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Abstract
International Relations is not only characterized by situations of ‘Cooperation’ and ‘Competition’ but also ‘Conflict’. The raison d’etre of this paper was to examine the inevitable phenomenon of ‘Conflict’ in the relations among ‘Actors’ in the global arena. The paper ascertained the connotation, causes, examples and effects of ‘Conflict’ in international relations as well as the strategies for ‘Conflict’ resolution. The paper utilized Secondary Sources of information as well as Content Analysis. It also made recommendation on how Nation-States should engender peaceful co-existence which is a sine-qua-non for meaningful socio-economic cum political development of mankind.

INTRODUCTION
International Relations is characterized by situations of ‘Cooperation’, ‘Competition’ and ‘Conflict’. The objective of this paper is to analyze ‘Conflict’ as an inevitable phenomenon in International Relations as well as ascertain the strategies for Conflict resolution in the global arena. To this end, we shall diagnose what Conflict connotes in international relations; the causes of Conflict in the interactions among nations; some cases of Conflict situation in international relations; the effects of Conflict on the affected areas as well as the available strategies for settling Conflict for purposes of peaceful co-existence in the world community.

Since Conflict among actors in international relations overheats and destabilizes the international socio-economic and political system, the knowledge of the actual causes of Conflict, will help both the State or Governmental actors and the Non-state or Non-governmental actors in international relations to be in a better position to prevent its occurrence. Besides, our exposition of the available ‘Pacific’ (Peaceful) modes of Conflict resolution in international relations will go a long way towards ensuring the realization of Article 2(4) of United Nations Charter which ‘prohibits the use of force or threat of it in the settlement of any international dispute’.

With the observance of the above, the State actors (such as Head of States, Ambassadors, Foreign Affairs Ministers, etc) and Non-state actors (like Liberation Movements, private individuals and groups such as terrorists, International Organizations; Multi-national Corporations, etc.) will no doubt be in a better position to help in the much needed transformation of the environment of international relations from its contemporary Hobbesian or anarchic-like terrain to a situation of progressive international peaceful-coexistence within which meaningful socio-economic cum political development is tenable.

THE CONNOTATION OF ‘CONFLICT’ IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
To start with, ‘Conflict’, like ‘Cooperation’ and ‘Competition’, is one of the major features of international relations. It is as old as the history of the emergence of nation-states. Though we have national (or domestic, or internal, or within-the-nation) conflict, the conflict we are concerned here is the ‘International one’-involving two or more countries. However, a ‘National’ or ‘Domestic’ conflict may metamorphose into ‘International’ one when such a conflict becomes internationalized (or even globalized) by the involvement of other external or foreign actors.

Against the above background perspective, we now go to what conflict connotes in international relations. In this regard, the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1972:226) notes inter-alia that

A conflict emerges whenever two or more persons or groups seek to possess the same object, occupy the same space or the same exclusive position, play incompatible roles, maintain incompatible goals, or undertake mutually incompatible means for achieving their purposes.

The Encyclopedia went further to note that “whether competitive situations become conflictual may depend, then upon whether the incompatibility is perceived and also upon whether the issues involved
are of high importance to the parties” (International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 1972:227). In relation to international relations, the Encyclopedia also notes that “conflict suggest a special situation of competition in which both actors are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which each is strongly impelled to occupy a position incompatible with the perceived interests of the other” (International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 1972:228).

In his analysis of the modern dynamics of conflict, Ray Ofoegbu (1980:45) recorded that conflict relationships in the international system “occur when there is serious disagreement, use of violence or threats of the use of violence”. K. J. Holsti has not his hands akimbo on what international conflict is all about. He stated inter-alia that it is:

A situation where one or more government have made demands upon another state, backed up with the threat of force or where they have taken planned military or confiscatory actions which were a threat to the interests of other states (K. J. Holsti 1973:143).

From the foregoing, we can deduce the common thread that ran across the various assertions on what international conflict is all about. Thus, international conflict can be aptly viewed as a situation of intense antagonism between two or more nations over one or more opposing issues or interest involving a threat of force or actual application of force by either or each of the contending parties.

CAUSES OF CONFLICT IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The causes of conflict in the relations among nations are multifarious. Wayne H. Ferris (1973:23) noted that “states come into conflict over interests or desired goals that they deem important, or necessary to their welfare and security. If two states desire the same interest, and if the interest cannot be enjoyed equally and fully by both parties, a conflict situation exists”. So, here ‘opposing national interests’ constitutes one of the causes of conflict in the politics among nations.

Maurice Duverger (1980:163) in his analysis of the conflict between territorial groups and especially between wealthy nations and poor nations observed that:

The struggle between wealthy nations and poor nations is one of the basic causes of international conflicts... This conflict between territorial groups is sometimes concealed behind ideologies and myths, which make the controversy, appear more idealistic, less materialistic, but the material factor is present nonetheless.

He further observed that two worlds now confront each other-one, rich; the other, poor. While the former sees on the horizon the dawn of a society of abundance, the latter remains close to the middle ages, with its famines, epidemics, and human misery. The gap between today’s bourgeoisie and proletarian nations is as great as the gap between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat of a single nation in nineteenth-century Europe. As social antagonisms gradually diminish in industrial societies, the class struggle tends to move from the national level to the international level. The fact that rich societies become richer and poor societies become poorer naturally aligns the latter against the former. The antagonism is further intensified by the fact that wealthy countries exploit the poor ones, just as the bourgeoisie exploits the proletariat in capitalistic societies (Maurice Duverger, 1980)

I quite agree with Duverger’s observation of the ‘material dimension’ of the causes of international conflict especially as it pertains the exploitation and subjugation of poor nations by rich one with the attendant conflict generation.

The above materialistic aspect of the causes of international conflict notwithstanding, there also exists the ideological and hence idealistic-oriented dimension. Thus, Israel Okoye (1993:6) recorded that:

Socialist writers contend that capitalism is the bedrock of conflicts in international relations. Through Transnational corporations and other agencies of capitalism, international financial oligarchs exploit different parts of the world and, consequently, accentuate areas of conflict in international relations.

In their analysis of the nature of conflicts in international politics in terms of the relationship between the three worlds, Mandani and Bhagat (in Israel Okoye, 1993:8) identified the following contradictions that generated tensions in international relations during the period of the dominant bipolar power structure: (a) Contradictions among the superpowers; (b) Contradictions within the bourgeoisie of the western countries; (c) Contradictions between the superpowers and second world, contradictions between the imperialists and the Third World.

Explaining the contradictions between the superpowers, Israel Okoye (1993) remarked that the contradictions were rooted in the ideological struggles between them and the struggles for dominance in the international system. While America left no stone unturned to role back communism, the Soviet Union
employed all instruments within her reach towards destroying capitalism and American influence in the world. This type of relationship between the superpowers was not a healthy one. In fact, there is no doubt that the existence of international opposing ideologies (like Socialism and Capitalism) constitutes a major cause and catalyst of international conflict (such as between former U.S.S.R. and U.S.A., present Cuba and U.S.A., China and U.S.A., North Korea Vs South Korea/U.S.A., etc).

Ray Ofoegbu (1980:47) also analyzed and ascertained that conflict relationships in international system arise from very many sources. In the words of Ofoegbu:

(i) They arise when the demand for culturally derived goals outruns the supply of such ends of policy. This situation of scarcity, incompatibility and clash of national interest causes conflict;

(ii) Actors may develop clear-cut territorial designs against other actors in order to acquire more territory, re-unite peoples, free some people from the control of other powers, or adjust frontiers.....

(iii) Economic and commercial resources may become sources of conflict when cooperation and competition fail to establish general patterns for their most beneficial exploitation and use....

(iv) International conflict arises from suspicion, fear, mistrust and differences in perception. These may be caused by failure in communications, limited understanding, and attitudes of intolerance, dogmatism, self-righteousness and general inability to admit error. When these happen, actors define situations in divergent ways, misread rules as well as misinterpretate signals, and perceive wrongly the aims and objectives of others. For example, the defence preparations of actor A may be taken by actor B as evidence of A’s offensive intentions....

Ofoegbu (1980) also observed that the international legal, diplomatic and administrative processes for resolving disputes and disagreements, as well as for securing redress and compensation, may break down and cause conflicts or block conflict resolution efforts; that some human beings, as decision-makers are greedy for power and influence; are selfish, possessive and bellicose in their general attitudes towards others, accept the thesis of the survival of the fittest, fell enthusiastic when there are rational or irrational disagreements over ends, means and goals, and see in war and conflict the highest ideals and callings on them for excellence and devotion and that those generally labeled ‘hawks’ in the U.S.A., U.S.S.R.(defunct), Israel, and among the Arab States, fall neatly into this category of war-mongers.

Finally, R. J. Rummel (1979:241) has researched and came out with a compendious presentation of the causes and conditions of international conflict whether violent or non-violent. He noted inter-alia that:

International conflict behaviour is caused by opposing interests and capabilities, contact and salience (awareness), significant change in the balance of powers, individual perceptions and expectations; a disrupted structure of expectations; and a will-to-conflict.

Rummel (1979) further ascertained that international conflict is aggravated by socio-cultural dissimilarity; decentralized or weak coercive state power and is triggered by perception of opportunity, threat, or injustice.

Worthy to note too is that some of the domestic or national conflicts can be internationalized via the involvement of national interest seeking foreign actors. Among the causes of some of these conflicts are ethnicity; the greed for power by individuals or groups; scramble for scarce resources; foreign instigations, etc.

SOME INSTANCES AND EFFECTS OF CONFLICT IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Inherent in the history of International Relations is the history of international conflict. Consequent upon this, we cannot provide all the enormous cases of international conflict especially after the European Peace Treaty of West Pharia (1648) that gave rise to the existence of recognized nation-states.

K. J. Holsti for instance recorded seventy-one cases of international conflicts involving the threat of or actual use of force from 1919 to 1939 and 1945 to 1965-depicting the sides and participants in the conflict. Some of these international conflicts he noted (to reduce volume) are:

a) The 1919-1921 Allied intervention in Russia involving Russia, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Japan and U.S.,
b) The 1949 conflict over Germany reunification involving U.S.S.R., France, Great Britain, U.S.,
c) The 1951-1953 Anglo-Iranian oil controversy Iran and Great Britain;

Quincy Wright (1965:149-159), in his study of war, also noted one hundred and twenty two cases of international conflicts. This he called ‘Statistics of Deadly Quarrels’ and includes

a) The 1921 conflict over some Islands involving Finland and Sweden;
b) 1921-1924 conflict over Albanian Frontier involving Albania, Yugoslavia and Greece;
c) 1948 conflict over Palestine Partition involving Israel, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria;
e) The 1956 Suez Canal conflict involving Egypt, Israel, France and the U.K.;
f) The 1960-1965 internationalized Congo civil strife involving Belgium and Congo;
g) The 1963 Border conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia, etc.

Other examples of international conflict are the conflict between Israel, Palestinians and Arab countries; Iraq and the Allied Forces over the invasion of Kuwait; Libya vs. U.S. and Britain over the extradition of two Libyans for alleged Lockerbie plane terrorism; North Korea versus U.S.A. over Nuclear programme; Iran vs. the US/EU/Israel over Nuclear programme, conflict between Nigeria and Cameroon over the ownership of Bakassi Peninsula; the then conflicts in Liberia, Angola, Burundi, Algeria; Zaire, Mozambique; Rwanda; Russia versus Chechnya; Yemen, Syria, Somalia, etc.

For purposes of elucidation of a case of conflict, let us have a brief overview of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. The entire Middle East appears to be a constant zone of conflict in world politics. Yesterday, it may be Iraq vs. Iran, Iraq vs. Kuwait; etc. and today, the intractable Israel-Arab conflicts (particularly over Palestine) which has witnessed the 1948/49 war, 1956 war, 1967 six-day war, 1973 war, etc. with its attendant enormous destruction of lives and properties, refugee problems (especially on the part of the Palestinians) as well as the Arab generated international terrorism that is overheating and destabilizing the international political system.

In a nutshell, the Israeli continued occupation of Arab Lands in the aftermath of the 1967 war and settlement expansion and denial of creation of Palestinian State continue to be a bone of contention in the Middle-East region. As Tunde Adeniran (1983:59) noted:

_The Israeli occupation of Arab lands continues to be attacked as a violation of international law also because it amounts to trespassing on other states’ territories and deprives the Palestine of their right to self-determination._

For long the Palestine under the umbrella of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) have covertly and overtly been engaged in conflict with Israel over the annexation of their supposedly territories including Gaza strip, West Bank and East Jerusalem. Besides, though Israel has withdrawn from Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula after 1979 Camp David accord, her continued occupation of Syria’s ‘Golan Heights’ captured in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war continue to act as catalyst to non-peaceful co-existence between Israel and Syria. On this, Chukwuemeka Gahia (1994:22) noted that:

_For the Syrians, the Golan Heights, a 1,675 sq. km, rocky and treeless plateau on the Syrian-Israeli borders seized by Israel in 1967 and annexed by it in 1981 have remained a mark of defeat and deep wound on national pride. Consequently, based on the U.N. resolution 242 on the Middle East crisis embodying the principle of land and peace, Syria wants full and total withdrawal form the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights first, with security and peace guarantees coming as a result of the withdrawal. For many Israelis the security implication of the Heights is worrisome. Because of its strategic location, its retention by Israel is considered a guarantee that Syria artillery will not be able to shell Northern Israel. It is also seen as precluding Israel from being over-run by Syria tanks in surprise attack.

In fact, all the United Nations resolutions (such as Resolution 242 of 1967 requiring Israel to withdraw from occupied Arab lands) as well as various mediations for establishment of State of Palestine to co-exist with State of Israel notwithstanding, Israel’s reliance on Political Realism (the Power Politics and Security Paradigm) and her covert and overt backing from her Western allies, particularly U.S., who have enormous economico-geo-strategic interests in the Middle East, have continued to prolong the Israeli-Palestinian/Arab debacle.
On the general effects of Conflict in international relations, in the main, it (Conflict) leads to enormous destruction of human lives and properties as well as social, economic and political retardation of affected areas. Besides, since the world is a global village, whatever affects a part affects the whole. Consequently, Conflict situation in a nation or between nation-states directly and indirectly endanger global peaceful co-existence and mankind’s socio-economic cum political development.

STRATEGIES FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Many strategies have been developed over the years for the settlement of international conflicts. With these strategies, many conflicts within and between nations have been resolved without recourse to the catastrophic last resort, ‘Military Warfare’ thereby rescuing the conflicting nations and the global community from Thomas Hobbes’ ‘State of Nature’ where life was naive, brutish and short.

Though Section 2(4) of United Nations Charter prohibits the use of force or threat of it in the settlement of any international dispute, base on the realities on ground, the modes of conflict resolution in international relations can be broadly categorized into

(a) the Adjudicatory procedure and
(b) the Non-adjudicatory procedure.

Within the Adjudicatory procedure, we have Adjudication and arbitration while within the Non-Adjudicatory procedure, we have Negotiations, Good Offices, Conciliation, Mediation, Inquiry, Sanctions/Boycott, Military use of force. All these can also be grouped into Pacific (or Peaceful) and Non-Pacific (Non-Peaceful) methods of conflict resolution.

ADJUDICATION

This is one of the methods of conflict resolution in international relations. The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1974:91) defines Adjudication as “passing of judgment in a matter of law”. Tunde Adeniran (1983), noted that Adjudication is a type of legal procedure that is done by the courts; that it is usually done before a permanent tribunal with specific number of judges and they base their judgments and decisions on law and that all members of the United Nations are parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The cases that are usually brought for adjudication by the International Court of Justice are usually international conflict between two or more states. However, before this is done, the conflicting parties or states must collectively agree to allow their case to be adjudicated upon (using International Law) and to abide by the decisions of the court. Some states, aware of the problem of enforcing the International Court of Justice judgment, have refused to obey the court’s decision (such as South Africa on Namibia: Iran on American hostages) while some have obeyed the judgment (such as Libya on Aouza strip conflict with Chad). However, Martin Wight (1978:205) noted that “many wars occurred because of inadequate arrangement for international litigation”.

ARBITRATION

International conflict can also be resolved via arbitration. The new Encyclopedia Britannica (1974:481) explained arbitration as “a legal technique for resolving disputes by referring them to a third party and that such arbitration may be between states or between states and foreign nations or foreign corporations”. Tunde Adeniran noted that arbitration is, perhaps, the oldest way of setting disputes and that it is the settlement of disputes between states by people of their mutual choice and on the basis of respect for law but the arbitrators’ awards are not always binding on the parties unless there is a prior agreement to that effect. The parties may choose an arbitrator as well as the principles upon which any award is to be made, (Tunde Adeniran, 1983). It should be noted that the Hague Conference of 1907 established a Permanent Court of Arbitration. Adeniran also remarked that Arbitration has not been able to set up precedents and it is not a strictly legal procedure because it invokes compromise. He however, noted that arbitration is a useful and peaceful way of settling a dispute by getting the parties to compromise on an issue and come before the tribunal (Tunde Adeniran, 1983).

NEGOTIATION

This is also another means of conflict resolution in international relations. Here, no third party is involved and as Bruce Sanders and Alan Durbin (1971:187-188) noted,

Negotiation is a process in which explicit proposals are put forward ostensibly for the purpose of reaching agreement on a common interest where conflicting interests are present.
In fact, current example of negotiation process is that between Israel, Jordan and Syria especially as it concerns Palestinian homeland and Israeli withdrawal from its occupied Golan Height (NewsWatch, August 1, 1994). On what Negotiation entails, Fred Charles Ikle (in Bruce Sanders and Alan Durbin, 1971:187) asserted that:

*To resolve conflict and avoid the use of force, it is said, one must negotiate. Negotiation requires willingness to compromise and both sides must make concessions. Neither side can expect to win all its wants. If both sides negotiate in good faith, they can always find a fair solution. If there is conflict about many issues, the less controversial one should be solved first because agreement will lead to further agreement.*

**GOOD OFFICES**

The raison d’ etre of ‘Good Offices’ in international conflict resolution is to get the contending parties to decide the conflict for themselves. Tunde Adeniran (1983) noted that a third party which could be a State, International Organization (eg. African Union, Economic Community of West African States, European Economic Community, etc) or a renowned private individual will come with the aim of bringing people to direct negotiation. A case in point is the role played by Warren Christopher—the American Secretary of State, in getting the stalled peace talk between Israel and Syria back on track.

**CONCILIATION**

This also belongs to the non-adjudicatory means of settling international conflict. A third party is involved here. In this case, Adeniran also remarked that conciliation refers to a situation whereby disputes are referred to a commission and people who must look into the facts and make a report, which would contain proposals for the settlement of the disputes. These proposals do not have binding force or any binding character of an award or penalty for or against any of the parties involved in the dispute (Tunde Adeniran, 1983).

**MEDIATION**

As machinery for conflict resolution in international relations, the aim of the mediator (in the mediation process) is to reconcile two opposing goals of the disputants and to ensure that they settle their disputes amicably. As Adeniran (1983) observed, unlike the Good Offices, mediation involves some degree of participation in the process of settlement. A mediator takes part in the negotiations and suggests terms of settlement to the disputing states and to do this, he must enjoy the confidence of both sides (which is often difficult to have). A case in point is U.S. President Barack Obama’s failed mediation effort in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.

**INQUIRY**

This is also another method of conflict resolution in international relations. In a nutshell, it is a fact-finding exercise and its practice days, as Adeniran (1983) recorded, goes back to the Hague Convention. It should also be noted that even the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations have established many Commissions of Inquiry to investigate certain problems or conflicts and give recommendations. However, L. Goodwin and Andrew Linklater (1975:117) remarked that: “both the League and the United Nations have proved disappointing to Collective Security enthusiasts”.

**SANCTIONS/BOYCOTTS**

The above is also one of the modes of resolving international conflicts. For example, limited or total economic sanction/boycott may be visited on either or both of the conflicting parties or states by say a group of foreign countries; international organizations (eg: A.U., E.E.C., etc), interested in an end to the conflict. Besides, if the relationship between the conflicting states is asymmetrical, the economically, militarily and technologically superior party may apply its weight either alone or in co-operation with its other foreign allies to subdue her rivalry into submission or withdrawal from the conflict. This is not a peaceful or pacific settlement— even though short of war.

**MILITARY USE OF FORCE/WARFARE**

Though the United Nations Charter prohibits ‘the use of Force or threat of it’ in the settlement of International dispute, the use of force or military warfare appears in reality to be the last resort in the continuum of means of conflict resolution in international relations. Ray Ofogbe (1980:48) noted that “it
involves formal blockades which must be enforced by the army, navy and air-force, limited use of force, reprisal actions and sometimes full-scale war”. In this circumstance might become right and herein comes the advantage of power capability variable among conflicting parties or states. On this, Professor Arnold Wolfers (in Ray Ofoegbu, 1983:116) aptly states:

_A well-timed and skillful use of force may produce a quick surgical result when without it an issue festering over the years may lead in the long-run to much more serious disadvantage._

However, contrary to the above, Bruce Sanders and Alan Durbin (1971:205), in their analysis of international conflict in the Nuclear Age, contended that “though Von Clausewitz once described ‘war’ as the continuation of diplomacy by other means, modern diplomats are faced with the prospect that war may destroy the entire system of international relations rather than accomplish some limited diplomatic goal”. There is no doubt that military use of force or warfare is a veritable instrument for conflict resolution even though its use is prohibited by Section 2(4) of United Nations Charter. In contemporary international politics grounded on Hams J. Morgenthau’s motion of Power Politics (or Political Realism) ‘Might makes Right’ and ‘Justice is the advantage of the Stronger’. Thus, we witnessed Britain’s use of force against Argentina in taking over the disputed Falkland Island: U.S.-led allied forces liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi annexation, etc.

Finally, the military use of force and other aspects of conflict resolution in international relations is logically presented by the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1972:228) thus:

_State A and State B each seeking possession of an Island, may thus be in conflict. To resolve the issue, one state may withdraw its claim or the two states may divide the Island by mutual agreement; or they may decide to fight for it…. If both sides tire of combat, they may agree upon an equal-sided armistice for achieving resolution by non-violent and non-coercive means. On the other hand, if the armistice is unequal and it is clear that one side is coercing the other, then the agreement has been shaped by threat of superior force…. If in the course of a conflict situation, one side uses force and the other submits, the assumption is that the submitting side has ‘agreed’ and that the consequence is essentially violent and coercive relationship._

**CONCLUSIONS**

The foregoing or preceding analyzes is on the issue of Conflict and Conflict Resolution in international relations. We made an inquiry into the meaning; causes; examples and effects of conflicts in international relations as well as analyzed the various strategies for Conflict Resolutions in international relations. It is ascertained that conflict in international relations is an adverse situation of intense antagonism between two or more states whereby one or more governments have made demands upon another state, backed up with the threat of force or where they have taken planned military or confiscatory actions, which were a threat to the interests of other states.

However, some national or domestic conflict can metamorphose into international one consequent upon unbridled involvement of national interest-oriented foreign actors. We also noted that the causes of international conflict is multifarious, ranging from opposing national interests; antagonistic ideological differences; territorial/boundary factors; negative perceptions and misconceptions of national decision-makers; the egoistic, jingoistic and war-monger nature of some national leaders; power seekers; ethnicity; foreign instigations; the intense struggle or scramble for scarce world resources by various nations; the enforceability problem of international law; the negative activities of some nationals or individuals such as international terrorists; etc. Examples of national international conflicts were also highlighted including the intractable Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The paper also ascertained the various strategies of conflict resolution in international relations such as Adjudication; Arbitration, Negotiation; Good Offices; Conciliation; Mediation; Inquiry; Sanctions/Boycott as well as Military use of force or war. In conclusion, therefore, to ensure global peaceful co-existence, necessary for mankind’s socio-economic cum political development, we recommend that ‘States’ and ‘Non-States’ actors should eschew acts that can cause, aggravate and trigger international conflict but as the need arises, should recourse to the Pacific (Peaceful) modes of conflict resolutions rather than resort to catastrophic oriented warfare.
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