challenge to realist assumptions attributing causes solely to objective features, that is, interests, Fetherston argues that the contribution from social psychology generally does not go so far as to suggest how modifications to accepted structural arrangements can be addressed. The purpose of research is to identify and validate that there are subjective elements to conflict which need to be taken into account and evaluated as they alter under changing circumstances. However, it can be argued that studies that take this approach at least articulate a dissatisfaction with the former relatively simplistic realist explanations of conflict that focused primarily on the concept of force, expressed as either suppression or aggression, to account for conflictual relations within and between nation-states. Ideas derived from the field of social psychology reflect that concepts such as security could be interpreted as conditions that could be attained, and that they could be attained through integrative processes, rather than just through processes involving threat of force. To make these distinctions when explaining conflict it would be necessary to acknowledge the subjective values of multiple groups of actors within the context under study. Consequently this would shift the emphasis away from a sole focus on national security in order to consider the concept of security as it is subjectively expressed through human agency at different levels of social interaction. Niarguinen expresses certain aspects of the dilemma of finding a balance between objectivist/subjectivist approaches as follows:

It is often claimed that Realism is static and ill-famous for its consistent exclusion of moral and socio-psychological dimensions, and thus there has been disregard for cultural phenomena. While it is difficult to render the claim totally invalid, sharper analysis reveals a somewhat different picture. Realists would not deny the role of culture in international affairs, but their answer to the question ‘to what extent culture governs state behavior’ would be ‘it all depends.’... A central tenet of Realism, the security dilemma, arises for the situation when “one actor’s quest for security through power accumulation exacerbates the feelings of insecurity of another actor, who in turn will respond by accumulating power”. As a result of this behavior, a vicious circle or spiral of security develops, with fear and misperception exacerbating the situation. Security dilemmas are constructed because identities and interests are constituted by collective meanings which are always in process. This is why concepts of security may differ in the extent to which and the manner in which the self is identified cognitively with the other.

By applying a social constructivist approach, it is possible to emphasize the relationship between norms, identities, and interests and try to provide a causal explanation of how the norms affect outcomes. Norms shape conceptualizations of interests through the social construction of identities. In other words, a constructivist account is necessary to get at ‘what deters,’ and how and why deterrence ‘works’. International relations theory cannot afford to ignore norms. Demonstrating the impact of norms on the interests, beliefs, and behavior of actors in international politics does not and must not invalidate Realism. Rather, it points to analytical blind spots and gaps in traditional accounts. In so doing, it not only casts light into the shadows of existing theory but raises new questions as well. However, with all the ‘constructivist’ adjustments made (which are absolutely credible), it is important to keep in mind ‘pure rationalist’ tools as well.
Fetherston points out that approaches in social psychology have not posited a need for a radical, alternative basis of objectivity apart from *interests* and an alternative theoretical framework for generally offering objective explanation about the causes of conflict. This would require something more than the present *realist* conceptual paradigm for evaluating self-evident and significant pressing problems in social relationships, apart from relationships within and between nation-states, as a basis for envisaging workable strategies for settlement of survival and security issues as a global concern.

According to critics promoting more pluralist paradigms, such as Burton and Mitchell, the primary limitation of the *realist* paradigm is that it has been generated primarily within states that already maintain a relatively privileged position in terms of wealth and power in the international system. Therefore, the means used to interpret and analyse supposedly objective conflicts of *interests* is biased to simply represent them through extensions of normative social science approaches. This approach is most meaningful for scoping *interests* as they are defined when maintained within the context of developed states. The tendency to reflect the norms and aspirations of modern Eurocentric states is regarded by its critics as a reflection that the *realist* paradigm is based on its own unacknowledged subjective ideological assumptions relating to modernity. As such it sets the direction for conceptualising how other states might in turn realise or maintain cohesion and security.

Burton draws attention to the tendency of the *realism* to discount the significant role that developed states play in the creation of the social realities of underdevelopment. Independent neocolonial nation-states, whose numbers trebled between 1945 and 1975, have had to struggle to create and maintain internal legitimacy and power, often within fixed territorial boundaries imposed by colonial settlers. These did not necessarily take full account of former political, economic and social realities and divisions. Simultaneously, those directing the development of newer states were required to maintain the necessary balance between cooperation and competition in the larger international system. *Realist* approaches to conflict and how it can be settled maintain a focus on the overall system’s capacity to either contain or control violent conflict. The basis of this assumption is that conflicts would ultimately be settled as the integrity of newer nation-states was consolidated. They would then be better placed to work toward achieving and coordinating their self-interested goals. Taking the *realist* view, the instabilities and perceived incapacity of many neocolonial states to alleviate both internal and external conflicts appears to reinforce the Hobbesian validation of the international system itself, which asserts that international relations is necessary to provide checks against anarchical behaviour. In Burton’s view such assumptions fail to factor into
appraisals of contemporary political, economic and social realities the variability of historical processes that have led to the underdevelopment of many neocolonial states. Similarly it does not take account of how modern states themselves maintain political, economic and social processes which marginalise certain social groups within their sphere of influence.  

Burton also considers that the extension to the international paradigm from the nationalist perspective, derived through normative or functionalist social science approaches, is inadequate for taking account of processes of change on a world-wide scale. This could be represented in terms of how the forced imposition of modernity affects ideas and issues relating to equality, well-being and environmental integrity in underdeveloped states. It could also be seen in the way that systematic patterns of inequality and human and environmental exploitation are actually structured into relationships between states. He advocates the need for a world society paradigm to review and overcome the flaws of the realist paradigm, which has a limited capacity for evaluating correlations within the international system itself as change occurs over time. He sees this alternative paradigm as necessary in order to evaluate how the contemporary political framework might actually address the alleviation of unsustainable practices which, in future, are likely to impose a common and general threat to humanity and the ecosystems which support all life. Burton suggests that depicting relationships in structural terms requires a shift of focus away from the ‘black-boxed’ state as the unit of analysis in favour of a ‘cobweb’ model in which the unit of analysis is the relationship between actors as strands of a web. Individual actors would appear on such a conceptual map as the hubs at which strands meet. Extending the metaphor, separate issue-specific networks of relations superimposed upon one another would hide from view the boundaries of states. This would reveal that a majority of transactions taking place across borders do not directly involve the state. He introduced the concept of intermesticity - the observation that domestic events can often have transnational effects and international conflict is “probably a spillover effect of domestic system failings and domestic politics”. Relationships could be recognised as transactions between states that go beyond the realm of governments, and interactions between countries would continue without, or even despite, the role of the state. This depiction of domestic actions having international consequences through the multiple connections of interdependent relationships was his basis for promoting the concept of a world society paradigm.

The basis of Burton’s interest in structural theory about conflict relates to his ideas about the way certain core issues which precipitate violent conflict could be resolved, as
opposed to merely settling episodic manifestations of them. This led him to promote the need for an alternative ontologically based generic structural theory which could provide explanation about the *objective* causes of conflict as they manifest in all circumstances and at different scales of social interaction. Whereas *realist* approaches frame the objective features of conflict as *interests*, Burton frames them as *needs* and hypothesises that the denial of basic human needs is the source of conflict that becomes violent in character. He claims that:

There are certain human needs concerned with development, as well as survival, which are ontological and generic needs. Their frustration is a sufficient explanation for political and social instabilities. Policies of intervention and attempts at resolving conflicts fail unless this is taken into account. The current return to the individual as the unit of concern is not because of some vague notion of natural justice; it is a concern that there are needs that must be satisfied if the individual within the social system is to be supportive of it. In the tension between human needs and institutions, it is change in institutions that is required.82

The three fundamental needs that Burton recognises are those for identity and recognition, security and the possibility of development.83 He argues that *realism* operates according to a commonly accepted view that human beings, living within the boundaries of particular states, are socially malleable and that aggressive natures can be contained under the rule of law. Within Burton’s framework, aggression is not assumed to be inherent. It manifests as an outcome of a denial of human needs. When socialising processes and forms of control are maintained that do not meet fundamental needs, rather than socialising, they lead to frustrations and to disturbed and anti-social personal and group attitudes and behaviours that escalate towards some form of violence.84

Burton took issue with what was being achieved as an outcome of strategies of containment, which were put into practice according to a perception of competing international political realities. Settlements within this framework could not reformulate incompatible social goals because they were only capable of negotiating about finite and divisible *interests*. Given that *needs* are ontologically based and located within each human being, they cannot be exchanged or divided between people. For instance, with an issue such as security, one person’s fulfilment of a sense of security does not necessarily lessen that of other people. In fact, it is more likely that when the need for security is being more universally met, it is less likely that security will be a cause of conflict.85 Burton reasons that a needs-based approach can make more realistic correlations between extremes of advantage and disadvantage and cumulative threats from social and environmental exploitation and degradation. He conceives that the framework of a *world society paradigm* is a viable means to take account of global
interests through means other than an international system of competing states, with its bias to focus primarily on balances of political power.86

Burton is critical of realism’s primary emphasis on present political realities, which gives minimal consideration to means for shaping possible future social goals and other possible means, besides present political realities, through which to consider future directions of change.87

The interdisciplinary approach of Wallerstein88 combines empirical-historical depth with theoretical concepts to express how the entire world has come to be dominated by a capitalist system that increasingly limits the autonomy of specific social units. His major concern is to re-frame historical analysis of how worldwide disparities of political and economic power have developed, rather than to necessarily propose how these fundamental problems might ultimately be overcome.89 Wallerstein portrays how centres of modern power originated from Europe, North America and Japan and how they presently influence the worldwide system of individual nation-states through a particular pattern of organisation. His view of capital is broader than that of Marx, because he portrays capitalism as an actual system in itself, encompassing economic, political and social dimensions. Wallerstein's approach reconstructs an historical social science freed from biases that, he asserts, have distorted both history and approaches to scientific inquiry through means such as reductionism, Euro-centrism, state-centrism, and compartmentalism. The world-systems approach seeks to understand the system overall by looking both at broad historic trends, while maintaining an interest in the influence of political actors and the aggregate effect of local politics and cultural dimensions.90 The project allows historical developments to be re-examined in a way which does not presuppose natural and separate histories of nation-states.91 It represents an alternative framing of a realist worldview than the more conventional Western subjective understandings of the world political map.92 His approach suggests that over the last five hundred years a growing number of previously more or less isolated and self-sufficient societies have been incorporated into a complex system of functional relations in a competitive state system. The expansion of capitalist relations has resulted in a small number of Eurocentric core states, themselves made up of smaller amalgamated units, transforming huge external global arenas into periphery relationships with them.

Wallerstein's conceptualisation of the capitalist world-economy encompasses a wide range of activities of states, which impinge on family life and decision-making mechanisms within particular localities. This allows societies to be represented not only in terms of
reproduction and adaptation, but also in terms of creation and self-production. Conflict in this sense can be framed as the outcome of struggles between actors who have different visions of desirable futures conceptualised in terms of human consciousness and agency. World-systems theory posits that conflict arises in all situations and scales within the world system. It can arise within and between a range of different components within systems of power formed by governing structures and, equally, in processes by which economic power is transmitted by market forces through capitalist institutions and processes through which people act individually and collectively through voluntary association.

Wallerstein's theory of capitalist imperialism suggests that all forms of intra-state and inter-state trading arrangements in the world economy encompass the two major requirements of capitalist exchange: expansion and unequal exchange. This perspective of competitive global trading patterns actually explains why it has not been possible to formulate some form of conventional international politics as a means of regulating transnational economic activity. Wallerstein also predicts the end of the contemporary US hegemony, given that the very success of the capitalist system, which has led to its expansion, will itself be the downfall of liberalism and faith in the state as the central locus of social change and progress. Increasingly disparities of wealth will create an even greater failure to fulfil human needs and the search, primarily through identity politics, for new structures of security. While he does predict world disorder, he also proposes that new solutions could be found, which, in part, will require revisions in the way we looking at the past as well as at the future. He suggests:

> We shall find ourselves in what scientists today are calling a bifurcation far from equilibrium, whose resolution is intrinsically unpredictable, but in which every intervention has great impact.

In summary, the above overview of structural theories indicates a range of frameworks that can be employed for explaining and evaluating incompatibilities of interests, needs and goals, and provide foundations for critically considering matters of scale and context when explaining the occurrence of conflict within social systems. However, the capacity to explain complex ideas through simple concepts is both the strength and the weakness of structural theories. There needs to be complementarity with agency-based theories to more comprehensively understand why particular conflicts occur exactly where, when and how they do, and why they take particular forms, some of which involve overt violence while others do not.
Theories that Explain Conflict in Terms of Human Agency

Agency-based explanations locate the causes of conflict at the level of individual or collective agency based on studies of human behaviour. Applied separately, or sometimes conjointly, they are useful for evaluating marked increases or decreases in social conflict as a result of conscious processes. They focus on the attitudes and behaviours of individuals who become involved in conflict and on social processes whereby conflict is perceived in social interactions that take place between individuals and groups. They can also be useful for explaining competition and exchange mechanisms, and for evaluating how conflicts develop through similar or dissimilar patterns.

Sociobiological studies tend to examine human nature as shaped by the competitive conditions under which conflict can emerge and develop. A great deal of sociobiological theory has drawn from the ideas of Darwin, relating to natural selection and the role of biological evolution as it affects and is affected by human societies. There is a strong tendency to acknowledge that aggression within species, including humans, is strongly rooted in genetic inheritance and that certain types of aggressive behaviour, such as predatory aggression, inter-male aggression, maternal defensive aggression, fear induced aggression and irritable aggression, are innate and biologically determined. However, studies about the range of biologically determined behaviours have widened. Other inherited patterns of human behaviour, including innate gestures of submission and a willingness to cooperate, have similarly been drawn into consideration. There is presently no general consensus about the degree to which aggression can be singled out as a fundamental trait or human pattern of behaviour. Darwin’s theories remain central for biological research that traces behaviour to biological roots. However, developments within fields such as anthropology and sociology, which focus on relationships between human behaviour and human culture have been less inclined to draw conclusions about basic instincts. Instead what they reveal are the diversity of ways through which behaviour is created and reproduced in a variety of ways through social learning.

Research that has followed from ideas based on the psychoanalysis of Freud focus on the psychological roots of human aggression governed by instincts. This approach maintains a strong interest in the degree to which aggression is dependent on social institutions that influence basic human nature, in order to ascertain whether it is the inevitable arbiter of human conflicts. Recent studies highlight the need to qualify many Freudian concepts about human instincts. At issue is the fact that there are so many different kinds of behaviour that can be construed as aggressive, depending on the social context, that it is difficult to determine a general pattern. Absolute conclusions have not
been drawn about a general human instinct for aggression. Most studies now generally acknowledge that humankind is faced with a wide range of conditions in which aggression can be a natural response.\(^{101}\)

Social psychologists maintain an interest in human interaction. Studies focus on processes of group formation and differentiation. One of the key terms in social psychology is symbolic interaction. It emphasises that to understand human behaviour it is necessary to understand both its subjective and reflective character. Meanings used to guide behaviour grow primarily out of the interactions between people.\(^{102}\) A focus on the role that images, (mis)perceptions, stereotyping and dehumanisation play in the social processes which can lead to violent conflict is exemplified in the work of Lewin. He founded a school of thought that has come to be known as group dynamics. Lewin's studies, coming from a background of Gestalt psychology, gave the name ‘field theory’ to his approach. Behaviour is seen to be the result of a field of forces which determine the behaviour of those involved in social processes.\(^{103}\) Lewin's approach illustrates how studies relating to human agency within group dynamics can make meaningful connections with theories relating to systems. His studies demonstrate different styles of leadership that can affect behaviour. Deutsch's work has followed closely from that of Lewin.\(^{104}\) His approach has more specifically centred on conditions in which conflicts can be effectively resolved and the articulation of certain rules that both sides need to agree to follow even while continuing their conflict, in order to consider possible paths to resolution.\(^{105}\)

Pruitt and Rubin\(^{106}\), also social psychologists, take a particular interest in articulating how groups deal with conflict through certain basic strategies that they summarise as contending, yielding, problem solving, withdrawing and inaction. They focus on evaluating which actions and strategies are more or less likely to escalate conflicts. For instance, when parties adopt contending strategies, a situation is created whereby each perceives itself to be the more powerful and, while each has high aspirations for the future, they share little perception of common interests. In a similar way, they have evaluated forces through which escalation of conflict can be resisted. These include factors such as fear of escalation, bonds existing between the potential antagonists, bonds with other parties who oppose conflict, conflict-limiting norms and institutions and the existence of a balance of power.\(^{107}\)

A significant pioneer of the study of the role of conflict in relation to social organisation was the German philosopher and sociologist, Simmel. His major interest was to
emphasise the continuity between conflict and other social processes. He recognised that transitions from conflict to peace were likely to be more problematic than transitions from peace to conflict.

The ending of a conflict is a specific enterprise. It belongs neither to war nor to peace, just as a bridge is different from either bank it connects.\textsuperscript{108}

Simmel identified five main patterns associated with terminating conflict, namely, disappearance of the object of conflict, victory for one of the parties, compromise, conciliation and irreconcilability. He also suggests that the tendency to compromise “is one of mankind’s greatest inventions”.\textsuperscript{109} According to him, all exchanges of things are compromises, based on the development of a common standard of value for what is at issue and some explicit agreement on that standard basis, which serves the interests of both parties.\textsuperscript{110} In the 1950’s, Coser\textsuperscript{111} attempted to give a more formal representation to many of Simmel’s ideas, extending them to suggest, as in the following example, how conflict may be observed in relationships.

Discussion of the distinction between types of conflict, and between types of social structures, leads us to conclude that conflict tends to be dysfunctional for a social structure in which there is no or insufficient toleration and institutionalization of conflict. The intensity of a conflict which threatens to “tear apart,” which attacks the consensual basis of a social system, is related to the rigidity of the structure. What threatens the equilibrium of such a structure is not conflict as such, but the rigidity itself which permits hostilities to accumulate and to be channelled along one major line of cleavage once they break out in conflict.\textsuperscript{112}

Kriesberg\textsuperscript{113} approaches conflict from yet another perspective. His interest has been to evaluate what factors contribute to making some conflicts easier to resolve, while others become particularly resistant to resolution, a phenomenon he describes as "intractable conflict".\textsuperscript{114} Kriesberg maintains an interest in the formation of personal and social identities. He suggests that intractable conflicts are usually those in which patterns of opposition have become so strongly embedded in the parties' sense of identity, they are less susceptible to resolution simply through discussion of interests in an objective way. Thus identifying the parties’ interests will not necessarily address all that is really at stake in the conflict.\textsuperscript{115}

In a relatively similar vein, Azar\textsuperscript{116} seeks to explain post-colonial wars that cannot necessarily be described as either international wars or internal wars within successor states. His approach is concerned with understanding the dynamics that generate violent and persistent conflicts that revolve around the questions of communal identity.\textsuperscript{117} Azar describes this type of conflict in the following terms:

...many conflicts currently active in the underdeveloped parts of the world are characterized by a blurred demarcation between internal and external sources and actors. Moreover, there are multiple causal factors and dynamics, reflected in changing goals, actors and targets. Finally, these conflicts do not show clear starting and terminating points.\textsuperscript{118}
Some theories about the relationship between human agency and social organisation attempt to more clearly formulate ideas that can apply with regard to different social systems. The sociologist Homans\textsuperscript{119} sought to define a set of principles relevant to all social interactions, irrespective of differences between societies or cultures, describing the material and social benefits that people derive from the social system as exchanges of ‘goods’.\textsuperscript{120} His analysis evaluates interactions broadly in terms of reciprocity, the rewards and costs experienced by the individuals involved and, how, when rewards in relation to costs are tolerable, behaviour is maintained that brings the most communal benefit. Homans’ approach provides a framework for analysing how and why certain groups are formulated, and the primary patterns of interactional behaviour through which they are maintained.\textsuperscript{121} Theories about exchange and reciprocity can be useful when they relate to ideas about equity and distribution and how group interaction links with social conflict in terms of perceiving certain arrangements as just or unjust. The conditions in which people perceive they have not achieved equitable outcomes are likely to be conditions of marked social conflict and can be especially intense when people perceive themselves to be committed involuntarily to social relationships that are inequitable.\textsuperscript{122}

Another theoretical approach is that of the economist Boulding\textsuperscript{123} who draws heavily from economic models to understand social processes, exchange mechanisms and conflict.\textsuperscript{124} Boulding suggests that conflicts, especially in matters relating to economic interests, tend to be regulated by markets, because the more perfect the competition, the less likelihood of economic conflict. In this respect, his interest has been to study both occasions when markets operate successfully and when they break down. He emphasises the importance of comparing these two aspects in relation to one another to avoid the tendency to attribute to economic institutions themselves phenomena that are essentially associated with their breakdown.\textsuperscript{125}

Boulding accepts that modern economics tends to deal primarily with positive exchanges of ‘goods’ but he explores how economic theory can also be used to understand negative exchanges that represent the ‘bads’ in exchange systems.\textsuperscript{126} He focuses on the way exchanges of reward differ from exchanges of punishments and threats to harm. Boulding considers that one of the main differences lies in the fact that negative exchanges most often do not have points of equilibrium, such as those that determine price value in positive economic exchanges.\textsuperscript{127} His ideas have relevance for studying whether transfers of goods and services have adequate reciprocity, or whether they are one-way transfers, or transfers where goods may have a different value for the giver and receiver.\textsuperscript{128} One of Boulding’s most notable contributions to the study of economics was to give it structural...
meaning as a component of power in relation to other social processes (depicted as Three Faces of Power in the model set out in Fig 1, Chapter 1).

A second grouping of theories described in this section are social discourse theories. They attempt to understand conflict by drawing from critical social theory, or post-structural theory. Many contemporary theories recognise that certain differences between people are difficult to explain simply by theorising generally about overall systems, given the profound variations in the way societies deal with basic differentiations based on race, religion, nationality or gender. In many instances, status can change depending on age or other determinants. For instance, change can occur according to an individual’s generational placement as a determinate of particular privilege and obligation. Social change, such as sudden increases in birth rates that create demographic pressure, or change in groups' traditional modes of production, suggest there are likely to be corresponding changes in the social patterns through which personal status is legitimated which consequently leads to profound social conflict. In a similar way, gender roles can undergo change at different stages in the life cycle. When societies undergo rapid social change due to innovations and adaptations of technology or when economic conditions impact on levels of household prosperity, changing roles and occupational areas such as that of homemakers, can create social conflict. Feminist theory has attempted to give recognition to the biases and the predominance of male perspectives in the development of social theory in Western academic traditions. Feminist studies,\textsuperscript{129} analysing life and society specifically from a female point of view, can focus either on psychological and cultural issues that are only indirectly tied to the social structure in order to understand distinctive female qualities or on reducing analytical bias based on gender difference. In some respects, feminist theory attempts to apply a structural approach to social organisation, when the considerations relate to the way that the female sex can be systematically disadvantaged in male-dominated societies. Insofar as it attempts to reveal how this contributes as a factor within a structure influencing the general organisation of society, gender difference can be conceived as a considerable factor influencing social conflict.

Studies with this orientation are generally referred to as social discourse theories because they emphasise the language and concepts people routinely use and apply in their lives.\textsuperscript{130} This is relevant particularly in terms of how these features can generate exclusionist identities, such as insiders and outsiders, or conceptualisations of advantage and disadvantage, or threat and security. They emphasise that conflict cannot be solely explained by focusing analysis primarily on elites within political, economic or social
spheres. Social discourse promotes the development of an ethos of pluralism and new discourses through which to celebrate difference, diversity and otherness, rather than perceiving difference as a problem. One of the most notable theorists in this field is the German philosopher and sociologist, Habermas. Habermas’ theory of how language in everyday life is used to produce collective understandings and mutual agreements is called universal pragmatics. He uses speech act theory to explain what people might be assuming and how they defend their statements when they actively communicate. This has implications for the commitment between people talking with each other about means to cooperate.

A third grouping of agency-based theories that offer explanation about the underlying causes of conflict is human needs theory, developed most notably by John Burton. As previously indicated, human needs theory has a structural element, because it can be applied to more clearly differentiate between individual and collective positions, interests, values and needs. However, equally, as a theoretical concept, it has relevance for identifying the needs of individual agents. Accordingly, it represents positions as a set of public demands, which are closely linked with negotiable interests. It represents values in terms of a set of individual or collective cultural constructs which are less open to change. The final category, needs, as defined by Burton, represents underlying basic human needs which he asserts are ontologically-based, and are universal and non-negotiable. Burton argues that, irrespective of the variability of the overall features that can be identified as influencing a conflict, analysis must relate back to the fundamental issue of the satisfaction of basic needs. This is on the understanding that they are essential for social stability, and that people will seek to satisfy them, even at the cost of social disruption. When social institutions change in ways that fail to satisfy basic human needs, or if they are violated, analysis needs to focus on identifying how this gives rise to protest, rebellion and violence. Burton’s approach does not follow normative sociological tradition, which tends to regard conflict as a symptom of dysfunctional behaviour. He promotes the need to analyse conflict as a more intrinsic component inherent in all human relationships.

The peace researcher, Galtung, also takes a specific interest in human needs. He identifies certain relationships in terms of need-subjects and satisfiers of needs as need-objects. For example, hunger is a need and food is the satisfier of that need. This approach encounters a significant theoretical problem because needs cannot be definitively identified in terms of groups or collectivities of people. Galtung addresses this problem by asserting that social arrangements are required in order for needs to be
satisfied. In this sense, people work collectively through social processes to bring about the fulfilment of needs because the collectivity shares the same individual needs. It could be argued that striving to fulfil needs could be described as rights. However, rights can be differentiated from needs because rights are located in relationships between people, whereas needs are located within single individuals. Social processes through which individuals seek to fulfil human needs will inevitably have similarities with political processes, because acting collectively to fulfil human needs requires some general consciousness of the need. Galtung expresses this idea in the following terms:

..to satisfy such basic material well-being needs as food, clothing, shelter, medical treatment and schooling, something material is obviously needed, meaning that there is a material economy of need-satisfaction. For a freedom need like the need to move, to have choice, or to express oneself; or an identity need like the need for a sense of meaning with life, it is doubtful whether in general anything material is needed at all.

In summary, the above overview of agency-based theories indicates a range of approaches that provide bases for understanding the agency of individuals in group behaviour, differences between fleeting and protracted conflicts, the importance of discourse for revealing meaning and the relevance of culture as well as the centrality of human needs. The study of conflict requires linkages to be made between structural theoretical assumptions that support and complement agency-based theories. Together they contribute to our capacity to understand the context in which a conflict is embedded and make distinctions between an actual conflict and its outcomes and consequences.

**SECTION 2: PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES**

This section specifically elaborates on ideas about conflict that have developed within the broad framework of peace research. The concept of peace is generally treated as having exclusive relevance in fields such as metaphysics or religious or ideological debate. Given the wide range of connotations and philosophical conceptualisations of peace, it has inevitably been challenging for scholars working within the field, as much as it is for those who are not, to fully grasp the substance of this subject. Peace researchers have shared a general concern that conventional approaches, on their own, have limited capacity to contribute to scientific knowledge through which to understand the relevance of peace in relation to contemporary world events, or at least that there is a warranted need to develop a wider more inclusive framework in which to situate ideas about peace. The ethos of science has been seen as a valid means through which studies that maintain the concept of peace as their source of legitimacy are disengaged from nonscientific discourse. As the field of peace research has evolved, it has gained wider
recognition due to the trend in social discourse to accept the interdependence of knowledge systems.

A significant challenge is whether, as a social science, peace research can maintain scientific integrity while, at the same time, extend and transcend conventional discourse in order to incorporate considerations and possibilities that may have an impact on future as well as present relationships. Achieving this purpose has required scholars to consider conventional processes of scientific investigation that are reliant on factual data to generate warrantable additions to knowledge while also looking for innovative approaches through which to articulate how present realities actually embody a potentiality for transformational change.

Most interpretations of peace suggest some consistency with a broad image of harmony of interests. However, this is somewhat different from simply suggesting that harmonious interests are sustained completely by harmonious behaviour or that peace can necessarily be the keystone of all community life. At different levels of human experience, peace tends to imply a certain quality of inter-relationship, from a personal state of being through to how individuals relate with one another and respond to overcome divisions, consider alternative preferred goals and seek to create common well-being and community.

Peace research does not necessarily maintain the purpose of suggesting how individuals should modify their ideas as to what peace signifies for them personally. Thus there is an acceptance that no single definition could encompass the full extent of the meaning of peace. Nevertheless, like any other expression of human existence or experience, the concept of peace warrants systematised study in order to explore its conceptual significance, how the concept is applied and how individuals within a range of social and cultural contexts reflect upon it. Scientific methodology has been applied in peace research based on the presumption that the concept of peace influences and permeates all human endeavours to deal with problems, contradictions, uncertainties and incompatibilities that occur both in everyday circumstances and in large and complex institutionalised processes. It is studied to explore how the concept of peace contributes to our understanding of the range of possible means through which people can respond to conflict.

However, this does not presuppose that conflict itself is the concept that is taken to be in diametrical opposition to peace. The more critical issue is the relationship between the
concept of peace and the phenomenon of violent conflict. The significance of violent conflict in the contemporary world confronts us regularly through the popular media. Empirical data and statistics accessible through research institutes such as the Center for International Development and Conflict Management at the University of Maryland and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute indicate trends and the magnitude of fatalities that are a direct outcome of systematic warfare. However, empirically based statistics could not possibly summarise the cumulative detrimental affects of all episodes direct or indirect violence and simmering cultures of non-cooperation that negatively influence the quality of life of millions of people.

Discussion in this section initially traces the emergence of contemporary peace research within the particular historical context of the twentieth century. This serves, firstly, to describe its evolution as a field of scientific inquiry and, secondly, to provide a basis for appreciating how it has attempted to generate frameworks of understanding that will be consistently relevant in diverse and changing circumstances. Early contemporary studies focused predominantly on what is described as 'negative peace', or a concern to better understand the phenomenon of war and the potential for alleviating war. This was open to be construed as a scientific representation of the relatively limited concept of 'pacifism'. The focus of research has broadened toward an integration that is as concerned with 'positive peace'. Scholars who study the relationship between the concepts of peace and conflict tend to see the primary purpose of research being to explore for and identify capacity toward integration, cooperation, compromise and trustworthy relationships. They are taken to be fundamental considerations for envisaging and promoting cohesive, healthy and sustainable societies. However, there are two elements entailed in the study of 'positive peace'. The first, which is the primary focus of this chapter, requires the development of analytical processes through which to explain the meaning of violent conflict. As a conceptual idea it has to encompass more than episodes of overt and systematic violent warfare. It is also necessary to explain how unjust and oppressive relationships actually limit capacity for people to realise 'positive peace'. The second element requires the development of analytical frameworks to explain social processes that have the capacity to transform violent relationships. Therefore the concept of 'positive peace' is equally relevant to the discussion in Chapter Three, which focuses on interventionist strategies that are a response to violent conflict.

Chapter One first raised the idea of the potential for a more meaningful integration of studies relating to violent conflict and sustainability, given that both can be conceived as global problems. Most definitions of sustainability suggest the need to consider the
impact of present realities on future realities and aspirations to develop social processes that focus on ways to improve the quality of life in such a way that the actual life-support systems on which we depend are sustained.  Although the present discussion focuses on ideas developed specifically within peace research, it is possible to conceive a parallel application of these ideas in sustainability research. For instance, the alleviation or the rectification of practices perceived to be unsustainable could be conceived as 'negative sustainability' while attempts to promote practices that are inherently more sustainable could be defined as 'positive sustainability'.

Establishing a Place for Peace Research in the Scientific Discourse

Scholars whose work has contributed to the development of contemporary peace research have sought to apply quantitative techniques through diverse academic traditions to study wars that were taking place on an ever-widening scale. They have attempted to relate scientific technique to social issues traditionally perceived to belong more within the province of ethics and morality. One American scholar of war, Quincy Wright, was a noted expert on international law. His major work *The Study of War* surveyed the history and causes of wars from primitive warfare through to warfare in the atomic age. Another English scholar with an interest in war was Lewis Fry Richardson. Richardson was trained in the natural sciences and is most noted as a leader in the science of meteorology through his applications of mathematics to predict weather patterns. However, stemming from his Quaker concern with issues of peace, he also sought to apply mathematical modelling techniques and statistical analysis to quantitatively investigate dynamics relating to war and peace. Richardson drew correlations between the conditions which create violent weather and the conditions of a social atmosphere which create group violence. This is reflected in one of Richardson's most noted quotations:

Big whorls have little whorls that feed on their velocity, and little whorls have smaller whorls and so on to viscosity. 

Richardson posited whether it was possible to use the power of mathematical logic to help understand basic processes of human conflict. While he argued that "science ought to be subordinate to morals", he nevertheless considered it necessary to remove normative bias from scientific work, on the grounds that science itself demanded moral neutrality in the name of objectivity.

In 1955 another English scholar, Theodore Lentz, became the first Director-General of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. At that time, the scientific community was bound up with attempts to resolve the aftermath of World War II and to
deal with the realities of the Cold War. Lentz’s most significant publication, *Towards a Science of Peace*, tentatively sets out reasons for applying scientific knowledge to confront pressing problems for the world community at that time. His view was that science could offer a universal discourse, with a core principle of free discussion at all social levels. Lentz claimed this could provide a broader foundation for more realistically and practically supporting the prevention of war than either theology or philosophy. He argued that scientific method was capable of divorcing itself from distorting prejudices and could transcend social and political barriers. Lentz envisaged a science of peace being a means for restoring a balance between the development of physical power and the insufficient development of what he termed human ‘character’ to better realise human potential. His goal was to draw a distinction between a universally relevant academic discourse about the causes of war with the relatively untrained particularist outlooks and philosophies underpinning peace movements.

Lentz argued that academic discourse committed to research where peace was conceived to be a universal ideal required the advancement of scientifically based explanatory causal laws. This would be a means of developing capacity to predict certain outcomes if certain conditions were observed to prevail. Thus the purpose of the positivist scientific approach advocated by Lentz would be a core commitment to providing the grounds for understanding when certain events could be expected to occur, explained in terms of conformity with a universal model. This could be differentiated from the purpose of a realist philosophy of science where the trend is toward a requirement for delineating the causal processes involved in the generation of any phenomena that is the subject of study. Whereas the positivist approach places reliance on logical argument as a basis for identifying evidence that certain conditions give rise to certain outcomes, the realist philosophical approach takes the position that it is necessary to provide a basis for describing connections between causes and effects. In this approach there would be less interest in indicating in what way a phenomenon, such as war, could be described as a consequent event arising out of certain causal conditions as certain former conditions may not necessarily regularly give rise to certain outcomes. The realist philosophy of science requires that equal significance be given to offering explanation about intervening mechanisms and structures linking causes and effects together and the manner of their interaction. On this basis, the study of war would be reliant on a social science framework that could describe specific structures and mechanisms.

Lentz was promoting a general commitment from the scientific community towards positivism with respect to war and peace alongside empirical research methodology.
However, his aspirations were overshadowed by a continuing emphasis on the advancement of the realist approach. The predominant means for offering causal explanation has been through mechanisms and structures defined in terms of national interests. It was in the sphere of national political processes that the direction of scientific inquiry was dictated, and moral and financial support given to advance scientific projects. Scholars advocating the positivist approach generally had to settle for less universal projects, which could be undertaken and supported within their own national spheres. This analysis firstly emphasises that it is necessary to make distinctions in the way the term realist is applied in scientific discourse. However, it also indicates how the two uses of the term have a direct bearing on each other in this thesis.

**Establishment of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Movement**

Processes of dispute resolution are more generally conceived as a response to a contentious situation and as such will consequently be discussed in subsequent chapters. However, an outline of the evolution of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) movement is incorporated at this stage because conceptual and theoretical ideas developed in this field also shed light on perceptions of the causes and characteristics of conflict. The terms 'conflict resolution' and 'dispute resolution' are often used in a relatively uncritical and interchangeable way, which leads to ambiguity as to precisely what a process is attempting to resolve. Sometimes scholars and practitioners use the term 'conflict resolution' when describing ADR processes; however many scholars perceive a conceptual difference between disputes and conflicts.

The field of ADR originated primarily in the US to contribute towards better management practices with respect to the functioning of the apparatus of the status quo. One significant theorist in this emergent field in the 1930's and 1940's was Mary Parker Follett. Her theoretical approach to organisational behaviour and labour-management relations theory was seminal to the development of concepts such as 'mutual gains', 'win-win' solutions, community-based solutions, strength in human diversity, 'integrative bargaining' as an alternative to the more concessional 'distributive bargaining' approach. The theoretical orientation of ADR tends toward the ontological strand of theory described as the **subjectivist approach**. This approach relates behaviours to attitudes, as these concepts feature in the conflict triangle in Fig. 4. This is because ADR processes can be conceived as the means for ultimately determining **contradiction**, or **incompatible interests**, in the immediate context of a dispute. It can be differentiated from the **objectivist approach**, which focuses on offering causal explanations that more broadly
consider how existing structures maintain *contradictions* and thus require radical change within the structure itself.

There are inevitable overlaps between the objectives of the ADR movement and peace research. However, ADR was developed to be incorporated within the structure of an existing functioning social system rather than to be instituted in situations that had become significantly radicalised by conflict. Those directly involved with prescribed legal processes perceived it to be a necessary alternative process that could be accommodated within a functionalist social science framework developed to be relevant within a specific national context. This means there has not been the same need for scholars and practitioners involved with ADR to grapple more critically with ideas about how to define its role and legitimacy to the extent that this has been necessary for scholars involved with peace research.

As ADR developed as a practical response to a perceived need, there is not as strong an emphasis in the literature about its theoretical underpinnings. It evolved primarily at an organisational level, both through professional bodies set up to promote its advancement, and through court systems themselves that required its development.\(^\text{165}\)

The ADR movement tends not to have a cohesive homogeneous school of thought guiding its development. There is no overall consensual definition of what constitutes ADR.\(^\text{166}\) Its practices have evolved to address a range of substantive issues, including commercial and civil issues, labour disputes, environmental disputes, family and divorce, neighbourhood disputes and public policy matters. In this sense, ADR reflects a pragmatic response to the critical tenor of the times.\(^\text{167}\) ADR theory could be described as emerging as a set of core principles developed by those who have gained useful insights through practice and the reporting of outcomes. Rather than a representative theoretical framework, its purpose is demonstrated by reference to these principles, which are maintained across a wide range of ADR functions. Despite distinctions in ADR practices in different contexts, it is broadly regarded as a movement promoting greater flexibility to allow for consensual approaches as alternatives to litigation through the courts to deal with contention.\(^\text{168}\) Its processes have been conceived to afford potential benefits in civic terms through a focus on mutually satisfactory outcomes capable of fostering more positive relationships. In the US it was envisaged to be the means of fulfilling two relatively distinct purposes that will be discussed in turn.
The first purpose, funded and supported by the courts and the legal profession, was to provide protagonists with an ‘alternative’ to resorting to costly and protracted formal legal or judicial processes. ADR principles have proved sufficient to explain the fulfilment of this purpose as a particular type of interventionist strategy, or means of problem-solving. It has found favour amongst many individuals and organisations as well as the judiciary itself, to counter an increasing trend toward litigation.\textsuperscript{169} From as early as 1913 boards such as the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service were established to carry out mediations for a range of collective bargaining disputes. These disputes were creating problems for the judiciary and those seeking recourse through the courts. By the latter half of the twentieth century, US court lists were so full that there were long delays in obtaining trial dates. This led to concern being expressed through judicial institutions and policy-makers about access to justice. Complex litigious procedures were generating high costs, delays, confusions and the potential for intimidation. The procedures were perceived to actually inhibit people with real grievances from pursuing them through formal legal processes. ADR was advocated to streamline case processing and provide quicker and less expensive resolutions when conflicts might otherwise drag on or escalate. Increasingly high awards granted as an outcome of litigation were also contributing to a perception that litigation could be both unpredictable and hazardous. This created a climate in which it was understandable that those who might otherwise have become involved in litigation could consider ADR as a viable alternative.\textsuperscript{170}

The second purpose was to develop ‘alternative’ processes that could overcome the continuance of deep-seated inter-group community conflicts embedded within US society through the establishment in the 1970’s of civil programs run through neighbourhood and community social justice centres. These contentions manifested primarily through social movements promoting radical change to existing laws and policies. The concerns included civil rights, minority group rights and the rights of women. These broad-based social conflicts were generally beyond the jurisdiction of a court to address in their entirety. Only certain manifestations of underlying social conflict could come before the courts, expressed as particular dispute actions.\textsuperscript{171} Where communities were experiencing long-term disharmony, ADR mediation was seen as a means to increase individuals’ direct participation in the resolution of issues and thereby contribute to rebuilding neighbourhood communities. A major issue that was perceived to have an impact on parties’ capacity to participate was how to take account of ‘continuing relationships’.\textsuperscript{172} The goal of the civil mediation programs run through the neighbourhood justice centres was to address community disputes through processes that were less expensive and more effective than adjudicatory processes that could give specific attention to the present
and future community context in which resolutions would take effect. A primary focus was on articulating shared responsibilities as well as individual rights that could produce satisfactory outcomes for the parties immediately concerned as well as having a positive flow-on influence within the broader community.

However, ADR was unable to achieve this second intended purpose of alleviating deep-seated and widespread communal dissent. Research undertaken by Harrington indicates that instituting these informal justice programs had little actual effect on caseloads dealing with actions brought before the courts by individuals. Civic programs ultimately came to rely heavily on court referrals. Although the primary purpose of the neighbourhood justice centres was to frame disputes within a wider community context, there appeared to be no notable differences in the way ADR functioned in community contexts and the way it functioned as an alternative to conventional court proceedings. This meant that the civil mediation services bore little resemblance to the neighbourhood-controlled programs that had originally been envisaged for building or rebuilding a sense of community.

The reason can, in part, be attributed to the fact that the theoretical explanations as to how ADR would overcome this type of deeply embedded social conflict were still biased toward and constrained by normative and functionalist models. Little allowance was made to develop an alternative way of scoping or framing the actual root causes of the problems, that is, new ways of approaching the component of problem-identification. This reflects that understanding deep-seated conflicts requires a much broader analytical framework than that required for explaining disputes. Burton asserts that the distinction between disputes and conflicts is that the contradiction inherent in a dispute can be resolved through the parties reaching a compromise. A subjectivist approach would be sufficient to identify problematic individual attitudes and behaviours. Interventionist strategies such as adjudication, arbitration, facilitated mediation or negotiation could be instituted in an effort to change them and there would be little need to drastically alter the mechanisms and institutions governing the social system. However, Burton suggests conflicts "are not the ordinary ideas, choices, preferences and interests which are argued and negotiated as part of normal social living". The lack of success with regard to the second purpose in promoting ADR reflects that conflicts require more than a simple assessment of immediately apparent factors. An objectivist approach is required in order to identify contradiction in terms of the social structure itself, as a basis for indicating how it has an impact on both the attitudes and behaviours of individual constituents.
Peace Research Generating New Theoretical Approaches to Conflict

Peace as a subject of systematised scientific inquiry began to consolidate in the 1960’s in part as a counter to the way in which scholars, such as Carr, in the discipline of international relations, were framing past and present realities primarily in terms of realist relations between states. This maintained a strong focus on political power, sovereignty and the primacy of national interest, which was articulated most convincingly and forcefully by stronger and more stable core states compared with neocolonial states. *Realist* approaches tend to comprehend the way things actually appear to be, whereas peace research sees the need for another approach which makes it possible to more broadly speculate about what things should or could become.

One program dedicated to the concerted study of the phenomenon of conflict was instituted at the Center for Research in Conflict Resolution in the late 1950’s at the University of Michigan. Its scholars came from diverse fields within the social sciences and included Kenneth Boulding, an economist, Anatol Rapoport, a sociologist, Herbert Kelman, a social psychologist, and Walter Isard whose focus was on regional studies. The Center's studies made a significant contribution toward counter-balancing the bias in the more conventional fields of political science and international relations, framed in terms of the immutable nature of external relations between sovereign states. The scholars' concern with conflict, and war as a quite specific form of violent conflict, was in part influenced by the advent of the nuclear arms race between the superpowers of the US and the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR).

Through conferences in the late 1960’s and the 1970’s, debate emerged about the role and purpose of peace research. It had inevitably been fostered in a climate in which the superpowers were attempting to maintain and expand their spheres of influence. European social science scholars claimed that US researchers’ framing of the purpose of peace research maintained too strong a bias toward state-centric frameworks. Even though European scholars supported the scientific orientation and methodologies through which American researchers were developing innovative means to study war and conflict, they were critical of the way US scholars took for granted approaches generated through international relations theory. They saw a reliance on *realist* state-centric frameworks to be fundamentally problematic, even if the ultimate goal was to present alternative arguments within those frameworks.

These debates took place within a social climate where modern establishment values were coming under critical review and assertions were being raised about the rights of
minorities or those otherwise disempowered within nation-states. It reflected a civil backlash against superpower involvement in the nationalist politics of other states. One reflection of this trend was US involvement in the national politics of Vietnam.\textsuperscript{184} This crisis of legitimation concerning the values of Western democracies reflected disenchantment with both the internal condition and external relations of Western democracies, what Habermas refers to as "the untruth of prevailing legitimations".\textsuperscript{185} It was a protest against the way European ideals of the Eighteenth Century had developed into constitutional norms that prompted a questioning as to whether those ideals could be effectively reproduced in other societies in ways that adequately maintained the human needs and interests of people within those societies. The extensive promotion of Eurocentric ideals was seen to be a factor widening the gap between industrially developed states and newly emerging developing neocolonial states.\textsuperscript{186} The widening gap between poverty and abundance in global terms coupled with the impact that human activity was having on the planet prompted the United Nations to establish the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1983. It was through the Commission’s Brundtland Report that the concept of sustainability emerged.\textsuperscript{187}

In America the predominance of functionalist approaches gave rise to a systems-theoretic sociology reflecting a relatively uncritical scientific rationalisation of the status quo.\textsuperscript{188} This is exemplified in the previous discussion relating to ADR. Mainstream US sociology tended to focus on the description and management of the existing social system. This was criticised as playing down the role and significance of critical social theory. The US approach still characterised post-industrial society in terms of abundance based upon the production of material wealth. There was an increasing reliance on a disproportionate consumption of the world's non-renewable energy resources to support this lifestyle.\textsuperscript{189} The European approach tended toward making meaningful connections between scientific inquiry and social reality, more strongly influenced by a range of social theorists including Kant, Hegel, Weber and, in particular, Marx, as a means of describing changing social relations. European scholars, also drawing on the ideas of scholars such as Habermas\textsuperscript{190}, favoured a more reflexive participatory understanding requiring that the objectifying, value-neutral standpoint of a purportedly impartial observer give way to the subjectively open, value-committed attitude of an interlocutor in a shared practice.\textsuperscript{191}

European peace researchers were not only critical of the way social theorists were framing US domestic politics. They were equally concerned with the way that this influenced the framing of external relations between states, particularly relations between developed and newly independent states. The functionalist approach was perceived to
have influenced the US peace researchers’ framing of the study of prevailing wars, particularly wars of liberation being played out in the shadow of bi-polar superpower politics. European scholars sought to shift the focus of peace research from a concern with an East-West axis of conflict to a North-South global divide. They supported the idea that a more critical basis was required to challenge the assumption that the expansion of Western capitalism was crucial to the modernisation of the regions of the world that were construed to be undeveloped. This perspective drew heavily on a Marxist framing of political economy that anticipated different consequences of the expansion of capitalism.

Third world scholars were themselves also challenging positivist theories of modernisation. They depicted their states as becoming increasingly dependent upon, and underdeveloped by, international Western capitalist relations. Neocolonial states were drawn into relationships of dependence between the global core of developed states and an underdeveloped periphery driven by economic exploitation to primarily benefit core states. The scholars also depicted how, in turn, these external relationships created profoundly uneven social and economic relations within undeveloped or underdeveloped states themselves that benefited a relatively small dominant class within the peripheralised state.

Scholars who were unwilling to frame conflicts simply in terms of bi-polar politics were concerned that terms such as ‘counter-insurgency’ borrowed from realist approaches were being too narrowly applied to describe conflict in neocolonial states. They argued that this implied that the role of peace research was merely to provide options for supporters of US policies rather than provide a balanced analysis capable of depicting people struggling to free themselves from Western imperialism. The bias in American scholarship was perceived to delegitimate peace research because it favoured the perspective of predominant players in international relations. In turn, the criticism of US researchers, such as Boulding, was that European scholars, advocating an alternative to their more conservative stream of research, were merely seeking to steer peace research toward a Marxist view that framed conflict as a class struggle.

In the debates, Schmid, a Marxist-oriented scholar, perceived that part of the role of peace research was to "render manifest historically latent conflict through the encouragement of polarisation, and even the escalation of conflict". This implied that the peace researcher’s role was to sharpen or intensify the focus on conflict in order to conceptualise a need for confrontation and structural change. The intention to more
clearly articulate situations of conflict in order to bring about transformation, through revolutionary or other means, challenged whether the term ‘peace’ research was too limited for such purposes.202

**Global vs. International System**

Johan Galtung, whose ideas feature prominently in subsequent discussion, views the Marxist framework as limited to locating *interests* within an historical understanding of capitalist social relations. He argues that this fails to articulate *incompatibilities of interests* between modern capitalist relations and other types of social and economic relations maintained in small-scale social systems because Marxist frameworks are based on the general idea of an exploitative class structure as a means to explain economic relations. Therefore, this limited focus on the material forces that produce goods and services does not necessarily provide a means that is any more satisfactory for defining a wider range of *interests* with respect to an all-encompassing *global social system*. It does not offer a more satisfactory basis for explaining the characteristics of conflict than that applied by the American scholars who had been criticised for focusing primarily on "open palpable violence".203

Galtung conceives that a more universalist approach is necessary to incorporate a diversity of interpretations in order to be able to qualitatively evaluate relationships between diverse elements within systems.204 Scientific discourse would not express a wider range of identities of interests if it were solely reliant on a *realist* understanding of the world, exemplified in the OECD state-centric framework depicted in Fig. 5.

Galtung envisages that peace research has to distinguish itself in two significant ways.205 Firstly there is the need for it to be distinguished from unscientific and value-laden applications of the concept of peace. Secondly, there is also the need to develop a scientific framework through which to generate alternative sources of hypotheses amenable to assessment and to arbitrate between competing and ideologically biased theoretical accounts of social activity and identities of interests.206

Conventional international relations explanations tend to focus on external-horizontal control, whereby decision-makers seek to control or influence systems *similar to their own* in the external environment of a relatively anarchical international system where competition and the likelihood of war remain an ever-present possibility.207 This perspective generates analysis of the behaviour of nation-states framed in terms of each other's national security. An alternative approach would have to address the constraints
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Fig. 5: An OECD state-centric framework of interpretation of global trade and development

imposed by insisting that social realities have to be explained primarily in terms of states' internal relations or their external relations. These parameters are the primary realist bases for determining the characteristics of conflict. On the one hand, they define conflict as a matter of social control within a state, and therefore concepts and ideas are framed in terms of internal validity. Alternatively, they are defined as conflicts relating to a collectivity within a state seeking to achieve interdependence or independence from the social control of a state. In this case they are framed in terms of external validity. Galtung conceives that the realist perspective of international relations is problematic because it tends to place restrictions on analysis and evaluation by limiting explanations to be relevant only in terms of relations between entities similar to each other. Any alternative framework would have to be conceived as having a more universal application. Its purpose would be to define the quality of relationships between collectivities of people
who maintain different types of social systems and whose worldview is constructed according to different understandings from those that primarily support the idea of modern nation-states.

In Galtung's view a radical conceptual framework and methodological approach would have to suggest more than simply a revision of the prevailing realist paradigm. It would have to free discourse from the distortions and modifications required in order that identities of interests fit within the parameters of the generally accepted realist conceptual worldview. This would be most relevant with regard to the interests of marginalised peoples, such as the interests of indigenous communities or refugees, which can not necessarily be accorded equal or adequate significance and legitimacy alongside the institutions of modern states.  

Galtung uses an analogy with respect to the value of health as a way of describing the basis of an alternative conceptual paradigm. He asserts that this would allow for the most consensual and "intersubjectively communicable" standards. He argues that values, such as those outlined in Fig. 6, could be empirically defined and ranked according to the understandings of a medical community. He envisages the indices would be similar to those developed through the United Nations Development Program's Human Development Index (HDI) that rank countries by indices such as a long and healthy life, educational opportunities and standard of living. In Galtung's view, there was potentially a capability of allowing its members to portray an ideal picture of what the social system should, could or ought to be. In this way, he sought to avoid the prospect of functional analysis being simply a form of value judgement with respect to either preserving or changing the status quo.
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<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Growth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Socioeconomic growth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Justice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Social Injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autonomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Solidarity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marginalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ecological balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ecological Imbalance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6: Galtung's 'value dimensions' derived antonymically from a set of positive/ negative social conditions that formed the core of the World Indicators Program at the University of Oslo. (Galtung, 1974)
The questions raised by the debates amongst peace researchers centre on the issue of whether peace research could actually differentiate itself from both conservative systems-theoretic functionalism and Marxist structural frameworks and develop its own definitions and meanings about the nature of social control.\(^{213}\) An alternative framework would be required to explain relationships between diverse elements within systems and to depict both *harmonies of interests* and *disharmonies of interests* operating within and between social systems. This more inclusive framework would in turn also provide a basis for explaining different prescriptive strategies that could potentially transform problematic social relations in a wide range of contexts expressed at different scales of analysis.\(^{214}\)

Peace research would have to distinguish itself from an external-horizontal focus by giving equal significance to internal-vertical social relations, whereby decision-making could be appreciated as attempts by people to control or influence elements above or below them within a global social system.\(^{215}\) This would have to be conceptualised in terms of social activity, scoped on a global scale, to be representative of a unity of interacting parts. It would serve as a way to take account of relative degrees of cohesiveness and, where there were *disharmonies of interests*, to firstly attempt to identify what might still be objectively conceived to be common interests in terms of how people seek to meet basic needs for survival.

It is this paradigm, framed in terms of conceptual abstractions that are asserted to have consistent relevance with regard to the autotelic value of health\(^{216}\) and well-being of all people who make up the global social system, that is referred to in this thesis as an *idealist* approach.\(^{217}\) It can be broadly distinguished from the *realist* conceptualisation of a worldwide system based primarily on relationships between states where the focus is on states’ rights to compete and assert coercive power to ensure the survival of the integrity of individual states.

The *idealist* framework is problematic in the sense that abstract conceptual ideas and meanings have limited usefulness if ultimately they cannot be directly related to specific circumstances and actualities. Nevertheless its advantage is that it remains sufficiently general to apply in a wide range of circumstances without necessarily reflecting the vantage point of specific individuals, groups or nations.\(^{218}\) Explanations with wide applicability can, despite their generality, serve as cognitive tools, when the alternative would be to simply perpetuate competing interpretive discourses.\(^{219}\)

More empirically-based frameworks to counter orthodox international relations theory conceiving of a global system, rather than merely a system of states, have emerged, such
as Wallerstein’s world-systems theory. Wallerstein’s approach does offer an alternative interpretation of the way capitalist relations have, over the past five centuries or so, shaped the modern world. He argues this approach promotes a broader conceptual understanding of the way the contemporary international system has come into being and thus provides a basis for predicting how it might operate in the future. His approach thus shares certain goals in common with peace research. It shifts the focus toward thinking about the past, the present and the future in terms of relationships and interactions taking place between entities that are not necessarily similar to one another, rather than thinking in terms of fixed territorial or political units. However, the primary difference is that Wallerstein’s purpose is to provide an alternative basis for explaining the way social systems operate rather than to make evaluations about those elements of a system that can be construed to be positive or negative. Nevertheless Wallerstein’s world-systems approach does at least indicate that there are optional ways, beside mainstream realist approaches, for interpreting the past and the present. Rather than treating states as relatively fixed units so that explanations are couched simply in terms of interactions between them (entities conceived to be relatively similar to one another) he identifies a range of social forces that perpetually operate at different levels throughout the system overall. In this sense his approach does not prioritise the importance of nation-states.

Despite theory generated in the discipline of international relations becoming more pluralistic and inter-disciplinary, and developing capacity to be future-oriented, interpretations of social activity are still founded on a particular and relatively fixed nationalist-based understanding of past histories as a basis for defining present and future relationships between states. Thus its overall purpose can still be construed to be that of perpetuating a certain understanding of and support for the status quo. Given the hegemonic position of realism, it is doubtful that well-established conceptual understandings about terms such as peace and violence, or competition and cooperation, will radically change. As a conceptual framework it is questionable whether it fully allows for the incorporation of other subjective interpretations of past events as a means of explaining contemporary conflicts.

Even though Galtung envisages that the purpose of peace research should not be limited to analysing the interests of specific parties themselves, it would be necessary to develop capacity to express in objective terms certain categories of interests. The most obvious social science methodology is to elicit subjective understandings of interests and goals directly from parties involved in conflict. However, in addition, he sees the need to develop a conceptual framework which could also include interests which could be
understood as "values, not necessarily held by the actor...or the investigator, just as postulated values", such as those defined in Fig. 6. This would allow peace research to retain a transideological character, extrinsic to the specific interests of particular social groups. The approach could thus retain an autotelic quality that could take account of a potentiality for a wider and more inclusive reformulation of interests. If this were achieved, peace research could be appreciated as a way of giving more significance and substance to the notion of a common good.

This would inevitably attract criticism from scholars more inclined to favour realist approaches. However, it would equally attract criticism from within the field of peace research itself. Schmid, for instance, claims that idealist universalism could be dismissed on the grounds that it is divorced from social realities that have to be appreciated in terms of present hegemonic interests. He favours a more functionalist role for peace research, and suggests that its role can only be conceived to be that of working toward overcoming 'negative peace'. Schmid expresses doubt that any consensus exists as to the substantive content of 'positive peace', given it is so dependent upon subjectively held values.

Attempts to frame ideas in terms of an idealist paradigm in order to identify and explain capacity toward integration across a diverse range of relationships come up against the theoretical problem that structural theory and agency-based theory require a degree of complementarity with one another. Galtung counter-argues that the concept of agency is itself actually constrained if relationships continue to be primarily framed in terms of entities similar to each other, which is more the case with political realism. It is dependent on an acceptance of classifications made primarily in terms of the agency of states, and in this respect it is prone to belie the realities of situations where states cannot effectively function. This was the case at the time of the debates in peace research with respect to the Vietnam peninsula. A theoretical approach conceptualising ideas in terms of a global social system would need to assert a capacity to identify relationships between diverse elements representing diverse agents of social change. Agency that relates only to states or statist international institutions actually constrains capacity to take into consideration a wider range of relationships above and below each other within social systems and actually limits the way capacity can be identified in a variety of forms of agency.

Agency defined primarily in terms of political and economic relations between states is reliant on a presumption of a range of common identities of interest among the
incorporated elements. The issue of *identities of interest* becomes significantly more problematic to define when a social science framework is expanded to accommodate a global frame of reference. However, on the other hand, Galtung's basis for validating the promotion of the alternative paradigm is that it does not presume that there are necessarily only *common identities of interests* amongst collectivities comprising modern states. He takes the very existence of alternative collective voices as a justification for exploring a more universal and inclusive framework.\(^{228}\) Allowance needs to be made for the possibility that groups have other equally significant bases apart from those couched in nationalist terms through which to express their *identities of interest*, and therefore there other bases of analysis are needed through which to represent non-sovereign activity.\(^{229}\) According recognition to other forms of agency as a way of explaining how parties define their interests is one of the primary reasons why Galtung and other peace researchers have explored the prospect of an alternative more inclusive conceptual framework. It could be applied to explain transnational social, ideological and religious movements, non-government coalitions, relations between ethnic groups, and most particularly the interests of people excluded from or marginalised by the means through which modern states realise their primary interests.\(^{230}\)

Despite the *idealistic* paradigm being unconstrained by *realist* parameters, its application poses particular theoretical problems. The most significant question is whether conventional social science methodologies, developed to apply within national systems, can be re-framed. Identifying and explaining issues about social control and integration between diverse elements within a global social system poses the problem of what alternative bases could feasibly parallel those conventionally applied in sociological research framed in terms of national systems.

The logical progression taking a *realist* approach extends the statist elements to the international system. An *idealistic* approach would also need to draw upon social science theory. However, rather than suggesting that it should simply be extended and applied beyond single national systems to explain relationships between a range of national systems, the potentiality would have to be explored for social science frameworks themselves to expand. The validation of the alternative framework would depend on the extent to which certain social and environmental problems that have to be comprehended on a global scale, such as weapons of mass destruction with a global reach or global warming, make it patently self-evident that such a shift is required. The *idealistic* paradigm as a framework for explaining and evaluating social activity in terms of health and well-being would be reliant on categories that could be defined in terms other than relations
between states, such as the fulfilment of basic human needs, the attainment of relative harmonies of interests, the alleviation of violent conflict and a commitment to sustainability. If the conceptual scale of research relating to these categories were expanded to transcend national boundaries, scholars would be required to radically review how they express the fundamental purpose of social science theory. There would necessarily be the problem of how theoretical constructions would maintain consistency and legitimacy when applied in a range of different contexts and situations.

The complexity of these considerations, as they relate particularly to scientific inquiry to explain the characteristics and the causes of conflict, can be illustrated by discussing them in terms of the conflict triangle in Fig. 4. Reimann draws attention to the idea that research relating to the nature of conflict usually centres on the two ontological strands previously mentioned, namely subjectivist and objectivist approaches. Irrespective of whether a realist or an idealist frame of reference is employed, the inter-relationship between these two approaches has to be addressed.

Subjectivist approaches attempt to explain contradiction primarily in terms of human agency. The goal is to analyse and evaluate relationships in order to explain in objective terms incompatibilities in protagonists’ subjective interpretations, or attitudes, which have actually created incompatible interests and goals that, in turn, have an influence on their behaviour. This would require the researcher to provide objective explanations that were independent of the subjective perceptions held by particular actors. The purpose of analysis is to objectively depict contradiction in terms of certain features, such as misinformation, mistrust, cultural misunderstanding, misperception or stereotyping and similar categories relating to communication between the parties. The underlying assumption in this approach is that, if these problems were overcome, some sort of status quo could be realised. The subjectivist approach for example is generally regarded as sufficient as a basis for defining how ADR processes can overcome contradiction. The underlying assumption is that it is the subjectivist features, directly attributable to the agency of particular individuals, that serve as a basis for explaining the causes and characteristics of the contradiction.

The purpose of analysis and evaluation applying an objectivist approach is to objectively explain contradiction in terms of the social and political make-up of the broader social structure. In this case, the focus is on identifying structurally unfair or unjust relationships, which the parties directly involved might not necessarily clearly articulate. The researcher's purpose is to show how contradictions inherent in the social structure
perpetuate certain types of relationships and thus have a profound influence on the ongoing attitudes and behaviours of specific actors.233

The issue of objectively determining interests, beyond parties' subjectively expressed interests, for the purpose of identifying and explaining the structural causes of conflict, can be illustrated by considering relationships between a master and slaves. Even if slaves exert no active feelings of hostility toward their circumstances in the belief that their present role is the only one possible, or because the master is benevolent, objectively, there remains an inherent latent conflict of interest between the master and the slaves.234

As well as the necessity of explaining the set of relationships that exist between them, the analytical process would also have to depict the features of the interactions that take place between them in order to draw conclusions about relative harmonies of interests and disharmonies of interest. For the purpose of objective analysis, a researcher would need to assert that certain objective criteria are pertinent as a basis for qualitatively evaluating the interactions and that, moreover, they could be consistently employed to identify and evaluate interactions enacted in more than one set of circumstances. Thus objectivist explanation about the characteristics of conflict has to contend with the dilemma of how scientific method can be applied at varying scales and in varying contexts in such a way that explanations maintain their meaningfulness beyond a taken for granted set of values and norms.235

An inherent problem is that the 'objective' researcher, in identifying certain relationships, either at the inter-personal level or a structural level, as conflictual or violent contrary to the parties' own perceptions, as exemplified in the master-slaves relationship, could be construed to be simply offering another subjective interpretation. Analysis would only reflect "another subjective assessment of the situation […] by some third party rather than by the participants".236 Reimann suggests that it is not necessarily constructive to rely exclusively on either approach. A more comprehensive understanding of a conflict can only be achieved by combining a mixture of subjective features, such as protagonists' identities, needs and interests, as well as supposedly objective structural features, such as unequal or violent relationships. In this way the contradiction is not only explained as being caused by particular attitudes and behaviours; contradiction in the social structure can also be explained in terms of the impact it has on individual attitudes and behaviours.237 This discussion serves to illustrate the perpetual tension between supposedly objective and subjective approaches when explaining any social activity. It is a problem that has to be confronted, irrespective of whether the researcher maintains a
state-centric realist external-horizontal understanding of relationships and interactions or the more idealist internal-vertical conceptual frame of reference. The preceding analysis indicates some of the strengths and weaknesses of conventional realist-based approaches that rely on a national or an international frame of reference compared with a more global idealist-based conceptual framework through which to develop a communicable form of knowledge that is sufficiently general to transcend certain social, intellectual and ideological boundaries. The focus now shifts to consider in turn two ways in which Galtung attempts to provide alternative objective bases for offering explanations about relationships as well as explanations about the nature of interactions taking place within particular relationships. Both examples reflect that he deliberately chooses not to align his ideas with specifically identifiable political philosophies, or appear to be passing judgements on them, even though, inevitably, he does extract understandings about present realities from them. His goal in taking this approach is to avoid the appointment of any specific social group as privileged historical agents of social change, or to suggest that one realm of human activity is more significant in terms of influencing social transformation. It reflects a tendency in peace research to theoretically frame ideas through analogy, rather than by citing specific examples. This framework has the advantage that objective explanations are not biased to represent certain elements or sets of elements, such as nation-states, more than others. However, they do leave unaddressed the problem of the way in which the methodology through which these more abstract objective explanations are developed will then be integrated with understandings about actual relationships and interactions.

The first example, developed in Galtung's essay Violence, Peace and Peace Research reflects an attempt to develop greater clarity with regard to terminology for explaining and qualitatively evaluating relationships, with a particular emphasis on objectively defining violence inherent in relationships. Galtung suggests that

"violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realisations are below their potential realisations."

Galtung sought an interpretation that was not limited to how violence is perceived in conventional Western social science discourse. This would merely follow the tendency of other scholars to treat violence as a course of action attributable to human nature and social reality. It would suggest that Galtung's interpretation conflated the concepts of violence and domination, with violence being taken to be the means used to establish, maintain, and extend dominance relations. Instead Galtung sees the need for research to be directed toward analysing and qualitatively evaluating how violence can be conceived
to be inherent in relationships between actors. To provide an objective explanation it would not be sufficient to resort to understandings biased to favour the values or the goals of either apparently dominant or subordinate groups. This would assume that the underlying purpose of peace research was simply to give expression to the subjective values held by specific groups of actors as a means of defining their conflict.

Galtung sought to extend the definition of violence to include more than the idea of direct physical harm. He proposes that violence also has to be explained that is actually built into unequal, unjust or unrepresentative social structures. This means that theoretical analysis of conflict has to take account manifest forms of violence, but must take equal account of more latent or less apparent forms, which he conceptualises as structural violence. The concept of structural violence provides a basis for explaining that contradiction can reflect not only incompatibility of interests but also incompatibility of goals. Explanation about the way violence features in both inter-personal and structural relationships would not necessarily provide a basis for suggesting how it could be alleviated, or how disharmonies of interests could be transformed. However, Galtung nevertheless argues that a more adequate definition of violence is a necessary precursor to an adequate comprehension of the concept of peace. In Galtung’s definition violence is specified as "the cause of the difference between the actual and the potential, which increases, or prevents the decrease of, the distance between them". Given that human fulfilment is inescapably a socially and culturally constructed category, the notion of potentiality is problematic. While potentiality could be understood generally as a contingent category connected to "given level of insights and resources", it could only be understood in relation to actualities if the violence was avoidable and known to be so. Galtung overcomes the problem of how to specify the definitions of these categories by suggesting that, in practice, they would be "guided by whether the value to be realised is fairly consensual or not". With regard to somatic realisations, he suggested that one basis for estimation was the average life span within the social order.

Outlined in Fig. 7 are six dimensional ways that Galtung expresses an understanding of violence. His sixth category represents an attempt to address the argument of the Marxist scholars that latent conflicts become manifest upon a transformation of consciousness whereby the actors develop a realisation of their position in an unjust order. This idea can again be illustrated by using the analogy of the master-slaves relationship, whereby the slaves would come to perceive the difference between enslavement and freedom and would thus be justified in exerting influence to achieve freedom. The Marxist implication is that in some circumstances, the oppressed would be justified to use violent means to
### The Distinction Between Physical and Psychological Violence
The concept of physical violence incorporates degrees to which people can be hurt somatically to the point of being killed. However, as well as reducing somatic capability below what might be potentially possible, the concept also takes into account constraints on human movement, either when a person is incarcerated or when, through a monopoly on mobility, people are restricted as to where they can freely go. The concept of psychological violence incorporates the degree to which people are subject to lies, brainwashing, indoctrination, threats and other means, which decrease mental potentialities.

### The Distinction Between Negative and Positive Influence
The concept of negative influence incorporates the punishment of people when they do what the influencer considers wrong, while the concept of positive influence incorporates the rewarding of people when they do what the influencer considers right. Such influences can have a bearing on the degree of increase or decrease in physical or psychological capabilities, but they can still prevent people from realising their actual potentialities. Reward or punishment oriented systems can narrow down the range of actions available to people, so that the choice can be to avoid overt negative impacts by responding to more covert manipulation.

### The Existence or Nonexistence of an Object that is Hurt
This type of influence appears to have no direct object. The concept suggests that, despite no physical object being hurt, influence has still been brought to bear because human action is constrained by virtue of a threat that is posed, either through a display of physical threat of violence, or a display of a manipulation of the truth. The doctrine of a balance of power is based on efforts to intimidate and create a sense of foreboding associated with this influence.

### The Existence or Nonexistence of a Subject who Acts
This type of influence makes a distinction between personal and structural violence. The outcome in either case is that people can be killed or hurt and subject to intimidation, but whereas personal violence can be traced back to specific individuals, in the case of structural violence there may be no identifiable perpetrator. "The violence is built into the structure and shows as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances". In both cases, individuals are prevented from realising their potential. It is concerned with the uneven distribution of a wide range of resources, but particularly with power to influence decisions about the distribution of resources. The concept incorporates exploitation, but Galtung prefers the term social injustice so that the concept would not be specifically confined to political or economic dimensions.

### The Distinction Between Intended and Unintended Violence
To make this distinction, the focus relies on identifying the consequences of influence in order to trace whether the cause was intentional or unintentional. An emphasis on consequences can be useful for evaluating whether the motivations of individuals were intended or unintended, but also allowing scope to give recognition to the nature of the structure within which the action takes place. A bias toward intention would only seek to identify the connection between intent and guilt. Examining both the actions of individuals and the logic of the structure in which they are operating helps to distinguish between intended and unintended violence, although it may not necessarily make clear how the particular roles of individuals or groups create or maintain an unjust or exploitative structure.

### The Distinction Between Manifest and Latent Violence
This distinction depends on whether violence, either personal or structural, is observable or otherwise. Latent violence represents a structural potentiality for violence to become manifest. It is inherent in situations where there is apparent equilibrium that is nevertheless exerting a type of influence that denies people opportunities to realise their potential. Therefore, there is a corresponding latent potentiality for the equilibrium to become destabilised when attempts may be made for that potentiality to be realised.

---

![Fig. 7: Galtung's Six Dimensions of Violence (Galtung, 1969).](image)

achieve liberation from dominance. However, latency in Galtung’s interpretation is not necessarily connected to consciousness. Irrespective of subjective awareness, it is possible to still objectively depict a potentiality for latent violence to become manifest because influence is exerted by the master whether the slaves perceive that to be the case or otherwise. Galtung’s point is that there should not be a presumption that structural violence would necessarily be eradicated merely through revolutionary action. On its own it does not necessarily bring about a social transformation. Further structural
violence could still occur as a new hierarchical order evolves. Revolution to eliminate oppressive elites would not necessarily end structural violence if new expressions of elitism were latent within the ideological perspective of the new holders of power.

Some peace researchers, such as Schmid and Dencik argue for a bias toward the oppressed. Galtung’s framework rejects the Marxist argument for this bias that implicitly legitimates the need to eradicate latent violence through manifest violence. Galtung’s approach reflects an assertion that peace research should maintain a continuing commitment to *nonviolence*. However, it also reflects that articulating what the term *nonviolence* implies requires the development of a more precise usage of the concept of *violence* itself, and to extend the range of forms which could be made meaningful within the theoretical constructions of peace research. For instance, Sharp’s interpretation of nonviolence below suggests that it is as much to do with activity striving toward the realisation of ‘positive’ peace as it is to do with passivity or disengagement from activities associated with ‘negative’ peace, such as pacifism.

*Nonviolent action is a means of combat, as is war.* It involves the matching of forces and the waging of “battles”, requires wise strategy and tactics, employs numerous “weapons” and demands of its “soldiers” courage, discipline, and sacrifice...This view of nonviolent action as a technique of active combat is diametrically opposed to the once popular, though uninformed, assertion that no such phenomenon really existed, or that anything “nonviolent” was simple passivity and submission...

The second example of Galtung’s contribution to peace research is developed in his essay *A Structural Theory of Imperialism*. The purpose is to develop an objective basis for describing the mechanisms or *interactions* through which *imperialism*, a particular type of dominance relationship, is maintained. It depicts how *contradictions* operating within certain structures within a given social system can be characterised as a form of *structural violence* because they are exploitative.

Galtung deliberately depicts this particular type of dominance relationship as an abstract theoretical concept not tied to historical actualities to stress the importance of distinguishing imperialism from other types of dominance relationships, such as military occupation. His more abstract approach emphasises that the conceptual ideas can be objectively applied to a range of social situations. When portraying *imperialism* as a type of dominance relationship between particular entities or *collectivities*, he uses the relatively general term *nation* to avoid the assumption that these conceptual understandings are only relevant in terms of modern *realist* political theory.
Galtung explains *imperialism* as a dominance relationship whereby a bridgehead is established between an elite group within one collectivity, depicted in the diagram in Fig. 8 as the *centre* in the *Centre nation*, and an elite group within the other, depicted as the *centre* in the *Periphery nation*, whose purpose is primarily to create mutual benefit for both elites rather than to create benefit for the collectivities as a whole. The interactions whereby weaker collectivities are exploited by stronger ones can involve many types of exchange that have economic, political, and social dimensions.\(^{261}\) Imperialism is defined as a general structural phenomenon whereby forces are applied that actually detract from the health and well-being of both individuals and groups within social systems.\(^{262}\)

Fig. 8: Galtung's Structure of Imperialism  (Galtung 1971: 13)

Galtung's approach describes imperialism as a system that splits up collectivities and relates some of the parts to each other in relations of *harmony of interest*, and other parts in relations of *disharmony of interest*, or *conflicts of interest*, whereby there is a pursuance of incompatible goals. Within the system as a whole some specific goals are stipulated and can be determined by actors outside of a particular collectivity. Thus a general set of goals is pursued even when they are contradictory to what parties themselves might put forward as their subjectively-determined true needs and interests. The general goals are legitimised by the outside actors who contend that particular parties themselves do not necessarily know, or are unable to express, their 'real' or actual interests, which that outside actor can claim are universalist. The interactions would reflect a psychological dominance because attributions of knowledge and understanding are unevenly portrayed. Unilinear concepts such as *development* and *modernisation*, which derive from the Centre nations, are imbued with an aura of legitimacy that leads to the perpetuation of assumptions about the 'false consciousness' of particular parties.\(^{263}\)
socialisation and educational processes controlled by core groups, parties who are imbued with a sense that they must suppress their own true interests come to experience a profound sense of contradiction in personal and social terms.\textsuperscript{264}

As portrayed in Galtung's diagram, there is more \textit{disharmony of interest} within the \textit{Periphery nation} than there is in the \textit{Centre nation}, but as well, there is a \textit{disharmony of interest} between both peripheries, that is, the \textit{periphery} in the \textit{Centre nation} and the \textit{periphery} in the \textit{Periphery nation}. This is because there is a vertical interaction relationship in the exchanges between the two \textit{centres}, but a ‘feudal’ interaction structure operating by varying degrees within both \textit{Centre nation} and \textit{Periphery nation}. The term ‘feudal’ is used to indicate that some inequality is maintained and reinforced. However, the use of the term extends beyond political or economic dimensions of inequality.

All interactions tend to reflect cultural dominance. For instance, economic factors, such as the flow of raw material, indicators of wealth, such as capital, and the availability of goods and services, are evaluated in relation to the effects of other types of interactions, such as political, military, communications and cultural processes. They all contribute to whether the effects of certain interactions are regarded as positive or negative. To qualitatively measure the effects of interactions, Galtung poses it is necessary to take account of influence of all value-exchanges on \textit{inter-actor relationships}, how the exchanges affect diverse values, lifestyles and modes of production. However it is also necessary to take account of the influence that value-exchanges have as an \textit{intra-actor} phenomenon, the way individuals internalise the effects of these interactions.\textsuperscript{265}

In Galtung's interpretation imperialism can be understood as a structural relationship that maintains interactions between the Centre and the Periphery that are \textit{vertical}. However, at the same time he stresses the importance of recognising that interactions between the periphery of the Centre and the periphery of the Periphery are \textit{missing}. Similarly, multilateral interactions between all the parties are also \textit{missing}. In turn this means that all interactions with the outside world are \textit{monopolised} by the Centres. The result is that Peripheries cannot have interactions with other collectivities, and Centres do not have interactions with other peripheries.

The degree of conflict or \textit{disharmony of interest} is indicated by whether, when the parties interact, the gaps in terms of material and psychological quality of life are increasing or decreasing. Galtung draws a distinction between \textit{parties} and \textit{actors} because a party, a category or a type of group, may not necessarily have crystallised into clearly specifiable
actors. This distinction is important because at certain stages within a system it may not be clearly articulated how conflicts of interest actually show up as conflicts in the goals of the different parties. If, for instance, in a set of circumstances, the groups that form the centres in the Centre-Periphery structural relationship exert power to increase their own advantage over the potential advantage that those in the peripheries could derive, a disharmony of interest arises between centres and peripheries. However, even if there is a disharmony of interests between the parties, it does not presuppose that actors in the peripheries will be able to fully appreciate the way in which they are being exploited. This means they are unable to formulate clear goals as to what they might do to address the disharmony of interests.266

Lawler describes Galtung's approach to imperialism in the following terms:

For Galtung, imperialism was not the same as military domination or the threat of conquest; nor did it embrace the reductionism of "marxist-leninist theory," which he read as offering an overly economistic model of imperialism. Attributing to marxism-leninism the assumption that imperialism would vanish along with the demise of capitalism, Galtung viewed it as "a more general structural condition between two collectivities." Economic imperialism was but a specific manifestation of a generalizable structural relationship that was not dependent upon the existence of capitalism.267

Like Wallerstein, Galtung suggests that flows need to be represented in economic, political, military, communication and/or cultural terms, with the nature of the flow of interaction being the means of indicating which entity will benefit most from the relationship. Exploitative exchanges could come about through conquest, that is, by taking without offering anything in return. Otherwise they could come about through colonial arrangements, that is, merely satisfying the subjective contentment of the peripheral group, or in the case of world economic market relations, adhering only to 'objective' market values according to the logic of the capitalist system. The former form of exploitation implies taking without offering anything in return but, in terms of human interaction, it can also extend to the exploiter becoming a slave-owner whereby 'natives' are peripheralised and forced to actually participate in extraction processes.

Galtung argues that there is not much of a quantitative difference in the extent of exploitation if new owners of the means of production maintain control over the working conditions of those who then are required to work for whatever wages are set by colonial administrators, or in more recent times set by those controlling the activities of transnational corporations.268 In each type of vertical exchange, it is significant that the Centre nation, that actually processes raw materials, gains a more far-reaching enrichment than the nation that delivers raw materials. This is because included in the follow-on are all the technological and social enhancements this affords. In other words,
those in *periphery* of the *Centre nation* derive a relatively greater degree of gain than those in the *periphery* of the *Periphery nation*. Such spin-off effects are not acknowledged in the logic of international capitalist exchanges, even though they continually widen the gap between the relative living conditions of the two groupings of people they encompass. This applies particularly for people in both peripheries, but the most drastic losses are experienced by people in the *periphery* of *Periphery nations*.269

Galtung’s representation of the second mechanism, the feudal or horizontal interaction structure depicts the way trading relationships reinforce inequalities in the external-vertical interaction relations. The *centre* groups of the interacting nations monopolise all the interactions of the *peripheries* in their respective nations. In doing so they set up exclusions which prohibit the development of alternative interactions by *periphery* groups with other nations. This restricts the scope and direction of trade links from the periphery. Those in the *periphery* of the *Periphery nation* become limited to and reliant on the exportation of primary products. This arrangement perpetuates the *Periphery nation’s* dependency on the arrangements controlled by their *centre* group. It is the people in the peripheries who are most subject to the vulnerability of world fluctuations in the price of raw commodities that are beyond their immediate control. The structure, which the system creates, actually denies opportunity for new interactions to develop except through the mechanisms of the *centres*, which is primarily concerned to operate to protect its own interests.270

Galtung’s structural understanding of *imperialism* has more in common with that of Wallerstein than it has with that of Marx who focuses most specifically on *capital* merely in economic terms. However, a distinguishing feature of Galtung’s more abstract ahistorical approach is that it is purpose is inherently *idealistic* because he seeks to explain more than the way different forms of power operate within a social system. He also seeks to identify the degree to which they apply power through means that can be classified as violent and exploitative.

Although Galtung’s approach is more abstract, there is a parallel theme in Wallerstein’s structural theory of intra-state capitalist relations as set out in Fig. 9. Imperialism is represented as class conflict between a state’s core and periphery, while in inter-state relations, it is defined in terms of processes of unequal exchange. Wallerstein depicts how these two types of relationships together produce the uneven trends in development experienced in most third world or peripheral states.271 Every transaction between core and periphery states is priced in a world market that incorporates these inequalities within
its operations. It is not simply a matter of different technology levels, although this is incorporated into the unequal exchange. The essential difference is in the social relations worked through in political and economic terms in each location. The ‘worth’ of goods depends on the relative strength of wage structures. This is reflected in the intra-state relations in Core nations and the way capital is redistributed beyond the predominant core group to be experienced as an improvement in lifestyle by the people within their own periphery. This is most clearly reflected in the quality and the extent of a state’s social welfare programs. In the internal-horizontal relationships, political intervention within national economies determines the manoeuvrability that a state can devise with regard to its trade, wage and welfare policies.272

![Fig. 9: Wallerstein's Four Relations of Imperialism (A is the dominant class, B the dominated class)](Taylor 1993: 111)

**Summarising the Contribution of Peace Research**

Peace research has sought to critique the purpose and the role of conventional social science, particularly the way in which it has been generated at the nationalist level throughout the twentieth century. Galtung’s approach reflects that the legitimacy of peace research is founded on the principle that existing moral, intellectual and communal boundaries are inevitably candidates for review, modification and possibly dissolution.273 The research agenda maintains an interest in the idea of potentiality, whereby the concept of interests could take account of the immanence of another world within the present - a future world.274 Galtung concedes that answers to questions about how this wider range of interests could be defined and incorporated have not yet been arrived at. However, rather than suggesting that this is a reason for abandoning or limiting peace research, he stresses that this issue has to be regarded as one of the major contemporary challenges confronting science.275
Peace research can thus be described as fulfilling a need to develop a more universal or global social science framework as an alternative to a world-wide international relations framework as a basis for explaining the phenomenon of social conflict. Like Burton, Galtung envisages that determining basic needs that are fundamental in both the ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ regions of human experience\textsuperscript{276} is a necessary precursor to making evaluations about the positive and negative effects of social relationships and interactions. Galtung's critical examination of the meaning of violence and its impact on capacity to realise basic needs allows us to conceive that many problems confronting the world community require a more critical definition of the relationship between peace and violent conflict as a discrete category within the more general concept of conflict.

The research agenda includes giving consideration to how the ordering of social life will be defined in an increasingly globalised world community. Discussion has emphasised that peace research seeks to bring about new approaches to the way we conceptualise contemporary problems and draw conclusions about social relationships and interactive social processes. Theorists such as Galtung have promoted that a social science framework that is expressed in terms of a health model is warrantable as a basis for offering explanation about harmonies of interest and disharmonies of interest expressed at all levels of sociability. Such a framework would serve as a basis for diagnosing causes of ill-health in order to promote better health, or at least to reduce unhealthy outcomes. This more value-oriented idealist approach to scientific inquiry has the potential to broaden discourse about issues that would otherwise only be promoted and given voice through political dialogue or through particular idealistic social movements concerned with issues of peace, social justice and sustainability. In this sense, peace research can be conceived as providing a framework through which to critically reflect about processes of social transformation and potentially realisable goals that might otherwise not be imagined, or not be well-articulated as options.

Conclusion
Approaches explaining the causes and characteristics of conflict outlined in this chapter range between those that are well established, and others that are more specific to the emerging field of peace research. All make a contribution to the way we understand how conflict shapes and influences social processes, social institutions and social structures as well as shaping and influencing individual and group attitudes and behaviours. However, given the dynamic nature of conflict, the conceptual and theoretical foundations that are most relevant to the component of problem-identification often need to be understood in
relation to particular understandings of responses to conflict, that are more relevant to the
component of problem-solving. Conceptual and theoretical approaches that contribute to
our understanding of strategic interventions, representing one particular response to
conflict, will be discussed in the next chapter.

There will be an ongoing interest to explore what Galtung describes as the
transideological character of the concepts of conflict and peace. There will be a particular
focus on the relationship between peace and the fulfilment of needs, and how it might be
possible to conceive of this goal being underpinned by certain values and interests that
are extrinsic to the interests or perceptions of specific individuals or social groups, as
conceptualised in an idealist worldview.

---
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Rapoport, 1971: 91-106

Clements frames this idea in the following terms: Peace, justice, truth and compassion are central to most utopian and religious visions. For example, the concepts of Paradise and Nirvana both have strong connotations of justice, harmony, non-violence and union. These aspirations are religious ways of saying that most people in most communities and cultures, confronted with choices between order/chaos; peace/war; harmony/disharmony; structural stability/instability; equality/inequality; inclusion/exclusion; justice/injustice; tolerance/intolerance; abundance/poverty will wherever possible choose the former over the latter....The critical question, therefore, is how to ensure that these normal acts of kindness, altruism, reciprocity, justice and courtesy are translated into strong political commitments to justice, peace and conflict sensitive development. Why are these seemingly universal impulses so difficult to realize in political practice? There are some factors which occur with sufficient regularity to suggest a fairly universal correlation with violent conflict and there are other factors (e.g. specific triggers or local means of mobilizing group differences and discontent to violent ends) which are much more unique. The conceptual challenge is to identify the universal risk factors within potential or actual conflict situations while being sensitive to the cultural specifics.

The World Commission on Environment and Development Report is more commonly known as the Brundtland Report. It defines sustainability as a phenomenon of social concern applying at all scales of interaction, which can be defined as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (1987: 43) There is a certain parallel between the evolution of peace research and the evolution of international relations as it is contemporarily understood. International relations emerged as an autonomous academic discipline in the wake of the First World War. Previously, matters of war, peace and diplomacy were primarily framed and dealt with by reference to history, philosophy and law.

The implication in the realist approach is that applying logical argument to articulate causal laws in order to make predictions would not necessarily provide a basis for causal explanation and, thus, a capacity to specify why events occur as they do.

The concerns about delays, costs, and risks associated with litigation which have been experienced acutely in the US have also become cause for concern in other countries with a relatively similar common law jurisdiction. ADR processes have therefore been taken up and applied to complement formal legal processes in other states. It has not, however, been taken up to the same extent in European states, where the role of the courts is of less constitutional importance to the development of social and economic claims. European civil law jurisdictions tend to encourage different roles for lawyers and the courts, and there are less technical and detailed rules for the disclosure and production of documentary and witness evidence.
Lawyers in European states have, in many cases, not exercised the collective corporate power and influence in financial and commercial affairs that are familiar in the US, Britain or Australia. There is not a great deal of evidence to suggest that ADR, as it has emerged in Western practice, has been applied to the same extent in non-Western countries. Brown and Marriott, 1993: 14-17
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Miall, 2000: 41

Reimann, 2000: 3-4

In the US, there are now many organisations, such as the Center for Public Resources (CPR) seeking to promote individuals, groups, organisations and corporations to explore ADR before resorting to litigation. There are, as well, many professional associations, and some, such as the Society for Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR), the Academy of Family Mediators, and the Conflict Resolution Education Network, merged in 2000, so that they are all represented within the Association for Conflict Resolution. As well there are many US state and local bar associations which have special ADR sections and committees. In addition to its promotion in the private sector, ADR processes have been formally introduced into court systems, with ADR developing as an adjunct to the decision-making apparatus of state systems. In this way, the courts have become a focal point for a range of dispute resolution services. It is also worth noting the Memorandum on Agency Use of Alternate Means of Dispute Resolution and Negotiated Rulemaking which was passed through the US Congress on 1 May 1998. It was a memorandum for heads of executive departments and agencies to designate interagency committees. Their role was to facilitate and encourage agency use of ADR and Negotiated Rulemaking between different sectoral interests through a wide range of agencies and governing bodies at different levels of the US society in order to integrate political, judicial and social imperatives.

Brown and Marriott, 1993: 14

Scimecca, 1991: 29

Schellenberg, 1996: 188

As early as 1898 and in subsequent legislation the US Congress has authorised mediation for collective bargaining disputes. This reflected a belief that stable industrial peace could be achieved through the settlement of collective bargaining disputes; settlements in turn could be advanced through conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration. In these processes, mediation was not conceived as an alternative to adjudication; it was seen to be an alternative to disruption ensuing from actions such as strikes, brought on by the failure of unassisted settlement negotiations. From 1923, other forms of mediation were also being introduced into the courts for matters other than labour disputes. The American Bar Association sought to assess its applicability for diverse court-related conciliation programs. In this case, the concern was primarily with the cost effectiveness of conciliation for the courts and the parties, rather than the avoidance of disruption for non-parties. They were considering the speed of processing cases through the legal system, the costs for the parties and the system, and issues of accessibility and fairness. There was interest in the tendency for conciliation to teach honourable compromise and produce greater satisfaction among the parties. Thus, in contrast to the focus on the interests of society-at-large, which had spurred the use of mediation in collective bargaining, the objectives of the court-related programs were based primarily on the needs of the parties and the courts.

Scimecca, 1991: 29 Scimecca notes, for example, that the Ad Hoc Panel on Dispute Resolution and Public Policy assembled by the National Institute of Dispute Resolution in 1981 defined ADR "to include all methods, practices and techniques, formal and informal, within and outside the courts that are used to resolve disputes". He comments that such broad definitions do not make adequate distinctions between traditional and alternative methods to address conflicts and disputes.

In the 1970's the Community Relations Service of the US Department of Justice initiated mediation programs for civil rights disputes. In the ensuing years, they mediated hundreds of prison, school, police-community and other civil rights conflicts. The programs were designed to promote greater awareness of civil rights, suggest effective remedies for people subjected to discrimination, and create settlements that could exemplify means to reduce discriminatory practices and promote racial harmony.

There was a general perception, based on an understanding of mediation in societies structured around small communities, which gave rise to the assumption that mediation worked best and adjudication worked less for parties who were relatives, neighbours, or economic partners. To address conflicts at community level and sway people from pursuing adversarial solutions to neighbourhood problems would require a commitment to consider future relationships as well as present relationships. (Harrington, 1982)
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David Singer (1998) notes that international relations scholars saw little relationship between the role of a political scientist and the role of a peace researcher. Singer recounts an illustration from the time when he was working with the Center for Research in Conflict Resolution at the University of Chicago in 1957. James Pollock, Chair of the overall Department of Social Relations at the University of Michigan, had been instrumental in setting the direction of the post-war occupation of Germany. Pollock considered himself an expert on matters of war and peace. He was outraged by Boulding, a pacifist economist, who was challenging US policies with regard to interventions in Central America and the Middle East, astronomical military spending, nuclear weapons testing and the continuing role of the US in Europe.

Kenneth Boulding subsequently moved to Boulder in 1967 to establish the Conflict Studies Program at the University of Colorado.

Scholarship that emerged from the Center reflected a perceived need to treat war as an urgent problem necessitating the application of social science to address the threat of nuclear war and the polarisation of political attitudes in a divided global community. (Lawler, 1995: 73)

The usage of this term is somewhat different from the way it has been applied in international relations to depict idealism as the means in the earlier decades of the twentieth century to override the tendency for stronger states to take responsibility for world affairs. Idealism in this usage is exemplified in the way US President Woodrow Wilson promoted the advancement of the League of Nations so that control and power could be asserted through the collective action of all states, as a means of placing international relations on some kind of constitutional basis. This same ethos applies with respect to the United Nations. In this interpretation idealism maintains a state-centred worldview to the same extent as realism.

Taylor, 1993: 52-53
Galtung's point can be illustrated in terms of what Fetherston describes as an inherent problem with underlying assumptions about critical theory, and what it purports to represent. She cites George (1994: 29-30) who suggests "the power of discourse is to render 'right', 'legitimate', 'taken for granted' 'natural' specific ways of knowing, acting and organising social life. More precisely it makes 'real' that which it prescribes as meaningful". Fetherston argues that modern discourse purports to produce a rational encompassing form of knowledge, based on the assumption that we can 'know' - objectify, make rational, and therefore understand. Discourse seeking to offer explanation, understanding and possibly enlightenment as to how violent conflict may be transformed tends to presuppose that by so doing this will alleviate it as it is problematised. In other words, it carries the assumption that it is possible to come to understanding through its processes both causes and solutions, given that certain practices, institutions and social meanings can be re-arranged. Fetherston suggests that a difficulty with the assumptions of modern discourse is that it privileges rational knowing. It has a tendency to also delegitimise that which is 'irrational', and sets what it suggests is not knowable or controllable outside the bounds of discourse, making those features separate and separable from what is 'real' or 'legitimate'. If there is an assumption that all there is to know about a set of circumstances can be absolutely 'known' and controlled through modern discourse, then those assumptions will be the only basis for offering explanation about social life. The focus will primarily be on practices and capacities that might render a set of circumstances more efficient and controllable.

In this sense an idealist framework also has a role to play in identifying where there is a need for greater clarity with respect to essential terminology when expressing broad conceptual ideas.

In Galtung's view a more universal conceptual framework is needed in peace research to make sufficient allowance for the diverse ways that people conceptualise their past as well as their present circumstances, because in turn they are the foundations for envisaging and evaluating how present relationships might be transformed. Lawler, 1995: 49-51

Thus its capacity to significantly change the way it represents present or future interests remains relatively limited. It can also be conceived that the realist paradigm actually constrains the capacity of specific actors to put forward alternative explanations about the causes of contemporary injustice, suffering and disharmonies of interests that manifest through violent conflict and exploitative relationships and, equally, how they might figure in future. Lawler, 1995: 49-51

Peace research scholars such as Galtung often tend toward using abstract concepts for the purpose of developing a communicable form of knowledge about social relations that is not limited to be relevant to just one type of historical or contemporary situation rather than another. In this sense peace research is concerned with testing the general relevance of certain concepts and terminology in a diverse range of situations, even when this poses the problem of an increased possibility of ambiguity. This approach is reflected in this thesis in instances where a more stringent qualification of concepts and terminology, made possible by citing specific examples, might constrain rather than expand the discourse. Precise meanings are sometimes left open so that, by virtue of the degree of generality, there is an increased potential for interpretations to transcend particular ideological and intellectual boundaries.
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The following depiction of Apartheid in South Africa by Henrard (2002) epitomises an extreme form of structural violence. "Apartheid and its labyrinth of regulations were based on an imposed group membership on the basis primarily of race but, for the black population, also ethnicity (Manby 1995: 27; Kotze 1997: 2). The entire classification process was legally imposed and ascribed, more specifically on the basis of the 1950 Population Registration Act, and often arbitrarily implemented (Coetzee 1995: 90; Harries 1989:110). The act distinguished four major racial categories, namely white, black/African, coloured and Indian/Asian. The apartheid regime indeed did not limit its racial classifications to black and white but also further subdivided the overwhelming non-white majority in three sub-groups namely Africans, coloureds and Indians/Asians. In furtherance of its divide and rule policy and in an attempt to prevent the emergence of a unified resistance movement, the apartheid government deliberately created an intermediate position for the coloureds and the Indians (Carrim 1996: 47, 50). The preferential treatment of these two population categories, *inter alia* in respect of the distribution of resources (Manby 1995: 28), contributed to some kind of internalized white racism and a concomitant condescending attitude towards the African population (Carrim 1996: 47; Sonn 1993: 66). This apartheid strategy entailed for the coloured and Indian population group an ambiguous but still marginalized position, which has ongoing implications and effects (Galiguire 1996: 14-15).

Furthermore, the African group was subdivided in ethnic categories, such as Zulu, Xhosa, Ndebele etc. Subsequently, this rigid scheme was implemented and extended to just about every area of human life through various pieces of legislation." Henrard, 2002: 1
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This idea aligns with Galtung's research carried out with respect to the World Indicators Program referred to in Fig. 8.
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While this presents the problem that his approach is not entirely satisfactory as a normative theory, it means there is not necessarily a requirement to allude to particular *attitudes* and *behaviours* of actors within the system in order to explain how *contradictions* are maintained. Lawler, 1995: 106-107
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CHAPTER THREE: THEORIES ABOUT INTERVENTIONS ADDRESSING CONFLICT

To attribute meaning to social conflict requires recourse to a range of theoretical perspectives. Chapter Two presented a broad indicative outline of theories whose main purpose is to explain the causes and the characteristics of conflict as they can be defined systematically both within structural theories and theories relating to human agency. They could thus be described as mainly contributing to the component of theory addressing problem-identification. The approach in this chapter further extends discussion with respect to problem-identification. However, in this case the purpose is to consider how this component relates to the development of theoretical propositions about responses to social conflict, the component more concerned with problem-solving.

This chapter does not follow the same format as Chapter Two and present an indicative outline of theoretical developments concerning the full extent of possible responses to conflict. This would necessitate outlining a range of studies that help understand how individuals and groups deal with conflict through various responses, including avoidance, acceptance, suppression or gradual reform. While they can all generally be incorporated within the broad field of conflict management, they do not all necessarily contribute directly to the argument being developed in this thesis.

The primary focus is on the development of scientific knowledge concerning circumstances where groups have become involved in significant confrontation and are required to review their changing situation and relationships. More specifically, the focus is on one particular means of dealing with confrontation, namely, through some form of intervention.

Section 1 indicates the type of situations where the ideas about interventions developed in this chapter have most relevance. It illustrates why inter-group conflicts are likely to be more complex and intractable than intra-group conflicts and explains why there is a greater need to critique theoretical explanations about different interventionist strategies for addressing them. Section 2 outlines the different types of interventions that are being considered and indicates that it is possible to make a broad distinction between conservative 'official' interventions and more radical 'non-official' interventions. It further explains that radical interventions can be characterised as either 'revolutionary' or 'resolutionary', but that in this chapter the primary focus is on
the latter form. The generic term 'resolutionary' is used to stress that even though it is possible to make distinctions between specific versions of this type of intervention, the immediate concern is to highlight the features they share in common. This establishes that the purpose of this chapter is to articulate fundamental differences between 'official' or conservative interventions that are more often explained using mainstream behavioural science frameworks and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' processes that are best understood within the framework of applied conflict resolution studies.

The purpose of Section 3 is to establish the importance of being able to distinguish one type of intervention from another, and that one way of doing this is to describe them as Track I or Track II processes. An important reason for being able to make distinctions between them is that they may be initiated simultaneously as a 'multi-track' approach. It then becomes crucial to have a constructive basis for making assessments as to the efficacy of different strategies.

Section 4 elaborates on the idea that there are marked differences in the methodological processes through which theoretical understandings are generated with regard to 'official' and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions. Differences in methodological approaches are highlighted because, firstly, it is through this means that knowledge is generated which establishes the standards and competencies required of third parties assigned to conduct interventions. It is also through this means that knowledge is generated about the significance of particular interventions and the influence that they have on the way that a conflict might change.

Section 5 then turns attention to the way scientific understanding is generated to explain the purpose of particular interventions and the inter-relating matter of the ideological basis that serves to give a process its legitimacy. This discussion makes a connection with a key idea developed in Chapter Two that the conceptual understandings inherent in underlying paradigms shape theoretical explanations. As well as influencing ideas about the causes of conflict, they will similarly influence ideas about the purpose of an interventionist response to it. Discussion highlights that realist-based ideas about the nature of conflict will have resonance with the way the purpose of 'official' conservative interventions are expressed and that idealist-based ideas about the nature of conflict will have more resonance with the way the purpose of 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions are expressed. This section takes a comparative approach to consider ideas with regard to the channels through which the purpose of an intervention is expressed, the criteria of success of an intervention, the
means through which the legitimacy of a process is defined and, as a separate category, the means through which the role of parties conducting interventions is legitimated.

There is a secondary purpose implicit in this thesis which is to demonstrate the relevance and the correlations between theoretical ideas relating to social conflict and those relating to sustainability. This chapter reflects a general interest in the extent to which these two fields of study can be integrated, on the basis that the worst excesses of both violent conflict and unsustainable practices can be framed as threats to the entire global community. In this sense, both fields share the purpose of developing theoretical means to define certain phenomena and make evaluations with respect to trends toward or away from well-being and harmonies of interests. Although practices that could be deemed unsustainable are all ultimately locally determined, the phenomenon of sustainability will increasingly require the same type of general framework as that needed to study contemporary trends in conflict. The emergent interest in the concept of sustainability reflects that people hold profoundly conflicting ideas with regard to its significance and contestable interpretations as to whether certain practices can be regarded as sustainable or otherwise. Thus it is necessary to consider bias in terms of how objective scientific meaning is attributed to uncertain or contradictory states of affairs where there are different ways of making qualitative evaluations with regard to the direction of change. This chapter reflects that both conflict studies and sustainability studies also share a common concern with optional responses to problems. Both fields equally have to deal with the problem of bias in explanations about interventions whose supposed purpose is to remedy practices that some regard as unsustainable. They both need to comparatively analyse different interpretations of the changes that are considered necessary and the viability of different strategies through which preferred changes can be brought about. In this sense they share a need to develop constructive theoretical bases for describing, explaining and qualitatively evaluating interventionist processes. This means that the uncertainties and contradictions of sustainability, like those more categorically framed in terms of inter-group conflict, will increasingly require the development of consistent and universally-relevant conceptual and theoretical frameworks of understanding through which to articulate the relationship between problem-identification and problem-solving.
SECTION 1: CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE CONFLICTS ARE ADDRESSED THROUGH INTERVENTION

There is a wide range of situations where issues of uncertainty, contradiction and change have to be resolved or settled through some form of intervention. The circumstances that are of particular interest to this study are those involving more than one relatively discrete social group or sector of society who do not share the same values, interests or goals, or the same conceptual understandings through which to attribute meaning to the issues at stake. This type of problematic inter-group relationship augments the degree of complexity entailed in the conflict, as well as increasing the degree of unpredictability as to how the circumstances will change.

One aspect of the problem is that each group will have its own routine political, legal and social processes based on particular cultural and ideological considerations. Through these accepted mechanisms those within the group identify and interpret what is at odds, intolerable or apparently unsustainable. Their own interpretations will be guided by certain knowledge and authority they recognise as legitimate as a basis for defining problems, and consequently for deciding what sort of prescriptive response would be most appropriate for addressing them. In other words they will employ certain processes of problem-identification which serve as their basis for deciding what sort of process of problem-solving would be most appropriate to institute in the circumstances. However, inter-group conflicts are much more unwieldy to manage because there will be a range of factors that inhibit the groups from coming together and engaging in some sort of process of concerted problem-identification and so establish some mutually acceptable description of the cause of their problematic relationships. These ideas can be exemplified in the way Filitova considers how violent conflicts in various regions of Africa should be described:

“For the last three decades the international Africanist community has been engaged in debating the legacy of the state in Africa. Is it mostly African? Or is it Western, colonial, imposed? Which of these two legacies is to blame for the atrocities of African civil wars, wars, coup-d’états, maladministration, corruption etc. - African or European? Is the African state not enough Europeanised to behave ‘normally’, or is it too Europeanised — and thus alien?”

The second aspect of the problem is that each group has its own basis for determining that certain responses to problems are viable and legitimate. In circumstances entailing inter-group conflict there is likely to be a greater degree of uncertainty as to what would be the most appropriate strategic response in the unprecedented circumstances. There are likely to be conflicting ideas when it comes to making strategic choices. On the one hand constituent members could nominate to continue to
rely on the conventional decision-making and problem-solving processes that they routinely employ as part of normal social living. They might otherwise consider that in the circumstances those processes no longer seem to be a sufficient or appropriate strategic response to address contention with other groups. Inter-group conflicts, irrespective of their intensity or scale, tend to reflect that it cannot be taken for granted that there is a right way to manage the situation.³

Critiquing Theoretical Approaches When Attributing Meaning to Interventions

The theme of this chapter is that there are significantly different ways in which theoretical propositions emerge with regard to interventionist strategies. The strategic dilemmas confronting people caught up in actual situations of contradiction, hostility and unpredictability have to be reflected in theoretical constructions of ideas that are developed to describe and explain the changing group dynamics and dialectics of such situations.⁴ The most confronting issue will be whether accepted conceptual and theoretical frameworks still seem appropriate to capture a sense of the changing dynamics of inter-group conflict, given that the basis for attributing meaning to the circumstances will in turn be the basis for describing and explaining consequent responses. Whether explicitly stated or otherwise, the approach taken to attribute meaning to intervention as a form of problem-solving, will be founded on and will need to be understood in relation to particular approaches to problem-identification.

For instance, Chapter Two indicated that some approaches to problem-identification tend to ontologically treat conflict as a relatively value-neutral social phenomenon of human creation that manifests in all relationships and cultures.⁵ This approach implies that the conflict is capable of being transformed and the way that this happens will depend on how people respond to it. In other approaches it is conceived to have mostly negative and pessimistic connotations based on a Hobbesian understanding of human nature as brutish, (as discussed in Chapter Two), and therefore it is conceived to be a phenomenon somewhat synonymous with violence that has to be controlled and contained. Ropers expresses this tension in the following terms:

The gap between official and ‘unofficial’ diplomacy is not just an expression of the differing legitimacy and power-political options of the world of states and the societal world. To many protagonists of dialogue-based approaches, it also reflects a fundamentally different understanding of conflict.⁶

Chapter Two also highlighted that epistemologically a nominated theoretical framework is likely to require a combination of subjectivist and objectivist features to explain a conflict. The former are required for indicating what a conflict means when understood in terms of human agency, while the latter are required for indicating the way in which
conflicts are situated within a broader structural context explained through more abstract conceptual and theoretical ideas.

In situations of inter-group conflict, these ontological and epistemological considerations have to be taken into consideration to fully appreciate how understanding develops concerning interventionist responses. The ontological considerations that reflect conceptual understandings about the nature of a conflict have an influence on explanations about the underlying purpose of an intervention. The epistemological approach when studying responses to inter-group conflict may thus have to be reviewed to ascertain whether the conventional way of scoping and framing a particular set of circumstances remains valid when those circumstances undergo significant change or otherwise whether a more radical approach is warranted.

The epistemological approach will influence what subjectivist and objectivist features are considered significant when describing particular interventionist responses. These features will establish the theoretical basis for making analytical assessments and evaluations as to the viability and validity of certain strategies to address what seems to be at odds. Previously accepted models or frameworks, such as nationalist frameworks, may prove insufficient as a basis for describing or evaluating how those involved in conflict are attempting to manage their changing circumstances.

SECTION 2: DIFFERENT STRATEGIES AND DIFFERENT EXPLANATORY THEORIES: CONSERVATIVE AND RADICAL APPROACHES

The way that conflict is conceived ontologically will influence its treatment as a subject of scientific study. Social conflict prompts the question of whether its management should be reliant on the typical, or conservative, interventionist mechanisms of one or other of the involved groups, or some more radical approach. Figure 10 identifies three different types of intervention as forms of agency reflecting particular ways of either promoting or resisting change, one that is conservative and two that are radical. It is postulated that conservative approaches are more likely to take a negative view of conflict and treat it as a social pathology requiring intervention as a form of therapy. When this approach is taken the accepted management strategies of the status quo, both coercive and non-coercive, are more likely to be regarded as the most legitimate means through which to control and contain conflict so that social cohesion and social order can be maintained. This is represented in Fig. 10 by the direction in which authoritative, coercive power (as represented in Boulding's model of 'Three Faces of Power' set out in Fig. 1, Chapter One) is exerted by the group representing the status
quo to influence the relationship between that predominant group and a group dissatisfied with their influence.

In contrast, changing circumstances may prompt people to consider taking a more radical approach. Radical approaches can be conceived to take two primary forms. One group might respond to circumstances that they perceive to be unacceptable or intolerable through confrontation that is 'revolutionary' in character. This is represented in Fig. 10 in the way a dissatisfied group exerts coercive and forceful power as a counter-measure to the influence of the status quo. The inherent risk entailed in this response is that the conflict could escalate rather than have its root causes alleviated. Such responses can precipitate spiralling violence and destructive patterns of behaviour attributable both to the underlying causes as well as to the violent response.

![Diagram of three ways power can be directed in interventions addressing inter-group conflict]

However, there are also circumstances where the preference is to respond radically by attempting an intervention through 'resolutionary' means as one way of averting spiralling violence and destructive behaviour. In these cases there is an onus on the groups involved to voluntarily contribute to the formulation of and participation in a non-coercive integrative process. In some cases the parties themselves attempt to manage this type of process. However, this chapter focuses on processes that are facilitated by third party intermediaries who intervene to assist the parties try and manage what might otherwise be considered an unmanageable state of affairs. This is represented in Fig. 10 as groups opting to try and primarily exert integrative power (again as
represented in Boulding's model of 'Three Faces of Power' in Fig. 1) in a non-coercive process to look for solutions that all the parties could sustainably live with. The process itself can prompt groups to give reflective consideration to ideas about desired directions of change and, in the process, reflect on possibilities as to how well-being, harmony of interests and sustainability might be achieved in the present and, implicitly, in the future.

A proposition developed in this thesis is that the practical usefulness of the study of conflict is relatively limited, and can seem even futile, if diverse ideas do not converge in a meaningful way. This suggests that with regard to the study of responses it is not enough to simply compare different interventionist strategies. A general framework is needed to accommodate and systematically integrate and compare different streams of theory that each makes a valid contribution to our understanding of different interventionist strategies. It is the means to overcome needless and constraining compartmentalizations whereby conventional mainstream approaches develop in relative isolation from more radical and exploratory approaches, such as those generated in peace research and applied conflict resolution studies.

For instance, conservative theoretical approaches that are primarily concerned with how the status quo is to be maintained can postulate that all uncertainties and contradictions manifesting within a given domain should always be treated as disputes capable of being remedied or settled through intra-state or inter-state mechanisms. Conservative approaches are more likely to define social problems in terms of political or economic relations and in turn are more likely to assume that conventional forms of intervention will be sufficient for resolving or settling contention in accordance with prescribed political and legal frameworks. Such interventions are likely to be regarded as a necessary form of therapy to bring about settlements that accord with taken for granted social norms and values embodied in nationalist frameworks. The parties that institute these more routine status quo interventions might overlook vital capacity to review and take account of the necessity for, or the possibility of, fundamental changes and social transformations. If the focus is solely on the status quo therapeutic orientation there is a risk that theory oriented toward explaining this approach lacks reflexivity. Taken for granted inherent assumptions that could actually maintain oppressive or unequal social conditions or unsustainable practices might not be constructively confronted and reviewed. On the other hand, approaches that maintain only a focus on radical transformations without maintaining some degree of attention to how social order and continuity are to be upheld run the risk that theory lacks capacity
to take into consideration ideas about the potential for social disintegration and anarchy.\textsuperscript{12}

Discussion in the following three sections sequentially gives consideration to three reasons why it is necessary to compare alternative scientific approaches when attributing meaning to interventions. The first concerns the way in which different interventionist processes are characterised. The second relates to differences in methodologies through which theoretical understandings about strategies are generated. The third concerns the way that the purpose of an intervention is expressed and how interventionist strategies are accorded legitimacy as viable and valid strategies for addressing conflict.

**SECTION 3: CHARACTERISING DIFFERENT FORMS OF INTERVENTION**

One reason this thesis argues that different approaches need to be critiqued in relation to one another is that it helps to more comprehensively understand the characteristics of particular types of intervention. Circumstances could make it warrantable to do more than simply describe or explain one actual interventionist process. It could be as important to explain how those involved in a conflict make a considered choice of one particular strategy from a range of potential optional strategies. For instance, in certain cases it may seem to be sufficient to rely on a conservative form of intervention that can be initiated by the status quo. However, to more fully understand the direction in which a conflict is being channelled, it may be as significant to explain whether there are equally valid strategic options worthy of consideration and thus how a conflict might otherwise be directed if a more radical form of intervention were instituted. This type of comparative analysis provides a constructive basis for articulating the extent to which parties involved in conflict have had the opportunity to consider alternative strategies and in this way explain whether or not some parties regard certain alternative strategies to be equally viable options. One illustration of the way different strategies can be comparatively reviewed is set out in Fig. 11.
There is a further reason for comparatively analysing different theoretical approaches, which is that it is a constructive basis for assessing the extent to which different strategies might complement one another\textsuperscript{13}, or otherwise undermine one another. Strategic analysis is constrained if ideas about interventionist strategies developed through different strands of theory are not comparatively reviewed so as clarify how different strategies are validated as legitimate. The more that approaches are integrated the less likely it will be that optional strategies are perceived to be entirely distinct and oppositional.\textsuperscript{14} Different approaches could be relevant at different stages along a continuum of dynamically evolving social interactions and group dynamics.\textsuperscript{15} The changing dynamics of conflict inevitably make it difficult to discern what might be the most appropriate strategy in a given set of circumstances. However, the changing dynamics also pose the problem as to what theoretical framework will be most appropriate to capture a sense of the characteristics, the purpose and the outcomes of particular interventionist strategies. No single theoretical approach is likely to provide the perfect basis for qualitatively evaluating strategies with regard to complex and uncertain states of affairs where communities and groups are drawn into problematic relations with one another.\textsuperscript{16}
One means to differentiate between particular types of interventionist strategies is to characterise them as Track I or Track II processes that might take place independently or interdependently within the overall context and time frame of a conflict. Even though each falls within the general category of intervention they may differ in emphasis when conceptualised as ‘ideal types’. At this stage in the development of the argument of this thesis, it is necessary to articulate the primary distinctions between Track I interventions, which are more usually conducted under the auspices of ‘official’ parties, and Track II strategies, which are more likely to involve ‘non-official’ parties. However, in Fig. 12 a subdivision is made with regard to Track II interventions to signify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track I</th>
<th>Track II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track I activities tend to refer to ‘official’ status quo therapeutic strategies, which can include non-coercive facilitation, negotiation, mediation and peacekeeping as well as more coercive measures such as arbitration, determination, sanctions and peace enforcement applied for the purpose of settling or containing conflict. In the contemporary modern world they are primarily initiated through the formal processes of governmental or diplomatic actors. Track I activities, most often undertaken through formal representatives of pre-existing institutional structures, are more likely to carry the assumption that settlements should be accommodated and worked through in a way which primarily accords recognition and legitimacy to those pre-existing formal structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In contrast Track II strategies include ‘resolutionary’ strategies that incorporate less formal and ‘non-official’ efforts by parties representing either governmental and non-governmental institutions or actors. They have a stronger emphasis on facilitation or mediation that takes place between entities that are not necessarily similar to one another. They involve processes such as negotiation, problem-solving workshops or round table discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track III strategies include activities such as grassroots awareness-building, advocacy, training and capacity-building in preparation for ultimate direct engagement with other parties in a process of negotiation. Track III strategies also include problem-identification with respect to need for structural reform, trauma work, human rights and development work and humanitarian assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Involved</th>
<th>'Official' Interventions Track I</th>
<th>'Non-official' Interventions Track II (subdivided into Track II and Track III strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and military leaders as mediators and/or representatives of conflict parties</td>
<td>From private individuals academics, professionals, civil mediation/citizens diplomacy to international and local non-government organisations involved in conflict resolution</td>
<td>From local grassroots organisations to local and international development agencies, human rights organisations and humanitarian assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategies Taken | Outcome-Orientated: From official and coercive measures like sanctions, arbitration, power mediation to non-coercive facilitation, negotiation, mediation, fact-finding missions and good offices | Process-Orientated: Non-official and non-coercive measures mainly facilitation/consultation in the form of problem-solving workshops and round tables | Process and/or Structure-orientated: Capacity-building, trauma work, grassroots training, development and human rights work |

Fig. 12: Track I and Track II Actors and their Strategies (Based on Reimann 2001: 5-7)
that Track III interventions often need to be instituted in the context in which a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' processes is being attempted. (The significance of Track III interventions as a distinct category will be elaborated in Chapter Five.)

Framing strategies in terms of different Tracks helps to signify that, although they may differ in emphasis, they can be initiated simultaneously and in conjunction with one another. A 'multi-track' approach could be taken if it were likely that reliance on only one strategy, attempted in isolation, would be relatively limited as a means of alleviating or transforming a conflict. Different types of intervention may have to be considered and instituted at different stages or at different levels of social interaction. A general framework can help to emphasise that they may require relatively distinctive theoretical treatments, while at the same time making allowance for the prospect that in the complex and dynamic circumstances of inter-group conflict the processes may not necessarily operate in isolation from one another.

The comparisons in Fig. 12 reinforce the idea that assessments about the validity and efficacy of any one form of intervention should not discount the significance of or the potential complementary relationship that one strategy might bear to others. Conflicts can be perpetuated through a range of forms, including coercive political or social activity enforced through institutions such as police, military, paramilitary or guerilla forces. However, a broad framework of understanding is needed to comparatively review different theoretical approaches if there is doubt or ambiguity as to how particular strategies should be characterised. For instance, it could be crucial to examine whether a conservative or more radical theoretical basis is being used to characterise interventions such as shuttle diplomacy. The stated goal is usually to build consensus and cooperation primarily between a range of 'official' actors to see if they can find solutions without the need to resort to more coercive strategies. Comparative analysis in such cases can help to establish whether this type of consensual process is being characterised as a Track I strategy because it is conducted under the auspices of the status quo. Such an approach could emphasise the 'official' position maintained by a third party fulfilling the role of intermediary. On the other hand consensual processes can also be characterised as more radical Track II strategies when greater emphasis is given to the flexible and non-binding nature of the process, particularly if a 'non-official' third party intermediary is appointed whose impartiality all parties mutually acknowledge. Different bases for characterising consensual processes may need to be critiqued because explanations could vary depending on whether they are being interpreted according to a normative or
functionalist framework, a conservative approach, or otherwise an approach generated through applied conflict resolution studies that is more radical.

SECTION 4: METHODOLOGICAL PROCESSES GENERATING SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CONSERVATIVE AND RADICAL INTERVENTIONS

The overall purpose of this chapter is to make general comparisons between different knowledge bases that scholars draw from in order to explain the characteristics and the viability of different forms of intervention. It does not set out a comprehensively outline of all the features of either conservative processes or 'resolutionary' processes. The immediate purpose is to indicate in broad terms that there are distinctive theoretical approaches that can be employed to explain interventions. This purpose has a pivotal bearing on the argument of this thesis that is further developed in Chapter Four. It is that a heightened appreciation of the complementary relationship between different fields of scientific inquiry to explain interventions becomes most critical when it is the role of a scholar to report about a specific interventionist process. Both conservative mainstream theoretical approaches and more radical approaches generated through applied conflict resolution studies have to be given consideration by scholars assigned to report about interventions. If and when necessary it may be appropriate to use an integrated framework to specify the differences and reveal biases in the way particular understandings are generated.

The immediate purpose of discussion in this section is to indicate in general terms how the more radical theoretical approach is generated and to show that this approach is distinguishable from what could be regarded as a conservative approach. It is argued that it is necessary to give greater consideration to the more radical approach because more conventional conservative forms of intervention instituted through 'official' channels are relatively more self-evident. Conservative interventionist processes are already well established and are conducted as a matter of course within given domains, usually national settings. The routine mechanisms that are instituted within national contexts or those employed to maintain particular international relations are more representative of 'official' strategies. Their role is generally to determine what is right or wrong according to pre-existing rules and regulations based on precedent. They are more likely to be explained through normative and functionalist frameworks that privilege certain assumptions, social norms and values embodied in the mechanisms of the status quo that serve as a basis for evaluating how contention and contradiction should be settled or resolved. However, it is in circumstances where
social conflict takes on an overwhelming significance that conservative status quo processes, whose purpose is to uphold social and political order through governing institutions, may require critical review.

Significant social conflict can call into question pre-existing assumptions as to the most appropriate means through which conflict should be managed. Well-established processes can become prone to problems if and when they cannot institute reforms and adapt to changing dynamics through gradual reform in a timely and effective way. Legal determinations and political decision-making processes may not necessarily translate into efficient, equitable and stable outcomes in practice. Consequently the formal mechanisms of the status quo can come to be perceived as incapable of alleviating civil strife or averting eco-catastrophes that undermine a sense of security. It then becomes questionable as to whether and how conservative political and social institutions can keep pace with demands placed upon them, particularly when changing circumstances call for the re-framing of present relationships and future possibilities.

When changing relations between groups give rise to uncertainty and contradiction, it may be crucial to hold in tension theoretical ideas that are generated through both conservative and more radical, exploratory approaches. Assessments and evaluations about innovative modes of change, such as 'non-official' forms of 'resolutionary' intervention, are more likely to be instituted through non-government agencies and supporting theory generated through applied conflict resolution studies.

'Non-official' interventions are sometimes described as workshops, such as those initiated through the Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management based in Germany. One example is an initiative in relation to a Georgian-Abkhazian dialogue-building project. It has been carried on in cooperation with Conciliation Resources, United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution since 1997. In 1998 violent clashes threatened the cease-fire that was in place since the war ended in 1992/93 due in part to the fact that the cease-fire line divides the region not only politically but also economically and socially. Despite numerous political and diplomatic mediation initiatives by Russia and the UN, the two sides' demands still appear irreconcilable. The key conflict issues are described as the status of Abkhazia vis-a-vis Georgia (an independent state in a confederation, or an autonomous region within Georgia) and the return of Georgian refugees to Abkhazia:

Until April 2003 altogether ten workshops have been conducted. Each of the 1-week seminars was attended by 6-7 "influential figures" from the Georgian and Abkhazian
sides (representatives of politics, administration and NGOs). Two categories of
participant were selected: persons with expertise relevant to the seminar topic, and
persons with close contacts to political decision-makers. Around half the "persons of
influence" attend the Dialogue seminars on a regular basis; the other participants vary.
This safeguards the continuity of the process while expanding its sphere of influence
and widening the network of politicians interested in promoting peace. All the experts
participate in their private capacity, rather than in their political role. The Dialogue is
based on a six-stage process: 1) establishing contact; 2) fostering mutual
understanding; 3) joint analysis of conflict issues; 4) exploratory problem-solving; 5)
shared activities; and 6) seeking inspiration for negotiations. The format is a mixture of
"problem-solving workshops" and other forms of communication and cooperation.

One reason it is necessary to review alternative theoretical approaches is that they are
likely to draw on different knowledge bases for assessing the viability of different forms
of intervention. Those who are more familiar with conservative approaches that focus
on the need to control and contain the negative elements of conflict will be more likely
to perceive any radical forms of intervention in a negative light. As they are all
conducted in an unconventional way, their viability and validity may not be well
articulated or understood through accepted conventional frameworks. This can lead to
a general reluctance to give credence to any type of radical process, irrespective of
whether it is 'resolutionary' and 'revolutionary' in character, simply because such
interventions do not follow conventional prescribed procedures.

The comparative approach taken in this section shows that theoretical ideas with
regard to 'official' and 'non-official' strategies are generated in different ways and that
the latter emerge through a particular kind of applied theory that is articulated through a
scholar-practitioner nexus. This term reflects that, although a wide range of third parties
can fulfil an intermediary role in 'non-official' processes, the most comprehensive
understanding of such processes emerges when a practitioner is also a scholar who
maintains a direct or indirect link with a teaching and learning institution. In many
cases these scholars fulfil their role under the auspices of humanitarian non-
government agencies. Discussion will sequentially consider two significant types of
knowledge that is generated through this nexus so as to allow 'resolutionary' strategies
to be accorded recognition as a significant form of agency in its own right. The first
concerns the way that practice informs theory so as to generate understanding about
the practical capacity of intermediaries to fulfil the third party role in 'resolutionary'
processes. The second concerns the way that practice informs theory for the purpose
of generating theoretical propositions to explain the significance and influence of this
form of intervention on a conflict. Through this means objective generalisations can be
made for the purpose of describing how 'resolutionary' processes bring their own
strategic influence to bear on the way conflicts can change.
Methodologies Generating Knowledge that Establishes Standards and Competencies Required of Third Parties who Conduct Interventions

One characteristic that distinguishes 'non-official' strategies from 'official' strategies is the extent to which they rely on precedent. The very nature of 'resolutionary' processes suggests that each deals in an innovative way with conflict and is therefore unprecedented. It is nevertheless possible to generalise about such processes because each is reliant on a particular type of third party intermediary role. It is through applied conflict resolution studies where practice informs theory that understandings of the particular competencies, skills and expertise associated with this role are developed and have come to be recognised as consistently relevant. This knowledge base makes it possible to conceive that there are generally accepted standards across a range of applications of this role.

The immediate purpose of discussion is to highlight that a feature 'resolutionary' processes share in common is that they are all mediated by practitioners who have developed particular expertise and skills that have been described by Raiffa as both an art and a science. Chapter Five will elaborate further on the idea that in some cases understandings about this intermediary role develop in relatively well-regulated societies while in other cases they evolve through the work of scholar-practitioners undertaken in acutely divided societies where violence is at a high level. At this stage the focal consideration is that the scholar-practitioner nexus develops to best effect when practitioners maintain a direct or indirect affiliation with a teaching and learning institution. Experiential learning and reflective analysis contributes to the consolidation of a qualitative understanding of the particular skills and expertise required of practitioners who fulfil this type of third party intermediary role. This suggests that in the case of 'resolutionary' processes, there is a strong focus on how this particular type of role can be replicated rather than on how the same process might be exactly replicated in markedly different circumstances.

The intermediary's role can be described as exerting the power of persuasion to convince protagonists that there are potential benefits in attempting to find a mutually acceptable way of managing their conflict through non-coercive means. Intermediaries put to protagonists the idea that, with assistance, they might mutually find that such a process serves as the most viable strategy for considering how their circumstances might change for the better. In their role they are not authorised to find the solutions for the protagonists, but to encourage them to muster their own propensities for imagination, creativity, hope, compassion and tolerance which it is hoped will lead them
to see their issues in a new light. Intermediaries use the deliberative process to encourage protagonists to confront the inherent and consequent risks they face if there is no change in hostile attitudes or destructive behaviours. This type of facilitative assistance usually works to best effect when the contending groups have come to a point of willingness to negotiate and concede that decision-making or problem-solving could stall or become unsustainable without this form of intervention.

The extensive range of contingences that intermediaries have to anticipate cannot be specified in this thesis. However, one readily accessible example that reflects the degree of considered judgment required of intermediaries at each stage of a process is available on the website of Beyond Intractability, Conflict Resolution Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. The focal issue that is being discussed is that a specific knowledge base has cumulatively been developed as a direct outcome of the experiential learning of intermediaries, primarily through the scholar-practitioner nexus. It is this knowledge base that has to be taken into account as a basis for making comparisons between different theoretical approaches.

**How Interventionist Processes are Conducted**

'Resolutionary' processes instituted in any given situation will necessarily be shaped by the way the protagonists ordinarily address conflict, and whether they concede that a 'non-official' process that they voluntarily enter into can retain its validity as a viable strategy for addressing conflict. Both prior to and at the commencement of 'resolutionary' processes, an initial consideration that intermediaries need to share with the parties is how they will formulate, or at least agree to abide by, certain protocols and procedures that will give some sense of structure and order to the process. The formulation of such guidelines makes a crucial contribution to a general sense of confidence that the process will be conducted fairly and equitably. These ideas are based on the premise that mutually accepted procedures and protocols will alleviate the possibility that the process will be controlled by parties with predominant interests or power, whereby one group's social knowledge is given priority over another. A further premise is that all the parties need to agree about the fairness of the process so as to avert the possibility of later hostile backlash and recrimination if parties come to perceive that resolutions were not found through consensus but rather that settlements were manipulated or imposed. Thus one of the facilitating intermediary's first important roles is to ensure that the process gives all parties an equal opportunity to contribute, and that all contributions will be recognised as significant. This will reflect that each party recognises the legitimacy of the intermediary role on the basis that it affords them
equal opportunity and bargaining power in the process, despite the likelihood that there will otherwise be disparities of power.30

'Official' interventions are more likely to follow precedents, and be conducted by 'official' actors. Those who officiate in formal processes have to demonstrate that they understand and are able to follow prescribed rules and procedures established through political or legal institutions. In contrast third party intermediaries who facilitate 'non-official' processes are not authorised to impose prescribed rules but to help the participants themselves confirm their acceptance of certain groundrules and procedures. Thus, the processes differ significantly in terms of the way they are conducted. However, even though intermediaries who facilitate in negotiated mediations are not obliged to follow prescribed rules, they may nevertheless have to demonstrate the validity of their mediating role by indicating that they have sufficient understanding as to what rules might work best for participants in 'resolutionary' processes. Thus a significant difference with regard to the conduct of 'non-official' processes is that the groundrules that might keep a 'resolutionary' process on track are not rigidly enshrined within a particular institutional body. There is greater scope for manoeuvrability in the way such processes are conducted in comparison with 'official' processes. A key idea is that the rules cannot be learnt in the same way that rules are learnt and enacted with regard to conventional political or legal processes. The relevant body of knowledge has been cumulatively generated through applied conflict resolution studies.

**What Matters Interventionist Processes Deal With**

The immediately preceding discussion in this section focused on the idea that a mediator's role is to help protagonists decide how they might work through an alternative decision-making or problem-solving process, one that is not necessarily conducted in the same way as conventional processes. It is now also necessary to draw attention to another aspect of their role that is likely to be much more indeterminate when compared with the way 'official' processes are conducted. The emphasis in this case is on the fact that a mediator's role is also to help protagonists decide what issues can actually be satisfactorily dealt with through a 'non-official' process. This is an equally challenging aspect of the role that mediators play in keeping 'resolutionary' processes manageable. The critical idea in this case is that there are not just fundamental differences in the way 'official' and 'non-official' interventions are conducted. It is equally significant that the processes will vary in terms of the way specific substantive issues are described and dealt with.
'Official' interventionist strategies instituted under the auspices of political or legal institutions are guided by well-established rules and regulations that reflect certain ways of identifying problems. In any national context a wide range of institutions are authorised to deal with particular types of contentious issues, such as industrial relations, human rights or property rights protection, environmental protection and so on.

In contrast, resolutionary' processes are often instituted in circumstances where more prescribed conventional processes no longer seem totally appropriate or sufficient as a means for resolving or settling a conflict. Protagonists are likely to hold profoundly competing and contradictory perceptions of the issues at stake and therefore they will scope and frame substantive issues in markedly different ways. Some mediators specialise to deal with specific types of contentious issues and they may be framed in the same way as they would by political and legal institutions. Nevertheless third party practitioners in 'resolutionary' processes in all cases have to be as concerned with the component of problem-identification as they are with that of problem-solving. The innovative nature of such processes means that there is not necessarily a requirement for intermediaries to begin the process by stipulating how protagonists should scope and frame issues to the same extent that this is necessary in 'official' prescribed processes. The way intermediaries deal with problem-identification will have a significant bearing on the perceived legitimacy and appropriateness of any treatments or strategies mediators put forward as a way of providing assistance with regard to problem-solving.

One aspect of the role is to encourage protagonists to take advantage of the opportunities made available through a 'resolutionary' process to subjectively express how they interpret the issues at stake. The underlying purpose of this stage is to increase the chances that each party's ideas will be more clearly and explicitly understood by other parties, on the premise that this process of analytical appraisal will increase the chances that as many facets of the conflict as possible are brought forward for consideration. It is more likely that only when the intermediary discerns that this stage of concerted problem-identification has been explored sufficiently that the parties can be asked to think about how they might re-frame their ideas in order to see if more mutually acceptable ways of expressing the issues can be found.
It is then that the stage of *concerted problem-solving* can be considered. Mediators could begin by asking the parties to reflectively consider alternative courses of action, even strategies that formerly seemed unfavourable, and speculate as to whether they seem more or less viable for resolving or settling what seems to be an unmanageable, unacceptable or intolerable situation. In this way, the intermediary can prompt parties to speculate about the likely outcomes that might ensue depending on whether they to opt for coercive or non-coercive strategies.

Fetherston\textsuperscript{32} draws attention to one reason for critiquing underpinning premises of theoretical frameworks that explain the importance of first attempting to mediate about the underlying meanings participants attribute to the issues at stake. She proposes that there is the potential for protagonists to perceive such processes to be part of an apparatus of power through which certain third parties attempt to discipline and normalise a situation according to their own subjective value-judgments.\textsuperscript{33} Through this means discourse can seem to be supporting an assertion that all contingencies are absolutely knowable, and thus overlook the possibility that discourse itself may have to be opened up to encompass a wider range of interpretations of reality.\textsuperscript{34} Fetherston elaborates on this idea as follows:

The prescriptive rationality that underlies analytic problem-solving sets up several difficulties. Rationality within a modern project prescribes a singular ‘objectively’ reasoned truth. Consultation aims to facilitate the process of ‘re-perception’, a coming-to-see by the parties their own problematic communication patterns and ‘learning’ more appropriate ones - those empirically tested and found to be most ‘effective’. In analytic problem-solving a rational distancing is demanded, where participants in the process come to see their conflict as unfulfilled human needs and ‘learn’ through this insight how to better handle conflicts of interest. Ultimately, application of consultation or problem-solving methods leads to resolution because the participants have been ‘corrected’ (however subtly) and, armed with this newly enlightened perspective, can together seek appropriate resolutions. This discursive practice has its limitations. What is considered right and, therefore, ‘rational’ is really merely ‘point of view’ but is rendered as discursive truth. And although most CR scholars would not pretend to have all the answers, they are operating from a particular standpoint of modernity where they are on the ‘right’ track and further research, and application, will refine what is now known. This progressive linearity of knowledge is central to the modern project. Perhaps more interesting than what is considered ‘rational’ is the unstated but implied consideration of what is ‘irrational’ and therefore in need of enlightenment. The whole of the Balkans is looked at through this lens of irrationality, cut off from normal rational living and in need of instruction. Participants of a problem-solving process have to re-perceive the totality of their war as irrational, simultaneously rendering their experiences and practices illegitimate and irrelevant - and cutting off, at least, an understanding of the power of war as social construct which conditions and is conditioned by social meaning. One potential outcome of problem-solving then is to undermine, by delegitimising and disempowering, particular practices of survival and resistance.\textsuperscript{35}

Fetherston's comments highlight that there is an inherent risk that any suggested treatments put forward by an intermediary, if undertaken in an inappropriate way, could
potentially undermine the core purpose of the process. If treatments are inappropriate, instead of being a means for resolving or settling the issues at stake, they could lead to subsequent unmanageable conflict overlay problems. These secondary conflicts are attributable specifically to the way attempts are made to move the parties toward addressing the core issues at stake. They have a profound influence on whether a 'resolutionary' process can be maintained or whether it will falter. The complexity of problem variables entailed in protracted and deep-seated conflict can often seem to be virtually overwhelming and insurmountable. However, part of an intermediary's role is to ensure that as wide a range of aspects of a problem are identified and acknowledged. Their role also involves providing encouragement to participants to appreciate that actually developing a heightened and more explicit awareness of how the issues can be expressed is an integral part of the process. The facilitator's role often requires striking a balance between the way protagonists identify problems and suggesting different ways of looking at them. In some cases, they can draw from their past experience and put forward relatively abstract descriptions of a particular sort of problem that the parties could find cognitively helpful if the underlying meanings are explored to see if they are relevant and useful in relation to the immediate circumstances.

Bias Toward Western Models
There is an emerging appreciation that in a diverse range of situations 'resolutionary' processes could be the more viable strategy to deal with social conflict. However, Lederach emphasises that there are no universally applicable process models and that 'resolutionary' processes are not constructive strategies if they are founded on the premise that the parties should be persuaded to adhere to a single process model in order to resolve their differences. He proposes that 'resolutionary' processes are most effective when fixed pre-existing formulas give way to openness and flexibility. These qualities have to be reflected in the facilitator's skills and expertise. Avruch suggests that part of this skill is a certain 'studied agnosticism' in the way that the parties are offered the opportunity to engage with a mediator so that they might be facilitated in an attempt to work toward re-framing and reviewing present realities and future possibilities.

This discussion points to a further reason for situating a range of ideas about strategies to deal with conflict within a general framework, which is to overcome a bias toward Western models. This bias is understandable given that relatively well-regulated wealthy nations inevitably have more resources to invest in teaching and learning
institutions. Thus proportionately more scholars have access to formal Western-oriented training even if ultimately they opt to apply their knowledge in a non-Western environment. In well-regulated Western nations, the study of extremely radicalised violent conflict does not necessarily seem so urgent nor of paramount significance. The primary need is to analyse and offer explanations as to the best means through which social cohesion can be maintained and to understand the way that political, economic and social institutions function to deal with contentions, uncertainties and change. In these situations, normative and functionalist theoretical approaches often seem adequate to provide a basis for understanding present realities, solve or deal with apparent dilemmas and problems, and develop management skills which will allow citizens to fulfil prescribed roles in society.

There are profoundly more windows of opportunity to institute ‘resolutionary’ processes and generate theoretical propositions with regard to them when the status quo itself promotes them for certain purposes and supports professional development with regard to the mediator role. Examples that will be further discussed in Chapter Five are processes specifically developed through the ADR movement. However, the applicability of theory relating to ‘resolutionary’ processes extends well beyond the relatively limited purpose of serving as an ‘alternative’ means for the status quo to deal with internal disputes. Particularly in the post-Cold War era, there has been an increasing awareness of the significance of recourse to mediation in a wide range of situations involving contention and contradiction. There has been a corresponding requirement to broaden the theoretical framework to acknowledge that although theory relating to ‘resolutionary’ processes is often underpinned by very general core ideals, there are no universally appropriate models and mechanisms that can be presumed to apply in the same way in diverse situations. Each process will be unique and will involve its own specific substantive issues and will be situated within its own particular social, cultural, environmental and temporal context. This means that theoretical propositions must take account of the pronounced differences between the social realities and the lived experiences of people attuned to a more bureaucratically regulated modern societies and situations where social instability has created far greater degrees of personal and communal insecurity. The favouring of Western models, particularly in non-Western contexts, can be regarded as both a cause and an outcome of the compartmentalising of knowledge about different strategies to deal with conflict.
One way of expressing the distinction between conservative and more radical theoretical approaches to explain interventions is reflected in a model developed by Functowicz and Ravetz concerning different types of scientific inquiry. They have, in an attempt to link scientists' work with uncertainty and risk in public decision-making, employed a model as set out in Fig. 13. They pose that the term 'applied science' is more appropriate for describing what Kuhn terms processes of everyday puzzle-solving and they distinguish this from what they term the 'post-normal science' of highly uncertain and potentially risk-laden decision-making. It is argued that this type of distinction is similar to that drawn in this thesis between conservative and radical theory, and that both are a reflection of what Feyerabend conceives to be a need to proliferate alternative theory.

![Fig. 13: Three Kinds of Science (Booth 2000 - based on Functowicz and Ravetz, 1991)](image)

Making this type of distinction with regard to the approach taken to scientific inquiry has resonance with the present discussion about different ways that theoretical explanation can be generated concerning conventional 'official' interventionist processes and more radical 'non-official' interventions. The distinction is reflected in the contrasting roles that third parties play in each case. 'Official' actors, such as third party adjudicators, in more determinative conservative processes are authorised to bring about settlements, through coercion if necessary, that accord with prescribed rules and regulations. On the other hand, third party mediators in 'non-official' interventions can only exert the power of persuasion in an attempt to avert the risk that hostile conflict will escalate rather than be settled, resolved or transformed. The latter approach is generated through a stream of theory that has more resonance with the concept of 'post-normal science'. In some cases an intermediary may only be dealing with and generating
theoretical ideas about matters that are more akin to everyday puzzle-solving. However, in many situations it is as likely that the matters being addressed entail a high degree of risk and uncertainty and are therefore more relevant to the realm of 'post-normal science'.

Functowicz and Ravetz\textsuperscript{43} note that the way puzzles are framed may not well reflect the contradictions and paradoxes to do with reality. In disciplines such as behavioural and environmental sciences reality tends to be reflected and mediated through the conceptual structures defining particular puzzle-solving exercises. The model suggests the need to contrast the training and mind-set of this type of puzzle-solving with "a positive quality of our experience of the real world, that makes it rich and stimulating, perhaps sometimes even leading us on from mere knowledge towards wisdom."\textsuperscript{44} However, the distinction, expressed in the conceptual model as the difference between 'applied science' and 'post-normal science', needs to be exemplified to show how it can actually be reflected in practice.\textsuperscript{45}

The ideas discussed in this section are an indication of the way in which this distinction can be shown to have relevance in practice. The more radical approach generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus reflects that both the practice and the supporting theory of conflict resolution studies may often be more representative of 'post-normal science' when compared with more conservative approaches that are likely to be closer to what Functowicz and Ravetz term 'applied science'. The model could be interpreted as the tension between more mainstream 'applied science', represented as normative or functionalist social science or empirical science approaches to puzzle-solving, which are prone to distance themselves from the more radical 'post-normal science' approaches. This would include ideas that fit within the components of problem-identification and problem-solving generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus. It is argued that it is difficult to make the connections and appreciate the distinctions in these two streams of scientific inquiry when there is a lack of complementarity between mainstream and more radical social science discourse about means to 'solve puzzles'. In the present discussion they concern the issue of alternative strategies through which the contradictions and paradoxes of social conflict can be addressed. The tendency is to articulate how, as a puzzle or a contradiction, social conflict can be settled or contained. This can be compared with the more radical 'post-normal science' approach, which in the case of social conflict, tends toward the premise that it is more realistic to articulate the contradiction within a domain of uncertainty as to what factors will ultimately influence the way it is settled, resolved or transformed. This idea is
exemplified in the way Lederach expresses the need to appreciate the paradoxes associated with conflict transformation and peacemaking:

Approaching conflict from a dialectic perspective encourages us to look at peacemaking in terms of paradoxes. A paradox is the interplay of two opposite ideas or energies that seem to create an irreconcilable contradiction. The irreconcilable nature emerges from a tendency to understand contrary ideas in an either/or frame of reference in which one must be chosen over the other. A paradoxical approach suggests the energy of the ideas is enhanced if they are held together, like two sides of the coin (Smith and Berg 1987). I have found the paradox a useful tool in understanding conflict and in exploring the key values of peacemaking.46

Methodologies for Developing Scientific Understanding about the Significance of Interventionist Strategies

Discussion now focuses on the importance of the methodological approach through which descriptive or explanatory theory is generated for attributing meaning to and making evaluations about the significance of different forms of intervention. Different streams of theory provide the underpinning knowledge base required for analysing and objectively evaluating the way that 'official' and 'non-official' interventions actually precipitate change and thus bring influence to bear on a conflict. Differences in the way theory is generated, and the vantage point of the researcher, are critical factors when there is a need to correlate and integrate ideas about conservative and radical forms of intervention.

Methodologies through which descriptive and explanatory theory is generated as a basis for qualitatively evaluating the significance of 'official' interventions require the researcher to observe the way interventions are officiated and conducted through the apparatus of established political or legal institutions. As well as firsthand observation, data can also be drawn from secondary sources such as official reports or accounts generated by other scholars or conveyed through the media.

In contrast, if an intermediary in a 'non-official' process is a scholar-practitioner, their unique vantage point allows them to treat the process as one of experiential learning. It not only serves as the methodology through which understandings can be generated about this particular type of third party role; it can equally serve as the methodology through which theoretical propositions are generated with regard to the significance of 'non-official' processes.

A subjectivist element is needed to describe firsthand and attribute meaning to the protagonists' own attitudes and behaviours, in order to indicate how they express the significance of a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' process. Such accounts would attempt to
capture a sense of the parties' own perceptions of what is at issue, the purpose of the process, how such processes should be conducted, the way issues are dealt with and the outcomes attained or otherwise not achieved. This type of explanation provides an account of the way contending parties qualitatively evaluate the process. It would thus signify whether it was perceived to be viable because it allowed for a more coherent understanding of the conflict to emerge and provided significant opportunities for the parties to reflect on the prospect of reaching mutually acceptable sustainable outcomes. Overall this type of understanding provides a general indication as to what, in particular circumstances, motivates parties to voluntarily engage in 'resolutionary' processes and whether such processes are perceived to be viable strategies for working through their differences.

An *objectivist* element is also needed so that the scholar-practitioner can bring forth a more objective interpretation of the significance of the process that is not necessarily dependent on the participating parties' subjective interpretations. This objective account is more representative of the way that scholar-practitioners analyse and make qualitative evaluations as to whether such processes fulfil the purposes for which they were actually instituted. These accounts are as significant as the accounts of other parties, particularly for the purpose of strategically analysing and evaluating 'resolutionary' processes in relation to other interventionist strategies.

Theoretical propositions about particular 'resolutionary' processes generated through the *objectivist* approach in applied conflict resolution studies contribute to the development of a comprehensive and general understanding of the causes and characteristics of conflict as well as a better understanding of particular 'non-official' strategies. Scholar-practitioners require a broad knowledge base so that their experiential learning is informed by and can be qualified and tested in relation to descriptive and explanatory theory generated within markedly different streams within the broad field of conflict management. This is necessary so that the type of theory that is cumulatively generated through experiential learning can be further tested and validated, and thus provide better indications of the characteristics that distinguish 'official' from 'non-official' processes, as well as those that distinguish one type of 'resolutionary' process from another. However, even allowing for the fact that each process is relatively unique and unprecedented, a further reason for critiquing theoretical propositions is to more clearly identify the characteristics 'resolutionary' processes share in common. It is their general characteristics that will signify the fundamental differences between 'official' and 'non-official' strategies.
A primary reason for highlighting differentiations between knowledge generated through radical theoretical approaches compared with that generated through conservative approaches is to establish that they serve equally as bases for helping us to make more informed decisions and choices with regard to the viability of alternative strategies. Comparing conservative and radical approaches can reveal the extent to which approaches that are premised on profoundly different ontological and conceptual understandings, particularly with regard to the nature of conflict and how it should be addressed, have tended to develop in relative isolation from one another. Comparisons can help to identify ambiguities and contradictions, particularly those that are due to differences in the essential terminology used to develop theoretical propositions. The compartmentalisation of different strands of theory can perpetuate the problem that different meanings continue to be attributed to the same terms or otherwise different terms are used to attribute meaning to the same things. One striking example is the way the term 'conflict' itself is used in such an uncritical and relatively ambiguous way in everyday usage and in the popular media, more often reflecting a bias toward the relevance of the term within the framework of political realism. These predominating interpretations, although they are inherently ambiguous, then transfer to the discourse of scientific inquiry.

Isakovic, when considering the role of universities to promote people to look for creative solutions that might transform social conflict comments as follows:

There is an open question: how (could) governments – if they cannot find a common language with academicians and other people who belong to their own side in conflicts – be expected to find that kind of language with the opposite conflict side?.....As challenges and uncertainties lie ahead, there is the open question of what is the proper role of the University within the conflict escalation process and simultaneous intensive and often dramatic national debate; how can the University contribute to deescalation? This dilemma opens the question “knowledge for what?”, i.e. for what purpose does observed society need knowledge offered by the University during the conflict escalation process? Within the context of the conflict transformation method study, this questions means primarily how one can reach the empowerment of the parties to handle themselves the conflict by peaceful and democratic political means? Answering this question one can begin with essential knowledge of the basic conflict (escalation) vocabulary. Trying to create the dictionary one could gather and analyze data on, for instance, how many faculty members, students and graduates can define the terms regarding the conflict process: (ethnic) conflict, its early warning, escalation, diagnosis, mediation and mediator, third-party intervention, arbitration, resolution, management, therapy, prognosis, prevention, ethnic identities, genocide and ethnic cleansing, peace, peace-making and peacekeeping, peace-building, reconciliation, truth and reconciliation commission, etc.
SECTION 5: EXPLAINING THE UNDERLYING PURPOSE OF INTERVENTIONS AND HOW THEIR PURPOSES ARE LEGITIMATED

The argument of this thesis poses that competing ideas about conflicts and appropriate ways to respond to them need to be situated in a general framework to allow conservative and more radical scientific approaches in this field to be comparatively analysed. Explanations with regard to the purpose of an interventionist strategy, and evaluations as to whether it is positive and constructive or otherwise negative and destructive, depend to a great extent on the way that conflict as a social phenomenon is perceived. Therefore discussion with regard to the purpose of interventions has to again consider a key idea first raised in Chapter Two, which is that explanations about the causes and characteristics of conflict are shaped by conceptual understandings inherent in the underlying paradigm. It is argued that the underlying paradigm will similarly shape theoretical explanation with regard to responses to conflict. This idea has direct relevance to the way the purpose of an intervention is expressed. It is proposed that conservative understandings underpinned by a realist paradigm with regard to the nature of conflict will be reflected in the way the purpose of a conservative interventionist response is expressed. In contrast, markedly different understandings underpinned by an idealist paradigm with regard to the nature of conflict will be reflected in the way the purpose of a 'resolutionary' interventionist response is expressed. These ideas are directly relevant to the two inter-relating considerations discussed in this section. The first concerns the way that the actual purpose of an intervention is expressed. The second concerns the way that the purpose is accorded legitimacy.

Channels Through Which the Purpose of an Intervention is Expressed

The present discussion stresses the need to clearly identify the theoretical understandings and explanations that serve to inform about the actual purpose of an intervention as it is expressed firsthand by the party initiating the intervention. It is important to distinguish this type of explanation from theoretical ideas and evaluations that serve to make more general critical assessments as to the viability and appropriateness of an intervention. Therefore an initial consideration with regard to establishing the purpose of an intervention will be the channels through which the purpose is put forward by the initiating party.

In the case of 'official' interventions, actual political or legal institutions of the status quo will be the typical firsthand sources of information and explanation with regard to their
purpose. Normative and functionalist theoretical frameworks would then serve as the means through which more scientifically based descriptions and explanations about 'official' interventions are generated. This is somewhat different from the role served by critical theory which is to analyse the laws, rules and regulatory policy shaping the purpose, and make critical assessments with regard to the perceived efficacy of 'official' interventions.

In the case of 'non-official' interventions, intermediaries often undertake their role through or in conjunction with institutions motivated by humanitarian concerns in an attempt to maintain 'non-official' mediations. Therefore the purpose of 'non-official' interventions can in some cases be expressed firsthand through the channel of non-government agencies. However, another equally meaningful firsthand source of information about the purpose of 'non-official' processes develops through the scholar-practitioner nexus. This idea emphasises that in this case there is a direct, firsthand relationship between practice and theory, and that ideas about the purpose of 'resolutionary' interventions are actually generated through the particular stream of applied conflict theory that has been discussed throughout this chapter.

The Criteria of Success of Interventions

One way that the underlying purpose can be revealed is to examine how the initiating party expresses the goals or the 'criteria of success' of the intervention.48

In very general terms the criteria of success of conservative interventionist strategies are to ensure that conflict that calls into question and threatens to undermine the cohesive functioning of the social system is contained and controlled through political and legal mechanisms established for that purpose. Success is more likely to be articulated in terms of the status quo's capacity to uphold particular social norms and values enshrined in the institutions through which the social system is supported. The purpose would be scientifically elaborated through a normative or functionalist framework founded on an acceptance of the significance of particular social norms and values. Because such frameworks are primarily concerned to offer understanding about the ongoing functioning of a given social system, they do not necessarily have to be reflexive or critically discursive with regard to role of the status quo. Theoretical propositions about the purpose of an intervention can be conceived to be realist-based if ideas about the strategy to deal with conflict are predicated on an acceptance of the conservative worldview and the way power is exerted that allows the status quo to maintain social order. Thus ideas can be realist-based, irrespective of whether
propositions support or criticise the way the status quo operates. (This idea will be further elaborated in Chapter Four.)

This can be broadly compared with the way that the purpose and the criteria of success of ‘resolutionary’ strategies are expressed. The purpose of ‘non-official’ interventions is more likely to be expressed in terms of an aspiration and a commitment to promote individual and communal health and well-being and the alleviation of suffering and violence. The ‘value dimensions’ compiled by Galtung (set out in Fig. 7, Chapter Two) provide a good indication of what are postulated to be the universally relevant positive ideals promoted in this approach in relation to what can be conceived to be their negative aspects. Øberg more succinctly expresses the idea that the purpose of ‘resolutionary’ processes is more inclined toward a health model in the following terms:

Conflict-resolution is not about harming or killing people. It is about killing problems and harnessing the human and circumstantial attraction to violence.49

The unprecedented nature of ‘resolutionary’ processes means that in many cases an idealist-based theoretical framework is required to express their criteria of success. This would be on the basis that, even if conservative institutions of the status quo claim to share the same ideals, conventional normative or functionalist frameworks through which they would be expressed would be inherently biased to indicate their relevance in terms of particular social norms and values. It is proposed that radical idealist-based ideas about the means to deal with significant inter-group conflict are more likely to be predicated on an acceptance of the underlying principle that non-coercive strategies have a more constructive influence on the parties’ ultimate capacity to find enduring sustainable outcomes. A key idea is that non-coercive processes can only exert the power of persuasion to convince protagonists to seek cooperative and consensual means to address their conflict, and it will always be far more indeterminate as to whether and how such processes might be successfully instituted. Therefore one of the first criterion of success is that parties voluntarily opt to engage in a non-coercive ‘resolutionary’ strategy. This suggests that idealist-based approaches are founded on an assumption that ‘resolutionary’ processes are a more ideal strategy, particularly in circumstances where the management of inter-group conflict has become so uncertain that the only alternative strategies would involve high levels of force and coercion. Examples would include the option to institute a conservative strategy through which a settlement could be imposed or otherwise to initiate a ‘revolutionary’ strategy as a form of resistance to an imposed settlement. The underlying implication is that ‘resolutionary’ processes cannot be initiated based on fixed pre-determined criteria as
to what might be the most successful outcome, as would more likely be the case with regard to conservative processes where the criteria of success are founded on already established social norms and values. At the outset success can only be measured in terms of the contending parties' willingness to look for settlements or resolutions through non-coercive means. This principle or ideal needs to be expressed in very broad terms to reflect its transideological significance, and thus reiterate that it extends beyond the way the concept might be accorded meaning by the predominant status quo.

The ideals expressed through this approach are founded on the postulated idea that there are certain values and interests that the contending parties share in common as well as those values and interests about which they disagree. They are to do with the most fundamental concerns about survival and the realisation of a sustainable future. Thus one of the purposes of ‘resolutionary’ processes can be to persuade the parties to give equal attention to fundamental values and interests that they actually share in common and to acknowledge and accord them recognition as self-interests. This discussion emphasises that while the criteria of success of ‘resolutionary’ processes will initially be relatively indeterminate, there is an underlying implication that a goal that warrants primary consideration is the parties' own capacity to look for outcomes that meet all the parties’ fundamental needs.

**How the Legitimacy of Interventions Reflects the Underlying Paradigm**

Discussion now considers the inter-related matter of how legitimacy is accorded to the purpose of interventionist responses to conflict. Interpretations of the ideological commitment will vary depending to how matters of control and management are generally legitimated and this requires consideration to be given to the underlying paradigm or conceptual frame of reference.

The legitimacy of conservative interventions underpinned by a realist paradigm will be founded on conceptual understandings about and acceptance of the authority of the conservative institutions of the status quo to exert the power of coercion if necessary and impose settlements that accord with accepted norms and values. The purported legitimacy of conservative interventions is relatively straightforward to determine because it is explicitly expressed through the political and legal institutions of the status quo. It is likely to be upheld even in circumstances signifying significant social conflict where parties whose interests or values are at odds with the status quo do not accept the asserted legitimacy.
On the other hand, the legitimacy accorded to 'resolutionary' interventions is not as self-evident and determinate. This type of intervention can only be driven by the power of persuasion, not by the power of force or coercion. This difference means that the party who conducts the process, the intermediary, is not necessarily the sole determinator of its legitimacy. 'Non-official' processes have to be legitimated by the parties themselves who voluntarily opt to participate.

A sense of the legitimacy of 'resolutionary' processes requires a conceptual frame of reference more in keeping with an *idealist* approach, which can serve as an alternative to sole reliance on *realist* interpretations. Just as *realist* frameworks may not be sufficient to capture a sense of the realities of inter-group conflict that has become highly radicalised, unstable or violent, they may be equally insufficient as a means to express the legitimate purpose of 'resolutionary' processes. For instance, the above discussion suggests that conservative institutions provide a much more determinate basis for comprehending the legitimacy of conservative processes. This makes it relatively straightforward to develop scientific explanations about their legitimacy in objective terms. In contrast, 'resolutionary' processes are often instituted in circumstances where relationships between parties have become highly radicalised and polarised and are thus more uncertain. This degree of uncertainty means it is consequently far more indeterminate and uncertain as to how scientific meaning can be attributed to the legitimacy of 'non-official' processes. When an *idealist* conceptual frame of reference is employed in applied conflict resolution studies, it is the *objectivist* aspect that allows more universally relevant abstract conceptualisations of the underpinning *ideals* to be forged to explain the legitimacy of a 'resolutionary' process. However, to a greater extent than what is required in *realist*-based approaches, objective understandings alone cannot serve to fully convey how legitimacy is accorded to the process, that is, what it means in the actualities of a real situation. In applied conflict resolution studies the *subjectivist* approach is equally significant for tracing and reflexively qualifying what certain *ideals* mean to the parties who actually participate in such processes. The *subjectivist* approach is crucial in order to indicate the relationship between the general abstract principles and how they are enacted when put into practice.

**Legitimation of the Role of Parties Conducting Interventions**

The preceding discussion suggests that there are fundamental differences in the way legitimacy can be accorded to the different types of *processes* outlined in this chapter.
Their distinguishing characteristics make it necessary to consider as a separate matter the legitimation of the role of parties who officiate or conduct the interventionist process.

Conservative interventionist responses to conflict take for granted the legitimacy of the established political and legal institutions of the status quo. This in turn suggests that legitimacy is automatically accorded to the role of officiators authorised to conduct such processes as appointed representatives of conservative institutions. They would be appointed on the basis that they can follow prescribed procedural guidelines. Normative and functionalist theoretical principles would thus be sufficient to attribute scientific meaning to the legitimacy of this type of role.

However, the legitimacy of the role of an intermediary in 'resolutionary' processes is not self-evident, and therefore the intended purpose of 'non-official' processes can only be fulfilled if the parties themselves actually legitimate the intermediary role. The voluntary and innovative nature of 'non-official' processes means that intermediaries are not obliged to observe and follow the same prescribed procedural rules that give legitimacy to 'official' interventions. However, even though intermediaries are not constrained by the same requirements, they may nevertheless be required to demonstrate what principles they think should guide and legitimate the way a 'non-official' process might best work in practice. 'Non-official' mediators have to be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the protagonists their own personal commitment to adhere to certain guiding principles. This means that the instituting of 'resolutionary' process rests heavily on establishing a level of trust that is sufficient to convince the protagonists to legitimate the third party role and engage in a process that requires them to step outside of convention.

One of the primary principles that would establish the necessary degree of trust is reflected in an intermediary's personal commitment to humanitarian concerns that a politically or economically motivated party might not necessarily be able to maintain as their foremost priority. This would be reflected in a personal commitment to an improvement in individual and communal well-being and the alleviation of suffering and violence. These principles can open the way for 'non-official' interventions in situations where 'official' mediators could not fulfil the same role, often because they would be perceived to represent the interests of parties with a greater degree of power and influence.
Another important way in which the necessary degree of trust can be accorded to the role of an intermediary is through a demonstration that the intermediary intends to act as a neutral and impartial third party. The underlying principle in this case is that this facilitating role serves the purpose of encouraging the parties themselves to become the ultimate decision-makers. Curle suggests that the intermediary role is one that attempts to achieve more than a material settlement and that there is equally a concern to help the parties find a psychological settlement. This implies that the facilitating role requires protagonists to be open to new ideas and new ways of thinking about each other and the contentious issues at stake.

However, as well as personal demonstrations of commitment to key principles, they may be reinforced through the way they are formally expressed through non-government agencies under whose auspices an intermediary might work. Thus there could be a combination of personal and formal expressions of principled commitment that will serve to give legitimacy to the role of an intermediary. For example, the Code of Conduct for Conflict Transformation Work of the NGO International Alert (IA) is expressed in the following terms:

To help maintain impartiality, IA's work is informed by a clear framework of principles and values. This framework is based on internationally-recognised standards such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and Protocol II.

Chapter Five elaborates on the idea that in relatively well-regulated social systems, the legitimacy of intermediary roles is more straightforward to express because of a greater degree of professionalisation with regard to the provision of mediation services, but in more radicalised situations this alone would not necessarily prove sufficient.

Conclusion
Modern complex institutional and bureaucratic structures tend to be conceptualised as effective functioning mechanisms in their own right (an idea that was discussed in Chapter Two in terms of the way Weber approached the problem of bureaucracy and rationalisation). Increasingly there are objectified conceptualisations of these formal institutions as entities other than the product of human creation for ordering social life. The reification of formal institutional structures does not encourage reflexive consideration of their limited capacity to be the mechanisms through which communities address problematic and changing social relations. It is argued that this prevailing reified Western worldview does not prompt us to think in terms of general framework in which to situate diverse ideas about strategies for alleviating or
overcoming social problems, and more expressly include processes that strive to apply integrative as well as authoritative forms of power. In turn this means there is less incentive to better understand how integrative power can actually influence support for, or resistance to, conservatism and authoritative power. More emphasis is given to simply describing and explaining the effect that integrative power has on the reified institutions of the status quo. A consequence is a tendency to treat 'non-official' processes as stop-gap measures for resolving contention until an assumed 'normality' that accords with the reified worldview, more likely a realist worldview, can be resumed. Their very informality masks their importance in daily life as the invisible oil that keeps political and economic institutions and bureaucratic structures functioning effectively. Primary emphasis on the study of formal institutions and 'official' processes reinforces a perception that they are themselves relatively unchanging and are the immutable means for organising and managing the complexities of social relations. The longer-term risk is that this perception can lead to a point where differences and contradictions between the role of 'official' and 'non-official' processes give rise to social forces with the capacity to destabilise the institutions whose claimed purpose is to regulate social cohesion.

The tendency in Western oriented studies is to treat 'resolutionary' processes simply as adjuncts to formal processes. However, if they are simply conceived as stop-gap strategies theoretical propositions lack a rigorous interest in the relationship between 'official' and 'non-official' processes. Significance can be lost with regard to the fact that the processes apply power in markedly different ways. It is then less likely that the potential for alternative strategies to either complement or contradict one another is meaningfully articulated. Capacity to speculate about the potential advantages of instituting 'resolutionary' processes is often overlooked until the point is reached where more conservative management strategies are no longer able to contain or settle conflict. When conflict reaches a point where it cannot be managed through the routine channels of authoritative power, it is more likely that the stakes will become increasingly high. At times when manageability becomes highly uncertain a comprehensive appreciation of 'resolutionary' strategies may provide the only persuasive argument for stemming the tide away from recourse to 'revolutionary' strategies.

'Resolutionary' processes have been employed by groups at all stages and places in human development where people have found themselves in circumstances prompting a need for innovative and cooperative approaches. The fact that they allow social
cohesion to be restored or maintained through less coercive means has inevitably lessened the need to record them as dramatic episodes in historical accounts of social interaction. Ury expresses one aspect of this idea as follows:

The reason, then, why archaeologists have found so little evidence of organized violence during the first ninety-nine percent of human history may well be the obvious one. We have been maligning our ancestors. They weren’t cavemen looking to bash every stranger over the head. Rather, they worked hard at coexisting.....The chief explanation for such coexistence does not lie in the inherent peacefulness of human beings. Rather it is that fighting and domination do not make much sense for people living in a flexible interdependent network and roving all over the landscape in search of game and plants. People’s livelihood depended on cooperating within the group and with other groups. .... That our ancestors were quite capable of violence, that indeed they had the ability all along to make war, and that they undoubtedly had many conflicts makes their feat of coexisting all the more remarkable. They had to work hard and courageously to prevent conflicts from arising, to resolve difficult issues, and to contain violent fights. Our image for the first ninety-nine percent of human history should be neither of killer apes, nor of naturally peaceful folk, but of human beings prone to conflict and struggling to coexist amid their differences. If anything, we are Homo Negotiator.58

The comparative analysis developed in this chapter provides an indication of matters that need to be taken into account in order to determine whether interventionist processes have a conservative or a more radical orientation, which may influence the way they are explained and evaluated in scientific discourse. It is argued there is a need to integrate the discourse of peace research and applied conflict resolution studies with theoretical propositions developed through more mainstream behavioural science disciplines in order to test their validity and evaluate their relative strengths and weaknesses. Chapter Four further elaborates this idea by demonstrating how an integrated framework can be used as an analytical tool to more systematically compare different conceptual approaches, methodologies and theoretical frameworks and the extent to which alternative approaches complement or contradict one another. This type of comparative analysis is particularly important in the broad field of conflict management because it contributes to shaping the way we understand the role that conflict plays in social life and what considerations have to be taken into account to make informed and constructive responses to it. It is a basis for making informed decisions as to when, where, why and how one strategy rather than another could seem to be more viable. It is also a constructive basis for speculating about the consequences of inappropriate intervention and the potential risk that conflicts that are not satisfactorily settled or resolved not only fail to alleviate hostile attitudes and behaviours, they become more prone to escalate. While this comparative approach has general applicability, it has particular relevance for scholars assigned to produce
purportedly 'independent' reports relating to the way conflict is being addressed through intervention.

Chapter Five in turn identifies why a further process of comparative review is also significant. Three different 'resolutionary' processes are comparatively reviewed. The purpose at that stage is to demonstrate that broad correlations between conservative and radical strategies are not necessarily all that may be required. The distinguishing characteristics of different 'resolutionary' processes also need to be established because, by degrees, they may have a conservative or a radical orientation.

1 The broad definitions through which these ideas and concepts are being explored, such as group, identity and culture, are applied here in a relatively uncritical way. I have left the terms open to suggest that specific interpretations could constrain their meaning. However, there is a presumption that if an integrated framework were employed to attribute meaning to conflict and the agency through which it could change, at that time the terms would ultimately require critical examination. This reflects an approach developed by Schön (1983), who suggests that professional competence derives from effective reflection by those engaged in social practice. In this thesis the idea of the professional competence will centre on the role of scholar-reporters interpreting processes of social change.

2 Filitova, 2000

3 Sustainability represented as 'conflicts of ideas' presumes a similar underlying theoretical issue. When sustainability issues arise which can be defined as an intra-group problem, problem-identification can give rise to problem-solving. However, with respect to sustainability issues affecting more than one social group, concerted problem-identification in order to establish a concerted description of what is problematic will actually depend on and be influenced by whichever social group's knowledge and authority is able to establish what could be an appropriate prescription. However, the ultimate realisation of a sustainable outcome will depend on the knowledge, authority and capacity of all the involved groups, and sometimes third parties, to develop the means to manage concerted problem identification. This becomes a basis for concerted problem-solving, undertaken on the understanding that certain postulated ideals relating to sustainability can be seen to have common relevance.

4 Spitzer, 1982: 241

5 Lederach, 1996: 9

6 Ropers, 2000: 6

7 The way the term 'management' is applied in this thesis could be regarded as too narrow because it alludes only to the technical and practical side of the effort. I apply the term bearing in mind Lederach's concern as to whether the meaning of the term should have most relevance with regard to the professionalization of the fields of conflict resolution and peacemaking. He suggests it is necessary to qualify the term. In this case it is being applied to imply that management includes all conscious systematic strivings for the attainment of social justice. Lederach, 1996: 17

8 Isaacman et al (1982) provide an informative indication of the way that these three different forms of intervention can play a significant role in attempts to maintain social order, in this case in Mozambique. The conservative status quo approach is reflected in the imposition of Portuguese political and legal processes on the local population. The 'revolutionary' approach is reflected in the resistance movements of FRELIMO in the 1960's and 1970's. The 'resolutionary' approach is reflected in the development of locally controlled popular tribunals initiated when the former Portuguese legal system was no longer accorded recognition.

9 The term 'therapeutic' has been used by Reimann (2000) to describe conservative interventions to address conflict. It implies a view that status quo management practices pertaining to the political and social ordering of society are assumed to be capable of providing a 'therapy' to manage the way social conflict should be settled or alleviated. While one interpretation of the term relates to the way it is used by political institutions, the term is often applied in the same way by Western-oriented NGO's. When discussing 'therapeutic' programmes instituted in Kosovo Pupavac (2000) draws attention to the need to critically analyse how the concept of a 'therapy' is being applied. Her conclusions reflect a need to
reflexively specify how a health model can be used when attributing meaning to violent conflict. Pupavac suggests that many reports relating to conflict refer to refugees as ‘traumatised’, ‘hopeless’, ‘emotionally scarred’, ‘psychologically damaged’, or ‘overwhelmed by grief’, and that the emotional state of refugees has come to the forefront of humanitarian work. Counselling programmes have become a standard response to contemporary conflict situations, even displacing hunger as the most prominent issue in the Western public’s imagination. In her estimation Kosovo was no exception. Psychosocial intervention has become a core aspect of the humanitarian response. British Red Cross, International Committee of the Red Cross, CAFO, CARE, Children’s Aid Direct, Concern, MSF, Oxfam, Save the Children, Tearfund, UNICEF are just a few of the dozens of agencies involved in psychosocial work. Her point is that the therapeutic model is assumed to be relevant to the needs of all societies. She suggests the need for critical examination of how the international psychosocial response to the Kosovo crisis has constructed refugees as traumatised. In essence she summarises the international psychosocial model as follows: traumatic experiences result in trauma causing low self esteem and dysfunctionalism leading to abuse/violence, and external intervention is required to break the cycle of trauma and violence. She questions the international projection of refugees as traumatised. She suggests that psychological intervention can also be interpreted as a new mode of external governance which entails cultural imperialism, that is, the imposition of a Western therapeutic model on other societies which have their own coping mechanisms. She cites the psychiatrist Summerfield, formerly of the Medical Foundation for Victims of Torture, who describes Western psychological concepts and methodologies risking ‘an unwitting perpetuation of the colonial status of the non-Western-mind’. Accompanying the idea of whole populations becoming dysfunctional as a result of trauma is a belief that extensive international administration is necessary. Her paper concludes that the construction of populations as suffering from mass trauma is leading to their disqualification from self-government.

10 Reimann, 2000: 8
12 Reimann: 8
13 Ibid: 7
14 Ibid: 7
15 Ibid: 7
16 Ibid: 7
17 Reimann comments that it is dubious whether such isolated systems would even be attainable given the multidisciplinary and heterogeneous underpinning of all three approaches. She thus suggests they can be more fruitfully understood as variations on Weber’s ‘ideal types’. Reimann, 2000: 4
18 Reimann, 2000: 4
19 Reimann, 2000 cites Glasl 1982, Fisher and Keashley 1991 and Prein 1994 as providing examples of how complementary approaches to conflict management have been applied in a ‘multi-track’ approach. Reimann, 2000: 3
20 Ibid: 7
21 Ibid: 7
22 Offe (cited in the United Nations Development Programme: Promoting Conflict Prevention and Conflict Resolution through Effective Governance: A Conceptual Survey and Literature Review) suggests that the state has become an arena where officials conduct their real business more or less behind closed doors, and experts administer policies with a technical know-how that bears little relation to normative objectives. This is a theme developed by Habermas who sees states and institutions developing their own technical rationality, which has become "uncoupled" from the everyday life of cultural and social interaction. According to Habermas in the Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society (1991) many new social movements can be interpreted as an attempt to open greater opportunities for collective choice and to limit the influence of systemic power. 23 Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2003: Georgian-Abkhazian Dialogue - Building of Democratic Institutions in Transformation Societies.
24 Raiffa, 1982
25 An overview of the trend toward ADR in the UK is available on the website of the Department for Constitutional Affairs, Justice, Rights and Democracy. In Australia it is summarised on the website of the National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council which operates under the auspices of the Australian Government Attorney-General's Department. In the US it is summarised on the website of the Dispute Resolution Section of the American Bar Association and that of Mediate.com.
27 Folberg & Taylor, 1984
Further training resources besides those developed and made available online through the University of Colorado's Conflict Resolution Consortium are listed in the bibliography.
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Curle expresses this idea as follows: "Long term private or non-official mediation focuses on building relationship through which mediation can dispel some of the misconceptions, fixed ideas and irrational dread and hatred that develop all too easily in times of violence. It does so through the quadruple approach of communication, providing information, befriending and active mediation that has been described. This approach, if properly used, should both promote a more genuinely realistic understanding of the situation and diminish the distortions of ego compulsion. It would be absurd to claim that diplomats, UN officials and negotiators representing various governments and international agencies do not, to a considerable extent do most of the same things; if they did not, they would have scant respect. Mediators, however, have no other role that could interfere with their fundamental psychological, or it would be more correct to say human, task. They are tied by no policy, they have not other allegiance, they are entirely devoted to working on the mental obstacles to peace, believing that if these can be diminished so will the material ones.” Curle, In The Middle: Non-official Mediation in Violent Situations

International Alert in their Code of Conduct refer to this 'ideal' as 'principled partiality'...a position that is bound to international standards of human rights and humanitarian law while maintaining an inclusive and even-handed approach with regard to the parties to the conflict.
International Alert, Code of Conduct for Conflict Transformation Work. This publication also cites a definition of impartiality for professionals in dispute resolution: “Ethical Standards of Professional Responsibility for the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution,” adopted 2 June 1986: “Impartiality means freedom from favoritism or bias either by word or by action, and a commitment to serve all parties as opposed to a single party.”
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Wenger defines reification as ‘the process of giving form to our experience by producing objects that congeal this experience into “thingness”.’ Wenger 1998: 57-62

In the Three Faces of Power, Boulding considers the distribution of power by examining the social structures of power and argues that power in groups tends to be hierarchical with a consequent need to develop decision-making mechanisms, mostly with instructions flowing down the hierarchy and information flowing up. Within such hierarchical structures, power is limited by available knowledge. Boulding argues that "hierarchical power cannot survive unless it can be legitimated. Authority in some sense is always granted from below." (1991: 44) Thus he seeks to emphasise that power structures generally rest on a complex mix of the three types of power indicated in Fig. 1 in Chapter One, but that the role of integrative power in maintaining structures is both the most important, and the least recognized or understood.

Ury, 1999: 55-56
CHAPTER FOUR: APPLYING AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK TO SCHOLARLY REPORTS ABOUT CONFLICT INTERVENTION

The ideas developed so far in this thesis show that there are variable theoretical approaches that scholars can take both to interpret conflict and to interpret interventionist responses to it in objective scientific terms. For either of these research purposes a scholar may nominate a specific approach based on a particular conceptual and theoretical framework that establishes some basis for objectivity relevant within a particular field or discipline.

The aspect of the argument of this thesis that is developed in this chapter shows that there is a particular application of conflict theory which serves a purpose that is distinguishable from the two purposes so far discussed, namely defining conflict and describing strategies to address it. It is proposed that scholars who are appointed to produce ‘independent’ reports about interventions serve a unique reporting role that requires them to apply conflict theory in a particular way. A structured outline is developed to indicate the concept of a framework that integrates different scientific approaches employed for understanding conflict and responses to it. In this way the integrated framework can hold in tension and comparatively review a range of considerations relevant to the reporting process. Doing so can reveal that scientifically based meanings can be attributed to the viability of certain strategies in markedly different ways. This inter-disciplinary comparative approach can be used to critique the bases of validity and legitimacy taken for granted in different approaches and indicate how they signify or assume an intervention will channel conflict in a particular direction. Whether explicitly stated or otherwise, theoretical constructions purporting to offer objective interpretations and explanations carry underlying assumptions, biases and value-judgements about conflict, if only in terms of what a methodology includes or excludes as a basis for analysis and evaluation.

The ideas developed in this chapter are indicative of the way an action research methodology has been used to reflect on and consider ways to overcome certain problems initially identified in relation to the construction of the case study report. The one that is most relevant at this stage is the need to constructively confront the inevitability of bias in reporting.
The term scholar-reporter is used to signify that this role and the purpose fulfilled through it can be conceived in general terms because it is employed in a range of cases. It is expressly articulated in circumstances where scholars are appointed to produce a report developed in part through an experiential participant and/or observational methodology for the purpose of reporting on the way particular parties engage with one another in the immediate context of an intervention. The experiential aspect of the reporting role signifies a need to articulate the relationship between the scholar producing the report and the other actors who bring influence to bear on the intervention, that is, to identify and specify particular agents through which certain descriptive or explanatory ideas are brought forward. However, it is equally significant that the scholar is recognised as having the capacity to draw extensively on scientifically based understandings about social conflict. This capacity makes its own unique contribution to the legitimacy of such reports. For the sake of transparency a scholar-reporter needs to reflexively indicate what and whose knowledge and authority have been taken into consideration, and to what extent this supports the scholar-reporter's claim as to a report's 'independence'. Thus one usage of the terms 'knowledge' and 'authority' alludes to the scientifically derived understandings that validate ideas put forward by the scholar-reporter in the report. It is this source of understanding that is of focal concern in this chapter.

The comparisons to exemplify how different conceptual and theoretical approaches can be reviewed in relation to each other are framed in relatively abstract terms in this chapter. This degree of generality is necessary to stress that this type of comparative review can be undertaken in diverse situations, irrespective of whether the intervention that is the subject of a report is conceived to be an 'official' or a 'non-official' process. While each case will vary considerably, the actual process of reporting requires a degree of consistency, generalisation and shared understanding in terms of the way reports themselves are constructed. One reason is that the way matters are being addressed within a particular locality may need to be scoped according to different scales of understanding and framed according to different conceptual frames of reference. They may need to be appreciated as an integral part of a broader, more general problem that, in an age of globalisation, confronts the world community.

Section 1 focuses on considerations that are more specific to the component of problem-identification. Section 2 then focuses on those that are more relevant to problem-solving. These broad terms, problem-identification and problem-solving, are
used in the present context to signify that scholar-reporters need to treat them as relatively discrete components of the reporting process. The terms allude to any sources through which understanding is derived in the process of producing a report. *Problem-identification* as a general category will include those theoretical propositions that contribute to the way factors are described or explained with regard to the causes and the characteristics of a conflict. *Problem-solving* will similarly include theoretical propositions that contribute to the way factors are described or explained with regard to the features of an interventionist strategy. The intervention that is the subject of a report may vary in terms of when and how the two components are addressed.

Means to deal with conflict often begin with and move from describing the problem to prescribing a solution. However, 'resolutionary' processes are more generally instituted when it is no longer straightforward to regard certain attitudes and behaviours as more appropriate than others or when it is no longer the case that one strategy for resolving problems can be assumed to be the more efficacious. This implies that within such processes it will be as important to explore parties' perceptions of what is at odds, the *problem-identification* component, as it is to explain those aspects directly concerned with *problem-solving*.

One purpose of this chapter is to indicate how and why scholar-reporters need to systematically compare different theoretical approaches and thereby show the extent to which scientifically based interpretations can vary. Another purpose is to emphasise that the experiential process of producing this type of report will bring forth warrantable additions to knowledge that are generated in a markedly different way from those generated through purely academic research.

**SECTION 1: COMPARING APPROACHES TO PROBLEM-IDENTIFICATION**

**Conceptual Frames of Reference Underpinning Interpretations of Conflict**

The use of an integrated framework can help to establish why and for whom particular understandings of social relations are most meaningful. A scholar-reporter initially has to address the underlying paradigm, the basic social construction of reality and the ideological foundation that dictates what is deemed deserving of consideration. Conceptual frames of reference have a profound influence on the way present realities and future possibilities are interpreted. They influence all facets of human experience, including the way that scientific methodologies and frameworks of analysis and evaluation are developed and applied to attribute meaning to life
experiences. They represent the implicit construction of ideas underpinning the way that people objectify the institutional ordering of social life. Reification is a way of describing how people apprehend the products of human activity and take them for granted as something other than the products of human authorship. Reified worldviews represent an objective social world which is not necessarily consciously apprehended as such. Experiences played out within a particular worldview tend to be taken as factual and all-encompassing.

One way in which conflict theories can be distinguished from more conventional social science methodologies and frameworks of analysis is that their purpose is likely to include attributing meaning to what occurs when peoples’ worldviews clash. This necessitates giving consideration to the way that paradigms frame ideas about social disorder and dysfunctionality as well as order and functionality. However, it also means giving consideration to ideas about the way that conflict itself prompts the need for people to reconceptualise human experience and attribute meaning to social relations when taken for granted processes of objectivation are called into question, or particular worldviews no longer appear to be fully comprehensible. The study of conflicts that affect more than one discrete social group must concern itself with the way in which people individually and collectively reconceptualise and perhaps re-interpret dynamic social change. It can necessitate the accommodation of a diversity of knowledge and authority even from unfamiliar domains of human experience. Problematic inter-group relations usually signify an unprecedented and unpredictable set of circumstances that cannot necessarily be represented as part of normal social living. Nevertheless, the dynamic events and changes must be accommodated within an ideological worldview in order to conceptualise what responses and strategies could, in those circumstances, be taken to be logical, viable and legitimate. The capacity to relate the uncertainties of such life experiences to theoretical concepts is given expression by peace researcher Peter Wallensteen as follows:

The common feature for traumatic and encouraging events is that they challenge established wisdom, disrupt trends, and even cause paradigmatic shifts. Traumas remind us that there are limits to the established “wisdom” concerning the ways things work. This mindset has to be overcome, and this is where research could play a role. The encouraging events we see indicate that reality offers many surprises. Some of them stem from utopian visions which suddenly take material form. This proximity between reality and research is a feature of social research in general. But in peace research in particular, a culture of openness and willingness to challenge established assumptions has been essential and central.

One basis of comparison to illustrate the concept of an integrated framework in this chapter is the realist conceptual framework. This interpretation does not purport to be
the only way in which the idea of conservatism can be represented. It can apply to the way in which any society is maintained and reproduced through taken for granted social norms, values and practices. In this case it is understood to be a conservative basis for attributing meaning to the social ordering of the political, economic and social institutions that maintain the modern international capitalist world-economy. The *realist* framework is well established in both core states and periphery states that make up the modern international world-system. It is used as a basis for interpreting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALIST APPROACH</th>
<th>IDEALIST APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biased to prioritise the interests of political, economic and social institutions that maintain the modern world-system.</td>
<td>Biased to prioritise certain postulated <em>ideals</em> asserted to be commonly and consistently relevant for the entire global community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalises in terms of an international system.</td>
<td>Generalises in terms of a global social system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on assumptions that it has a predominant relevance and influence throughout the world and takes for granted the knowledge and authority that maintains the status quo.</td>
<td>Stress that a predominant paradigm does not necessarily encompass and give meaning to all groups’ interests, and that there is other valid knowledge and authority and variable ways of interpreting reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews, evaluates and attributes meaning to circumstances in the light of their influence on the fulfilment of its own purposes.</td>
<td>Reviews, evaluates and attributes meaning to circumstances to evaluate capacity to fulfil potential realisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumes that change and sustainability can be managed through gradual reform, and prescription should be through therapeutic 'management' strategies that accord with its own political, economic and social institutions.</td>
<td>Assumes that the uncertainty about the future direction of change warrants radical review, with some circumstances requiring prescriptions that are radical but non-coercive to institute change and promote sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frames conflict in terms of competition according to national/international interests.</td>
<td>Frames conflict as a phenomenon that is socially constructed and can be transformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions about future direction of change are based on inherent perceptions of past and present perceived 'realities' in terms of hegemonic power.</td>
<td>Assumptions about future directions of change are based on the goal of the fulfilment of the postulated value of harmonies of interests and the achievement of sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern discourse is biased toward normative theoretical frameworks that take for granted the 'realities' of the national/international political, economic and social institutions.</td>
<td>Promotes that discourse can be transformed so that it does not impose limitations about how meaning is to be attributed to latent potentialities and possibilities for change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 14: Summary of Significant Differences Between *Realist* and *Idealist* Approaches

both cooperative and conflicting relations within and between nation-states, particularly with regard to understandings expressed through 'official' channels. In
turn it underpins the majority of scholarship in disciplines such as politics and international relations. For the purpose of general comparison, it is proposed that normative and functionalist theoretical approaches are more likely to be underpinned by realist conceptual understandings about conflict. The issue is not whether theory developed according to this paradigm positively supports how the system is maintained. The key idea is that it is the frame of reference that carries the greatest significance. Certain ways in which this paradigm can influence how meaning is attributed to social conflict are set out in Fig. 14.

An important idea with regard to both this and the following basis of comparison is that the conceptual approach has to be relevant at different levels of explanation. In the case of a realist approach, it can be understood to be a conservative approach for explaining conflict in particularist terms, that is, directly in terms of human agency, as well as for offering explanation in more generalist structural frameworks. For the purpose of this general comparison at the particularist level and at the more generalist level a realist approach is concerned with the way in which the status quo is maintained.

The other basis of comparison is an idealist conceptual framework. It is described as the more radical approach because it implies a global frame of reference. Chapter Two provided indications of the way that scholars in peace research such as Galtung have drawn on the idealist conceptual approach as a framework for understanding and explaining social relations in generalist terms. Social activity is represented as a unity of interacting parts with an emphasis on internal-vertical social relations. As a basis for attributing meaning to cooperation and conflict, explanation tends to be offered in terms of how groups attempt to control diverse elements within the global system, which influence their well-being.4 In this sense, it is inclined to conceptualise circumstances in terms of the health of entities within a given system.

For the idealist approach to be a valid basis of comparison it too has to be consistent and relevant at different levels of interpretation and explanation, that is, at particularist and as well as more generalist levels. This is not possible by considering only the way the idealist approach provides a basis for the development of relatively abstract theoretical explanations developed in critical peace research. In Chapter Three it was established that an idealist approach can be an equally meaningful conceptual frame of reference when it is employed by scholar-practitioners in applied conflict resolution studies to explain parties' direct engagement in 'resolutionary' processes. In
circumstances where groups are directly involved in conflict this approach is useful because *ideals* are often the primary motivating force providing a sense of certainty in a situation that is otherwise uncertain and changing.\textsuperscript{5} Idealist-based understandings generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus are relevant in this section of the chapter, which focuses on ideas about the nature of conflict itself, that is, *problem-identification*, as they are to the subsequent section which focuses on explanations about attempts to resolve conflict. This is because 'resolutionary' processes can be conceived to have a *problem-identification* component as well as a *problem-solving* component. Scholar-practitioners who facilitate in 'resolutionary' processes can use an *idealist* approach as an alternative conceptual basis for generating understanding about contending parties' perceptions of the present realities of a conflict, and thus it has relevance in *particularist* terms. However, at the same time through this methodology it can be applied as a basis for generating theoretical explanations about the conflict conceived in more abstract *generalist* terms. To conceive how the *idealist* conceptual frame of reference can underpin theoretical ideas about conflict, it is necessary to think in terms of an integration of ideas generated through two strands of theory, critical peace research and applied conflict resolution studies.

Subsequent discussion will highlight that there are significant differences in the way conservative and radical theoretical ideas are generated and that in each case it is necessary to consider the influence of the underpinning paradigm.

**Methodological Approaches Dictating the Way Conflict is Interpreted**

The methodology through which data are obtained is the foundation of the validity of consequent theoretical analysis and evaluation about the nature of conflict. Comparisons of what and whose interpretations are deemed significant, and how they are derived, can reflect whose purposes are served through the employment of a particular scientific approach. The approach will critically determine the way that a purportedly objective interpretation develops as to what is at odds. Conflict presupposes competing and apparently incompatible perceptions of a state of affairs, defined according to the perspective of particular actors. Because of the changing and uncertain dynamics of conflict it may be necessary for scholars assigned to produce 'independent' reports to critique different methodological approaches, and compare how and to what extent they are able to capture a sense of seemingly unmanageable social relations.
Comparisons can indicate differences in the way interpretations are brought forth, and in doing so highlight the way that diverse parties' attitudes and behaviours are taken into consideration. One primary consideration is the nominated ontological strand of theory. This will establish whether a methodology is more inclined to take a subjectivist or an objectivist approach, as first outlined in relation to the 'conflict triangle' in Fig. 4, Chapter Two. Reimann suggests that rather than relying on one or the other exclusively, it is more feasible and constructive to develop a comprehensive understanding of a conflict through an integration of the features identified through both approaches. Subjective features include individual identities and expressions of particular values, needs and interests while objective features include the characteristics of the social structure and the extent to which certain problems, such as inequality, are actually built into social arrangements.

With regard to either a subjectivist or objectivist approach, the perspective through which methodologies allow interpretations of the issues at stake to be identified is significant. Interpretations of how different actors' attitudes and behaviour influence a conflict will depend on the way a methodology derives the data that ultimately becomes the basis of analysis and evaluation of contradiction within a particular theoretical construction. Methodologies can acknowledge at least three perspectives, namely:

- the subjective interests of individuals or single parties ("I" statements),
- interpretations that assert to represent certain common identities of interest amongst those involved ("we" statements), or
- external third party perspectives ("they" statements).

Comparing approaches can help to establish the extent to which there is bias or prioritisation with respect to one or another perspective according to a particular basis of knowledge and authority.

An integrated framework can be a means to indicate how different methodologies elicit subjective interpretations, and the extent to which they allow a comprehensive understanding to develop about competing perceptions of a given state of affairs. Therefore, a second primary consideration will be the extent to which methodologies are reflexive. Comparative review of different approaches can indicate the extent to which the analytical process through which understandings are derived about particular problematic issues are actually validated by the people whose understandings are incorporated within the methodological process itself.
A third primary consideration is the extent to which particular approaches with regard to component of problem-identification are predicated on certain assumptions about the form of agency that could be most viable as a problem-solving strategy. Comparative review of different methodological approaches may be necessary to reveal the extent to which the two components are governed by, or constrained by, the same conceptual assumptions. A particular approach with regard to problem-identification can maintain certain biases if it is nominated because it seems the most logical and meaningful in light of assumptions about what problem-solving strategy will most likely be instituted. These implicit assumptions are likely to affect the priority that is accorded to one of the above three perspectives. For instance, a conservative approach, based on assumptions about the status quo’s own capacity to manage conflict, is more likely to favour methodological approaches that assume there are still sufficient common identities of interest to prioritise the second more objective (“we” statement) perspective. On this basis, typical normative or functionalist methodologies will be taken to be a sufficient and viable means of obtaining data, and lay the foundation for attributing meaning to the conflict. The approach would primarily focus on how conflict can be understood and addressed through taken for granted determinative strategic mechanisms that frame ideas in terms of national interests within the international arena.

The independent status of a scholar-reporter is only likely to be validated if it is evident that the purpose is to provide a third party indication with regard to the matter of whose security is at issue and how security and threats to security are being defined. An integrated framework that makes allowance for different approaches to be considered broadens the framework of the problem-identification component. It can then more comprehensively indicate that there are alternative bases for interpreting the conflict and different and possibly competing perceptions of what needs to be remedied. The most obvious reason why this is important is that it establishes a useful basis for explaining why in a given set of circumstances particular parties might consider certain courses of action to be potentially more or less viable for remedying what is at odds. However, it may be necessary for the component of problem-identification to also emphasise what other problem-solving strategies have been previously attempted so as to take account of parties’ perceptions of their efficacy and their impact. This will highlight the extent to which parties understand former attempts to reach resolutions or settlements are a significant part of the problem, particularly if previous strategies have failed to alleviate the uncertainties and bring about enduring mutually satisfactory outcomes.
In this sense the component of problem-identification can be described as a process of risk assessment with regard to parties’ perceptions of the potential for an increase rather than a decrease in hostile attitudes and destructive behaviours. One way of indicating this potential for confrontations to escalate even further will be the extent to which subjective interpretations of the present state of affairs are extremely polarised and incompatible, so as to signify that there are few or no perceived common identities of interests (we" statements).

Having specified three primary considerations with regard to methodology discussion will now indicate how they could be relevant in an integrated framework. The first basis of comparison is realist-based normative behavioural science methodologies that are primarily developed and applied within specific national contexts. Their capacity for defining significant social conflict has to be critiqued because this scientific approach is primarily generated in relatively stable Western states for the purpose of attributing meaning to ongoing social relations. Conflict is defined and evaluated according to the normality of a relatively consistent and cohesive state of affairs. These methodologies are founded on an assumed degree of common identities of interests and overall capacity to manage social cohesion. They are generally geared toward offering explanation and interpretation of relationships measured primarily against what is implicitly understood by the status quo to be 'normal' attitudes and behaviours. Objective representations of the given state of affairs tend to be evaluated in accordance with the norms and values of the social system, usually a nation-state, in which the methodologies have been generated. Normative methodological approaches may not necessarily provide sufficient data to fully reveal influences on a conflict that are generated beyond the national context, or they may have limited applicability in circumstances where social relations within a national context are undergoing radical change.

Normative methodologies and theoretical constructions underpinned by a realist framework do not purport to offer a single primary ideological basis beyond the imperative that coercion or force can be asserted where necessary to maintain balances of power, both within a national context through the state’s mechanisms of control and in the broader competitive international system. Conventional realist-based normative and functionalist approaches are founded on taken for granted historical assumptions and perceptions about the way that the international system functions. They are therefore less amenable to what Kuhn describes as a more revolutionary scientific approach capable of generating an alternative theoretical
process. In fact it can be argued that realist-based theoretical frameworks constrain the development of an alternative basis of scientific inquiry for the purpose of attributing meaning to conflict because they purport to be capable of giving expression to competing ideals, while still privileging an interest in how the status quo is to be maintained.\footnote{11}

By contrast, the type of methodology developed to attribute meaning to conflict through parties' engagement in a 'resolutionary' process is an integral part of the actual process in which a scholar-practitioner participates and thus the methodology is directly linked to their role as a third party intermediary. As a facilitator, one of their ultimate goals is to try to bring about a more comprehensive understanding of what is at odds ("we" statements) within the process itself. However, an initial goal is to elicit subjective interpretations ("I" statements) directly from each of the parties. Only in further stages of this type of facilitated process would an attempt be made to re-frame issues to allow a more comprehensive objective interpretation to emerge.\footnote{12} Such processes explicitly acknowledge that there are polarised positions, representing contradiction, but that voluntary participation in the process itself actually reflects a certain degree of common interest to alleviate the furtherance of responses based solely on those polarised positions. Participation can itself be recognised as an acknowledgment by the parties of the potential for unabated conflict to actually decrease capacity to concertedly address it through non-coercive means, but that as well it could actually increase the chances of it escalating. There is thus also likely to be a realisation that this would further increase the unpredictability of the direction of change, and this could be detrimental to certain common interests such as the health of people and their supporting environment. This suggests that an idealist approach is founded on an assumption that social conflict precipitating uncertainty and change requires a radical approach that allows the concerted development of a reconceptualised frame of reference in which to more comprehensively understand the dynamic and changing nature of the conflict. This focus presupposes that the restoration of social cohesion may not be achieved through a sole reliance on the institutions of one or other groups involved as they have formerly operated. The purpose when taking this approach is to encourage review of the possibility for new ways of conceptualising the problem as well as seeking innovative means through which a seemingly unmanageable situation might be better managed.

The methodology employed with respect to 'resolutionary' processes asserts a broad ideological purpose. Methodology is linked directly to group participation in a process
where there is acknowledgment that the circumstances are contradictory, uncertain and changing. The broader purpose of the process as methodology, if based on an idealist approach, is ultimately to obtain sufficient data in order to attribute meaning and make evaluations in ways that try to avoid privileging one particular ideology or the values held by one particular party. The purpose is rather to privilege the ideals that direct the purpose of the intervention. It is directed by knowledge and authority asserted to be inherent in ideals about well-being and the promotion of harmonies of interests, which are legitimated on the basis that they are common concerns for the entire global community-at-large. The underlying assumption using this type of methodology is to develop a more radical theoretical framework capable of taking account of diverse interpretations of reality in a given state of affairs, even amongst social entities that are dissimilar to each other. The scholar-practitioner would be directly concerned with the possibility of re-framing and reconceptualising them in a way that the participants themselves could reflexively validate as legitimate and useful ("we" statements).

This suggests that an idealist-based methodological approach to problem-identification cannot necessarily be based only on prior notions about 'normality'. Greater emphasis would be given to exploring the potential for agreement about certain postulated ideals that the parties could recognise as being of common concern in any emerging reconceptualisation of their present problematic circumstances, which could become their basis for conceiving how healthy social cohesion might be restored.

Two further primary considerations are now raised that require review when comparing methodologies underpinned by either realist or idealist approaches. The first concerns the need to critique the essential limitations of modern discourse to comprehensively interpret conflict. An idealist approach does not necessarily discount the significance of modernity or its supporting contemporary institutions. However, it does allow more scope within an integrated framework for the idea to be expressed that modernity maintains its own biases and assumptions. This idea is relevant both with regard to the range of social constructions that are possible in the contemporary world, and the range of social constructions that might apply in the future. Empirically-based methodologies generally maintain the purpose of bringing forward a definition as to how a state of affairs appears to be according to a particular interpretation of what is normal, 'real' and deserving of consideration and as such
represent a significant form of knowledge and authority. Fetherston expresses ideas with respect to the limitations of a ‘modern’ outlook in the following terms:

Critical analysis within discursive knowing can only rearrange, and perhaps make more efficient, practices - it cannot transform. The unproblematised discourse of modernity which is at the heart of both IR [international relations] and CR [conflict resolution] theory and practice, demands that this objective knowing be uncontaminated by the subjectivities, the contingencies of social life – although ironically the main purpose of modernity is to itself ‘contaminate’ social life. The knowledge this discourse produces is rational, universal and permanent. The end project of modernity is total knowledge, total power, total enlightenment, the end of history, and simultaneously, the end of difference. Conflict resolution as part of this modern project comes with baggage that is made invisible because of its seeming ‘rightness’. Set within an unproblematised version of a discourse of modernity, conflict resolution assumes that we can ‘know’ – objectify, make rational, understand - violent conflict to such (Burton, 1990, 6) an extent that we can have power over it, and thus, solve the problem of it. Eventually, à la enlightenment, violent conflict will cease to exist - the implication being we have all ‘come to understand’ both the cause and solution of violent conflict and re-arrange practices, institutions, and social meaning accordingly. Parties in conflict become aware and are enlightened by the prescribed knowing and rational processes of conflict resolution.15

When it is evident that other ways of knowing matter besides those that can be defined within a modern worldview, it may be necessary to stress that analysis and evaluation has only taken account of certain perspectives because of the very limitations of modern scientific discourse. A comparative approach may be needed to show that particular methodologies can only bring forward certain aspects of problem-identification, which have their own validity, even though they may not necessarily be commonly legitimated by all concerned. The legitimacy of a methodology where it is not feasible to derive sufficient data from all parties may signify that there is not a basis for objectively defining what is problematic in the present circumstances. In turn, therefore, there would not necessarily be an objective basis for valid speculation about the overall direction of change beyond the frame of reference that was formerly construed to be appropriate for analysing and evaluating the problem.16

An argument for comparative review of underlying assumptions that influence the employment of particular methodologies for problem-identification is that it illustrates the need for more rigorous reflexivity in scientific inquiry relating to social conflict. It can help to stress that the research outcomes of positivist or normative scientific methodologies may have to be taken to be just one source of knowledge and authority in the wider context of what is uncertain and in conflict. An integrated framework can serve as an analytical tool through which to specify where a greater degree of reflexivity is required. This comparative basis of reporting can more systematically indicate the extent to which realist-based normative or functionalist approaches are sufficient for the purpose of interpreting conflict or whether an
idealist-based methodology might bring forward markedly different interpretations. This is particularly important with regard to the interests of individuals and groups who are not well represented within the predominant social, economic and political institutions of the status quo. Examples include people who identify strongly with transnational social and political movements, minority groups within states, refugees, indigenous groups or others who do not live according to the precepts of modernity.

The final primary consideration with regard methodologies through which meaning can be attributed to conflict concerns scholarly understandings about the very nature of social conflict. In order to produce an 'independent' report, a scholar-reporter may need to use an integrated framework to show that different methodological approaches can bring forth markedly variable interpretations even with regard to the presence or absence of conflict itself. This can depend on whether it is defined in terms of the presence or absence of overt violence.

Overt violence is often a determining factor as to the presence of conflict because it is relatively self-evident. On a theoretical level it may be necessary to critique how the concept of violence is treated in the methodology. Galtung makes the point that violence is most readily identifiable as a course of action, which suggests its more overt forms are most relevant in terms of behaviour. On a practical level it may no longer be possible, in more radicalised circumstances, to think in terms of people sharing sufficient common identities of interests. The basis for defining 'normality' itself may well have become too ambiguous and uncertain to make it possible to obtain meaningful data from all parties using a normative approach. Overt violence may signify a need to critique whether formerly taken for granted data collecting methodologies used for defining the 'normality' of a given situation are still appropriate as a basis for explaining social relations that have become more hostile and polarised.

On the other hand, conflict can also be defined in terms of the presence of covert or structural violence operating within what could be regarded as a 'normal' state of affairs. This again suggests the need to consider how methodologies treat the concept of violence. Depending on the orientation a set of circumstances may not even be characterised as entailing social conflict. Structural violence may not be revealed through normative methodologies that have formerly taken that particular state of affairs to be normal. For instance, from the second perspective, the predominant status quo may determine that there is no conflict, and that what is
occurring is merely a dispute among groups who primarily share common identities of interests. If this is the assumption then what is occurring is capable of being objectively defined as part of normal social living according to the status quo's conventional institutional framework. However, if it is possible that certain other parties may assert that this perspective does not comprehensively define the conflict as they understand it, it can be warranted to indicate how contradiction might otherwise be expressed. Galtung’s purpose in broadening the definition of violence is to suggest that there a need to develop better theoretical capacity to identify and qualitatively evaluate how violence is inherent in relationships between actors. The determining factors with regard to more covert or latent violence would be as much about attitude and they would be about behaviour. If it were no longer sufficient to define violence simply in terms of a course of action comparative review of data collecting methodologies can help to establish their criteria for explaining violence maintained within a social system through structural violence. It would be necessary to establish how the methodology elicits interpretations of violence inherent in relationships, both as they would be subjectively interpreted by the parties involved, or as they might be objectively interpreted in theoretical propositions.

A comparative approach is needed if there is ambiguity as to whether a set of circumstances should be treated as entailing significant social conflict precisely because the inherent violence can take covert as well as overt forms. A scholar-reporter could justify the use of an integrated framework because both overt violent behaviour and more covert violence inherent in structural relationships can signify the potential for a state of affairs to take different and unpredictable directions of change.

The analogy of the master-slave relationship can be used to illustrate this point. If it were purported that an intervention is instituted to bring about a change in present relationships, an 'independent' reporter's role would be to establish who are the agents who maintain control over problem-identification. This is significant because this definition ultimately becomes the basis for giving consideration to problem-solving strategies for settling, resolving or transforming the contradiction in the relationship between the master and the slaves. 'Objectivity' could focus on the master's hegemonic position, or the subordinated position of the slaves. However, if there were an intervention, then the purpose of an 'independent' report would be to depict how both parties appreciate the problem and the optional means that could potentially settle, resolve or transform it. The reporter would have to reflexively specify how they
have taken account of particular parties' perspectives, and the extent to which the parties actually legitimate the type of methodology through which interpretations of their position are derived.

This final consideration has a focal bearing on the development of the argument of this thesis and will be exemplified with regard to the case study. The circumstances described in the case study report can be interpreted as a scenario where many aspects of violence are covert rather than overt.

Theoretical Analysis for the Purpose of Attributing Meaning to Conflict

So far discussion has indicated how an integrated framework can serve as a basis for a scholar-reporter to take account of the way different methodologies obtain the data required to analyse a state of affairs involving conflict. It is now necessary to consider processes of analysis and evaluation through which purportedly objective interpretations are developed.

Theoretical constructions relating to conflict must take the issue of bias in approaches to be central for two primary reasons. Firstly, the purpose of theory is to attribute meaning to a set of circumstances where there are likely to be competing subjective interpretations of past, present and future realities. This means that there will correspondingly be competing perceptions of the validity and legitimacy of different groups’ pre-existing knowledge and authority as a sufficient or appropriate basis for defining the problematic inter-group relationships. Secondly, conflict is a dynamic phenomenon rather than a static condition or event. It involves competing perceptions of who has, or who should have, control over attributing meaning to the issues at stake and, implicitly, how and through what agency control should be maintained over the means of managing the direction of change. The dynamics can change depending on who holds predominant power at different stages of a conflict. When or if circumstances radically change the power dynamics, it is necessary to consider whether theoretically constructed definitions are structured in such a way that they retain their validity and relevance.

In the discussion relating to methodologies it was proposed that a primary consideration is the range of perspectives that are taken into account. This will signify the inevitable tension between objectivist and subjectivist ontological strands of theory. A scholar-reporter has to take account of both strands because each has a
critical bearing on the way meaning is attributed to a particular set of circumstances in terms of what might be scoped and framed as 'internal' or 'external' factors that bring influence to bear on a conflict.

Attention is again drawn to the need to integrate subjectivist and objectivist strands of theory to highlight that they intersect with another way of making a distinction between two different theoretical treatments of conflict, namely particularist and generalist levels of analysis. While it may seem that these two ways of thinking about the construction of theoretical ideas serve the same purpose, they can actually be distinguished from one another. Nevertheless, when interpretations are made at the particularist level directly in terms of human agency, it is more likely that there would be an emphasis on ideas developed according to the subjectivist approach, that is, the way attitude relates to behaviour as a basis for defining contradiction. Similarly, when interpretations are made at the generalist level, it is more likely that there would be an emphasis on ideas developed according to an objectivist approach, that is, the way contradiction that is inherent in social structures is defined as having an influence on both attitude and behaviour.

One way of making a categorical distinction between their purposes is that the differentiation between subjectivist and objectivist approaches is primarily used to draw attention to the need to integrate both approaches within a theoretical framework. However, the theoretically constructed ideas might all still nevertheless only make sense within one particular conceptual framework such as the inherent assumptions underpinning realist or idealist paradigms. This point is made to stress that each approach, maintaining its own particular biases, could constrain the way a conflict is being explained. Fetherston makes the point that an integration of subjectivist and objectivist interpretations would not in itself posit a need for a radical alternative basis of objectivity. For instance, theoretical explanations couched primarily in realist terms tend to give prominence to national interests, state actors and the agency of statist institutions. This implies they are less likely to give equal standing to interests other than national interests or to other forms of agency.

The differentiation between particularist and generalist levels of analysis is made to draw attention to the way in which transfers of interpretive ideas are made between different scales of analysis. In this case the purpose is clearly predicated on a posited need to explore alternative bases of objectivity (which in this thesis have been exemplified by considering biases in realist and idealist conceptual orientations). It is
with regard to this idea that the difference between scholarship undertaken mainly for
the purpose of contributing to scientific knowledge about conflict and the role of the
scholar-reporter to bring certain ideas about a conflict to a wider readership through
an 'independent' report can be most clearly articulated. Scholarship for the purpose
of defining a conflict is usually dependent on the bases of objectivity favoured within
particular academic disciplines. However, the role of a scholar-reporter requires a
more inter-disciplinary approach and an integrated framework can be used to
compare alternative approaches, an idea that is expressed in Fig. 15.
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Fig. 15: Two Different Purposes of Comparison - Identifying Bias and Identifying Degrees of Consistency

It then becomes crucial to trace the relationship between particularist and generalist
levels of analysis to ensure that the alternative bases of objectivity are consistently applied at the different levels. The point was made in the first part of this section that realist-based approaches can be consistently applied to explain social relations operating at any level within the international system. However, it is only possible to conceive how an idealist approach can be consistently applied by clearly articulating the relationship between idealist-based explanatory theory generated through critical peace research and idealist-based theory generated through applied conflict resolution studies. The more abstract ideas generated through peace research are informative, but on their own there is an inherent limitation because their validity cannot be verified in relation to the actualities of real situations. Only when these two areas of study are brought together is it possible to conceive how the idealist approach can be consistently applied at both particularist and more abstract generalist levels of analysis and evaluation.

Discussion will now consider the first stage of comparative review of analytical processes through which to bring forward a purportedly objective definition of a conflict at the particularist level. A realist-based approach would be more inclined to scope and frame ideas according to the taken for granted hegemonic interests of the
status quo. This would reflect bias to scope ideas about an actual conflict in terms of its location within a national context. This would influence how problem-identification is framed directly in terms of human agency. Analysis and evaluation of particular subjectively-held attitudes and behaviours would be predicated on certain assumptions about the legitimacy of 'official' conservative nationalist institutions and their supporting legal and legislative frameworks. The underlying assumption is that they have the capacity and the authority to make determinations about the way certain problematic attitudes and behaviours need to be identified (as well as capacity and authority to manage how problems should be settled or resolved). Therefore a particular problem requiring a settlement or resolution would be framed to privilege what the status quo deems to be 'normal' and thus appropriate subjective attitudes and behaviours. The realist bias, which maintains inherent assumptions as to what are acceptable and unacceptable individual attitudes and behaviours, is less interested in new ways of framing problems so as to accommodate subjectively-held attitudes and behaviours that are already objectively deemed to be 'abnormal'. Articulating bias in this more conventional way of framing problems is significant because it implies a corresponding bias as to the preferred or anticipated direction of change.

Idealist-based objective definitions of a conflict at the particularist level can only emerge through the component of problem-identification in a 'resolutionary' process, so it is already established that a more radical means of problem-solving is being explored. Engagement in this type of intervention is only possible because of the influence of individual attitudes and behaviours on the social dynamics operating within the particular context. The parties' willingness to engage in a 'non-official' process implies they are prepared to put aside fixed ideas as to what should be deemed 'normal' or 'abnormal' attitudes and behaviours. The goal of the third party facilitator is to work with the parties to forge a more comprehensive understanding of the conflict. The more objective understanding generated in the problem-identification component emerges through the parties' attempts to re-frame their subjective-held interpretations. Such a process could not be predicated on an assumption that one group's interpretations of what is at odds should be privileged. An underlying assumption is more likely to be that the circumstances necessitate the parties reviewing their values and interests in terms of general postulated ideals, those that could lead them to consider how they might achieve harmonies of interest, well-being and sustainability.
Incorporating scientifically-based ideas relating to *problem-identification* framed in *idealist* terms at the *particularist* level can be particularly significant because they reflect an approach that in recent decades has gained increasing recognition, and can be contrasted with more conventional ways of framing problems. However, unlike conventional approaches, where there is likely to be bias as to the preferred or anticipated direction of change, the *idealist* approach places greater emphasis on the need to take stock of potentially different directions of change. In fact, one purpose served by the above comparisons is to show the extent to which ideas about *problem-identification* inextricably link with those concerning *problem-solving*. Hence it is important to treat the approach to *problem-identification* as a relatively distinct category so as to be able to identify the underlying bias in this aspect in both approaches.

Discussion will now consider the second stage of comparative review of analytical processes through which to bring forward a purportedly objective definition of a conflict at the more *generalist* level. This concerns the process whereby ideas and concepts are subsequently expanded on and interpreted in terms of the broader social structure. In this case, *realist*-based normative or functional social science approaches are more likely to draw interpretations from a particular context according to an intrinsic emic perspective. Interpretations and explanations would then most likely be expanded on from what is taken to be particular within a given context in order that more general explanations could be offered, based on an extrinsic etic perspective to interpret the reality of a situation. In modern Western discourse, this is more likely to be in terms of the international system made up of individual nation-states.

*An idealist*-based approach would be more inclined to draw interpretations with respect to a particular context as the explanations are elicited directly from participants within a 'resolutionary' process instituted in part for that purpose. The scholar-practitioner then has a basis for expanding on explanations about what is occurring within that particular context. The purpose would be to bring forward a more general explanation as the ideas have relevance according to universally-relevant *ideals* pertaining to *harmony of interests*, *well-being* and *sustainability* defined as concerns of the entire community-at-large of the world.

The purpose of comparison at both levels is to reveal, firstly, the degree to which different approaches seem to complement or contradict one another and, secondly, to
identify the degree to which the bases of objectivity employed in different approaches are *consistently applied* at different levels of analysis. The *idealist* approach is more vulnerable to being inconsistently applied. This is particularly so if the predominant presumption holds sway that it is only possible to expand on explanations derived at the *particularist* level whereby they are situated within a broader structural context according to a *realist* conceptual framework. The outcome then is that the conflict is still only defined in terms of the competing interests of states that make up the international system.

Two stages of comparative review of alternative bases of explanation are necessary to more explicitly indicate the extent to which certain underlying assumptions and ideological biases governing a framework at the *particularist* level are consistent when applied at the broader more *generalist* structural level, as illustrated in Fig. 16. The degree to which there is consistency will be one indicator of the purpose a certain theoretical construction is serving, and, implicitly, whose purposes are being served.\[27\]
SECTION 2: COMPARING APPROACHES TO PROBLEM-SOLVING

Conceptual Frames of Reference Underpinning the Way Meaning is Attributed to Interventionist Strategies

The first section of this chapter indicates how a scholar-reporter can apply an integrated framework as a basis for reviewing different scientific approaches to explain conflict. It emphasises the need to specify the relationship between the way data derived through particular methodologies will influence how ideas about conflict are ordered and structured in a theoretical framework. However, initial emphasis was given to conceptual worldviews that govern and legitimate the way ideas are scoped and framed. This idea has particular relevance with regard to understanding social conflict because it is a phenomenon that often signifies a profound clash of worldviews.

A comparative approach can thus firstly highlight that a broad range of considerations and perspectives may need to be taken into account as a basis for interpreting problematic social relations. The comparative approach can help to emphasise that significant social conflict actually creates a need to review taken for granted attitudes and behaviours with regard to what is at odds. This is the forerunner to assessments with regard to different parties' perceptions as to what constitutes an appropriate strategic response in a given set of circumstances. When introducing ideas about strategic responses there is similarly a need to use comparisons. In this case the purpose is to demonstrate that a broad range of perspectives have to be taken into consideration to interpret how contending parties actually understand the features and the preferred outcomes of different strategies. This section again begins with discussion about conceptual frames of reference to show that realist-based approaches tend to underpin bases of explanation about 'official' conservative approaches while an idealist-based approach may be needed to underpin explanation about 'non-official' 'resolutionary' strategic approaches. A further purpose is to show how these particular conceptual worldviews underlie assertions as to why particular strategies should be regarded as the most valid and viable.

Conceptual worldviews, which influence the way a particular state of affairs is interpreted in terms of problem-identification, will in turn also shape the way problem-solving responses to conflict are interpreted. Inevitably underlying assumptions and biases will dictate what and whose knowledge and authority are considered to be a
legitimate basis for interpreting the characteristics and the purpose of an interventionist strategy. Thus one purpose of 'independent' reporting is to more explicitly articulate that social conflict requires considered review of taken for granted ideas and the importance of dialogue and openness to the possibility that strategies might be understood in markedly different ways.

The first primary consideration in this aspect of the development of an integrated framework is to establish that this type of comparative review is most needed when an intervention is initiated to address inter-group conflict. Explanation about strategies will be complex because, apart from attributing meaning to what is occurring in the context of an immediate intervention, it may also be necessary for a scholar-reporter to take account of the more routine processes that the contending groups usually institute to deal with contention. This explanation helps to establish the type of processes the parties are most accustomed to. It should extend to providing understanding about the underpinning knowledge and authority that, within a particular social system, legitimates the more routine processes. In other words, there is a need to attribute meaning to the processes that in the past the parties have considered adequate for their own needs. However, the main focus in this section is on a far more indeterminate matter in the context of inter-group conflict. It concerns whose knowledge and authority will matter and be recognised as legitimate with regard to the instituting of an inter-group interventionist strategy, as well as interpretations as to its purpose and legitimacy. This aspect of a report will highlight that, in the more unusual circumstances, there will be greater uncertainty as to whether the more routine processes people have formerly taken for granted still seem to be sufficient and acceptable.

Taking a comparative approach may reveal whether conservative realist-based approaches could be based on the premise that the parties can rely primarily on the conceptual understandings that have formerly been regarded as appropriate and sufficient by the predominant status quo. In this case the tendency would be to still scope and frame understandings only in terms of the way in which nation-states maintain mechanisms of control and exchange within their own national jurisdictions as well as the way in which they participate in the broader competitive international system.

On the other hand idealist-based approaches tend to be the basis for explaining non-coercive 'resolutionary' strategies. They are more inclined to acknowledge the need
for what Kuhn describes as a 'paradigm shift,' precipitated by a sense of immediate threat or a heightened consciousness of the uncertainty of a state of affairs. Paradigm shifts tend to reflect a tension between former ways and new ways of looking at the world. They can be prompted by perceptions that present realities seem so uncertain they no longer reflect what was formerly accepted as normal social living. A scholar-reporter may need to draw on ideas in keeping with this approach when giving consideration to the extent to which those involved in an intervention are exploring paradigm shifts. This would signify whether the parties are thinking along the lines that, in the circumstances, one specific strategic course of action may not necessarily be the only way of overcoming what is at odds. An underlying concern would be how to assess and explain whether consideration is being given to a multi-track approach incorporating both 'official' and 'non-official' strategies. This would reveal the extent to which the parties are reconsidering and re-evaluating the potential efficacy of optional strategies in relation to one another.

A second primary consideration concerns the way that people might conceptualise the type of power that is exerted in the strategic approaches that might be evaluated in terms of their viability.

In realist-based approaches political and legal institutions would be framed as the most significant instrumental form of agency through which power and control can be asserted. They generally have the capacity to exert coercive force if and when it is deemed necessary (see Fig. 1, Chapter One interpreting Boulding's 'Three Faces of Power'). Most explanations as to when coercive force is required could be conflated to be representative of some way in which the interests of the status quo need to be upheld and maintained.

Practitioners who fulfil intermediary roles in 'resolutionary' processes, and in turn provide explanation in idealist terms, can only rely on the exertion of integrative power (also represented in Fig 1). Such processes are voluntarily entered into and therefore they come to be conceptualised as an instrumental form of agency whereby a third party assists parties in conflict to explore new ways of looking at a problem as a basis for considering what might be a mutually agreeable solution. It is the power of persuasion that allows the process to become an instrumental form of agency that enables the parties to explore together what might be the more ideal direction of change. They are more likely to be instituted in circumstances where the parties
concede that the 'official' processes of one or other of the groups involved could not necessarily achieve this purpose.

A third primary consideration concerns ways of conceptualising the bases of legitimacy of 'official' conservative interventions and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions. One aspect of this idea, which was first raised in Chapter Three, is that the conceptual bases of understanding about the alternative strategies are likely to be expressed through different channels.

Realist-based conservative approaches would tend to give more credence to the taken for granted social norms and mechanisms of control and exchange maintained by the status quo. The legitimacy of an intervention would usually be expressed through the political, legal, economic and social institutions maintained within particular national contexts.

However, this is not necessarily the case with regard to 'non-official' idealist-based 'resolutionary' strategies. Although these interventions cannot be conceptualised as self-evidently as conservative processes, there is nevertheless a need to somehow convey a conceptual understanding of them if they are to be given consideration as a valid and viable optional form of agency.

When a heightened awareness of threats to security posed by inter-group conflict prompts people to consider alternative non-coercive ways of responding, a significant problem will be how a non-coercive strategy can be conceptualised as a potentially viable option. A key dilemma will be how people can come to envisage the form that such a relatively unprecedented radical strategy might take. There are likely to be few or no immediate precedents and it is often this lack of precedent that makes it profoundly difficult for groups in conflict to make an informed choice between this type strategy and other possible strategies. In turn, because it is so difficult to conceptualise it as a relatively unfamiliar and seemingly untried optional strategy, people assigned to represent constituent groups often cannot muster sufficient support to fully explore the potential efficacy of non-coercive 'resolutionary' strategies.

Conservative status quo approaches are relatively more straightforward to describe and understand in both conceptual and practical terms, given that they are the more taken-for granted and self-evident strategies. However, in many cases the option of a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' strategy might also be worthy of consideration. It also
needs to be described and understood in conceptual and practical terms, even though such processes do not function in the same way or necessarily serve the same purposes as more conservative strategies. For this reason the following discussion first concentrates on some indications of what the relatively abstract idealist paradigm represents. In turn consideration is given to one highly significant channel through which this conceptual approach can be conveyed, that is, through the agency of the scholar-practitioner in applied conflict resolution studies. It is through the generation of scientific knowledge that a deeper conceptual understanding of such processes develops. This nexus has a key bearing of the general argument developed in this thesis because it is through this field of scholarship that scientific knowledge is generated about such processes based on an idealist conceptual framework. It creates a feasible alternative conceptual basis of explanation about strategic options that can be compared with those underpinned by the realist paradigm.

An idealist paradigm could be broadly interpreted as a way that conceptual meaning can be attributed to attitudes and behaviours that indicate an effort is being made, or needs to be made, in order to move parties in conflict closer toward achieving certain postulated goals. In this thesis these ideal goals that are asserted have fundamental and universal significance are summarised as well-being, harmonies of interest and sustainability. There is an underlying assumption that their attainment should be the key consideration when defining the purpose of responses to conflict. The idealist paradigm can only be maintained as a broad abstract concept framed in terms of a health model, as depicted by Galtung in Fig. 7, Chapter Two. It is only capable of maintaining its validity in terms of any usefulness it might serve the global community. It is a way of giving expression to the idea that optional ways of looking at problems and optional ways of looking for solutions are needed that go beyond recurrence and repetition of past means for dealing with them. This is on the understanding that many situations in the contemporary world where fundamental needs presently go unmet reflect the profound contradictions inherent in political realism. The fundamental contradiction is that giving priority to serving national interests actually places constraints on collective capacity to meet fundamental individual and communal needs. The idealist approach thus promotes the exploration of alternative non-coercive strategies that could be worthy of consideration when conflict poses threats that are more profound than simply threats to political and economic institutions that are taken for granted according to a conservative worldview.
indication of this idea is the way Lerche describes the purpose of one form of 'resolutionary' process, namely truth commissions:

Though truth commissions very likely promise more than they can deliver, what they can deliver... is very significant. This is ...illustrated by considering the differences between truth commissions and courts. It must be remembered that commissions are instituted in countries where the legal system had been, one way or another, perverted in such a way as to permit human rights abuses to occur, and even be "justified." The new order emerging out of a "top down" transition simply does not have... the institutional capacity to right the wrongs of the past through the rule of law. Truth commissions represent, therefore, an imperfect but politically viable alternative way for a people to raise and examine at least some of the shortcomings in the human rights practice of their legal systems and security forces. ....Ironically it is these non court-like characteristics that have enabled us, the general public, to hear a wide ambit of evidence which has raised questions about the role of the courts, police and instruments of law and order and justice in our society. ¹

When realist-based approaches accord greater legitimacy to interventions that favour the maintenance of the status quo and its preferred direction of change, there is inevitably constraint placed on the range of problem-solving strategies that will be considered feasible or viable. Greater legitimacy would generally be accorded to the knowledge and authority that underpins 'official' processes that implicitly privilege the status quo's political, legal, economic and social institutions. The assertion is likely to be that a range of coercive, adversarial or managerial means to respond to conflict are justified as therapies in order to maintain the preferred direction of change that accords with the interests of the status quo.

Conceptual ideas underpinning the purpose of 'non-official' Track II processes cannot be conveyed solely through the agency of political institutions. As explained in Chapter Three many scholar-practitioners undertake intermediary roles under the auspices of university-based research centres and work in conjunction with non-government organisations so that in turn they can develop and disseminate theoretical understandings about such processes. Through this channel protagonists involved in conflict are allowed an opportunity to conceive 'resolutionary' strategies as viable options worthy of consideration. Even though each process is initiated in a relatively unique set of circumstances, theoretical explanation contributes to a broader and more general understanding of this type of strategy so that there is a basis for conceiving how, if necessary, such a process might be replicated.

This channel is thus particularly significant when circumstances suggest that protagonists involved in inter-group conflict are unable or unwilling to recognise the legitimacy of a conservative interventionist process. It increases the chances that
they may nevertheless be willing to consider the viability of a 'resolutionary' strategy if
the only alternative would be one that is more 'revolutionary' in character. In such
cases, it would have to be conceded that interpretations of the purpose and the
viability of 'resolutionary' processes could not necessarily be confined to the way such
strategies are conceptually understood by the conservative status quo. The voluntary
nature of participation in 'non-official' Track II facilitated processes suggests that there
is a much greater onus on the contending parties themselves to accord legitimacy to
the process. 'Resolutionary' processes tend to be legitimated on the basis of certain
ideals that the protagonists themselves have been able to recognise as significant
criteria for defining their purpose. They can only proceed if there is an agreed
understanding that it represents an initiative emphasising social learning, more than
social control, as a basis for attempting to find solutions that are potentially the most
mutually beneficial. The non-coercive nature of 'resolutionary' processes limits the
range of strategies that could be considered preferable according to this approach.
An idealist approach would not favour violent 'revolutionary' confrontational strategies,
but neither would it necessarily favour processes that simply justify coercion on the
basis that the interests of the status quo have to be maintained.

Legitimation according to an idealist approach would be conceptually based on the
premise that unprecedented and uncertain states of affairs signify that pre-existing
knowledge and authority upheld by involved groups may not retain sufficient
relevance for addressing what is uncertain in problematic social relations between
groups. If the uncertainties of a state of affairs suggest there is unpredictability as to
the direction of change, concerted review and re-framing of problems is warranted in
order to explore what might be the more ideal direction of change. The underlying
concern is that in circumstances where there is the probability of inter-group social
relations becoming even more polarised and unmanageable, radical 'resolutionary'
approaches are worthy of consideration. Such assertions would have to be based on
the conceptual idea that they afford greater chances for the parties involved to
maintain collective and non-coercive control over managing their new social relations
in order to seek enduring solutions. These ideas indicate that there is a direct
correlation between the ideological concerns expressed within an idealist conceptual
frame of reference and the underlying core principles that apply when instituting
'resolutionary' processes. What is asserted in an idealist approach is that the viability
of 'resolutionary' strategies to address conflict warrants consideration because they
are capable of maintaining a common interest in the fundamental needs of all the
parties involved and therefore maintain common relevance for all concerned.
A key idea with regard to the way the bases of legitimacy of realist-based ‘official’ interventions and idealist-based ‘non-official’ interventions are conceptualised is that they can be distinguished by the degree to which they emphasise the treatment of conflict as a catalyst for social learning. Idealist-based approaches are more likely to emphasise that access to a range of sources in order to understand the nature of conflict is an important component of social empowerment that is likely to have a significant qualitative influence on the parties’ capacity to deal constructively with conflict. Thus ‘resolutionary’ processes are more inclined to be conceptualised as having a broader purpose than simply treating conflict as a social phenomenon that is a catalyst for social change with a primary emphasis on its political aspects.

**Methodological Approaches Influencing the Attribution of Meaning to Interventionist Strategies**

Discussion has so far sought to establish that an integrated framework can be applied to make comparisons between methodological approaches employed to bring forward theoretical explanation about the characteristics of a social conflict. A similar interdisciplinary process of comparative review is needed to reveal the way alternative methodologies assemble data as a basis for bringing forward theoretical explanations about the features of interventionist strategies. These features will include their characteristics, purposes, their conduct and what their outcomes signify in terms of the preferred direction of change. Theoretical interpretations of the way interventions bring about change in inter-group relations will depend on the way methodologies derive the data that ultimately becomes the basis of analysis and evaluation.

Comparison can indicate what and whose data are included or prioritised in particular methodological approaches. The purpose of critique is not simply to show that different methodologies are presently employed to attribute meaning to different types of intervention. The primary reason for comparing different approaches is that each represents a specific way of studying and contributing to a general framework of scientific understanding about the range of strategies parties can opt for in order to address conflict. It is proposed that scientific bases for assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of different strategies cannot be validated unless a sufficiently wide range of ideas within this broad field of social inquiry are taken into account because they are integrated within a broad framework of understanding. This section discusses considerations that may need to be reviewed when assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of different methodologies in a given set of
circumstances. This is necessary to reveal and acknowledge the bias in different approaches due to assumptions in the underlying conceptual frame of reference taken to have most relevance. Some of the key differences in approaches are indicated in Fig. 17.

**REALIST**
- As the predominant paradigm, it asserts capacity to interpret ‘reality’ for all - presumes all groups will follow a prescribed path to modernity
  - Conservative intervention strategies to address conflict - imposes adjudicatory or coercive determinative settlements legitimated by the status quo
  - Conflict intervention strategies based on maintaining the status quo according to realist worldview
  - Maintains typical functionalist methodological approach to elicit data for analysing the purpose and the outcomes of the intervention
  - Theory interprets according to realist structural frameworks to attribute meaning to conflict and how it is settled through intervention
  - Assumes control over the direction of change

**IDEALIST**
- Alternative paradigm for reviewing quality of relationships in terms of harmonies or disharmonies of interests - asserts a common relevance for all
  - Radical conflict intervention strategies to address conflict - voluntary ‘resolutionary’ process using a third party intermediary - neutrality legitimated on the basis of ideal to address problematic relations without recourse to undue force or coercion
  - Conflict intervention strategies based on recognition of uncertainty about maintaining well-being and requirement for reflection about potential direction of change according to idealist worldview
  - Scholar-practitioner nexus means that the process is also the methodology for eliciting data for analysing the purpose and the outcomes of the intervention
  - Theory can interpret according to idealist structural framework to attribute meaning to conflict and how it can be transformed through intervention
  - Assumes the direction of change is uncertain and this warrants concerted problem-solving

---

Fig. 17: Factors governed by different conceptual frames of reference that can influence the approach when attributing meaning to an intervention addressing inter-group conflict.

The first primary consideration concerns the ontological strand of theory. In the same way that both subjectivist and objectivist approaches have to be taken into consideration in a methodology for identifying the causes of contradiction, they are equally significant when explaining an intervention to address it. In the case of a subjectivist approach, contradiction has its origins in problematic attitudes that influence behaviours. Therefore attitude would be the primary focus for indicating the way in which an intervention might overcome contradiction. The focus of interpretation would be on the extent to which an intervention is employed to try to overcome blocks in communication and encourage more constructive engagement between parties as a basis for promoting changes in their behaviour. In an objectivist
The approach, the cause of contradiction has its origins in the way unequal or unjust relations are perpetuated through the social structure. This approach suggests that contradiction will have a general impact on both attitude and behaviour. The focus of explanation is then on how an intervention might be the means to alleviate unacceptable or destructive patterns of behaviour brought about through changes in attitude. However, equal emphasis would be given to the need to bring about change in the broader social structure itself if the contradiction is to be transformed, otherwise interventions will only be capable of bringing about 'band-aid' solutions. As previously discussed in Section 1, these two ontological strands need to be integrated, as they both have a bearing on the way ideas about conflict and strategies to address it are framed and scoped.

Discussion first concentrates on the way methodologies identify and frame the features of an intervention, bearing in mind that underlying paradigms shape the way significance is accorded to different parties' knowledge and authority and how their interpretations of the process are taken into account. Data may represent the perspective of:

- one particular party or group ("I" statements),
- a perspective that presumes to represent parties' shared understandings ("we" statements) or otherwise
- the perspective of third parties ("they" statements). This would include the perspective of scholars or other reporters who volunteer or are asked to make their own objective interpretations and assessments about the features of an intervention.

The way issues are framed is more complex and problematic when an intervention is addressing inter-group conflict. One reason is that consideration also has to be given to methodologies that would have formerly been regarded as a satisfactory for explaining more routine intra-group interventionist processes. These methodologies would tend to be more indicative of the conceptual idea of 'applied science' as set out in the model developed by Functowicz and Ravetz (Fig. 13, Chapter Three). This idea in the model implies that within a certain context it is still reasonable to assume that sufficient common identities of interest validate the claim that those in conflict nevertheless still share common understandings ("we" statements) about the features of the process being instituted.
Realist-based approaches are likely, even in more radicalised inter-group situations, to continue to favour conventional normative and functionalist oriented methodologies to assemble the data required to interpret 'official' interventions. This is because, despite changes in the circumstances, 'official' processes of the predominant status quo are assumed to be capable of imposing modifications and adjustments, through non-coercive or coercive means if necessary, in order to manage social relations in a way that maintains the interests of the status quo. These conventional methodologies have been developed primarily in core states of the modern international system to explain how a relatively consistent and cohesive state of affairs can be maintained through both cooperative and competitive social relations, governing mechanisms and institutional procedures based on precedent. There is likely to be an assumption that overall there is a sufficient degree of common identities of interests within the modern international system to justify and legitimate 'official' determinative mechanisms.

However, formerly accepted methodologies, based on assumptions of shared norms and values, may no longer be sufficient or valid for attributing meaning to an intervention instituted to address highly contentious and polarised inter-group relations. It then becomes a matter of deciding whether normative or functionalist methodologies retain their validity as reliable means for obtaining data. In situations where present realities signify profoundly competing perceptions of a particular state of affairs and, in turn, competing perceptions as to who should assert capacity to rectify what is at odds, it may not be warrantable to still place sole reliance on a conventional methodology for obtaining data. When circumstances are highly radicalised and unpredictable it may be necessary to think in terms of what Functowicz and Ravetz describe as 'post-normal' science (Fig 13, Chapter Three) because pre-existing assumptions about appropriate governance and the capacity of routine strategies to maintain social cohesion may no longer apply. Such situations may have become virtually unmanageable because attitudes and behaviours have become polarised to an extent that events are taking an unprecedented direction of change.

One reason for reviewing whether taken for granted methodologies are still appropriate is that radicalised circumstances signify a need to take account of competing subjective perceptions ("I" statements) about the features of an intervention. In the context in which it is being instituted there is likely to be a high degree of ambiguity as to whether the parties share a sense of their common
identities of interest. ("we" statements). This suggests that, in turn, the parties are equally unlikely to agree on one interpretation ("we" statement) of the features of the intervention. In cases where the parties have competing perceptions of the features of an intervention ("I" statements) there is likely to be ambiguity as to whether the intervention is perceived to be capable of equally serving all the parties' interests.

The methodological approach in idealist-based applied conflict resolution studies is to obtain data through the actual conduct of a ‘resolutionary’ process. It is through the scholar-practitioner nexus that data is obtained that becomes the means for developing scientifically based explanations about this type of intervention. This type of methodology is not predicated on an assumption that groups necessarily share common identities of interest ("we" statements). Neither is there an assumption that realist-based scientific understandings about interventions should prevail in all cases simply because a significantly high proportion of people conceptualise and make sense of world events in terms of the way the modern international system operates and exerts control.

For instance, realist-based normative or functionalist methodologies that are routinely employed to explain 'official' conservative processes may have to be critiqued as to whether they retain their validity as a basis for explaining interventions in highly radicalised circumstances. If a methodology assembles data so that matters are framed to give priority to the interests of the status quo, there will be a tendency to focus only on the regulation of social norms and practices through 'official' problem-solving strategies instituted by the status quo. However, if data is not included in the conservative methodological approach that even indicates a contending group's basis of disagreement as to the legitimacy of these interventionist processes ("I" statements), there will be bias in the consequent theoretical framing of the legitimacy of this type of conservative determinative intervention. The methodology would simply be taking for granted the right of the predominant group to assert its own knowledge and authority and maintain control through its interventionist processes, through coercive means if necessary. By implication, the methodology would not only support the assumption that the status quo's preferred forms of intervention should prevail, it would also be supporting the assumption that the status quo has the right to control the way legitimacy is accorded to a contending group's knowledge and authority.
In highly uncertain circumstances, contending parties may mutually agree to engage in a 'resolutionary' process because they conceive it to be the more appropriate form of intervention. They are likely to concede that they do not necessarily express their interests and values in the same way and do not necessarily perceive the world in the same way. Their reason for favouring a 'resolutionary' process would more likely be that it initially allows competing subjective interpretations ('I' statements) to be framed by the parties themselves. Idealist-based approaches are more likely to be based on the conceptual assumption that enduring sustainable outcomes could be achieved through non-coercive interventionist strategies. Any adjustments and modifications that are an outcome of the process need to be jointly agreed to by the parties themselves. A characteristic that defines 'resolutionary' processes as non-coercive strategies is that they aim to avoid privileging the knowledge and authority of one particular party.

However, 'resolutionary' processes ultimately have to incorporate a process of re-framing. This stage necessitates the parties moving beyond voicing their own particular subjective interpretations and to begin working concertedly toward finding a more comprehensive objective basis for defining what is in need of resolution. Intermediaries play a significant role in assisting with the advancement of new conceptual understandings that the parties themselves forge and share ('we' statements). This means the methodology has to take account of what is occurring in a dynamically evolving process so that if and when agreements do emerge as an outcome of the parties working together they can be conceptualised as representing a new expression of knowledge and authority. This differentiation is significant because it represents the parties' revised basis for defining the extent to which they conceive that certain common identities of interests underlie those agreements ('we' statements). New agreements would not necessarily be based only on pre-existing social norms, values and practices. Instead, this new knowledge and authority would be an indication of the parties' mutually agreed basis for framing norms and practices in terms of their overall influence on matters to do with well-being, harmonies of interests and sustainability.

If problem-solving proceeds successfully, part of the intermediary's role is to encourage the parties to bring forward their own way of conceptually expressing two crucial ideas. Firstly, the parties need to jointly indicate ('we' statement) that they conceive the 'resolutionary' strategy to be a legitimate process capable of serving their purposes. This type of indication would confirm that it was through the process
itself that the parties were able to agree to adopt certain problem-solving strategies that might settle or transform the conflict. Secondly, the parties need to jointly indicate ("we" statement) that new knowledge and authority was forged in the process so that a mutually satisfactory revised basis of understanding was developed through which to express new agreements, which can actually be represented as a revised basis of legitimacy. Data derived by a scholar-practitioner within the process relating to both of these aspects would be equally significant. Only when the parties themselves validate both the process and its outcomes would the scholar-practitioner have sufficiently comprehensive data and a legitimate foundation for objectively interpreting how the parties, through agreements made between them, envisage that their future relations will more workably coexist.

This type of methodology has to assemble sufficient data to be able to ultimately explain within a theoretical framework how, through a non-coercive strategy, contending parties took the process to be an opportunity to find what Curle describes as both 'material' and 'psychological' settlements. The ideological assumption in this approach is that a combination of the two are unlikely to be achieved if a strategy is predicated on one party's right to control the way legitimacy is accorded to a contending group's knowledge and authority. To stress this point, and to lend weight to the validity of the methodology, sufficient data needs to be assembled to indicate the way in which the parties subjectively frame ("I" statements) how this new knowledge and authority was forged. These subjective explanations can be crucial because they signify the extent to which parties are prepared to make modifications and adjustments in relation to their initial position. They make it less likely that there will be ambiguity about the parties’ conventional knowledge and authority which at the end of a ‘resolutionary’ process has to be appreciated in relation to the new form of knowledge and authority forged within the process as their agreed new basis for agreements. In relation to this point it is necessary to reiterate an idea first raised in the first part of this section, which is that conceptual understandings about ‘non-official’ ‘resolutionary’ forms of intervention are highly reliant on the scholar-practitioner nexus as a channel for conveying conceptual ideas about such processes. A comprehensive understanding of them cannot necessarily be channelled simply through the agency of political institutions. However, the very general terms used in this discussion, that is, ‘knowledge’ and ‘authority’, implicitly suggest that ‘non-official’ processes deal with, and attempt to integrate political, economic and social elements. Therefore sufficient data is needed so that accounts can be framed to show how, despite their ‘non-official’ status, such processes can
ultimately bring their own significant influence to bear on more formal political processes.

Discussion will now focus on how methodologies are instrumental in the way the features of an intervention are scoped, given that underlying paradigms will influence how the intervention is understood to be situated within a given context. Like framing issues, those to do with scoping have to take account of an inherent tension between subjectivist and objectivist strands of theory. The way data are assembled through the methodology will be the basis for signifying which factors are scoped as 'internal' contradictions, those that could be addressed in the specific intervention that is being instituted. Others could be scoped as 'external' contradictions that may not necessarily be fully addressed through a single interventionist process, but which could nevertheless still be conceived to be factors bringing significant influence to bear on the outcomes. This suggests a need to also take account of the tension between particularist and generalist levels of interpretation and consider whether the data obtained about an intervention can be consistently applied and retain their relevance when scoped according to different levels of social interaction.

Realist-based methodologies tend to obtain data that will serve as a basis for explaining the way 'official' interventionist processes are instituted within a given context. Thus, data obtained to scope an intervention at the particularist level of social interaction are automatically scoped within the broader context of national or international relations. The purpose of the methodology is primarily to obtain data that serves to explain the significance of all 'official' strategies and their relationship to one another at various levels of social interaction. They are based on realist assumptions that all processes taking place at a particularist level ultimately, at the more generalist level, can be scoped in terms of their influence on broader social structures of nation-states participating in the international system. This type of methodology, primarily concerned to explain 'official' processes, may not take the same degree of interest in data that serve as a basis for explaining 'non-official' events, including 'resolutionary' processes.

Idealist-based methodologies rely on the scholar-practitioner nexus as a unique means through which data are obtained to serve as a basis for explaining the immediate events taking place in a 'resolutionary' process. It is relatively straightforward to conceive that this methodology enables sufficient data to be obtained to scope the intervention within a particularist context. The facilitation of the
process can thus be appreciated as that aspect of a scholar-practitioner's methodology through which the subjectivist approach is developed. Yet, there is equally a requirement for the methodology to draw on more abstract conceptual ideas derived from explanatory theory. This type of data is also required so that there is a basis for explaining how the intervention is being scoped at a more generalist level of interpretation. It may not be sufficient to simply draw on data that scopes interventions primarily in realist terms, that is, in terms of the modern international system. It may equally be necessary to draw on explanatory theory derived through peace research so that events are scoped in global or universalist idealist terms.

Both subjectivist and objectivist aspects of the methodology contribute to the way an intervention will ultimately be understood in relation to ongoing political realities. A significant factor in the case of 'resolutionary' processes is that intermediaries fulfilling third party roles are usually regarded as 'non-official' agents. This raises the problem of when and how it is necessary to indicate the relationship between this type of 'non-official' process and more 'official' processes. One way of explaining the significance of this relationship is that 'resolutionary' processes can often only be conceived as bridging mechanisms instituted to help the contending parties advance toward the development of new political, legal, economic, social and environmental arrangements between themselves. Previous discussion has raised the idea that more formalised processes and arrangements would only begin to be forged once the parties have worked through a re-framing process, so that they have a mutually agreed ("we" statement) basis for expressing how they envisage their future relations will more workably coexist.

The scholar-practitioner methodology provides a unique opportunity to assemble data that serves as a basis for attributing meaning to the immediate realities of 'resolutionary' processes at the particularist level. However, the above discussion highlights that ultimately this methodology also requires scholar-practitioners to draw on data derived through explanatory theory so that there is a basis for explaining the significance of the intervention contextualised in relation to ongoing realities at a more generalist structural level.

The overall legitimacy of analysis and evaluation concerning an inter-group intervention will depend on the extent to which the data obtained are verifiable. Methodologies can vary in terms of whose particular understandings of an intervention are taken into account and how they are obtained. Therefore, a second
primary consideration concerns the extent to which methodologies are reflexive. There can be variability as to whether it is considered necessary for the methodology to be validated by indicating the extent to which contending parties have been able to verify the relevance and accuracy of data purporting to reflect their points of view about an intervention ("I" statements).

Realist-based methodologies employed to interpret 'official' conservative interventions are limited in the extent to which they allow the parties in contention to reflexively validate 'official' conservative interventions. One significant reason is that the political and legal institutions of the status quo assert their own capacity to be self-regulating and self-monitoring on the assumption that there are sufficient shared understandings ("we" statements) about 'official' processes and their legitimate right to function as they do. In this sense, the role of behavioural science disciplines is more concerned with describing and explaining through normative and functionalist frameworks the way in which political and legal institutions carry out their functions.

Idealist-based methodologies employed by scholar-practitioners to describe and explain the features of 'resolutionary' processes differ considerably from this approach. They are more likely to be based on an assumption that initially it is not possible to take for granted the extent to which the parties share the same conceptual understandings ("we" statements) about the features of this type of 'non-official' process. There is a stronger emphasis on the fact that understandings and perceptions have to be reflexively validated by the intermediary through direct consultation with the participating parties.

A third primary consideration concerns the extent to which methodological approaches treat problem-identification and problem-solving as relative discrete components. One reason for making this separation is to reveal how, when and through which means problem-identification (the subject of Section 1 of this chapter) is established, which then serves as the basis for envisaging what factors require attention in the component of problem-solving. This idea can be elaborated by considering, in very general terms, the significance of problem-identification in relation to problem-solving in realist-based 'official' determinative processes and idealist-based 'non-official' 'resolutionary' processes.

There are many cases where the problem-identification component of 'official' conservative processes occurs even before an interventionist process of problem-
solving is instituted. The political, economic, legal and social institutions of the status quo are reliant on certain criteria established through precedent as a basis for making assessments in terms of problem-identification. Issues are identified as requiring intervention by, say, law enforcement agencies in accordance with social norms and prescribed rules that are primarily expressed within particular national contexts. The assumption in this approach is likely to be that within the national context there will be sufficient common identities of interests ("we" statements) to warrant a requirement for people to abide by the same regulatory rules and processes in order that social cohesion is maintained. In these situations the implication is more likely to be that the conservative institutions of the status quo have both the legitimacy and the capacity to determine what are acceptable and normal attitudes and behaviours. In turn they are also empowered to determine how to remedy those that are regarded as unacceptable and abnormal through the exertion of coercive authoritative power. It follows that realist-based methodological approaches are more likely to be based on the assumption that it is the interventionist mechanisms of the status quo that need to be instituted for the purpose of problem-solving. Thus the primary focus is on obtaining the type of data that are normally required to explain the purposes and the conduct of 'official' interventions that can determinatively impose settlements. However, it is necessary to review whether it is deemed necessary to obtain data that clearly shows what sort of modifications and adjustments a contending group is required to make. This type of data can reveal whether any changes in behaviour imposed on one particular party or group actually makes any difference to their attitudes, that is, the extent to which the groups move closer to sharing a common perception of the efficacy of the intervention.

In contrast, there are many cases where there is an apparent need for a 'resolutionary' process because of the presence of profoundly competing perceptions of present realities. Situations where opposition is being expressed about the way the status quo determines the acceptability or otherwise of certain attitudes and behaviours reflect significant contradiction, which indicates a lack of unifying common identities of interest. It can also follow that there are perceptions that the 'official' institutional processes of the status quo are not necessarily perceived to be the only valid means for rectifying problems that seem to be undermining social cohesion. Given the potential for situations to become even more adversarial and polarised and in many cases overtly violent should people resort to 'revolutionary' strategies, it may seem warranted to institute a 'resolutionary' strategy as a way of exploring how different or competing identities of interest might be reconciled. The methodological
approach in *ideal*ist-based applied conflict resolution studies is to obtain data through the actual conduct of a 'resolutionary' process, whose purpose is based on the premise that some conflicts cannot necessarily be controlled simply through 'official' political and legal institutions of the status quo. 'Resolutionary' processes are often instituted in circumstances where no pre-existing criteria seem mutually satisfactory for making assessments with regard to *problem-identification*. Even though the purpose of this type of intervention is more often conceived to be that of *problem-solving*, it is significant that they are often instituted in situations where there are profoundly different ways of interpreting present realities. Therefore, as previously stressed, 'resolutionary' processes are dependent on *problem-identification* being an integral component of the process. The scholar-practitioner's methodology with regard to both components is reliant on elicited subjective interpretations ("I" statements) derived directly from participants. It is only through a process of re-framing and concerted review that a more comprehensive understanding can emerge ("we" statements) that can serve as a basis for giving consideration to potentially viable and mutually satisfactory solutions. Given such processes are not necessarily conducted according to fixed procedural rules, the sequence in which all the relevant data are obtained with respect to both components may be less well-defined and indeterminate. The full significance of the relationship between both components may only become discernible and separable from one another as the process evolves in stages.

Highlighting these differences as to when and how understandings with regard to the two components are generated reiterates the idea that methodologies in either case can reinforce bias. The methodology through which data are assembled with regard to *problem-identification* can be biased if it is governed by taken for granted ideological assumptions as to the more likely or appropriate strategy through which a conflict will be addressed. The methodology through which data are assembled as a basis for interpreting *problem-solving* can in turn be biased because is more or only meaningful if one particular type of intervention is instituted. In this sense methodologies can be conceived as a means of controlling or even manipulating scientific interpretations and evaluations because of a tendency to assign greater significance and legitimacy to one particular form of intervention over others. Approaches can be predisposed to seek only certain data that can be readily accommodated, or seems more significant and relevant, within a favoured theoretical framework. Governing ideological assumptions about the way strategies should or could bring about change may mean that only certain features of an intervention are
highlighted and thus the methodology may fail to give significance or relevance to other features.

As well as critiquing methodologies to reveal whether they attempt to control the assignment of legitimacy to one form of intervention at the expense of giving less consideration to the features of other potentially viable strategies, there is another equally constructive reason for this type of comparative analysis. It can also reveal the extent to which methodologies employed for the purpose of problem-identification retain their relevance and validity irrespective of the type of problem-solving strategy that is ultimately instituted. The purpose in this case is to establish the extent to which methodologies are sufficiently inter-disciplinary so that, at both particularist and generalist levels of social interaction, there is sufficient data for strategic analysis to be couched in terms of the possibility of a multi-track approach. This would mean making allowance for both 'official processes and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions to be given consideration because both could possibly be instituted at the same time. In this case it becomes crucial as to whether there is sufficient data to be able to predict or evaluate the efficacy of different types of interventions and the extent to which they might complement or contradict one another.

There is a fourth primary consideration as to why, when circumstances indicate increasingly polarised inter-group attitudes and behaviours, formerly taken for granted methodologies have to be reviewed. As well as the need to critique methodologies as to whether they are appropriate as a means to obtain data for taking account of competing perceptions of the intervention actually being instituted, it may be equally significant to obtain data to take account of the parties' preferences amongst a range of different strategic problem-solving options. As previously stressed, bias in the conceptual frame of reference can mean that greater emphasis and significance is accorded to a favoured type of intervention, and the bias is then transferred to the nomination of a particular type of methodology. The focal issue in this case is that bias in the underlying conceptual assumptions of particular scientific approaches not only influences the way the favoured methodology brings forth interpretations of the favoured interventionist strategy. Bias would in turn also influence interpretations of any alternative interventionist strategies because all interpretations would be underpinned by the same conceptual assumptions relating to the preferred direction of change.
Theoretical Analysis for the Purpose of Attributing Meaning to Interventions

Discussion now focuses on the way that data are theoretically analysed and evaluated in order to attribute objective meaning to an actual intervention. Inter-group conflicts reflect circumstances where there are contradictory perceptions of present realities and consequently there will be contradictory perceptions of future possibilities, including the efficacy of strategies to direct the way in which circumstances could or should change. Making comparisons between realist and idealist approaches can identify bias in the way that they underpin theoretically constructed explanations about 'official' interventions and 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions.

The first primary consideration is how different theoretical constructions frame ideas about the intervention. Preceding discussion with regard to methodologies proposed that comparing different approaches can help to highlight bias because the underlying conceptual frame of reference influences the way particular theoretical constructions frame the various features of the intervention. Different approaches are likely to have their own bases for asserting that certain data need to be incorporated into the analytical process to explain an intervention and evaluate whether it is the most appropriate and legitimate in a given set of circumstances.

The variable framings of explanations can be significant for two reasons. On the one hand, approaches may vary depending on what data are taken into consideration in a particular theoretical construction to attribute meaning to features of the intervention, that is, the way the process directly influences protagonists’ attitudes and behaviours. Framing issues will thus influence the analytical process used to attribute meaning to the actual intervention and its capacity to bring influence to bear on the relationships between the contending parties. As well, approaches may vary depending on the framing of data when the emphasis is on making evaluations about an intervention according to its assumed criteria of success. The criteria of success inherent in the purpose of an intervention will indicate what is deemed to be the preferred or anticipated outcome and direction of change.

The second primary consideration is how different theoretical constructions vary in the way ideas about interventions are scoped. Inter-group conflict often arises as an outcome of both conflicting perceptions about the level at which the issues at stake have most relevance, and consequently conflicting perceptions about the appropriate level at which an interventionist strategy is needed to address what seems to be at
odds. Differences in the way the conflict itself is scoped will ultimately influence the way the purposes and the outcomes of the intervention are scoped.

An idea first raised in Section 1, with regard to problem-identification, is equally significant with regard to problem-solving. It is that theoretical analysis and evaluation concerning an intervention has to make a distinction between particularist and generalist levels of explanation as well as distinguishing between subjectivist and objectivist approaches (see Fig. 16). In the present case, distinctions between subjectivist and objectivist approaches help to emphasise the need to integrate features so as to provide a more comprehensive explanation about an intervention as a problem-solving strategy. However, one problem is that the features that are identified could all still only make sense according to one particular conceptual framework. Therefore, it is not posited that there is a need for some alternative basis of objectivity when explaining the intervention. In the case of the differentiation between particularist and generalist levels of analysis and explanation, the purpose is predicated on the need to explore alternative bases of objectivity. The reason for tracing the way in which realist-based and idealist-based explanations about an intervention offered at the particularist level are then expanded to the more generalist level is to ensure that the alternative bases of objectivity are consistently applied.

Comparative review of alternative ways of scoping interventions can indicate the degree to which theoretical constructions situate features such as the purpose and the outcomes of an intervention within a narrow context or a broader temporal and spatial context. The way ideas are situated within a broader context will dictate the extent to which account is taken of historical and contemporary external influences and, in turn, how the conflict itself might influence the broader context. This is significant if, for instance, conflict involves changing relationships whereby more localised traditional social systems have been or are being incorporated through historical processes, by voluntary or involuntary means, into the more centralised structures of nation-states. In such social processes a local group's attitudes and behaviours could be defined as being supplemented or supplanted by attitudes and behaviours that are maintained by people who relate to more powerful centralised institutions which influence the entire nation-state. The following account by Helander exemplifies this idea with regard to resolving conflict in Africa:

The shortcomings of the international system's mediation attempts in the current war scenes of Africa are related to at least two major problems. The first problem is that these conflicts have a clearly different nature than 'ordinary', inter-state, border disputes and armed conflicts. Conventional mediation designs presuppose centralized...
deals between neatly circumscribed and clearly delineated groupings that, in most contemporary African armed conflicts, have proven to be non-existent. The need to seek new and unconventional approaches to mediation and conflict resolution has been repeatedly stressed. Yet, nearly all such influential proposals (e.g. Ury, Brett and Goldberg 1989; Vayrynen 1991) continue to be based on centralist, 'top-down', notions that, in von Clausewitz's vein, assumes that one is dealing with more or less well-organized armies, with clear lines of command from the political leadership down to the actual fighters. However, trying to apply such principles to the rag-tag militias that reign in, say, the streets of Mogadishu or Kinshasa has been demonstrably fallacious (Marchal 1993a; Prendergast 1994a, 1994b). However, the alternatives to centralized negotiations appear far from clear. While enjoying a good deal of support among non-governmental organizations, so-called bottom-up approaches to peacemaking remain burdened by the fact that they have to be based in particular local situations. Tailored on culturally specific needs, their ad-hoc appearance tend to be dissuasive for international organizations like the UN. Bradbury points out that the UN is an organization made up of governments and in its peacemaking endeavours it will always strive to establish central governments, not to contribute to what may appear as a fragmentation of states (Bradbury 1993).33

At the particularist level explanation about the features of an intervention would be inclined to focus on the attitudes and behaviours of the people directly involved.

Realist-based approaches would tend to explain interventions by highlighting the features that are prioritised in 'official' determinative processes based on precedent whereby authoritative political power can be exerted to control the way conflicts are settled or resolved. Therefore it is necessary to examine whether there is a tendency to give greater legitimacy to the features of an intervention concerned with achieving outcomes that align with the political, economic and social interests of the status quo and its preferred direction of change. Analysis and evaluation based on normative or functionalist approaches would tend to legitimate taken-for-granted realist conceptual assumptions, social attitudes and behavioural norms maintained through established conservative practices which may, at the same time, delegitimate those conceived to be abnormal.34

An idealist-based approach would tend to explain interventions by highlighting the features that are prioritised in the more innovative 'resolutionary' processes maintained through integrative power rather than authoritative power as a means to bring about the settlement, resolution or transformation of conflicts. The focus of analysis and evaluation would be on the extent to which the parties directly involved recognise the possibility that their former taken-for-granted routine strategies may no longer serve a sufficient or efficacious purpose in terms of problem-solving. Explanation of the features of the process would focus on the extent to which an intervention allows the parties directly involved to participate voluntarily and without undue coercion. Therefore explanation would be geared toward indicating the extent
to which the parties are able to reconsider pre-existing conceptual assumptions, attitudes and behavioural norms and attempt to re-frame their ideas. Re-framing would be seen as a way of building capacity to find new means for managing a situation that could otherwise become more unmanageable and destructive. This aspect of the process could only be legitimated by the parties directly concerned on the basis that they share in common a need to review optional directions of change. Explanations would be based on the conceptual assumption that without such a strategy there is a greater risk that the only option open to the parties is a more violent ‘revolutionary’ strategy. One focus of analysis would therefore be on the extent to which the process is able to treat the conflict as a catalyst for social learning as much as a catalyst for change. There would be an emphasis on whether the parties perceive the need to generate new knowledge and authority and the possibility of new capacities for problem-solving. The primary basis of evaluation as to the criteria of success would be the extent to which the parties conceive the relevance of certain ideals that could be postulated to have common and universal relevance (such as Galtung's 'value dimensions' set out in Fig. 7, Chapter Two) and generate capacity toward achieving harmonies of interest, well-being and sustainability.

Discussion now elaborates on the way in which theoretical constructions can scope explanations about interventions at broader more generalist levels of analysis. This highlights that it is not enough to focus only on the capacity of an intervention to influence the attitudes and behaviours of those directly involved in an intervention. It is necessary to take a more objectivist approach and integrate ideas that signify its influence on contradiction inherent in wider spheres. Dahrendorf has, for instance, suggested that at broader scales of social interaction, analysis has to take account of suprasocietal forces maintained within larger systems that bring their own influence to bear on ongoing relationships maintained within particular states, regions or localities. Comparing alternative approaches provides a means of monitoring to ensure that interpretations are not isolated from the encompassing worlds-of-meaning in which conflicts are embedded.35

More generalist levels of explanation can reveal that, while groups who are directly involved may acknowledge a non-coercive process as legitimate, the process has not necessarily distanced itself from ongoing political realities that may reflect contradiction that is inherent in broader hegemonies and hierarchies of power. These broader realities have to feature in the way the purpose of an intervention is scoped.
This idea can be exemplified by again considering how Helander describes this problem in the context of Africa:

> While Gulliver carefully distinguishes negotiation from adjudication on the basis that the latter involves the mediation attempts by parties external to the conflict, he concentrates nearly exclusively on self-contained conflict resolution mechanisms. In other words, there has been no modern anthropological attempt to look at the broader context of relations that allow or encumber locally brokered conflict resolutions to succeed. A useful point of departure for new research in this field could therefore be that one cannot view local conflict resolution systems in isolation from the governmental agencies and the international organizations that work actively to see them resolved. Nor can locally established peace accords in low intensity conflicts be expected to hold unless they are understood and supported by the measures taken by the external actors..... Related to these problems, there is a failure of researchers to define clear and sustainable alternatives to the conventional routes to reconciliation. While the study of small-scale social and political organizations has long constituted one primary focus of anthropology, and although there is a broad set of varied approaches to the study of war, there are comparably few studies of how modern conflicts are resolved. In particular one may note the absence of studies that combine a small-scale focus with an awareness of the larger structures that local communities are linked to.37

Realist-based approaches tend to scope analysis and evaluation so that explanation prioritises the way in which an intervention brings influence to bear within the present international system and external-horizontal relationships maintained between nation-states.38 Interventions would thus tend to be scoped either in terms of a state's internal validity or external validity according to the international system. Interpretations of the features of the intervention understood from an emic perspective in the particular context of the intervention, that is, the 'reality' of a given situation, would then be expanded upon. Generalisations would be drawn based on an externalised analytical perspective, or etic perspective that would most likely be based on the realist assumptions inherent in the conceptual framework.

A key idea in this case is that ideas scoped in structural terms about new formalised arrangements that emerge, irrespective of whether an intervention is characterised as 'official' or 'non-official', are likely to be interpreted as simply a re-arrangement of political power arrangements. If ideas are founded on realist assumptions that the interests of the status quo will prevail and the present system will be maintained, then the purpose of theoretical explanation will be biased toward asserting control over knowledge and authority. For instance, an idealist basis of explanation about the features of a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' intervention at the particularist level may not necessarily be consistently applied at the generalist level. The features of the 'non-official' intervention that are heavily reliant on an idealist basis of explanation at the particularist level are, by a sleight of hand, re-interpreted according to the realist paradigm at the more generalist level. This increases the likelihood that crucial
features of the process that gave it legitimacy are distorted and delegitimated. The question is whether it is valid to attempt to scope analysis and evaluation in another way at the generalist level using an idealist-based approach so that explanation focuses on the way interventions have an impact on a global scale. The focus would be on internal-vertical relationships to reflect how people exert power and influence over diverse elements above and below them within the global system overall.

It is more problematic to expand upon ideas about the purpose of ‘resolutionary’ processes in order that meaning about this form of intervention can be scoped in terms of broader structural frameworks. At the particularist level the features of ‘resolutionary’ processes seem to be most meaningful in terms of a subjectivist approach. The methodology makes allowance for explaining how changes in attitude have an influence on behaviour. One way in which these changes in attitude have been described in this chapter is as a new form of knowledge and authority forged by the parties to represent their mutually agreed conceptual basis for committing to new formalised inter-group arrangements.

Certain aspects of the problem of expanding on particularist ideas were initially raised when discussing the methodological approach. The problem is that intermediaries are generally conceived to fulfil ‘non-official’ roles and therefore ‘resolutionary’ processes can often only be thought of as bridging mechanisms instituted to help contending parties advance toward the development of new political, legal, economic and social arrangements between themselves. The scholar-practitioner nexus can therefore provide a crucial channel for more objectively explaining proposed new arrangements between groups in broader structural terms at the generalist level. To expand on explanations about the features of a ‘non-official’ ‘resolutionary’ form of intervention so it is represented in the context of a wider reality, they are equally reliant on explanatory theory developed through peace research as well as theory generated through applied conflict resolution studies. It is only through analysis and evaluation at the generalist level that meaning can be attributed to the relationship between an intervention and the broader context in which it is situated. An integrated framework allows idealist-based ‘non-official’ process and realist-based ‘official’ political processes to be more meaningfully appreciated in relation to one another.

There are two ways of conceiving how interpretations can be expanded on to more objectively define the features of a ‘resolutionary’ process at the generalist level. The first is to interpret the way an intervention could be taken to be a legitimate form of
agency for addressing the conflict in a specific set of circumstances. The second is to stress that the goal of ‘resolutionary’ processes is to help protagonists bring forward new expressions of knowledge and authority that could only emerge through this type of non-coercive process. This type of outcome may have to be interpreted as a *revised basis of legitimacy* if ultimately the protagonists are to formalise particular agreements between themselves, which also emerge as an outcome of the process. This second aspect is significant so that scholar-practitioners can convey the idea that power relations between the groups remain somewhat uncertain because ‘resolutionary’ processes cannot assert authoritative power to enforce agreements. However, it is possible to assert that it is through a ‘non-official’ process that potentially viable arrangements are envisaged through which authoritative power, economic power and social relations could be channelled in a new and more constructive direction.

Two important ideas need to be taken into consideration concerning the way that outcomes of interventionist processes are scoped in broader structural terms. The first is the need to comparatively review the way different approaches scope outcomes so as to indicate the extent to which understandings and decisions arising out of the process require explanation to be qualified. Qualification in this case concerns the way account is taken of the external environment which itself would be influenced by the outcomes. Qualifying explanation may have to be understood in terms of two-way influence, the influence directed outward and the influence directed inward.

Scoping has to take account of the influence of outcomes that would be directed outward from the particular circumstances to a broader context. This would represent how issues that are construed to be *particularist*, that is, issues specific to the context in which the intervention takes place, might be perceived by external groups as having either a positive or negative broader impact. In relation to this aspect, there may be a need for qualifying explanation about the extent to which the outcomes are conceived to be a potential means of overcoming *contradiction* due primarily to changes in attitudes and behaviours at the particularist level directly in terms of human agency. This basis of explanation would be more in keeping with the *subjectivist approach*. This type of qualifying explanation would be necessary on the understanding that other groups would want to be informed how the conflict has changed, and what any ‘internal’ changes in attitude and behaviour could mean for external parties within the broader context.
Scoping would also have to take account of influences that would be directed inward from the broader context and how it would be anticipated that this would have an impact on prospective outcomes in the particularist context. This aspect would also require qualifying explanation. Again there would need to be an indication of the extent to which the outcomes are conceived as a potential means of overcoming contradictions. However, in this case, more in keeping with an objectivist approach, the point would be to signify that outcomes of the intervention at the particularist level are conceived to be only a partial means for overcoming contradiction. This would be the case if the manifest conflict were perceived to be just one episode of a deeper core contradictory issue, that is, a contradiction embedded in the broader social system overall. Outcomes would then need to be qualified to explain that the contradiction could not be fully overcome simply through changes in attitude or behaviour at the particularist level. The concern would be to qualify how external parties themselves may be perceived to have an impact on the outcomes.

The second important idea is that there is a need to comparatively review the way different approaches scope outcomes to indicate the extent to which understandings and decisions arising out of the process require explanation to qualify any differences between internal and external bases of legitimation. This aspect of scoping suggests a need to explain how outcomes at the particularist level are conceived to be based on a revised basis of legitimacy, and how this legitimacy can itself be meaningfully explained in terms of its relationship with bases of legitimacy expressed by other parties within the broader context. There would need to be qualifying explanation to indicate the way any prospective settlements, resolutions or transformations of social relations, representing new inter-group arrangements, would be formalised in political terms at the particularist level. Consequently it would need to be established how it would be envisaged that this revised basis of legitimacy would coalesce and inter-relate with bases of legitimacy that govern institutional and social processes maintained through authoritative and economic power operating within the broader context at the generalist level.

**Conclusion**

To demonstrate in general terms the viability of employing an integrated framework to comparatively and constructively review alternative approaches it has been necessary to express ideas with regard to each aspect in relatively abstract terms. The purpose has been to set out in these broad terms a range of considerations that
help to emphasise that all understandings about conflicts and how they might be overcome (even those generated through scientific discourse) can be conceived to be cultural and social constructions. Critiquing and reviewing different scientific approaches in relation to one another cannot be conceived to be a way of actually resolving conflict. Nevertheless the purpose of this chapter has been to show that there is a need to draw on scientific principles to test and validate what the concept of 'independence' means in relation to a field of study which is, by its very nature, concerned with contradiction and uncertainty. It is proposed that the most meaningful way that the concept can be articulated is through the employment of an integrated framework that allows a more comprehensive understanding about a range of competing points of view to emerge. This shifts the emphasis away from the idea that the purpose of scholarship in relation to social conflict is necessarily to objectively determine certain espoused truths. The focal issue becomes that of using scholarship as the means to develop a greater general awareness of the two equally significant aspects of social conflict that have to be considered in light of the preferred direction in which we envisage change should or could be channelled. To benefit from a greater awareness of what issues are at stake in conflicts and our capacity to weigh up their significance, matters to do with problem-identification have to be studied and shared in relation to ideas that can improve capacity to make informed, considered problem-solving responses.

In our globalised world, pre-existing governing structures and institutional processes are increasingly confronted with the problem of how to accommodate or settle profound contradiction through the power of force or coercion and the imposition of settlements. Thus it is becoming more critical that the legitimacy and relevance of theoretical constructions that support alternative approaches, which give equal attention to the non-coercive power of integration, are given equal credence and consideration. It is particularly in the area of reporting on interventions that there are windows of opportunity to explore the potential usefulness of analytical tools to indicate how particular strategies differ from one another, and how and by whom they are legitimated. This is particularly important when the issues at stake have to be made meaningful and negotiated between Western and non-Western traditions.

Chapter Five will in turn indicate that it is as valid to apply an integrated framework to make comparisons between different 'resolutionary' processes that can be employed to address contention manifesting at a range of different levels of social interaction. They can be applied to assist people deal with contentions that could be scoped as
having inter-personal, local, regional, national, international and global dimensions. The primary focus will be to examine theoretical explanations with respect to their purposes to determine the extent to which they are inclined toward a conservative or a radical orientation. Appreciating the differences allows for greater discernment in order to take into account the scale of the problems and the scale at which it is possible to seek settlement, resolution or transformation. It is argued that, irrespective of the particular context in which an intervention to address conflict is undertaken, scholar-reporters can use an integrated framework to review the way contentious issues and interventions to address them are being defined and explained.
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26 Headland (1990) indicates that the terms 'emic' and 'etic' were derived by the linguist anthropologist Kenneth Pike from an analogy with the terms 'phonemic' and 'phonetic'. Pike suggests that there are two perspectives that can be employed in the study of a society's cultural system, just as there are two perspectives when studying the sound system of a language. It suggests it is possible to take the point of view of an 'insider' or an 'outsider'. The emic perspective focuses on the intrinsic cultural distinctions that are meaningful within a given society in the same way that phonemic analysis focuses on the intrinsic phonological distinctions that are meaningful to speakers of a given language. In the emic perspective, the members of a cultural group are the sole judges of the validity of an emic description, just as the speakers of a language are the sole judges of the accuracy of a phonemic identification. The etic perspective relies on extrinsic concepts and categories that have meaning for scientific observers in the same way that phonetic analysis relies on the extrinsic concepts and categories that are meaningful to linguistic analysts. In the etic approach, scientists are the sole judges of the validity of an etic interpretation, just as linguists are the sole judges of the accuracy of a phonetic transcription. The fundamental ontological and epistemological issues associated with the usage of the term have increased rather than decreased as the terms have been more widely applied in different fields of the social sciences, including anthropology, sociology, education, folklore, management, medicine, philogy, psychiatry, psychology, public health. For instance, Marvin Harris, who used the terms to make distinctions in perspectives in his approach to cultural materialism, was responsible for them becoming part of the working vocabulary of many anthropologists. However, there are disagreements about the
goal of the etic approach. Pike interprets the etic perspective as a useful means for penetrating, discovering and elucidating emic systems, while asserting that etic claims to knowledge have no necessary priority over competing emic claims. Harris takes the position that the etic approach is useful for making objective determinations of fact, and that etic claims to knowledge are necessarily superior to competing emic claims, and are an end in themselves (Lett, 1987). According to Pelto (1970: 82-83) "Pike supports an 'idealist' explanation of human behaviour, that is, causes of human action are to be found mainly in the definitions, beliefs, values and ideologies of the actors". He therefore tends toward the belief that objective knowledge is an illusion, and that all claims to knowledge are ultimately subjective. Harris, on the other hand, claims that objective knowledge is at least potentially obtainable, and that the pursuit of such knowledge is essential for a discipline that aspires to be a science. It is Harris' approach that has been predominantly applied in the social sciences.

Similarly when reporting about contentious sustainability matters a comparative approach may be required to indicate different ways that linkages can be made between explanations concerning particularist episodes when they are expanded on so as to be meaningful when scoped and framed in more generalist terms. This is particularly significant when it is necessary to articulate the cumulative impact that local human activity is having on ecosystems overall. Reporting requires a basis of comparison in order to represent competing perceptions and viewpoints in a structured and systematic way. This can allow a broader conceptual meaning of a sustainability issue to develop, which has relevance when applied within and between diverse social and biophysical systems. In other words, reporting is a key mechanism for defining how particular episodes of sustainability problems can be appreciated as having a potentially cumulative effects in generalist terms. The purpose of comparison would be to determine the degree of synchrony between capacity for concerted problem-identification and capacity for concerted problem-solving. This should not necessarily be confined to realist perceptions of what are the most significant sustainability issues. Applied research defining sustainability problems can also be based on an idealist approach to ensure that the way meaning is attributed accords with the 'triple bottom line' of socio-political, economic and environmental interests at different levels of interpretation. The purpose of an integrated framework when reporting on sustainability issues should ultimately be that of contributing to understanding specific problems and uncertainties in particularist terms while simultaneously demonstrating how particular problems can be conceived to be embedded within the ecosystem app An example of this type of problem was the 'green revolution' of the 1960's and 1970's whereby Western development agencies and businesses promoted the introduction of new farming practices and crop strains in 'undeveloped' regions or in 'underdeveloped' countries. The development programs were often instituted through top-down social policy strategies which did not take full account of the social and ecological significance of local farming practices, nor the impact that farming according to a capitalist market logic would have on local modes of production and social systems. A modern equivalent dilemma about food production is represented in the debate about benefits and risks associated with genetically modified crop strains.

In the present case with regard to problem-solving through intervention, at the particularist level, it is again more likely that there would be an emphasis on ideas developed according to a subjectivist approach to indicate the way in which an intervention actually influences parties' attitudes and behaviours in the specific context in which an intervention takes place. At the generalist level, it is more likely that there would be an emphasis on ideas developed according to an objectivist approach, due to the fact that contradiction would equally be conceived to be embedded within the broader social structure. Accordingly it would be necessary to explain the way in which an intervention is influenced
by and has an influence on *contradictions* that can only be explained in more *generalist* terms because they are inherent in the broader social structure.
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CHAPTER FIVE: APPLYING AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK TO COMPARE DIFFERENT 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES

The purpose of this chapter is to further develop the argument of this thesis with regard to the feasibility of using an integrated framework to comparatively review the way different theoretical constructions define features, such as the characteristics, the purposes, the conduct of an interventionist strategy and its outcomes. It is argued that this approach can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of different strategies in relation to one another. Whereas Chapter Four serves the purpose of making broad comparisons between conceptual and theoretical approaches through which meaning can be attributed to 'official' interventions in relation to 'non-official' 'resolutionary' interventions, the focus of this chapter is to contrast frameworks attributing meaning to the three different 'resolutionary' processes. This type of review can further enhance the capacity of scholar-reporters to use comparison to characterise different types of intervention and signify the purposes that they serve. It is argued that an integrated framework provides a useful basis for articulating the extent to which one particular process is regarded as the most viable and appropriate to institute in a specific social context and set of circumstances when compared with optional strategic choices.

Section 1 presents an indicative outline of distinguishing characteristics and variabilities relating to three nominated 'resolutionary' processes, namely, ADR, conflict resolution and conflict transformation. Although these interventions can all generally be defined as 'resolutionary' processes, their efficacy depends on theory as a source of knowledge and authority to validate why one process should be nominated rather than another for addressing a specific type of conflict. Section 2 specifies differences in the underlying conceptual and theoretical frameworks that serve as the bases for training intermediaries. Comparisons are used to show the relationship each process maintains with a supporting theoretical base through which to articulate its purpose, and the practical capacities or competencies required of intermediaries in particular circumstances. Section 3 then indicates that an integrated framework is not only applicable for comparing different theoretical interpretations of 'official' and 'non-official' strategies for addressing social conflict. A scholar-reporter can employ an integrated framework when reporting about 'resolutionary' interventions to highlight the degree to which such processes can themselves be construed to maintain conservative or radical orientations. It is proposed that opportunities for contending groups to consider more
radical 'non-official' strategies as viable options compared with conservative 'official' determinative strategies tend to be limited. 'Non-official' processes do not follow prescribed precedents and they are therefore particularly reliant on theoretical models to validate why one particular 'resolutionary' process rather than another might be considered a more viable strategy in a specific set of circumstances. Comparing alternative ways of theoretically interpreting such processes helps to more rigorously identify and clarify the characteristics and the relevance of different 'resolutionary' processes and thus highlight why specific features are most significant in relation to a 'resolutionary' process which is the subject of a report.

Section 4 discusses how comparisons serve another purpose besides indicating the breadth of theoretical understanding required of an intermediary in order that they can competently and appropriately facilitate and report about a specific type of 'resolutionary' process. Discussion stresses the need to develop a more general framework that allows theoretical understandings about such processes to be appreciated in relation to one another. Such a general framework is needed so that practitioners have a credible basis for asserting that in circumstances where there are protracted deep-seated or high-stakes conflicts there may be a warranted need for prior preparatory training and capacity-building. Such programs afford prospective participants opportunities to identify the relationship between their own immediate circumstances and the relevance of and the perceived viability of addressing conflict through a 'resolutionary' strategy.

Thus this chapter overall draws attention to the need for theoretical clarity when defining the purposes, the viability and the efficacy of different 'resolutionary' processes. Given the fundamentally uncertain nature of conflict, contention and disagreement can inevitably arise as to the reasons attributed to perceived successes or failures of strategies instituted to fulfil certain purposes. Theoretical constructions are the means through which systematic analysis and evaluation can be undertaken to explain the way that those involved in conflict attempt to address their contradictions and incompatibilities. However, the broader purpose of conflict theory is to make evaluations not only about preferred or anticipated directions of change, but also potentially different directions of change. An integrated framework can be a constructive means for identifying the potential for bias when reporting the outcomes of 'non-official' processes in terms of relative successes or failures. Its employment as a basis for scholarly reporting allows consideration to be given to competing conceptual
and theoretical explanations of apparent successes or failures of interventions and how they could influence the direction of change.

SECTION 1: ARTICULATING THE DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS OF THREE 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES

This section outlines some of the characteristics that distinguish Alternative Dispute Resolution, Conflict Resolution and Conflict Transformation. The comparisons allow the motivational ideology that supports their purposes to be discerned, and indicates how, when, where and why these three different 'resolutionary' processes might warrant consideration. Identifying their specific capabilities contributes to an enhanced understanding of the way each can be appreciated as a legitimate optional approach for addressing conflict.

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

The development of the ADR movement was initially discussed in Chapter Two. It can be conceptualised as a range of procedures that serve as alternatives to adjudicatory procedures of litigation and arbitration for the purpose of resolving disputes. It involves the intercession and assistance of a neutral third party whose role is to facilitate the process. Brown and Marriott describe ADR in the following terms:

ADR complements litigation and other adjudicatory forms, providing processes which can either stand in their own right or be used as an adjunct to adjudication. This enables practitioners to select procedures (adjudicatory or consensual) appropriate to individual disputes. ADR allows parties greater control over resolving the issues between them, encourages problem-solving approaches, and provides for more effective settlements covering substance and nuance. It also tends to enhance cooperation and to be conducive to the preservation of relationships. Effective neutral third party intercession can help to overcome blocks to settlement, and by expediting and facilitating resolution it can save costs and avoid the delays and risks of litigation. ADR processes, like adjudicatory procedures, have advantages and disadvantages which make them suitable for some cases but not for others.¹

One of the commonly expressed motivations for promoting ADR is the prospect of greater empowerment for the individuals involved. This has been an argument with strong appeal to groups who wish to avoid the necessity of assigning the full and final responsibility as to how contentious issues can be dealt with to a lawyer or advocate.²

Formal conservative processes for resolving disputes in both Western and non-Western traditions can involve advocates or lawyers, who use procedures, language and reasoning that have evolved through judicial processes to present issues on behalf of a client party, and have them settled through a trial process. In Western traditions, the professionalisation of these processes does not tend to empower individuals to maintain control over the way their issues are presented or ultimately resolved. Thus a
core value of an alternative mediated settlement is its capacity for reconnecting people to their own inner wisdom or common sense.\textsuperscript{3}

In Western social systems, disputes can be resolved through a number of different fields of activity associated with ADR. One of the most common ADR processes involves negotiation. It can involve disputants communicating their differences to one another through conference, discussion and compromise, even without a facilitating third party, in order to resolve contentious issues or come to new agreements. However, as a 'resolutionary' process it is most often associated with the involvement of a mediator to facilitate the process.\textsuperscript{4}

Another field of ADR is referred to as mediation-arbitration, also known as Med-Arb.\textsuperscript{5} This process allows parties to select and authorise a third party to serve both as the mediator using voluntary techniques of persuasion and discussion. However, if the mediation process should fail to bring about a satisfactory settlement, the third party has the authority to then become an arbitrator and issue a final and binding decision. The decision to use this process is one which parties usually commit to before undertaking the process. A perceived advantage of this process is that in one way or another a decision will be reached. It consequently encourages the parties to try harder to resolve the matter during the mediation phase. The other perceived advantage is that if an adjudication is required, there will be less time and expense involved compared to the option for parties to undertake another process which would require them to go over the same facts and issues of their case. However, it also raises the issue of ambiguity with regard to the capacity of the third party to transfer from one role, as a mediator, to that of an arbitrator and function effectively in either role. A core principle of mediation is that parties can trust the neutrality of a mediator and make disclosures independently or in joint sessions, based on the assurance that confidentiality will be maintained and that evidence will not be used against them in an adjudicatory process. The mediator’s role as a neutral third party might be compromised if parties feel inhibited in the mediation stage of the process. Likewise, the third party’s role could be compromised in the arbitration mode, because the information gathered during mediation is without prejudice and is privileged. It would be necessary to re-evaluate the worth of information in terms of its appropriateness for an adjudication process. Some of these concerns can be overcome if parties agree to the process, but not necessarily to using the same person as mediator and arbitrator.\textsuperscript{6}
A further field of ADR is referred to as a mini-trial or executive tribunal. These processes are often employed to bring about a negotiated settlement, particularly in lieu of corporate litigation. It is a structured settlement process in which senior executives of the companies involved and their legal representatives meet in the presence of an impartial third party, often a retired judge or another lawyer. After hearing presentations of each party’s position with respect to the dispute, executives who have authority to settle can attempt to formulate a voluntary settlement. The object of the mini-trial may not be to make a final determination, but to allow parties to express non-binding opinions to each other about the case. This allows each party’s primary representatives to have an opportunity of ‘hearing’ the case and for these primary representatives to form their views about how their own and the other party’s lawyers are representing their views. This explains why the process is sometimes referred to as an ‘executive tribunal’. Having parties directly engaged in dialogue at the same time as their legal representatives enables all the parties to appreciate the issues from different positions simultaneously, taking into account both practical and legal issues. The process allows all the parties to overcome misunderstandings and make sounder judgements through taking all the settlement issues into account. The term ‘mini trial’ has been popularly coined for this process, but in fact the term is not altogether accurate, given that it is a non-binding ADR process designed to assist parties in dispute to gain a better mutual understanding of the issues. This thereby enables them to enter into settlements on a more informed basis. Each party engages in direct across-the-table exchanges of information, while, beside them at the table, their respective lawyers and other supporters also face each other.

Further areas of ADR include consensus building processes, most often instituted when a neutral third party attempts to help a range of interest groups reach a consensus, particularly with respect to environmental or public policy conflicts. It also includes processes described as summary jury trials, which involve presentations by lawyers in complex cases before a jury empanelled to make advisory findings.

**Conflict Resolution**

The resolution of conflicts could, in its broadest definition, signify any marked reduction in social conflict brought about by any means, including any form of change or outside influence that can have a bearing on social relations. However, the focus that has most relevance in conflict resolution as a field of study concerns the way it is conceived as a conscious process that is facilitated by a third party to assist protagonists to resolve contentions and contradictions. Thus conflict resolution can be conceived to be
concerned with marked reductions in social conflict as a result of the conscious resolution or settlement of parties’ incompatibilities.¹¹

Conflicts that require a more radical approach to bring about a resolution tend to reflect a set of circumstances that are well outside of what would otherwise be regarded as normal social living and, therefore, in need of more than a straightforward assessment of immediately apparent factors. This suggests that conflict resolution processes require a more concerted analytical understanding of the issues from different perspectives. The re-framing stage allows the parties to reflect on and review their expectations with regard to the preferred direction of change. Intervention is called for because there is contention to do with particular substantive issues. However, it is likely there is also contention about the most viable and appropriate process through which particular substantive issues can be settled. To a greater extent than processes of ADR, processes of conflict resolution often have to deal with contention about the validity and legitimacy of routine taken-for-granted institutionalised processes. The inherent uncertainties and contradictions concerning what is at odds are likely to have called into question the legitimacy and effectiveness of conventional mechanisms for bringing about settlements or resolutions. Conflict resolution processes therefore have to address both incompatibilities relating to substantive issues and incompatible perceptions about the legitimacy of conventional decision-making mechanisms through which substantive issues can be addressed.¹²

Compared with disputes, inter-group conflicts signify a greater degree of unpredictability with regard to their impact on the general direction of change, either within a particular social system or in terms of relations between different social systems. There is the possibility that some groups involved may not be willing to compromise or make modifications and adjustments. Thus a characteristic of confronting social conflict is a tension between social forces seeking to maintain normal social living, while other social forces, through some form of social activism, are seeking to bring about change. Some forms of social activism, such as lobbying or public demonstrations as well as mediated negotiations, tend to be nonviolent in character. They often reflect that people are calling for change or modifications to the status quo through gradual reform. However, other forms of social activism, where an effort is made to radically alter a state of affairs through coercive counteraction or insurgency, have an increased potential to escalate toward more violent ‘revolutionary’ strategies.¹³
An underlying consideration will be whether the parties are prepared to look for settlements that comply with a conservative orientation. It could be either through the predominant party’s routine institutionalised processes or through that party setting up a quasi-formal process where settlements are first sought through diplomatic channels. In either case conservative elements still retain control over the way the intervention is conducted. It is therefore more feasible to categorise both of them as Track I strategies (See Fig. 12, Chapter Three). The type of conflict resolution processes that are the focus of discussion in this chapter are more representative of Track II strategies.14 This is on the understanding that the third party intermediary maintains a 'non-official' facilitating role between protagonists who are willing to use the intervention to explore for a greater degree of mutual accord. Although such processes are unprecedented, they nevertheless need to be legitimated as a coordinated and systematic means for seeking the resolution of a conflict.

Practitioners of conflict resolution can include among others social workers, psychologists, lawyers, ministers of religion, military strategists, diplomats and labour management specialists. However, they do not necessarily put into and draw from the same knowledge bases that contribute to a general body of knowledge indicating in what way their practical methodologies and frames of reference are more or less effective.15 Thus there are a range of practitioners who can fulfil this type of mediating role. However, the most useful insights for attributing meaning to what occurs in the immediate context of an intervention, that is, at the particularist level, as well as at a generalist level in more abstract theoretical terms, are derived through applied conflict resolution studies. In this case a scholar-practitioner undertakes the facilitative role. It is a combination of training and experience that allows scholar-practitioners to articulate their practical role in theoretical terms, that is, how they undertake it. They are as well able to give an account in theoretical terms of the features of particular processes and develop criteria for making evaluations. They could be concerned with whether all or only some the anticipated goals were achieved, or the extent to which the process was able to bring about a mutually satisfactory resolution.

Conflict resolution processes vary markedly, depending on the type of conflict that is being addressed, the stage at which an attempt is being made to address it, and the motivations of those who exert control and influence over the process. However, in general terms, the processes usually involve an exploration of whether it is possible, through re-framing, to bring about a paradigm shift and begin to think more constructively about the frames of power, influence and understanding in which
practices and procedures are situated.\textsuperscript{16} This idea about the potential for people to change the way they feel and think about a conflict and interventions for addressing it has resonance with the argument being developed in this thesis. It highlights a need for ideas about conflict to be situated within a general and inclusive framework that will allow different constructions to be appreciated in relation to one another. The broader the range of ideas, the more it is likely that protagonists can review their conflict and the means through which it might change.

The literature of conflict analysis and applied conflict resolution began to increase significantly during the late 1970's. The following quotation by Burton indicates the trend toward problem-solving processes as an adjunct to formal diplomacy:

\begin{quote}
This was not utopian idealism. It was rather, essentially a costing analysis. Resolution was seen as possible, not through goodwill and an altered value system, but by a realistic analysis of situations and an assessment of the costs and consequences of policies that were based on false assumptions and perceptions. Conflict analysis first sought the explanation for the failure of traditional power-elite, deterrent strategies. To do so there had to be examinations of conflicts at all social levels - family, ethnic, industrial and international. The research processes included bringing together parties to conflicts, helping them to be analytical, and observing their responses. The conflicting parties concerned in this research seemed to benefit from the exercise. Accordingly, the research process was modified to become a conflict resolving process. A decade or so later sources of conflict were becoming clearer.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

Theoretical knowledge about conflict resolution develops from the study of the capacity of interventionist processes to contain, settle or transform conflict. Processes of conflict resolution are more likely to be regarded as feasible in situations where protagonists have at least some clear sense of the actual incompatibilities in their interests, values and goals.\textsuperscript{18} Thus conflict resolution processes are more likely to be efficacious when it is apparent that the parties involved have some relatively straightforward vision of what they hope to achieve. This would tend to indicate that they already have a relatively clear way of framing the issues at stake. What may be inhibiting a resolution could be, in part, at least, attributable to a lack of an appropriate decision-making process.\textsuperscript{19} Thus the parties may benefit from additional innovative techniques or skills advocated by an intermediary, rather than a sole reliance on their usual repertoire of techniques and skills, in order to try to develop a more appropriate mechanism for dealing with their incompatibilities.\textsuperscript{20} This idea is exemplified in the way Rothman describes as follows the usefulness of a needs-based approach to help protagonists address deep seated identity-based conflicts:

\begin{quote}
It is difficult if not impossible to prove the existence of either a hierarchy of needs or the specific types and forms of needs that are presented as universally shared. The main point of a needs analysis in deep conflict is that it provides a common conceptual framework to use in articulating and organizing the motivations of those locked in the
conflict. Moreover, by suggesting that needs are universal and that threats to basic needs and frustration over unmet needs are at the root of intransigent conflicts, a new type of analytic discourse about conflict motivations replaces polemical positional discourse about solutions. This new discourse can help foster a common conflict frame.21

It is argued that the espoused purpose of an intervention will be based on certain ideological motivations, often expressed in terms of assertions that certain knowledge and authority have most relevance. In the case of a mediated conflict resolution process, the establishment of the legitimacy of the process will be dependent on the degree to which the parties can commonly accord legitimacy to the role, function and the expertise of the intermediary. The parties' support for the process will be influenced by their own conceptual understandings of its ultimate purpose, and its capacity to realise a satisfactory outcome. Support will be dependent on parties' perception of relative gains or losses that might be the outcome of one type of strategy when compared with others. Groups' bases for nominating a particular process may not only depend on what they expect to achieve as an outcome when compared with the prospects through an optional process. It will also depend on their perceptions of how they anticipate that certain outcomes could be achieved through a particular process.

Susskind, a scholar-practitioner, suggests that the most fundamental question that has to be reflexively considered with regard to any process of dispute resolution or conflict resolution is: "were the people who managed the process responsive to the concerns of those affected by the final decision?"\textsuperscript{22} He claims that the consensual processes that are most likely to be perceived to be fair and legitimate will be those that are most open to continuous modification by the protagonists. However, he suggests there is a counter argument to this perception, which is that what should count most in evaluating fairness is that the rules of the game should not change. This is on the basis that set rules, such as those that apply in litigation, allow each protagonist to plan precisely how they might achieve their own objectives. Therefore, he argues that shifts in procedure can seem unfair because they undermine preconceived strategies through which parties are seeking to achieve gains. In more conservative 'official' approaches that adhere to this argument each group's goal is to control the final decision. However, on the other hand, if it is the satisfaction of all the stakeholding parties that is the desired outcome, he suggests that no one would want the rules of the game to get in the way of an ingenious solution.\textsuperscript{23}
Conflict Transformation

Conflict transformation as a field of study and a practical endeavour has often been instituted to address conflicts that are profoundly difficult to fully articulate. The parties themselves may have no clear vision of what they can actually hope or believe is possible to achieve. Therefore overall there is less clarity about how to frame the issues and objectives other than in very general terms. The conflict is cumulatively represented as a range of episodes that, over time, indicate how it has been maintained and how it has been experienced. This is particularly the case when less powerful groups perceive that, due to their lack of power and influence, it is difficult to clearly assess the actual scope of all the relevant issues at stake. Protracted conflicts can be very uncertain, unstable, destructive and unjust. The forces promoting social change perceive the conflict to be threatening, but the issues are likely to be viewed in a profoundly different way by each group involved. Perceived threats are likely to be felt more acutely and directly by subordinate groups, but the underlying tensions also represent a more general threat that could irreversibly change or undermine the cohesion of existing social systems, or relations between people identifying with different social systems.

Conflict transformation addresses the problem that in these circumstances groups face significant difficulty just defining their overall interests and goals, even though it is evident that some forces influencing the conflict are advocating the need for social change. The situation is likely to have reached a point where the parties involved perceive they have few common interests, and there has been a consequent polarisation of ideas about protagonists' own particular interests and goals. At this stage in a protracted conflict, its presence is felt, but it has not been wholly or completely articulated so that it is commonly understood by all concerned.

In circumstances where there is a high level of social activism maintained either through violent 'revolutionary' social forces or more nonviolent confrontationist social forces, there is less likelihood that protagonists would benefit from immediate intervention through a 'resolutionary' process. The reason is that parties’ positions would be so polarised there would be no overall sense of the ultimate goals that could be realised. Goals could seem so vague as to be virtually unachievable. Given that protagonists would perceive there is very little common ground, they would also be likely to believe there is little chance that the root structural causes of the conflict could be dealt with simply through a single 'resolutionary' process. Subordinated or oppressed groups may not actually see the benefit of reducing or modifying their overt
confrontationist attitudes and behaviours. They may perceive that to embark on a process that attempts to resolve problems before they have been fully articulated to their satisfaction would simply be an exercise of co-optation. Conflict resolution studies are primarily interested in whether marked reductions in social conflict can come about through the parties’ conscious endeavours through an interventionist process. However, studies relating to conflict transformation focus on increasing capacity to recognise that the type of interventions promoted in the field of conflict resolution may sometimes, on their own, be insufficient for addressing conflicts that reflect profound contradictions deeply embedded within social systems. A single ‘resolutionary’ process may not afford adequate opportunity to define the characteristics of the conflict or address profoundly hostile attitudes and violent behaviours. Profoundly polarised social relations generally reflect that parties perceive there has been a gradual erosion of or destruction of certain material or symbolic resources that are fundamentally important to their sense of identity. These views are in turn likely to be closely associated with perceptions of the gradual erosion of independence, freedom and well-being due to certain group’s interests and actions predominating over the interests of others. An assertion that one particular process would be capable of resolving such deep-seated problems before they have been comprehensively defined could be interpreted by some to be a premature attempt to end the confrontation even when the need to be confrontational about what is at odds is still justified.

An underlying concern in the conflict transformation approach is that protracted conflicts of this kind, if left unabated, can escalate toward even more destructive patterns of behaviour. When conflict moves beyond verbal disagreement to reflect diminishing physical or psychological well-being and a failure to meet fundamental needs, patterns of overt distrust or destructive hostility become established and entrenched. This can lead to a polarisation of social alliances, and polarised positions with respect to each party’s perception of their own and other parties’ interests, values and goals. Protracted conflicts maintain social dynamics that actually reinforce protagonists’ perceptions and ideas about each other, particularly concepts with regard to ‘self’ and certain ‘others’. A consequence of polarisation is a less accurate, simplified understanding of the intentions of others, and a corresponding decrease in individuals' ability to clearly identify and articulate their own intentions. This gives rise to new questionings about self-identity and esteem associated with the development and formulation of stereotypical images. These perceptions tend to dominate each party’s perceptions of other protagonists. The unpredictability with regard to the
direction of change is increased when a social event or an eco-catastrophe within a state or a region triggers social change or a crisis of legitimacy, which intensifies confrontational challenge, often to the point of civil or inter-state war. In more developed states similar dynamics are more often identified as impasses in terms of how the goals of different sectors of society can all be accommodated in a sustainable way.31

Conflicts that can be characterised as complex, deep-seated and protracted generally entail core issues, as set out in Fig 18, that have a direct bearing on fundamental human needs or associated environmental needs. There are usually a wider range of variable issues at stake, including contention about the legitimacy of taken-for-granted decision-making institutions of the status quo, and their right to impose settlements that prioritise the interests of the predominant group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Denial of Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The denial of a person's sense of self, or a failure to recognise the legitimacy of his or her group identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Denial of Other Human Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to identity (which is a fundamental need), the denial of other fundamental needs such as security, or the ability to pursue one's own goals often leads to intractable conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domination Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts about who is on top of whom in the social, political, and economic structure tend to be intractable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Stakes Distributional Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High stakes win-lose conflicts over who gets what and how much can often become intractable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 18: Core Issues of Intractable Conflict (Website of the International Online Training Program on Intractable Conflict)

**Goals of Conflict Transformation as a Process**

Two fundamental goals can be identified in conflict transformation processes. The first is to attempt to define a situation in terms of what it means for those directly involved, through which they will hopefully develop a better understanding of the conflict overall. The second is to promote, through intervention, opportunities to put in place more constructive rather than destructive patterns of behaviour.32 This goal could be interpreted as increasing the possibility for channelling change in a direction that protagonists could commonly recognise as the more *ideal*. Changes would need to reflect a more concerted appreciation of how such *ideals* have meaning with respect to the interests, values and goals of all concerned.
In both these endeavours there would be little precedent for capturing the broader sense of what could be required in the immediate circumstances to promote a significant reduction of disorder, contention, injustice or violence. Therefore to move toward the first goal would require the development of a more concerted description of the characteristics and dynamics of the conflict. The underlying assumption is that there would be little point in moving toward the second goal of concerted problem-solving before developing a more consensual sense of what prescriptions would be aiming to achieve. The first goal would be to promote consideration of the possibility of lessening the violence entailed in the relationships, framed as a principle or ideal, which itself could be appreciated as a constructive step toward concerted review of what is contradictory and problematic in present relationships.

Protracted conflict sets up confrontation with respect to previously taken for granted conventions and ideas relating to knowledge and authority asserted through coercive power operating within or between polarised social systems. The fundamental consideration will be whether radical strategies could be channelled in a constructive rather than a destructive direction of change. A further consideration is how expression can be given to the possibility of social dynamics being transformed through facilitated negotiation. To achieve this would require the development of an adequate understanding of the core elements that have led to a social situation entailing a high degree of unpredictability, and the development of ideas as to how it could be transformed.

Profound social division and polarisation indicate a high degree of uncertainty as to the direction of change. Groups could see their options for changing the conflict as being to either further escalate it through violent confrontation, or otherwise to look for a more constructive form of confrontation that holds promise of transformation through dialogue and deliberation. The framing of the problem and potential solutions would most likely have to be in terms of a need to enhance general well-being and lessen destructive systematically entrenched behaviour patterns. The latter option would require a social commitment to explore for an innovative approach to either complement or supersede formerly taken for granted social norms and institutional processes. This would be on the basis that former ways of framing the issues at stake are likely to be perceived by at least some protagonists to be no longer adequate or appropriate for accurately expressing the true state of affairs and how it could be changed.
The conflict transformation approach is based on an assumption that protracted conflicts require a distinctive form of analysis and evaluation. Some of the interventionist strategies would be described as Track III strategies, rather than Track II (see Fig. 12, Chapter 3). In circumstances involving profound degrees of incompatibility and contradiction, one immediate problem facing contending groups is that former ways of describing the issues at stake, or the mechanisms through which they could be addressed, are not commonly recognised as accurate, adequate or legitimate. Therefore a necessary stage would be to explore the possibility of generating a more commonly acceptable way of articulating what is occurring.

**Stages of Conflict Transformation**

The fundamental ideas in the matrix set out in Fig. 19 were originally developed by Curle as an outcome of his experiences as a 'non-official' mediator in clashes between India and Pakistan, with parties involved in the Nigerian civil war and many other subsequent hostile clashes. It was initially developed as a way of conceiving how conflict can move through certain phases toward a reconstruction of ideas about the social realities of change from destructive to more constructive directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNPEACEFUL RELATIONS</th>
<th>PEACEFUL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Static</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unstable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>UNBALANCED</th>
<th>BALANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>Latent Conflict</td>
<td>1. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>Overt Conflict</td>
<td>3. Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sustainable Peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 19: A Progression of Conflict (Curle, 1971 elaborated by Lederach, 1995)
Three key functions are significant in the matrix, namely education, advocacy and mediation. There is not necessarily an assumption that conflicts follow or stay within prescribed theoretical formulas, particularly when analysed in the short-term. At any point, conflicts can move between any place within the quadrants of the matrix for extensive periods of time. Deep-seated conflicts rarely lead to an immediate restructuring of relationships. Nevertheless, overall, the matrix lays out a longer-term view through which those involved in conflict can contemplate a vision of where they are presently situated, and where they could be placed if the conflict were to take different directions of change. This broad framework makes it possible to conceive of the multiplicity of potential influences that could contribute to the way settlements, resolutions or transformations might be achieved.

**Education**

A number of practitioners, including Curle and Lederach, have adopted Freire’s term *conscientization* to indicate that the meaning of education in this context is as much to do with the elicitive development of understanding as it is to do with instruction. The term, as both a concept and a tool, is meant to convey a sense of a growing awareness of ideas about social change that can be developed simultaneously at personal and social levels. *Conscientization* can be represented as a growing confidence with literacy, learning to read and write, but it can also represent any means through which individuals use their self-expression to convey an awareness of themselves within their own social context. In protracted conflicts, this process has to take account of grief and trauma work, as well as deep feelings of fear, frustration, anger and bitterness that can accompany accumulated personal, family or group loss of needs for identity, security and recognition.

The stage of *conscientization* is particularly important when conflicts have remained virtually hidden, or have been understated in the formerly prevailing social system. The outcome can be that people do not have an appropriate means to describe certain incompatibilities, such as a sense of imbalance, injustice or misunderstanding in their relationships in an open and commonly understood way. The goal of *conscientization* is to heighten individuals’ and groups’ understanding and awareness of the nature of the unequal relationships, and the need felt by those directly concerned as to how issues of equity, recognition, security or identity could be addressed or restored. However, unless those who feel the incompatibilities most keenly are allowed to develop their own way of framing these ideas, and they remain couched in terms of the
understandings of the dominant culture, they can simply represent another form of cultural imperialism.\textsuperscript{42}

Increasing an awareness of how to articulate needs and interests does not assume that they will be immediately addressed. In fact, a significant issue for less powerful groups is that their needs and interests have not been understood or taken to be legitimate by those who have been deriving a perceived greater share of benefit and privilege, and therefore they are more likely to perceive the circumstances quite differently.\textsuperscript{43}

- **Advocacy**

The goal of this second of the three functions is to help groups, particularly those who feel they have formerly had insufficient capacity or influence within a social system, develop a better understanding of means available to them to promote their ideas about pursuing change. This phase is only fully effective once groups, through conscientization, are more confident about articulating the perceived incompatibilities and power imbalances, and have considered their goals in terms of a possible restructuring of power arrangements and decision-making capacity. The advocates’ role, therefore, is not to present their own interpretation of what groups themselves have to say about their position and the legitimacy of their concerns. It is to heighten awareness of the role of confrontation, that is, the means to make it clear to other groups how they perceive more interdependence or independence might be established. A critical role of advocacy is to promote and develop a heightened awareness of different mechanisms through which confrontation could be effectively undertaken. This allows for opportunities for those concerned to consider whether and where there are choices as to how they could convey an understanding of their interests, needs and values to other groups.\textsuperscript{44} Both violent and nonviolent confrontations can be catalysts for making a group’s position clear to other groups. In the present understanding of the role, however, advocacy has a stronger emphasis on promoting alternatives to violent processes. Advocacy focuses on promoting those involved in conflict to reflect on and consider longer-term costs and benefits that could be the outcome of different strategies of confrontation.

- **A ‘Resolutionary’ Mediation or Negotiation Process**

The necessity for the third function emerges when protagonists have developed a heightened sense of why social relations are so confrontational. The triggers can take a variety of forms. It could be one specific event epitomising the inherent contradictions. In the case study to be discussed in Part II of this thesis it was one
particular legal judgement through which the need for institutional change was articulated. A mediator's role is initially to promote as many parties as possible to consider decision-making or problem-solving processes that could offer the optimum prospect of joint resolution, especially those processes that allow for an increased capacity to share ideas and information before decisions are made. Whereas advocates would tend to initially work with one group, mediators work between groups, promoting them to consider what sort of process might avert a situation where one group can absolutely impose its will or otherwise downplay the concerns of others. Negotiation processes that are the outcome of the two earlier phases tend to give as much attention to articulating ideas about how they might restructure relationships between the parties as they give to parties' particular interests. This could be exemplified in the extent to which the parties are prepared to employ an integrative, consensual style of negotiation over one that is distributive or competitive. The choice of process becomes a key factor in determining the extent to which protagonists envisage they can negotiate the formulation of mutually agreed procedures, which of necessity would have to precede negotiation about specific substantive concerns. This idea is exemplified in the case study set out in Fig. 20.

In Northern Kenya, the growing pressure on arid land and the introduction of a Kalashnikov culture into traditional cattle-raiding has led to an increase in both the extensity and intensity of conflicts between nomadic pastoral communities, as well as between pastoralists and agriculturalists. Not only historical rivals such as the Turkana and Pokot or Somali and Borana, but also communities which coexisted peacefully in the 1980s are now engulfed in war. The militarisation of these pastoralist communities is severely affecting the security of Kenya and the neighbouring territories, and damaging the affected communities. In response, Oxfam facilitated peace talks relying on local elders in the Baragoi Pastoral Project of 1997. A crucial aspect of Oxfam’s ongoing work in the area is an effort to appreciate the codes of honour and conduct of these peoples and their understanding of conflict, through lexical and ethnographic analysis (Kona 1999). In this vein, a local committee of women from the affected communities set up the Wajgir Peace and Development Committee, a network of 27 governmental organisations and NGOs in north-eastern Kenya. This group conducts training and capacity-building, and contributed to a cease-fire in 1993 and continuing efforts to prevent and resolve local conflicts in the region (European Platform for Conflict Prevention 1999a, 152; 1999b, 243-47).

Fig. 20: Case study relating to the work of the NGO Oxfam in North West Africa

The role of facilitating practitioners in circumstances indicating an extensive degree of overt violent conflict or more covert structural violence is to promote the parties to consider less hostile attitudes and violent behaviours even when their polarised positions mean that they have few constructive bridges of communication between each other. This is the goal even when the parties’ own polarised perceptions of incompatibilities and contradictions suggest that there are no apparent mechanisms that could be employed through which dialogue could be restored, or there seem to be no immediately realisable prospects of transforming the conflict. Theory relating to
conflict transformation promotes the importance of understanding the impact that hostile conflict has on protagonists' perceptions and patterns of expression and communication. It also promotes a better understanding of the roles that third parties can play in fostering a better understanding of the conflict, and what stages it might have to move through in order that it could be channelled from a destructive direction toward one that is more constructive.48

The aspects that are highlighted through a comparative review of three different 'resolutionary' processes in this section are summarised in Fig. 21.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR):**
- ADR processes tend to be applied as a means to bring about the resolution of disputes that disrupt social cohesion and social norms within a social system, usually within a national context.
- The processes are often promoted as either an adjunct to or as an alternative to formal judicial prescriptive procedures of a court or similar institution that would bring about a determinative settlement of the issues in conflict.
- The processes are mostly undertaken in an attempt to reach a compromise or settlement before having the issues adjudicated by a third party or determined according to prescribed rules.
- There is an underlying assumption that the outcomes should be capable of being ratified or legitimated through the more formal institutions of the social system.
- A further underlying assumption is that if a mutually agreeable outcome is not settled by those directly involved, the parties would recognise the knowledge and authority of the more formal institution, and its legitimacy to be the final arbiter.

**Conflict Resolution:**
- Conflict Resolution processes are often applied as a means to bring about the resolution of apparently incompatible sets of issues which not only disrupt social cohesion but also give rise to uncertainty which calls into question the legitimacy and capacity of taken-for-granted formal institutions to address the issues appropriately, and thus prompts a review of accepted social norms and behaviour patterns as a basis for settlement.
- There is conflict relating to specific substantive issues, but there is also conflict relating specifically to the capacity, appropriateness and legitimacy of conservative prescriptive processes.
- There is intransigence because the pre-existing conservative institutions assert a right to force or impose a settlement according to past precedents and pre-existing social norms.
- An intermediary intervenes to assist the parties to voluntarily undertake concerted analysis of the issues at stake and consider optional means of addressing them and therefore optional directions of change.
- There is a tendency for the involved groups to each have a relatively explicit understanding of their interests and goals that accord with their own perspective on the apparently incompatible issues. The role of the intermediary is to attempt to develop through a re-framing process a more concerted description of the issues at stake, which would be the basis for attempting to resolve them.
- There is a tendency for the involved groups to each have a relatively definitive vision of what they hope to achieve. The intermediary's role is to encourage the parties to determine in what way their goals are incompatible with those of other groups. The ultimate purpose is to work toward problem-solving on the basis that they may have certain interests in common, and that they may be able to consider a direction of change that they could commonly envision and live with.
Conflict Transformation:
- Conflict Transformation processes are most often applied in circumstances where the causes of conflicts are deep-seated, complex and difficult to articulate.
- The conflicts usually relate to protracted ideological differences which affect personal and group identity and stereotypical images dominate groups’ perceptions of each other.
- The characteristics of the conflict inhibit groups from understanding each other's interests and values and thus why they have different goals, indicating that the conflict is not wholly or completely articulated and is not commonly understood.
- There is a tendency for its protracted and complex characteristics to inhibit the groups involved from developing clear visions of relatively realisable goals.
- A 'resolutionary' process on its own would be unlikely to resolve the issues at stake, as the conflict is so deep-seated it could actually require a transformation of social norms which maintain adversarial behaviour patterns through which the involved groups express their values and their interests to one another.
- A 'resolutionary' process would need to be preceded by intervention in the form of social support to articulate the social change being sought, on the basis that this could only be realised incrementally in stages. The purpose of support would be to encourage review of present relationships and exploration of ways to institute new patterns of interactive behaviour.
- 'Resolutionary' process could follow on from preceding stages, which would include:
  (1) education applied in a broad conceptual sense, the development of a more conscious awareness and reflection on the prospect of social change at personal and social levels
  (2) an advocacy role to assist groups heighten their own explicit awareness of the conflict, and
  (3) 'resolutionary' processes of mediation or negotiation.

Fig. 21: Comparative Summary of Three 'Resolutionary' Processes

SECTION 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMES OF REFERENCE THAT INFLUENCE INTERMEDIARY TRAINING TO FACILITATE 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES

In Chapter Four comparisons were made between realist and idealist approaches to illustrate how these different conceptual frames of reference could bring forth biased theoretical interpretations of conflict as well as interventionist responses to it. However, it was stressed that the purpose of making comparisons was not necessarily to suggest that they should be treated as being in diametrical opposition to one another. An idealist approach would be invalidated if it could not ultimately be accorded significance in the context of present realities, so as to take account of the political, economic and social institutions that uphold the status quo as well as those maintained by parties holding a contrary perspective. It has been argued that comparative review through an integrated framework promotes a greater degree of theoretical reflexivity particularly when comparisons make it evident that explanations have to be qualified to take account of commonalities and differences in theoretical approaches that influence the construction of ideas about intervention. This type of review has most usefulness when alternative approaches are not treated as entirely distinct or oppositional. It can be used to emphasise the potential, at different stages in a conflict, for different approaches to serve complementary purposes.

An integrated framework can be employed to review whether particular understandings about intervention that maintain a conservative status quo orientation or a more radical
orientation appear more meaningful and viable with regard to a particular set of circumstances. This same type of comparison has equal relevance with regard to different 'resolutionary' processes. Examining the bases of intermediary training is a constructive way to broadly indicate their distinctive purposes. The framework of training provides an indication of how, through the scholar-practitioner nexus, a particular type of applied theory develops that enables 'resolutionary' processes to be replicated when future needs for them arise. Training frameworks will implicitly reflect a relationship between the way scholar-practitioners have treated 'resolutionary' processes as a methodology for generating ideas through this type of applied theory, how the nominated theoretical framework scopes and frames ideas and how ideas might be shaped by a particular underlying conceptual frame of reference.

**Frame of Reference of Practitioner Training - ADR**

The underlying assumption of all 'resolutionary' processes is that certain ideals and principles will be brought to bear so that those involved are ultimately responsible for and can accord legitimacy to the final outcome. The increasing trend toward the implementation of more consensual ADR processes in developed Western states maintaining complex legal and bureaucratic systems has developed primarily to promote 'alternative' processes as adjuncts to more formal, Western court-based adjudicatory procedures to settle contention. Rothman interprets the framework through which it evolved as follows:

Built in significant measure upon the evolution in labour and industrial relations...a wider field of interest-based conflict management evolved in some ways as an alternative to legalistic and litigious means of addressing disputes...Its most popular incarnation was in "principled bargaining," which was launched most fully in the early 1980's by theorists and practitioners at or affiliated to Harvard University and later sustained and promoted primarily by the Harvard-based Program on Negotiation, and widely applied to law, diplomacy, environmental disputes and business.

Processes of ADR generally represent those that the status quo itself can interpret as viable alternatives to more coercive 'official' processes through which to maintain or restore social cohesion. It attracts funding and support from judicial and public policy institutions and also from professional development organisations. Training tends to focus on how, from prior experience of applications of the processes, the principles of dispute resolution can be replicated and developed to primarily serve national interests. Thus it is most often promoted to serve as a practical alternative to judicial determinations, to assist with the resolution of inter-personal, local and regional, state and national issues.
To the extent that ADR processes allow decisions to be negotiated by the people for whom the issues are of direct concern, rather than by an arbitrator or adjudicator, they reflect a radical approach. The mediator's role as an impartial third party can be validated on the assumption of commitment to assist the parties to achieve outcomes that they can live with. This is primarily on the implicit understanding that the involved parties accord legitimacy to the overarching judicial institutions of the status quo that can ratify agreed decisions. Particularly where Western traditions prevail, these formal institutions are empowered to maintain control through authoritative power expressed through institutional procedures. 'Official' settlements are likely to have more legitimacy than decisions achieved through 'non-official' social processes where people deliberate over issues and reach decisions through consensus.

Processes of ADR are generally framed as an 'alternative' to having settlements imposed by an adjudicatory third party. Practitioners in all types of 'resolutionary' processes inevitably contend with how parties can participate in a problem-identification component so that there is a shared basis for considering problem-solving strategies. However, in ADR processes, it is more likely that there will be an assumption that if the process cannot either successfully achieve a mutually agreed resolution, there is recourse to an institutional body, such as a court, whereby ultimately a settlement can be imposed.

This means ADR processes have a relatively limited scope of application. There is a presumption that mediated outcomes can be legitimated in accordance with the pre-existing legal and legislative frameworks of the status quo. It is radical, therefore, only in the sense that it is a type of process that can serve as an 'alternative' to court-based determinations. The processes are most effective when contentious issues or disputes relate to the practicalities of distributional decision-making within a national context. There tends to be a bias toward a realist approach because ADR processes are often perceived to be those that bureaucrats and adjudicators can nominate to institute in order to develop consensus where this could be helpful to more effectively fulfil the purposes of the status quo. The training for ADR practitioners generally scopes issues in accordance with a national frame of reference. There is a bias to take as paramount the ultimate legitimacy of national legislative and judicial institutions. There are thus certain limitations on the capacity of ADR processes to deal with contention where some parties perceive the issues at stake according to a different frame of reference.
This can be illustrated in terms of the organisations through which mediation skills training is developed. The tendency is to train ADR intermediaries who already have prior professional qualifications or expertise within a specialist field that relates to some aspect of law or public policy. Training, therefore, tends to be aligned with specific substantive issues and specialist fields of expertise as they are defined within established schools of teaching and learning institutions. For instance, mediation training relating to industrial and labour issues could be aligned with commerce and business schools. Family disputes and community and neighbourhood issues would tend toward expertise generated through university and vocational training focusing on social work, law, political science or social psychology. Environmental contentions would tend toward expertise generated within geophysical science or environmental science schools, and so on.

The assumed advantage of this trend is that the intermediary's understanding of relevant substantive issues will enhance their capacity to understand the parties' issues that have to be addressed within the process. However, this is dependent on an assumption that the involved parties' perceptions of the issues generally accord with those of the political, economic and social institutions upheld by the status quo. If the involved parties are all fundamentally in accord with, say a realist approach, then the mediator's role as a neutral third party can be taken to be legitimate.

However, the disadvantage of this trend in mediation training arises when the parties' perceptions of the issues at stake are fundamentally at odds with those of the status quo. If a mediator's professional role is based on training that develops in discrete academic disciplines that take for granted a realist frame of reference, there is a possibility that their expertise maintains a bias toward a conventional status quo framing and scoping of substantive issues. This can lock disputes into a framework of understanding that prioritises their significance for the status quo and bias the mediator to perceive the criteria of success of the outcomes as those that accord with the purposes of the status quo.

Particularly with regard to the mediation of inter-personal, family and community disagreements, ADR processes can promote individual empowerment, or at least offer individuals opportunities to take greater responsibility for the resolution of issues which concern them because the processes are consensual. However, Brown & Marriott raise the point that it is doubtful they can actually change power relations:
The term ‘empowerment’ could be a misnomer: ADR processes may increase power, for example by giving parties increased knowledge and authority; but it may be more accurate to say that it facilitates their recognising and exercising their existing power.\textsuperscript{51}

The notion of empowerment may be limited to allowing individuals more control over the outcome of the dispute, so far as the parties can agree on this. To the extent that the process permits individuals to shape the final resolution of the issues, it is, at least, a means for decreasing some of the psychological trauma that can itself undermine people’s capacities to cope constructively with contention. However, it can be argued that, where there are severe power imbalances between the parties, ADR may not be empowering and may in fact be inappropriate.\textsuperscript{52}

Theory for the purpose of training ADR intermediaries tends to apply a relatively narrower frame of reference than that required for conflict resolution or conflict transformation. It has limited applicability when conflict has arisen between social entities such as states, or where certain elements of the conflict relate to social or economic processes that involve more than one state. Practitioners of ADR may have limited training to apply their skills outside of a relatively cohesive national context. In such circumstances, there is a need to address the prospect of profoundly competing conceptual frames of reference. Such circumstances are more likely to indicate that the dynamics represent a conflict rather than a dispute. This can be the case when a state itself is contending with intra-state majority/minority rights issues, or when a conflict is being expressed through ‘revolutionary’ strategies to a level that threatens the continuance of the status quo. When social contention involves different societies or cultures, a broader theoretical foundation is necessary in order to analyse and evaluate how effectively a ‘resolutionary’ process might be applied.\textsuperscript{53} The necessary level of analysis in such cases is generally beyond the scope of traditional training undertaken for ADR.

**Frame of Reference of Practitioner Training - Conflict Resolution**

The focus in this training approach is to develop and evaluate intermediaries’ capacities and skills measured against those of other intermediaries. The purpose is to develop vocational and academic qualifications and expertise based upon an intermediary's capacity to undertake their role in a wide range of social contexts, and with respect to a wide and interrelated range of substantive issues. This can be compared with the focus in ADR training where the purpose is to develop specialist intermediary capacities and skills. In that case they are evaluated in terms of their usefulness to deal with specific substantive issues such as industrial or family disputes, which would
themselves be defined according to conventional normative or functionalist theoretical constructions.

The theoretical framework for training with regard to conflict resolution needs to be more extensive because consideration has to be given to more than the substantive issues protagonists perceive to be at stake. Conflicts imply there is also disagreement about the legitimacy and fairness of pre-existing institutional procedures and mechanisms. The theoretical framework for attributing meaning to processes of conflict resolution has to be capable of incorporating perspectives to do with a set of circumstances that represent challenges to the assumptions of the status quo. For instance, the circumstances may relate to a general and widespread disparity of legitimacy and power in intra-state relations, manifesting as particular episodes of conflict symptomatic of underlying inequalities that reflect structural violence. The circumstances may otherwise relate to a sense of threat due to widespread and unsustainable environmental degradation that is broader in scope than a national context.

Theoretical frameworks underpinning an understanding of conflict resolution processes provide intermediaries with a capacity to assert that their own knowledge and authority, derived through training and experience, is a valid basis for claiming what type of radical approach is warrantable in a given set of circumstances. They may be required to clarify that their 'non-official' knowledge and authority gives them a legitimate basis for claiming what would be the most viable process, even though it is distinguishable from claims expressed through 'official' overarching institutions of the status quo. The capacity for an impartial third party to make this type of assessment can be crucial if potentially a status quo assessment does not afford contending parties adequate opportunities to reflexively evaluate the viability of 'official' processes for addressing the issues at stake. This could be highly significant when the involved parties' subjective interests and values extend beyond a national context, or there are competing perspectives that are not fully recognised as legitimate within the national context. If this were the case then an intermediary needs a basis for claiming that a more radical Track II approach is warranted on the basis that it applies a frame of reference that is broader than a nationalist perspective. It is likely that training derived only through conventional nationalist-centred normative or functionalist theoretical constructions would not incorporate the degree of theoretical complexity required to support assertions as to what type of approach is warrantable in these situations.
This discussion reinforces the idea that differences between approaches to training becomes most critical when the contentious issues at stake signify circumstances involve a social conflict rather than a mere dispute. Conflict resolution processes are usually instituted in situations that signify a greater risk of disruption to social cohesion and thus a higher level of unpredictability with respect to the direction of change. Theory that underpins the training of intermediaries to address high-stakes inter-group conflict necessarily has to take account of broader frames of reference than a nationalist perspective. The degree of uncertainty could suggest it would be unrealistic to presume that there would be ultimate recourse to have outcomes and decisions legitimated according to a pre-existing set of social norms, or through one overarching agency or political institution. If resolution of a high-stakes conflict cannot be brought about by persuading parties to draw on integrative power, the option would most likely be recourse to assert the power of coercion and force, usually through one party imposing a settlement. Contending parties could either abide by the settlement, or otherwise respond through a more radical 'revolutionary' strategy.

Training to institute non-coercive radical strategies in these circumstances will be reliant on the degree to which the legitimacy of the intermediary is demonstrable. It will be critical that prospective intermediaries can indicate the knowledge and authority that is required to intervene in circumstances where what is perceived to be at odds signifies more than a dispute that merely disrupts normal social living. While groups may demonstrate a willingness to review the way the purportedly neutral third party characterises a particular state of affairs as a conflict that requires 'non-official' intervention, they will also be concerned to develop their own bases for evaluating the third party intermediary's own knowledge and authority. The intermediary may need to demonstrate how their type of training has been applied in other situations to assist parties deal with contention. Examples of prior practice can indicate how groups might assess a prospective process as being capable of addressing the full range of contentions they seek to have addressed. The degree to which an intermediary's training takes account of competing frames of reference will be one indicator of their capacity to effectively intervene in deep-seated conflicts, and demonstrate their commitment and capacity to maintain impartiality. Thus an intermediary's training has to be sufficiently broad to allow their assessments of what constitutes the difference between a dispute and a conflict to be considered legitimate.

The comparisons between different conceptual and theoretical frames of reference so far discussed suggest that training can be a useful indicator of the knowledge and
authority practitioners develop to characterise the nature of a conflict. Their training will thus be an indication of the legitimacy of their 'non-official' basis of assessments, which may differ from 'official' assessments, as to what type of interventionist process would be most viable and appropriate to institute in particular circumstances. An important consideration that this discussion highlights is that the characteristics of a conflict can change depending on how it moves through stages. A more conservative institutional process, or an ADR strategy, may appear more viable at a stage in a conflict where it is regarded by the status quo as relatively manageable. However, at another stage, it may appear to have become profoundly more unmanageable, and more considered attention would need to be given to alternative strategies.

These discernments would be far less critical if what is at odds is being treated as a dispute. However, if circumstances are indicative of a more protracted deep-seated conflict, it becomes more critical to discern whose knowledge and authority for making assessments is taken to be legitimate. It could, for instance, be critical to compare assessments about the particular stage to which a conflict has progressed, and how it might change depending on the timing of an intervention as well as what type of intervention is instituted. It would be the breadth and the type of theory that underpins an intermediary’s training that would provide their basis for assessing the stage of a conflict at which an intervention is being planned. It will also be their basis for assessing the variable issues that are likely to be significant in the immediate context, given that these initial evaluations will be their basis for articulating the way they conceive a ‘resolutionary’ process would have an impact on the conflict. Comparative review of training frameworks can indicate the extent to which interpretations might differ with regard to the variable issues that could be more or less relevant in present and future developments. An integrated approach, which allows for comparative review of different bases for assessing the risks associated with conflict, as well as those to do with instituting an appropriate intervention strategy, is a constructive basis for assessing different interpretations of the possible directions in which a conflict might change.

Training frameworks can also be an indicator of the extent to which intermediaries actually emphasise an interest in the stages immediately preceding engagement, and the possible need to prepare individual parties for engagement with one another. In this respect training frameworks can also indicate the extent to which it is part of the intermediary’s role to assess how an understanding of the ‘resolutionary’ process itself is actually going to be conveyed to the prospective participants. This would be on the
assumption that the parties themselves, as well as the intermediary, require a workable level of understanding about such processes in order to make an informed decision as to whether they can voluntarily commit to it and participate effectively.

**Frame of Reference of Practitioner Training - Conflict Transformation**

One of the most marked distinctions between the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that inform training with regard to the three 'resolutionary' processes discussed in this chapter is that they signify practitioners actually intervene in different types of conflicts, and at different stages of a conflict. In previous discussion it has been proposed that training for intermediaries who intervene in protracted higher-stakes conflicts will need to give greater consideration to what type of intervention would be more viable at a particular stage of a conflict. Given that such conflicts entail profoundly competing interpretations and perspectives, a broader conceptual and theoretical frame of reference will be necessary as a basis for indicating at what point in the dynamics of a conflict intervention is being attempted. This idea applies equally for practitioners working in the field of conflict transformation who offer capacity-building and training programs for protagonists prior to engagement in a 'resolutionary' process.

One of the purposes underlying all 'resolutionary' processes is that practitioners assist with the formulation of a more informal yet facilitated processes that afford contending parties with improved capacity for meaningful dialogue with one another. A primary goal is to foster an approach that will allow the parties to have equal bargaining power in the process despite the likelihood that there would otherwise be disparities of power. Conflict transformation training necessarily has to take account of power disparities between groups that affect relations within or between social systems. Deep-seated protracted conflicts usually signify contention relating to majority/minority issues within a social system, or contention between groups who identify with different social systems within a geographic region. The theoretical basis of training must therefore maintain an interest in the characteristics of conflicts that are more indeterminate and uncertain than either a dispute requiring an ADR process or a conflict where an immediate intervention is sought through a process of conflict resolution.

A focal issue in theoretical constructions relating to pre-engagement forms of intervention will be to articulate the foundations upon which an assertion can legitimately be made that there is a need for preliminary intervention prior to the stage where those involved embark on direct inter-group engagement. It is the significance
of the preliminary Track III stages in conflict transformation which will comprise the discussion in the subsequent section.

**How Training Gives Validity and Legitimacy to Different ‘Resolutionary’ Processes**

The foregoing comparative analysis shows that each of the ‘resolutionary’ processes outlined represents a radical type of intervention that can be most meaningfully explained according to a particular theoretical framework or model. Theoretical constructions applied for the purposes of training practitioners may vary in terms of their frame of reference. Nevertheless, there are likely to be certain common features and principles which underlie the role that practitioners serve, which, coupled with practical capacity derived through experience, enhances their competence to fulfil the practitioner role. Cumulatively, the body of knowledge derived through interpreting the roles of these practitioners in diverse social contexts affords a replicable basis on which to build expertise with broad general relevance.

However, the primary purpose of this chapter is to indicate that the processes also have distinguishing features that are reflected in the theoretical frameworks that support the training of practitioners. One distinction is the extent to which a theoretical construction is required to frame and scope issues in relation to a more general overall context. There is variability with regard to the requirement to attribute significance to both matters that are directly relevant in *particularist* terms as well as matters that have relevance in more *generalist* terms. There is also variability in the extent to which theoretical explanation is necessary to justify why and how a practitioner becomes involved in an intervention at a particular stage in a conflict and under whose auspices they may become involved. Fisher articulates this problem in the following terms:

> A... notion in the current third-party literature is the idea that not all conflicts at all points in time will be amenable to a single and unified method of intervention. In other words, it is important to carefully consider all key elements of the conflict in question before surmising which form of intervention is likely to be most useful in moving the parties toward settlement and resolution.

> The defining characteristics of the context of the conflict need to be considered in the light of the question as to which type of third-party might intervene in the conflict most effectively and in which manner. Attention also needs to be paid to the stage of the conflict, which can range from initial expression and management through escalation to stalemate and exhaustion, and hopefully to negotiation, settlement, and post settlement. The role of violence in rendering conflicts protracted and seemingly intractable raises particularly difficult problems for interveners. This type of thinking, which seeks to adapt method to certain aspects of reality, appears contrary to much traditional practice, especially in the area of mediation, which persists in applying the same medicine to what may be widely disparate problems.54

**Theoretical Attention to the Stage of a Conflict at which Intervention is Instituted**

Normative or functionalist theoretical constructions would more likely be regarded as adequate for defining the purposes of ADR. This would be on the assumption that the
The contentions with which intermediaries become involved are disputes occurring within an otherwise relatively cohesive national context. While each ADR process must concern itself with developing an understanding about the background to the contention as an integral part of the problem-identification component of the process, training most strongly focuses on what occurs once the process of engagement is initiated. The processes are most often instituted through the protagonists being referred to a mediation agency either directly by a court or through the protagonists themselves instituting the process as an alternative to having their issues dealt with by a court. Therefore the primary emphasis is to indicate in the theoretical construction the way in which an ADR process might deal with particular protagonists' issues that would otherwise be dealt with by a court. In broad terms, both the consensual process and the determinative process would be taking place within a broad social structure which, because of its relative cohesiveness, would take account of the same range of variable issues and apply the same broad frame of reference.

There is a repertoire of practices that fulfil preliminary functions in relation to ADR processes. However, theoretical constructions relating to conflict resolution and conflict transformation could not necessarily presume that the non-coercive consensus-building processes they promote would scope variable issues and apply the same frames of reference as those that would apply in a conservative status quo approach. The latter are founded on a presumption that conflicts are far more indeterminate than disputes. They would entail a far greater complexity of variable issues and greater differences with respect to the range and size of parties involved, power differentials between them and, thus, the likelihood of profoundly competing frames of reference and competing perceptions about the legitimacy of formal institutions.

Protracted conflicts can be characterised as cultures of non-cooperation that incur the risk of becoming progressively more violent and unsustainable and, thus, there is a greater potential for them to undermine tolerable degrees of social cohesion. In circumstances where there is a higher level of threat to social security it cannot be presumed that all those involved would perceive they have recourse to have matters settled appropriately or justly through an overarching judicial or legislative institution should a 'resolutionary' process fail to realise a mutually satisfactory outcome. Theory that supports training to intervene in these higher-stakes conflicts must maintain the capacity to situate the immediate circumstances within a theoretical framework that can systematically take account of the broader context. Thus an important aspect of applied conflict resolution theory is capacity to specify the point in the conflict at which
interventions could be crucial as well as what type would seem more viable. The training of both conflict resolution and conflict transformation practitioners is likely to incorporate theoretical ideas generated through descriptive and explanatory theory as much as through applied theory. Both aspects of theory will help to establish the knowledge and authority that gives scholar-practitioners a legitimate basis for assessing the features that make it warrantable to intervene through a particular strategy at a particular stage in a conflict.

The purposes of intervention in high-stakes conflicts through a process of conflict resolution or conflict transformation would not be as prescribed as those expressed in relation to ADR. The purposes of ADR processes are more often directly aligned with or fulfil relatively similar functions to those instituted through national judicial or legislative processes. The other two more radical types of intervention are often instituted in situations where there is a far greater level of uncertainty, risk and instability. Their purposes have to be couched in terms of a need for protagonists to review the dynamics operating within the social system overall to take account of the relative unpredictability with respect to the direction of change. This level of theoretical complexity is required to convey a more comprehensive understanding of the need to review optional strategies and provide the justification for support and investment in exploring the viability of non-coercive strategies. One significant reason why these theoretical constructions must clearly indicate the intended purpose of intervention is that 'non-official' interventions are not necessarily instituted under the auspices of political or a legal entities. Practitioners are far more reliant on theoretical constructions to articulate the legitimacy of the purpose of 'non-official' interventions.

Particularly with conflict transformation, explanation with regard to its purpose has to be sufficiently comprehensive to allow practitioners to convince protagonists why neither a Track I strategy nor a Track II problem-solving strategy alone would be sufficient as a form of intervention to address complex protracted social conflict. Thus on the one hand theory becomes the basis for making a case that an immediate attempt to institute a strategy requiring direct engagement between the parties may not prove to be efficacious. One the other hand, it is needed as a basis for making a case that it is in the parties’ own interests to make resources available to support the institution of Track III processes. The latter can be crucial, given that support and resources might need to come from ‘official’ bodies as well as from ‘non-official’ sources such as NGOs. This support would only be forthcoming if the protagonists can conceive that Track III processes are sometimes a necessary precursor to ultimately engaging with one
another in a process of mediated problem-solving. The validation of the need to sometimes institute Track III capacity-building prior to participants' direct engagement will be further elaborated in Section 4.

Need for Supporting Theory When Reporting Outcomes of Intervention

The theoretical constructions that support the training of intermediaries will also be a basis for developing capacity to report on the outcomes of interventionist processes. Given the voluntary nature of 'resolutionary' processes, appropriate reporting that reflects some degree of impartiality or independence will be a basis for establishing trust and continued willingness to participate. Establishing trust usually requires a combination of the scholar-practitioner's practical capacity to fulfil the intermediary role and theoretical capacity if they assume the role of a scholar-reporter to attribute appropriate meaning to the process. Explanation may be required in particularist terms, to indicate how developments and outcomes within a specific process have been framed. However, it may also be necessary to report in more generalist terms, to indicate how a particular process is scoped and relates to the broader context in which the issues at stake are embedded. By this means it is possible to acknowledge the overall complexity and scale of the conflict as well as the significance of the actual intervention. The validity of supporting theory will be a basis for expressing the legitimacy of the way in which a scholar-practitioner intermediary who also fulfils a reporting role characterises the conflict. This validity may also be the basis for asserting that the conflict cannot be addressed through immediate engagement between the parties in a Track II process but that, instead, the process may have to be undertaken in incremental stages, beginning with Track III processes.

This is not as great a consideration in theory supporting ADR training because the outcomes of a dispute resolution process may seem to be of immediate concern only to the parties directly involved. However, there may be a requirement to report to the judicial or legislative institution through which the parties were referred, or otherwise there may be a requirement to report if outcomes need to be ratified through a formal institution. In this sense, reporting with respect to ADR only has to take account of what transpires at the particularist level, as the generalist level is usually presumed to be the national legislative and judicial framework as it operates within a relatively cohesive national social system. In the case of an ADR process, if participants are dissatisfied with the way in which it is intended to report on the process, there is recourse to have a court put forward a more determinative way of both settling and reporting on outcomes.
However, in circumstances involving high-stakes confrontation it will be more critical to report both in terms of the *particularist* level, and to also in more *generalist* terms so that outcomes are qualified in relation to a broader context. The indeterminate nature of higher-stakes conflicts can signify either that they represent a direct challenge within a national context or otherwise that they represent the influence of social forces operating beyond that domain. This suggests that reporting must take account of a greater level of unpredictability should groups become dissatisfied with a process, and seek recourse to have matters settled through more coercive or forceful means. Such circumstances will therefore require a more complex supporting theoretical construction to consider how reporting should be framed. To a greater extent than third parties that conduct ‘official’ conservative processes, intermediaries are more heavily reliant on theoretical ideas acquired through training as their basis for articulating the purpose and the outcomes of particular ‘resolutionary’ processes. The extent to which those directly involved, and third parties, are able to validate the reporting about a 'non-official' process will have a significant influence on perceptions as to its efficacy, transparency and legitimacy. This can be critical if the parties involved are seeking support, such as financial resources, from other quarters to maintain ongoing developments through this type of non-coercive approach.

Discussion in this section highlights that theory generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus will be equally critical when it is necessary to convey ideas about the risks and limitations associated with more indeterminate 'non-official' strategies. This is particularly so with regard to circumstances where to begin with direct engagement between the parties would actually hinder or undermine the manageability and the sustainability of this approach. Theoretical constructions serve as an important basis for articulating how and why there are cases which require incremental developmental stages, described as Track III processes, prior to direct engagement.

**SECTION 3: USING AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO ASSESS THE VIABILITY OF OPTIONAL STRATEGIES**

Discussion so far indicates that besides using an integrated framework to compare different theoretical interpretations of 'official' and 'non-official' strategies it can be as useful for highlighting the degree to which 'resolutionary' processes can themselves be construed to maintain conservative or radical orientations. The fact that 'non-official' processes do not necessarily follow prescribed precedents contributes to the problem
of how contending groups might give consideration to such strategies and take them to be as viable as a more conservative 'official' determinative strategy. An argument developed in this chapter is that there is a stronger reliance on theoretical models as a basis for intermediaries to claim why one type of 'resolutionary' process rather than another should be instituted in a specific set of circumstances. Comparing alternative ways of theoretically interpreting such processes helps to more precisely identify and clarify the characteristics and the relevance of different 'resolutionary' processes in relation to one another.

However, as well as using a comparative approach to support claims as to why one type of 'resolutionary' process is more appropriate, it can also be used to explain why a different type would be less appropriate. It can be a basis for showing that instituting inappropriate processes actually contributes to undermining the perceived validity of 'resolutionary' processes in general. The theoretical framework used to support the training of intermediaries who intervene in more indeterminate high-stakes conflicts can serve as one important basis for assessing and articulating the potential risk that conflicts can be exacerbated and become more polarised, rather than being resolved, if an inappropriate intervention is instituted. A process could be undermined due to a failure to initially appreciate the extent to which the protagonists hold profoundly competing subjective interpretations of the entailed issues. For instance, it could be presumed that all that is required is an ADR process, which would be represented in Functowicz and Ravetz’ model (see Fig. 13, Chapter Three) as 'applied science' which generates 'professional consultancy' drawing as much on normative or functionalist theory as it does on conflict theory. However, in actuality, the scope of the problem may be beyond the capacity of a typical ADR process to fully address. An ADR intermediary may recognise the complexity of inter-relating issues but in the interests of pursuing their professional role, they may maintain a focus only on the particular issues that they have been specifically commissioned to address within the process. There is a presupposition in theoretical constructions relating to ADR that if resolution cannot be achieved by the parties themselves, then matters in contention can be referred back to be settled through the processes of 'official' legislative or judicial bodies that ultimately support ADR processes.

However, trust in radical processes that seek to avert undue force and coercion can be undermined and taken to be unworkable if there are constraints on identifying the full range of entailed issues. There could be perceptions that such processes are employed to deal only with relatively peripheral issues and actually sideline attention
Thus a factor that can undermine processes dealing with deep-seated conflicts is a failure to formally acknowledge the extent of the conflict. This idea emphasises that scholar-practitioners have to demonstrate not only a commitment to principles of neutrality but also to those of transparency.

Chapter Four stressed the idea that it can be constructive to treat the components of problem-identification and problem-solving as relatively discrete aspects of a process. In 'resolutionary' processes protagonists are initially encouraged to subjectively interpret the range of variable issues that they perceive are at stake in a conflict. It is proposed that 'non-official' processes are less likely to be undermined if it is clearly acknowledged that it may not necessarily be possible to immediately resolve all the issues identified in the stage of problem-identification. The transparency of the process is more likely to be assured when there is qualifying explanation in the reporting process as to why certain issues initially raised could not be addressed because they would have to be dealt with at a different time or through a different type of process. For instance, it could be that they require consideration according to a different scale of understanding or according to a different frame of reference to an extent that precludes them from being immediately addressed. Such qualifying explanations in a report can help to ensure that even matters that cannot be addressed are acknowledged to indicate that ultimately they have a significant bearing on the conflict and how ultimately it needs to be settled, resolved or transformed. Separating problem-identification from problem-solving means there is a clearer framework for explanations to indicate the relationship between those issues that a specific process is able to address and those that are not. This level of transparency can contribute to a sense of assurance that specific problem-solving strategies can be clearly and qualitatively understood in relation to the range of issues that require resolution, even those that cannot be immediately addressed. The extent to which parties can maintain a continuing commitment to non-coercive strategies often depends on their perception of the transparency and appropriateness of both the process and any explanations about it made by third parties.

The degree of complexity and uncertainty associated with inter-group conflicts compared with disputes is reflected in the degree to which theory that supports training in conflict resolution and conflict transformation is conceptually broader than that of ADR. The associated theory has to maintain a capacity to take systematic account of diverse subjective interpretations of issues, even when time available, funding or other constraints mean that it is possible to only address particular issues through
incremental stages of intervention. Intermediaries involved with high-stakes protracted conflicts are more likely to need to transparently indicate, both within the process and in explanations developed with respect to it, the extent to which the parties have only been able to address certain immediate concerns. They would also need to specifically indicate that, given the inherent uncertainty and unpredictability associated with the circumstances, a comprehensive sustainable resolution might only be achieved if all the parties are prepared to make a longer-term commitment to finding solutions through non-coercive strategies. This could be necessary to indicate how a specific intervention relates to and is part of a series of incremental stages in a transformative process. In this way, there would still be incentive to deal with immediately achievable goals, because they are qualified and can be appreciated as outcomes in a stage toward achieving the ultimate goal, which is to more fully address deep-seated core issues.

The theoretical understanding that supports a scholar-practitioner to provide this type of explanation are more likely be represented in Functowicz and Ravetz' model (Fig. 13, Chapter Three) as 'postnormal science.' The type of theoretical constructions generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus would provide a basis for articulating that it is the non-coercive characteristics of 'resolutionary' processes that significantly influence why intermediaries gain compliance from protagonists to participate in this type of intervention. If there is lack of assurance that sustainable solutions could ultimately emerge without recourse to coercive force, groups can be more inclined to maintain entrenched positions, or seek to prolong the conflict through more adversarial confrontationalist 'revolutionary' strategies rather than seek to moderate it.

SECTION 4: VALIDATING COMMUNITY CAPACITY-BUILDING PRIOR TO VOLUNTARY ENGAGEMENT IN 'RESOLUTIONARY' PROCESSES

This section further elaborates the argument developed in this chapter which is that 'non-official' practitioners are strongly reliant on theoretical models as a basis for developing the knowledge and authority they require to fulfil their intermediary role effectively. Their capacity develops as much through training as it does through the development of personal attributes and prior experience. The relatively unprecedented nature of 'resolutionary' processes signifies a consistent need in all cases for some sense of acknowledgment by the parties who voluntarily enter into the process that practitioners have a legitimate capacity, or competency, based on certain established fundamental principles, that qualifies them to fulfil the facilitative role. It is the parties'
mutual recognition and legitimation of the facilitator's knowledge and authority that underpins their acceptance of the 'non-official' process. In other words, the process is dependent on the parties jointly acknowledging that, potentially, a non-coercive 'resolutionary' process may be more satisfactory than recourse to an 'official' process where the third party maintains an authoritative role as an adjudicator.

Discussion has so far stressed that to even reach a point where groups would consider voluntary participation in a 'resolutionary' process, they would have to be able to conceptually appreciate why this type of intervention could be more viable than other strategies. There would have to be an acknowledgment that it is a fundamentally different type of process because it promotes constructive confrontation over adversarial, coercive or violent confrontation, where each party's position primarily emphasises self-interest. ‘Resolutionary’ approaches promote the parties to try and re-frame their interests and together explore the potential for gains that are mutually acceptable. Gains could be framed as improvements in inter-group relationships or at least an improvement in the way that groups engage with one another. This implies the parties are willing to recognise and acknowledge that outcomes are being sought through the exertion of the power of persuasion, or integrative power, (see Boulding's 'Three Faces of Power' model in Fig 1, Chapter One) rather than the power of force to impose a settlement. Coercion and force can be the arbiter of power applied in 'official' processes because the adjudicator is empowered to impose a final decision. Coercion and force would likewise be the arbiters of power in radical 'revolutionary' strategies, which are often undertaken as a means to counter an imposed authoritative settlement. To be in a position to make choices, parties must necessarily be able to understand and articulate what could potentially be involved in changing present power relations if they were to undertake optional strategies.

While this discussion suggests that in all cases where people are contemplating taking a 'resolutionary' approach there will be general uncertainty as to the viability of optional strategies, this is less of a critical consideration with respect to ADR. Processes of ADR are usually instituted through a referral from a court, or as an alternative to recourse to a court. There is, therefore, a more clearly defined point of engagement, and a much clearer definitive purpose. This means there is usually less of a perceived need for individuals or groups embarking on the process to first consolidate their own understanding or alleviate anxieties as to the way this strategy might deal with their issues before they engage with the intermediary. This is often because the courts themselves sanction the processes. An assumption can to some extent also be made
that the credentials of intermediaries are monitored according to national standards.\textsuperscript{57} Even so, practitioners will usually place a strong emphasis on preliminary explanation in order to establish with the parties their concurrence as to how the process could or should be undertaken. If there were an agreement to proceed, the process would necessarily have to start with a \textit{problem-identification} phase to identify the range of substantive issues. If, in this component or in the \textit{problem-solving} component, parties are unable to reach adequate consensus to make the process viable, there is an underlying assumption that there is recourse for matters to be dealt with through the authority of an 'official' institution using a determinative process.

However, this underlying sense that there is recourse to have matters alternatively determined or settled by a body holding authority commonly recognised by the parties is not necessarily the case in higher-stakes protracted inter-group conflicts that are more complex, dynamic and uncertain than disputes. There are likely to be underlying unresolved core issues (as set out in Fig. 18), episodes of which may be more immediately identifiable and evidently in need of immediate resolution than others. Processes of conflict resolution and conflict transformation are likely to be more efficacious than ADR to deal with complex high-stakes conflicts. Thus they need a broader framework of understanding with respect to supporting theory, one that is more akin to 'postnormal science' expressed in the model developed by Functowicz and Ravetz (Fig. 13, Chapter Three).\textsuperscript{58} The framework has to take account of a wider range of uncertainties, some of which relate to the legitimacy and authority of governing institutions, that could not be accommodated within a normative or functionalist 'applied science' framework. In the case of ADR accepted models of practice are often developed under the auspices of the same political, legal or bureaucratic institutions that explain and guide the conduct of 'official' processes. However, the most pertinent models to explain and guide the conduct of conflict resolution and conflict transformation processes are derived from scholarly accounts or published reports, as to how processes dealing with a high level of risk and uncertainty have been carried through elsewhere. These 'postnormal science' models would be predicated on the argument that it may no longer be possible for formerly accepted notions such as social norms, values, expressions of power and appropriate governance to be taken for granted. They would imply a need to develop a revised basis of analysis to justify why a multi-track approach might be needed that gives equal significance to processes emphasising non-coercive forms of power alongside those that emphasise coercive or forceful power. This type of model would in turn be the basis for establishing why this would have a significant bearing on the quality of ongoing inter-group relationships.
However, in the second place, there would also need to be a theoretically constructed argument to specifically indicate how this shift in emphasis in terms of power could come about. In processes of conflict resolution and conflict transformation, supporting theory has to take into account the greater degree of complexity of problematic inter-group relationships, and in the case of conflict transformation to stress that they might only be transformed in incremental stages. As the matrix developed by Curle and modified by Lederach (Fig. 19) suggests, an ultimate goal of the process needs to be envisaged, such as the development of a well-founded and ongoing 'resolutionary' transformative process. Yet at the same time the theoretical construction of conflict transformation has to give equal consideration to the possibility that, with respect to circumstances involving deep-seated protracted conflict, these ultimate goals could not be established on the basis that there are readily identifiable possible solutions. In fact, the theoretical model would need to convey the idea that the first stages of conflict transformation would be a requirement to develop a clearer articulation of the underlying core issues.

Thus there would be little point in the theoretical constructions of conflict transformation only emphasising the role of a mediator, mainly exerting the power of persuasion, facilitating in an interventionist process. The realities of the actual conflict could signify a profound lack of social cohesion due to the parties' polarised attitudes and hostile behaviours toward one another. Such circumstances could suggest that there was not common support for or faith in pre-existing forms of institutional authority. This would be due to perceptions that such institutions could not represent common identities of interests. The presumption of institutions being able to represent certain common identities of interests would more likely be the case in the 'applied science' theoretical constructions that support ADR processes undertaken within national contexts. In the case of conflict resolution or conflict transformation, the circumstances would more likely reflect that profoundly contradictory social forces are contributing to the contradiction. They would be prompting people to deal with a relatively uncertain or undesired state of affairs through strategies whose purposes would be to forcefully bring about change in existing institutional structures and relationships. High-stakes protracted inter-group conflicts can thus be represented as ideological contests of ideas about the legitimacy of 'official' conservative institutional processes as the means through which to realise desired changes. In fact, because protracted conflict itself diminishes social cohesion, it has the propensity to radically alter or overtake groups'
capacity to maintain routine processes, due to the strategic need to institute either offensive or defensive means to deal with the conflict.

This section now focuses on issues that need specific consideration when using a conflict transformation model to support a claim that capacity-building programs could be crucial to the parties ultimately making an informed decision to participate in a 'resolutionary' process.

**Theory Serving to Validate Claims that Groups Need Capacity-Building Prior to Direct Engagement in a 'Resolutionary' Process**

As well as theory derived through the practice of 'resolutionary' processes being a source of replicable knowledge to further enhance the practical competence of intermediaries, it can also be the basis for legitimating a need for processes to be undertaken prior to parties directly engaging in a 'resolutionary' process. The present discussion focuses on the need to articulate the *basis of legitimacy* of claims in both ideological and theoretical terms in order that prospective parties can fully appreciate the ultimate purpose of a 'resolutionary' process. Its articulation through this channel would be the basis for prospective parties to make evaluations about what they might realistically expect by way of outcomes if they opt to focus on applying the power of persuasion in this way. It provides a basis for parties to compare this strategy in relation to the purposes and outcomes of optional strategies that apply the power of force and coercion that are more likely to be articulated through the channel of political institutions.

Theory that has evolved as an outcome of the scholar-practitioner nexus relating to processes of conflict transformation has necessitated the development of a substantive basis of explanation as to *why* 'resolutionary' processes may not necessarily immediately fulfil parties' expectations. This type of explanation could only be generated through 'postnormal science' theory as a basis for indicating that, given the uncertainties associated with high-stakes protracted conflicts, a 'resolutionary' process on its own would be unlikely to bring about mutually satisfactory sustainable change. Theoretical constructions would have to emphasise the idea that there are no immediately identifiable solutions, but that there is a likelihood that solutions could come about through incremental transitional stages, and that they can be conceived to include Track III capacity-building programs. This broader theoretical approach is necessary to support and validate the need for the development of the parties' capacities to conceptualise and evaluate the viability of voluntarily participating in a
Track II 'resolutionary' process. For such a goal to be conceptualised as a way of achieving satisfactory long-term outcomes, theoretical constructions would have to put forward explanation as to why such programs were necessary. This explanation would be radical, compared with more conventional theoretical explanations based on certain established and taken-for-granted norms and values. Theoretical constructions would have to provide their own set of reasons, such as those expressed through the *idealistic* paradigm, for asserting a need for parties to have prior opportunity to deliberate about two relatively distinct matters. Firstly, *how* such processes could be effectively undertaken and, secondly, *why* the parties would need both practical and psychological preparation prior to prospective engagement between them in a 'resolutionary' process.

These ideas stress the need for such explanations to come from a 'non-official' source, the most notable example used in this thesis being knowledge and authority upheld as legitimate in scientific discourse. It is distinguishable from more 'official' political discourse that would have its own bases for establishing why prospective participants may require an opportunity to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of alternative strategies in relation to one another. The theoretical constructions of conflict transformation have to indicate that, without capacity for parties to make comparative evaluations of optional strategies, there would be consequent uncertainty and ambiguity as to the overall purposes of different strategies, particularly those that can be differentiated as being either 'official' and 'non-official' strategies. These conceptual ideas have to be developed within a theoretical framework capable of indicating how change could possibly come about in circumstances where a conflict has eroded a sense of stability or there are indications that radical change is called for with respect to structural arrangements.

A case would have to be argued that sustainable change may not necessarily be brought about simply by resorting to previously taken-for-granted institutional mechanisms, which are theoretically explained through conventional normative or functionalist scientific approaches that are more akin to 'applied science' (Fig. 13, Chapter Three). It could also be necessary to argue that comparative review is a constructive way to signify how they differ from more radical 'post-normal' theoretical constructions for expressing ideas about the sort of *power* community capacity-building programs foster to bring about change, and through what channels such power could be directed. The point that would be stressed is that explanations about power could not be limited to those usually channelled through conventional political mechanisms and normative or functionalist constructions to explain the way 'official' institutions exert
power. Explanations generated and channelled through 'postnormal' conflict transformation theory are likely to have a significantly different basis for expressing the type of power that is exerted if parties voluntary commit to non-coercive 'resolutionary' processes. Theoretical constructions to explain the purposes of community capacity-building and training programs, where the preferred outcome would be a heightened awareness of the potential for realising the goal of long-term sustainable change through a 'resolutionary' process, will be further discussed at a later stage in this section.

The immediate focus is to consider the question of what sort of power community capacity-building programs foster. When circumstances prompt consideration of non-coercive approach in order to change inter-group relationships through constructive confrontation rather than adversarial or violent confrontation, the processes involved would most likely have to be conceived to be relatively unprecedented. This would also mean that all those who might prospectively participate would be relatively unfamiliar or unlikely to have considered strategies with a stronger focus on the viability of applying integrative power in order to generate a consensual non-coercive approach. Groups would thus need theoretical constructions to provide a model that would assist them to comprehend the ideological basis upon which 'resolutionary' processes are generally founded. An idealist conceptual framework would be viable as a basis for indicating the way in which such processes emphasise a different form of power from that generally applied in more conventional realist-based political processes, or in 'revolutionary' processes. Without first developing a conceptual sense of what type of power would drive the process, prospective participants would have virtually no incentive to direct their energies towards its formulation.

This discussion emphasises the importance of theoretically articulating ideas relating to instituting change through different forms of power. It has so far been established that 'resolutionary' processes emphasise integrative power as an option to applying the power of coercion and force. Particularly with respect to circumstances where conflicts are protracted and deep-seated, it becomes more critical to be able to comparatively examine bases of explanation about what forms of power could drive alternative strategies. The more radical idealist-based theoretical constructions of conflict transformation are likely to suggest that firstly if 'resolutionary' processes are to work in practice then there is a potential requirement for those involved to step outside of familiar social and institutional arrangements and conventions. Secondly, they are likely to suggest a need to review and consider how the notion of power can be
articulated in conceptual and theoretical terms and how this supports particular explanations about the driving forces of different interventionist strategies. These ideas are raised to emphasise why it is necessary to take a comparative approach to review the capacity of conventional realist-based theory and that which is more idealist-based to fully explore and express ideas about what alternative forms of power could be mustered if ‘resolutionary’ strategies are to be conceptualised as viable options in a multi-track approach.

Kenneth Boulding’s conceptual understanding of ‘three faces of power’ (see Fig. 1, Chapter One) can serve as a model for portraying how different forms of power can operate dynamically in relation to one another to maintain relatively cohesive and stable social living. However, because the model emphasises both positive and negative elements of each form, it is equally relevant as a model for portraying how the dynamics of power might be operating in circumstances where relationships are asymmetric, uncertain or polarised. Just as it can represent who holds power in a cohesive society, it can also represent people’s aspirations to change, or be released from, the way authoritative power is applied, or to challenge who should hold ‘power over’ others. Similarly it can represent aspirations to change how people should maintain ‘power to’ undertake certain economic activity. The model can signify that the underlying ideas about what change is necessary or desired are not necessarily generated simply by those who presently hold authoritative positions or those directing particular exchange mechanisms. They are as likely to be generated through the third form, through what Boulding describes as integrative power, whereby people affiliate and engage with one another in a very wide range of social interactions. It is through this form of power that a sense of personal identity is generated or diminished through the events that shape peoples’ attitudes and behaviours toward one another, and through which they perceive themselves to be ‘with’ or ‘against’ others. Feelings and perceptions of others that become intensely negative reflect a polarised community or society. Integrative power can be a basis for explaining both ideological as well as manifest material struggles played out between people in order to determine the value and legitimacy which could or should be accorded to authoritative or economic arrangements, and in what way people may aspire to change them. Boulding’s model therefore is useful for theoretically conceptualising that integrative power is the key focus of practitioners undertaking Track III capacity-building programs, but that this necessarily has to be understood in relation to other forms of power, such as authoritative power and economic power.
However, a further model is set out Fig. 22 to indicate that it is equally significant to conceptualise power arrangements hierarchically. At different stages in a social conflict, there is likely to be a predominant group with capacity to assert more authoritative power, and most likely hold significant sway over economic power, than another.

![Hierarchical Power Arrangements](image)

Fig. 22: Power arrangements represented hierarchically - adapted from Miall's model of multitrack conflict resolution (1999: 20)

The two models illustrate different ways in which the concept of power can be represented. In very simplified forms, Boulding's model highlights the quality of different types of power that individuals can exert to settle, resolve or transform conflict. The model adapted from Miall highlights the relative degree of power that people perceive that they hold and could exert according to their present placement within a hierarchical system. This is a more critical factor in conflicts where the degree of power is profoundly asymmetrical.

The two models together are useful to conceive that initially there is likely to be a greater need to institute Track III strategies which focus on assisting those who feel themselves to be more acutely disempowered and disadvantaged. The institution of programs at the grassroots level could be an evident necessity because of the way that the core issues entailed in the conflict (see Fig. 18) have negatively impacted on people's relative position within the structure in terms of political, economic and social power arrangements. Burton argues that circumstances involving deep-seated protracted conflict with high levels of polarisation and hostility are indicative of social dynamics where a group's fundamental human needs are not being met. He proposes that these needs cannot be contained by socialisation processes and in many cases people will resort to forceful and violent confrontation when other efforts to have them
met fail to bring about a change in prevailing structural arrangements. Boulding's model is useful for conceiving that there would be challenges to authoritative arrangements and arrangements relating to the means of economic exchange. However, it can be equally useful for conceiving that there could also be a high level of polarisation without there necessarily being overt hostility in inter-group relationships. People who feel that they are disempowered and their fundamental needs are not being met may not necessarily conceive that they have the capacity to bring about change in political and economic arrangements. In this case, the violence may only manifest as structural violence.

Capacity-building programs promoting non-coercive means to realise social change are more likely to be initiated with those who feel most disconnected from those holding authority and control over the use of and distribution of resources. Power disparities can indicate that grassroots groups have been denied opportunity to directly engage in cross-sectoral or cross-cultural participatory processes, or that they have become heavily dependent on advocates or managers to oversee issues on their behalf with top-level leaders. Therefore, they are more likely to need greater assistance to develop capacity to directly put forward their own understandings and positions with regard to the issues at stake.

Nevertheless, conflict transformation theory has to clearly articulate that there would be a consistency of purpose inherent in capacity-building programs at whatever social level they were instituted, and irrespective of how people presently maintain their sense of identity in ongoing political, economic or social arrangements and interactions. Expressing this concept is crucial to reflect that all groups, who could prospectively engage in processes promoting the power of persuasion over the power of force or coercion, could need to consider new capacities to conceptualise what would be entailed in engagement in a non-coercive integrative process.

Hierarchical understandings of power are useful for conceptualising present relationships between groups. They provide a basis for conceiving that, despite present disparities of power, a 'resolutionary' process could ultimately afford groups opportunity to participate in an integrative process which at least holds out the possibility of more equitable bargaining power. Boulding's model emphasises that, to conceive of the option of a 'resolutionary' interventionist strategy, all parties ultimately could need to develop new capacities and a new sense of 'power with' others, expressed for example through more respectful attitudes and behaviours. It would be
through such a transformational process that consideration could be given to how more cohesive integrated social arrangements could come about. A heightened awareness would have to be developed to conceive how changes in *attitudes* and *behaviours* could contribute to overcoming *contradiction* through the transformation of asymmetrical relationships and the development of processes of reconciliation.

Thus a major focus of capacity-building programs would be to promote the fostering of self-understanding, and understanding about others, as well as an understanding about the conflict and how it might be addressed. Conflicts are often defined as contests about authoritative power or contests about economic power but Boulding’s model stresses that they also have to be appreciated as being equally influenced by *attitudes* and *behaviour* relating to issues such as respect and recognition. In order for *attitudes* and *behaviours* to change, certain values may need to be re-framed as values that groups might ultimately come to perceive that they hold in common, which have in this thesis been summarised as *ideals* relating to *well-being*, *harmonies of interests* and *sustainability*. They can be appreciated as the elements reflecting the positive aspects of integrative power. It is the negative forms that create enemies, alienate people from one another and negatively alter perceptions of personal worth. Protracted deep-seated conflicts, while inevitably played out in terms of authoritative power and economic power, are still most generally described as identity-based conflicts because a core source of *contradiction* is an incompatibility or friction between people who identify with different ethnic, cultural and sectoral groups. Thus Track III strategies can be conceptualised as fostering *capacity* for self-development and self-awareness, as a basis for conceiving how the power of persuasion and integration could change relationship patterns. The purpose in doing so would be to bring about a more constructive engagement between parties as a basis for considering changes in hierarchies of power.

The present discussion relating to Track III strategies has relevance to certain ideas first raised in Chapter Two with respect to both a practical and theoretical understanding of the concept of violent conflict in terms of its relationship with that of peace. Scholars in the field of peace research have sought to develop alternative frameworks so that there is not sole reliance on conventional *realist*-based normative or functionalist frameworks as a basis for interpreting violent conflict, and how and through which forms of agency it can be changed. The primary focus in the *realist* approach tends to be that of articulating the interests of either predominant or subordinate groups involved in a conflict in term of hegemonic political or economic
power. This means that the primary focus is on groups' present interests and on their present capacities. Marxist frameworks have conventionally been cited as the most useful comparative basis for explaining the reasons for violent social change. These approaches tend to be underpinned by a presumption that violent 'revolutionary' strategies have been, or will be, the inevitable recourse of oppressed subordinated groups. Violent revolution is presumed to be the means through which oppressive elites are to be overcome to realise a change in the way political or economic power is organised within a social system.

However, the concept of the development of new capacities to change structures maintained through structural violence or to change hostile attitudes or violent behaviours can also be expressed through idealist-based theoretical constructions that have emerged in peace research. They can serve as useful alternative bases of comparison in an integrated framework because their overall focus is not necessarily to privilege specific individuals or social groups who could be identified as the most significant agents through which new capacities could develop to bring about social change. The theoretical constructions relating to Track III strategies can emphasise that, even though they are more often initiated at the grassroots level, this does not of itself represent a privileging of one realm of human activity and agency as more significant than another in terms of ultimately influencing social transformation. The theoretical approach of conflict transformation emphasises the need for capacity to bring about change in all three forms of power rather than simply altering the structures of authoritative or economic power. In this framing, capacity-building undertaken at one level needs to be construed to be just one potential avenue for influencing an overall capacity toward social transformation.

Thus theoretical frameworks relating to training and awareness-building or conscientization to promote integrative social change are more constructive when they emphasise the conceptual idea that they are equally significant and relevant for a range of parties rather than for specific parties. Developing this idea overcomes the implication that they are primarily for the benefit of those affiliated with more powerful or less powerful groups. This conceptual idea can highlight that the programs are equally relevant for those who presently maintain authoritative forms of power in the more powerful institutions of the status quo, as well as those who are seeking to be released from some form of dominance relationship that reflects structural violence. It makes allowance to conceive that social change is capable of emerging through radical strategies initiated at different levels. For instance, a radical strategy could be
considered as a more viable option than a conservative strategy implemented from the top-level, or promoted and supported through the middle-level, or otherwise at grassroots level. When circumstances signify that conflict is precipitating adversarial or forceful confrontation which represents a challenge to the existing status quo, new institutional capacities may need to be developed that treat the contention as something more significant than a dispute capable of being settled through conventional means.

The theoretical proposition that can be put forward taking an objectivist approach is that where circumstances reflect manifest social dissatisfactions it is warrantable to treat the conflict as contradiction entailing underlying unresolved core structural issues. To take this proposition further, consideration also has to be given to the idea of what channels and processes could potentially be required in order to maintain or restore more equitable social relations. To do this emphasis has to be given to what sort of power can be mustered and fostered in order to bring about change through different channels and mechanisms. According to Boulding's model, consideration has to be given to three different sources of power. This concept is useful to represent how each person's own power relates to political, economic or social institutions. It will also be important that consideration is given to what new capacities might be developed to re-evaluate how fundamental needs for security, identity and recognition and capacity for personal development can be met. The above ideas have resonance with those expressed by Rothman:

It is ironic that negotiation can make conflicts worse. Premature problem solving or negotiation can force conflicting parties to compromise without any firm basis for doing so. In premature negotiation, disputants may try to do the impossible - forge a feeling of mutuality out of hatred. Nowhere is this more true than in the long-standing conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians. In confronting this bitter, intractable conflict, prenegotiation is needed to prepare the ground for more formal negotiations to follow.61

In summary, the above discussion suggests that an integrated framework can be useful to comparatively review how different conceptual and theoretical constructions generate understanding about alternative sources of power that people can employ, and through what channels it is envisaged power can be directed. These features need to be considered depending on the stage of a conflict when change through intervention is being considered. Review can also be useful to examine how consideration is given to ideas about the forms of power that people can use simultaneously how this might influence their capacity to make choices between optional strategies through which to overcome contradiction. Radical 'postnormal' theoretical constructions, such as those explaining the purposes of 'resolutionary'
processes, can articulate the significance and viability of realising social change through processes promoting integrative power rather than through processes exerting economic or authoritative power requiring a high level of reliance on force or coercion.

Theory as a Channel for Articulating the Purpose of Capacity-Building Programs Prior to a 'Resolutionary' Process

Theory relating to all aspects of conflict must maintain a central concern with the issue of bias and this is an important consideration with regard to theoretical explanation about the purpose of community capacity-building programs. Conflict transformation theory is one important source of explanation about their purpose. It is more likely to reflect 'postnormal' science, and as such may need to be compared with explanations generated through normative or functionalist frameworks that would be more inclined to reflect 'applied science'.

Given that the theoretical constructions of conflict transformation are more likely based on an idealist approach to convey ideas about purpose of capacity-building programs they tend to be expressed in relatively abstract terms. This is because they are articulating ideas about programs designed to foster the capacity of a range of parties involved in or influenced by social conflict. This level of abstraction is necessary when defining the purpose in objective terms to avoid privileging one specific interpretation of a conflict, or the vantage point of specific individuals or groups. The purpose can in this way at least be conceived to be mutually relevant for all groups, rather than programs being perceived as having primary relevance for one specific group. However, ideas about the conduct and the outcomes of programs can be articulated in much more precise practical terms if the scholar-practitioner nexus is maintained as an integral feature of such programs. Through this channel it is then possible to conceive how such programs promote and develop the capacity of individuals to articulate their own ideas with respect to the viability of non-coercive integrative strategies in relation to other strategies.

Realist-based explanations about pre-engagement strategies to consider means to deal with conflict developed through conventional normative or functional approaches would be more likely to favour interpretations that make sense according to the status quo. In this case, explanations would directly or implicitly be based on and link with that particular group’s interpretation of the conflict itself or, framed another way, be based on an objective interpretation that assumes that the status quo can accommodate common identities of interests. Subjective interpretations as to the
legitimacy of this claim would be dependent on where groups perceive they are presently situated in terms of relative power. Groups which perceive they are marginalised are unlikely to agree that the status quo can accommodate their interests and values. If the purpose of capacity-building programs were defined in a way that privileges a particular interpretation of the conflict, it will reflect certain biases. Consequently groups which do not hold to that worldview could not legitimate the interpretation. The purposes of capacity-building programs could then still be represented as an overture to reduce adversarial or hostile confrontation in favour of non-coercive constructive confrontation. However, if the realist-based interpretation of what is at odds prevails as the only legitimate version, some protagonists could regard such programs simply as strategic devices designed to ensure that the interests of the status quo prevail over the interests of other parties.

There are two other important inter-relating considerations with regard to defining the purpose of pre-engagement capacity-building programs. The first concerns the need to promote groups in conflict to conceptualise what their goals might be with regard to social change. The second concerns the need to promote groups to conceptualise how attempts are being made or could be made to achieve those goals. In the preliminary stages of such programs consideration would need to be given to long-term goals, that is, how groups articulate both their anticipated and their preferred direction of change. However, it would be significant to make distinctions between short-term and longer-term goals in order to overcome ambiguous or uncertain presumptions about the immediate purpose and the overall purpose inherent in courses of action to bring about social change.

The longer-term goals would more likely reflect ideas about what core issues entailed in a conflict, representing contradiction, would ultimately need to be overcome. Therefore one purpose of such programs would be to elicit from participants their own understandings of the issues at stake, as the basis for elaborating and developing on them to forge a more conscious and explicit articulation of what is at odds. A simultaneous purpose would be to elicit from participants their own understandings with respect to how their aspirations are being sought or how they could be sought. The focus would therefore be on facilitating the parties to express what they are seeking by way of long-term outcomes. This would establish a basis for then considering the way these ideas about long-term goals relate to ideas about more immediate and short-term goals, and how, through transitional and transformative stages, they could work toward achieving some or all of their preferred long-term outcomes. Thus there would be an
inter-relationship between the way participants express their immediate and short-term goals, that is, the purpose of strategies which could be construed to be transitional strategies, and the way these ultimately relate to strategies for achieving long term goals. Programs would be concerned with how groups understand the purpose and the criteria of success of their immediate strategies to deal with conflict, and how they see the actual criteria of success of particular processes directly affecting the likelihood of successfully achieving more long-term outcomes. Programs would encourage groups to reflect on and consider what longer-term outcomes might be achieved if different short-term strategies were undertaken. The purpose would be to develop a basis for correlating and evaluating the extent to which different strategies could be construed to be more appropriate and viable options for achieving particular outcomes, and to be able to more explicitly articulate what those outcomes might be.

The purpose of focusing on short-term goals would be to promote consideration and reflection about the characteristics of different strategies and their viability as optional means for bringing about desired social change. As well as developing a more conscious articulation of ideas about the characteristics of different strategies, there would have to be a corresponding focus on evaluating what capacities are required to institute different strategies. The major comparison in this case would be differences in capacity to institute coercive or non-coercive strategies of inter-group engagement, and, as discussed previously within this section, what sort of power would drive different types of processes.

This type of comparative evaluation would have the purpose of promoting parties to reflect on and consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of different strategies. Programs would also promote parties to reflect on and consider the degree of familiarity and understanding that they have with respect to different strategies. These ideas establish a basis for considering what additional information may be needed in order that meaningful comparisons can be made between strategies, given that there will be a disparity of understanding between those with which groups are most familiar and those with which they might be less familiar. The purpose in this case would be to develop an increased level of understanding that would allow comparisons to be made as a basis for making more informed choices between processes that would be governed by existing precedents, and processes such as a ‘resolutionary’ process that are more indeterminate.
Given the probability that some groups would have had little experience of a 'resolutionary' process, dialogue would foster interest in how such processes could be understood to be a viable option. A central idea in developing understanding about the viability of this optional strategy would be that it could only be conceptualised as a viable option if those involved appreciated what was meant by appropriate capacity to ensure such a process was ultimately the most efficacious option. A key idea to be conveyed is that such strategies actually require the parties themselves to directly contribute to its formulation, preferably with the assistance of a facilitating intermediary. To establish this capacity the parties would need to draw on and enhance their own interactive skills and capacities. This would help to establish the idea that the parties would need to relinquish sole reliance on their routine practices and to some extent step outside of convention. It would reinforce the idea that 'resolutionary' processes place the onus on the parties to establish mutually agreeable procedures and protocols rather than rely on those that they have formerly legitimised as appropriate. Through these processes of analysis and reflection a more informed basis would hopefully be established to allow consideration to be given to different capacities required to undertake different strategies, and thus the overall capacity of different processes to fulfil all or some of the parties' goals.

Consideration would also have to focus on immediate goals in order that a 'resolutionary' process could be conceived to be a viable option when viewed over a longer time period. Parties would be encouraged to consider strategic issues, such as how participants directly engaging in a 'resolutionary' process would maintain support from their constituent group membership, and how understandings about the developments taking place in the process would be relayed back to the wider community. Given the innovative nature of 'non-official' processes when compared with more formal 'official' processes, there would be a greater need to for the parties to think through these strategic issues and develop their own capacity to monitor whether there was ongoing support from constituents about developments in the process. Strategic consideration would have to given to the way in which the legitimacy of a 'non-official' process would be articulated. This would include clarifying specific roles played by a third party intermediary. Other considerations would include the means through which the process would be monitored for fairness and transparency, what sort of procedural guidelines would apply, the way that certain attitudes and behaviours would be sanctioned by the parties and who could be appointed to report on the process and its outcomes.
A further and final important consideration is the need for capacity-building programs to encourage parties to articulate and reflect on the risks associated with optional strategies. As a general idea 'resolutionary' processes could come to be conceived by parties to be a viable optional strategy, yet programs would also have the practical purpose of highlighting the latent risks associated with undertaking an unprecedented process. Such processes are prone to be undermined if the parties, the intermediary, or others supporting its development have not given due consideration to the uncertainties and risks associated with processes that require all the involved groups to step outside of familiar conventions.

Given that the primary form of power employed in 'resolutionary' processes would be integrative power, it would have to be contrasted with other forms of power, which have otherwise directed and maintained the course of the conflict. This would clarify that there are inherent risks that non-coercive processes are susceptible to intentional or unintentional mismanagement or manipulation. These ideas can reinforce why it is necessary for all contingencies to be considered prior to engagement with other parties. If a process is instituted without attending to the need for well-founded protocols and procedures, instead of fulfilling the purpose of constructive non-coercive engagement in a process of social change, there could be a reversion to more hostile and coercive strategies. Therefore the significance and the legitimacy of the facilitative intermediary role would have to be fully explored, particularly the role an intermediary could play in averting the process foundering due to secondary conflict overlay problems arising within the actual process itself.

Thus, a primary justification that would prompt parties to invest in preliminary capacity-building programs would be to lessen the likelihood of a prospective process of non-coercive inter-group engagement being undermined. Their deterioration is often due to a lack of opportunity to consider and develop awareness of protocols that would help to alleviate the potential for an otherwise viable process to be undermined.

These considerations would also serve to heighten prospective parties' awareness of the potential problems if a process were perceived to be unable to be maintained as anticipated. This could occur if secondary conflicts to do with the way the process was conducted took on an overwhelming significance. An outcome could be that the process becomes so unwieldy it is incapable of addressing the core issues in contention. Programs would thus have to draw attention to the potential risks entailed in non-coercive processes. Even though the goal is to bring about increased...
understanding, change and reconciliation, they could nevertheless potentially also be the means to further diminish or disintegrate goodwill between the parties. This could be an outcome of problems to do with the way issues are presented, how other groups might respond to the way specific facts, surmises or predictions are interpreted, or how groups might respond if there is a perceived lack of adherence to established procedures or protocols.

**Conclusion**

Theoretical constructions of ideas about social conflict help us understand in a more systematic way the dynamics of problematic inter-group social relations and the strategies that parties can employ in an attempt to deal with them. This means ideas generally have to be framed and scoped within a domain of relative uncertainty and possibility. The argument being developed in this thesis is that an integrated framework represents a conceptual tool that can be particularly useful for scholar-reporters assigned to report on interventions. The reason is that it promotes the development of a more coherent general framework oriented toward a broader project than simply critiquing particular scholars’ assessments of what is at odds and what is being done about it. However, the concept of a general framework remains limited unless there is an attempt to integrate and critique the conceptual frames of reference that underpin different approaches to reveal the extent to which inherent biases are perpetuated in theoretical propositions about conflict and change.

In this chapter it is argued that a more integrated approach to the study of conflict and interventions to deal with it needs to go beyond making broad comparisons between constructions of ideas relating to ‘official’ conservative processes and ‘non-official’ ‘resolutionary’ processes. Bearing in mind that theoretical explanation is a crucial channel through which ideas about ‘non-official’ processes can be conveyed it is equally important to compare frameworks of understanding to highlight differences in particular ‘resolutionary’ process models. Another facet of this argument is that an integrated framework can serve as an analytical tool to more precisely and systematically compare differences in theoretical constructions. It establishes a useful basis for assessing the way in which practitioners are trained to engage in and provide explanation about a particular type of ‘non-official’ processes, such as those discussed in this chapter. In both of these aspects, it is likely to become increasingly more crucial to be able to compare and critique approaches in relation to one another. There is firstly the need to consider the extent to which explanations are able to integrate features of a process derived through both subjective and objective approaches. There
is also the need to consider the extent to which explanations underpinned by particular conceptual frames of reference are consistently applied at different levels of analysis and evaluation. In this thesis broad indications have been put forward to suggest why ideas underpinned by realist and idealist paradigms need this kind of comparative review. It is proposed that this comparative approach has the potential capacity to assist scholars indicate biases in the way ideas are generated at the particularist level in terms of human agency. However, it has also been stressed that the meaningfulness of explanations developed at this level are limited unless there are specific indications of the way in which they can be expanded to a more generalist level of explanation. In each case it is necessary to indicate how the features of an intervention are scoped and framed when they are situated within a broader structural context.

The analysis in this chapter has indicated that all 'resolutionary' processes promote individual and group empowerment, because people are encouraged by mediators to consider a wider range of problem-solving strategies to overcome problematic relationships. However, ADR processes are more often instituted on the presumption that the processes serve a legitimate and constructive purpose for dealing with uncertainty and change as these ideas apply within a realist-based national frame of reference. In this sense the processes maintain a more conservative status quo orientation. There are inevitably many applications in national contexts where it is warranted to employ 'resolutionary' processes as a more constructive means of resolving disputes or community conflicts than more formal determinative processes. However, the same assumptions that there are self-evidently more ideal means or more constructive approaches for addressing a conflict cannot be made when protagonists attempt to resolve or transform protracted deep-seated inter-group conflicts where the stakes are higher. In such cases, it is argued that an idealist-based approach may be required that does not confine explanations to be meaningful only in terms of the present international system reflecting cooperative and competitive relations between nation-states. It allows for alternative explanations when there may not necessarily be a commonly agreed legitimate basis for asserting that an intervention which would be efficacious in a national context will necessarily be efficacious when the conflict itself cannot be explained solely in terms of national identity or national interests.

However, a second idea has been developed in this chapter. Given that 'resolutionary' processes are often described as 'non-official' processes, there is a far stronger
reliance on theory as a basis for asserting and validating claims that such processes can be both viable and effective alternatives to more ‘official’ processes in certain circumstances. Recognition has also been given to the idea that theoretical explanation is likely to be a primary channel for claiming it is warrantable that, in certain circumstances where a conflict threatens to escalate pre-engagement Track III community capacity-building programs should be instituted. The basis for such assertions would be that to begin with direct engagement, before groups have had opportunity to fully develop their own understanding of a ‘resolutionary’ process as a viable strategic choice, could actually undermine the prospect of realising constructive social change through a non-coercive process. The theoretical constructions of conflict transformation provide a basis for explaining why protagonists may need to develop greater awareness of potential strategic choices for addressing their conflict. Correspondingly, groups could need to gain insights about how to increase their capacity to evaluate the viability and potential efficacy of facilitated non-coercive processes that are more reliant on integrative power than the power of force or coercion. Thus the purpose of preliminary programs could be described as assisting groups make a more informed decision about the viability of voluntarily participating in a non-coercive ‘resolutionary’ strategy. Comparison of alternative constructions of ideas about the purpose of pre-engagement processes can also contribute to greater clarity about the ultimate objectives of interventionist strategies, and what they signify in terms of the preferred or anticipated direction of change.

The next chapter introduces the case study of this thesis, in which the theoretical considerations discussed in Part I are related to a report concerning a particular intervention. The case study report entails considerations that are relevant to the type of comparisons discussed in Chapter Four between conservative and more radical innovative strategies to deal with problematic inter-group relationships. However, considerations also have relevance with regard to the type of comparisons discussed in this chapter, namely, different conceptual and theoretical models of ‘resolutionary’ processes. Section 3 in Chapter Seven, the second case study chapter, will again take up discussion in more abstract theoretical terms. This discussion is resumed at that point so that the ideas have immediate relevance when appreciated in terms of their practical application. The case study provides useful indications as to why it is necessary to critique the significance and appropriateness of different theoretical models as bases for understanding, initiating and reporting on an unprecedented ‘resolutionary’ process of negotiation in an Australian context as well as evaluating the
way that capacity-building programs can engender the confidence required to voluntarily commit to and participate in a 'resolutionary' process.
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This is referred to as the Mabo decision of the High Court of Australia with regard to native title. The details of this decision will be discussed in Chapter Six.

This idea exemplified in the way Woodhouse (1991: 14) describes Adam Curle's focus when he articulates differences between peaceful and unpeaceful relationships: Relationships that involve polarised inter-group perceptions tend to reflect: (1) The pressures and demands for internal loyalty within groups, the closing of ranks and the differences within groups which are set aside in favour of conformity to confront a perceived crisis situation. (2) The factors that lead each group to place more stress on task accomplishment rather than the needs of the individual members of the group. (3) How groups begin to see other groups as the enemy and experience distortions of perception in ways such as (a) a mirror image, whereby the parties are convinced that they are right and see the negative attitudes and actions of the other, while repressing an awareness of similar behaviour by themselves, (b) a double standard, where there is a tendency to see their own group's attitudes and actions as justified even if they are identical to those of the other side, whose actions they see as unjustified, and (c) polarised thinking, whereby once there is a conflict of interest, because people have invested so much in it and fear losing out, all the characteristics of negative stereotyping of the other side are maintained, in a self-fulfilling cycle where each side is fully justified in fearing the hostility of the other.

In Australia, for instance, the National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council provides advice to the Commonwealth Attorney-General about programs for training and monitoring developments relating to ADR.

As expressed, for instance, on the website of the National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Committee (NADRAC) established under the auspices of the Federal Attorney-General's Department in Australia.
PART II: THE CASE STUDY - APPLYING THE THEORETICAL IDEAS DEVELOPED IN PART I TO AN AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT
CHAPTER SIX: THE APPLICATION OF AN INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK – CRITIQUE OF ITS RELEVANCE WITH REGARD TO THE CASE STUDY REPORT

The present and subsequent chapter will elaborate on ideas that have relevance with regard to the compilation of the case study report. The report relates to a consultative process that took place in South Australia (SA) in the latter half of 2000. The Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM) Native Title Unit (NTU) commissioned me in my capacity as a post-graduate scholar to produce an independent review. The actual report is incorporated as Appendix ‘A’.2

The consultations were conducted in connection with a proposal that negotiations take place between the South Australian Government, two significant peak bodies representing farming, pastoral and mining interests, and Aboriginal native title claimants within the state of South Australia. The claimant communities were represented through their Native Title Management Committees (NTMC) in these consultations. The goal was to determine whether claimants would concede it was feasible to negotiate native title on a statewide basis through an Indigenous Land Use Agreement (ILUA). Given that one outcome of the consultations was an agreement by claimants to accept the proposal, the case study process can be represented as the first stage in the development of a complex cross-cultural and cross-sectoral process of negotiation.

I was appointed by and incorporated onto the NTU's consultative team for the express purpose of compiling an independent review. This was on the expectation that it would provide a baseline understanding of developments in the process and would put forward evaluations as to the degree to which the facilitating team had been able to achieve their intended purposes by the end of the reporting period. The report itself that was produced could thus be regarded as a third party interpretation, somewhat distinguishable from the subjective understandings held by the parties directly involved by virtue of it being based on knowledge and authority upheld as legitimate within the behavioural sciences. Subsequent discussion will indicate the extent to which the report has been legitimated as a scholarly account.

The purpose of this part of the thesis is to elaborate on theoretical considerations that, both explicitly and implicitly, guided the way I attributed meaning to the process
through this independent report. These reflections serve a twofold purpose. In the first place, they provide an indication of the problems on which I needed to reflect that were difficult to articulate and resolve at the time of producing the report. In this sense, they indicate that the production of the report was itself the catalyst for the development of the more general theoretical considerations developed in Part I of this thesis. In the second place, these elaborations represent the way I have tested the relevance and validity of the action research methodology to identify where it is possible to improve on practice. They indicate that certain problems relating to the construction of this particular scholarly report could, as a result of further reflection, be more constructively addressed. Moreover, exemplifying where there is scope for improvement could have more general relevance in other circumstances where scholars are assigned to produce purportedly independent reports relating to decision-making or problem-solving processes dealing with a high degree of complexity, contradiction and conflict.

One purpose of the report was to describe how the facilitated consultations enabled claimants to make an informed decision. There was a requirement for the report to explain how claimants voluntarily came to agreement to take up the SA Government's proposal to negotiate. A further requirement was for the report to make evaluations about decision-making capacities that related directly to the consultative process itself, as well as immediate and future capacities that will influence the extent to which the subsequent stage of negotiation can be maintained. This chapter deals with the first purpose while Chapter Seven more specifically deals with the second.

Section 1 presents an overview of recent developments in Australian society so as to place the case study report within that context. The explanations suggest it is warrantable to employ conflict theory rather than rely solely on a normative or functionalist framework in order to explain cross-cultural relations in Australian society because in many cases these relationships are profoundly contradictory and dysfunctional. This is a primary consideration as the subsequent discussion considers the way an integrated framework can be more deliberately used when compiling scholarly reports. Therefore, it is initially necessary to establish some basis for asserting that the case study report was in fact attributing meaning to a process whose purpose could be interpreted as addressing a deep-seated social conflict that prevails in Australian society.
For this initial purpose, explanations are framed primarily in realist terms, that is, they are framed as they are most meaningful within context of Australia as a nation-state. At the same time, however, these explanations also indicate why scholarly reporting, encompassing ideas about negotiating so as to integrate political, legal, economic, social and environmental issues in Australia, as elsewhere, may need to be framed in terms of promoting more sustainable outcomes. This supports the secondary argument of this thesis that ideas about sustainability will increasingly have to be integrated with ideas about social conflict.

Section 2 shifts the focus from the broader national context of Australian society to more specifically outline developments that are particular to one state of the federation, namely, South Australia. Section 3 then reflects on some differences between reports that purport to be 'objective' and those that purport to be 'independent', and why these differences need to be taken into account by scholar-reporters. It establishes the way that different approaches can be held in tension in order to go beyond sole reliance on one purportedly 'objective' framing of interpretations. It is argued that by doing so, it is possible to more categorically establish some sense of the 'independence' of a scholarly report.

The following sections discuss considerations with respect to the construction of the report in the same broad format followed in Chapter Four. Section 4 firstly considers conceptual frames of reference, or worldviews, that have significance within the context of the case study. Section 5 addresses the relevance of the employed methodology and, ultimately, Section 6 elaborates how certain ideas and considerations can be constructed within different theoretical frameworks of understanding with respect to the case study.

Discussions in Sections 5 and 6 are framed in terms of roles of reporting. Although I implicitly appreciated the significance of these roles when producing the report, in this chapter they are more constructively amplified. Adopting this structure helps to articulate how each role makes a contribution to the way meaning is attributed to interventionist processes. The first role concerns the way a reporter characterises present realities, and the degree to which they are regarded as conflictual, and thus warrant the employment of a theoretical approach that can be differentiated from and held in tension in relation to a more normative or functionalist approach. The second role concerns the way an intervention is characterised while the third concerns the way that the purpose of a process is described. The fourth concerns the way the
conducted of a process is described and the fifth concerns the way outcomes are described. The sixth role, relating to the way evaluations are made with respect to the actual process, as well as evaluations with regard to immediate and future capacity to effectively implement plans, is more specifically the topic of Chapter Seven.

SECTION 1: ESTABLISHING THAT CROSS-CULTURAL RELATIONS IN AUSTRALIA REFLECT THE PRESENCE OF DEEP-SEATED SOCIAL CONFLICT

The need to revise Australian laws and legislation can be represented as the outcome of social forces which, over time, have prompted calls for change and a greater demonstration of social justice with respect to the rights and interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This social movement has come to national prominence, particularly from the 1960's onwards. A referendum in 1967 led to changes in the Australian Constitution and confirmed the right for Aboriginal people to vote in the Australian parliamentary system. One call for change led ultimately to a common law finding in the High Court in 1992 which is generally known as the Mabo decision. This ruling gave recognition to the fact that the political and legal concepts on which the Australian common law and legislative frameworks were established were based on erroneous suppositions. There had been a failure to recognise and develop appropriate institutional capacity to serve the interests of Aboriginal people. It was based on what is now recognised as a legal fiction that at the time of settlement Australia was *terra nullius*, or 'land of no-one'. It is the formal recognition of this legal fiction that has necessitated the instituting of new understandings and procedures through which the Australian common law can now make grants of communal native title to Aboriginal people to make some redress through the common law for the former oversights.

The passing of the subsequent federal legislation known as the Native Title Act 1993 established the requirement to make many revisions and adjustments to pre-existing exclusionary laws, legislation and social policy. It has also necessitated a review of former administrative means through which the settler population asserts the right to manage Aboriginal issues at both federal and state level. The Mabo ruling of the High Court and the subsequent Native Title Act 1993 were the primary mechanisms that made certain revisions to laws and legislation a requirement at both federal and state level. However, they also represent an articulation of a need for reconciliation, so that
in future more inclusive, just and cooperative arrangements could be given recognition and maintained between the settler population and Indigenous people.

The National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT) was established in 1994 under the auspices of the Federal Court specifically to mediate how native title could be given expression within the Australian legal system. The role of the NNTT has been to process Aboriginal claims for native title by mediating how the Australian common law, a relatively abstract legal concept, can accommodate and give recognition to Aboriginal people’s rights to use land and other material and symbolic resources according to their traditional customary laws. This is a system of laws and customs that are given significance as they are maintained in practice by diverse collectivities of Aboriginal people. Sutton describes the basis for claims in the following way:

For indigenous claimants to prove their native titles in Australia, among other things they need to show not only that they have rights in country according to their own system of laws and customs, but also that such a system is a rightful descendant of an organised society which occupied the relevant area at the time when British sovereignty was established.9

The mediation process leading toward court determinations has sought to give expression to the way the two social systems might coexist where formerly the interests of the settler population predominated. Native title is a relatively recent concept in Australia. In the years immediately after the passing of the Native Title Act 1993, native title as a concept could only be framed, understood, and debated in abstract legislative and legal terms. Prior to any actual determinations, it was difficult for people to conceive how it was intended to work in practice. It was far more comprehensible in realist terms because native title as a concept was devised in order that legal meaning could be attributed to the need to revise Australia’s common law to more inclusively recognise the entitlements of Indigenous people. There are still uneven understandings with respect to it in conceptual and actual terms throughout Australian society, as interpretations have been defined, challenged and refined through the legal system.

Developments with regard to native title have prompted a great deal of dialogue, debate and legal challenge. Most challenges have come from conservative social forces resisting initiatives to formalise new arrangements for sharing power and promoting more inclusive participation in decision-making between groups whose cultures and ways of living had formerly not been required to coexist to this extent. The element of resistance is exemplified in the following quotation attributed to Hugh
Morgan, a businessman with significant interests in the mining industry, which was published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 1 July 1993:

Mabo directly threatens the unity of Australia. It brings in a separate law for one group of Australians. It encourages Aboriginal Australians to think of themselves as separate and distinct from their fellow citizens. It promises racial tension. It guarantees economic stagnation. I call on all of you to stand up for the ideals of Federation - one nation, one continent, one law, one people, one destiny.\(^{10}\)

This thesis does not directly detail the impact of former laws, attitudes and actions of the settler population on Aboriginal communities.\(^{11}\) However, it is significant that recent shifts in emphasis in historical accounts of the settling of Australia have drawn attention to massacres, forced evictions from land and a prevailing attitude of superiority which led to abuses of privilege and indifference to suffering. More recent reconceptualisations of Australian history have swayed both legal decisions and popular understandings of past and present relationships between Aboriginal communities and the settler population.\(^{12}\) This introductory outline can only serve to indicate there is an acknowledged need for legal and legislative revision and change. It reflects, according to the ‘conflict triangle’ (see Fig. 4, Chapter Two), the presence of *contradiction*, contending *attitudes* and social *behaviours* operating within Australian society that suggest cross-cultural relations can be characterised as entailing deep-seated social conflict. The issues at stake extend beyond what could otherwise be characterised as a dispute. This is because Aboriginal people are also seeking some clearer articulation of Aboriginal sovereignty through a treaty\(^{13}\) and there is a call for a formal apology from the federal government for former hardships and sufferings. Thus the conflict primarily involves the settler population who are more representative of the conservative status quo and Aboriginal people who are now a minority group whose interests have generally been subordinated to the interests of the status quo.

**Optional Strategies Through Which Aboriginal Claimants Can Realise Native Title**

The case study report required that consideration be given to processes of institutional and social change that are a consequence of the original federal Native Title Act 1993. However, the 1998 revisions to the Act are also significant. This later legislation made amendments to the procedures through which native title claims can be progressed through NNTT and the Federal Court. However, the revised Act also made allowance for an alternative strategic option. It allows for the possibility of having native title negotiated with other parties with an interest in land that is subject to a native title claim. In this way a negotiated Indigenous Land Use Agreement (ILUA) can serve as a basis for recognising native title if the Agreement is ratified by
the Federal Court. Since the revised Native Title Act 1998, which allows for the possibility of negotiating native title through ILUAs, there is an even further layer of complexity in order to understand native title, given the need to appreciate these alternative decision-making processes through which it can be realised.

There are significant differences between the optional strategies. The former is the more conservative determinative court-based approach, while the latter can be described as a more radical option to negotiate. The primary distinction between the optional processes is that court-based determinations of native title represent only a capacity to grant native title as it is to be interpreted within the common law as a legal concept. Such determinations do not necessarily specify how native title rights will actually coexist in practice with the rights of others in the present or in the future so as to take account of diverse political, legal, economic, social and environmental issues. The relationship between native title rights and the rights of others with an interest in a specific claim domain would have to be negotiated as and when a need arose. One role of the NNTT is to ensure that from the time that a particular claim is first made claimants have a right to negotiate with other parties about matters that actually or potentially could affect native title in that case. However, negotiations between claimants and other parties, such as resource developers, would not be transacted under the auspices of the NNTT. As the court process is primarily concerned with determining the existence of native title rights in legal terms, it represents only one stage towards ultimately determining how native title rights and interests will practically coexist with the rights and interests of others in a specific claim domain.

It is significant to draw a comparison between the court-based approach and the option to negotiate native title through an ILUA. A primary difference is that a negotiated ILUA establishes a far broader and more fixed understanding of the way native title will actually be expressed and maintained within a specific claim domain. Each native title claim has unique characteristics. Therefore, the negotiation of ILUAs cannot follow one prescribed model. Each will require a relatively unprecedented process undertaken outside of the parameters of formal political and legal structures. There are likely to be few precedents to indicate how and with whom such a process should be formulated, how it should be conducted, and what might be the criteria of success of outcomes in each case. When an ILUA is registered through the Federal Court all existing and potential native title holders or claimants are bound by the terms of the Agreement. The ILUA contractually determines how native title will, in a specific and unique sets of circumstances, practically coexist with the entitlements of
other groups with an interest in land or other material and symbolic resources in the claim domain.

Explanation about these alternative processes through which claimants can realise native title rights is stressed at this stage because the differences between them have a bearing on much of the subsequent discussion. The purpose of the case study report was to attribute meaning to the process that took place between July and October 2000. A primary substantive issue that had to be deliberated by claimants within that process concerned the differences between optional processes through which native title could be realised. In other words, the case study report exemplifies how a report may have to attribute meaning to a particular process, but there is an additional layer of complexity if a key substantive issue to be deliberated concerns making choices between different strategic options. This idea is illustrated in Fig. 23. In this case claimants were required to consider whether they would opt to continue having their claims dealt with through the more conservative court-based process or otherwise agree to pursue the more radical proposal to negotiate native title through an ILUA.
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**Fig. 23:** Illustrating that a key substantive issue of the consultative process was to deliberate about optional strategies.

Moreover, the South Australian proposal represents a far broader and more radical interpretation of the option to use negotiation as the means through which to address native title when compared with the way this option has been interpreted and put into practice in other Australian states. No other Australian state had proposed negotiating an ILUA on a statewide basis. Thus on an unprecedented scale, prospective negotiations would have to take account of the political, economic, legal, social and environmental needs, interests and rights of very diverse Aboriginal groups in South Australia.


Relationship between Improvement in Cross-cultural Relations and Environmental Sustainability

The goal of an ILUA is to negotiate in such a way that meaningful linkages are made between the social, economic, political, legal and environmental dimensions of native title. However, there is a high degree of uncertainty and contention about the way the environment of Australia should be understood and managed. There is a case that fixed negotiated agreements settled at one point in time with regard to the management and maintenance of land and resources could lock the parties into prescribed ways of responding to future sustainability issues. This would be significant, for instance, if and when other parties might also express an interest in the resources of a claim domain. New developments would necessitate further integrated multi-party decision-making. In such cases there would be a requirement to reconsider both short term and longer-term sustainability implications with respect to new decisions. Some issues could be specifically relevant to just one immediate claim domain while some may also have relevance within a broader regional context. What is still uncertain is whether more fixed negotiated ILUAs actually make allowance for the way that different parties with an immediate interest in a particular domain might be represented if and when a sustainability issue have to be addressed in multi-party decision-making undertaken at a broader scale.

SECTION 2: SHIFTING THE FOCUS FROM THE NATIONAL CONTEXT TO SOUTH AUSTRALIA AS THE MORE SPECIFIC CONTEXT OF THE CASE STUDY

The process described in the case study report can be understood as one strategy through which the state government of South Australia has attempted to fulfil certain responsibilities. Each state government is required to institute revisions so that existing state laws and legislation will be consistent with amendments made at the federal level. The approach proposed in South Australia to negotiate native title represents one way in which the SA Government has responded to this requirement. The intended purpose can thus be described as a means to bring about changes in the relationship between the settler population and the Aboriginal people throughout that state through the option to negotiate a statewide ILUA. Two ways of signifying the Aboriginal claimant groups that were involved in the consultative process are taken from the report and expressed here as Fig. 24 and Fig. 25.

However, even within this particular state, there are complexities that reflect both forces of potential and resistance to change in cross-cultural relationships.
Fig. 24: South Australia showing registered native title claims and national park areas as at May 2000  (Department for Environment and Heritage and Wildlife, South Australia)
### Native Title Claim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTMC</th>
<th>Native Title Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adnyamathanha</td>
<td>Adnyamathanha claim (SC99/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antakirinja (ALMAC)</td>
<td>Antakirinja claim (SC95/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabunna</td>
<td>Arabunna claim (SC98/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barngarla</td>
<td>Barngarla claim (SC96/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Rose Hill</td>
<td>De Rose Hill claim (SC94/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Landers Dieri Peoples</td>
<td>Eddie Landers Dieri Peoples claim (SC97/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eringa</td>
<td>Eringa claim (SC96/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Peoples Murray Mallee</td>
<td>Murray Mallee or Ngarrindjeri # 2 claim (SC98/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawler Ranges</td>
<td>Gawler Ranges claim (SC97/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaurna*</td>
<td>Kaurna Peoples Claim (SC00/2) - undergoing registration (as at May 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokotha</td>
<td>Kokotha claim (SC99/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narungga Nations</td>
<td>claim application not yet lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauo</td>
<td>Nauo-Barnagala claim (SC97/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngadjuri*</td>
<td>claim application not yet lodged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarrindjeri</td>
<td>Ngarrindjeri &amp; others or Ngarrindjeri #1 claim (SC98/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukunu</td>
<td>Nukunu claim (SC96/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urlpariarra Wilurarra</td>
<td>Amalgamation of Wirangu #1 (SC97/6), Mirning (WC95/13), Maralinga (SC96/1), Yalata (SC96/2), southern part of Ted Roberts (SC95/5) claims: not yet re-registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangkangurru-Yarluyandi</td>
<td>Wankangurru-Yarluyandi claim (SC97/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirangu</td>
<td>Wirangu # 2 claim (SC97/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandruwandha-Yawarrawarka</td>
<td>Yandruwandha-Yawarrawarka claim (SC98/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankunytjatjara</td>
<td>Yankunytjatjara-Antakirinja claim (SC97/9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 25: Native Title Management Committees Participating in the Consultative Process

Throughout the entire consultative process, a test case was before the Federal Court relating to the right to claim native title on the De Rose Hill pastoral lease. Based on certain historical precedents specific to South Australia, this case argued for the extinguishment of this and all native title claims within the state. The level of complexity with respect to different types of processes through which amendments could be made to systems of governance is reflected in yet another strategy. Prior to and during the period of the consultative process legislation was being progressed through the SA Parliament designed to extinguish the right to claim native title over certain classes of leasehold land. Therefore, while the consultative process was instituted primarily to further the proposal to deal with native title through negotiation, it was simultaneously influenced by the fact that more conservative, and seemingly contradictory, processes were being enacted through the courts and through the state parliament. These inter-relating dynamics had to be held in tension in the report in order to represent the context in which the consultative process took place. Each element contributed to degrees of ambiguity, contradiction and confusion that had to be given significance in the review of the process. It was necessary to make
correlations between these different forms of agency for bringing about change because they directly and indirectly influenced perceptions of the purpose of the consultative process.

Discussion so far makes a case that protracted deep-seated social conflict exists in contemporary Australian society. It has manifested in both overt forms of violence as well as through more covert means whereby violence is actually built into the dominant/subordinate structural arrangements. Both have been significant during the period of settlement of Australia. The covert form of cross-cultural conflict in Australia was particularly significant prior to the 1992 Mabo High Court ruling that overturned the doctrine of terra nullius because certain elements that were unjust were not formally acknowledged by the status quo. These ideas with regard to the way that a social conflict is expressed had to be borne in mind when constructing the case study report. Where certain elements of a conflict are hidden or covert, the onus is on a scholar-reporter to consider whether the nominated conceptual and theoretical framework attributing meaning to present realities is capable of consistently taking account of contradiction expressed through both overt or covert forms of violence.

SECTION 3: DISTINGUISHING AN 'INDEPENDENT' REPORT FROM AN 'OBJECTIVE' REPORT

Chapter Two first raises an idea put forward by Mitchell that a scholarly account can be perceived to be merely another 'subjective' interpretation of a social process, albeit one that can be differentiated from the subjective interpretations held by the protagonists themselves. However, there is a convention that they can be legitimated as a more 'objective' interpretation, distinguishable from more subjective interpretations, if ideas are supported by scientifically based knowledge and authority.

The theoretical reflexivity of a scholarly report becomes more critical when circumstances suggest the presence of significant social conflict because of the extent to which there will be competing or contradictory interpretations to take into account. In such cases the reporter has to consider whether their role is to produce an 'objective' or 'independent' report. There is less of an onus on scholars producing 'objective' reports to incorporate reflexive explanations and justifications as to why a certain conceptual and theoretical approach has been nominated. Reflexivity in the case of an 'independent' report places more onus on the reporter to indicate the way one particular approach can be understood in relation to other possible approaches that might otherwise be nominated. This was a practical concern at the time of
compiling the case study report, and it is a significant reason why this thesis has explored the concept of an integrated framework for highlighting differences between approaches that maintain conservative and more radical orientations. The concept developed as a direct outcome of reflecting on potentially different ways that ideas could be scoped and framed in the report. It is therefore proposed that to produce an 'independent' report a scholar-reporter cannot necessarily rely on only one approach or one framework of understanding as a basis for interpreting how a particular process may change the characteristics of a conflict.

Although it is widely accepted that cross-cultural relationships in Australia entail significant social conflict, most manifestations are not overtly violent. It is postulated that more radical theoretical constructions have not been widely employed in Australia to describe the conflict and the means through which it might change. A contributing factor is that significant structural changes, such as Indigenous peoples' rights to vote and the High Court Mabo ruling, have been initiated and instituted through conservative processes. This means that there is evidence to suggest that the conservative institutions of the status quo are willing and able to bring about certain gradual reforms that have a bearing on the national context. Given this degree of gradual reform, a valid case can be made for continuing to scope and frame ideas about social relations in the Australian context primarily within conservative normative and functionalist frameworks. These gradual reforms also mean there is less of a case to resort to the kind of radical theoretical constructions that are needed to explain more radical strategies groups initiate in situations where social relations have become extremely polarised and overtly violent.

However, the process that was the subject of the case study report was quite unprecedented. As such it could be represented as a relatively radical strategy through which to bring about reform except that in this case a 'resolutionary' rather than a 'revolutionary' approach was taken. The ambiguity with regard to the way the process should be characterised underpinned my reasons for questioning whether it was sufficient or appropriate to rely on the same kind of theoretical framework used to report on conservative processes.

At the time of compiling the report, it seemed sufficient to simply attempt to integrate both conservative normative and functionalist elements as well as more radical conceptual and theoretical elements that reflected grounding in both descriptive and applied conflict theory in order to produce an inclusive and holistic report. However,
reflection on some of the anomalies that could not be resolved prior to or during the reporting process has led to the development of the argument of this thesis that an integrated framework can be used as part of the methodology for producing 'independent' reports. Its purpose is not necessarily to establish certain 'objective' espoused truths but rather to establish that, when reporting on circumstances entailing profound contradiction, the concept of truth is likely to be relative according to competing interpretations whereby quite different 'objective' conclusions can be drawn. Its use can help to more clearly indicate the extent to which explanations constructed according to particular approaches are consistent and compatible, and therefore complement one another, or otherwise are inconsistent and incompatible, and therefore contradict one another. This approach to reporting places more onus on a scholar-reporter to elaborate on the way that different approaches bring their own influence to bear on the construction of explanations, and in doing so helps to overcome the problem of different approaches being treated as relatively discrete and unrelated. It reflects that sometimes reports may need to serve the purpose of providing a better understanding of how and why people are confronted with the need to make strategic choices because of differences in the way they perceive issues should be dealt with.

The comparative analysis in subsequent sections elaborates why an action research methodology required me to more systematically reflect on and critique the case study report. The process of identifying where there was scope for improvement itself represents a warrantable addition to knowledge that could be as useful as the report itself because there is potential for similar analytical processes to be replicated with respect to the compilation of other reports. Realist and idealist bases of knowledge and authority, with their own biases and viewpoints, could, with regard to each reporting role, have been taken to be the more legitimate basis for offering 'objective' explanations and interpretations with respect to different aspects of the reporting process.

SECTION 4: CONCEPTUAL FRAMES OF REFERENCE

This section discusses differences in conceptual frames of reference, or worldviews, that can underpin meanings attributed to cross-cultural relationships in Australia, and particularly how they have been expressed in the context of the consultative process.
The most apparent differentiation of worldviews in Australia can be represented as the conceptualisations and perceptions of the predominant settler population and those of the Indigenous people. However, it is argued that in order to attribute meaning to a dynamic process seeking to bring about change in cross-cultural relationships, it is more constructive to hold in tension differentiations between the realist and idealist conceptual frames of reference, such as those summarised in Fig. 14, Chapter Four. It is proposed that they provide a more useful basis of comparison with respect to the way a report attributes meaning to the process as a form of agency. In the present case the purpose of the report was to indicate that the consultative process was the form of agency that would lead the stakeholder parties toward constructive engagement in complex cross-cultural negotiations. When compiling such a report each stage needs to focus on the way meaning is attributed to the potential for changes in the relationships between the two primary groups. It is therefore necessary to emphasise through comparison potentially different approaches to reporting about what this particular form of agency is addressing.

**Realist Approach**

The realist approach represents how Australian cross-cultural relationships can be conceptualised within the national context. It is according to the nationalist paradigm that interpretations are generated about the legitimacy of particular rights and interests, expressed in terms of the Australian Constitution and the common law as the bases for existing political and legal frameworks. Until relatively recent times little recognition was given to Aboriginal rights, interests or systems of governance within this paradigm. It was primarily through the Mabo decision of the High Court in 1992 that the contradiction was formally expressed, which precipitated a need for major review of former attitudes and behaviours. This has set in place formal requirements to revise the Australian common law in order to accommodate and give recognition to Aboriginal customary law. The term ‘native title’ is a conceptualisation that accords with a realist paradigm. It is a term that describes the way that Aboriginal customary law can, under certain conditions, be accommodated with Australian common law. It defines a need for new practical arrangements through which Indigenous groups’ rights, interests and systems of governance can coexist with those of the settler population within Australian society.

This description exemplifies the way the realist approach purports to be capable of encompassing and attributing meaning to common identities of interests, even where those involved may not necessarily live according to modern political, economic or
social precepts. There is an inherent assumption that what is most important is that
different circumstances are made 'real' through modern legal and legislative
frameworks of understanding and modern critical theoretical constructions develop
according to realist perspectives. This approach, therefore, asserts the capacity to
make its own interpretations of Aboriginal worldviews, primarily as they need to be
made meaningful for the purpose of coexisting with those of the settler population
who more often represent the conservative status quo. According to a realist
paradigm, the consultative process can be represented as an initiative to negotiate
native title as a direct consequence of a legitimately defined need articulated through
the High Court which has ruled that revisions need to be made to the Australian
common law.

A key issue in this approach is the extent to which, when instituting and reporting on
strategic initiatives seeking change, conceptual ideas about Australian cross-cultural
relationships, that is problem-identification, continue as before or whether the High
Court ruling is prompting the development of new ways of conceptualising them.
Explanations as to what needs to be remedied will provide the basis for explaining
why certain changes are being sought. There will still be a reflection of
dominant/subordinate relationships if new ways of defining what is problematic, and
defining initiatives to incorporate Aboriginal identities of interests, are interpreted to be
most meaningful according to the viewpoint of the settler population. For instance,
the concept of native title does not represent as fundamental a change in
relationships as the changes that could be possible through the instituting of a treaty
that accords some recognition to Aboriginal sovereignty. These changes would
require a much more fundamental and extensive reconceptualisation of what is
problematic in the relationship between the settler population and Indigenous people.
It would be relevant for all Indigenous people throughout the continent, not just those
who are entitled to make claims to native title.

The social and political relationships within the national context can also be
understood in terms of the international paradigm. It is the prevailing realist approach
that is mainly applied to interpret both why and how Australia was settled and how it
is now situated within, and maintains some degree of control and influence in the
external environment beyond the national context. Australia can thus be
conceptualised as part of a broader systematic framework of nation-states. This
perspective generates interpretations of attitudes and behaviour framed primarily in
terms of each nation-state's national security. It is according to the international
paradigm that comparisons can be drawn between different nation-states. Some
nation-states, such as Canada, New Zealand and the United States, are defined as
having social systems, and political and economic institutions, that are relatively
similar to those maintained in Australia.\textsuperscript{17}

As well as considering the implications of simply applying a \textit{realist} approach to
explain the consultative process itself, it is also significant to consider how it would
influence descriptions of the substantive issues that, in the present case, concerns
interpretations of the alternative strategic options open to claimants. As previously
outlined, native title claims can now be mediated and progressed through the NNTT
and the Federal Court to determine the legal existence of native title and claims can
also be negotiated to establish ILUAs. A statewide negotiation would involve all the
individual native title claimant groups throughout South Australia, the SA State
Government, and peak bodies whose constituent members maintain key interests in
land over which native title can be claimed. If the parties are able to reach
agreement, they will need to articulate how social cohesion and coexistence is to be
maintained as these ideas have meaning at different scales of governance. The
outcomes of a negotiated agreement will have to be conceived to be legitimate and
meaningful for both the settler population and for each specific Indigenous
community. Appropriate governance will have to be maintained at the local level with
respect to individual native title claim domains. However, simultaneously, it will also
have to be meaningful with respect to local, state and broader federal laws and
legislation that apply at these various tiers of governance within the national context.

The \textit{realist} approach as one basis of comparison serves the purpose of indicating
how the proposed negotiations will have significance in terms of the predominant
political, economic and social institutions as they are generally conceptualised by the
settler population. They make up the majority of people living within the state who are
now representative of the status quo.\textsuperscript{16} Thus \textit{realist} frameworks are relatively specific
in terms of the way they interpret the character, the purpose, the conduct and the
outcomes of decision-making processes. At whatever scale, they can be
appreciated as structural changes required as an outcome of the Mabo decision and
the passing of the Native Title Acts. From a \textit{realist} perspective, these developments
have been the primary catalysts for instituting the consultative process. The proposal
to negotiate can be represented as a preliminary stage leading toward agreements
that will bring about revisions in structural arrangements where formerly the status
quo was able to maintain a dominance relationship and had the prerogative to 'manage' cross-cultural relations.

**Idealist Approach**

The *idealist* approach represents a different way of perceiving present realities and the need for change in relationships. It is reliant on abstract *ideals* to explain positive and negative influences on social relations. It maintains a concern with degrees of *harmonies of interests, well-being*, in the sense of meeting fundamental human needs, and *sustainability* as a universal need to promote developmental paths that take full account of present and future social and environmental impacts on ecological processes and life-support systems. This approach bases explanations about relationships on the degree to which power is directed away from violent or exploitative dominance relationships that can manifest as political, economic or social imperialism, and more toward inclusiveness, social justice and the sharing of power. In this sense, explanations tend to be analogous with those used to explain integrative forces through which communities strive to realise health and well-being. The approach is more abstract and universal because its purpose is to articulate a need to explore for and identify *capacity in a variety of forms* and incorporate into discourse the potentiality for optional agents of social change. The implicit assertion is that the incorporation of the widest possible range of interpretations of problematic relationships cannot be fully explored if definitions are limited to interpreting agency only in terms of nation-states or statist institutions which accord with the national/international paradigm.

The case study report reflects an intention to integrate an *idealist* approach. It is firstly articulated by explaining that the reporter does not necessarily have the capacity or the authority to make objective interpretations with regard to subjective value-judgements expressed by Aboriginal participants in the process without some degree of reflexive verification. Secondly, however, specifying the need for reflexivity in the reporting process helps to establish that a focal issue is the extent to which Aboriginal people and the settler population have incompatible or competing *identities of interest*. This helps to avoid the presumption that the report is based on the notion that the parties share the same *identities of interest*. This type of explanation helps to emphasise that the primary purpose of an independent report is to capture a sense of the significance and qualitative impact that a dynamically-evolving process has on the participants, which is made possible through capacity to observe the way they actually engage in it. An *idealist* approach underpinned ideas in the report about the
significance of the consultative process as a radical initiative that was exploring for potentially new ways through which qualitative changes in cross-cultural relationships could be instituted in South Australia.

In this sense, the more abstract idealist approach makes allowance for reporting to specify, according to its own objective criteria, the extent to which a process does or does not impose limitations on participants’ capacity to express their own subjective value-judgements. In the case study report it was important to explain that there was not an obligation to follow convention. It was the process itself that allowed the Aboriginal people who participated a unique opportunity to explore their own way of according significance to the need to bring about changes in present relationships. The idealist approach was explored in order to articulate certain principles, or ideals, that scholar-reporters must maintain in their capacity as impartial third parties. In the case study report it was necessary to specify that I was not authorised and nor did I have the capability of interpreting an Aboriginal worldview, as this would be understood in terms of claimants’ normal social living. However, it was constructive to draw on an idealist approach in an attempt to find an alternative basis for interpreting the significance of the process as an unprecedented radical strategy whose purpose was of direct concern to claimant communities. Given it was not possible to attribute meaning to the process simply in terms of claimants' own worldview, an idealist approach was explored to provide some other viewpoint, to alleviate a total bias toward realist perspectives in terms of way the parties' interests or values could be represented. The underlying idea was to compile a report that could serve to mediate understanding about the potential capacity of the process to bring about a qualitative change in relationships. An idealist conceptual framework was feasible to underpin interpretations of the consultative process on the basis that this approach is particularly useful for attributing meaning to more radical 'resolutionary' strategies that do not necessarily follow convention. This is because certain postulated values, principles or ideals, have to serve as the primary basis of legitimacy when explaining their purpose and their criteria of success. Conceptualised in this way the initiative in South Australia can be framed as having the potential to realise outcomes that are more ideal in terms of the quality of relationships that are possible between the parties.

Through this approach the consultative process can be interpreted as a strategy through which claimants could be socially empowered in a way that had not hitherto even been conceived as a possibility in order to allow them to make an informed
decision about certain strategic choices open to them. They have expressed their willingness to proceed with the more radical 'resolutionary' statewide negotiations through which to realise their native tile rights in a way that is more inclusive than an ILUA which is relevant to one or only a small number of specific native title claim domains. There has been commitment by those enabling the process to explore the increased potential for native title rights, interests and systems of governance to practically and sustainably coexist with those of the settler population throughout the entire state of South Australia.

As well as employing an idealist approach to explain the consultative process itself, it was also significant to employ it to describe the substantive issues, that is, interpreting the alternative strategic options open to claimants. This was necessary because the proponents, particularly the SA State Government, who enabled and funded the process, had not specified what prescribed form the prospective negotiations would take. In this sense, the consultative process was seeking only an in-principle decision as to whether claimants were willing to proceed with the option to negotiate. In other words, allowance was made for claimants to be entitled to determine how the negotiations would be conducted. There was an openness to consider a range of possible strategic frameworks for the statewide ILUA negotiations. Although the preliminary consultative process was enabled and funded by parties maintaining a realist conceptual frame of reference, it was nevertheless envisaged that it would allow for a reconceptualisation of the possibilities for constructive change in structural arrangements between the status quo and Aboriginal communities. In this respect, the parties who funded and enabled it were open to the prospect that the proposed negotiations would be a radical yet nevertheless legitimate mechanism for exploring for new ideas as well as new capacities to address problematic relationships. The instituting of an effective and workable negotiations process to deal with native title could incorporate and give consideration to substantive issues framed in other terms besides realist terms, an approach to native title which could be appreciated within a 'bigger picture' of postulated values such as social justice and sustainability.

SECTION 5: DIFFERENT METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

This section discusses considerations to do with the nomination of a methodological approach for the purpose of compiling a report about a process dealing with significant social conflict. Comparisons will be used to illustrate differences between the methodology that was employed in the case study report to compile data in
relation to others that could otherwise have been employed. One way of expressing this variability is in terms of the relationship that methodologies bear to particular processes of analysis and interpretation. A key idea will be whether the approach maintains a conservative or a more radical orientation.

Prior to the consultative process with Aboriginal claimants, the other prospective stakeholder groups and the NTU discussed the viability of the proposal and its initial developmental stages at Main Table meetings. It was recognised that a close working relationship already existed between the NTU and claimant communities in South Australia. The NTU’s primary purpose was to assist claimants advance their individual native title claims through the NNTT. It was therefore mutually agreed that a separate Secretariat be established within the NTU, that would be funded by the SA Government, in order that the NTU could bring together a team specifically for the purpose of facilitating the consultative process. There was general agreement that this strategy would be preferable to the consultations being conducted under the auspices of an already existing formal institutional body that followed prescribed conventions in terms of the way meetings and consultations are conducted. Conventional procedures would be more attuned to the requirement of the settler population rather than those of Aboriginal people.

The NTU Executive Officer, Mr. Parry Agius, deemed that it would be constructive, irrespective of the final outcome of the process, to commission an independent, transparent and scholarly review. The report could convey an understanding of the process to representatives of the other stakeholding parties and to a wider audience to indicate how the facilitation team planned and implemented the consultations. The consultative team recognised that there were potentially different ways in which the process of reporting itself could be undertaken. It was evident at the initial planning stages that it would not be feasible for those facilitating the process to follow pre-established conventions and norms. Therefore a scholar was sought whose approach was flexible enough to capture a sense of a process that was stepping outside of convention. In other words, the methodology could not necessarily be underpinned by assumptions that support accepted normative or functionalist approaches. An innovative and adaptable methodological approach was required in the circumstances because a more conventional approach would be prone to focus on compiling data so as to emphasise the significance of the process in relation to pre-established conservative realist national or state legislative and legal frameworks. The consultative team could not necessarily be sure that their strategic plan for the
The conduct of the consultative process would be acceptable to claimants and, if it were not, then there was uncertainty as to the way in which it might need to be modified or changed. The facilitation team recognised that the process being planned was itself unprecedented, and in this sense relatively radical. They consequently recognised the need for a dynamic participant/observer methodology in order that an independent report could be compiled. My role in the process can thus be appreciated as being both that of scholar-practitioner as well as scholar-reporter. I was appointed to report on the process on the basis of my grounding in conceptual and theoretical understandings relating to ‘resolutionary’ processes as a means for dealing with social conflict as well as an understanding of more formal decision-making and problem-solving processes of the status quo.

The data for the report was drawn from direct attendance at meetings, discussion with claimants, NTU staff and consultants throughout the process. Data were also drawn from focus group discussions, by reviewing participants’ own evaluations of meetings, and from an ongoing archive that was begun in February 2000 to record all forms of relevant correspondence and communications. From these diverse sources it was possible to develop a general understanding of the interactions taking place between the people planning, initiating or otherwise involved in the consultative process. Dr. Richie Howitt drew up the terms of reference for the independent review prior to the commencement of the process so that the report could be formulated as the process evolved. A methodology that followed the entire process was regarded as more appropriate than one undertaken at the end of the process where outcomes would be of paramount interest. In the present case, the consultative team recognised that conveying an account of the way in which the process was conducted and legitimated as appropriate by claimants would be as important as conveying an account of claimants’ final decisions. This methodology as a basis for formulating the report meant it could be available soon after the process concluded and, in anticipation of claimants ultimately agreeing to proceed with the option to negotiate, it could advantageously contribute to the planning and preparation of subsequent stages of the negotiations process. The prompt production of the report would also be advantageous in order that an understanding of developments in the consultative process could be made available to other people with an interest in native title issues. It would be available as one legitimate source of understanding about the purpose served by the consultative process as well as its outcomes.
The methodology that served as the basis for formulating the report was ultimately legitimated as effective by virtue of the report being approved for publication by the Native Title Unit of ALRM, and made available to claimants and other parties. It was also legitimated by virtue of the ILUA Negotiation Team appointed by the SA Government making it publicly available on their internet website dedicated to keeping interested parties informed of developments toward negotiating a statewide ILUA in South Australia. To this extent it has been accepted as a valid general account of the process.

The following discussion specifies that the methodology required the assembly of data with respect to five aspects of the process addressed in this chapter. Each has relevance in terms of the specific reporting roles. The first required the compilation of data to attribute meaning to present realities as they could be understood both within the particular context of South Australia and in broader terms, such as the national context. The second required the compilation of data to explain the type of process that was being initiated, which has been termed characterising the process. The third required the compilation of data to explain why the consultative process developed as it did in the particular context of South Australia. This has been termed as expressing the purpose of the process. The fourth required the compilation of data to attribute meaning to how the facilitation team conducted the process and how the parties deliberated about the substantive issues. The fifth required data to indicate the outcomes of the process.

**First Reporting Role - an Indication of Present Realities**

This aspect of the methodology required the compilation of data through which to demonstrate and validate that the circumstances, that is, present realities, entail significant social conflict. This would make it warrantable to draw as much on methodologies employed to attribute meaning to social conflict as it would to draw on more conventional normative and functionalist bases of explanation that are inclined to emphasise social cohesion. The type of data outlined by way of introduction in Sections 1 and 2 provides an indication of how this was asserted in the present case.

It is this role that initially establishes whether a reporter is seeking to produce an 'objective' or an 'independent' report. In some reporting processes the onus is on the scholar assigned to produce an 'objective' report to compile sufficient data to put forward a definition of the conflict based on certain criteria, such as a contradiction within the national legal framework. In the case of an 'independent' report, the onus is
on the scholar to be reflexive and specifically indicate that they can only purport to assemble sufficient data to *indicate* the presence of deep-seated, protracted social conflict. This would be reflected in the extent to which there are contradictory interpretations and explanations about a particular state of affairs. Expressing them only as *indications* would make it evident that it is not the role of the reporter to provide a single 'objective' definition of all that is at odds. This aspect of the methodology requires consideration to be given to the extent to which data can be accessed from a range of sources, on the understanding that an 'independent' report cannot begin by relying on one external source as a basis for defining that particular state of affairs. All that can be asserted is that particular definitions are *indicative* of a situation as it stands at the starting point of an interventionist process. Subsequent aspects relating to methodology elaborate on the idea that there is more onus on an 'independent' scholar-reporter to indicate the extent to which interpretations of what is at odds may need to be sourced through the actual process itself, in what has been described as the component of *problem-identification*.

It may be necessary for scholars to articulate certain principles that govern the role of 'independent' reporting. One underlying principle is that there are likely to be implicit underlying biases in terms of the way a reporter compiles data in order to initially define a conflict in 'objective' terms. Therefore a scholar-reporter cannot rely on a single external source of data as a basis for establishing a purportedly objective definition of present realities. This would bias all subsequent analysis and interpretation of the way in which an interventionist process serves as agency for change.

**Second Reporting Role - Characterising an Interventionist Strategy**

The case study report was heavily reliant on a flexible participant-observer methodology to compile data as the process evolved. This is itself a significant indication that it would not have been appropriate to characterise the process in the same terms as a more formally prescribed 'official' processes. It was more feasible to characterise it as an unprecedented 'resolutionary' process. The process was planned by the NTU team, with authority from claimants and support from the other stakeholders, to be initially relatively un-centred so as to encourage the emergence of new capacities and new understandings that would themselves become the basis for moving on to further developments in the process.
Drawing on data made available through the participant-observer methodology made it possible to develop a sense of the extent to which the process, even though it was unconventional and unprecedented, was capable of being legitimated by all the involved stakeholders. Certain key ideas and information provided the basis for conveying through the report an understanding of the way in which the process was legitimated and who it was perceived needed to legitimate it. The type of information that contributed to actually characterising the process as radical was drawn from indications that it was not necessarily constrained to deal with the substantive issues in a prescribed way.

However, as well as considering the way in which this methodology made it conceivable to characterise the consultative process itself as ‘resolutionary’, it is also relevant at this stage to draw attention to a matter that was problematic at the time of compiling the report. It has so far been established that claimants were invited to participate in the consultative process in order to make a strategic choice between optional processes through which to deal with native title. It is therefore more accurate to describe the nomination of one process rather than another as a core substantive issue of the consultative process. However, it is pertinent to indicate the inter-relatedness between the data used as a basis for characterising the consultative process itself and that required for characterising the optional processes being considered.

The data required to compile the report was gathered as the process evolved, that is, prior to claimants' ultimate decision to negotiate native title through a statewide ILUA. Therefore, there were two possible scenarios that could have eventuated at the end of the reporting period. One scenario would be that claimants would continue to have their individual claims to native title processed through the ‘official’ court-based processes that can be characterised as conservative. These processes for determining native title are conducted by and reported on, and thus legitimated according to the established legal and legislative frameworks of the NNTT and the Federal Court. A key consideration with respect to this optional strategy is that it would be representatives of the courts, rather than any other stakeholder parties, who would play a direct role in legally determining native title. Any subsequent settlements to establish how the interests of specific native title claimant groups and the interests of other parties, such as miners or pastoralists, could coexist would be dealt with through relatively separate processes of negotiation as and when the need arose.
However, it was necessary to consider that there would be a quite different scenario in the case of claimants accepting the proposal to negotiate native title through an ILUA, which was in fact the scenario that emerged. In this case, it would not necessarily be sufficient to draw on data framed in conservative terms, that is, through established legal and legislative frameworks, to fully express the characteristics of the prospective negotiation process. Specific attention would need to be given to the means through which the negotiation process would be accorded legitimacy and who would need to sanction that legitimacy. These ideas are raised at this point to stress that in all likelihood the most valid model in order to explain the ‘resolutionary’ characteristics of the prospective negotiations would be the characteristics of the consultative process itself. In both cases their characterisation as radical would be based on ideas signifying the relatively uncentred and innovative nature of the processes, a factor that would distinguish them from more formal conservative processes. In other words, in the same way that there was a requirement for all the stakeholder parties to recognise a need for the consultative process to take an innovative, unprecedented approach, this characteristic would similarly apply with regard to the prospective negotiations. It can be argued that the negotiations would have to be founded on certain principles or ideals that would establish a legitimate basis for all the stakeholder groups to voluntarily come together and enter into negotiations. As previously indicated, an ILUA can be ratified by the courts as a basis for the granting of native title. However, it would not necessarily be appropriate for the courts to play a formal guiding role in determining how the ILUA negotiations process should be conducted, given that the agreement would have to encompass far more than a legal settlement. The substance of agreements reached through an ILUA would have to extend well beyond a legal determination of native title because the process also determines the practical ramifications of the coexistence of native title rights and other asserted rights. Thus it would have to take account of legal, political, economic, social and environmental issues.

For these reasons, it was significant that the report draw on information that would convey ideas to signify that the proposal to negotiate native title was radical. There was a need to signify that all the parties involved endorsed both the consultative process, and the prospective negotiation process that will ensue as an outcome, as legitimate forms of agency. This was so even though the procedures and protocols that would guide the way they would be conducted could not necessarily be based on established precedent. This aspect of the methodology made it possible, within this
reporting role, to avoid leaving ambiguous the idea of the complementary relationship between this more radical type of process and more conservative processes.

**Third Reporting Role - Defining the Purpose of an Interventionist Strategy**

Data had to be assembled to explain and qualify the factors that enabled the process to be initiated. There was a requirement to establish a basis for understanding the motivations and the expectations of the various stakeholder groups in order to be able to capture a sense of the way they perceived its overall purpose. Information was needed to establish why the initiative developed, an aspect that can be appreciated as relatively distinct from that of explaining how it developed. The report had to indicate the reasons why individuals from the different stakeholder groups were able to muster support from the institutions which they represented in order to legitimate the purpose of the consultative process through which, ultimately, the more radical strategy of negotiating native title could be instituted. Thus it was necessary to draw on information that would allow the report to indicate that it was through the agency of particular key individuals in the government and industry sectors that the proposal to negotiate actually emerged and developed.

These ideas had to be represented in *realist* terms to indicate that the initiative evolved as an outcome of deliberations by individuals who held significant positions within the predominant social system. However, the purpose could also be represented in *ideal* terms because the individuals who maintained these formal roles were acting in a way that went beyond compliance with established rules or precedents. It was necessary to include information that would convey the idea that key individuals were themselves motivated to make certain strategic choices, and that their choice was proposing a negotiated settlement of native title on a statewide basis. To make this choice necessitated giving meaning to key individuals' subjective value-judgments expressed according to what I have generally termed *ideals*, such as principles of social justice, as well as subjective value-judgments involving more pragmatic considerations with respect to each stakeholding party's own immediate interests. Information about the way in which individuals aligned with each of the stakeholder groups came to understand the significance of the strategic choices open to them was assembled in a chapter of the report entitled 'Enabling the Process'. It traces how deliberations about choices motivated individuals to envisage and support the development of the consultative process for progressing the initiative to negotiate native title.
However, it was also necessary to describe how the other prospective stakeholders engaged with the NTU, and through the agency of the NTU, how the stakeholders engaged with claimants themselves. In the chapter of the report indicating the factors that enabled the consultative process to be undertaken, it was also necessary to indicate how the possibility of negotiating native title came to have relevance for claimants themselves. The purpose of the process as a form of agency that would deal with matters of direct relevance for Aboriginal communities was authoritatively established by those claimants who attended a preliminary meeting in February 2000. At that meeting, convened by the NTU, the SA Attorney-General indicated that the government he represented was serious about negotiating native title on a statewide basis. He also indicated that the government and other stakeholders needed to hear what Aboriginal people themselves had to say with respect to the proposal. For this purpose the SA Government was willing to financially support the consultative process. Claimants authorised the NTU, which conventionally fulfils the representative body function of assisting claimants to progress their court-based claims to native title, to organise meetings that would allow each of the claimant groups’ NTMCs to be consulted with respect to the proposal to take the optional strategy. This authorisation became the basis for the consultative process undertaken between July and November 2000.

Fourth Reporting Role - Describing the Conduct of a Process and Explaining What Transpires
This aspect of methodology required initial meetings with Mr. Agius’ facilitation team to gain an understanding of the strategy they planned to employ in order to fulfil the goals of the process. These meetings established that the facilitating team conceived that their role was to facilitate a dynamic, relatively uncentred process that would provide claimants with opportunities to consider the substantive issues for themselves. The process would be geared toward the facilitation team awaiting instruction as much as giving instruction in order that participants themselves could create and direct the way the process would evolve. This would establish a basis for then making an informed decision as to whether to accept the proposal to negotiate native title on a statewide basis in preference to proceeding with court-based determinations. The approach taken by the facilitation team could be framed as much in idealist terms as it could in realist terms. Preliminary meetings indicated a conscious realisation that there was no obligation at the outset of the process for the substantive issues to be dealt with in a prescribed way. This bias would have constrained rather than extended the way all the participating parties could develop
their understanding about the prospect of negotiating. The approach adopted by the facilitation team did not presuppose claimants' interpretations of their circumstances, or which issues would be regarded as more important. Thus the process was not founded on specific presuppositions as to what data would be most relevant or how it would influence its development.

In order to convey an understanding of the way procedures developed to conduct this process, it was necessary to monitor and interpret the way relationships developed between those facilitating the process and the claimant participants. The methodology for compiling data used in the report required accessing materials maintained in the facilitation team's archive as well as a participant-observer methodology both when meeting with the facilitation team, and when attending the meetings they arranged for claimants. The insights gained through this methodology made it possible to depict the extent to which the parties were concertedly able to achieve this intended purpose. It was necessary to gain consent from the Aboriginal participants whose interests were central to the process to use a participant-observer methodology as well as the consent of the facilitating team. These approvals represented a validation that the information presented in the report was elicited for the express purpose of conveying a broad understanding of the conduct of the process.

It was significant to describe how the team used their facilitation and communication skills to provide information as it was sought by the NTMCs at the meetings as well as by the wider claimant communities whose interests were being represented through the NTMCs. This made it possible to track the way the team and the participants related to one another and together shaped a better understanding of what was required in order to make an informed decision with respect to the proposal.

This methodology made it possible to develop a basis for objectively articulating, from a third party perspective, the way the process was conducted. Data was gathered that provided a basis for describing how the process allowed Aboriginal participants' subjective perceptions, perspectives and interpretations, to be expressed in claimants' own cultural terms. The process allowed claimants to work collectively toward identifying specific issues and problems, and consider the implications with regard to the optional strategies for dealing with native title. The approach had to be reflexive to acknowledge where it was the case that Aboriginal interpretations of present realities, social relations and identities of interest were based on a worldview
that differed considerably from a modern realist worldview. This same acknowledgment would also apply to claimants’ perceptions of the most appropriate strategies through which to rectify certain contradictions. It was therefore important to specify that it was not the reporter’s role to translate claimants’ interpretations so that they could be framed and scoped only in terms of the modern nation-state of Australia or in terms of South Australia as one state within the federation.

In other words, this type of methodology could not assert a capability of making ‘real’ through a process of objectification subjective value-judgements and meanings with regard to particular substantive issues that claimants raised in the process. They were being framed and scoped according to the values, interests and perspectives of the participants from diverse Aboriginal communities. However, the participant-observer methodology at least made it possible for objective meaning to be attributed to the way participants who hold an Aboriginal worldview were able to respond to the way the process was facilitated. It was possible to grasp a sense of the degree to which the process provided an opportunity for claimants to review the possibility of a change in present social relations as an outcome of the proposal to negotiate native title on a statewide basis.

It is useful to think in terms of this aspect of the methodology requiring attention to both the components of problem-identification and problem-solving. These descriptive categories can help to indicate how a methodology brings forth information that is specific to each component and then establishes the way they have been related to one another. This idea emphasises that a report has to gather information in order to represent how ideas are initially developed and in what way different parties’ perceptions of what is problematic with respect to present realities become the subject of deliberation in order to consider potential solutions.

**Fifth Reporting Role - Describing the Outcomes of the Process**

Previous discussion with regard to the methodology has stressed the need to highlight the way the components of problem-identification and problem-solving feature in a process and relate to one another. With regard to the case study report it was considered important to try and develop a structured way of explaining these linkages. In the first place, the report had to give an account of the way the process allowed claimants an opportunity to define present realities in terms of what was unsatisfactory and contradictory with regard to their immediate circumstances. In the second place it was necessary to give an account of the way they were able to
consider the specific substantive issues, the optional strategies, and how they might influence the way in which their circumstances might change. Articulating the way the two components relate to one another within a process can make it more apparent where there is a need to make a clear separation between the previous reporting role and the one presently being discussed, that is, describing the outcomes. It can highlight that there is a significant difference between eliciting data to enable a reporter to describe the problem-solving component where people are deliberating about potential solutions compared with the way the reporter then describes the actual outcomes in more objective terms.

This aspect of the methodology posed problems with regard to bias in terms of the way that outcomes could be described in the case study report. On the one hand, the participant-observer methodology was still sufficient in order to compile data through which to convey an idea of the way final decisions were legitimated by the actual participants involved in the process. However, there was also a need to source data to convey an idea of the way final decisions could be explained for the benefit of other parties who were not directly involved in the process but who nevertheless have a vested interest in those outcomes. An important consideration was to incorporate indications of the way outcomes were communicated and described to the other stakeholders and to the general public through channels such as media releases.

The purpose of this section has been to raise considerations with regard to the methodology that were specific to different reporting roles. This critique reflects the extent to which it was considered significant to integrate and incorporate elements of both realist and idealist approaches. The latter was one approach through which to make allowance for the likelihood that Aboriginal participants' conceptual worldviews and ways of scoping and framing their present circumstances, their interests and their aspirations, could not necessarily be accommodated only in modern realist terms. Integrating ideas generated according to the alternative idealist framework seemed particularly significant because the espoused purpose of the report was to attempt to transcend particular social, intellectual and ideological boundaries. At the same time it was as important to recognise that certain boundaries, such as realist conceptualisations of state or national interests, would ultimately have to be given specific relevance. Reflecting how these two considerations were taken into account with regard to the compilation of data for the case study report also serves to demonstrate that attempts to integrate elements from different approaches will not necessarily provide a sufficient level of reflexivity. It may be necessary to employ an
integrated framework in a more structured and systematic way with respect to each reporting role to make more categorical comparisons between different approaches.

SECTION 6: DIFFERENT THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

This section discusses considerations that support the argument that 'independent' reporting may require comparisons to be made between conservative theoretical frameworks of interpretation in relation to those that can be described as more radical. Discussion in Chapter Four stressed that reporters need to take into account the prospect that competing perceptions are likely to be underpinned by different conceptual frames of reference. These different perspectives will in turn influence the way methodologies and theoretical frameworks provide a basis for attributing meaning to an interventionist process. These ideas are directly relevant to the present discussion because the case study report on the consultative process could have been conceptualised and characterised in different ways.

In this section explanations are again considered in terms of the five key reporting roles being addressed in this chapter. They indicate how different approaches can influence the way present realities are interpreted, the way a process is characterised, the way its purpose is framed, how it is conducted and the relevance of outcomes. Discussion illustrates the way ideas underpinned by idealist and realist conceptualisations were integrated because sole reliance on one approach would have significantly biased the report. However, explanation also indicates why certain aspects of reporting require this type of integration of different approaches to be more explicitly specified through a process of comparative review. Discussion elaborates how an integrated framework can overcome the problem that conservative and more radical approaches are treated as relatively distinct and separate and thereby limit capacity to be critically discursive with respect to alternative approaches. It shows that a comparative approach can be useful for identifying underlying assumptions and biases, and that this serves the purpose of determining the degree to which different bases of objectivity are compatible or incompatible with one another.

First Role – Establishing a Justification for the Employment of Conflict Theory

Sections 1 and 2 of this chapter relied primarily on a realist framework to indicate that there is significant cross-cultural conflict in Australian society, and that this had to be taken into account when compiling the case study report. However, it is necessary to reiterate an idea that underpins the argument developed in this thesis, which is that
distinctions need to be drawn between different applications of conflict theory. In one application, the purpose is to provide a third party objective definition of a conflict. However, another application, that of using conflict theory as a basis for compiling an 'independent' scholarly report, maintains the purpose of drawing on objectively based explanation to provide certain indications. In this application, theory is employed for the primary purpose of indicating that a situation entails significant and protracted social conflict to an extent that makes it warrantable to employ conflict theory when reporting about an interventionist process with respect to it. In the latter case it is more categorically asserted that a certain explanation is not necessarily the only way in which the conflict can be objectively defined. This differentiation between applications becomes most critical when, particularly with regard to more covert conflicts, it could be that certain interpretations of present realities might not even define social relations as entailing significant social conflict.

Although distinctions between these applications need to be made both have to take account of theoretical treatments that can be applied to develop more objective understandings of social conflict. Certain ideas relevant to the present discussion were first raised in Chapter Two and illustrated in term of the 'conflict triangle' (see Fig. 4, Chapter Two). Discussion has emphasised the two ontological strands of theory that affect the bases of objectivity when explaining conflict. Both subjectivist and objectivist approaches allow meaning to be attributed to a conflict beyond a set of subjective value-judgements or social norms which are implicitly held by the parties who themselves are engaged in the conflict.

Ideas relating to the tension between objectivist and subjectivist approaches were further discussed in Chapter Four. They are reiterated again at this point because they have a direct bearing on the construction of ideas in the case study report. Previous discussion has highlighted the need for a mixture of subjective features, such as individual identities, needs and interests, and purportedly objective structural features, such as inequalities built into social arrangements. Both approaches have a critical bearing on the way a scholar-reporter might attribute meaning to a particular set of circumstances that are the catalyst for initiating an intervention. Ideas could be framed in terms of the way that an interventionist process might impact on present social relations in one immediate context. However it could also be equally significant to take account of broader structural factors that could be regarded as external to the process, even though they could be conceived as also bringing some influence to bear on it. These theoretical considerations have a critical bearing on the way a
scholar-reporter might convey ideas to indicate how both subjective and objective features influence change in attitudes and behaviours and therefore how understandings of the inherent contradictions that are representative of the overall conflict are conceived as a basis for speculating about their rectification. In Chapter Four it was stressed that the differentiations between subjectivist and objectivist approaches have to be made to draw attention to the need to integrate both approaches within the theoretical framework of a report.

However, Chapter Four also elaborated on the idea that these two strands can be integrated without necessarily positing a need for a radical alternative basis of objectivity and therefore theoretically constructed ideas might all still only make sense within one particular conceptual framework. Therefore another means of differentiation has been proposed in this thesis so as to make a distinction between particularist and generalist levels of analysis. The purpose in this case is to draw attention to the way in which transfers of interpretive ideas are made between different scales of analysis if and when alternative bases of objectivity, such as realist and idealist conceptual frameworks, are being compared. Differenations between them need to be made to ensure that alternative bases of objectivity are consistently applied. These two reasons for employing an integrated framework are relevant to the present discussion and have to be borne in mind with regard to each subsequent reporting role.

Discussion at this point considers the way that ideas about the context of the case study, as first outlined in Sections 1 and 2 of this chapter, were scoped and framed in the report. This will exemplify why there is a need to integrate subjectivist and objectivist approaches, as well as articulating the conceptual framework that applies at particularist and generalist levels of analysis and explanation. An objectivist approach was necessary to broadly depict how ideas relating to the consultative process can be represented in generalist terms as a conflict embedded in the social structures of Australian society as these ideas have relevance within a realist approach. Contradiction has been objectively interpreted in terms of the formal acknowledgments through the Australian judiciary and legislature that former structural arrangements and cross-cultural relationships have been unequal and unjust and that there is a need to make certain changes in order that they can to some extent be redressed. This has been expressed by articulating the concept of native title. Nevertheless, the conflict is ongoing despite these specific changes in legal and legislative mechanisms, because contradiction can still be depicted in
subjective attitudes and behaviours through which the problematic cross-cultural relationships are maintained.

However, it is argued that an idealist approach can establish its own basis for depicting contradiction in structural terms, which is inclined to scope social relations in more abstract universal terms that are akin to a health model. In this approach the imperialist dominance relationship that exists between the settler population and Indigenous groups in Australia can be appreciated as one manifestation of a particular type of dominance relationship that is maintained in many different localities around the world. A theoretical problem first considered in Chapter Two that Galtung sought to address is that an alternative to a realist conceptual framework must develop some other basis besides interests framed in realist terms in order to qualitatively interpret dominance relationships and the impact they have on communal and individual well-being. Galtung posited that an alternative basis for defining dominance relationships, such as the idealist basis, would require a methodology and an analytical process capable of depicting the degree of violence entailed in relationships. In order to be able to use this type of alternative conceptual framework, Galtung envisaged it would be necessary to first establish much more specific conceptual understandings about the meaning of violence itself. Expanding the definition (as outlined in Fig. 7, Chapter Two) would make it easier to conceive violence in objective terms to be more than simply a course of action. The concept could also be applied to explain in objective terms those characteristics of a social system through which exploitative or unjust dominance relationships are maintained. Theoretically interpreted in this way, the notion of violence could thus be employed to provide an objective basis for explaining why people seek to liberate themselves from unjust, exploitative or violent relationships. The incorporation of this approach would alleviate the need to be solely reliant on subjective bases of explanation as to the meaning of violence. For instance, the concept of structural violence suggests that change expressed in political or legal terms is generally not sufficient as a basis for depicting in qualitative terms any changes in actual relationships. This is because such changes do not necessarily liberate people from dominance relationships if dominance continues in other forms, such as economic or cultural dominance.19

However, since reflecting on the relevance of these ideas in relation to the report, it is conceded that the methodology with regard to the first reporting role could not provide appropriate data for bringing forth this type of alternative objective idealist definition of the conflict. At the beginning of the process, prior to the participant-observer
methodology, there was no alternative basis besides a realist framework, favoured by the settler population, through which to explain in objectivist terms the structural factors that indicate contradiction in Australian cross-cultural relationships that had specific relevance to the report. There was no data that could be conceived to serve as a basis for using the concept of violence to explain why Aboriginal people in this particular situation were seeking to liberate themselves from structural violence.

Yet it is posited that a valid purpose could nevertheless be served by taking an integrated approach in this aspect of the reporting process. An idealist framework could be applied to reinforce the possibility that the contradictions entailed in present realities could be scoped and framed in quite different ways and, moreover, that it was possibly beyond the bounds of modern Western discourse to necessarily 'make real' Aboriginal interpretations of present realities. The alternative idealist approach could be used to reinforce the idea that, potentiality, different frameworks might bring forward different objectivist interpretations of the way social structures perpetuate contradiction. It was particularly relevant to indicate that an Aboriginal worldview could bring forth fundamentally different interpretations from those based on the realist worldview of the settler population scoped and framed primarily in terms of national and international relations. Idealist-based considerations would at least makes allowance for the potential that native title claimants would have a very different basis for scoping and framing the objectivist features of the conflict because they would accord with an Aboriginal conceptual worldview.

Explanation about the limited capacity of modern Western discourse to bring forth an unbiased definition of a cross-cultural conflict could imply that no meaningful purpose would be served through the production of an 'independent' report that would itself be reliant on that discourse. These problems can be addressed because explanations can be qualified to stress that subsequent aspects of the report could, to a reasonable extent, bring about some degree of their resolution. To make this type of qualification it would be necessary to highlight in objective terms at least two key ideas.

The first is that worldviews are not static and that the subjective value-judgments of people who are at odds are not only influenced by contradictions such as inequalities or injustices that are presently maintained through social structures. This point can help to highlight that they may equally be influenced by the extent to which there are initiatives to actively explore for new understandings and new capacities that have the potential to change people's relationships with one another.
The second point is the need for an 'independent' report to at least acknowledge a lack of capacity to take some viewpoints into account at the preliminary stages of the process. With regard to the case study report, this explanation was needed to stress and acknowledge the degree to which there was a lack of understanding of the way that the Aboriginal native title claimants actually interpreted the conflict. Their interpretations of it would have a direct bearing on their ideas about how and through which forms of agency present realities could be changed.

It is particularly significant to reflect on the need for a comparative approach with regard to the theoretical framing and scoping of ideas about conflict involving cross-cultural relationships because the national context may not necessarily be the only significant frame of reference. In the case study report, allowance had to be made that Aboriginal people do not necessarily maintain a realist worldview as a basis for defining ideological, social, political, legal and territorial concepts. Integrating an idealist approach would at least make allowance for the likelihood that claimants' contextual understanding of the arena in which contradiction is significant could differ considerably from the regional, state, national or international contexts and boundaries that are most meaningful in realist terms. This is because their interpretations would accord with their own conceptual worldview.

Second Role - Characterising the Process

Reflection on the significance of this reporting role made it clearer to conceive that a further reason for comparing alternative theoretical constructions of ideas is to make distinctions between the way a process is characterised as an 'official' conservative process or otherwise as a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' process. Particular approaches will have their own bases for characterising an interventionist process as a form of agency through which change is being sought. As these differences had an influence on the way the case study process could have been characterised in the report, discussion now raises considerations with regard to the way different frameworks of understanding needed to be integrated, underpinned by both idealist and realist conceptual orientations. The differentiations between them emphasise why an 'independent' report may need to employ an integrated framework to make comparisons rather than placing sole reliance on one purportedly 'objective' interpretation.
This aspect of reporting requires some basis for reflexively indicating whose purposes are implicitly served in terms of the way the characteristics of a process are explained. The matter of characterisation was particularly important in the present case because of the need to highlight that it was the agency of the consultative process itself that paved the way to proceed with the prospective ILUA negotiations between all the stakeholder parties, including the SA Government. These negotiations will bring about revisions, adjustments and changes across a range of social and institutional activity that has a bearing on native title and how it can workably coexist with other forms of landholding and resource management. The characterisation of the process in the report would be one indication as to how it could be conceived as a model, a basis for understanding those aspects of it that could be effectively replicated in the subsequent negotiations.  

The degree to which an 'independent' report characterises a process as radical is likely to depend on the extent to which it is perceived to take place within or outside of the jurisdiction of formally prescribed political or legal processes and frameworks of understanding. When a process that is characterised as radical is instituted, it can signify that outcomes require adjustments and changes that could not necessarily be brought about simply by instituting a process managed through formal political or legal institutions and prescribed according to precedent.

This discussion explains why it is feasible to articulate ideas about the characteristics of the process according to a more radical framework underpinned by idealist conceptual understandings even though the other stakeholders would most likely have conceived it to be relevant primarily in realist terms. A key idea is that a scholar-reporter requires grounding in both explanatory conflict theory and applied conflict resolution theory because in many situations, explanations about the distinctions between 'official' and 'non-official' processes can be highly crucial. This grounding is derived primarily from understanding the way that scholar-practitioners working in the field of applied conflict resolution studies have described similar interventionist processes. The consultative process could be characterised as 'resolutionary' because the facilitation team were not able to draw on one particular prescribed model which was self evidently the most appropriate in this particular context. It was unprecedented, and it was deliberately initiated in a relatively un-centred way rather than anticipating how outcomes could otherwise have been achieved through a process based on past precedents. Allowance was thus made for the potential of the process to develop new understandings and new capacities and possibilities,
including new ideas about the type of agency required to bring about change in problematic cross-cultural relationships. It was important to emphasise that the process was a radical departure because formerly cross-cultural relationships were managed primarily through dominant/subordinate structural arrangements controlled by the settler population in a way that reflected a significant power imbalance.

The facilitation team planned to try and maintain an elicitive process whereby they would wait on instruction and endeavour to respond with support as this was sought. They were thus not assuming that they should be instructing as to what particular prescribed form of consultation would be most viable and workable in these particular circumstances. The section relating to the conduct of the process incorporates narrative to indicate that a crucial element of the planning of the consultations developed by listening to claimants’ concerns about its conduct and its purpose in the preliminary pilot sessions. If the team had not responded as they did to claimants’ concerns to change the conduct of the process, they would have presumed that they already anticipated the way in which it should develop. It was the capacity to be flexible that helped to emphasise that the team conceived the process to be a means of increasing social knowledge and socially empowering the Aboriginal people involved. It was possible to depict in objective terms that they did not intend to place unnecessary constraints on the range of issues and concerns that could be articulated, or the way in which matters could be dealt with, which would be the case with more 'official' prescriptive conservative processes.

However, this discussion has to further explain why it was also necessary to hold in tension the way the process could have been characterised if it had been interpreted according to a more conservative realist-based conceptual framework. An illustration is used here by making reference to another process that operates in the context of the case study. This example will help to elaborate on the idea that, had there been sole reliance on a conservative approach, the consultative process could have been characterised in a markedly different way. It indicates that the radical elements of the consultative process may not have been as clearly or constructively articulated had there been sole reliance on normative or functionalist theoretical constructions that are more often used to attribute meaning to prescribed conservative processes.

One type of process that could be characterised as dependent on and have most relevance according to a realist orientation are the more conservative court-based processes for determining individual native title claims. Court-based claim processes
progress through the NNTT. If agreement is reached amongst a claimant group as to the way native title can be expressed with regard to that particular claim domain, and if the claim is uncontested by other parties, a determination can then be ratified by the Federal Court. The NTU was initially established to assist claimants with the preparation of their claims through this process. However, other parties can challenge the legitimacy of certain claims to native title and can contest native title claims through court proceedings. As previously mentioned, one such case was before the Federal Court at the time of the consultative process relating to a claim to native title on the De Rose Hill pastoral lease. It was challenged on the grounds that certain historical precedents specific to South Australia established a legal case for the extinguishment of all native title claims within that state. These prescribed court processes have a more conservative orientation because they are conducted and determined according to national legislative and legal frameworks and institutions deemed to be the primary form of agency through which social cohesion and social control are maintained in Australia. Knowledge and authority are reflected in official managerial competencies, such as legal expertise, that are relevant when more conservative processes are conducted.

However, it is necessary to briefly note at this stage that an ADR model of mediation is used to facilitate applications to claim native title lodged with the NNTT. Mediation is required in these circumstances to enable non-conservative concepts and identities of interests to be incorporated into the already existing conservative legal framework of the common law. In this respect the mediation can be envisaged to be an adjunct to or an extension of the more conservative aspects of the court-based process. Mediation is defined on the NNTT website in the following way:

Mediation: the process of bringing together all people (parties) with an interest in an area covered by a native title application to help them to reach agreement about such things as whether native title exists, what other interests exist in the area, and the relationship between native title and other rights and interests. The Federal Court of Australia decides whether the National Native Title Tribunal should conduct mediation on a native title application. Mediation allows everyone involved to explore agreements, including agreements about a consent determination or an indigenous land use agreement.

The focal issue in the present discussion is that an integrated framework can be employed as a means to compare the way conservative realist-based and more radical idealist-based frameworks can bring forth different ways of objectively characterising a process. It has particular relevance when there is ambiguity as to whether decision-making or problem-solving processes should be characterised as 'official' or 'non-official'. There is a degree of ambiguity as to whether the relatively
unprecedented consultative process and the consequent statewide ILUA negotiations that will follow on should apply the same conceptual and theoretical framework as those employed to attribute meaning to more prescribed conservative processes. In cases where there is ambiguity there would be an onus on a scholar-reporter to critique the extent to which objective interpretations with a conservative orientation consistently give priority to the interests and the institutions of the status quo. This can be determined by the extent to which the focus is predominantly on those features of a process that have direct relevance in terms of national legal and legislative frameworks.

A further consideration that can be illustrated through the case study concerns the extent to which objective definitions need to take account of diverse subjective value-judgments when characterising the form of agency instituted to realise change. The report had to incorporate a conservative orientation to meaningfully characterise the process as one that would have an influence in terms of formal legal, legislative and political frameworks of the predominant Australian social system. However, to favour this approach would have meant legitimating and privileging only certain social institutions that could be represented as significant agents of social change. To do so would have discounted the relevance of other subjective value-judgements, the way that individuals expressed through both attitude and behaviour their support for instituting the initiative to negotiate native title on a statewide basis. Although there was a mandatory requirement for state-based rules and regulations to ultimately comply with those in place at the federal level, the decision to opt for negotiation as a strategy through which to achieve this compliance was voluntarily entered into by the parties. It could not in fact have been brought about through the exertion of force.

This was a significant reason for attempting to integrate ideas taking a more radical approach that would reflect that the process could also be characterised as 'resolutionary'. For this purpose it would not have been feasible to rely solely on a more conventional normative approach underpinned by assumptions about common identities of interest and taken-for-granted shared social norms. There was equally a need to draw on ideas generated through a more radical framework to acknowledge that the concept of negotiating native title on a statewide basis came about as much because of particular parties' principles or ideals. Key parties conceived the strategy to be the most constructive means of overcoming significant cross-cultural problems within their jurisdiction.
With regard to this reporting role, it was important to depict that individual human agency influences capacity to institute a 'resolutionary' process and contributes to it being conceived as a legitimate form of agency in its own right. This type of explanation can highlight that agency can be channelled through integrative forms of power whereby individuals bring influence to bear on dynamics of social change in relation to more authoritative forms of power.\textsuperscript{23} Explanations about the characteristics of 'resolutionary' processes are necessarily more complex than those relating to prescribed processes. One reason is that there is a greater need to highlight the potential for radical processes to complement more conservative processes if a multi-track strategy is taken. It can be necessary to explain the way in which processes employing integrative power have a significant bearing on processes employing authoritative power, and there is a need to recognise that both have a qualitative influence on the way circumstances can change.

This idea was exemplified in the case study process because individuals expressed their identity through their informal engagements as well as through their formal roles. This meant that both objective and subjective characteristics needed to be incorporated to take into consideration perceptual understandings about the need to maintain cohesiveness and continuity, as well as perceptual understandings about the need to explore for new capacities for alleviating problematic relationships, which themselves can undermine social cohesiveness.

It was significant that the report indicate in objective terms that it was the ideals upheld by many of the key individuals involved, both those who enabled the consultations to be actualised and those who were directly involved in its facilitation. It was ideals that prompted them to envisage what might be possible by voluntarily supporting a more radical strategy in order to explore the prospect of more cooperative cross-cultural arrangements in South Australia. These ideas applied to individuals who identified more closely with the status quo, such as the SA Attorney-General, the ILUA Negotiations Team and representatives of the other stakeholder groups. It applied equally to those who identified as closely with Aboriginal identities of interests, such as the Executive Officer of the NTU and the claimant groups that he has engaged with over many years.

The idealist approach can thus be conceived to be a useful alternative way of conceptualising that it was individuals' ideals or principles that could be taken to be certainties in a state of affairs that was otherwise relatively uncertain. Highlighting
where subjective considerations were significant made it possible to depict how individual cultural and personal identities shaped by family and community life and values are reproduced through personal interactions through integrative power. In this way it was possible to acknowledge that, at times, personal attributes and values can even seem to stand in dialectical opposition to ideas and values that individuals may express through their more formal roles. It can highlight that personal qualities and capacities can be instrumental in bringing about new perceptions of problematic issues or new ways of expressing principles and ideals to do with improving the quality of relationships. It was thus through the subjectivist approach that individual motivations, attitudes and actions needed to be accorded recognition as forms of agency in their own right in order to signify the influence that individuals’ values had on envisioning the benefits that could be derived through negotiating native title.

The comparisons with regard to this reporting role reinforce the idea that ‘independent’ reporting can serve as a means of actually expanding discourse itself. In the present case, holding ideas in tension can help to overcome the limitation of thinking in terms of processes of social control and processes of social learning as mutually exclusive when they can both be conceived as catalysts for instituting change.

Third Reporting Role - Defining the Purposes of a Process

A further reason for reflecting on the roles entailed in producing an ‘independent’ report is to clarify the aspect that conveys an understanding of the way that various parties appreciate the purpose of a particular interventionist process. It is this aspect of reporting that will establish certain criteria that ultimately allow a process to be evaluated as having been successful or otherwise in terms of what outcomes are achieved. Comparing different theoretical constructions of ideas can indicate that particular approaches will have their own basis for establishing the criteria of success of a decision-making or problem-solving strategy. It is with regard to this role that a reporter has to consider how the parties themselves interpret the purpose in subjectivist terms as well as reflexively considering the way the purpose will be defined in objectivist terms in a report.

Discussion first considers that realist-based theoretical frameworks could have been the sole basis for defining the purpose of the consultative process. Native title is a relatively recent concept that has primary significance in realist terms because it represents the way the High Court has determined that Australian common law is
now required to accommodate Aboriginal customary law within national legislative and legal frameworks. The substantive issues that claimants were considering in the case study could thus be simply described as the need for claimants to make a choice between optional processes through which to establish within the Australian common law how native title could coexist with certain other forms of landholding and resource management. Another more general objective way of describing this purpose would be as a means to bring about a greater degree of integration between the interests of Aboriginal people and those of the settler population so that they could then more collectively be represented as *national identities of interest*. It has so far been established that it is only through relatively recent legal and legislative changes that there are now requirements to make grants of native title that allow some degree of redress for and, where possible, overcome certain structural inequalities in cross-cultural relationships in Australian society.

However, it is necessary to bear in mind that theoretical frameworks based on *realist* conceptual understandings of the substantive issues would maintain particular biases. For instance, perceptions of present realities will influence the reasons put forward as to why particular decision-making or problem-solving processes need to be instituted and what outcomes they need to achieve. To some extent *realist* framings of the purpose of any process concerned with the granting of native title may not necessarily extend to admissions that the former structural arrangements were representative of a covert yet significant form of social conflict maintained through structural violence. The purpose of a process is then more likely to be limited to simply defining in normative or functionalist terms the need to comply with current statutory obligations.

At the time the proposal to negotiate a statewide ILUA evolved, claimants were already pursuing their native title claims through the court-based process. It is therefore necessary to consider the way in which *realist-based* theoretical constructions would make a distinction between the purposes of these two alternative processes. If the primary focus in both cases were simply to comply with legal and legislative regulation, this would influence the framing of the purpose and the criteria of success of the consultative process itself. Interpretations could be biased to emphasise the purpose of fulfilling the legal requirements with regard to the granting of native title.

When native title claims are dealt with through conservative court-based processes, the NNTT does not necessarily play a role to mediate how coexistence will be
negotiated and established with other parties. The purpose of the process is confined to that of determining whether or not native title can be legally granted with respect to particular claim domains. The court-based processes are limited to identifying and dealing only with those specific issues that have a direct bearing on the purpose of legally determining the existence or otherwise of native title. Thus the processes of the NNTT and the Federal Court only need to concern themselves with Aboriginal people's interests that have a bearing on the way their rights to native title can be accommodated within the national legislative and legal framework of understanding.

Given that there are quite specific criteria that affect the legal decision as to whether a claim is successful or otherwise, the court-based processes are conducted in a relatively prescribed form, even though one aspect of the process involves mediation. There is a limited range of substantive issues that require consideration. The framework for reporting the outcomes would reflect that there was a limited range of Aboriginal people's interests to take into account, only those that are relevant to the determination. The reporting processes of the Federal Court are relatively similar to already existing frameworks for reporting outcomes that have relevance in terms of national political and legal institutions. There would be an objective assumption that this approach was sufficient because of the extent to which there are common identities of interest within the national arena. In other words, even though certain understandings and interests can be appreciated as representative of diversity there is nevertheless an overriding need to focus on unity. Those that cannot be accommodated within the national framework can be deemed to have less overall relevance than the understandings and interests of the status quo.

Realist-based normative and functionalist theoretical frameworks for explaining the purpose of decision-making and problem-solving processes would be more inclined to privilege the knowledge and authority maintained by the conservative status quo through its social, political and legal institutions. They would not necessarily require the same degree of reflexivity as radical frameworks because there is not necessarily a requirement for external monitoring. Frameworks would be based on well-established nationalist conventions and, accordingly, a capacity would be asserted that prescribed processes can be self-monitoring and self-evaluating in terms of how they are conducted and the legitimate purposes that they should fulfil.

The institutional structures that primarily serve the settler population maintain a predominating influence over definitions of the purposes of processes to address
cross-cultural relationships. For instance, the structural changes made possible through the development of the concept of native title is relatively limited, compared with structural change that would be required with respect to the institution of a treaty. This would, at the nationalist level, require significance being accorded to a much broader range of Aboriginal identities of interests.

Sole reliance on a realist framework to objectively interpret the purpose of the consultative process could have limited its interpretation in the report. The incorporation of ideas generated through an idealist framework were deemed to be equally appropriate for depicting the way that the facilitation team, who were stepping outside of convention, appreciated their role. An attempt was made to objectively describe it as providing opportunities for claimants to deliberate about a complexity of inter-related issues. A wide range of issues would influence their choice of strategy as a means for realising improvement in their social circumstances through the granting of native title and what their choices would signify in terms of potentially different directions of change. Therefore, there also had to be sufficient scope within the report to articulate the way that the Aboriginal people involved might otherwise understand the purpose and the criteria of success of the consultative process.

It would not have been sufficient to conceptualise the power operating to enable the actualisation of the consultative process, as a preliminary stage that would lead to negotiations, simply as authoritative political power. The subjective value-judgements and attributes of a range of individuals played a vital role in the development of the initiative. Together they forged the rationale for committing funds and resources as the economic power necessary to support its development. This reflects that a range of different forms of power contributed to conceptualising the ILUA negotiations as a viable means for bringing about change in inter-group relationships, and for new understandings to be generated. The report had to indicate that certain ideals or principles guided the formulation of the purpose of the consultative process. They centred around the idea that in Australia the common law now formally incorporates an obligation to recognise the right for Aboriginal people’s customary laws to coexist with other laws and practices, and that these rights cannot simply be interpreted as an abstract legal notion. They are rights constructed within Aboriginal law and need to be recognised through the lived experiences of those who are entitled to them. A motivating force at individual level amongst the proponents was trust in the moral correctness and the practical benefits of the initiative, combined with trust in the personal integrity and competency of the people who were to facilitate and otherwise
contribute to the process. Those directly involved were upheld by trust in the capabilities of the team leaders, and the team’s commitment to their principles and beliefs. The purpose was centred on the potential realisation of the native title rights of claimants, and the development of opportunities to bring into being a mechanism for making decisions about matters that are of concern to them in connection with their rights and their sense of well-being and social security.

Thus the purpose of the process could not be interpreted only within the confines of a conventional realist framework. The more radical idealist framework was as appropriate to indicate that perceptions of the option to negotiate were, for all concerned, relatively speculative and the facilitation team were not necessarily bound to plan the process as if the purpose was absolutely prescribed. It would not have been appropriate to rely solely on realist-based normative or functionalist theoretical constructions to define the way the facilitation team understood the purpose of the process. It would not necessarily have been sufficient as a basis for expressing the idea that alluding to models of more formal determinative processes would not be the means for capturing a sense of its purpose. As a more radical process, it could not necessarily be based solely on assumptions about social norms and values maintained through the social and institutional mechanisms of the status quo which primarily serve the settler population.

The purpose of the process framed in idealist terms could help to convey the idea of the potentiality inherent in the process and that the planning for its institution and conduct allowed for the interests and the aspirations of claimants to be expressed in terms of their own subjective value-judgments. In this sense, its purpose was to promote information-sharing and social learning. It was as useful to apply a more radical theoretical framework of the kind generated by scholar-practitioners who have formerly engaged in ‘resolutionary’ processes. These framings could help to convey in objective terms the extent to which the process maintained the purpose of exploring what might be the more ideal outcome and direction of change in a far more inclusive way than had been previously attempted.

Making comparisons between realist-based and idealist-based theoretical frameworks highlights that this aspect of an ‘independent’ report requires reflexive consideration with regard to the way the purpose of a process is validated. Explanation was required in the report to indicate the extent to which the consultative process was subjectively perceived by the participants themselves to have been appropriate and
legitimate in order to achieve its intended purpose. Thus part of a scholar-reporter’s role was to objectively articulate that in the planning and implementation of the strategy allowance was made for a continuing need for feedback from claimants as a basis for reflexive self-monitoring so that the process could be mutually validated as legitimate.

It was necessary to explain in the report that the consultative process could not simply be conceived as having the relatively limited purpose of allowing claimants an opportunity to make a decision as to whether they would opt to negotiate native title on a statewide basis. This limited explanation of the purpose would only be meaningful according to a realist conceptual worldview. It was also necessary to convey the idea that an informed decision would not simply be a matter of claimants attaining a better understanding of the differences between and the significance of the optional strategies framed in realist terms. Claimants could only validate and legitimate the purpose of the consultative process if it could be conceived to be meaningful according to an Aboriginal worldview. Native title is not a concept that has any particular significance within an Aboriginal worldview except as a relatively recent way of expressing a need for greater social justice so as to liberate Aboriginal people from certain former exclusions and discriminatory practices. Its recognition would only represent the means through which Aboriginal customary laws and lifestyles could be accorded legitimacy. A more qualified explanation was necessary to indicate that the facilitation team conceived the purpose of the process to be based on principles of social justice that could not necessarily be confined to the way these ideas would be expressed according to realist-based understandings. It could be conceived as having been instituted to allow claimants to deliberate with one another in a way that had hitherto not been possible. It was planned to allow them to draw their own conclusions as to whether the SA Government’s proposal to negotiate could be the means through which they could assert certain rights and responsibilities that were of profound significance to them as Aboriginal people within their own lived experiences.

Another way of describing the aspect of reflexive self-monitoring concerns the expression of a sense of accountability with respect to the purpose of the process. It was reflected in the way the facilitation team expressed their sense of direct accountability to the participants. This was maintained throughout the process by a reiteration of the fact that the purpose would be to focus on, and monitor what might be the most appropriate way of giving recognition to participants’ own subjective
understandings. Moreover, the team recognised that they would be learning how to accomplish this as they went along so that they could make categorical distinctions between participants' understandings and those of other non-Aboriginal parties.

**Fourth Reporting Role - Describing the Conduct of a Process**

Reflection on this aspect of reporting suggests that two considerations have to be dealt with simultaneously. In the first place, this role requires a reporter to consider the theoretical framework through which to describe how a process is conducted. However, this inevitably intersects with the need to describe how the conduct influences the parties' capacity to deal with the substantive issues. While the two aspects inter-relate, it is useful to make a degree of separation between them in order to consider particular problems that each aspect poses with regard to the production of an 'independent' report. The following discussion indicates why an attempt was made to integrate ideas about this aspect of reporting generated according to different frameworks of understanding within the report and also why, in certain cases, an integrated framework could be required to more explicitly articulate the bias inherent in alternative bases of explanation.

Both of the considerations with regard to this aspect of reporting can highlight differences in terminology for communicating ideas. One argument for comparing different approaches is that it draws attention to the need to consider whether certain terminology carries implicit assumptions of universal applicability or whether terminology has to be reflexively validated. An integrated framework can be useful to indicate the degree to which it is considered necessary to reflexively qualify for whom certain explanatory terms have relevance and meaning and whose interests might be privileged because of the way in which certain matters of process are being interpreted. For instance, normative or functionalist theoretical constructions underpinned by a *realist* conceptual frame of reference are usually sufficient for conveying ideas about processes underpinned by taken-for-granted social norms and values. On the other hand, theoretical constructions that are developed to attribute meaning to processes dealing with significant social conflict are more likely to be geared toward conveying ideas about competing or incompatible values and interests. In this case an *idealist* conceptual frame of reference may be required as a basis for postulating what might still otherwise be the parties' shared values or interests, or at least the potential for a process to find the means for different values or interests to coexist.
The first consideration in relation to this reporting role concerns explanations about the conduct of a process. In this case a scholar-reporter may need to draw comparisons between explanations that are reliant on knowledge and authority that usually serves as a basis for explaining the conduct of more formal conservative processes and those that have developed through the scholar-practitioner nexus as a basis for understanding the conduct of 'resolutionary' processes. The NTU played a pivotal role in the planning and implementation of the consultative process as well as continuing to fulfil their original role, which was to assist native title claimants follow the prescribed procedures required by the NNTT and the Federal Court. The comparisons with regard to this aspect of reporting can therefore be exemplified by considering the way processes are described in both of the roles served by the NTU.

There are specific competencies required of the lawyers, anthropologists or other personnel working under the auspices of the NTU in terms of how they assist or advocate on behalf of claimants to progress their individual court-based claims. Training with regard to legal processes provides the expertise to know what established procedures need to be followed. This training tends to require realist-based normative and functionalist theoretical constructions. Practitioners are recognised as having particular expertise in their field because they know what is required to comply with specific procedures that support and progress native title claims, such as the way the Native Title Act specifies that evidence of family histories and genealogies needs to be presented.

However, with the advent of the initiative to negotiate native title in South Australia, the Executive Officer of the NTU had to assemble a facilitation team for conducting the consultative process. For this purpose specific competencies and understandings were required that would be useful for a relatively uncentred and unprecedented process. Many of these competencies can be most meaningfully explained through the construction of ideas about the conduct of more informal 'resolutionary' processes. Understandings about this category of competencies would tend to be underpinned by idealist conceptual frameworks on the basis that such processes are more reliant on integrative expressions of power rather than authoritative power.

These comparisons highlight that the negotiation of native title through a statewide ILUA will require a radically different process from those that simply deal with the more prescribed realist-based legal and legislative aspects of native title. This was reflected in the conduct of the consultative process. The goal of negotiation will be to
explore what might be a mutually agreeable basis for expressing how in practice
native title rights can coexistence with the rights of other parties with interests in
particular claim domains. An idealist-based framework was considered to be as
meaningful to convey the idea that potentialities and possibilities will be explored
through negotiation in order to bring about change that could signify a qualitative
improvement in cross-cultural relationships. Part of such a process would most likely
involve giving consideration to the widest range of interpretations of concepts such as
well-being, harmonies of interests and sustainability. These ideas were inherent in
the planning of the consultative process because its purpose, and the way it was
conducted, made allowance for the emergence of new understandings and new
capacities.

Explanation in the report had to indicate that the consultations were conducted
through an elicitive process which allowed participating claimants an unconstrained
opportunity to subjectively articulate their own issues and concerns that shape their
perceptions of present realities. It was significant to indicate that the facilitation team
saw their role to be that of bringing claimants together in order that they could
develop a sense of what they collectively perceived to be problematic and
contradictory issues in their present state of affairs. However, it was also necessary
to explain that the process was the first time that claimants within the state had had
an opportunity to concordedly develop this collective sense of their shared aspirations
as Aboriginal people and a sense of how their aspirations could be most effectively
achieved. While the prospect of negotiations could afford claimants an opportunity to
achieve certain goals, these goals would be embedded within their perception of
present realities, the broader ongoing cross-cultural conflict. An idealist framework
allowed an alternative way of explaining that it would not have been adequate or
appropriate to institute such a process with a proviso that claimants had to articulate
their identities of interests within the relatively limited concept of native title, which is
itself a realist construction.

Explanation had to indicate that the process provided opportunities for social
knowledge to be developed and shared amongst claimants who had come together
from very diverse regions of the state in an unprecedented way. As well, it provided
unique opportunities for the facilitation team to see where they could be most
receptive and responsive to claimants’ needs, particularly with regard to identifying
where the team could best assist with the provision of supporting information.
Reporting had to convey a sense of the general level of uncertainty and the
profoundly uneven understandings that both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people hold with regard to the concept of native title and what negotiated outcomes could mean in practical terms. This framework could not necessarily privilege ideas expressed only in terms of legal or legislative changes given that claimants did not necessarily subjectively frame their concerns in realist terms.

An idealist approach was a basis for reporting that could coherently integrate analysis and understanding oriented toward explaining the extent to which claimants themselves were able to set in place culturally appropriate procedures through which the process could be conducted and in what way this was conceived to be socially empowering.\textsuperscript{25} It was also useful as a basis for indicating the extent to which the process allowed claimants opportunities to conceive of the possibility of new and more just power-sharing arrangements and social relationships with non-Aboriginal people when these ideas could not be couched in conventional normative terms. This was particularly important given that formerly it had been regarded as acceptable to employ normative frameworks that could discount or marginalise a sense of Aboriginal identities of interest. This idea has resonance with earlier discussion with regard to the usefulness of the term violence as a way of objectively depicting how unjust or unequal relationships are maintained. It could not have been presumed that claimants perceived that change instituted through the legal and legislative institutions of the status quo was necessarily the means of bringing about a qualitative improvement in cross-cultural relationships if structural violence was still maintained through other forms of dominance, such as cultural dominance.\textsuperscript{26}

This idea highlights the need for a more general framework in which to situate theoretical ideas about conflict in order that they retain their relevance and meaningfulness in a range of different circumstances. In some it may be self-evident that conflict involves a high degree of apparent hostility and is thus overt. However, reflection on the construction of the case study report demonstrates how important it can be for scholar-reporters assigned to produce purportedly 'independent' reports to develop consistent and systematic analytical processes, such as an integrated framework to compare different approaches, that can be applied even in circumstances involving covert conflict. It can be as important to use conflict theory constructively when reporting about the way these circumstances are being addressed, particularly given that some parties will not even concede that the situation should be treated as one involving conflict.
Discussion now focuses on the second consideration with regard to this aspect of reporting, which concerns explanations about the substantive issues raised by participants in the process. It is with regard to this topic that it becomes most evident why scholar-reporters need to be specific about the way they are using certain terms and categories. Ensuring that meanings are as precise as possible contributes to a capacity to address specific elements of a process in a systematic way within a report.

One way to demonstrate the significance of the precise use of specific categories is to trace the relationship between the purpose of the first reporting role and the way objective understandings about the substantive issues develop through this fourth reporting role. The first reporting role is used to provide *indications* that a situation entails significant social conflict. These *indications* are necessary to validate that it is warrantable to draw on conflict theory to describe an interventionist process with respect to it. The use of the separate category of *indications* is thus highly significant. It reinforces the idea that it would be inappropriate for a scholar-reporter to assert a capacity to provide purportedly objective definition of all the issues at stake before an intervention actually begins. This type of categorical distinction is important because a scholar-reporter may need to specify that it is more appropriate for objective definitions to emerge through the methodology of the fourth reporting role. At this stage the scholar-reporter is authorised to develop a more detailed account of the way that the parties themselves actually interpret the conflict and thereby develop a more meaningful and reflexively verifiable basis for purportedly objective definitions. In other words the scholar-reporter has authority to elaborate on the substantive issues entailed in the conflict at this stage because the methodology makes allowance for direct monitoring of the way *problem-identification* is dealt with in the actual process.27

Before discussing how these ideas have immediate relevance in relation to the case study report, it is necessary at this stage to further consider the use of specific terms to make certain types of categorical distinctions. Discussion so far has established that categorical terms are needed that help to make a distinction between the first and fourth reporting roles, and then that, within the latter role, there are two primary interrelating considerations, one concerning the conduct of a process and the other concerning the substantive issues dealt with. This helps to emphasise that a scholar-reporter needs to be able to relate explanations about the conduct of the process to explanations about the substantive issues that participants are able to
raise. This relationship has to be articulated because it is the means for identifying the way in which control is maintained with regard to the production of interpretations of the substantive issues. When there are likely to be profoundly competing interpretations of the issues at stake, it can be crucial to specify how and why certain types of categorical distinctions need to be made.

It is in the context of the present discussion about the fourth reporting role where two other categorical distinctions also become highly significant. The first is the difference between the components of problem-identification and problem-solving, which have to be systematically explained within the reporting process. Despite the complex and dynamic nature of social conflict, it is argued that it is important to make a separation between the way the components are treated in a report. This is because the way ideas are scoped and framed with regard to problem-identification will necessarily influence the way ideas are scoped and framed with regard to problem-solving.

The other categorical distinction, between realist and idealist conceptual and theoretical frameworks of understanding, is only needed if an integrated framework is used to make comparisons between different approaches through which analysis and explanations about the conflict are developed. Thus the precise use of terms denoting specific categories becomes even more important if a comparative approach is being used. An integrated framework can in the present context be used, firstly, to signify that there are different ways of explaining the way the conduct of a process influences how parties are able to deal with substantive issues. Secondly, it can be used to signify that there are different ways of explaining the relationship between the components of problem-identification and problem-solving, which will have a significant bearing on the process.28

Ideas about the sequence in which parties deal with problem-identification and problem-solving are relevant to this aspect of the case study report. They support the idea that explanation about present realities could not be limited to the way they were understood by the SA Government and the other stakeholders at the time that they initially put forward the proposal to negotiate. While, on the other hand, an idealist approach could not serve to 'make real' the Aboriginal claimants' own interpretations, its incorporation is nevertheless useful. It provides an alternative basis for explaining in the report the degree to which Aboriginal claimants required significant time given to problem-identification in the consultative process. This was a requirement before
they could even consider whether and how negotiations could be the most constructive way of changing present realities that they perceived to be unacceptable.

These ideas about the need for clearly defined categories so that a range of factors can be dealt with in a systematic way can be exemplified by considering two early developments in the planning to institute the consultative process. Both narratives demonstrate why it is important that a report indicate the capacity of a process to identify and frame substantive issues according to the perception of different parties involved. While these ideas relate more specifically to problem-identification they ultimately have a significant influence as to what substantive issues become the bases for problem-solving. Each example illustrates how the proposal to negotiate native title might otherwise have developed.

**Aboriginal Claimants' Representation in ILUA Negotiations**

In discussions held in 1999, the Executive Officer of NTU had to make choices in terms of a response to the initial proposal presented to him by the other prospective stakeholders. An initial suggestion had been that the NTU, whose conventional role is to assist Aboriginal communities submit and progress their native title claims through the procedures of the NNTT and the Federal Court, similarly act as the claimants' representative body to negotiate on their behalf. This option would have meant that the NTU, along with other stakeholder representatives, would be in a position to control the scoping and the framing of substantive issues. The other stakeholders assumed that the NTU, as a representative body fulfilling certain functions for claimants, could assert the status of a peak body and thus maintain the capability of speaking on constituents' behalf ("we" statements). If the proposal to negotiate had been progressed as the other stakeholders had initially envisaged, the NTU would have been in a position to make objective interpretations of *Aboriginal identities of interests* in a way that presumed they were based on claimants' subjective interpretations. In the preliminary meetings the NTU had to convey an understanding to the other stakeholders that this arrangement was not satisfactory. It would have actually perpetuated dominant-subordinate structural relationships. The concept of native title was a way of recognising in realist terms that claimants had certain interests in common, yet their interests as Aboriginal people were in many respects diverse and unique within particular social and environmental contexts. What could be deemed to be their *common identities of interests* could only be determined by claimants themselves.
In the proposed scenario, claimants would have had minimal opportunity to undertake a concerted and collective process of problem-identification and develop a sense of where they shared a perspective with regard to the substantive issues that could be addressed in statewide negotiations. The degree to which the process could be interpreted as radical in the sense of being a process of social learning and empowerment would have been constrained. In view of the likelihood that such a process would operate with a 'top-down' orientation it would correspondingly be likely that a realist-based normative and functionalist framework would have been considered appropriate as the primary basis for reporting. It would most likely be presumed that realist-based frameworks would be a primary requirement just as they are when professional practitioners employed by the NTU assist claimants with court-based procedures. In other words, even though the processes would be different, there would be an assumption that the kind of expertise required to conduct each process would be the same. Thus a conservative framework would have been considered adequate to objectively interpret the characteristics of the process, its purpose, the way it was conducted and its outcomes. Precedence would thus be given to the framing of substantive issues as they were of direct relevance according to the conservative legislative or legal frameworks.

**Using Pilots to Ascertain the Most Viable Strategy for Conducting the Consultative Process**

This second longer narrative illustrates how the pilots of the consultative process shaped the way claimants actually came to develop certain shared understandings about the substantive issues. It requires outlining certain developments in the way that the NTU facilitation team planned their strategy for instituting the consultative process. The team recognised that for the process to ultimately be legitimated as appropriate by those directly participating and by those who would be influenced by its outcomes, it would have to be more elicitive than prescriptive. The team recognised that deliberations and decisions would have to be based on claimants' subjective interpretations of the issues at stake. This would be the basis for further deliberation as to the capacity of statewide negotiations to be a viable and effective means for improving cross-cultural relations through the realisation of native title rights. Any other basis of decision-making would have undermined the purpose of allowing claimants to make an informed decision.

In the preliminary planning stages of the process, the consultative team speculated how, within the constraints of time and funding, they could best conduct the process
and consult with the diverse Aboriginal groups that had to be involved. They recognised that the option to negotiate native title agreements at the level of the state was a difficult concept to grasp because it concerned complex changes in the level at which decision-making about some native title matters could be settled. The plan, as initially envisaged, was to follow a strategy of holding consultative meetings in four regional areas of the state between mid-July and the end of August 2000. They would combine community consultation with respect to the SA Government proposal, illustrate what benefits claimants might derive by negotiating about native title on a statewide level, and offer information and training to convey how some of their issues could be dealt with collectively through negotiations.

The team would put forward an organisational model, as illustrated in Fig. 26, for the NTMC representatives to consider. If approved, two representatives from each claimant group's NTMC could be appointed to a Reference Group to create a cohesive and culturally appropriate position on behalf of all claimants. This group would be provided with further specialised information, advice and training about negotiation. The resources would be developed within the Statewide Native Title Secretariat, which was a separate arm of the NTU supported and funded for this particular purpose by the SA Government. The model suggests an even smaller team would then be appointed to represent claimants at the Main Table, the
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Fig. 26: Proposed organisational model through which claimants could negotiate (developed by Dr. Richard Howitt of the NTU's Technical Advisory Group)
name given to the forum through which the SA Government’s ILUA Negotiations Team and representatives from the other major stakeholder groups discussed negotiation issues. For claimants to organise in this way, they would be reliant on a supporting statewide communications network, also to be developed through the Secretariat, to allow two-way discussion and deliberation within each native title claimant community about the issues being negotiated at the state level. It was envisaged that the Reference Group might begin negotiations as early as the end of the consultative process in late 2000. The purpose of training would be to introduce claimants to the concept of negotiations and consider how, through this alternative strategy, claimants might collectively develop a statewide ILUA to bring about the joint practical resolution of many native title issues. The stakeholders at this stage included the SA Government, SA Chamber of Mines and Energy (SACOME) and the SA Farmers Federation (SAFF).

The team trialed the strategy for the conduct of the consultations at two pilot sessions in July 2000. Despite NTMCs appreciating from the presentations the significance and the merits of the proposal, claimants indicated that they could not take up the option of negotiating through the suggested decision-making model put forward by the consultation team. They also indicated that in order to weigh up the full significance of the proposal, they needed information about the issues to be tailored so that the starting point was their own perspective on the issues. This would make the proposal relevant as it had meaning for each local claimant community in terms of Aboriginal customary law, which is the basis of native title. Many claimants had little experience dealing with native title issues beyond their own claim level. Some of their reservations and uncertainties related to the implications of decisions being made at any level other than local level. One problem raised by claimants was that there was no formal avenue through which they could engage with groups from other claim areas. In turn this meant there was no means for assessing what common issues statewide negotiations might address. There was concern that statewide negotiations could undermine local claim autonomy and authority, which was grounded in Aboriginal customary law and which was relatively unique within each local claim group. At the pilots, Aboriginal participants expressed concern that the suggested model for negotiating to address their issues at state level rather than at local claim
level was founded on certain assumptions. It implied that a reference group could speak on behalf of all claimants and define their collective interests.

Through the pilot sessions the NTU’s facilitation team came to understand the significance of each NTMC’s lack of opportunities and resources through which to confer and compare their circumstances and their issues with other NTMCs and claimant communities. Their isolation from each other meant that they could not collectively evaluate the full significance of the information and concepts being presented as statewide issues, nor consider the implications and overall relevance of the proposal as it would affect them directly as claimants. As well, there was concern about the organisational makeup of any small team who would directly engage in negotiations at the state level on claimants’ behalf. There was concern that this could contravene traditional customary law whereby traditional owners spoke only for their own country.

However, the SA Government, which funded the process based on estimates drawn up with regard to the earlier planned strategy, was confident of the integrity of the facilitation team and had not stipulated a requirement to follow through with the planned strategy. The outcomes of the pilots prompted the facilitation team to review their initial planning and modify the strategy. The more radical strategy involved bringing the claimant group’s NTMCs together in three statewide congresses so that all decision-making could be based on claimants collectively giving voice to their issues and concerns. Those comprising the facilitation team envisaged this strategy as a means of fulfilling the goal of allowing claimants to make an informed decision through a more concerted and collective process of deliberation. The NTU team came to appreciate that an integral facet of making an informed decision was the creation of opportunities through which information about the proposal could be evaluated collectively by the NTMCs. They could then develop clearer shared ideas about the implications of the proposal as it had relevance for them as Aboriginal people in the wider social context of South Australia in which the changes would have relevance.

A primary problem raised by claimants at the pilot sessions can be objectively described as the lack of some sort of confederal organisational structure. This meant there was no adequate interface between institutions undertaking decision-making at state level and claimants' conventional modes of decision-making, which, within each specific local claim domain, had relevance according to Aboriginal customary law. It was through the opportunities made available through the congress meetings that
claimant groups were able to concertedly identify, deliberate about and make plans for addressing their present lack of organisational capacity. In this way they could themselves decide about and control the way certain interests could be expressed as shared interests that could be collectively negotiated though the statewide negotiations. In the formative discussions in the consultative process, this body came to be conceived as their 'united voice'.

Claimants also came to conceive how it would be feasible to maintain this organisational body to represent all claimants' collective interests that were being negotiated at the state level. It could be maintained through the same infrastructural support and communications network that had been initially envisaged only as a means for transmitting information about the conduct of statewide negotiations between local and state levels. It was conceivable that these networks could simultaneously serve the purpose of supporting the 'united voice' in such a way that this body, rather than the NTU, could represent all claimant communities' interests as a stakeholder group in the prospective negotiations. In fact the lack of and a fundamental need for such an organisational structure for claimants was one of the most significant issues that emerged in the problem-identification component of the consultative process. It was through exploring for potential solutions to this problem that claimants ultimately came to envisage the proposal to negotiate as a viable strategy. Prior to the strategy to convene congress meetings, there were no possible means through which claimants could have envisaged or devised this type of organisational capacity.

The facilitation team envisaged how in the process they would convey and develop a general understanding of the way in which the statewide negotiations could address certain issues that were relevant for all Aboriginal claimants. However they recognised that, nevertheless, Aboriginal identities of interests incorporated other issues as well as those defined within the relatively narrow concept of native title. Ideas included those pertaining to Aboriginal understandings of normal social living within a specific local context and how these ideas were meaningful in terms of their own more universal cosmology which is often translated as 'the Dreaming'. They also included issues that accounted for Aboriginal peoples' general subordinated position within the Australian national context. These were perceived subjectively by many claimants to require certain structural changes that were even more radical and extensive than the changes expressed through the concept of native title. Thus claimants' concerns extended to issues such as the handing back through freehold
title certain land within the localities with which Aboriginal people identified in order to retain or regain some sense of a more complete relationship with their land. Also, at the broader national scale, concerns extended to the issue of a treaty or some other means through which an Aboriginal sense of sovereignty could be given recognition.

It will be unlikely that the ensuing negotiations will be capable of problem-solving with regard to all issues of concern raised by claimants in the component of problem-identification, such as those that could only be resolved at the national level. Thus many unresolved issues are likely to continue to have an impact on the relationship between the Aboriginal people and the settler population in South Australia in the same way as they do in other states of Australia. Nevertheless it was still possible for the stakeholders to conceive that the option to negotiate an ILUA would bring forward a greater degree of improvement in power-sharing arrangements as a basis for decision-making at state level to achieve workable coexistence when compared with the more prescribed process for determining native title through the court system. An idealist approach could make allowance for the idea that native title was a concept developed to suggest how relationships between Aboriginal people and the settler population might become more reconciled, rather than a concept that reflected an Aboriginal worldview or Aboriginal social or cultural norms. Native title could only be conceptualised as one issue embedded in the broader cross-cultural conflict as it could be perceived according to an Aboriginal worldview.

At the outset of the process, it was only possible to articulate what substantive issues were likely to feature in the component of problem-identification in realist terms. It was the actual process itself that highlighted this was due to the fact that claimants had no organisational structure that enabled them to collectively express their concerns, or respond with a decision to the proposal to negotiate native title on a statewide basis.

Based on what the facilitation team learnt and responded to at the pilots, they saw their role being, with regard to component of problem-identification, to conduct the process in a way that would allow claimants an unprecedented opportunity to meet together and develop some collective sense of relevant substantive issues. This would centre on claimants' subjective perceptions of what was problematic in their present relationships. In order to achieve this purpose of the process the team was required to listen and support claimants to articulate their concerns. It was only through the component of problem-identification that claimants then had a basis to
begin to concertedly develop their own ideas as to how they aspired for their circumstances to change. The component of problem-solving could be represented as the way in which claimants then came to consider the viability of the proposal to negotiate. To report on the deliberations with regard to the substantive issues, the component of problem-solving, it was necessary to convey a sense of the way in which claimants developed and expressed their own understandings about the potential efficacy of the proposal to negotiate. Even though until this time the proposal had been primarily conceived by the other stakeholders in realist terms, there was also a requirement for the report to articulate ideas about the way claimants developed their own sense of its significance. An idealist basis of explanation was equally useful to indicate in objective terms the extent to which the proposal was conceived to be to some extent a means of liberating claimants as Aboriginal people from dominant/subordinate relationships and a means of building capacity for coexistence. If both ways of framing the proposal as a substantive issue were not acknowledged, the report itself could have been perceived by Aboriginal people and those supporting their aspirations to achieve social justice to be yet another reflection of cultural bias and domination.

Discussion with regard to both considerations in this aspect of reporting, the conduct of a process and the attribution of meaning to substantive issues raised in the process, serves to illustrate two key ideas. Firstly, it highlights the usefulness of an integrated framework to make comparisons between different frameworks of understanding. Secondly it highlights the need to identify and articulate the relationship between the components of problem-identification and problem-solving.

Fifth Role - Describing the Outcomes of a Process
Reflection on this aspect of reporting suggests a need to consider differences in the way outcomes and decisions can be reported. One way of interpreting where matters stood at the end of the process is included as Fig. 27. Specific substantive outcomes of the case study process will be discussed in Chapter Seven so that they can be appreciated in relation to the sixth reporting role, that of making evaluations. Like other aspects of reporting about interventions, the scholar-reporter's 'independence' can be articulated by employing a more systematic analytical process using an integrated framework. In this role the purpose is again to make comparisons between different approaches, exemplified in terms of realist or idealist bases of explanation, to highlight bias in the way that outcomes can be interpreted. However, beyond the
need to highlight how explanation about outcomes and decisions can vary according

to particular conceptual and theoretical frameworks, an integrated framework

e emphasises the need for a more systematic treatment of two broad elements. The

Fig. 27: The relationships that evolved between key organisations as an outcome of the

statewide consultations through which to negotiate native title in South Australia.
first is the need to integrate ideas derived through both subjectivist and objectivist approaches. The second is the need to ensure that explanations according to different frameworks are consistently applied at different levels of analysis and explanation. It is the second element that articulates how there is a transfer from the particularist level to a more generalist level. This is particularly important with respect to outcomes because it determines how immediately relevant ideas are expanded on so that they are contextualised within a broader structural framework.

Discussion now considers the way that each of the preceding reporting roles can help to qualify outcomes and thereby ensure that reporting specifies how particular outcomes have been arrived at and whether they are perceived to be specifically attributable to the capacity of the process that was employed. It also ensures that reporting specifies for whom and in what way particular outcomes have significance.

The first reporting role helps to qualify outcomes because it establishes the relationship between explanations about the nature of present realities and the way it is conceived that certain outcomes will change those realities. This could also be described as one way in which the component of problem-identification relates to that of problem-solving. In previous discussion about the first reporting role it was established that, rather than the scholar-reporter asserting capacity to define the conflict, this role is used in an 'independent' report to indicate that different parties are likely to hold profoundly different perceptions of present realities. The comparative approach would need to be maintained when qualifying outcomes to stress that at the outset of a process the parties would have had very different conceptual bases of understanding for describing the outcomes that they aspired to achieve in order to remedy what is at odds. Accordingly one purpose of this aspect of reporting on outcomes is to reveal and qualify potentially different ways of according significance to certain outcomes. This type of explanation could otherwise be described as giving an account of different parties' perceptions of the capacity of the interventionist strategy to bring about the changes they are seeking in social relations.

Prior to the consultative process it was not possible to envisage how else to scope and frame present realities except in realist terms, that is, defining the problem as how native title could be accommodated within both federal and state legal and legislative frameworks. As indicated when discussing the first reporting role all that could be achieved by incorporating a contrasting idealist-based framing was a clearer
acknowledgment that there could be other versions of present realities framed according to an Aboriginal worldview. Doing so would at least help to categorically establish the idea that Aboriginal claimants would not necessarily define either the problems or the outcomes in realist-based terms. Their informed decision to proceed with the option to negotiate native title had to be qualified to articulate the idea that it was based on their own understandings of its potential capacity to change their present circumstances.

The second reporting role helps to qualify outcomes by signifying whether they are achieved through a process characterised as either 'official' or 'non-official'. It was significant that the case study report convey a sense of the 'non-official' characteristics of the process to stress that integrative power was a significant driving force that brought about the outcomes of the consultative process. Outcomes of 'official' processes are more often determined through authoritative power, which can justify the use of coercion and force. However, the case study process had more elements of a 'non-official' process because it did not follow prescribed precedents and all the involved stakeholders were prepared to relinquish authoritative power, and therefore their own control over the process. They were willing to explore what outcomes could instead be achieved through integrative power. The reporting role that indicates the characteristics of the process can serve to qualify outcomes by emphasising how outcomes are achieved. This has to be consistent at all levels of explanation to emphasise that the radical elements of the process, rather than conservative elements, were instrumental in bringing about certain outcomes. This type of qualification helps to ensure that when there is a transfer of meaning from particularist to more generalist levels of interpretation there is less risk that understandings about the way that outcomes were achieved will be framed primarily or only in realist terms. If this were the case then at the generalist level the relevance of the radical elements of the process could be overlooked or ignored.

The third reporting role helps to qualify outcomes by emphasising the legitimacy of the process through which they were achieved. This aspect is particularly important in the case of 'non-official' processes. In the context of the case study all the stakeholder parties mutually agreed that certain principles or ideals would guide and legitimate the purpose of seeking claimants' informed agreement to negotiate native title. This type of explanation makes two important linkages between the purpose and the outcomes. Firstly, the mutually recognised legitimacy of the consultative process by all the participating parties provided a significant indication of the legitimacy they
ultimately accorded to the outcomes. Secondly, the stakeholder groups acknowledged that a conservative process that would follow prescribed procedures could not have been able to fulfil the intended purpose and therefore achieve the sought outcomes.

The fourth reporting role helps to qualify outcomes because it emphasises that certain outcomes are directly attributable to the way in which a process is conducted. It can clarify that the third party facilitating role in a 'non-official' process requires particular competencies and that, while they are different from those required for third party roles in 'official' processes, they are equally significant. This type of qualifying explanation is important because it emphasises that many 'non-official' processes falter and fail to achieve outcomes because they are inappropriately conducted. This type of qualifying explanation establishes the extent to which it is acknowledged that different processes generate their own capacity for participants to arrive at certain outcomes. This was an important consideration with regard to the consultative process. It was significant to specify in the case study report that the component of problem-solving was vitally dependent on the way the component of problem-identification evolved in the process. Explanation emphasised that by stepping outside of convention unique opportunities were made available to claimants. Their capacity to decide how it was to be conducted allowed them for the first time to be able to develop and consolidate their own way of collectively expressing their own interpretations of present realities. This role helped to ensure that outcomes could be conceived to be based on claimants' own interpretations of the significance of the proposal to negotiate native title.

Conclusion

The ideas generated in this chapter provide an indication of considerations that influenced how, as a scholar-reporter, I fulfilled certain roles to interpret and attribute meaning to the case study process. Thus it is indicative of considerations with respect to the first of two broad purposes of the report. This was to establish a baseline understanding of what transpired in order that native title claimants were able to respond to the SA Government's proposal.

Chapter Seven discusses a continuing theme of these case study chapters, which is to demonstrate the applicability of an integrated framework to identify different bases of knowledge and authority which a scholar-reporter may need to take into
consideration. The next chapter deals with the second purpose of the report, which was to make evaluations that would provide an indication of the stage that was reached at the conclusion of the consultative process. It expands on ideas about what was and what was not achieved by way of goals, and the consequent implications this had for articulating the idea of capacity to ultimately actualise an effective ‘resolutionary’ process of negotiation.

---

1 Morrison, 2000
2 This and the subsequent chapter provide a general indication of the substance of the report. The full report is included as Appendix ‘A’ so that a direct linkage can be made between matters raised in the report and the present critique of the way it was compiled.
3 Henceforth in this thesis where reference is made to the needs, rights and interests of Aboriginal people within the context of Australia as a nation-state, the underlying assumption will be that this refers also to those of Aboriginal people living on the mainland of the continent, but also to those indigenous people who live on the islands of the Torres Strait.
4 One of the most fundamental changes to the 1901 Australian Constitution was an outcome of federal legislation in 1962 giving Aboriginal people the right to vote in federal elections. This was subsequently followed by similar amendments through legislation in each state. By 1965 Aboriginal people attained the right to vote in both federal and state elections. In a national referendum in 1967 over 90% of the electorate voted to remove sections of the Australian Constitution which discriminated against Aboriginal people. These changes reflected a prevailing movement for political change relating to indigenous affairs. (National Archives of Australia Fact Sheet 150 http://www.naa.gov.au/publications/fact_sheets/FS150.html)
5 When English colonists acquired territory overseas deemed to be uninhabited, the colonists took their existing English Common Law to be an unchallenged foundation of law in that territory. Those who represented the sovereignty of the Crown at the time of settlement of Australia were, in effect, representing the ultimate power of British imperialism. At the time of Australian settlement they deemed that the indigenous inhabitants were so primitive in their social organisation that it was as if the land were uninhabited. The assumption was that there was no social order, and therefore no law, already in existence. (Butt, 1996: 23) It was on the basis of this assumption that the law of England became the only recognised law of the territory. In 1788 when Governor Philip landed at Port Jackson with his First Fleet of English settlers, he declared that as a representative of ‘the Crown’ he was acquiring the colony of New South Wales by occupation, rather than by cession or conquest. Although the colonists were well aware that Aboriginal people inhabited the land, in their opinion the indigenous people had so little apparent social organisation, as this was understood according to their own beliefs, attitudes, values and philosophical traditions, it was as if the land were uninhabited. The colonisers did not appreciate that Aboriginal cultures and social systems were based on egalitarian principles, rather than principles which support a hierarchical system. Therefore, according to their own assumptions and understandings, they had no obligation to recognise the laws and customs of Aboriginal people as representative of a political relationship that implied sovereignty. As other parts of Australia were settled and became separate colonies, it was the Common Law of England that was, by implication, internationally recognised as law having a controlling influence on settlement throughout the continent of Australasia, with the separate colonies ultimately federating as the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901.
6 The historian Henry Reynolds’ book The Law of the Land (1987) was cited in the Mabo judgment. It represented a significant trend toward the revision of the history of the settling of Australia because it took greater account of the impact of settlement on Aboriginal communities. Further references to historians reviewing Australian history appear below in Endnote 6.
7 The first settlers and their counterparts in England formally applied the doctrine of terra nullius in 1788 as the concept had meaning at the time of colonial expansion. Its meaning is fundamental to understanding a complex set of meanings and issues linked to the settlement of Australia, and how it was now exists as a modern nation-state. It is a pivotal in terms of history and law, that is, both past and present ideas about the way power and control can be asserted. It is particularly significant in contemporary Australia with respect to ideas about the way that sovereignty can be conceptualised and
maintained, and how it can be acquired and held by groups who maintain markedly different lifestyles
and express their identities of interest according to markedly different worldviews. It is deeply
implicated in defining what types of power have been and are being vested in different concepts of
legality, land holding and sovereignty.

8 The High Court ruling in the Mabo case set a significant precedent in Australian law. It was that
indigenous people in Australia, both Torres Strait Islander people and Aboriginal people, could have a
legitimate connection with their own land. To say that the territory now called Australia was \textit{terra
nullius}, or ‘land of no-one’ at the time of colonisation was not only inaccurate in fact but should also
have been recognised as such in law. However, the judges were not prepared to concede that their
ruling altered the claim of sovereignty made by Governor Philip on behalf of \textit{the Crown} in 1788 over all
of Australia. This claim had been the entire basis on which the colonies of Australia were established.
Australia was reliant on that claim to continue to function as a nation-state with its own parliaments and
its own laws and means through which to establish relationships within the external international arena.
All it could do was overturn the legal fiction that sovereignty over Australia was through occupation of
an uninhabited land. The judges found that according to precedent Australian common law was just as
capable of recognising communal interests in land as it was of recognising individual interests. If
Australia was not in fact \textit{terra nullius} at the time of settlement, the implication was that the native title
of the inhabitants at the time of settlement was not automatically wiped out. It should be given
recognition wherever indigenous people could demonstrate that they had maintained traditional laws
and cultural connections with their land. This meant some sense of entitlement had survived settlement
and the assertion of sovereignty by the British Crown. Nevertheless the judges ruled that all inhabitants
of Australia would remain subject to the sovereignty of \textit{the Crown}. This meant that grants of native title
were not necessarily a means of granting Australian indigenous people sovereignty over their own
particular territory, and neither would it afford them their own direct role in international relations
which was the prerogative of the national government to oversee.

9 Sutton, 1999: 41

10 This quotation was published in the 1 July 1993 edition of the Sydney Morning Herald, and attributed
to Hugh Morgan in his address to the Victorian branch of the RSL (Returned Servicemen's League).
Hugh Morgan has been a prominent figure in Australian business circles. In 1993 he was Managing
Director of Western Mining Corporation, a company operating vast mining projects both in Australia
and in other global regions.

11 Anthropological depictions of the direct experience of colonisation of Aboriginal Australia are well
documented by Berndt & Berndt (1952) and Trigger (1992)

12 The history of the settling of Australia varies markedly according to perspective. Until relatively
recent times, accounts primarily favoured a Eurocentric perspective. However, historians such as
Rowley and Reynolds have been influential in developing and challenging accepted historical
interpretations. Charles Rowley produced the first continental approach to a history focusing on the
impact of settlement on Aboriginal people, particularly frontier violence and resistance to invasion,
which had largely been ignored, and established a new genre of history. He writes that "no real
allowance has been made for the extreme violence of the treatment of the Aboriginal; for the facts are
easily enough established that homicide, rape, and cruelty have been commonplace over wide areas and
long periods" (Rowley: 1972: 7). Henry Reynolds' interest has been to ask what was the cost of the
warfare that was fought sporadically across the continent over 150 years, and that this was a question
"which white Australians have rarely posed and never satisfactorily answered". (Reynolds, 1981: 98).
These ideas have similarly been researched by Richard Broome ((1982), Tim Rowse (1987) and John
Connor (2002) as well as featuring in The Oxford Companion to Australian History. Over recent
decades Aboriginal historians, such as Marcia Langton, (1998) Jackie Huggins, (1994) Doreen
Wanganeen, Michael Williams and Wayne Atkinson have also played a prominent role in the dialogue
about the implications of different perspectives. Their themes expand traditional Western discourse and
also make allowance for the production of historical accounts that are equally concerned with
Aboriginal spiritual values, respect for ancestors and relations with people and country, and a concern
with understanding and preserving family histories. More recently Keith Windshuttle has rebutted some
historical claims to widespread massacre and abuse as "unsubstantiated guesswork"and his claim is that
the colonisation of Australia was largely peaceful (Windshuttle, 2002: 18).


14 Aboriginal people have ‘cared for country’ over a period of at least sixty thousand years to maintain
the basic productivity of the land and derive a living from its natural elements. This has wrought
significant changes to the biophysical landscape of the Australian continent. They created an optimum
habitat for themselves, and created conditions that best suited their hunter-gatherer lifestyle (Dovers,
One of the primary influences on the landscape was the way Aboriginal people cultivated the soil with fire. Most burning by Aboriginal people was deliberate. It was used as a means of managing the land according to the specific climatic conditions of different regions. In drier areas, such as the central deserts, burning occurred every several years. Aboriginal groups would burn ahead of anticipated rains, so that fires would not burn too extensively. Once the land rejuvenated, new grasses, tree seedlings and other flora provided food for a range of wildlife, and for the human inhabitants. The land, cleared in this way by Aboriginal people, made it easier for smaller animals, reptiles and insects to locate food sources, and to hunt prey. Animal food sources included small animals, such as native rats, possums, bandicoots, lizards and rat-kangaroos, as well as the larger animals, such as kangaroo and emu. As well, the burning influenced the productivity of a wide range of fruits, seeds, roots and other edible parts of over 400 species of plants. Many species of trees and other flora in Australia have evolved so that their seedlings reappear after burning. Fire as a means of husbandry was more intensive in higher rainfall areas, and particularly along streams and around waterholes burning would be likely to have taken place more than once a year (Jones, 1969: 1).

This conceptual idea was initially developed by Fetherston, 2000.

Discussion in Chapter Seven will elaborate on the idea that it is initiatives being developed through the institutions of settler populations in these nation-states that provide the models for reconsidering how the rights and the status of Indigenous communities in each context could or should be determined. Less account is given to the differences in the social systems of the Indigenous people who live in these regions.

To illustrate the extent to which there has been little critical examination in Australia of negotiation as a relatively informal form of agency compared with more formal agency of court-based processes based on precedent, in the 1997 Report of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner to the Attorney-General, as required by section 209 of the Native Title Act, there were 165 references in 116 pages of text to the option of using negotiation as an alternative to court-based processes. Similarly, in the 1999 Report, there were 128 references to negotiation in 93 pages of text. In both cases there was no conceptual or qualitative definition given of the term, nor consideration given, to how native title issues would be dealt with through this process compared with the way they would be dealt with through court-based procedures. There were no indications of how criteria such as fairness and justice could be safeguarded. I conclude that the presumption is that fairness and justice would be ensured if claimants' interests were represented in negotiations by their lawyers.

This idea is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 8.

Chapter Five developed the argument that to fully understand the characteristics of particular 'resolutionary' processes, models have to be critiqued in relation to one another, as well as in relation to more conservative processes, because they can serve markedly different purposes. The relevance to the case study of comparing models of different 'resolutionary' processes will be further discussed further in Chapter Seven.

Boulding's model (Fig. 1 in Chapter One) is useful in this case because it highlights that this influence may only be fully realised when those in authority are willing to make resources available as an economic form of power to support radical initiatives.

Chapter Four first elaborated on the idea that, because of the potential for bias in different approaches, an 'independent' reporter may need to identify whether bases of explanation have a consistency of purpose in terms of the way they treat both components. This is the case when peak bodies represent certain collective interests of groups such as farmers and miners, whose interests relate more directly with the status quo.
The anthropologist Stanner writes that within Aboriginal cosmologies there is little distinction between body and spirit. Continuities exist between each person and each person’s name, spirit, spirit-site, shadow, and totem signifying place (Stanner 1998: 229). It is a cosmology that copes with the paradox that there is no experience that is not governed by the abiding concept of unity, even though in everyday practical experience certain elements need to be isolated from each other. The overriding sense of oneness creates unity in relationships between people, and in relationships between people and other physical or non-physical entities. This also extends to create a sense of unity between waking-life and dream-life (Stanner, 1998: 229). He suggests that the Dreaming is a key to an intuitive appreciation of various aspects of a unified oneness across time, person and place, rather than a means to simply provide specific explanations. The power of abstract reason within Aboriginal cosmology is structured so that the entirety of life makes sense primarily within the framework of social principles; thus the meaning of kinship permeates the entire meaning of life. The unifying nature of an Aboriginal cosmos is regenerated as an ever-presence that intricately links together within the complex networking of bands, tribes and language groups (Stanner, 1998: 231). Rose identifies four principles of Dreaming Law that can be appreciated, on the one hand, as representing autonomous creative power, and, at the same time, to be part of a whole living system that continually reproduces itself. The focus is on the relationships between different parts of a unity that is not represented by a supreme deity and is not ranked within a hierarchical system (Rose, 1998: 242). The first is that of response, how different features communicate and relate to each other to reproduce the whole system to enhance life; the second is balance, so that each feature is in balance with others; the third is symmetry, to maintain each feature's strength and power, and the fourth is autonomy, to provide all features with their own integrity (Rose, 1998: 242-245). Cosmic principles feature in myths concerning autonomous, yet balancing, forces. These can be represented in relationships between natural elements, such as the sun or the rain, particular geological formations or geographic locations, and living entities, such as animals, birds, fish or other living creatures, as well as other entities and elements in the natural world, such as trees, water and the spirits of certain places. There are interactions which take place between entities, at different seasons and at different points in the life cycles of living entities and other entities in the cosmos, both seen and unseen, which give each part of the whole significance. Entailed in all relationships is a concept of the fulfilment of sacred responsibilities in order that all features of country will in turn maintain their responsibility to care for people and provide the necessities of life. Within this series of complex relationships between people and different entities within the environment, expressed through kinship categories, none are locked into one physical category. Each entity contributes to maintaining culture, language, and a way of life that reproduces itself, its Law and its relationships with all other entities. All maintain and enhance life within the entire system (Rose, 1998: 242-245). Thus the traditional lifestyle of Aboriginal people can be appreciated as emphasising an intelligent responsiveness to environmental features, rather than control over them (Christie, 1991: 1).
CHAPTER SEVEN: ELABORATING ON THE OUTCOMES OF THE CASE STUDY

Discussion in this chapter further elaborates on the way Chapter Six used the case study report to signify where and how 'independent' scholarly reporting about interventions can be improved. It is proposed that if an integrated framework is employed then a comparative approach can be applied in all six nominated reporting roles. In the case study they establish a basis for, firstly, indicating the significance of conflict in the given set of circumstances; secondly, defining how the consultative process was to be characterised; thirdly, defining its purpose; fourthly, explaining its conduct and what transpired and, fifthly, explaining its outcomes. It is proposed that a clearer articulation of these roles would have made a constructive contribution to the report. This chapter again considers the role of reporting outcomes but in this case the focus is on the way this role relates to that of making evaluations.

Section 1 considers the first of the two primary elements of this chapter, namely how the report explained and evaluated the outcomes of the consultative process in relation to its purpose. Explanation is provided in terms of capacity developed prior to and during the process. Ideas centre around the fundamental issue of enabling Aboriginal claimants to make an informed decision with regard to the proposal to negotiate native title on a statewide basis in South Australia. At the end of the consultative process claimants expressed their willingness to proceed with the option to negotiate. Sections 2 and 3 consider the second primary element, which is to indicate the way the report explained the outcomes and in turn made evaluations in terms of future capacity required to actualise the proposed negotiations. Section 2 specifically focuses on the idea that the report had to explain outcomes by looking forward to developments beyond claimants' actual decision to negotiate. It indicates a range of uncertainties associated with procedural, organisational and structural arrangements that would need to be put in place to actualise negotiations on a statewide basis. Section 3 also concerns the idea that there was uncertainty at the end of the consultative process as to how particular requirements would be put in place. This section focuses specifically on the need for capacity-building in terms of negotiation skills training. This discussion indicates the significance of negotiation skills training in order that claimants, and the other stakeholding parties, can ultimately engage confidently and effectively in cross-sectoral and cross-cultural negotiations on a statewide basis.
Overall, this chapter again compares realist and idealist approaches to show that they are likely to put forward different understandings about the relationship between willingness and actual capacity to constructively engage in a complex process of negotiation.

SECTION 1: EVALUATING THE PROCESS BY ARTICULATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ITS PURPOSE AND ITS OUTCOMES

Discussion in the final section of Chapter Six indicated that each reporting role can be helpful in order to give structure to ideas about outcomes because each can help to qualify explanations. The present purpose is to show that the use of this type of structure is equally useful in relation to the role of making evaluations about the process. Although many aspects of the process and its outcomes integrally relate with one another, the following discussion has framed ideas in terms of the achievement of anticipated goals, anticipated goals that were not achieved and unanticipated outcomes.

Achievement of Anticipated Outcomes

The majority of the evaluations in the case study report are concerned with indicating the relationship between the initial strategic planning of the process by the NTU facilitation team and how it was conducted in order to achieve certain outcomes. However, it is necessary to first consider the anticipated goals as they were understood by the other stakeholding groups deliberating at the Main Table forum prior to the process, namely the SA Government, and the peak bodies SAFF and SACOME.

- **Primary Anticipated Outcome – Claimants' Decision in Relation to the Proposal to Negotiate Native Title**

It was important to indicate in the report what potential benefits the other stakeholders envisaged would be the achieved by opting to support this more radical strategy. To do this information was drawn from the archive and incorporated into the report to indicate the immediate context in which the initiative developed. The inclusion of information about these prior stages helped to establish that the stakeholders had a vested interest in understanding and evaluating the capacity of the process to achieve its fundamental goal, which was to allow claimants to make an informed decision as to whether they would accept the option to negotiate native title. Establishing the role that the other stakeholders played in initiating the proposal and supporting the consultative process was also helpful because there was a need to signify whether the outcomes might impact on their longer-term expectations with regard to the option to negotiate
native title on a statewide basis. There was the prospect that, at the end of the process, the other stakeholding groups might have a more precise understanding, or even a different understanding, of the way that the proposed ILUA negotiations might be conducted and what substantive issues it might address. For instance, in September 1999 the SA Solicitor-General, in representing the purpose of proposed negotiations, indicated that ‘everything is on the table’. Although there was uncertainty as to his precise meaning, it was important to signify that key parties had demonstrated a willingness to step outside of convention in order to explore whether negotiations could ultimately bring about a mutually satisfactory and effective statewide ILUA.

Discussion about the anticipated goals as envisaged by the other stakeholders also reflects the significance of other reporting roles. For instance, with regard to the first reporting role, that of defining present realities, it was necessary to indicate that the other stakeholder parties had their own way of defining certain cross-cultural problems. In turn this would have a profound influence on what they envisaged would be the most viable and appropriate strategy for rectifying them. This then has a bearing on the second reporting role, that of characterising the process. Although the stakeholders did not articulate precisely in what way they conceived the radical option to negotiate native title on a statewide basis to differ from more determinative processes, it was important to signify that they conceived it to be a viable and legitimate way of bringing about the sought improvements. They were confident the consultative process could fulfil its purpose in a way that was complementary in relation to more determinative conservative processes. Thus evaluations in the report as to its capacity to achieve certain outcomes were of direct concern to them.

The goals of the other stakeholding parties prior to the process can be understood most readily according to a realist approach and thus evaluations also had to take account of this orientation. Their goals could be understood in terms of the requirement for state-based arrangements with regard to native title to comply with the federal Native Title Act 1998. It was this federal legislation that precipitated the need to make changes in state laws, legislation and social policy in order to express how claimants' rights and responsibilities associated with native title can coexist with the rights and responsibilities of others with an interest in the same claim domains.

However, sole reliance on realist-based explanation would have limited and biased the way meaning could be attributed to the purpose of seeking to negotiate native title. An idealist-based approach could be as useful for expressing the idea that the
representatives of the stakeholding groups involved with the proposal had made subjective value-judgements in terms of their choice of strategy as a means to achieve certain goals. An *ideal* framing could convey the idea that the key representatives were prepared to move away from the more conventional determinative approach and support the consultations as a stage toward the implementation of an innovative and unprecedented way of negotiating certain cross-cultural problems. The strategy to negotiate could be conceived to be more than a means to comply with federal policy and legislation in relation to the relatively limited concept of native title. Part of the goal was to establish a more workable degree of coexistence and a general improvement in cross-cultural relations throughout the entire state. The *ideal* approach could more categorically express the idea that certain principles and *ideals* also underpinned these stakeholders' commitment to advance the strategy and thus evaluations of the outcomes also had to take this orientation into account. The initiative evolved because the representatives of the stakeholder groups were thinking in terms of the goal of achieving a greater realisation of *harmonies of interests* even though inevitably the peak bodies were also thinking in terms of the need to realise their own self-interests.

By way of contrast, it was not possible to include in this section of the report a relatively clear understanding of the way that the Aboriginal communities interpreted present realities or their aspirations for improving their situation. Native title, a concept that is most meaningful in *realist* terms, was not necessarily an adequate or sufficient basis for Aboriginal people to envisage what changes would improve their situation. It could only signify one way through which a broader and deep-seated *contradiction* might in part be addressed. It was due to the *capacity* of consultative process that a clearer understanding of claimants' perceptions of problematic cross-cultural relationships emerged. The *problem-identification* component of the process in the pilot sessions and in the congress meetings made it possible for claimants to voice how they subjectively interpreted present realities. In turn they could establish a meaningful basis for articulating their goals and what type of *problem-solving* strategy they envisaged might be the means for achieving them.

The remainder of the present discussion focuses on the way evaluations could be made by comparing the NTU facilitation team's *initial strategic planning*, what they anticipated they needed to do to fulfil the purpose of the process, in relation to *the way the process was actually conducted* to bring about the outcomes. It thus illustrates how evaluations can be framed in terms of the *capacity* of the process to achieve certain goals.
• **Ongoing Monitoring of the NTU’s Accountability to Claimants**

Given that the consultative process was unprecedented, from the outset the facilitation team recognised the need for self-monitoring to ensure that it was conducted in a way that could be validated by claimants as a viable and legitimate strategy through which to explore the achievement of certain outcomes. The report signified that this purpose was fulfilled by making evaluations with regard to the extent to which both the facilitation team, as well as the claimants to whom the team saw themselves accountable, could substantiate that the consultative process was both workable and legitimate.

• **Clearer Articulation of What Constituted an Informed Decision to Negotiate Native Title**

Evaluation of the process and its outcomes had to indicate that the way it was conducted generated capacity for the claimants to develop their own understanding of the key substantive issue, namely, the optional choices being made available to them through which they could realise their native title rights. Evaluation had to signify that the very idea of what constituted an informed decision was refined as the process developed. At the end of the process the NTU team and the claimants had together developed a much more realistic concept of what constituted an informed decision than had even been previously possible to envisage. The fact that it was refined as the process developed reflected that what transpired had been a learning process. It was unlikely that the organisational and representational issues that claimants dealt with could have been given substantial definition and meaning any other way.

• **Fostering Social Empowerment and Capacity for Self-Determination**

One significant purpose of the process was to foster social empowerment and a greater capacity for Aboriginal self-determination. Evaluation had to signify that the NTU facilitation team recognised that capacity to negotiate equitably and effectively would not only be challenging because of marked differences in cultural and organisational styles. These factors were compounded by the degree to which Aboriginal people had formerly experienced a structural disadvantage in society as an outcome of unjust laws and prevailing attitudes and behaviours. Aboriginal communities had been extensively disempowered and dislocated and this itself was a factor that significantly constrained communities from exerting power or influence in a unified way. Therefore outcomes that were meaningful in relation to the primary
outcome included a developing sense of confidence that negotiations could bring positive outcomes and opportunities for Aboriginal people. Other outcomes included a developing sense of unity and purpose amongst the NTMCs and their claimant communities in the stages leading toward their decision to negotiate about native title issues and a capacity for claimants from diverse communities to work together as a larger group.

- **Clearer Articulation of Different Organisational Arrangements Required for Negotiating at the Statewide Level**

An anticipated outcome was a clearer articulation of different organisational arrangements that would need to be in place in order that claimants could negotiate at state level rather than just in relation to their own specific local claims. The facilitation team recognised that part of their role was to help claimants develop capacity to conceptualise the organisational arrangements required if they were to negotiate certain native title matters at state level. Evaluation had to signify that organisational arrangements for negotiating a statewide ILUA would be fundamentally different from those that apply for processing court-based claims to native title through the NNTT and the Federal Court as well as those that the NTMCs required to negotiate with other parties who have an interest in their own claim domain.

In the initial planning stages the facilitation team devised a prospective organisational model for claimants to consider that would allow Aboriginal communities to make certain collective decisions about native title at state level rather than at the local claim level (outlined in Fig. 26, Chapter Six). Evaluation in the report had to stress that, prior to the consultative process, it had not been possible for the facilitation team to take into account how this model would be subjectively interpreted and evaluated by the claimants themselves. There was no way in the formative stages that the team could fully appreciate whether claimants would perceive it to be an appropriate model. Evaluation had to signify that one reason why the NTU changed the planned strategy of consulting with claimants on a regional basis was an outcome of responding to claimants' concerns raised at the pilot sessions with regard to the proposed organisational model for negotiating on a statewide basis. The pilot sessions were conducted through elicitive facilitation rather than through prescriptive instruction in order to ensure there was a two-way learning process. This generated capacity to appreciate why claimants found the proposed organisational model for statewide negotiations inappropriate. The Aboriginal participants at the pilot sessions recognised the need to consult with other claimant communities and their NTMCs so that they
could collectively consider what might be a more appropriate model. The development of a more culturally appropriate organisational model that would allow claimants to negotiate in a unified way at state level, the ‘united voice’, will subsequently be discussed as one of the unanticipated outcomes of the consultative process.

The need to articulate different organisational arrangements to be able to negotiate native title at the statewide level is one aspect of reporting where it is useful to compare different bases of evaluation. A realist-based approach would be sufficient to indicate that the key stakeholder groups, the peak bodies SACOME and SAFF, had appointed representatives to participate in the exploratory dialogue about the possibility of realising a statewide agreement about native title issues through negotiation. Similarly the SA Government had established an ILUA Negotiations Team. The other stakeholder groups thus already had workable statewide organisational arrangements in place. Therefore, the only additional organisational arrangement that these stakeholder groups required was the development of the Main Table forum through which they could jointly discuss the proposal. The Executive Officer of the NTU was invited to participate in these discussions and, as previously alluded to in Chapter Six, the other stakeholder representatives at first presumed that he had a similar mandate to represent claimants as a constituent group at the Main Table meetings.

An idealist-based approach was equally appropriate to stress that the purpose of the proposed negotiations would be to bring about new arrangements between the settler population and the Aboriginal claimants. In this sense they could be described as negotiations taking place between entities dissimilar to one another. As many claimants maintain a fundamentally different culture and social system, greater consideration had to be given to the social and organisational arrangements through which claimants could participate in negotiations at state level. These deliberations led to the initiative to consult with claimants directly. The SA Attorney-General committed government funds and resources so that the NTU could facilitate the consultations, which were administered through the Secretariat established in the NTU specifically for this purpose.

- **Clearer Articulation of the Competencies Required To Conduct the Consultative Process**

An anticipated outcome was that the facilitation team would develop a clearer understanding of the competencies needed to assist claimants come to an informed
decision. Explanation and evaluation in this regard had to stress that the NTU team planning and implementing the process through the Secretariat recognised that they could not follow a prescribed model. This could be contrasted with the expertise and competencies required of those working within a more prescribed format in the arm of the NTU dealing with the court-based processing of claims. Competency had to be evaluated in terms of capacity to institute a flexible, elicitive process requiring good communication skills and a depth of understanding of issues of concern to Aboriginal people in this region. Evaluation had to signify two key aspects of competency, both of which reflected a need to treat each stage of the process as working toward a partnership with Aboriginal claimants. One concerned capacity to conduct meetings in a way that could be reflexively acknowledged to be appropriate by the NTMCs in attendance. The other concerned capacity to use the resources of the Secretariat to produce transparent reports about developments taking place at the congress meetings so that this information could be made available to the wider claimant community. This type of explanation helped to convey ideas about how the process was conducted and what substantive issues the NTMCs raised. Both were equally important elements of competency in a process dealing with matters that were complex and could be appreciated as relevant according to two distinct cultural and social systems.

- **Clearer Articulation of Differences in Competencies to Conduct a 'Non-Official' Process in Relation to Conducting 'Official' Processes**

As well as the need to evaluate the capacity of the NTU facilitation team to conduct the consultative process, it was also significant to make a more general distinction between the conduct of the formal court-based process for determining native title and more informal processes for negotiating ILUAs. It was necessary to explain that the competency in each case is reliant on its own particular body of knowledge and expertise. This type of explanation helped to stress that the capacities developed in relation to the conduct of the consultative process would similarly be required in the actual statewide negotiation process. Evaluating the differences in competencies was important because agreements achieved through the negotiation of ILUAs involve more than a legal determination of native title. Negotiations would have to be conducted in a less prescribed way and allowance would have to be made for a wider range of issues, understandings and perspectives to be incorporated for consideration.
With regard to the last two points, realist and idealist approaches could both serve as bases for making evaluations. A realist-based approach would be sufficient to explain and evaluate the capacity of the more formal processes undertaken through the NNTT and the Federal Court to bring about certain determinative outcomes. The competencies required to process native title claims in this way would be attained through education in mainstream fields such as law and social policy and through professional development programs, such as those instituted through the NNTT. An idealist-based approach was equally valid for explaining and evaluating the capacity of more innovative, flexible and informal processes, such as the consultative process and the negotiations that will follow, to bring about certain outcomes. These competencies derive from an understanding of mediated or facilitated cross-sectoral and cross-cultural 'resolutionary' processes. A significant factor in this case would be that differences in culture and social arrangements would not necessarily be conceived to be challenging issues to be overcome through compromise and modification.¹

Evaluation had to signify that in the consultative process Aboriginal culture was taken to be central and integral to the development of social knowledge as a basis for building claimants’ capacity to ultimately decide whether and how they would undertake negotiated decision-making at the state level. Culture was taken to be the resource that claimants themselves would have to use through which to make their subjective evaluations and deliberations about the proposal to negotiate about native title.

**Non-Achievement of Anticipated Outcomes**

Evaluations also had to indicate that certain goals that the other stakeholders and the NTU facilitation team expected would be achieved as an outcome of the process were in fact not achieved. This aspect is thus not only concerned with evaluating the capacity of the consultation process itself, but also the need to consider future capacities if ultimately the expected goals still needed to be achieved.

- **Commencement of Negotiations Immediately After the Consultative Process**

The other stakeholders had hoped that if claimants indicated a willingness to negotiate, negotiations could actually commence very soon thereafter. It was necessary to explain that, even though the NTMCs were not in a position to commence negotiations at the conclusion of the consultative process, this did not necessarily reflect a lack of competency on the part of the facilitation team. Part of their role was to provide information that could enhance claimants' understanding of the proposal to negotiate, but to be useful it had to be offered in an appropriate format and at an appropriate time.
This part of their role intersected with another, which was to make opportunities available for claimants to deliberate with one another in a way that had hitherto not been possible. These opportunities were vitally important in order that the NTMCs could gauge the extent to which they shared common identities of interests so as to make it viable to opt to negotiate native title on a statewide basis.

Evaluation had to stress that by the end of the process, the facilitation team, the claimants and other stakeholders had developed a more realistic appreciation of how claimants’ ultimate decision to negotiate was founded on their own collective deliberations made possible through the congress meetings. Thus as well as providing indications of the significance of what was achieved through the consultative process, these ideas also justified why it was not possible within the time frame of the process to achieve all the goals whereby negotiation could begin shortly thereafter.

- **Negotiation Skills Training**

The initial strategy planned by the facilitation team was based on the likelihood that claimants would accept the model for negotiating on a statewide basis as set out in Fig. 28, Chapter Six. According to this plan each NTMC would appoint representatives to be part of a Reference Group which would then receive specialised negotiation skills training. Evaluation had to signify that what transpired through the facilitated elicitive processes of the congress meetings was an even more fundamental learning process that had to precede more prescriptive negotiation skills training. The congress meetings allowed the NTMCs to build consensus and consolidate their understanding about a number of matters. They included appropriate protocols to ensure that the congress meetings functioned effectively and fairly, mutually acceptable organisational and procedural preferences for negotiating at state level and the type of substantive issues that could be better addressed at state level rather than at local claim level.

This type of explanation was necessary to justify why it had not been possible within the timeframe of the consultative process to offer negotiation skills training. Evaluation had to indicate that claimants therefore still needed opportunities to be made available in subsequent stages to develop their capacity to participate confidently in a complex process of negotiation. It was important to convey the idea that capacity-building and training programs were absolutely essential even though it was uncertain who would offer such programs or through which body the necessary financial support to run them would be provided.
Explanations and evaluations about the use of training to build capacity to engage constructively in negotiations can be conveyed in idealist terms when they are based on knowledge and authority derived through an understanding of factors that contribute to the efficacy of ‘resolutionary’ processes. However, it was necessary to ensure that training was equally meaningful in realist terms. It was important to signify that the less formal strategy to negotiate native title through a statewide ILUA was regarded as a legitimate bridging mechanism through which new arrangements between Aboriginal people and the settler population could be ratified through the courts and the legislature. Evaluation had to stress that in this context both claimants and the other stakeholding groups would be going through a learning process as to how best to deal with a wide range of relatively unfamiliar organisational and representational issues and other uncertainties associated with negotiation.

**Achieved Outcomes that Were Not Anticipated Prior to the Consultative Process**

Evaluations also had to indicate that certain outcomes were achieved that both the other stakeholders and the NTU facilitation team had not originally envisaged as goals. It was important to indicate that the way the consultative process itself was conducted through a facilitated elicitive process created the capacity for new understandings to be developed that the facilitation team had not been able to fully appreciate prior to the process. These indications helped to explain that the conduct of the process contributed significantly to allowing this potential capacity to emerge. This idea could not have been fully articulated simply by alluding to how certain anticipated goals were achieved.

- **Changing the Strategy for Conducting the Consultative Process**

  The NTU facilitation team recognised that a relatively uncentred process required them to be ready to respond to feedback from claimants as to whether it was appropriate in order to fulfil its purposes. The team was initially required to make a response as an outcome of claimants at the pilot sessions indicating their preference for NTMC representatives from all the claimant groups to be consulted together, rather than on a regional basis. An account of the way that the facilitation team changed the strategy in this early stage of the process to organise three statewide congresses was presented in Chapter Six. Evaluation of the significance of modifying the planned strategy had to stress that it was the elicitive deliberations developed in the pilot sessions that led both the claimants and the facilitation team to recognise that claimants presently lacked any organisational capacity to collectively confer about their concerns as Aboriginal people, including native title matters. An unanticipated outcome was a realisation that the
revised strategy to consult with NTMCs in statewide congresses could provide just such an opportunity.

- **Congress Meetings Serving as a Practical Indicator of a More Culturally Appropriate Organisational Model for Participating in Statewide Negotiations**

Evaluations had to signify that the conduct of process through the unifying congress meetings contributed significantly to the establishment and consolidation of more constructive and meaningful relationships between the diverse claimant communities. Its conduct actually gave the NTMCs unprecedented opportunities to develop a sense of what might be their *common identities of interest* and thus a basis for conceptualising the overall criteria of success of the prospective negotiations as a vehicle for social change. In fact, as the process evolved, it broadened the ideas and perspectives of all the stakeholder groups about organisational and representational issues that will have significance in the advancement of the cross-cultural ILUA negotiations. Many *new understandings* about the complexity of issues that will be entailed in negotiations were directly attributable to the facilitated elicitive style of the consultations. Evaluation also had to signify that the process broke down stereotypical images about the *capacity* of Aboriginal people to engage constructively with one another in order to consider the potential benefits that they could collectively realise by engaging in statewide negotiations.

The concept of the 'united voice' emerged in part through the generation of a number of diagrammatic forms of an organisational model that would give claimants a sense of being collectively represented as a constituency in statewide negotiations. This is illustrated in Fig. 28, which is taken from a whiteboard drawing developed in consultation with claimants at a meeting in Coober Pedy. The voicing of ideas as to why the initial model developed by the NTU facilitation team was not satisfactory served as a significant catalyst for exploring what might be a more appropriate model.
Fig. 28: Illustrating how ‘hard’ issues, difficult to resolve locally, could be addressed through ILUA negotiations

- **Consolidation of an Organisational Body to Represent All Claimants in Statewide Negotiations**

Evaluation had to indicate that the consolidation of the concept of the ‘united voice’, which would allow the interests of native title claimants to be collectively represented in statewide negotiations, was a highly significant unanticipated outcome of the consultative process. It was important to stress that it was a decisive factor in claimants' ultimate agreement to proceed with the option to negotiate even though prior to the process this model had not been conceived to be the way statewide negotiations could be organised. It accorded with claimants' own cultural worldview and, like the consultations, it could be maintained through protocols that claimants had a direct role in establishing.
An outcome of the process was that the NTMCs authorised the Secretariat, which was funded by the SA state government, to formally incorporate the 'united voice' body. Prior to the congress meetings, the arm of the NTU, which was funded by the federal government to process native title claims through the NNTT and the Federal Court, was the only body that could be conceived to be able to represent claimants’ interests at the Main Table meetings. However, as its role was limited to that of assisting individual claimant groups to progress their native title claim, it did not represent claimants collectively. The incorporation of the 'united voice' body would make it a legitimate vehicle through which claimants could engage with the other stakeholders at the Main Table meetings. Claimants would thus no longer only be solely represented at those meetings by the NTU.

Another significant outcome was a clearer indication of the type of support that could be offered through the Secretariat to assist the NTMCs prepare for statewide negotiations.²

Evaluation about organisational arrangements to represent the stakeholder constituencies in statewide negotiations could be oriented toward a realist approach. It would emphasise how the peak body stakeholders SAFF and SACOME envisaged statewide negotiations could resolve certain cross-cultural problems that seemed to constrain the capacity of their constituent members from realising their interests while at the same time bringing potential advantages for native title claimants. As previously indicated, the scenario that had originally been put forward was for the NTU to negotiate on behalf of claimants. Staff working in the federally-funded arm of the NTU had in their own professional capacities developed a high level of understanding of the process through which a legal determination of native title could be achieved. If they had then played a key role in the negotiations, this would have alleviated the complexity of having to address many uneven understandings both about native title as a concept and accepted procedural matters relating to the way it can be determined or ratified. It would have enabled the negotiations to begin soon after claimants agreed to negotiate.

Evaluation according with an idealist approach could be equally useful for highlighting that claimants’ former lack of appropriate organisational capacity beyond their own local claim level was in part a reflection of political and social arrangements that had since colonisation disadvantaged and dislocated Aboriginal people. It would be more inclined to stress that the 'united voice' would allow claimants throughout the state to
be collectively represented in negotiations through a constituent body capable of being formally incorporated at the same time as being culturally appropriate for Aboriginal people.

Evaluations based on an understanding of ‘resolutionary’ processes highlighted the longer-term significance of the way the process allowed claimants to develop the more culturally appropriate ‘united voice’ model. It was necessary to explain that it did more than increase claimants’ ultimate capacity to participate confidently and equitably in the negotiations. Its development also lessened the likelihood that the statewide negotiations would become increasingly more unbalanced and unwieldy as they went on. If they were not founded on mutually acceptable organisational arrangements and procedural guidelines subsequent negotiations would most likely have become more, not less, complex as they proceeded due to this fundamental flaw. It was necessary to convey the idea that confusions and secondary conflicts with regard to the way issues should be presented and who should present them could actually undermine the process and ultimately reduce the prospects of reconciliation between people who identify with different cultural and social systems.

If the consultative process had not allowed sufficient time for the NTMCs to collectively deliberate and articulate ideas about appropriate representation for negotiating at state level claimants would not have shared a sense of ‘ownership’ of the process or its outcomes. There would have been a bias for arrangements for negotiating to be most appropriate for meeting needs and addressing problems as they were framed and scoped by the other stakeholders. Even if negotiations proceeded on the basis of the initial model first proposed prior to the pilots, it too would have reinforced assumptions, based on stereotypical and unfair images rather than actualities, that Aboriginal people could not or were not seeking to directly engage in this type of cross-cultural and cross-sectoral participatory decision-making process. In fact, the consultations revealed that it was more the case that claimants hitherto did not have the organisational capacity necessary to develop the emergent negotiating model that accorded with their own cultural and social imperatives. Hitherto it had not even been conceptualised as a possibility.

- **The Consultative Process as a Prototype Model for Negotiations**

Evaluation also had to indicate that the consultative process would serve as the most useful prototype model for articulating the characteristics, the purpose and the sought
outcomes of the prospective ILUA negotiations and how it could be most efficaciously conducted. The case study report was a significant vehicle through which the stakeholding groups could develop an understanding of the consultative process as a useful model. Ideas were not scoped and framed entirely in accordance with realist-based normative or functionalist frameworks. There was an attempt to integrate idealist-based ideas so that the process could be conceived as a model of an intervention that defines part of its purpose to be reconciliation and the realisation of new arrangements fostering coexistence rather than a furtherance of dominant/subordinate political, economic and social relations.

SECTION 2: OUTCOMES EVALUATED IN TERMS OF NEED FOR INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORT TO ACTUALISE STATEWIDE NEGOTIATIONS

The report incorporated a chapter dedicated to giving an account of the process, as those who made up the facilitating team subjectively understood it. It summarised and represented their perceptions of ongoing and future developments and requirements. This was a way of giving recognition to a cumulative body of knowledge that developed as a direct outcome of the team's experiences in building their relationships with and their sense of accountability to claimants. Some of their understandings represented perceptions with respect to problem-identification. Ultimately the evaluations and recommendations in the report reflected how the team members individually or collectively envisaged problem-solving strategies could be planned for and undertaken in ongoing stages. Incorporating this range of ideas helped to signify how the requirements for instituting the more radical strategy of negotiation would be quite different from requirements already in place to progress individual native title claims through the more conservative court-based process.

The facilitation team's understandings were significant given their unique position to offer explanations and make evaluations as to what would be required in order for claimants to be ready to participate equitably and effectively in negotiations. The findings in the report were detailed and complex, and cannot all be enumerated in this chapter. However, when compiling the report it was important to acknowledge that the team's cumulative knowledge and authority warranted due recognition. It was necessary to indicate their specific areas of expertise and their competencies and how they all contributed to the effective functioning of the consultative process. Together with claimants' own assessments, the facilitation team's understandings were a further
useful and valid basis for justifying the provision of ongoing financial, administrative and infrastructural support that would be essential in order to effectively actualise the negotiations process.

The report had to indicate that, as a consequence of the NTMCs’ ultimate agreement to proceed with statewide negotiations, budgeting and planning covering a range of organisational and procedural areas would need to be undertaken. It could not have been anticipated precisely what arrangements were necessary prior to claimants making their final decision. The establishment of organisational arrangements and infrastructural support for the negotiations would have to be undertaken in accordance with the way that claimants wanted to proceed. The purpose of this section is to indicate that while the report had to specify that further organisational capacity and infrastructure would need to be put in place to progress the negotiations, there was uncertainty as to how and when it would be developed and how and through which agencies it would be funded.

Uncertainty as to How the Statewide Negotiations should be Organised

The development of infrastructural support and the implementation of capacity-building programs would be dependent on how the ILUA negotiations were to be funded. Federal funding still had to be made available to the NTU to support the progress of individual native title claims through the more conservative court-based determinations. The individual claims had to be maintained to ensure that, should the option to negotiate fail to bring about a positive agreement, claimants would still have recourse to have their individual claims processed. As the federal government was already fulfilling its obligations to fund the more conservative means for processing native title claims, there was a greater likelihood that the state government would have to take responsibility for financially supporting the negotiated statewide ILUA. This contributed significantly to the uncertainty as to when and how appropriate infrastructure and financial support would be made available and which bodies would undertake certain tasks that were critical to prepare for the negotiations.

Nevertheless, the report had to indicate that, irrespective of which organisation ultimately undertook responsibility for them, they would be vital to ensure adequate capacity to effectively institute statewide negotiations. The complexity and the inter-relationship of factors that would influence the development of organisational infrastructure and other capacities are exemplified by considering in turn two broad
areas of concern, namely the ongoing role of the Secretariat to support the NTMCs to prepare for negotiations and the need to review changing lines of accountability.

The Secretariat’s Role to Support NTMCs Prepare for Negotiations

As previously mentioned, the NTU was initially established within ALRM through federal funding to be the representative body assisting claimants progress their individual native title claims while the Secretariat functioned as a separate arm through funds made available from the SA Government to support the consultative process. This was a key issue when making evaluations in the report to stress that the Secretariat would need to be maintained beyond the period of the consultative process, given that NTMCs would need ongoing support in order that they could continue to meet and begin their preparations for negotiation.

The consultative process had set a precedent that statewide meetings were a means through which claimants could develop clearer mutual understandings through discussion and deliberation. Evaluations of the conduct of the consultations reinforced the idea that capacity-building and collective social learning was developed through the practice of sharing information and ideas at the congress meetings as much as through formal training. Claimants needed such opportunities to build relationships, formulate protocols and understandings and decide how they would formally incorporate the ‘united voice’ as an organisational body. There had not been opportunity within the consultation period to fully develop representative structures, operational procedures and policy frameworks similar to those existing in the farming and mining sectors, and within the government sector. This was significant factor because the ‘united voice’ body would need to develop capacity to function effectively as an organisational body that allowed a range of political, economic, social and environmental issues of concern to Aboriginal people to be developed. It would be the means for claimants' concerns to be clearly and meaningfully articulated in their own right as well as to signify the way they related to and might better coexist with those of other parties. Native title would be the basis for how some of their concerns could be addressed in a more integrated way through the formal decision-making apparatus of the state. However, while the other stakeholder groups would be primarily concerned with ongoing and future issues, the ‘united voice’ body through which Aboriginal concerns would be represented would be as concerned that negotiations also address a complex range of past issues. This is because many were a direct consequence of the former structurally disadvantaged position that Aboriginal people had held within the state since colonisation. Evaluation had to signify that claimants were only now in a position to formulate some sort of
collective position with respect to past issues that would impact on their position in statewide negotiations. The degree of complexity entailed in statewide negotiations was illustrated in the report by drawing attention to the idea that they would simultaneously have to address three fundamentally types of issue, which generally equate with Boulding's 'Three Faces of Power' model (Fig. 1, Chapter One). The first relates to negotiating about issues of equality and recognition as these concepts are enshrined in the political and legal institutions of both social systems, and thus they more closely align with authoritative power 'over' the way decisions are made and enforced. The second relates to issues of fairness, equity and the value accorded to material and symbolic resources in exchange mechanisms, and thus they more closely align with power 'to' maintain economic activity. The third relates to the way people with different lifestyles and cultures can most harmoniously live together within a given environment so as to maintain that environment in a sustainable way, and thus they more closely align with power to interact 'with' others through positive, constructive relationships.

Evaluation had to stress the idea that NTMCs and the 'united voice' body which was subsequently to be incorporated were relatively fragile organisational units that had no equivalence in traditional Aboriginal customary law. They had only relatively recently been established in order for native title claimant groups to comply with the settler population's legal and legislative requirements. It was important to signify that, in the stages leading toward negotiation, all parties would have to take account of the fact that NTMCs would have the significant burden and the responsibility of interfacing between two cultural and social systems. These were important considerations with respect to claimants' capacity to enter into negotiations on an equitable basis. Evaluation had to stress that the developments leading toward negotiations would be far more complex for NTMCs than they would be for the other stakeholders whose organisational arrangements were already well established.

The need to incorporate the 'united voice' as soon as possible would place the NTMCs under significant pressure. This is because they needed time and opportunity to reflect on and conceive in relatively abstract terms what might be the best way for it to function. However, very shortly thereafter, when there was direct engagement with the other stakeholding groups, they would be expected to demonstrate that this untried body had the capacity to function effectively in practice. The NTMCs would be reliant on further statewide meetings to consider organisational arrangements to do with the way in which the 'united voice' would appoint a negotiation team to represent them.
directly in joint stakeholder discussions. They would also have to consider how
decision-making would be undertaken so that information and input could be
transferred back and forth between those directly engaged in negotiations and
individual claimant communities. They would thus face significant challenges because
the ‘united voice’ was a new and innovative organisational model.

Beyond the NTMCs agreement to negotiate they would need to deliberate about their
preferred mode of engagement with other stakeholders and their own preferences in
terms of how the negotiations should be conducted and reported. It was thus important
to indicate in the report that choices had to be made concerning the mode of
engagement. It could be that the stakeholder groups nominate to negotiate directly
with one another, engage advocates to assist them to present positions and interests
along the line taken in more conservative processes. A third option would be to
appoint an independent negotiator or mediator to either monitor or play an integral role
in the proceedings.4 It was significant to indicate that these optional modes of
engagement in negotiations would need to be clarified to establish the terms for
‘negotiating understanding’ about cultural difference between the stakeholder groups.5

Evaluation also had to stress that claimants would continue to be dependent on the
Secretariat to provide financial and administrative support. This included the
development of the underpinning communications network, research, and the provision
of advice relating directly to substantive issues to be raised in the negotiations, as well
as advice and training about procedural issues. This would involve maintaining
permanent records; liaison with NTU officers progressing claims on an individual basis;
liason with other key stakeholder groups and key institutions such as the NNTT;
disseminating information about the process to interested parties as well as
establishing the communications and travel arrangements for fostering the developing
relationships between individual local claimant groups. Another key task of the
Secretariat would be to disseminate information to improve understanding about native
title as a concept, and the associated complexities about how it can be realised. These
understandings would be significant, given that native title issues can be addressed
through the courts, sometimes involving legal challenges through litigation, through
government policy determined by parliamentary legislation, and more recently through
the negotiation of ILUAs.

In fulfilling these ongoing roles, the Secretariat would also have to ensure that the
cultural significance of substantive issues was well articulated through ongoing support
to maintain the use of Aboriginal language as one significant basis for understanding and interpreting issues and, in association with this, Aboriginal protocols. This would be necessary to enhance a sense that traditional and post-traditional Aboriginal decision-making is more likely to be founded on both practical and spiritual connections and relationships between people and relationships between people and their land. This would mean that material issues would have to be framed so they could equally incorporate spiritual, economic, social and political dimensions as they have meaning according to an Aboriginal worldview. This would be the basis for fostering an understanding about Aboriginal perspectives within the wider community of South Australia as the negotiations developed.

The Secretariat would also have to collate and disseminate information that could contribute to benchmarking about how other people in Australia and elsewhere have developed integrated settlements, treaties and agreements. This would involve an understanding of the processes that were instituted, and whether the agreements they produced proved effective when put into practice. This type of benchmarking would be a way of reflecting on whether the goals being set for the negotiations were realistic and capable of being fulfilled. Benchmarking would be important for claimants and for other participants adjusting to making decisions within a relatively unprecedented process. Review would also be needed with respect to what sort of professional competencies were developing to deal with cross-cultural negotiations, both in Australia and in other countries where similar issues are being addressed.\(^6\) The report recommended that a facility be established to make resources relating to benchmarking about different negotiation procedures available to all prospective stakeholding groups representatives who would be participating in the negotiations.

Benchmarking would also be relevant with respect to immediate and practical process issues that would have significance and relevance to all stakeholder groups. This would include the development of more consistent understandings about the meanings of words, difficult and unfamiliar concepts, ethical issues, mechanisms for resolving contention, as well as reporting and evaluation mechanisms. It was suggested they could be developed through workshopping to ascertain the most appropriate processes and methods for dealing with issues that would have a bearing on the process of negotiation.\(^7\)
**Issues of Accountability**

Evaluation also had to draw attention to a second significant issue of uncertainty because, at the time of incorporating the 'united voice' organisation, it would then formally take over from the NTU the role of maintaining dialogue with the other stakeholders. This would significantly change the lines of accountability. These changes would require ongoing review and re-evaluation so that both claimants and Secretariat personnel were able to develop clear understandings about the full implications of a changing sense of accountability and responsibility. This would affect both the internal structuring and effective functioning of the Secretariat, and it would affect how its functions could be clearly articulated in order that they were well understood by other parties. The concept of accountability would be important because the 'united voice' would not function as a peak body. It would function as a conduit to support and maintain links in a developing two-way channel of communication between claimants directly involved in the negotiations process and each locally based claimant group to whom NTMCs maintained direct accountability and responsibility. Thus one of the Secretariat's roles would be to articulate the breadth and complexity of this two-way arrangement whereby the NTMCs would serve as a means of interfacing between the process arrangements being developed at the state level, which would simultaneously need to incorporate input from local claim communities. In addition, the Secretariat would also have to articulate the breadth of cultural significance involved. Ongoing arrangements would be reflecting a new path toward realising coexistence which could accommodate the requirements of government institutions and the wider society of South Australia while simultaneously recognising Aboriginality through culture, spirituality, ways of doing business, law and custom.

It was also necessary to explain and make evaluations about the need for new understandings and guidelines in order that, as new organisational arrangements were put into place, those offering professional expertise and advice understood how and for whom it was being made available and to whom they were accountable. It would mean that both givers and receivers of advice had established protocols to avoid issues about the purpose or the significance of specific advice becoming contentious. Evaluation also had to draw attention to the need for ongoing independent monitoring of the process. This would include evaluating the quality of working relationships, and how goals and objectives were being articulated, given that in an evolving unprecedented process people would be establishing working relationships through both formal and less formal procedures.
SECTION 3: EVALUATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING AND TRAINING PRIOR TO NEGOTIATIONS

The production of the case study report, as the first cycle in this methodological process of action research, posed problems in terms of defining what constitutes 'independent' scholarly reporting. Reflection on the problem of how scholars determine the appropriateness of one conceptual and theoretical basis for reporting in favour of another led me to conceive that the scholar-reporter's role is not necessarily to make that determination. It is proposed that instead it is to use an integrated framework to more explicitly compare different approaches. In the report idealist-based ideas and concepts, developed to explain 'resolutionary' processes, were used as a complementary basis of explanation and evaluation so as to avoid sole reliance on realist frameworks of understanding about the consultative process. This section now considers a further outcome of this reflective learning process. It elaborates how the type of critique used in relation to the case study report can equally be used when considering further anticipated stages of that process.

The way in which an integrated framework could have been used to make more precise comparisons between conservative and radical theoretical ways of interpreting the consultative process as an intervention more closely relates to ideas developed in Chapter Four. The present discussion elaborates on the idea that, as a scholar-reporter, I was also required to consider how meaning could be attributed to the training and capacity-building programs that will be required prior to engagement in negotiations. It reinforces the idea that just as there is a need for comparative analysis to identify the way a process of negotiation can be understood according to different conceptual and theoretical approaches, there is a similar need with regard to any pre-engagement programs. It is proposed that the most comprehensive way of critiquing pre-engagement programs is to consider the goal of training, that is, the type of 'resolutionary' process that it is anticipated recipients of training are being prepared to engage in. Thus the comparative analysis of theoretical models of 'resolutionary' processes in this section more closely relates to ideas developed in Chapter Five.

Ideas in this section articulate a link between explanations about what was achieved in the case study process and evaluations with regard to goals to be achieved in subsequent stages moving toward actual engagement in negotiation. While the need for negotiation skills training can be conceived as a stage that follows on from the consultative process, they can also be conceived as a preliminary stage prior to the
actual negotiations. The previous sections explained that there were uncertainties as to how the negotiations would develop because subsequent stages were dependent on the development of supporting infrastructure and organisational capacity. Nevertheless, the report had to at least make evaluations so that there was a baseline understanding about fundamental requirements for pre-engagement programs that would increase the capacity of claimants and other stakeholder groups to engage constructively in such a complex process of negotiation. The conceptual ideas generated about pre-engagement programs as future capacity could thus only be expressed in relatively abstract speculative terms in the report, compared with the more specific discussion about matters dealt with in the consultative process itself.

The first aspect of discussion in this section concerns the need to appreciate theoretical models as 'ideal types'. Subsequent discussion will then indicate there is a need to appreciate these theoretical models in relation to cited examples or prototype models so that the way a particular process has been implemented in one context can serve as a guide as to how it might be replicated in another. While cited prototype models provide useful indications as to how such processes can be implemented in practice, theoretical models provide a basis for critiquing assumptions inherent in the way a cited prototype is reported. Comparative analysis as to how, and by whom, pre-engagement programs are explained can alleviate ambiguity because it helps to identify the qualifying distinctions between models and overcomes the presumption that they all fulfil the same purpose and thus have universal applicability. For instance, training could be based on the preconceived idea that one particular training model is the only one possible because of preconceived ideas about the purpose and the goals of a particular 'resolutionary' process.

Bases of Understanding about Training for Negotiations Developed by Comparing Three 'Resolutionary' Processes as Theoretical Models

The three theoretical models of 'resolutionary' process discussed in Chapter Five, namely ADR, conflict resolution and conflict transformation are comparatively reviewed here to indicate how each has relevance in the context of the case study. The purpose of this discussion is to illustrate that, by degrees, the three theoretical models would vary in terms of the emphasis they give to pre-engagement training and capacity-building prior to direct engagement in the negotiations as a 'resolutionary' process. It indicates that the conceptual approach to preparedness for negotiating will have a significant influence on the ultimate approach taken to constructing understandings
about how and by whom the statewide ILUA negotiations should be formulated, characterised and conducted. Discussion will also illustrate that, by degrees, the models can maintain conservative or radical orientations and thus they can also vary in terms of whether explanations are more likely to be underpinned by realist or idealist conceptual frameworks.

**Alternative Dispute Resolution**

Chapter Five highlighted that processes of ADR afford parties an alternative means to settle differences and contentions rather than having them dealt with through a court-based adjudicatory process. In the present case, for instance, ADR is the model for much of the training offered to personnel within the NNTT that allows them to process individual claims.\(^8\) The role of the NNTT is to mediate the understandings by which Aboriginal customary law and connections to country can be interpreted so that they can be integrated with and coexist within the legal framework of Australian common law. The frame of reference of ADR, that is, the national context, is taken to be all that is required for this type of 'resolutionary' process. This is because it has the prescribed purpose of assisting claimants develop and express specific understandings that influence their case, so that, with supporting evidence, claims can be referred to the Federal Court for a decision to ratify the granting native title. Thus the purpose of the court-based process is to bring about a legal determination. Mediation does not necessarily serve the purpose of attributing meaning to Aboriginal *identities of interests* apart from those that are relevant within the relatively discreet frame of reference of native title. Therefore the primary competency required of NNTT Case Managers is an understanding of the legal ramifications of the issues being mediated while the competency to conduct mediations is a skill that is taught as part of their professional development. While the NNTT plays a mediating role to fulfil the purpose of processing claims, it has less direct involvement in the legal challenges and counter-challenges argued in the courts with respect to specific claims that involve long-running litigious proceedings.\(^9\) However, the NNTT does fulfil a further role, which is to ensure that, during the period when a claim is being processed, claimants' rights to negotiate with other parties are upheld. Even though the NNTT ensures this right is protected, it has had little influence over the way that claimants, state governments, resource developers and other parties actually conduct negotiations. It was not feasible to develop clear procedural precedents and guidelines with respect to these multi-party negotiations. What might be an appropriate model in one particular set of circumstances may not be so for another. The incorporation of the option to negotiate ILUAs in the Native Title Act 1998 was seen as a possibly better way of averting the
frustration, discord and enmity that ensued when claimants' right to negotiate was perceived to be merely an obstruction to the purposes of a market driven economy.

There were few precedents in Australia for the establishment of a body such as the NNTT and the procedures to be used through which the cultural and traditional rights of Aboriginal people could be mediated and determined. One source of knowledge, which served to express the purpose of the NNTT, was derived by key Members of the Tribunal attending the Program on Negotiation in the School of Law at Harvard University. At that time, a well-known and popular approach to negotiations advocated by the Harvard Program was the interest-based approach. The Program offers a model for people seeking to negotiate solutions. It proposes that to negotiate differences, the focus should be on negotiating about interests, rather than about positions. This separates the people from the problem, and establishes a basis to search for objective criteria in order to bring about a resolution.

However, when the interest-based model of negotiation is advanced by the NNTT in Australian contexts, as it would in any cross-cultural context, there is the possibility that Indigenous people can be placed at a disadvantage. This is because traditional small-scale community value systems are often integral with the economic system that mostly can be described as an unexpanded mode of production, as opposed to capitalist based modes of production which represent a focus on monetary values and expansion in order to create increased profit. The concept of interests in the Western model is inclined to represent in a relatively discreet way those things and commodities over which it is possible to compromise and make deals. This is because they represent things that can be reasoned about and measured, or things that can be bought, sold or traded. However, this model has limited usefulness in circumstances where people are putting forward positions about things that cannot be traded, such as values, needs and rights, which represent things that are non-negotiable. This suggests that all that can be negotiated in relation to them is coexistence. In contexts where a market driven economy is taken for granted, the interest-based model remains relatively workable, which explains in part why it has gained such popularity in Western societies. One of the goals is to remove impediments that interfere with efficiency, and often efficiency is equated with maintaining the interests of the status quo. In this approach, it can be construed that certain values, needs, principles and rights that are outside of the scope of a capitalist market economy are actually impediments to maintaining, through both competitive and cooperative interactions, the interests of the status quo. In Australia negotiation between people attuned to a modern capitalist
system involved in say, resource development, and Aboriginal people maintaining traditional or post-traditional lifestyles, has often meant that money has not fulfilled the same function for both parties. This has in part accounted for the relatively dysfunctional and unsatisfactory outcomes of negotiated agreements between governments, businesses and native title claimants when interests have been framed primarily in monetary terms. Problems associated with identifying precisely what has to be negotiated, who should be involved, and how sustainable agreements might be achieved has been one of the most significant reasons why there has been such resistance from the status quo to the granting of and the negotiating of native title rights.

If the framework of understanding of ADR were to be maintained with respect to the statewide ILUA Negotiations in South Australia, there could be an assumption that the primary purpose of a negotiated agreement would be its ultimate ratification through the court system. However, while this is one important feature of ILUAs, such agreements require the mediation of a far broader range of substantive issues that need to be interpreted in broader terms than a legal settlement.

The report on the consultative process had to give significance to the fact that the facilitation team promoted claimants to subjectively identify a very broad range of issues of concern to them in an unconstrained way. This meant claimants' interests were conceptualised as they had meaning according to an Aboriginal worldview, entailing a range of issues relating to problematic cross-cultural relationships. The report indicated that the consultative process allowed a broader frame of reference than that which would apply in a NNTT mediation process. The precedent set in the consultative process was that the prospective negotiations would not necessarily frame substantive issues only as they could be understood in realist terms. It was instituted in order that decisions about native title would not be geared simply to privileging the interests of the status quo. Ultimately the purpose of negotiations would be to consider what might be the more ideal outcome in both conceptual and practical terms. The goal would be to achieve what Curle has described as both material and psychological settlements that could overcome the problem of agreements being biased in a way that continues to reflect a form of cultural domination.

**Conflict Resolution**

The characteristic that distinguishes conflict resolution from ADR is an assumption that the contentions involve more than a dispute about specific substantive issues. There is
also likely to be contention about the appropriateness of accepted social norms and mechanisms through which issues can be settled. While the Mabo decision of the High Court was the ruling through which it became possible for native title to be granted, it was in fact acknowledging that former laws had been unjust, discriminatory and were based on erroneous assumptions. In this respect for the prior 214 years of settlement of Australia by the colonisers and immigrants, the legal understanding was maintained that Australia had been settled through occupancy rather than through treaty or conquest. The ruling thus gave recognition to the fact that throughout this period, Aboriginal people’s interest had been overlooked or subordinated to the interests of the settler population. This signifies that formerly little formal recognition was given to the cultural and social systems maintained by Aboriginal people.

However, incrementally, particularly from the 1960’s onwards, greater opportunities have been made available for Aboriginal people to express and share their feelings, their stories, their understandings and their sense of dissatisfaction with their subordinated position in Australian society. In terms of the three ‘resolutionary’ processes as ‘ideal types’, the contradiction is more indicative of a conflict rather than a dispute. Many Aboriginal people have expressed a wish for an apology from the Prime Minister on behalf of the federal government for dispossessions, displacements and social policies that dislocated families, whereby Aboriginal children taken into care over a protracted period of time are referred to as the ‘stolen generation’.15 There has been a call for greater understanding and social change so that Aboriginal people no longer have to experience the same degree of discrimination and actual and structural violence to which they were formerly subjected. There has also been widespread interest in the prospect of a treaty and recognition being accorded to Aboriginal sovereignty, which would extend the understanding of coexistence beyond the limited frame of reference of native title.16 The contradiction is also reflected in responsive backlash from conservative social and political institutions that favour maintaining the status quo as before and their rights to govern primarily according to the social norms and values of the settler population. The theoretical model of conflict resolution could, in the context of the case study, still be conceived to be relevant within a national framework of understanding.

**Conflict Transformation**

The characteristic that distinguishes conflict transformation from conflict resolution is the extent to which the involved groups have a relatively definitive vision of what should change and in what way it would bring about a change in problematic relationships.
Theory relating to conflict resolution focuses on the prospect that a 'resolutionary' process could be instituted as a means for those involved to consider how they might concertedly bring about a resolution through a mechanism that would be mutually satisfactory to the parties. However, theory relating conflict transformation focuses on processes more appropriate for circumstances where the causes of the conflict are deep-seated, complex and difficult to fully understand or articulate. The contradictions in Australian society maintain these characteristics, given that it has been sustained over a protracted period and involves deep ideological differences that have affected personal and group identities and relationships. It has given rise to narrow stereotypical images that dominate groups' perceptions of others.

This theoretical model therefore does not focus only on what would be possible to achieve through direct engagement between the parties in a Track II 'resolutionary' process. It focuses equally on the fact that such circumstances warrant some form of supportive advocacy and educative Track III capacity-building prior to direct engagement. The purpose in this case would be to assist parties to clarify and give expression to complex attitudes through which they attribute meaning to and maintain certain behaviours toward one another that perpetuate the contradiction. This theoretical approach purports that this has to be done in a way that allows individuals and groups to articulate in what way they envisage the problematic relationships might change. The model suggests this requires opportunities for reflection and discernment as to what might make the difference between attempting to change them through coercive or violent means or more constructive integrative means, whereby people are persuaded to reconsider how the conflict itself might be transformed in incremental stages. The purpose of pre-engagement programs would be to encourage individuals to review their present relationships and to explore potentially useful ways through which new patterns of interactive behaviour could be instituted. In the case study, the consultative process can be represented as one incremental stage exploring the prospect of negotiations that potentially could bring about changes in the relationships between the settler population and Aboriginal people.

The theoretical model of conflict transformation tends to require a frame of reference that encompasses more than a national context in order to evaluate what social support and pre-engagement programs would be required to promote the transformation of the conflict. The basis for this assertion is that attempts to address substantive issues before undertaking these preliminary reflective stages would have little or no effect on the overall conflict, and could even be the cause of deterioration in
existing relationships. These theoretical ideas are often applied to circumstances where conflict has become dramatically overt, hostile and violent. Nevertheless, the framework of understanding with respect to Track III strategies is equally relevant where the conflict is more covert whereby violence is conceived to actually be built into unequal structural relationships maintained between groups. Therefore this framework has equal applicability irrespective of however or to whatever extent an inter-group culture of non-cooperation exists. It represents a knowledge base through which to authoritatively assert that in certain cases prescriptive interventions for the purpose of resolving conflict that are undertaken without first instituting social support in the preliminary stages may ultimately undermine the endeavour. More specifically, theory relating to conflict transformation as exemplified in the approach of Lederach and Rothman provides a useful framework through which to articulate what may need to transpire in the preliminary stages leading toward engagement in a 'resolutionary' process. Through this approach the idea can be articulated that there are virtually no precedents in Australia to draw from on which to base the ultimate criteria of success of such a project, but that nevertheless theory derived from applying these ideas in other circumstances would provide useful and replicable models. Thus this theoretical model also provides a meaningful framework of understanding with respect to the capacity-building that would be required in order that claimants, whose conceptual worldview does not necessarily correspond with a nationalist worldview, are in a position to negotiate effectively and equitably. Moreover, it would stress the need for each stakeholder group to undertake pre-engagement programs, including those groups whose conceptual worldview is primarily nationalist centred.

The above outline has specified how the three theoretical models of 'resolutionary' processes all have relevance in the context of the case study. However, Chapter Five also stressed it is equally necessary to consider the significance of the underpinning paradigm. In this case, comparisons between the three theoretical models can also serve to indicate how their frameworks of explanation influence whether the purpose of pre-engagement programs might be expressed in realist or idealist terms.

Pre-engagement programs framed primarily in realist terms could be biased toward conceiving the purpose of the prospective ILUA negotiations to be a quasi-official process serving simply as an adjunct to more formal determinative processes of the status quo. In the context of the case study, pre-engagement training would focus on prototype models rather than theoretical models. One source would be reports on the way that other more localised ILUA negotiations have been conducted in other parts of
Australia. Another source would be reports on the way that mediation processes have been undertaken through the NNTT for the purpose of processing native title claims. The latter would most particularly assert a capacity to be self-regulating with regard to standards as to what is an appropriate and fair means for determining native title. Because the purposes inherent in these processes are relatively prescribed, there would not necessarily be a strong emphasis on pre-engagement programs because to a great extent stakeholder parties would be heavily reliant on legal advocates to direct the way mediations or negotiations should be conducted. In either instance, the theoretical model of ADR would more likely be assumed to be sufficient.

Pre-engagement programs framed in *idealistic* terms would not necessarily rely only on the way formal institutions of the status quo conceive the purpose of the prospective negotiations. They would draw on theoretical models to emphasise the extent to which it is conceived to be an innovative and unprecedented bridging mechanism through which to bring about changes in organisational arrangements with political, legal, social, economic and environmental dimensions to reflect a sense of both unity and diversity. The purpose of pre-engagement programs would be framed as heightening awareness of the potential benefits of this more radical process as a means to bring about *new understandings and new capacities*. However, at the same time it would also highlight the risks associated with such processes. It would be as important to stress the issue of who *controls* the process and that, as the participating parties would be voluntarily entering into it, they would be required to assume some degree of responsibility for setting standards and establishing fair and equitable procedures. In such cases, it may not be sufficient to rely on procedures that apply in more conventional status quo processes. Pre-engagement programs would be justified based on the need for all participating groups to develop their appreciation of procedures that have proved to be efficacious for sustaining other 'resolutionary' processes. It would stress that without them there is a higher risk of the process being needlessly undermined and ultimately proving incapable of fulfilling its purpose.

Programs would draw heavily on the theoretical models of conflict resolution and conflict transformation derived through the scholar-practitioner nexus as a guide for developing capacity to establish standards as to what would constitute a fair and equitable process and how to articulate the criteria of success.

An integrated framework can help to expand discourse because it can use comparisons as part of the process of analysis and evaluation. It can draw on knowledge and authority derived through the scholar-practitioner nexus relating to 'non-
official processes as well as knowledge and authority upheld through political and legal institutions relating to 'official' processes which would be theoretically explained within normative or functionalist frameworks. Thus comparative analysis would not necessarily be constrained to only offer explanation in terms of what is conventional.

The final aspect to be considered with regard to the topic of theoretical models is that understandings about 'resolutionary' processes have in this thesis been expressed in relatively broad terms even though the three theoretical models as 'ideal types' actually encompass a range of strategies that go by various names. Specific differences in the way approaches have evolved or the way in which their purposes, goals and criteria of success are expressed have not been specified. However, the indication of different goals of 'resolutionary' processes developed by Ross and set out in Fig. 29 illustrates the degree of variability in theoretical models.

**Community Relations** seeks to improve communication and intra-group and inter-group understanding, promote tolerant acceptance of diversity, and encourage building structures which safeguard the rights of all.

**Principled Negotiation** seeks to bring about positive sum (win-win) agreements between parties.

**Human Needs** emphasises a recognition of how each party to a problem-solving exercise has similar needs and share certain common goals, and that determining these features can be a prerequisite to joint action.

**Psychoanalytically Informed Identity Theory** tries to build analytic empathy between parties; it encourages a sense that agreement between the parties is possible, which lowers parties' fears so they are more able to explore alternatives which avoids coercive confrontation and promotes constructive confrontation.

**Intercultural (Mis)communication Theory** enhances effective communication by increasing the parties' knowledge of each other and breaks down negative stereotypes.

**Conflict Transformation Theory** attempts to change relationships among parties through empowerment, justice, forgiveness, reconciliation, and recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Relations</th>
<th>seeks to improve communication and intra-group and inter-group understanding, promote tolerant acceptance of diversity, and encourage building structures which safeguard the rights of all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principled Negotiation</td>
<td>seeks to bring about positive sum (win-win) agreements between parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Needs</td>
<td>emphasises a recognition of how each party to a problem-solving exercise has similar needs and share certain common goals, and that determining these features can be a prerequisite to joint action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoanalytically Informed Identity Theory</td>
<td>tries to build analytic empathy between parties; it encourages a sense that agreement between the parties is possible, which lowers parties’ fears so they are more able to explore alternatives which avoids coercive confrontation and promotes constructive confrontation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural (Mis)communication Theory</td>
<td>enhances effective communication by increasing the parties' knowledge of each other and breaks down negative stereotypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Transformation Theory</td>
<td>attempts to change relationships among parties through empowerment, justice, forgiveness, reconciliation, and recognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 29: Indications of Different Goals of 'Resolutionary' Processes  (Ross, 2001)

These indications highlight that specific differences become highly significant when considering the choice of and the purpose of a pre-engagement program. They emphasise why pre-engagement programs need to be critiqued, particularly to determine whose cultural, social and ideological assumptions are inherent in training models. Clarifying goals will be a crucial factor in the negotiation of the South Australian ILUA given the significant cultural differences as well as relative differences in groups' sense of power and capacity for self-determination that need to be taken into account.
Bases of Understanding as to the Purpose of Training for Negotiation When Processes are Cited as Prototype Models

Discussion now focuses on actual cited examples of other 'resolutionary' negotiation processes that have been put into practice. They too can serve as models whereby a process instituted in one context is conceived to be replicable in another.\textsuperscript{22}

Comparative analysis of different prototype models may be required to determine the extent to which they stress the significance of pre-engagement programs as a means of generating the necessary understanding as to their precise purpose. These types of models have to be critiqued not only to indicate the extent to which groups express a \textit{willingness} to participate. As discussion in the previous sections of this chapter indicate, it could be equally significant to demonstrate how \textit{capacity} to participate confidently and effectively is achieved and then whether the efficacy of the process could in large part be attributed to investment in pre-engagement programs. Such factors will have a bearing on the extent to which cited prototype models retain their usefulness when an attempt is made to apply them in a different set of circumstances.\textsuperscript{23}

Comparative analysis of different prototype models is important because it highlights the need to consider the agency through which ideas are conveyed, that is, by whom and in what way prototype models are reported. This then suggests the need to consider the conceptual frame of reference that underpins the way a cited model is explained. The degree to which models emphasise the significance of pre-engagement programs can serve as an indicator as to whether certain cultural, social and political and ideological assumptions are uncritically transferred along with the models.\textsuperscript{24}

If reporting about the \textit{particularist} context in which pre-engagement programs are instituted is assigned to an 'official' institution of the status quo, explanation is more likely to be scoped and framed within a \textit{realist}-based normative or functionalist framework. The focus would tend to emphasise treatments like ADR in order that ultimately agreements achieved through a 'non-official' process are compliant with requirements of the political and legal institutions of the status quo. There could be less emphasis given to pre-engagement programs because they are not a prominent feature in ADR models. This in itself could constrain opportunities for prospective participating parties to reflect and decide on the way they would prefer, according to their own subjective value-judgements, to scope and frame substantive issues or to consider optional models as to how a process might be conducted. 'Official' reporting
could be prone to give less attention to the range of issues that parties at odds with the status quo might wish to see dealt with in a 'non-official' process, that is, scoped and framed so as to reflect a worldview other than one that is realist-based.

Alternatively, responsibility for an 'independent' report could be assigned to a scholar-reporter, as it was in the case of the consultative process. Ideas specifically relating to pre-engagement programs would be founded on knowledge and authority derived as much through an understanding of idealist-based ‘resolutionary’ and Track III capacity-building processes generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus. An 'independent' report is more likely to try and incorporate ideas generated through different approaches to overcome bias. This could allay preconceived assumptions that the only valid source of knowledge and authority relating to training programs to engage in an unprecedented 'non-official' process is that maintained through the political and legal institutions of the status quo.

The second purpose of this type of comparative review is to identify the underlying assumptions in the conceptual frame of reference and particularly to ascertain whether it is consistently applied at different levels of analysis and evaluation. In this case comparison is a means of determining whether the underlying assumptions about the purpose inherent in pre-engagement programs as they are understood within the particularist social context in which such programs are implemented also underpin explanations at the more generalist level.

For instance, if explanations are expanded upon in realist terms, the model is more likely to favour the perspective of the status quo at all levels. The emphasis would be toward explaining training programs as a means for prospective participants to consider certain modifications in their social relations through processes geared toward a more comprehensive incorporation of marginalised groups into the national identity of interests rather than toward a greater degree of self-determination or coexistence. The more favoured models would be those that could inform and be replicated where the dominant group within a nation-state where the model originated maintains a social system similar to that of the dominant group in the state where the model is to be implemented. The favoured programs would more likely be those that allow a straightforward transfer of training expertise framed in relatively similar terms in both sets of circumstances. When prototype models indicate that there is a transfer of the expertise of the deliverers of training, it is then necessary to establish precisely what competencies are entailed and how they are relevant in the context in which the model
originated. This can indicate the extent to which there are preconceived ideas about who should maintain control over considerations as to what sort of changes are being envisaged and the means through which change should or could come about. This would reflect whether a model is founded on underlying assumptions about a preferred or anticipated direction of change. For instance, if there is a transfer to Australia of realist-based training models from nation-states maintaining similar political and legal frameworks of understanding, they would most likely be framed and scoped in terms that are most meaningful for the dominant groups, the status quo, in those nation-states. A dominance relationship can be identified in terms of the extent to which training models prioritise, supersede or even undermine existing social and cultural resources of the recipient groups, such as Aboriginal people, and favour the premises of taken for granted prescriptive models primarily generated and articulated by dominant groups.25

Alternatively ideas about the purpose of training could be expanded upon in idealist terms that make allowance for a more radical exploration of what might be the more ideal and sustainable direction of change. The prototype models that would be taken to be most informative and replicable when transferred from one context to another would be those that focus on signifying the way such a 'non-official' negotiated process brought about agreements seeking to change violent or exploitative relationships between dominant and subordinate groups. It is more likely that the idealist approach would underpin models that promote participatory discovery rooted specifically within cultural knowledge, while at the same time ultimately expanding and moving forward from where people are at a particular point in time.26 There would be a greater interest in how such models explain the way that pre-engagement programs contribute to the exploration of potential for improvement in well-being, harmonies of interest and sustainability. This potentiality would be given meaning in terms of how programs are a catalyst for two-way social learning as well as a preliminary stage before moving toward engagement in a process conceived to be a bridging mechanism whose purpose is in part to generate new understandings and new organisational arrangements. A crucial conceptual idea inherent in such programs would be the need to explore participants' own cultural and social knowledge, including their approach and their understanding of conflict, and the range of ways and means through which they conceive it might be addressed.27 However, it is necessary to bear in mind an idea first raised in Chapter Four. Just as idealist-based interpretations of 'resolutionary' processes expressed at the particularist level are prone to be re-framed when they are scoped at more generalist levels of explanation, the same holds true with regard to pre-
engagement programs. The tendency is for them to then be explained only, or primarily, through the lens of political realism to signify how they will have a bearing on the interests of the predominant status quo.

It is therefore important to identify the extent to which training models carry certain conceptual assumptions. An idealist-based approach would promote that outside models have to be critiqued and modified as an integral part of the program. The purpose would be to identify whether the purpose inherent in a model is to bring about an increase in both the trainer’s as well as the recipient’s’ understandings about the uncertainties of conflict and the potential for it to be addressed through both non-coercive as well as coercive means. The way such programs explore the potential viability of non-coercive strategies would have to be developed through an interactive training model rather than one that is simply transferred. The purpose inherent in such models would be that the process is driven by integrative power to promote personal empowerment. A significant goal would be to create and reinforce a legitimate respect for cultural difference and a mutual commitment to explore how relationships might be improved and how power might be expressed. Thus an idealist approach to training suggests that allowance has to be made for the development of new perspectives derived directly as an outcome of involvement in the pre-engagement program itself, a process that would make training specific to a particular cultural setting. The emphasis would be to envisage how outcomes and goals could be more positively founded on new ways of looking at and looking for the cultural resources that foster all subsequent stages to be an exploratory process of social learning.

Comparative analysis of cultural and ideological assumptions inherent in models can help to establish that specific training strategies have to be appreciated as one among a range of possible strategies through which people might prepare for engagement in a 'non-official' or unprecedented process. One criterion for evaluating them will be the extent to which training applies prescriptive or elicitive methods, and the extent to which programs have as one of their purposes the generation of awareness of cultural and ideological assumptions inherent in the nominated models being offered. This can be identified in terms of whose competencies are taken to have most relevance, that is, whether there is an emphasis on the knowledge and authority of those delivering training or the knowledge and authority of recipients of training. The elicitive component will ultimately make the crucial difference as to the significance given to particular attitudes to culture and to particular understandings about what is at odds.
This discussion concerned with explanation about the purposes and goals of pre-engagement programs reiterates a crucial reason to argue for a greater incorporation of ideas and concepts underpinned by an idealist paradigm within mainstream schools of thought. It can serve as a counter to alleviate the tendency for explanations about the purpose and the goals inherent in models at the particularist level being re-framed so that at the generalist level they seem more meaningful in terms of political realism. When this happens the underlying motivational principles and ideals of a program that were a central feature that guided such Track III progresses is lost in translation. The integral significance of attitudes to culture and conflict are downplayed as elements that can simply be layered on to models favoured by dominant groups.29

Discussion now considers a further reason for comparative review of prototype models. In this case the purpose shifts from considering the conceptual assumptions and biases inherent in the models themselves to that of bias in terms of who maintains control over deciding what might be the most appropriate model to attempt to replicate in a particular set of circumstances. The focus is therefore on criteria for making choices between alternative models. Given social conflict signifies competing perceptions, it is likely there will be different preferences in terms of which prototype models are considered most useful.

These ideas have relevance in relation to the case study because there are different attitudes and behaviours which reflect contradiction with respect to cross-cultural relationships in Australia, and correspondingly different perspectives about what could be an appropriate strategic process through which to address problematic relationships. The Mabo decision of the High Court articulated an indication of this contradiction through an acknowledgment that formerly the settler population in Australia had not given appropriate formal recognition to the rights of the Indigenous inhabitants whose descendants are now a minority group within the modern nation-state of Australia. This precipitated the passing of the Native Title Acts that have allowed a limited degree of recompense through the possibility of grants of native title. The Acts have generated the need for Australian citizens to reconsider interpretations of law, and how the force of law indicates a need for changes in prevailing attitudes and behaviours expressed in political, economic, social and environmental terms. The case study is representative of a need to make adjustments, including further mediations and revisions to a range of laws, regulations and taken for granted social norms, in order that native title rights are capable of coexisting with other rights and interests when applied in practice.
There is thus a need to consider prototype models of other ‘resolutionary’ processes as bridging mechanisms toward new cross-cultural organisational arrangements as well as prototype models indicating how certain adjustments can be negotiated internally within constituent groups, particularly within existing status quo legal, bureaucratic and business institutions. A complementarity between both types of social processes will most likely be necessary. This idea reflects that in contexts such as the case study a significant problem is that the contradiction is far broader than the way it has been formally expressed in realist terms. Its resolution cannot be encompassed simply in terms of native title rights, requiring only certain relatively prescribed modifications and adjustments within the prevailing legal framework of modern Australia as a nation-state.

The prototype models that would be favoured according to a realist approach would be those where the contradiction is conceptualised as a national concern. The bias would be emphasised in the way it is conceived that the predominant settler population is negotiating to accord recognition to certain rights and interests of Indigenous communities who have come to hold a ‘fourth world’ position within a ‘first world’ developed nation-state. The preferred comparisons would be between nation-states that maintain similar social structures, political systems and capitalist modes of production, and are at a relatively similar stage of development, as this is understood according to the international system. The preferred prototype models would be derived from nation-states that have relatively similar histories in terms of settlement where the overall concept of sovereignty is primarily understood according to the international capitalist world-system. In these circumstances Indigenous communities have limited capacity to assert other interpretations of sovereign rights. Precedents of social processes undertaken in contexts reflecting these social arrangements would be seen to have most relevance for the settler population because the purpose they serve would accord with conceptual understandings about the international capitalist world-system itself. The most significant prototype models that could be replicated in Australia would be those of processes undertaken in nation-states that can be represented as entities that are similar to each other, which include Canada, New Zealand and the United States.

Moreover, there would be a preference for models that attribute meaning to such processes through normative or functionalist theoretical constructions generated within these specific national contexts, where the focus would emphasise issues such as the
legal and legislative ramifications of any new agreements. Thus the primary purpose served by drawing on these prototype models would be to inform the predominant settler population how, in other circumstances, a combination of conservative and complementary 'resolutionary' processes were undertaken in order to bring about modifications and adaptations. They would indicate how allowance was made for an increased degree of coexistence between the rights and interests of the 'first world' predominant settler population and those of 'fourth world' Indigenous communities who maintain a subordinate position within the national context. This would not necessarily reflect that the indigenous communities involved maintain similar lifestyles or that their social adaptations and cultural constructs have developed through similar historical patterns prior to European settlement. Prototype models framed in nationalist terms would focus on improvements in the degree to which coexistence could be achieved based on realist assumptions. This would more likely be on the assumption that the predominant Eurocentric institutional and bureaucratic framework of the nation-state represents sovereignty for the purpose of maintaining internal relations within the nation-state, as well as external international relations, entailing both cooperative and competitive relationships with other nation-states.

Taking an idealist approach would extend the range of preferred prototype models because they could be derived from a more diverse range of situations on the basis that all manifestations of violent social conflict reflect a contradiction that increasingly needs to be conceptualised as a global concern. Whereas a realist approach would maintain a preference for prototype models that favour comparisons where there are similarities between predominant groups who represent the status quo in a national context, an idealist approach would maintain a preference for prototype models that favour a different basis of comparison. One criterion for favouring particular models would be to consider a wider range of circumstances where social conflict is maintained through dominance relationships that could be theoretically categorised as similar to one another. However, in this case the range of models could be extended beyond those where the predominant groups maintain similar political, economic and social systems. The other criteria when considering appropriate models are those that are specifically meaningful because they involve Indigenous communities whose lifestyles and aspirations are relatively similar to one another. The purpose in this case would be to indicate how other small-scale egalitarian societies who have traditionally maintained an unexpanded mode of production have sought to address issues such as self-determination in the contemporary world. Drawing on these types of prototype models from diverse contexts would mean that models could be equally relevant for
Because Indigenous communities have been required to respond in diverse ways to historical developments and patterns of change, there is a spectrum of prototype models that may be worthy of consideration by Indigenous communities in Australia. They could serve to illustrate a far broader range of social processes that could be instituted in order that their rights and interests are protected or reclaimed. There would be variability in terms of the degree to which Indigenous communities have sought to maintain traditional lifestyles with relative autonomy compared with the extent to which they might also have aspired to make changes with respect to lifestyle choices, where it could be more accurate to describe lifestyles as post-traditional. These considerations would also have to reflect the extent to which communities had been able to maintain an ongoing capacity for self-determination or whether such capacity has been eroded. Therefore it could be in the interests of Indigenous communities in Australia to make comparisons between models of social processes that have and have not brought about satisfactory outcomes for Indigenous communities maintaining relatively similar social systems.

The anticipated direction of change would more likely be consistent in realist-based models preferred by predominant groups, insofar as the preferred direction would be to maintain and continue to be able to participate competitively in the capitalist world-economy, that is, as a highly developed 'first-world' nation-state. However, considerations with regard to the direction of change that could be significant for Indigenous communities would be much more complex and indeterminate. For instance, the range of models would in some cases indicate trends where social processes have shifted away from a workable complementarity between conservative processes and 'resolutionary' processes as a means to look for ways of protecting or reclaiming asserted rights and interests. In some circumstances, the means for asserting them could also be reflected in overtly violent 'revolutionary' responses, as Indigenous communities attempt to fulfil their needs and bring about more equitable relationships through the exertion of the power of force. However, comparisons could also be significant where Indigenous communities have become profoundly dislocated and disempowered as a direct result of dominant/subordinate social relationships, sometimes reflecting profound degrees of structural violence. Thus Indigenous communities could also see the significance of prototype models of social processes from a range of contexts in Europe, Africa, Asia, the Indian sub-continent, Central
According to indigenous peoples, the present world society is a primarily a product of normative forces which not only gave rise to a certain kind of materialistic technology, but certain beliefs about how it should be used and distributed, arising out of sociohistorical experiences of western Europeans. This perspective intersects in some important ways with perspectives from the Third World, primarily in its reference to colonial/imperialistic nature of the present system, and thus indigenous peoples of the Fourth World find some solidarity with postcolonial thinkers and activists.

But indigenous perspectives are distinct from other critical discourses in many ways. For instance, in comparison with the Third World, indigenous peoples remain colonized and have not been acknowledged to have an internationally grounded right of self-determination - the simple right of control over their own political destiny (which they enjoyed 'since time immemorial' before European colonization) and therefore maximum control over their own processes of cultural adaptation and survival. According to Pat Patfort's formulation (1995), the non-violent position constitutes walking a "middle path" between defending one's rights on the one hand, and seeking non-violent or the least violent ways, or of doing so on the other. Domination is a violation of the rights of the subjugated peoples. Resistance is therefore a response to domination, and an appropriate defense of rights. The least violent way of defending one's rights is through the use of legal and political systems. Problems occur, of course, when available legal and political systems do not yet acknowledge the rights of some people (and this is particularly so when issues of collective rights are involved), or when they are ineffective in remedying violations of rights. In the case of indigenous peoples, legal and political structures themselves have often been mobilized specifically to marginalize, and thus violate, the rights of indigenous peoples.

Just as it has been necessary to speculate that the settler population's preferred mode of explanation with regard to models would be conventional realist-based frameworks, it is also necessary to consider the preferred frameworks of explanation that Indigenous communities might chose. It is unlikely that models framed in terms of normative or functionalist theoretical constructions would be as relevant to inform them how they might realise an improvement in their subordinated situation or to weigh up a range of considerations as to what might be the most acceptable way forward. In this regard Wilmer writes that Indigenous versions of modern historical processes are:

> told, for the most part, not in textbooks nor in much of the academic research reported in western-dominated societies, but by Indigenous peoples themselves in a variety of political and social settings, some local and within their own communities, and a growing number of them national, regional and global.

The structural disadvantages experienced by Indigenous communities in Australia are reflected in the fact that they are often conceived to have 'fourth world' status in a 'first world' nation-state. This positioning is in itself a factor that places restrictions on the capacity of Indigenous people to convey to others a sense of the needs, rights and interests they aspire to realise or see maintained. Ideas about individual and communal identity and a sense of security are integrally linked to the need for
recognition and a legitimate respect for cultural difference. Because the dominant-
subordinate social relations since colonisation have limited the advancement of respect
for, and an understanding of, cultural differences, Indigenous communities have been
constrained in the way they are able to assert their needs for identity and security.
Cultural domination, which is an integral aspect of political domination, has had a
marginalising influence on Indigenous people. The integrity and legitimacy of their
claims and aspirations with regard to identity and security, that are most meaningful
within their own traditional understandings and conceptual worldview, have been
devalued by the settler population because they do not correlate with their own. The
structurally disadvantaged position of Indigenous people often means that to be heard
and acknowledged they have to adopt the predominant settler population's
conventional means of expressing claims and aspirations. Thus Indigenous people
have had to become increasingly reliant on the mechanisms of the settler population to
articulate how their values, needs, rights and responsibilities can be meaningfully
represented and negotiated with people who do not share their worldview. It would be
to address this bias that an idealist approach would promote the possibility of drawing
on prototype models of social processes that have been undertaken in contexts where
the worldview of Indigenous people is legitimately recognised and respected. This type
of comparison would not be made on the presumption that the worldviews of the
different Indigenous communities would necessarily be altogether similar to one
another. Nevertheless, it would at least make allowance for the idea that there are
conceptual worldviews that are more likely to be in harmony with one another and that
they are fundamentally different from the worldview that conceptualises social relations
primarily in terms of the modern international system. For instance, even at the
particularist level of the consultative process, this idea has relevance. The Aboriginal
claimant groups who came together in the congresses did not necessarily share
languages and lifestyles that were similar to each other, but nevertheless they could
conceive that they shared certain common identities of interest and aspirations as
Aboriginal people.

This section has emphasised the need to incorporate conflict transformation Track III
models in relation to Track II models when considering optional strategies of
intervention. This is because they focus specifically on the crucial role of pre-
engagement programs that lay the foundations for parties to give thought to the
purposes of and the criteria of success of processes of negotiation. It has stressed
that comparative analysis of models encourages innovative thinking about potentially
different viable strategies and thus expands the dialogue beyond what may formerly have been regarded as the only way forward.

Conclusion

This chapter indicates the relationship between the reporting role of specifying outcomes and that of making evaluations. The significance of an integrated framework for 'independent' reporting is demonstrated by showing that realist and idealist interpretations of outcomes and bases of evaluation can be markedly different.

In Section 1 ideas are framed primarily in terms of the capacity of the consultative process to achieve its intended purposes. The latter two sections illustrate that the role of making evaluations may have to be as concerned with articulating ideas about future capacity. The consultative process exemplifies a situation where it was necessary to articulate the relationship between a willingness to voluntarily engage in a 'resolutionary' process and capacity to actualise such a process. In this case the report had to emphasise that the planning for the stages leading toward the commencement of negotiations will have to be as innovative as the planning to actualise the consultative process. Complex organisational arrangements, infrastructural support and procedural mechanisms will be needed that contribute to the capacity of the negotiations to serve as a bridging mechanism toward the realisation of new arrangements between the Aboriginal native title claimants and the settler population expressed in political, legal, economic, social and environmental terms.

Section 3 specifically considers future capacity with regard to negotiation skills training to assist participants engage confidently and constructively in this type of cross-sectoral and cross-cultural 'resolutionary' process. It highlights that an integrated framework can be as useful for critiquing the purpose and the outcomes of pre-engagement training programs as it is for reporting on actual interventionist processes. It shows the significance of comparatively analysing two types of models, namely, theoretical models and prototype models. Together they provide a useful basis for illustrating that favoured pre-engagement program models will have a considerable bearing on the way that the parties come to conceptually understand the characteristics of a prospective process of engagement, its purpose and how it should be conducted. It shows that comparative analysis is useful to articulate bias as to the choice of certain models in favour of others and which parties have the power to control those choices.
The way choices are made between different models is likely to influence the extent to which an instituted process is scoped and framed in *realist* or *idealist* terms.

This chapter helps to reiterate the idea that we are heavily reliant on reports as a source of understanding about interventionist processes, and the importance of developing a general framework of understanding so that scholar-reporters can more clearly and consistently indicate the way their reports about interventions are constructed.

---

1. Lederach, 1995: 68
2. Section 2 will elaborate on the type of support that the Secretariat would be able to provide for claimants in relation to planning and development in the next stage to prepare for statewide negotiations.
3. Morrison, 2000: Chapter 3
4. The only formal body capable of fulfilling this intermediary role would be the NNTT.
5. This is an important factor given the profound degree of cross-cultural misunderstandings that exist in Australian society generally, and the extent to which this contributes to the very uneven understandings about the concept of native title and how it can apply in practice. The preferred mode of engagement would make a critical difference. For instance, the onus could be on claimants and the Secretariat to present issues in negotiations as they would be most meaningful to other stakeholders, that is, with a *realist* orientation. Otherwise, the onus would be on all stakeholders to allocate sufficient time within the negotiation process itself to incorporate a two-way learning process as well as a decision-making process that would require ongoing mediation of cultural understandings between all of the parties.
6. This would help to ascertain what facilitative and advocacy roles and competencies are considered most effective to progress negotiations, and what sort of advice is available through academic and non-academic literature and professional development organisations.
7. Related ideas will be further discussed in Section 3.
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For instance previously in this chapter it was suggested that the consultative process itself could be cited as a workable and culturally appropriate model because the case study report gave a comprehensive indication of its characteristics, its purpose, how it was conducted and what outcomes it brought about. These understandings would allow many of its features to be replicated in the prospective ILUA negotiations.
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However, circumstances would not necessarily have to be limited to those where Indigenous people hold a 'fourth world' position within the context of a sovereign nation-state. Comparisons could equally apply where indigenous communities make up a larger proportion of the population, such as Papua New Guinea and many African states. However, even within such contexts, there would be profound differentiations. For instance, the context could be one where indigenous communities have developed capacity to participate directly in the international capitalist world system. This would be on the basis that they also maintain sovereign rights recognised according to the international system. Therefore indigenous groups would maintain a relative degree of autonomy with respect to both internal relations and external relations, notwithstanding that this is dependent on capacity to maintain a competitive position within the international capitalist world-system. In many contexts, historical developments reflect worldwide trends of European influence through mercantilism, colonialism and modern forms of imperialism through the activities of transnational corporations. These movements have both forged and contributed to the maintenance of the international system. These social dynamics have created circumstances where, even though Indigenous communities may comprise the larger proportion of the population, a numerically smaller Eurocentric settler population together with a local predominating core elite, can nevertheless exert a greater degree of economic or political power within a specific social and territorial domain. This means the smaller core group is able to maintain a controlling influence over the distribution of both material and symbolic resources as they relate to both internal relations within a social context as well as in terms of external relations.
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CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

The methodology developed in this thesis articulates a relationship between two primary components, namely, action and research. This approach was chosen because it has the flexibility and responsiveness required to propose both how and why a particular type of practice, which in this case relates to the compilation of scholarly reports, can be constructively changed and improved. A more investigative and diagnostic research process was needed because it was not feasible to initially put forward a hypothesis based on knowledge already identified in the literature. It has allowed scope for developing the hypothesis in emergent stages that have stemmed from an understanding of the initial activity and collected data. This approach has made it possible to begin with a relatively open research question so that, through an experiential cyclic learning process, more precise propositions could emerge. The additions to knowledge generated through this cyclic process can be conceived to be relatively speculative because, within the parameters of this thesis, it has not been possible to further verify through practical application the improvements that are asserted. It is therefore conceded that it is most constructive to appreciate the outcomes as contributing to an ongoing learning process whereby they can be reflected on and responded to in further cyclical stages of action research.

Methodologies that alternate action with critical reflection with respect to the initial activity and subsequent interpretations developed in the research process have to strike a certain balance of outcomes. On the one hand it is necessary to indicate their relevance and usefulness but it is equally significant to indicate the rigour of the research design in terms of achieving its purpose.

Section 1 indicates outcomes of each particular sequential stage of the methodology (as developed in Part I and Part II of this thesis). Each can be conceived as contributing to a guiding basis for considering how to improve the construction of 'independent' scholarly reports and achieve a more holistic and integrated basis for reporting about interventions dealing with significant social conflict. Section 2 brings together some general themes developed throughout the thesis in order to specify another category of outcomes that has been achieved. Seven types of distinctions are articulated to reflect the kind of choices scholar-reporters need to make in order to explain why this type of reporting role is undertaken in a particular way. Section 3 discusses the general proposition developed in this thesis that scholarly reporting
needs to be appreciated as an application of conflict theory requiring its own guiding framework and that it can be conceived to be an important aspect of risk communication with regard to contemporary social and environmental problems.

SECTION 1: OUTCOMES OF SEQUENTIAL STAGES OF THE METHODOLOGY

Two stages of the methodology develop in Part I of this thesis. The first (in Chapters Two and Three) develops by providing an indicative outline of theoretical propositions relating to the causes and characteristics of social conflict as well as those relating to interventionist strategies for dealing with it. This stage exemplifies that, as conflict plays an integral role in and can have a profound influence on a great proportion of social activity, it is constructive to critique scientific studies to ascertain whether and how they fit within a general framework of understanding relating to the topic. One outcome is an indication of the breadth of conceptual and theoretical understanding that scholar-reporters need to take into consideration in order to be able to report about a conflict intervention. Another outcome is the development of the general idea that the treatment of social conflict as the subject of scientific investigation warrants some degree of consistency no matter where or how the conflict manifests or how it is being addressed.

The second stage of the methodology (in Chapters Four and Five) is reflected in the development of the conceptual idea of an integrated framework, which stems from critical reflection as to how a comparative approach could be constructively used in the production of 'independent' scholarly reports. One outcome of this stage is a systematic explanation as to how certain key considerations (described in Fig. 2, Chapter One) are important structural elements that influence the way ideas about conflict as problem-identification and interventions as problem-solving are theoretically constructed and analysed. The key considerations indicate where different conceptual and theoretical approaches are likely to be most variable and thus how they have a profound influence on the way scholars develop the ideas they will use as bases for explanation in a report. Another outcome of this comparative analysis is a clearer reiteration of the proposition that different scientific approaches exemplified in terms of realist and idealist approaches can bring forth markedly different explanations about conflict and strategies for dealing with it. This highlights the importance of critiquing the extent to which different approaches are generated in relative isolation from one another and the need to work toward constructively integrating them within a general
framework. Another outcome of this stage is a clearer articulation of the idea that scholars who compile 'independent' reports can use an integrated framework to more systematically incorporate conceptual and theoretical understandings developed according to these markedly different approaches. Moreover, the analysis highlights that a crucial reason for adopting a comparative approach is to show the potential for bias in the way that reports are constructed. This stage thus indicates a framework for conceiving how purportedly 'independent' scholarly reporting can be improved through the development of an analytical process for both critiquing and improving on the way they are constructed.

Part II of this thesis (Chapters Six and Seven) represents a further stage of the learning cycle where the relevance of propositions developed in Part I are tested in relation to the production of the case study report. This stage provides a comprehensive indication of the relationship between the intended purpose of the report and my own capacity as a scholar-reporter to accomplish that purpose. The reporting process is deconstructed in order to, firstly, explain factors that were significant in terms of its production and, secondly, explain how an integrated approach could have been more explicitly articulated and the reasons why it would signify an improvement in the way such a report was constructed.

This stage develops a basis for contextualising and explaining the substantive situation in which the reporting process was undertaken and the contentious matters that are indicative of the conflict. One research outcome in this case is a clearer demonstration of the relevance of the key considerations articulated in Part I that serve as bases for conceptually and theoretically explaining the contentious issues and relationships entailed in social conflict. However, at the same time it more clearly articulates the significance of an integrated framework with regard to interpretations and explanations about these matters. It demonstrates that they are inevitably influenced by the nominated paradigm and the methodological approach through which theoretical ideas are generated, and thus the potential for bias in the way that meaning is attributed to contentious matters and how in this case they were being addressed through the intervention.

This stage develops further research outcomes stemming from the process of critically reflecting on and responding to developments in Part I, particularly the significance of an integrated framework. In this case the purpose is to provide clearer indications as to how it can be most usefully applied in practice with regard to the way scholars
undertake the reporting process itself. One research outcome is the way that different aspects of the reporting process have been identified that formerly had not been appreciated as separate components. Ideas are structured in terms of six relatively discrete reporting roles in order to demonstrate their significance and relevance. This more clearly shows that there is a need to compare the way different approaches would be applied in each of these aspects of the reporting process. This is because there is potential in each case for bias in the way that meaning can be attributed to the intervention on which a report is focusing.

It is particularly through the conceptual development of the idea of specific reporting roles that this stage is able to provide clearer indications of the need for scholarly reporting to simultaneously and systematically show the relationship between two key matters. It emphasises that scholar-reporters need to critique different ways that meaning can be attributed to the substantive issues at stake in a conflict that mainly come within the framework of problem-identification. These matters have to be related to 'process' issues where there are potentially different ways that meaning can be attributed to the actual interventionist strategy and prospects for change in terms of problem-solving.

Each of the stages in the methodology contributes to the establishment of more definitive standards and criteria with regard to the meaning of an 'independent' report and an improved framework through which to plan or critique how this type of reporting process can be undertaken.

SECTION 2: OUTCOMES AS A FRAMEWORK FOR ARTICULATING THE PURPOSE OF SCHOLARLY REPORTING

The outcomes articulated in this section are expressed in terms of conceptual understandings that have gradually emerged throughout the cyclic learning processes articulated in this thesis overall, which stem from the initial action of compiling the case study report. The outcomes articulated in Section 1 are indications that have emerged in specific sequential stages, signifying how scholarly reporting can be improved. In contrast the outcomes in this section are concerned with the need for scholar-reporters to reflexively explain why the reporting process is undertaken in a particular way and why this is a crucial aspect of 'independent' scholarly reporting.
This section also signifies a further outcome that derives from reflecting on the need to more precisely distinguish one type of reporter from another. While a wide range of agents can fulfil reporting roles, the term 'scholar-reporter' has been adopted to specify the type of agent on which this thesis focuses. Their knowledge and authority derive from theoretical propositions generated under the auspices of scientific institutions. This can be contrasted with reporters whose knowledge and authority derive from the role they serve in 'official' institutional and organisational bodies such as political or legal institutions that rely on a specific basis of 'objectivity'. A distinction has also been drawn between these agents and reporters who generate information through the popular media. As a specific type of agent undertakes scholarly reporting a more precise scientific framework is needed as a basis for compiling and critiquing this type of report. Scholar-reporters can draw from a very broad and diverse pool of scientific knowledge in order to substantiate or elaborate their ideas. Thus they will be confronted with choices as to what type of information generated through various scientific disciplines and schools of thought will have most relevance with regard to the type of report they are commissioned to produce.

The ideas in this section are framed in terms of seven distinctions to signify that they are outcomes of reflecting on some of the choices scholar-reporters need to make in order to specify the purpose of their report. To signify how these ideas relate back to the initial stage of the methodology, a brief indication is provided in each case about the way these distinctions have relevance in relation to the case study report.

First Distinction - Differences between Reporting about Functional and Dysfunctional Situations

Reflecting on the role of the scholar-reporter leads to the conclusion that there is a need to think in terms of a general framework in which to situate ideas about a range of forms of social conflict and the context in which they take place. Despite differences in the form, scientific inquiry should subject each to a relatively consistent theoretical treatment. This proposition is based on the assertion that, with respect to any form of conflict, the principles of reporting about the way it is being addressed need to be consistent.

It is understandable that there is a tendency to make conceptual separations and treat certain forms of conflict as relatively distinct. Those forms that entail extreme instability and hostile, destructive behaviours that seem to significantly threaten social security tend to be distinguished from those that manifest in zones where social life is relatively
stable and secure. It is of course beyond the capacity of individual studies to fully appreciate the complex and dialectic character of contemporary social life, and thus we develop broad dichotomous images of the world according to these zones. Nevertheless in an increasingly globalised world it is important to critique the way that social relations are treated in scientific studies in order to grasp a sense of the way that diverse communities inter-relate with one another.

Scholar-reporters have to consider their basis for explaining the context of the conflict under study and making evaluations about the way that the problematic circumstances could or should change. They may have to decide whether it is feasible to explain the circumstances according to a normative or functionalist approach or otherwise nominate one that is as concerned with explaining instability and dysfunctionality. One significant consequence of making marked conceptual separations in the way that different forms of conflict are explained in terms of problem-identification is that it leads to similar conceptual separations being made when explaining strategic responses in terms of problem-solving. Strategic responses implemented in zones experiencing acute social instability may vary considerably from those implemented in relatively well-regulated peaceful zones. Nevertheless, some degree of theoretical consistency is needed in the way dynamic situations are explained to stress that a nominated response is one amongst a general repertoire of strategic responses that people can employ to counter threats to a sense of individual and collective security. Maintaining a conceptual distinction between the two types of situations, that is, zones of war and zones of peace, in which a strategic intervention is implemented can perpetuate assumptions that those entailing overt violence should be subjected to a fundamentally different theoretical treatment from those that seem to reflect more acceptable attitudes and behaviours. To do so can make certain strategies implemented in more acute situations seem alien or irrelevant for those whose lifestyles are relatively secure. Those who can are then able to disassociate themselves from those attitudes and behaviours through which violent conflicts are perpetuated. Conceptual and theoretical separations can thus profoundly influence the way we understand who is secure and who is not and our interpretations of who is with us or against us in our need to feel secure. In a globalised world, there is a need to consider the way that scientific ideas are applied in order to understand issues of security and whether collectively we are most threatened by, or only threatened by, those who take overt violent action.
These ideas signify that scholar-reporters have to consider whether a report about an intervention concerned with significant social conflict can necessarily be predicated on the same theoretical premises that apply when reporting about social cohesion.

**Application in the Case Study Report**
It was necessary to reflect on this type of distinction in relation to the case study report because problematic cross-cultural relationships in Australia are rarely characterised by the settler population as overt hostile conflict. Australia is predominantly perceived as a relatively stable and cohesive society where there is little need for scholars to draw on conflict theory as a basis for describing cross-cultural and cross-sectoral relationships. This is not to say that there is not a wealth of theoretical discourse generated in Australia concerning problematic social relations. However, understandings about community problems generated in conventional fields of science such as legal studies, history, politics, anthropology, human geography, community relations, psychology, environmental science and environmental history tend toward thinking in terms of gradual reform. This perpetuates a bias toward normative and functionalist approaches as a basis for scoping and framing contentious issues and strategies through which they might be addressed. There are fewer tendencies to frame theoretical ideas relating to social conflicts perpetuated through structural violence within this national context in the same way that they are framed when attributing meaning to overt hostile conflict.

**Second Distinction - Differences between Reporting about 'Official' and 'Non-Official' Processes**
Reflection in this case leads to the conclusion that it is as necessary to think in terms of a general framework in which to situate ideas about a range of interventionist strategies as forms of agency for addressing social conflict. Despite differences in form, each needs to be subjected to a relatively consistent theoretical treatment because no matter what the form, the principles of scholarly reporting about it need to be consistent. The broader purpose of an 'independent' report may require the scholar-reporter to do more than explain the nominated strategy that is being instituted. It may be equally significant to specify its characteristics by making meaningful comparisons with different strategies. This would shift the focus toward explaining why the nominated strategy is taken to be the most viable in light of a range of strategies that could potentially have been employed.
This suggests that scholar-reporters may need to reflexively consider whether they see their role to be that of simply describing the conventional means through which power and authority are usually exerted using a normative or functionalist framework. They could alternatively see their role to be that of generating understanding about the extent to which contending parties mutually recognise the legitimacy of the conventional strategy. This basis of explanation could be particularly warranted because of the inherent potential for protagonists to resort to more radical 'resolutionary' strategies if they do not believe the one being instituted is capable of resolving or transforming the conflict. This approach could also be necessary in order to explain the extent to which contending parties mutually recognise the legitimacy of a 'non-official' 'resolutionary' strategy and its potential capacity to play a complementary role in resolving or transforming the conflict.

This type of educative element could be particularly crucial if a scholar-reporter sees the importance of fostering an interest in the potential benefits of multi-track approach (as exemplified in Fig. 12, Chapter Three). It is proposed that a comparative basis for explaining strategies can give those reading reports a greater opportunity to appreciate and reflect on the potential for different strategies to serve complementary or contradictory purposes in relation to one another. However, at the same time, a comparative basis of explanation can also foster a heightened interest in the prospects and the potential consequences if only one strategy is pursued despite some people perceiving the strategy to be an inadequate means to fully deal with what is at odds.

Scholarly reporting can thus be conceived as discourse through which to better appreciate not only that conflict is an inevitable and inescapable element of a great deal of social life. Reports can be equally significant as a means to generate understanding about the relative strengths and weakness of different strategies and the need to continually review strategic choices so as to avoid those that are prone to become more destructive and violent.

Application in the Case Study Report
It was necessary to reflect on this distinction in relation to the case study report because of the ambiguity as to how the consultative process should be characterised. It could have been characterised as a 'quasi-official' process so that it would seem to have most relevance in relation to other 'official' processes. The alternative was to stress its 'resolutionary' characteristics by emphasising that it was not bound by prescribed rules. The report could thus stress that the consultative process was
unconventional but that it was nevertheless regarded as a legitimate and appropriate strategy through which to achieve its intended purposes. Highlighting differences between conservative and radical strategies is also useful for emphasising that 'non-official' processes can be regarded as legitimate even though their legitimacy is not expressed in the same terms as that of 'official' processes. This distinction was significant in relation to the case study for indicating that different strategies can be conceived to be part of a multi-track approach and are capable of fulfilling complementary purposes in relation to one another.

Third Distinction - Differences between Reporting about Particular Issues and More General Issues

Scholar-reporters need to consider whether the issues at stake in a conflict should be treated as isolated matters that can be locally determined or whether they should be represented as part of a more cumulative social or environmental problem that has a wider impact, perhaps even in global terms. Conventional approaches tend to interpret the relevance of issues through the lens of specific disciplines in either the social sciences or the natural sciences and they are more often scoped and framed within national contexts. However, it is likely that in future explanations about problematic issues will need to be scoped and framed in broader terms than those that have formerly been required by convention.

Scholarly reports are likely to become an increasingly important source of understanding with regard to ideas about capacity to deal with problematic issues in contexts that range from the local to the global scale. In this thesis significant emphasis has been given to this idea by articulating the distinction between the way responses to problems are understood at the particularist level in relation the way they are simultaneously understood to be situated within a more generalist context.

In view of the contemporary trend toward globalisation, it is likely that both the scientific community and the wider community will increasingly become reliant on reports to monitor trends and review ideas about uncertainty, security and change expressed according to different scales. Scholar-reporters are uniquely placed to generate ideas about context, and so they have to consider whether the way that they scope and frame problematic issues contributes to the creation of bridges of understanding between local knowledge and more abstract theoretical knowledge.
Application in the Case Study Report
The process that took place in South Australia required consideration to be given to the way the circumstances should be scoped and framed in the report. Due attention had to be given to conveying a sense of the local significance of the consultative process and the proposal to negotiate native title on a statewide basis so that matters were meaningful in particularist terms in the report. However, these explanations were inevitably influenced by conceptual understandings about the broader context. It was necessary to reflect on underlying assumptions as to what would be an appropriate frame of reference at the more generalist level whereby local events are appreciated as embedded within broader structures and systems. Local events would have most significance for the settler population when contextualised in realist terms where Australia is conceived as a nation-state operating within the international system, particularly to take account of the dynamics of a globalised world economy. However, it was necessary to also consider the extent to which this way of scoping and framing issues in generalist terms would be relevant for the participating Aboriginal communities. They could contextualise its significance according to different social structures and knowledge systems based in part on kinship ties and connections to country where meaning is embedded within an Aboriginal worldview and cosmology. While this worldview could not necessarily be satisfactorily articulated through modern scientific discourse, an idealist approach could provide an alternative framework for interpreting problematic cross-cultural relationships as well as the need to explore for new ways of negotiating coexistence and achieving well-being, harmonies of interest and sustainability.

Fourth Distinction - Differences between Conventional and New Means to Disseminate Reports
Scholar-reporters have to consider how and to whom 'independent' reports can be made available. Their purpose is to communicate ideas about social change and, to a greater extent than is usually the case with the popular media, to convey a sense of the way that people are attempting to address the complexities of conflict. Hence, their purpose is not necessarily to highlight only those aspects of an intervention that would be regarded as newsworthy in the popular media. Scholar-reporters have to be as concerned to convey ideas about less dramatic but highly significant aspects by giving equal consideration to cooperative strategic responses to contentious problems as well as those that are more adversarial or competitive.
Changes in the channels of communications that support globalisation also make it possible to conceive them to be channels for disseminating scholarly reports to a wider audience. New and relatively readily accessible communications systems allow an increasing number of people to develop their awareness of issues beyond their own immediate circumstances, and in doing so come to recognise the way in which certain issues and problems are of general concern to the community-at-large. If new communications networks such as the internet are conceived as instrumentalities through which information and understanding can now be readily disseminated, then they can equally be conceived as a means of fostering ideological, intellectual and cultural change through networking. New channels of communication have to be given consideration so that an increasing number of people can gain access to and take advantage of the contributions to knowledge that the scientific community has to offer.

**Application in the Case Study Report**

The report was commissioned by the ALRM Native Title Unit so that there would be an independent scholarly account of developments in the consultative process. It can be accessed electronically by a wide readership because it is posted on a website relating to the ILUA Negotiations, which is resourced and administered by the state government. It would be of immediate interest to Aboriginal people living in South Australia, irrespective of whether they are affiliated with a native title claimant group or otherwise. It would also be of immediate interest to people whose interests are represented through the peak bodies of SAFF and SACOME. However, the South Australian Government is also a stakeholder. The availability of the report in electronic form means that it can further be conceived as a key mechanism through which the South Australian electorate can gain access to information about the initiative to negotiate native title on a statewide basis, a proposal that is unique to this particular Australian state. It purports to be an 'independent' account to stress that it is not necessarily confined by conventional political or legal frameworks. A broader framework was necessary to fully articulate the idea that the stakeholders mutually acknowledged the consultative process, a 'non-official' process, to be the most legitimate in order to achieve its purposes. The report was a significant way of allowing all the above constituency groups to appreciate that those directly involved in supporting and funding the process were prepared to step outside of convention and commit themselves to an innovative process geared toward generating *new understandings* and *new capacities*. The report could thus convey an account of the consultative process as a prototype model. Because it could be accessed
electronically, it could prove useful for those directly involved in, or those wanting to monitor, the planning for the next stages of the negotiation process. However, at the same time it could prove equally informative for people in other parts of Australia and further afield. Because the report can be readily accessed this consultative process can be comparatively assessed and evaluated in relation to other strategic processes for addressing problematic cross-cultural relations.

**Fifth Distinction - Types of Reports that are Useful in Different Circumstances**

Scholar-reporters have to consider another way of looking at the idea of who will find the information being conveyed in a report useful and relevant. In modern Western societies reports have become part and parcel of normal social living and a vast amount of complex information is generated and transmitted through them to help us understand the way contemporary social systems function and how they might be improved. However, this thesis proposes it is necessary to treat as a separate category scholarly reports whose purpose is to help us understand both confronting problems that threaten our sense of what is a normal, functioning state of affairs as well as strategies for addressing such problems.

The purpose of scientific endeavour is often described as generating and stimulating understanding and efficacy. This is usually developed through the formal study of relatively abstract conceptual ideas that can be shared through scholarly literature. The purpose is to re-work ideas and bring forth new or competing interpretations of issues that influence the human condition. However, the purpose served by producing an 'independent' scholarly report is somewhat different when compared with these more accepted applications of scientific knowledge. Even though there is a similarity of purpose, which is to generate additions to knowledge, there is a difference in terms of the audience to which those understandings and interpretations are directed. Scholarly reporting represents a quite specific way in which a wider range of people can gain access to knowledge that promotes critical and reflective thinking. The additions to knowledge so produced can still be framed in terms of ways to substantively improve human society. However, it is proposed that there are cases where this is too simplistic a concept and equal emphasis has to be given to the alleviation of threats to security, particularly those posed by social conflict and sustainability issues. In some cases such reports can be conceived to be a source of optimism, inspiration and hope, while in others their role is to contribute to discourse about risks and uncertainties. In either case they may need to stress that solutions to problems that might be feasible in one set of circumstances may not be so in others.
Application in the Case Study Report

The report can be conceived as disseminating understanding about the way that people within the state of South Australia have grappled with a significant social problem that has to be framed in broader terms than simply its direct impact on the security and well-being of Aboriginal people. Both the problem and the envisaged strategy for addressing it need be conceived in terms of the need to build healthier relationships, forged as much through integrative power as political or economic power. This idea is reflected in the personal choices and personal commitments expressed by many individuals within each of the stakeholding parties advancing the innovative strategy to negotiate. The report gives an account of the way they have responded to the need to build a new type of confederation that could potentially improve all the parties’ capacity for coexistence. In this sense the report can be conceived to contribute to discourse about human security as well as the inherent risk that if social conflict is not constructively confronted and resolved, there is potential for it to escalate in intensity. In this respect the report gives an account of a cultural shift in thinking about change and the potential for optional strategies to bring about more just and sustainable outcomes.

Sixth Distinction - Different Ways that Reporters can Express Accountability

Scholar-reporters have to consider new ways of responding to the question: to whom are those who represent the scientific community accountable in a world that has been transformed by globalisation. Scientific knowledge is more often generated within communities in developed nation-states that make up the core of the international system. They maintain a greater capacity to provide constituent members with the advantages afforded by a modern lifestyle. There is therefore a proportionately larger number of teaching and learning institutions in countries that maintain these complex bureaucratic systems. Such societies provide more of their constituents with a cushioning against an immediate sense of personal and social insecurity. Given this dichotomy, the question is whether scholars’ own relatively comfortable positioning, when appreciated in world terms, distances them from engagement in a more discomfiting discourse about the way profound global issues impact on different communities.

This thesis has articulated the idea that ‘independent’ scholarly reporting is a key mechanism through which the scientific community can express a sense of commitment and accountability. It is likely to require the development of a more widely
recognised general framework that prompts scholar-reporters to specify the sort of science they believe needs to be employed in a report and for how broad a community it is purported to have relevance and usefulness. Reports, such as Marshall and Gurr’s Peace and Conflict Report 2003 indicating contemporary trends in conflict, suggest that the scientific community will increasingly be required to reflect on the widening gulf in world terms between those who can generate scientific knowledge and those who can benefit from it.

Scholars commissioned to produce purportedly 'independent' reports are uniquely placed to articulate these tensions with regard to the purpose of generating knowledge about conflict interventions. A focal issue requiring reflection is whether the knowledge they generate through reporting should be scoped and framed in relatively narrow terms primarily to serve the interests of one immediate community. Alternatively, they may consider that the issues at stake also have relevance in terms of broader communal responsibilities. The dynamics of globalisation suggest that scholars will increasingly have to engage in this reflexive conversational discourse. In a rapidly changing and interactive world many people feel both a sense of disconnection and an alienation from the means to understand profound problems which manifest and have an impact on life at local, regional, world-wide or global levels. It is likely that scholar-reporters in future will have to offer more precise explanation about the way that scientific knowledge is being applied to lend legitimacy to reports. Particularly when reporting about contentious matters it will be crucial that these explanations are sufficiently reflexive in terms of who scholars envisage are the recipients and beneficiaries of the outcomes. To do this requires scholars to give consideration to the prospect that it is benefiting and serving the interests of an increasingly smaller proportion of our global community.

*Application in the Case Study Report*

Reflection on this consideration when compiling the report led me to consider certain choices as to why, how and to whom accountability needed to be expressed with regard to its production. The NTU's choice to commission a scholar to produce the report on the consultative process rather than assign the responsibility to one of its own staff reflects that the initiative to negotiate native title on a statewide basis raised quite specific issues to do with accountable reporting. Whereas staff could take responsibility for the production of reports concerning the NTU's routine decision-making processes governed by defined guiding frameworks, the consultative process was unprecedented and innovative and was not governed by the same pre-existing
conventions. The appointment of a scholar to produce it can be conceived as a way in which the NTU sought to overcome certain problems associated with producing an 'independent' report. One concerned the issue of perceived bias in the way ideas about changes in political, legal, economic, social or environmental arrangements should be scoped and framed. The report would not necessarily have reflected an 'independent' position if the responsibility for its compilation were assigned to a person formally representing the position of the NTU, or indeed a person representing the position of one of the other stakeholder groups. Another dilemma was that the consultative process bore no similarity to the processes which any of the stakeholding parties ordinarily used. Nevertheless each had voluntarily committed to exploring a new strategy through which coexisting rights and responsibilities, social justice and reconciliation could be better realised.

The NTU's own primary responsibility was to the Aboriginal native title claimant communities in terms of the way the team planned and organised the process. As a scholar-reporter I similarly shared a sense of accountability to the Aboriginal claimants but in my case it was to provide a fair and transparent account of the way that they had been able to engage with the NTU in this unique participatory process. However, apart from accountability to provide a transparent account for the benefit of those who actually participated, there was a certain degree of accountability to the other stakeholding groups as well, given that each had a vested interest in understanding how the process achieved its outcomes. Appointing a scholar to the role provided an alternative way through which a mutually acceptable report could be produced. It would be legitimated through the scholar drawing on scientifically derived understandings about participatory processes as a basis for explaining and evaluating the consultative process. A scientific framework was considered the most valid basis in this case because the process was unconventional and more akin to other 'non-official' 'resolutionary' processes.

However, there is a further aspect of accountability apart from that to claimants, the other stakeholders and to their constituent members. There was an implied sense of accountability to make meaningful and relevant contributions to scientific discourse. A scientific framework could convey to a wider readership the idea that, alongside the political, economic and social imperatives of the settler population, it was envisaged that those of Aboriginal communities in the region could be most efficaciously integrated through negotiation. There was thus accountability to apply scientific knowledge, particular that generated through the scholar-practitioner nexus, in such a
way that the consultative process could be usefully conceived as a prototype model. Alternative frameworks for producing such a model could not be perceived to be 'independent' because of the degree to which they would be biased to reflect the political and legal frameworks of the status quo.

**Seventh Distinction - Differences between an 'Objective' and an 'Independent' Report**

Scholar-reporters will be faced with the need to explore the viability of alternative paradigms in order to develop a more balanced 'independent' approach to reporting. As all organisation entails bias, there is a continual need to consider choices with regard to the way reports are constructed and the conceptual and theoretical bases of purportedly 'objective' explanations.

The integrated framework has been described as ‘a bridge toward a paradigm shift’ in order to suggest that it does not necessarily require a scholar-reporter relinquish a more conventional approach in favour of one that is altogether radical when attributing meaning to a conflict intervention in a report. However, it suggests the need to develop a basis for exploring whether predictions and outcomes based solely on the conventional framework maintain inherent contradictions and inconsistencies. As the goal is to move beyond the concept of one 'objective' framework and integrate different approaches, the scientific method thus generated represents an improvement over uniformity, which Feyerabend argues constrains critical appraisal as to contradictions and inconsistencies inherent in the prevailing approach. In this sense it signifies an improvement in the way 'independent' scholarly reports can be constructed and critiqued.

To demonstrate the asserted 'independence' of a report scholar-reporters have to consider how they will make systematic and meaningful comparisons between different approaches. The significance of doing this is demonstrated in this thesis by contrasting the mainstream realist approach with the more radical idealist approach. Rather than perpetuating needless and unproductive separations between different approaches that compartmentalise conflict theory, an integrated framework can be used to highlight where different approaches are at their most variable, and that different bases of explanation can bring forth contrary interpretations and conclusions. Conversely, it can be equally useful to highlight where there is a need to more clearly articulate distinctions as to way meanings are expressed in different theoretical approaches so as to overcome the perpetuation of ambiguity.
Application in the Case Study Report

Reflection on the process of reporting about the strategy addressing problematic cross-cultural and cross-sectoral problems in South Australia lead me to think in terms of the significance of integrating conceptual and theoretical ideas generated through both realist and idealist paradigms. The former was conceived to be useful and relevant as a basis for appreciating both social relations controlled primarily by the settler population within the context of South Australia as well as external dynamics operating within the broader national and international arena that influenced local events. These included economic and social interactions taking place in both the national context of Australia as a social system as well as the dynamics of globalisation that operate within the broader international system. The idealist paradigm was considered equally significant. Firstly, it provided a viable alternative basis for explaining and qualitatively evaluating the capacity of the consultative process, a 'non-official' process, to legitimately fulfil the purpose for which it was intended. It also provided a basis for conceiving the case study process as a model, a type of 'resolutionary' process that could improve engagement between the settler population and Aboriginal communities living in this region. Secondly, it provided a basis for interpreting issues to do with health and well-being in broader terms than they might otherwise have been expressed through the predominant political, legal or economic institutions of the settler population. It is proposed that, to have a sufficiently broad basis of legitimacy, any alternative model concerned with articulating the concepts of social as well as individual health must be supported by its own scientific knowledge and authority. It has therefore been necessary to demonstrate that there is sufficient scope within the overall pool of contemporary scientific knowledge to draw as much on conceptual ideas underpinned by an idealist paradigm as a basis for such a model.

My engagement with and an extended appreciation of the realities and the lived experiences of the Aboriginal people participating in the South Australian process suggested the need to seek an alternative framework through which to generate discourse. Their lifestyles and aspirations contrasted significantly with those of the settler population maintaining a more Eurocentric and therefore realist conceptual understanding of contemporary Australian society.
SECTION 3: SCHOLARLY REPORTING AS RISK COMMUNICATION

This thesis concludes by considering in general terms why it is necessary to think about scholarly reporting as a quite specific application of conflict theory that requires its own guiding framework. It is proposed that such a framework is needed so that it can be conceived as an important form of risk communication, capable of providing crucially important information when it most needs to be made accessible to a wide readership. This section begins by posing whether the popular adage - *necessity is the mother of invention* – is actually apt with regard to the way that different approaches to scientific inquiry are given priority and how they are applied in practice.

The outcomes specified in the foregoing sections indicate the importance of critical reflection on the kind of science that will prove most useful in relation to the particular circumstances in which a scholar-reporter undertakes to produce an 'independent' report. However, as well as the need to make choices as to the most appropriate scientifically-based understandings that are relevant for producing such a report it will be equally important to reflect on the way our vast pool of scientific knowledge comes to be generated. The relative stability of contemporary Western lifestyles has led to a proliferation of teaching and learning institutions through which people in such communities with time, resources, education and good ideas are provided with unprecedented opportunities to gain access to and generate scientific understanding. A great deal of it can be most usefully applied to improve the way modern societies function and to make the lives of people within such communities more secure and comfortable. In this sense, a much greater proportion of scientific knowledge is generated to alleviate uncertainties that arise and have to be dealt with as part and parcel of the ongoing and routine aspects of modern life. This signifies that a degree of social stability is required to allow new scientific and technological ideas to be taken up so that they can be gradually incorporated into everyday usage and contribute to modern communities' repertoires of choice.

However, it is proposed that the profusion of this type of innovation and understanding actually masks a profound shortfall in our knowledge system overall. It is reflected in a significant lack of investment in the generation and consolidation of another type of knowledge. This knowledge base has been articulated in this thesis as that which is relevant for assessing and communicating ideas about the risks associated with social conflict and the sustainability of life as we know it, which have a widespread impact on the community-at-large. It is the type of knowledge that will help present and future
generations prepare to practically and psychologically confront and cope with profound social and environmental problems and situations of crisis. The premise is that knowledge generated for the purpose of improving the quality of everyday modern social life may not necessarily serve as well for dealing with unexpected or unwanted changes that present profound threats to individual and communal security.

One aspect of this issue concerns the way that the body of scientific knowledge relating to risk is generated in relatively well-regulated and stable social situations. A problem in this case is that risk assessments and risk communications have tended to become quite highly regulated activities in their own right. They are recognised as subjects that can be studied as relatively discrete components within a range of mainstream disciplines in the social and the natural sciences. Risk has thus become more routinised through the creation of specialised professional niches whereby certain competencies and expertise are recognised as contributing significantly to a general capacity to cope with unexpected and unwanted developments in a relatively ordered and systematic way. This trend in complex modern societies suggests we are increasingly relegating the responsibility for defining and deciding how to deal with risk to a relatively smaller proportion of the population. Those with specialist expertise assume responsibility, and by implication are made accountable for the way our communities prepare to contend with profound problems and social change. It is inescapable that we will remain heavily reliant on the guidance of such specialists. Yet ironically one consequence of this specialisation is that the wider community has become somewhat distanced and alienated from discourse concerning risk and security. This thesis suggests the need to question whether we should ask more of these scholars than we ask of the general community when it comes to being accountable and taking responsibility for the way we will ultimately cope with the significant changes that lie ahead.

The other aspect of the issue concerning the generation of scientific knowledge relating to risk requires us to look as well at how we come to understand situations involving high levels of instability, social polarisation and violence. A much smaller proportion of scholars forego their own personal security in order to undertake research in communities ravaged by war or other forms of social or environmental crisis, which more often can be conceived as worst-case scenarios. This thesis has exemplified how in part this body of knowledge is generated through the role of scholar-practitioners who work as mediators, often in zones where conflict is deep-seated, protracted and violent. Through the work of this much smaller proportion of the
scientific community the wider community is provided with opportunities to learn important lessons about the erosion of security and the escalation of risk. This becomes particularly crucial if contending parties cannot find mutually acceptable non-coercive pathways and resort to more coercive strategies. The understandings that can be derived from these worst case scenarios cannot be underestimated as important components of risk communication. They are our reality checks as to the potential for situations to go from bad to worse when social and environmental problems are not satisfactorily alleviated or resolved.

Critical reflection on the tendency to compartmentalise and create separations between scientific knowledge that can be applied to improve everyday life and that required to understand confronting threats to security suggests that the routinisation of ideas about risk significantly influences the way we treat social conflict as a concept. This thesis proposes that the trend to treat conflicts that arise in everyday life and those that have moved to a much more unmanageable stage as relatively separate issues represents a profound risk in its own right. This is because it inhibits the development of a more general framework of understanding in which to situate a range of ideas about conflict. It constrains capacity to appreciate the extent to which the causes, responses and counter-responses to conflict inter-relate in a highly globalised world system.

It is further argued that a factor that contributes significantly to the current trend in our thinking about conflict is the tendency to study and communicate scientific ideas about it within the framework of a single paradigm. Most notably the realist or state-centric paradigm predominates as the basis for reflecting on fundamental questions to do with why and how scientific knowledge is generated and for whom it is useful. Critical reflection on this matter suggests that the field of scientific investigation relating to social and environmental conflict requires more than simply the recurrent testing of propositions within the predominant conceptual framework. Doing so inhibits critical thinking about risk because reliance on a dominant theoretical framework does not foster what Feyerabend describes as a 'principle of proliferation' which is needed to generate counter-evidence to that which is conventionally derived.

The predominance of realism as a taken for granted basis of scientific inquiry for the purpose of explaining social relations, which tends to coalesce with political realism as an ideological concept, not only influences scientific method. It is argued that realism actually inhibits commitment to a more diversified way of studying and generating knowledge about contemporary social and environmental conflicts as risk and security
issues. This thesis has stressed the need to develop a general more integrated framework in which to situate a range of approaches to the study of conflict. Such a framework can also reveal the way in which different approaches to scientific inquiry are supported and funded through scientific institutions. Research undertaken to relate conceptual and theoretical ideas about conflict to those about peace is often generated in research schools funded through grants and bequests from benevolent or charitable institutions rather than through direct financial support from the political institutions of nation-states. This suggests the need to consider whether this trend inhibits the capacity of peace research and applied conflict resolution studies, which can be as reliant on an idealist conceptual framework, to engage with and be integrated within more conventional mainstream disciplines such as politics, economics and international relations.

An overall outcome of this thesis can be conceived to be the development of a practical guiding framework for considering how to improve the way that 'independent' scholarly reports are produced, critiqued and distinguished from other reporting processes. This more clearly establishes that this type of reporting can serve as a crucial channel of communication. Most notably it creates and generates dialogue with regard to issues of risk and security in a way that makes them equally relevant and beneficial for the scientific community and the wider community.

The processes of critical reflection relating to the possibilities for improving on the practice of producing such reports can equally serve as a catalyst for considering ideas about the type of science that is relevant for this purpose. The breadth of these considerations could suggest that the enterprise is unwieldy to the point of impracticality because it entails such a degree of complexity, of the kind more often associated with 'rocket science'.

An action research methodology has been employed on the basis that potential improvements in the practice of producing such reports will primarily come through critical reflection by scholars who actually engage in the practice. Commitment to embracing the complexity of the type of science required of scholars in order to generate and share understanding through 'independent' reports about options for preventative or ameliorating strategies will depend on the extent to which this kind of knowledge is given equal significance alongside other scientific endeavours. It is argued that the role of the scholar-reporter requires a level of commitment that is equivalent to that required to generate the know-how about rockets and other
sophisticated weaponry, more so given their destructive capabilities and their strategic significance for exerting coercion and threat.

Perhaps the most important outcome developed within this thesis is that it demonstrates that scholarly reporting about conflicts manifesting in zones of relative peace are as important, if not more so, than those concerned with overtly violent social relations and extreme attitudes and behaviours. The reason is that the creation of a more harmonious and sustainable future will ultimately depend on the way that communities respond to problems manifesting in their own localities or regions. It is often the case that once a conflict has reached an extreme level of polarisation and violence, the parties have far fewer options in terms of the way they can strategically respond. The peace researcher Galtung suggests that the first victim of hostile conflict is not necessarily truth, but complexity. The case study report used in this thesis relating to one region of Australia exemplifies the idea that wherever scholarly reporting is undertaken the employment of an integrated framework is likely to lend legitimacy to the notion of a report's 'independence'. However, an equally significant aspect of this idea is that scholar-reporters will increasingly have to reflexively specify both how and why their reporting process has to take full account of the complexities of a situation even when some may not judge this to be necessary because the conflict seems relatively benign. As their role requires them to convey a comprehensive understanding of the capacity of the parties to make strategic choices in relation to the possible options open to them, they can treat the intervention as a catalyst for social learning as much as a catalyst for social change. Thus it is in circumstances where parties still have room to manoeuvre and make considered choices about optional strategies where scholarly reporting can serve its most useful purpose.

The reality is of course that none of us can go beyond mortal constraints and prophesy about the future. We learn from the past that all communities have had to continually grapple with the constraints of the human condition. Some stories endure because their messages remind us of our human limitations. The uncertainties of risk communication are reflected in the dramatic story of the downfall of Troy. Cassandra had a god-given gift of prophecy to tell the truth of the future coupled with a god-given curse that no one would believe her. Thus when she predicted the downfall of her own society, people thought she was mad. Such stories suggest that we will continually have to live with and contend with both our propensities for imagination and vision alongside our human frailties and fallibilities. Both have an impact on the way we perceive the world around us and seek to order social life and have some control over
the present, as well as prepare for the future. Like the ancients we are still grappling with the uncertainties as to whose advice we should seek and believe when confronted with circumstances that seem to be increasingly acute and critical. Scholarly reporting is an important and communicable form of knowledge whose purpose is to at least inform us how problematic social and environmental issues are being reviewed and in turn indicate plans being made for the future. It is a facet of scientific endeavour that has the potential to help us appreciate what may have formerly seemed unknowable, as well as to help us see things we already know from a fresh perspective.

1 Marshall & Gurr, 2003
2 Feyerabend, 1975
3 Exemples include: The Conflict Resolution Consortium at the University of Colorado, supported by the Hewlett Foundation; The Department of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford which was initially supported by Quakers; The Carnegie Corporation of New York established the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict; The Peace-Building Programs at Eastern Mennonite University are supported by the Mennonite Church and the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration which is supported by the Andrew W Mellon Foundation. Rotary Foundation has partnered with universities to establish Rotary Centers for International Studies, including Duke University University of North Carolina; International Christian University, Tokyo; Sciences Po, Paris; Universidad del Salvador, Buenos Aires; University of Bradford; University of California-Berkeley, and the University of Queensland, Brisbane.
4 Galtung, 1995: 92
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Peace and Conflict Research Institutes with Online Resources

Accord, South Africa
The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) is an international civil-society organisation working throughout Africa to bring appropriate African solutions to the challenges posed by conflict on our continent. Website: http://www.accord.org.za/web/home.htm

Alliance for International Conflict Resolution and Prevention
The Alliance currently has 32 member organizations. Focusing on areas affected by international and civil armed conflict, our members seek to resolve conflicts without violence, facilitate post-conflict reconciliation, and promote social, economic, and political development. At present, our members are working in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe. Website: http://www.aicpr.org/our_members.html

Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR)
ACR is a professional organization dedicated to enhancing the practice and public understanding of conflict resolution. ACR represents and serves a diverse national and international audience that includes more than 6,000 mediators, arbitrators, facilitators, educators, and others involved in the field of conflict resolution and collaborative decision-making. Website: http://www.acrnet.org/about/ACR-FAQ.htm#whatisacr

Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (ACPACS)
ACPACS is a key Australian Centre at the University of Queensland with a focus on national and international research and professional practice in peacekeeping, peacebuilding and economic, social and political development. It focuses on both developing insight into the causes of conflicts and promoting knowledge and understanding of different methods of resolving them. Website: http://www.polsis.uq.edu.au/acpacs/

The Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management
The Center initiates, supports and monitors projects and institutions which aim to transform ethnopolitical conflicts. Explicit stress is laid on the constructive aspect in order to highlight the fact that conflicts are an important and necessary element of social change, and that the challenge therefore lies not simply in containing them but in working through them constructively. The Research Foundation is jointly funded by the Swiss Federal Department for Foreign Affairs (EDA, PA IV) and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ). The implementing organization is the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies, which has established a branch office in Colombo, Sri Lanka. Website: http://www.berghof-center.org/english.htm

Berghof Handbook on Constructive Conflict Management
In response to the contemporary challenges of violent conflict and to recent developments in the field of conflict transformation, the Berghof Center has taken the initiative to produce this invaluable handbook. This project is based on the conviction that responding constructively to inter-group conflicts requires more ingenuity, creativity and hard work than has been invested into this area so far. It recognises that one of the main challenges in the field of conflict transformation is the weak relationship between practice, research and theory. Website: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/cf.htm

The Carter Center
This website indicates its record of achievement how the Center maintains the neutrality necessary to give peace programs the credibility needed to work nationally, regionally, and globally to advance many components of peace. Website: http://www.CarterCenter.org/peaceprograms/peacepgm.asp?submenu=peaceprograms
Center for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights, Croatia
A partnership of local community groups supported in part by the Academy for Educational Development, Austrian Peace Service, University California, Berkeley, Life & Peace Institute, Uppsala, Sweden. Website: http://www.centar-za-mir.hr/engtrebate.php

Centre for Conflict Resolution, Cape Town, South Africa
Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) is a non-profit organisation established by the University of Cape Town in 1968. It seeks to contribute to the building of peaceful and stable communities in South Africa and other African countries. Activities include mediation, facilitation, peace education, skills training, advocacy and research. Research focuses on security, defence, arms control and the prevention and management of inter and intra-state conflict. It promotes constructive, creative and co-operative approaches to the resolution of conflict and the reduction of violence. Website: http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/rss-admin/annual_report/ccr97.html

Conciliation Resources
CR aims to provide practical and sustained assistance to people and groups in areas of armed conflict or potential violence. We specifically work with those working at community or national levels to prevent violence or transform conflict into opportunities for social, economic and political development based on more just relationships. Website: http://www.c-r.org/about/index.shtml

Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum
The Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum (CPPF) was established in October 2000 to strengthen the knowledge base and analytical capacity of the United Nations (UN) system in the fields of conflict prevention and management, peace-making and peace-building. Its role is to provide UN staff with more systematic channels of access to scholars, experts and practitioners outside the intergovernmental system. CPPF follows scholarly and other expert analysis on issues of concern to the UN. It recommends experts on or from countries threatened by or experiencing conflict. It hosts off-the-record consultations between outside experts and UN officials, conducts technical evaluations related to conflict prevention and peace-building, provides research materials for UN training needs and otherwise supports peace efforts. Website: http://cppf.ssrc.org/

Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado
An invaluable and comprehensive gateway to a wide-ranging set of materials generated at the University of Colorado Conflict Research Consortium, particularly the International Online Training Program on Intractable Conflict Conflict Management and Constructive Confrontation: A Guide to the Theory and Practice Website: http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace

Communications for a Sustainable Future, University of Colorado, Boulder
An organisation founded on the idea that computer networking could be used to enhance communications with the objective of working through disparate views and ideologies to secure a more promising future. The contents of the archives and the quality of communications on CSF are intended to reflect this purpose. It provides a directory of college and university peace studies programs, research centres, institutes, organisations and networks. Website: http://csf.colorado.edu/peace/academic.html

Consensus Building Institute
CBI is a not for profit organisation which seeks to improve the way leaders, advocates, experts and communities make public and organizational decisions. It uses innovative strategies to engage diverse stakeholders, identify shared goals, manage conflicting interests, achieve joint gains, and build productive working relationships. We work with government agencies, community groups, businesses, advocacy organizations, researchers and educators. The work spans economic, environmental and social issues in the U.S. and around the world; organizational management in corporations, public agencies and non-profits; and conflict resolution education in schools. It is both a learning organization and a leading contributor to evaluative research on consensus building. We assess the effectiveness of consensus building and conflict resolution practices and programs in
organizations and policy arenas, develop and test new ideas, and provide professional education opportunities to the next generation of scholars and practitioners. The Institute initiated the Global Forum on Trade, Environment and Development (GFTED) in early 2001 in response to the difficulties experienced by the international community in setting and implementing a negotiating agenda on the evermore-pressing issues lying at the intersection of trade, environment and development. Its board includes Professor Robert Mnookin, Professor Frank E. A. Sander, Professor Mike Wheeler all of the Harvard Law School, Professor William Moomaw of Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University and Professor Lawrence E. Susskind, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Website: http://www.cbuilding.org/about/overview/index.html

Copenhagen Peace Research Institute
The institute focuses on international key issues related to peace and security studies through research, seminars, publications and news. Website: http://www.copri.dk/about_copri/about_copri.htm

COPRET - Conflict Prevention and Transformation
This is a division of Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) A government organization with a focus on armed conflicts being waged primarily within developing countries and countries in transition which present a growing challenge for Swiss policy makers in the areas of peace, development and humanitarian work. It networks within the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and is responsible for the sourcing and supply of know-how, expertise and strategies in the realm of conflict transformation and peacebuilding. The Division assists with working processes, the planning of country strategies and programmes, and undertakes conflict analyses. It also organises training courses and specialised seminars on prevention, conflict transformation and mediation and is networked with the most important bilateral and multilateral players in conflict management. Website: http://www.deza.admin.ch/organisation_detail.php?userhash=98694&l=d&nav=9,13,198,233

European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation
An organisation providing about information conflicts, conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and inspiring stories of efforts by people to prevent or resolve conflicts. It also provides profiles and contact details of international and local organisations working to prevent or resolve conflicts, and key conflict prevention experts in a country or region. It maintains references to publications and events relating to conflict prevention, with a focus on literature produced by NGOs and research institutes. Website: http://www.euconflict.org/

INCORE, International Conflict Research, University of Ulster, Northern Ireland
INCORE maintains a relationship with the United Nations University. It works with a wide-range of organizations internationally and within Northern Ireland. It offers online services to those interested in peace and conflict issues, publishes literature reviews in the Ethnic Conflict Research Digest. The Conflict Data Service (CDS) maintains a comprehensive database and resource guide to conflict-prone regions & countries, to the variety of interdisciplinary studies and themes generated by conflict and peace/conflict research. It is a gateway to academic programmes, research opportunities, institutes, organizations working in peace, conflict and reconciliation research, teaching policy and practice. Website: http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/services/

International Alert
An independent, international non-governmental organisation that works at local, national, regional and global levels to generate conditions and processes conducive to the cessation of war and the generation of sustainable peace. As well as providing scholarly publications, IA currently works with partner organisations and individuals in West Africa, the Great Lakes region of Africa, the Caucasus region of the former Soviet Union, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and the Philippines. It also conducts advocacy and policy analysis in the fields of Business, Development, Gender, Security and Religion in relation to peacebuilding. Website: http://www.international-alert.org/
International Peace Academy
The IPA is an independent, international institution dedicated to promoting the prevention and settlement of armed conflicts between and within states through policy research and development. IPA works closely with the United Nations, regional and other international organizations, governments, and nongovernmental organizations, as well as with parties to conflicts in selected cases. Its efforts are enhanced by its ability to draw on a worldwide network of government and business leaders, scholars, diplomats, military officers, and leaders of civil society. Website: http://www.ipacademy.org/AboutIPA/AboutIPA.htm

Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame
The institute conducts research, education, and outreach programs on the causes of violence and the conditions for sustainable peace. Website: http://www.nd.edu/~krocinst/about/index.html

KOFF - Center for Peacebuilding
The Center for Peacebuilding at Swisspeace is funded by Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) and 37 Swiss non-governmental organizations (NGOs). It contributes to developing the conceptual and operative coherence of Swiss peace policy by providing analyses, offering advice, training and networking to all relevant Swiss governmental and non-governmental actors. The Center promotes synergies between non-governmental and governmental actors involved in peacebuilding both, within Switzerland and internationally. It develops networks and provides information, training and advisory service on strategies, programmes and methodologies. Website: KOFF@swisspeace.ch

Mediate.com
This online forum provides an invaluable selection of articles by and for researchers and practitioners in the field of ADR and Conflict Resolution. Website: http://www.mediate.com

NCCR North-South
This is a long-term research programme based on international research partnerships funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. Its main goal is the analysis of syndromes of global change as well as their mitigation. Swisspeace is a partner of the lead agency Centre for Development and Environment and responsible for the "Environmental change and conflict transformation" project (IP 7). Anchored in the field of conflict and peace research, IP 7's approach is essentially comparative and interdisciplinary. Research focuses on mitigating environmental conflicts and on linkages between competing resource users, institutions, and the environment in semi-arid and highland-lowland areas. Website: http://www.nccr-northsouth.unibe.ch/

Peace Research Information Unit Bonn (PRIUB)
The Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn (AFB)/Peace Research Information Unit Bonn (PRIUB) is a national and international advice, information, and service centre covering the whole field of research into peace and conflict. It puts scholars and institutions in touch with one another; it provides information on the organizations, concerns, and findings of peace and conflict research; it organizes discussion groups and work groups on specific topics; it provides those wishing to set up projects with advice on both technicalities and subject matter; and it provides back-up in the presentation of research findings and academic publications. Website: http://www.priub.org/index_en.html

Peacemakers Trust
Peacemakers Trust is a Canadian charitable organization dedicated to research and education on conflict transformation and peacebuilding. (Gateway to Peace and Conflict Studies in Canada and elsewhere) Website: http://www.peacemakers.ca/education/educationlinks.html#training
Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School
An inter-university consortium committed to improving the theory and practice of negotiation and dispute resolution. Its research projects include dispute resolution, global negotiation, negotiations in the workplace, psychological processes of negotiation. Website: http://www.pon.harvard.edu/main/home/index.php3

Public Disputes Program
Since 1983 this program has been part of the inter-university Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. PDP is also affiliated with the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning, the Tufts University Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, and the not-for-profit Consensus Building Institute. PDP has been involved in testing, documenting, and assessing the advantages and disadvantages of using mediation and other forms of consensus building to resolve such disputes at the local, state, national, and international levels. Website: http://web.mit.edu/publicdisputes/

Resolve
A not-for-profit public policy dispute resolution organization working in the United States and internationally, with expertise in the full range of "alternative dispute resolution" and consensus-building processes and a commitment to understanding how these tools can enhance public decision making. Website: http://www.resolv.org/about/index.html

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
an independent institute for research into problems of peace and conflict, especially those of arms control and disarmament. Website: www.sipri.se

SwissPeace
Swisspeace is an action-oriented peace-research institute in the area of conflict analysis and peacebuilding. We research the causes of wars and violent conflicts, develop tools for early recognition of tensions, and formulate conflict mitigation and peacebuilding strategies. swisspeace contributes to information exchange and networking on current issues of peace and security policy through its analyses and reports as well as meetings and conferences. Website; http://www.swisspeace.org/about/default.htm

Transnational Foundation For Peace and Future Research, Sweden
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APPENDIX 'A': THE CASE STUDY REPORT

A CD version of this report is attached with this thesis. It is also accessible online at the website of the Statewide ILUA Negotiations.
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