Ganna Zhekalo

THE STUDY OF BASIC THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE INVESTIGATION OF CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

This article examines the existing approaches to the understanding of conflict transformation. In our days, there are different opinions about whether formed independent theory and practice of conflict transformation. The study emphasized that school of conflict transformation is different from the schools of conflict settlement, conflict resolution and conflict management, although all three schools rely on a shared tradition of thinking about conflict and intervention.

Keywords: conflict, conflict transformation, conflict management, conflict settlement, conflict resolution.

Transformation is a deeply significant conversion of the system that changes its structure and functions and redirect its development in another direction. Hence, the common understanding of conflict transformation as a strategy that changes the conflict redirect its development in another direction.

The purpose of this article is to examine whether the positions on the understanding of conflict transformation form a coherent theory and find out the essence of conflict transformation and the role of this strategy in conflict dynamics.

There are different views on whether to consider achievements on conflict transformation independent theory. The most significant scholar/practitioners working that studied strategy of transformation and its understanding in conflict studies are J. Lederach (1995 and 1997), A. Curle (1971) and the conflict/peace researcher J. Galtung (1996). Theorists of conflict transformation draw on a variety of conceptual building blocks, some recent, some older and some borrowed from other schools.

Scientific schools that are exploring the principles of conflict transformation are Berghof Foundation, Institute for Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding (ICP), scientific programs of Search for Common Ground.

In Ukrainian scientific researches there are no integrated works that would focused on conflict transformation as a separate strategy of influence on conflict or a separate theory of conflict studies. In mostly, domestic scholars focus in translating and studying western experience in understanding transformation of conflict. Transformational approach, in our view, more adequately describes the dynamics of modern political conflicts. At the same time, it does not deny the importance of their settlement.

In this regard, it is worth noting the expression of ukrainian researcher M. Telnyk "When conflict arises once it changes, transforms the events, people and relationships that were originally involved. Thus, the causal relationships are bilateral, from people and their relationship to the conflict and from the conflict to people and their relationships. In light of the theory of conflict transformation it is a term that describes a natural event" [11, c. 240].

The idea of conflict formation was already present in the work of the European structural theorists who analysed conflict formations. Perhaps the most influential work to date has been that of Galtung, which offers a rich brew of core concepts. Conflicts, he suggests, have both life-affirming and life-destroying aspects. They form from contradictions in the structure of society. They then become manifest in attitudes and behaviour. Once formed, conflicts undergo a variety of transformational processes: articulation or disarticulation, conscientisation or de-conscientisation, complexification or simplification,

polarisation or depolarisation, escalation or de-escalation. The incompatibility, which arises between parties may be eliminated by transcending the contradiction, by compromise, by deepening or widening the conflict structure, and by associating or dissociating the actors [7].

In his recently published book on "A theory of peace: building direct, structural and cultural peace" (2013) J. Galtung stated, that the major road to peace is conflict transformation where conflict uproots along with goals in contradiction and conflict triangle – attitude, behavior and contradiction. The conflict transformation restores peace attaining empathy, nonviolence and creativity [1].

Speaking about the Conflict Transformation School, first of all, we must reveal views of J. Lederach. John Paul Lederach developed the first comprehensive and widely discussed transformation-oriented approach (Lederach 1997). Building on the Complementary School, Lederach also sees the need to resolve the dilemma between short-term conflict management and long-term relationship building, as well as the resolution of the underlying causes of conflict. His proposal is to build "long-term infrastructure" for peace building by supporting the reconciliation potential of society. In line with the Conflict Resolution School, he sees the need to rebuild destroyed relationships, focusing on reconciliation within society and the strengthening of society's peacebuilding potential. Third party intervention should concentrate on supporting internal actors and coordinating external peace efforts. Sensitivity to the local culture and a long-term time frame are also necessary.

This approach has a key focus on peace constituencies by identifying mid-level individuals or groups and empowering them to build peace and support reconciliation. Lederach divides society into three levels, which can be approached through different peacebuilding strategies. Top leadership can be accessed by mediation at the level of states (track 1) and by the outcome-oriented approach. Mid-level leadership (track 2) can be reached through more resolution-oriented approaches, such as problem-solving workshops or peace-commissions, and with the help of partial insiders (i.e., prominent individuals in society). The grassroots level (track 3), however, represents the majority of the population and can be reached through a wide range of peacebuilding approaches, such as local peace commissions, community dialogue projects, or trauma healing [8, p. 4]. Acording to this Lederach's concept peacebuilding is seen as a structure-process.

One strength of his model is that it widens its view from the conflict and the conflict parties and indicates the scope for drawing peacebuilding resources from the wider society. A weakness is the limited attention it gives to the autonomous processes of change that transpire within the political system of the conflict-affected society [7, p. 6].

So, the largest contribution of the conflict transformation school is its shift in focus from international to local actors. It therefore puts even more emphasis on civil society and ordinary people. But, mainly these theories are prescriptive, offering peacebuilders a means to conceptualise the path from conflict towards desired outcomes.

More primarily analytical and interpretative, attempting to explain the formation and transformation of contemporary conflicts are theories proposed by E. Azar and R. Vayrynen.

Azar's work (1990) had an important influence on conflict transformation theory, by offering an explanation for the protracted quality of contemporary conflicts. He suggests an approach that is more appropriately suited to the characteristics of contemporary conflicts in fragile states. His work concentrates on the genesis and maintenance of protracted conflicts. His model goes beyond simple structural or behavioural explanations and suggests how patterns of conflict interact with the satisfaction of human needs, the adequacy of political and economic institutions and the choices made by political actors. It also suggests how different options can lead to benign or malignant spirals of conflict [7, p. 5].

R. Vayrynen argues for a conflict theory based on the idea of transformation rather than settlement, stressing that it is important to understand how conflicts are transformed in

dynamic terms. His approach is primarily analytical and theoretical, but is also suggestive of the types of intervention that peacebuilders should be considering: actor transformations – internal changes in parties, or the appearance of new parties; issue transformations – altering the agenda of conflict issues; rule transformations – changes in the norms or rules governing a conflict; structural transformations – the entire structure of relationships and power distribution in the conflict is transformed [7, p. 5].

A number of conflict theorists and practitioners advocate the pursuit of "conflict transformation", as opposed to "conflict resolution", "conflict settlement" or "conflict management" Conflict transformation is different from the other three. All three not only articulate varying approaches to conflict intervention, but also reflect different conceptualisations of conflict.

Conflict resolution implies that conflict is bad-hence something that should be ended. It also assumes that conflict is a short term phenomenon that can be resolved permanently through mediation or other intervention processes [5].

J.W. Burton as one of the most significant theorist of conflict analysis and resolution observed that conflict resolution means terminating conflict with an outcome that, in the view of the parties involved, is a permanent solution to the problem. Conflict resolution, as opposed to conflict "management" or "settlement," requires methods that get to the root of problems and, therefore, are highly analytical [2].

Some of the most common forms of conflict resolution are negotiation, mediation, arbitration and mediation-arbitration. Communication is a main concept of this forms. And all of them focus on solving the conflict with the best interests of all parties involved in mind.

The practice of conflict resolution via an analytical, problem-solving procedure is deduced from the theory that conflict is a universal response to frustrated needs. The practice involves providing opportunities for the parties to analyze relationships so as to generate an accurate definition of the problem in terms of basic/fundamental motivations and human needs; to cost their goals and policies once they are fully informed of all aspects of the dispute, including the fundamental motivations and values of the opposing side; and to discover possible options that may be available once there has been a full analysis of the conflict in all its aspects [2].

Conflict management correctly assumes that conflicts are long term processes that often cannot be quickly resolved, but the notion of "management" suggests that people can be directed or controlled as though they were physical objects. In addition, the notion of management suggests that the goal is the reduction or control of volatility more than dealing with the real source of the problem [5].

Conflict management is a process that aims at channeling the violent manifestation of an incompatibility of goals between two or more parties into a political process where their disputes can be addressed by non-violent means. "While conflict management, over time, may lead to conflict resolution, i.e., when the incompatibility between the parties ceases to exist or loses its political salience, its main objective is to find and sustain an institutional arrangement in which conflict parties have greater incentives to abide by political rules of dealing with their dispute than to use, or revert to, violence in pursuit of their incompatible objectives", argues specialists in contemporary security challenges S. Wollf and C. Yakinthou [3, p. 1].

Conflict management is a strategy that applies to the conflict and to the impact of conflict when complete resolution seems to be impossible, but on passage of the conflict still somehow can affect. This approach involves the control, but not resolution. Conflict management available when it is possible to manage the situation with a goal to make it more constructive and less destructive.

Dispute settlement refers to the working out of a mutually satisfactory agreement between the parties involved. Dispute settlement is primarily concerned with upholding

established social norms (of right and wrong) and is aimed at bringing the dispute to an end, without necessarily dealing with its fundamental causes. Thus, although the particular dispute might be settled permanently, another similar or related dispute may arise again later if the underlying causes are still present [10].

Conflict settlement means an agreement of conflict parties about ending the conflict actions that often involves a compromise or some concessions from both sides. Using this approach, third party or mediator often use pressure, inducements and/ or threats in order to compel the conflict parties to agree to a compromise solution. In practice, settlement of the conflict means the cessation of violence, but not solving the contradictions that have been a source of the conflict. Conflicts that have reached settlements are often re-opened later.

Conflict transformation is an open-ended, long-term, multi-track and dynamic process, which significantly widens the scope of actors involved. It effectively combines activities of three previous strategies.

Conflict transformation, as described by Lederach, does not suggest that we simply eliminate or control conflict, but rather that we recognize and work with its "dialectic nature". First, Lederach argues that social conflict is a natural occurrence between humans who are involved in relationships. Once conflict occurs, it changes or transforms those events, people, and relationships that created the initial conflict. Thus, the cause-and-effect relationship goes both ways – from the people and the relationships to the conflict and back to the people and relationships. In this sense, conflict transformation" is a term that describes the natural process of conflict. Conflicts change relationships in predictable ways, altering communication patterns and patterns of social organization, altering images of the self and of the other [10].

The definition of conflict transformation J. P. Lederach explained through some components: "to envision and respond, ebb and flow, life-giving opportunities, constructive change processes, reduce violence and increase justice, direct interaction and social structures, human relationships" [6].

Conflict transformation is also a prescriptive concept. It suggests that the destructive consequences of a conflict can be modified or transformed so that self-images, relationships, and social structures improve as a result of conflict, instead of being harmed by it. Usually, this involves transforming perceptions of issues, actions, and other people or groups. Conflict usually transforms perceptions by accentuating the differences between people and positions. Lederach believes that effective conflict transformation can utilize this highlighting of differences in a constructive way, and can improve mutual understanding. From the perspective of conflict transformation, intervention has been successful if each group gains a relatively accurate understanding of the other. In the end, improving understanding is the objective of conflict transformation, in spite of parties differing or even irreconcilable interests, values, and needs [10].

On that, C. Reimann argues, that conflict transformation aims to achieve a settlement of substantive issues raised by the needs and fears of the conflict parties. This has two elements: first, a process orientation approach emphasising the need to change mutually negative conflict attitudes and values among parties in order to increase cooperation and communication between them; second, a change oriented approach stressing the political imperative to create a new infrastructure for empowerment and recognition of underprivileged groups, thus fostering and enabling social justice [9, p. 13].

In article "Together in conflict transformation: Development co-operation, mission and diacony" [4, p. 11] Paula Dijk presents characteristics of conflict transformation through three main dimensions of conflict transformation. They are: the perceptions and attitudes of people, the context in which people live and the behaviour of people. Perceptions and attitudes: how people behave is influenced by their perceptions and attitudes. For example,

distrust, feelings of superiority (negative examples) or trust and confidence (positive examples). Context: this concerns the circumstances in which people live, for example, whether people have equal access to basic services and main opportunities. The context in which people live influences their perceptions and attitudes as well as their behaviour. Behaviour : is a result of both their attitudes and the context in which they live. For example, violence, corruption (negative examples) or peaceful coexistence and dialogue (positive examples). Behaviour also influences attitudes and context. The linkages between attitudes, behaviour and context imply that conflict transformation needs to address these three dimensions simultaneously.

Despite the fact that, the conflict has constructive and destructive consequences, conflict transformation can be considered with two major approaches. The first approach aims at an environment where the conflict has arisen. According to this approach, conflict changes the environment where it has arisen. The second approach consists in the fact that the transformation of conflict is a strategy of influence to its dynamics. This strategy is aimed at changing the objectives and means of conflict parties. Transformation involves even a change of the parties of conflict. In perspective, change of conflict parties as well as conflict means and methods can transform conflict functionality and its consequences.

Therefore, the theory of conflict transformation deserves a special attention, as provides a comprehensive approach to understanding the impact of the conflict. Unlike the theories of management, resolution or settlement of the conflict, strategy of conflict transformation aims to develop capacity and to support structural change, rather than to facilitate outcomes or deliver settlements. It seeks to engage with conflict at the pre-violence and postviolence phases, and with the causes and consequences of violent conflict, which usually extend beyond the site of fighting.

1. Bishnu Pathak Johan Galtung's conflict transformation theory for peaceful world: top and ceiling of traditional peacemaking [Electronic resource] / Transcend media service. Solutions-oriented peace journalism, 29 August 2016. - Available at: https://www.transcend.org/tms/2016/08/johan-galtungs-conflict-transformation-theory-for-peaceful-world-top-and-ceiling-of-traditional-peacemaking/

2. Burton J. W. Conflict Resolution as a Political System [Electronic resource] / J.W. Burton // Peace in Action. - Available at: http://promotingpeace.org/2007/4/burton.html

3. Conflict management in divided societies: theory and practice / ed. by Stefan Wolff, Christalla Yakinthoy . – London and New York: Routledge, 2012. – 279 p.

4. Dijk P. Together in conflict transformation: Development co-operation, mission and diacony / P. Dijk // New Routes. – Vol. 14. – 2009, p. 11-14.

5. Lederach J. P. Preparing for peace: conflict transformation across cultures [Electronic resource] / J.P. Lederach. – Syracuse University Press, 1995. – Available at: http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/transform/jplall.htm

6. Lederach J. P. Conflict transformation. Beyond Intractability. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess [Electronic resource] / J.P. Lederach / Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: October 2003. – Available at: http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/transformation

7. Miall H. Conflict transformation: a multi-dimensional task [Electronic resource] / H. Miall // Berghof research center for constructive conflict management. – 2004. – Available at: http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Handbook/Articles/miall_handbook.pdf

8. Paffenholz T. Understanding peacebuilding theory: Management, resolution and transformatio.Conflict transformation: three lenses in one frame / T. Paffenholz // New Routes. – Vol. 14. – 2009, pp. 3-6.

9. Reimann C. Assessing the state-of-the-art in conflict transformation – reflections from a theoretical perspective [Electronic resource] / C. Reimann // Berghof Research Center for Constructive

Conflict Management. – Available at:: http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2011/2568/pdf/reimann_handbook.pdf

10. Spangler B. Settlement, resolution, management, and transformation: an explanation of terms. [Electronic resource*] /* B. Spangler *//* Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted, 2003. – Available at: http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/meaning-resolution

11. Telnyk M. V. Politychni konflikty: osoblyvosti ta shliakhy rehuliuvannia [Elektronnyi resurs] / M. V. Telnyk // Aktualni problemy derzhavy i prava. – 2006. – Vyp. 29. – S. 237-242. – Rezhym dostupu : http://nbuv.gov.ua/j-pdf/apdp_2006_29_48.pdf

На сьогодні існують різні думки з приводу того, чи сформувалась самостійна теорія і практика трансформації конфлікту. Тому дане дослідженя спрямоване на вивчення існуючих підходів до розуміння даної стратегії. Зважаючи на це, охарактеризовані позиції провідних західних дослідників та практиків, які намагались сформувати й проаналізувати окрему школу впливу на конфлікт – школу трансформації конфлікту. В дослідженні наголошено на тому, що школа трансформації конфлікту відрізняється від шкіл врегулювання, вирішення та управління конфліктів, хоча всі вони опираються на спільні традиції вивчення конфліктів і втручання в конфлікти. Проаналізовано основні аспекти прояву трансформації конфліктів та їх характеритстики. Виокремлено елементи, які сприяють розумінню даної стратегії та самі підходи до розуміння. Зясовано, що трансформація конфлікту, як і будь яка інша стратегія впливу на конфлікт залежить від його функціональності.

Ключові слова: конфлікт, трансформація конфлікту, управління конфлікту, врегулювання конфлікту, вирішення конфлікту.

На сегодня существуют разные мнения по поводу того, сформировалась самостоятельная теория и практика трансформации конфликта. Поэтому данное исследование направлено на изучение существующих подходов к пониманию данной стратегии. Несмотря на это, охарактеризованы позиции ведущих западных исследователей и практиков, которые пытались сформировать и проанализировать отдельную школу влияния на конфликт - школу трансформации конфликта. В исследовании отмечено, что школа трансформации конфликта отличается от школ урегулирования, решение и управления конфликтов, хотя все они опираются на общие традиции изучения конфликтов и вмешательства в конфликты. Проанализированы основные аспекты проявления трансформации конфликтов и их характеритстики. Выделены элементы, которые способствуют пониманию данной стратегии и сами подходы к пониманию. Выяснено, что трансформация конфликта, как и любая другая стратегия влияния на конфликт зависит от его функциональности.

Ключевые слова: конфликт, трансформация конфликта, управление конфликта, урегулирования конфликта, разрешение конфликта.

Ilona Lavruk

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE IDEA OF "POLITICAL NON-PARTICIPATION" IN MODERN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The research is devoted to the analysis of modern methodological approaches to the conceptualization of scientific terms, concepts, categories, definitions in determining political non-participation and electoral behavior in modern Western electoral democracies. The basic principles of theorization, operationalization and categorization of scientific concepts are