"WESTERN THEORIES ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE BUILDING: A CRITIQUE"

YASMINE ZEIN AL-ABEDINE

PhD Candidate, Political Science Department, Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University and Assistant Lecturer of Political Science, Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Future University in Egypt
E-mail: bonbona3000@hotmail.com, yzein@fue.edu.eg

Abstract - This paper focuses on reviewing and analyzing critically the academic and scientific efforts that are related to; first- Peace theory, second- Coexistence ideologies and policies, such as; collectivism,globalism vs. universalism, and pluralism vs. multiculturalism.It aims at exploring strengths and weaknesses in terms of practice. The main hypothesis that it tries to test its validity is that there is a need, on theory and practice levels, for a new perspective on conflict resolution and peacebuilding in international relations. The methodology in this paper is not limited to the narrative review, which means explaining the background, and presenting the aim, the focus, the main aspects, and the findings of each ideology and theory, but it surpasses this step to the clarification of a specific critical position towards them and the analysis of their effects.

Index Terms - Identity- Conflict Management- Conflict Resolution- Peacebuilding.

I.INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that peace theory and ideologies and policies of coexistence and peaceful cooperation have attracted many philosophers, theorists and decision makers theoretically, but -at the same time- they have faced a lot of critiques when being transformed into practice. The following parts of the paper present the most known theories and the critiques which could be addressed to them based on different cultures and perspectives.

II. FIRST PEACE THEORY

Peace theory of the 20th century has been introduced by Immanuel Kant essay on "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch" published in 1795. In this regard, Kant tries to explore the main elements of a sovereign nation, what ought to be in terms of its stance towards other nations, government and masses attitude in order to achieve peaceful coexistence, and the conditions of external intervention in another nation affairs. Guarantees of perpetual peace reside in some points; first- treaties of peace without any precaution, second- the activation of the social contract set between government and people, third- nations should end the idea of the standing army in order to avoid wars, fourth- nations should work on realizing self-sufficiency economically, which helps in preventing conflicts, fifth- confirming nation's independence and refusing any intervention in its internal affairs, and finally- in case of wars, nations should maintain the minimum of ethics even towards their enemy. The first criticism that could come to mind when analyzing these six points is related to; their impossible existence together except in a just ideal international system on one hand, and within a balance of power framework on the other hand. Accordingly, many scholars argue that this type of peace could be reached only in a democratic republican government, at the same time, and in order to be described as a sustainable peace, it requires that all nations should also be republics (Democratic Peace). Another criticism is based on the idea of the social contract that will lead governments to create federations to maintain interactions with their people on one hand, and the other governments on the other hand. Kant theory could never be applied easily due to the vulnerability of its structure and the ambiguity of its procedures that are based on morals and self-interest motives related to the establishment of a global identity integrating all cultural, social and political differences without explaining its framework or bases. At the end of the two World Wars, many theoretical efforts appeared in order to end conflicts and to construct peace, the following part focuses on presenting, analyzing and criticizing two main theories; Herbert C. Kelman theory on conflict resolution, and Johan Galtung theory on peace.

A. Conflict Resolution: A Review of Kelman Theory.

In 1963, and without mentioning the concept of conflict resolution yet, Kelman wrote an article where he tackled another significant concept that is "Group Therapy". The group therapy, according to Kelman, has an effective role and is able to change any defective social situation by choosing the suitable treatment program. This group has all duties that could help in affecting people behavior, such as; exercising pressure, offering suggestions, emphasizing the positive side of change in order to convince people that it is for their well-being, presenting a role model, and making new information accessible. In fact, these duties are applicable effectively only in case of well understanding and taking into consideration the differences between people. Kelman did not mention the types of differences that should be taken into consideration, whether they are cultural, social, political, or ethnic,

and how could the group therapy deal with them. As a theoretical framework, Kelman distinguished between three phases of social influence; compliance, identification, and internalization. Concerning the first phase, it means that individuals are ready to execute orders aiming at gaining reward or avoiding punishment. In case of identification, individuals could accept the influence of group therapy due to their need to imitate it or to play a mutual role. The last phase or process is called internalization, which implies that people might accept the beliefs and the actions reflected in the exercised influence by the other because they are suitable to their value system. Based on Kelman analysis, the change in individuals' behavior is not enough, this change should be sustainable and continue even after the therapy period, which means that the role of group therapy does not have a specific limitation, neither in terms of time nor situation. The sustainability of the exercised influence is an indicator of its success, and the main challenge that could confront group therapy is the nature of techniques used in the two phases; before and after the therapy period, and that are to reach a balance between different forces toward change. In this regard, Kelman saw that group therapy is less powerful than the individual therapy that affects change more effectively and guarantees its sustainability. Accordingly, group therapy is more influential in terms of generalization of therapeutic treatment to practical life. As a criticism to this previous idea, there was no clarification presented by Kelman to justify this comparison made between group and individual therapy. In fact, it could derive from the absence of a framework that integrates all techniques and stages of therapy.

There is no doubt that group therapy in Kelman thought focused -only- on social psychological patience, and the unit of analysis was the patient and his behavior before, during and after the therapeutic process. This idea, its details, its different aspects, and the other ideas that have preceded it on attitude and opinion change could be considered as the nucleus of all Kelman writings on conflict resolution, and conflict resolution theories in general. In other words, Kelman tried to use the social psychological approach in analyzing conflict resolution, which is reflected -according to him- on the analysis of international conflict, and transforms the unit of analysis from the individual (the patient) to the state. In fact, conflicts -based on Kelman analysis- could erupt between ethnic, ideological and national identity groups, because of fear of basic needs or interests non-fulfillment, such as; self-affirmation, acceptance, respect of the other, security, and self-integrity. Hence, identity and collective needs escalate either internal or international conflict, and for resolving this conflict, collective fundamental human needs and fears should be addressed, which could realize justice by settling issues related to territory and resources. Conflicts are not only determined by contradictions and struggles of needs or fears between two different states, or between the government and the people, but they could also be manifested between social groups themselves due to ethnic or cultural problems in general, which affects the political environment and obliges the government to react by defining law. This type of conflicts -most of the time- complicates the resolution process, except in case of a political agreement signed the conflicting parties, or an attitude change, a reconciliation and a transformation of the relationship in case of collective identities conflict. According to Kelman, all different sectors of the society or the two societies should be involved in the agreement in order to avoid its application on the governmental level.

Concerning the contribution of the social-psychological analysis in the field of conflict resolution, it resides in the search for the social and psychological factors that cause violent conflicts and hinder conflict resolution (Berrebi& Klor, 2006). It also helps in identifying the procedures that could be extracted from the conflict opportunities of solving it, analyzing the process of resolution, either on micro or macro levels, especially in case of conflicts between identity groups, or conflicts with mutual influence in order to reach a long-term peaceful relationship, and finally, exploring the possibilities for attitude and stance change by establishing a new cooperative peaceful discourse addressed to different disputing parties, which paves the way to new kind of relationships. In this regard, conflict resolution represents a process of peacemaking that reflects a new set of values and belief system in the mind and attitude of all parties in order to protect them from any instability in their new relationship. Kelman pointed out that this type of changes requires an identity revision, on both or all sides, based on five main indicators. First- mutual acknowledgment and acceptance of the other, second- creation of a common moral basis for peace, third- understanding the other's identity historical context, fourth- acknowledgment of the other's responsibility within an integrative framework, and finally- establishment of a cooperative domain with specific tools in which the integrative framework could be activated or applied, which is able to adapt disputing parties' collective identities and neglecting all negative impressions on the other's identity. When trying to apply his theory and approach, Kelman focused on the Palestinian- Israeli conflict and his students focused on other ethno-national conflicts in South Africa, Sri Lanka, Colombia, …etc. The only solution that could be proposed -according to Kelman- to the Palestinian- Israeli conflict is the establishment of two states based on a compromise that meets both parties needs, acknowledges their national identities, and is able to fairly end any conflict (Kellen, Bekerman& Maoz, 2012). When starting applying

this approach, borders between the two states should be the first problem to be solved and clarified. Kelman affirmed that international legitimacy represented in UN resolutions -in this regard- is the main determinant; the Palestinian state consists of the West Bank and Gaza as it was indicated before 1967 war (Friedman, 2005). Concerning Jerusalem, it should be shared -according to Kelman- because of its importance for both national identities, and should contain the capital of each state. Emphasizing each state independence, acknowledging each people identity, and integrating both states in the international community, are the main principles on which is based a mutual beneficial cooperation in all vital sectors. Regardless of the impossibility of this solution due to the culture of the two peoples, and the Israeli policies (Maoz, 2002), Kelman -in his theory, when suggesting laws or agreements- did not mention any deterrent or sanction against the party that breaks the law or the agreement's articles. Another criticism addressed to Kelman theory is related to his focus on culture and identity as essential factors that could complicate and escalate conflicts. According to him, as presented above, solving this type of conflicts is a long term process, which needs a different approach to his theory that could simplify the steps he has proposed, such as; social influence, opinion and attitude change, mutual recognition, peaceful coexistence and integration of identities, …etc. These steps are in need of another approach with a cultural framework that carries in itself peaceful components and common ground characteristics and seeds to be applied. Eventually, conflict resolution theory, on one hand, and conflict management and resolution studies and strategies, on the other, spur the researchers on to study peace agreements and processes (Wallensteen, 2011), which represents a basis for peace theory that appeared in the 1960s.

B. Peace: Review of Galtung Theory.

The Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung is considered as the pioneer of peace research. He founded the Peace Research Institute Oslo in 1959, and the Journal of Peace Research in 1964. He started his work by focusing on the theories of conflict; stating its definitions and types, clarifying the difference between conflict theory and game theory, identifying conflict's dimensions, actors, goals, and analyzing its implications and levels. According to Galtung, conflicts erupt because of the basic human needs. He refuses the idea of scarcity and refers to politics as a main determinant of priorities, goals and programs of development. These programs are almost the main reason of conflict between state and society because of its ineffectiveness and deleterious impact on both economic and political life. Galtung divided the basic human needs into four progressive categories; the most basic needs (life, survival), basic needs (food, health, education), near-basic needs (freedom, career, political participation), and relation to nature (partnership), corresponding to the main contemporary problems, which are; violence, misery, repression, and environmental deterioration. Peace research was interested -in the beginning- in understanding violence and the conditions of reducing its direct effects, but recently, it was expanded to what Galtung has called "Structural Violence" which means that social, political and economic institutions could harm individuals and peoples by preventing them from their basic needs, which causes either disability or death and leads to cultural violence. In fact, he differentiated between personal violence and structural violence. Concerning personal violence, specific persons cause bodily harm to others by using different tools, such as; the economic organizations that reflect a more advanced tool and a development in terms of conflict's sources. In case of structural violence, individuals and peoples suffer inequality in the distribution of power. Some could argue that this distinction is not clear, on one hand, causing bodily harm might be the result of the unequal distribution of power, and -on the other hand- preventing people from their basic needs could affect health and therefore the body. Other scholars could consider unequal distribution of power as a consequence of two facts; first- individuals are different, and second- this heterogeneity affects their behavior and their performance. Based on this idea, Galtung affirms that violence is more natural and normal than peace, which means that in order to coexist together peacefully and to cooperate, humans are in need of mandatory rules to conduct their behavior and to orient them towards peace. These rules are imposed by the competent authorities, such as; the police, the army, …etc. Whenever there is no violence, two kinds of peace could appear according to Galtung; either positive peace or negative peace. Using "positive" and "negative" specifically as a description refers to the impact of the different types of violence. For example; the disappearance of the personal violence is not a condition of peace, but in case of the structural peace, its absence means that social justice is achieved, which represents a guarantee of peace. Galtung concludes that peace theory is not only related to conflict theory, but also to development theory (Equal distribution of power and resources). Within this framework, Galtung presented his peace theory. It is clear that there are some points of criticism that could be addressed to his key principles. First- when tackling the structural violence and its essential cause which is related to unequal distribution of power and resources, Galtung did not mention the criteria according to which state resources could be allocated equally. Second- Galtung did not take into consideration the difference between equality and justice, in contrary; he has used both concepts to signalize the same meaning. Third- according to him, the reasons behind violence and conflict are purely economic and political. In spite of his acknowledgment that the religious perspective on

or concepts of peace may contribute to its meaning because it will be related to some values, such as; the feelings of global love, and brotherhood, he omitted the role of culture in the outbreak of conflicts and violent actions. In fact, Galtung tried to synthesize the major theories of peace aiming at producing a cumulative one that is based on specified hypotheses and able to be tested, without neglecting the effect of what he called "the non-testable dimension, which is the peace philosophy. To introduce his idea, he differentiated between two main types of individuals' relations in social sciences; comparative and interactive. This means that people either compare themselves in terms of sources and personal skills and characteristics, or try to interact and to exchange some positive and negative values. Regardless of his focus on the resources or values as the only purposes of comparison and interaction, Galtung did not tackle the role of the community as a unit of analysis, and he replaced it by the individuals as actors in these relations. It is true that he has mentioned the word "groups" as a synonym of nations that are composed of individuals, and based on a complex structure, but this was only for analyzing the relationships on international level, and not for testing the possible integration between individuals or for understanding the relationship between them within a community framework, in spite of his avowal that the world is a social system (Offer, 2000). Additionally, Galtung distinguishes between different types of peace thinking, which could be divided into three main groups; personal, national and global types. The third group (intra-global) is not yet meaningful according to him. It needs to get the entire universe with it planets and natural phenomena involved in this relation. Concerning the first and the second groups, they could be considered as the best types of peace thinking, because they are able to be tested, similar and less complicated. The complexity in Galtung analysis of peace theories on one hand, and peace thinking on the other hand, resides in his attempt to adapt social sciences and individuals' interactions into mathematical formulas based on physics thinking process. This appears -for example- in his distinction between peace theory "atoms", and peace theory "molecules" to explain the difference between the simplistic peace thinking and the more sophisticated one and the richer in ideas that gather a number of theories, and contribute to them, which reflects his own theory. As mentioned before, Galtung defines peace as the absence of destructive behavior and violence. In this regard, he presented a specific peace formula, which is the following:

$$\text{Peace} = \frac{\text{Equity} \times \text{Empathy}}{\text{Trauma} \times \text{Conflict}}$$

This formula aims at promoting mutual and equal benefit on one hand, and the harmony (to live the feelings of the others; either suffering or joy) on the other. It also aims at solving violence by reconciliation and conflict by resolution. For fulfilling this equation, Galtung argues that it is important to; first- understand the origins and the dynamics of non-peaceful behavior. This behavior starts by a negative perception, and a destructive sentiment and attitude towards the other, which would lead definitely to conflicts. Second- identify strategies and approaches to peace and conflict management/ resolution, which could be summarized in facilitating constructive behavior and positive attitude. Some strategies aim at separating between the disputing parties and limiting all types of interactions, while other strategies are more successful because they provide parties with specific approaches that increase interactions and consider the strong relations as a protection from any troubling symptoms. Any conflict management/ resolution -according to Galtung- could start by the first strategy, but it would be described as positive whenever it ends by the second. Galtung focuses in his criticism of peace theories and his exploration of his own theory on the structure of thinking, and on the personal and the national levels only without tackling the international level. He found it researchable to tackle intra-personal and intra-social types and methods by analyzing education, socialization, interactions, conflict management, and sanctions theories on the individual level, and theories of peaceful relations on the social level. Concerning the international peace thinking, he claimed that it is clear that there are no specific general characteristics of the nations in terms of sovereignty, decision makers or actors, and diplomatic missions. There is another criticism that could be addressed to Galtung theory' basis on peace. In fact, he found that peace is easier on the micro level (intra-personal) and the macro level (intra-national), or on individuals and groups levels within a specific society or a particular nation. According to Galtung, a world with a lower number of actors could achieve peace easily, because the increasing number means more complexity in testing their interactions, managing information process, such as; gathering, analyzing and evaluating data. He also argued that the lower number is better when making decisions, the society is more secure; there is a high peace building potential, because the fewer actors are more rational in taking the needed precautions, and they are more able to predict. The only positive side in the high number of actors or nations resides in the balance of power. Galtung thought that sometimes the fewer actors are much tougher and susceptible to conflicts. Later, he touched on the relationship between homogeneity and heterogeneity, and the complexity of achieving peace between the high number of actors with different racial and ethnic characteristics. The problem resides in his attempt to relate between homogeneity and one nation on one hand, and heterogeneity and many nations on the other hand.

These relationships could be considered as illogical or unreal, because not all societies are described as homogenous (USA is racially and ethnically heterogeneous), at the same time, there are many societies that possess the same general characteristics, such as; the majority of the European countries, which means that the number of actors is not an indicator of homogeneity or heterogeneity.

According to Galtung, peace could never be achieved except between homogeneous nations; homogeneity creates internal cohesion and avoids external conflicts (MISTRA, 2014). Some other scholars defend this idea based on the claim that in the heterogeneous societies and nations, certain groups are excluded from public life and deprived from equal rights, which limits their impact and reduces the peaceful coexistence opportunities. This is considered as a claim because of the generalization, despite of all efforts that aim at testing the role of heterogeneity between promoting conflict and encouraging peace. The heterogeneous society -in Galtung thought- leads to the escalation of internal conflicts because of many reasons; first- it encourages external conflicts that deepen social divisions, second- some groups belong to other nations, and finally- these other nations could intervene in order to protect their groups. For these reasons, he considered homogeneityas the only guarantee to avoid internal conflicts, and to encourage interdependence between different groups. Galtung limited the exchange and the cooperation between homogeneous nations to travel, tourism, visits, work and study purposes on private level, and trade, diplomatic relations and political cooperation on public level, without mentioning any other dimension of integration, as if the type of cultural and structural homogeneity is absolute which is impossible even within the same society. Based on many theories, Galtung has seen these types of interdependence and exchange as the main indicator because of the following; first- cooperating together reduces interactions with the enemies, which could either solve conflicts or reduce it. Second- conflicts between homogeneous and cooperative nations are rare and limited at variance with the international conflicts that take a long time to be managed and solved. Third- in case of homogeneous nations or groups, conflicts' prediction is easier, which helps in avoiding any violent clashes. Fourth- cooperation between homogeneous nations contributes to the balance of power policies. Finally- economic and political cooperation encourages internal development and cohesion, which would emphasize integration and decrease aggression and conflicts prospects. Galtung addressed a criticism to some of these theories that aim at the transformation of interdependence to polarization because of the absence of guarantee that this process is stable or sustainable. Interdependence without polarization or what Galtung called it depolarization attracts former enemies to positive interaction, lets disputing parties withdraw from conflicts, support the emergence of an ideology of peaceful coexistence, and bolsters cooperation and diminishes the level of military capability (Military Disengagement). Depolarization -based on this way of thinking- involves non-governmental organizations and individuals in the process of interdependence or cooperation, which makes it peace productive because of its ability to provide all parties by certain benefits, especially power through justice, democracy and balance of power.

For a general theory of peace that could gather all previous consistent dimensions, Galtung started by explaining the concept of entropy as the common concept that plays an essential role in peace thinking. He tried to focus on only one rich and flexible idea that could cover all previous mentioned components. Galtung's choice of this concept is a proof of his interest in physics thinking methodology, because "entropy" is considered as a synonym of homogeneity and disorder, it is the inverse of negentropy that means heterogeneity and order in a system (Singh, 2013). It also means a change in an element's characteristics due to its total mixing with a different element, which reflects an exchange of characteristics while retaining the original ones (Greven, Keller& Warnecke, 2003). In this regard, high entropy means high variance and great disorder or that the elements are widely affected by each other (Dugdale, 1996), while low entropy means an ordered system with low variety and uncertainty or that each element keeps its own features without any change (Gigch, 1991). Based on this conceptual framework, Galtung has built his integrated theory of peace; he focused on the links between the different members (or actors), and he was trying to find out how these links are distributed and their meanings. The answer on this question depends on two essential points; first- the distribution of parties in terms of positions (Actors Entropy), and second- The distribution of links between each two parties (Interaction Entropy Actors). The distribution of actors and the links between them revive the social structure, in other words, according to Galtung, whenever there is a high entropy or homogeneity between the different parties, and a high interaction, peace could be settled easily, and with high number of actors, homogeneity and interactions are less probable, which affects peacebuilding negatively. In this regard, Galtung presented four types of interactions; first- Isolationism where interactions are concentrated within nations and focused on either governmental (strong public sector) or non-governmental (strong private sector) actors, second- Bilateralism where interactions are alive between each two parties and occurred either between governments or private persons and organizations, third- Multilateralism where there is an interaction between more than two

nations either through governments or private organizations, and finally- Internationalism where international organizations play the role of members or actors and interact together. As mentioned before, in case of multiple actors, in this theory, there is less opportunity for peaceful coexistence and cooperation, which could undermine any effort for peace, because of the increasing number of actors that are embodied in persons, states, governmental and non-governmental international organizations all over the world, and the need to interact peacefully without being homogeneous. At the same time, as long as peace could be applied within people in one society, and between a small number of nations, it could also be applied between a large number of nations and organizations, if not, there must be a defect in the theory or a flaw in the general framework that gathers or integrates all actors. Galtung did not only differentiate -on his general theory- between high and low entropy, but he also distinguished between dissociative and associative peace thinking. Concerning dissociative peace thinking, positive interaction is transformed into either neutral or negative interaction, while in case of associative peace thinking, the inverse is true; negative interaction is transformed into either neutral or positive interaction. The relationship between these two types of peace thinking on one hand, and entropy on the other hand, appears in the role of the private sector; in the dissociative thinking, there is no interaction between private sector entities within low entropy systems, and there is no interaction between all types of sectors in case of high entropy systems, while in the associative thinking, interaction is developed within public sector entities in the low entropy systems, and it is developed within all sectors in case of high entropy systems, which means that the dissociative thinking would never lead to peace, in contrary it leads to total war, especially in case of high entropy systems, and that the associative thinking leads to peace especially in the same case. Perhaps, the most important idea that was delivered by Galtung -in this part- resides in the relationship that he explored between effective peace and means of communication between people, which does not require homogeneity or could be hindered because of heterogeneity, but it needs suitable tools that are able to facilitate it.

In addition to his equation of peace, Galtung also focused on many important key concepts that could help as approaches to achieve his formula. However, his stance towards the international level of peacebuilding on one hand, and his understanding of the concept of homogeneity by relating it to the number of actors, on the other hand, represents a real barrier facing the application of his theory. In other words, Galtung theory lacks the framework that could allow all heterogeneous characteristics and sophisticated actors to integrate together and to cooperate peacefully, because the only way that helps in achieving peace according to him is the common cultural, structural, racial and ethnic features between masses and actors. There is no doubt that Galtung succeeded in projecting the micro level to the macro level, but he abstained from tackling the mega level, which reflects a dire need for another larger and deeper perspective that is able to handle all complicated relationships, manage all information process, and at the same time, maintain the balance of power.

III. COEXISTENCE IDEOLOGIESANDPOLICIES

The history of peaceful coexistence ideologies and policies is inseparable from the history of war. They acknowledge that any form of destruction or disorder or clash could be repaired and handled aiming at peace under specific conditions that would be presented in details with the criticism addressed to each one of them, which is the main focus of this part. The following forms of peaceful coexistence and cooperation are not the only forms, but they are the essential basis from which many other forms are created. This part starts by presenting the history of the concept (ideology or policy) and its pioneer, explaining its significance, enlightening its link with peace, and finally exploring its strengths and weaknesses in terms of application.

A. Collectivism

The founder of this concept is the Greek philosopher Socrates (469 BC- 399 BC) who has involved the collective thought that reflected his belief in the good of humanity and in people capability of making rational choices. This idea has been evolved and developed through Christians who have focused on the Bible to relate between collectivism and believing in God (Hale, 1867). Collectivism was used -in this context- in the sense of sharing property and possessions as a form of cooperation; which means that neither private property nor economic freedom exist in their world. Later, in Pax Romana (or Roman Peace) which is the period of relative stability and peace in the Roman Empire between 27 B.C.E. to 180 C.E., people were emphasizing common rights for the sake of order and security. In this historical phase, the majority of Europe believed in cultural and collective norm that has ruled people life. According to some scholars, collectivism -within this extreme meaning- neglects individual identity as a nucleus of group identity, which could hinder people fusion in the society, because it might lead to tyranny based on the continuing call for the authority obedience as long as it is the reflection of God on Earth. This was very clear in the case of the Ottoman Empire and in Europe where it took several centuries, that focuses on people freedom, personal achievements and self-interest, which has been transformed to selfishness

and revived the idea of collectivism again in order to protect the community on one hand, and to bolster the balance of power on the other hand. There is no doubt that individualism came first in ancient times, between the fourth millennium B.C. and the Middle Ages, as a way of survival and a tool that helps in protecting private property and self-interest. In the Medieval times, between the 5th and the 15th century, collectivism appears as an alternative of individualism, it focused on the sense of community, common good, and God's standards that could never be ignored. The Renaissance age, between the 14th and the 17th century, combined both individualism and collectivism in the sense of focusing on self-interest growth within the society. This balance has been continued with the Protestant revolution, in the 16th century, that allowed the integration of different cultures and languages to deal with the Bible, to interpret it and to contribute ideologically in understanding it. In fact, collectivism is defined as a cultural framework based on a determinant number of values and world perspectives that appear in people language, attitude, interactions and institutions use and structure. It aims at unifying the whole society, making it integrated and powerful with interdependent masses that belong to a specific group, which creates a categorization. In this case, people realize their personal and common goals at the same time due to their feelings of belongingness, interdependency, empathy, norms for integration, and finally their duties in the society and within their groups. They well understand each other and they are fully aware of their needs and goals as persons and as a group. Some scholars think that because the high emotional considerations, hostility and anger are accepted and approved under the umbrella of this concept, which raises many questions on collectivism and its relationship with peace as a goal. In general, collectivism is a type of linkage between the self and the relevant others based on differences between people in terms of gender, culture, …etc. Concerning the effects of collectivism, many theories are presented to test the validity of collectivism framework that could gather all types of differences. The Dutch social psychologist Geert Hofstede published a relevant book that is entitled "Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values" in 1980. The tackled collectivism, culture and peace, and concluded that collectivism or individualism is chosen -as an ideology that could help in achieving state goals- according to the population size and the gross national product. In this regard, culture -in Hofstede thought- is "the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another" (1980, p. 21), which means that culture -as a determinant of people identity- gives sense to population size and affects its relationship with gross national product in terms of either peaceful cooperation and fair distribution or struggle, because of the ability of culture in creating integration that differs between one society to another. The main problem in Hofstede ideas resides in his distinction between values and culture without any clear justification, which impedes the understanding of his interpretation of culture, its impact on collectivism and peace, and its role in forming collective identity.

Despite of its approaching to peace concept, collectivism as an ideology faces many objections and criticisms from liberal, socialist and other schools of thought. The classical liberals who support individualism argue that collectivism, when focusing on social identity (McKeown, Haji& Ferguson, 2016), such as; nationalism, ignores diversity, which certainly would affect its perspective on peace on the long run, it could also lead to disintegration and dissemination of armed conflicts. There is no doubt that collectivism achieves peace in the beginning, but at the end, an atrophy of democratic rights appears due to the prevalence of the government control that turns into taking the citizens majority support as granted. Many socialists are also against collectivism based on the same argument that is related to the fact of defining or interpreting collectivism as the tyranny of the minority, and as the other face of capitalism that emphasizes the idea of class interests and private property. They argue that despite of collectivism basis on common ownership over productive assets, it encourages personal possessions and individual production. Some other scholars see that collectivism would definitely lead to totalitarianism because it obligates individuals to waive their rights and their own interests for the sake of a common good in the leader's hand. As a response to these points of criticism, some argue that collectivism -as a concept- could be confusing because of its egalitarian and hierarchical dimensions without giving the individual self-interests any priority. This trend of thought finds that collectivism is able to minimize conflicts if it takes culture into consideration. Contrary to this, any neglect or violation of norms would lead to disorder and violence. For them, the hierarchy culture is the way to peace relations either domestically or internationally and among people on one hand and between them and the governor on the other hand. Social order is the basis of all peace dimensions and it is related to virtue and morals either through religions, such as; Catholicism, Protestantism, Evangelicalism, Islam, Hinduism, … etc., or the secular systems that are interested in moral code (Davis, 2006), which calls for exploring the specific determinants of peace in each culture and religion in order to clarify all dimensions of collectivism.

B. Globalism/ Universalism

Globalism, universalism and international law are perceived as the essential conditions of peace movement, especially when it comes to agreeing or conducting treaties on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The idea of globalism

appeared with the beginning of the Second World War in 1939, when the United States and the Great Britain started searching for a new global order and a transformation of the imperial federalism came to an end, and the federal democracy for welfare took its place. The concept of universalism is older and has its ancient roots that date back to the emergence of Christianity and the Apostles. In fact, Judaism uses the idea of universalism narrowly just to mean that it is open to all mankind. Universalism's meaning changes over time and gains different dimensions with new effects. Some scholars agree that it means the equal distribution of social goods among people regardless of their income, which means that "the fewer conditions for access, the more universal the benefits" (Anttonen, Häikiö& Stefánsson, 2012, p. 188), which is the more recent definition. Historically, universalism was considered only as a religious and a philosophical concept; in general, religion is a set of beliefs related to the nature of the universe and its purpose. It contains related worships and rituals and offers morals within an ethical system. Universalism -in Christianity- is a synonym of "Universal Reconciliation", which means that every human being is reconciled to God based on divine love and mercy. The religious universalism has two meanings; first- accepting other religions, and second- believing in the universal reconciliation between humans and God, in this regard, there is another concept that is called "Unitarian Universalism"; it bolsters the universal characteristic of the majority of religions, while the philosophical (or the non-religious) side is related to a set of values that surrounds people who believe in the universality of the human experience in terms of principles, ethics, and social beliefs. Referring to all these previous definitions, either a religion or a philosophy that claims to be universal based on shared values and norms between all humans under an ethical umbrella, is aiming at achieving peaceful coexistence and cooperation. However, it should be tested to prove its ability to gather and integrate all differences and human diversity within one system that helps all who belong to it to solve their problems and satisfying their needs on individual and collective levels anytime and anywhere under all circumstances.

Globalism appeared in the 1940s in the United States which was -at this time- the greatest power economically and militarily. This international position spurred the US on searching for policies that are suitable to the postwar period on all levels; economic, political, social and military. The American John S. de Beers was the first economist who has used the term "economic integration" in 1941 to indicate the mixture between different economies within a larger economy system or region, which has been developed and elaborated in US and Europe in many other academic and political studies that focused on the "economic cooperation" all over the world. The spread of this American ideology and others shows that either globalism or globalization appeared in the late twentieth century as a process that was theorized by many scholars, such as; the Austrian Manfred Steger and the Australian Paul James who are specialized in global studies and regenerate globalism theoretically as a contemporary ideology. According to Steger, globalism means dominant economic and technological approaches supported by political, cultural and ideological system that has already gained consensus worldwide especially on governments' level (2004). Paul James presented globalism in through four forms of integration mode; first- The Embodied Globalism that means the movements of peoples across the different countries as tourists, emigrants, even refugees, …etc., second- The Object- Extended Globalism that means the movements of objects, such as; trade commodities, third- The Agency- Extended Globalism that indicates the movement of institutions and corporations agents, and finally- The Disembodied Globalism that contains the transmission of immaterial things, such as; photos, electronic data, …etc. (James, 2006). Before tackling the relationship between globalism and peace and presenting a criticism to it, there is a dire need to differentiate between globalism and globalization. Many people might think that these two concepts are similar, but the fact that there is a clear difference between them. Joseph Nye demarcates this difference by defining each concept separately; globalism reflects the link or the inter-basic network that connects the modern world (Hulliung, 2016), while globalization focuses on the nature of this network and tests its deepness, strength and decline. As if globalism is interested in the horizontal world relations, and globalization is interested in the vertical ones. In fact, this difference is also reflected in the impact on peace; when presenting the studies that analyze the relationship between globalism and peace on one hand, and the studies that tackle the relationship between globalization and peace on the other hand, it will be clear that they get contradictory final results. Globalization mainly leads to war more than peace, especially in case of the absence of balance of power and the neglect of the other's differences in terms of culture, which could create coercion on the part of the most powerful state, and a sort of denial or refusal from the weaker party. However, some scholars argue that globalism promotes democratic peace, because it is able -at this moment- to identify the current threats and the opportunities in different cultural contexts. The main criticism that could be addressed to the impact of globalism on peace positively resides -on one hand- in the absence of general reasons of war; war has divergent huge number of causes, which means that a changeable party (either a state or an organization) is not able to present general solutions to end it anywhere and anytime in a variant world. On the other hand, there is a trend of thought that sees that

globalism has become the other face of the coin with liberalism (Cladis, 1992), and it is considered as an indicator of the victory of the Western ideals, which could hinder and stop the peace process.

C. Pluralism/ Multiculturalism

Pluralism is defined as the belief that people are able to live together in a society in spite of their different traditions and interests based on a disparity in social classes, religions, political views, races, … etc., while multiculturalism which is built on pluralism and on a dominant culture, is the recognition of other cultures that exist in the same society. Robert Dahl related between pluralism and the role of government that is crucial -according to him- in terms of controlling the wide variety of people, situations and circumstances, he also compared its role to the role of individuals, and argued that governments' decisions and policies are applied properly when individuals do not intervene in them because they are less efficient than the government (Connolly, 2010), which faced a lot of criticism based on the idea that supports individuals as the source of government power and control. For Truman, pluralism is reflected in the interest and pressure groups that represent people who share common attitudes. Based on this view, Truman found that conflicts between social groups are expected and justified (Schlosberg, 1999), which means that he gave more power to individuals and groups. Seymour Martin Lipset tried to create a balance in his theory on pluralism by presenting it within unity and combining between virtues and rights. He argued that the effectiveness and the legitimacy of any political system is a guarantee of the democracy stability, which will never be achieved except if the society is able to integrate all ethnic, religious, and social pluralism and to present it in form of a unity. This type of pluralism could sustain both effectiveness and legitimacy of the political system based on diversity on one hand, and shared valued and policies on the other hand. Some scholars consider pluralism as a precondition of peace, and those who claim that pluralism has been ended, emphasize the impossibility of living in peace. In this regard, and according to this idea, pluralism as a framework of people reality that appears in confirming their beliefs and attitudes would lead to civil peace and democratic consensus (Inazu, 2016). Theories on multiculturalism have been expanded in late 1980s; the most crucial one is presented by Will Kymlicka who combined both liberal values of independence and equality. He also distinguished between "Multinational States" where a national minority with a different language, culture and territory lives in the country, on one hand, and "Poly-ethnic States" which is described as an immigration territory that contains ethnic groups, and not national groups, as long as they have their distinct language and culture, but they do not live in separate spaces, on the other hand. It is clear that multiculturalism is more related to peace theoretically. Multiculturalism policies lead to peaceful coexistence if there is a recognition of minorities' presence and an equality of treatment for them within citizens, which could be applied -according to many political theorists- by creating a shared cultural or national identity, or constructing a national identity that reflects all cultures. The problem in the relationship between multiculturalism and peaceful coexistence theoretically always appears when it comes to practice; each state -at this time- confronts a specific paradox that is related either to lack of national identity that could reflect all cultural identities, or lack of actors who could formulate this type of unity, or lack of guarantee for a tolerant society or for the construction of social harmony in terms of law and political system.

CONCLUSION

From the Western perspective, there are lots of conflict resolution and peace theories, but the main problem appears when it comes to practice. There is no clear identification of suitable theories to specific cases. Generalization could never be applied, in other words, the focus on human needs without taking into consideration the nature of the culture; how it perceives peace and other's differences, obstructs the path instead of paving it. Mutual recognition within a particular cultural framework helps in analyzing any conflict structure and its processes on one hand, and predicting its effects on the other hand. In spite of the exerted effort over many years, there is no doubt that the West is still in need to develop a more comprehensive integrative theories and suitable conflict resolution practices, which gives way to new perspectives and theories that could fit different conflict resolution practices.

REFERENCES

A. Books

[1] Cladis, M. (1992). A communitarian defense of Liberalism. USA: Stanford University Press.
[2] Connolly, W. (Ed.). (2010). Pluralism in political analysis. USA: New Brunswick.
[3] Hulliung, M. (2016). Rousseau and the dilemmas of modernity. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
[4] Inazu, J. D. (2016). Confident Pluralism: Surviving and Thriving Through Deep Difference. University of Chicago Press.
[5] Mapungubwe Institute for Strategic Reflection (MISTRA). (2014). Nation formation and social cohesion: An enquiry into the hopes and aspirations of South Africa. Johannesburg: Real African Publishers.

[6] McKeown, S., Haji, R.& Ferguson, N. (2016). Understanding peace and conflict through social identity theory: Contemporary global perspectives. Switzerland: Spring International Publishing.
[7] Offer, J. (Ed.). (2000). Herbert Spencer: Critical assessments of leading sociologists. London: Routledge.
[8] Schlosberg, D. (1999). Environmental justice and the new pluralism: the challenge of difference for environmentalism. OUP Oxford.

B. Periodicals

[1] Berrebi, C.& Klor, E. (2006). On terrorism and electoral outcomes: Theory and evidence from the Israeli- Palestinian conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 50 (6), 899- 925.
[2] Friedman, G. (2005). Commercial pacifism and protracted conflict: Models from the Palestinian- Israeli case. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 49 (3), 360- 382.
[3] Hale, E. (Ed.). (1867). The Christian examiner, Volume 82. New York: James Miller Publisher.
[4] Kellen, D., Bekerman, Z.& Maoz, I. (2012). An easy coalition: The peacecamp identity and Israeli-Palestinian track two diplomacy. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 57 (4), 543-569.
[5] Maoz, I. et al. (2002). Reactive devaluation of an "Israeli" vs. "Palestinian" peace proposal. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 46 (4), 515-546.

★★★