TITLE: INTERGENERATIONAL DIALOGUE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RECONCILIATION, HEALING AND AWARENESS IN SOUTH SUDAN.

By Dr. Gabriel Alier Riak. PhD & PhD Candidate Dut Boyle Ayuel Bill

Associate Professor of Political Science, Upper Nile University South Sudan

Date: 10/12/2021

Abstract: -

The dialogue across generations can be used as a way to decrease the level of violence by using the knowledge and experience of previous generations to create awareness and to promote long term solutions for the risks faced by the community in South Sudan. In other word Intergenerational dialogues are interactive participatory forums that bring together older and younger generations and are intended to create shared knowledge and meaning and a collective experience. Intergenerational equity in economic, psychological, and sociological contexts, is the concept or idea of fairness or justice between generations. The concept can be applied to fairness in dynamics between children, youth, adults and seniors, in terms of treatment and interactions. Reconciliation is about strengthening relationships between the warring parties or parties caught up in conflict in other word this is a step whereby the parties caught up in conflict open a new page of peaceful coexistence for the benefit of all entirely citizen living in a given state E-g South Sudan. Reconciliation is an ongoing journey that reminds us that while generations of South Sudan fought but they still come together for the development and prosperity for our county. Our vision of reconciliation is based and measured on five dimensions: historical acceptance; race relations; equality and equity; institutional integrity and unity. The dimensions do not exist in isolation, but are interrelated. Reconciliation cannot be seen as a single issue or agenda; the contemporary definition of reconciliation must weave all of these threads together. For example, greater historical acceptance of the wrongs done to One another that can lead to improved race relation.

Keywords: - *INTERGENERATIONAL DIALOGUE, ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RECONCILIATION, HEALING, SOUTH SUDAN*

1.3 Definitions, nature and Characteristics of Conflict

There is somewhat general agreement that conflict is basic to every society. It is sometimes said to be a sign of healthy organization of men in the society, especially if its generic implication is to redress injustice. Even in the most economically advanced nations, conflict still take place at one point or the other. The basic truth is that individual's or group's interest differs, and their objectives, values and needs do not always coincide. Bland agreement on everything would be unnatural. Therefore, there should be opportunities for natural clashes of ideas and interests about tasks, projects, public decisions and allocation of values in the society so that the issues are explored and resolved. Yet extreme cases of conflict in the society or organization can have adverse consequence, especially if the opportunities and tool-kits for resolving such negative behaviors are scarcely available or utilized.

Conflict could be defined as the pursuit of incompatibility of goals by individuals or groups as a result of the inability of social structure to allocate values objectively. Ball (1983) situates conflict as a political process that generates from diversity of choices and distribution of scarce resources in the society. Stagner (1995) adds that the occurrence of cheat and aggressive behaviors on the part of individuals or groups that leads to the frustration of others may cause conflict. It is a disagreement that results from the allocation of scarce values or clashes regarding incompatibility of goals. It can also be regarded as disagreement that generates from distributive injustice. There are both positive and negative sides of conflict when it is resolved and when it exist respectively. The positive side can be used to minimize or resolve conflict. Similarly, the negative can be used to exacerbate conflict.

To promote conflict resolution and peaceful co-existence, one important tool is communication. Of course, Otitis and Albert (1999) have argued that adequate consultation and communication is one of the hallmarks of transforming conflict environment to manageable situation. Where communication is lacking either as result of the inability of the mediator to initiate it or the principals' blatant refusal to talk to each other, resolution may be difficult. Consultation and communication aim to promote the positive side of conflict and deterring the negative side. Corser in Otitis and Albert (1999) provides an elaborate definition: Accordingly, he states that; Social conflict may be defined as a struggle over values or claims to status power, and scarce resources, in which in which the aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain the desired values, but also to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals. Such conflicts may take place between individuals, between collectivities, or between individuals and collectivities. Intergroup as well as intra-group conflicts are perennial features of social life. In conflict situation, one individual or group tries to prevent or obstruct the other in achieving his goals because their behaviors are in opposition. Competition for a common goal has been singled out as the most basic element that may cause conflict. Mullins (1995) writes that where goals have no resemblance, conflict tends to be absent. This is rather instructive for conflict resolution challenges as a whole. If so, how do we redirect the goals of individuals or group in the society such that they are able to benefit adequately, yet pursuing different goals? Stated otherwise, how we allow individuals or groups to pursue same goals within different processes such that the interest of one realizing his goal does not endanger those of others. Why? How do we make individuals or group achieve their goals without necessarily utilizing the same tools or same means of achieving same goals? Availability of choices that lead to the accomplishment of same basic goals are, perhaps, important.

1.4 Triangle of understanding Conflict Known as ABC

Attitudes: (how the people view, feel and understand conflict) fear, anger, sadness, powerlessness, sense of impotence, need for revenge, hatred, fear, blaming the 'other', dehumanization, demonization, we/they, good vs. evil right wrong, win-lose, "violence is the only language they understand", "violence is an Acceptable means to achieve our goal", "they started it, they have to finish it", "if I keep my head low and don't make a fuss, it will increase my chances of surviving", feeling of endangerment; concern for those you love, determination, commitment to work for peace and stop the violence, etc.

Behavior: (how do people act physically) rape, killing, abuse, shooting, hurting, harming, torture, beating, inflicting suffering, bombing, kidnapping, attacking, sabotage, burning down businesses, blowing up homes, offices, and roads; withdrawal, turning away, doing nothing, not getting involved, etc.

Contradiction: (what the conflict is all about or the underlying causes) land issue, monopoly capitalism, feudalism, patriarchy, exclusion of minority groups, inequitable distribution of wealth, lack of participation, colonialism, interference by neighboring or foreign countries, gender inequality, inter-generation conflict, political, military, economic, cultural and social issues, territorial and or national sovereignty issues, environmental and ecological problems, etc

1.5 Causes of Conflict

(1). Greed (Stems from the Minority in Power)

▪ Corruption
▪ Tribalism
▪ Poor governance (No Respect of Human Rights, No democracy, no rule of law)
▪ Regional Imbalances
▪ Poor Services
▪ Poor institutions
▪ Poor governances (Tax, budget)

(2). Grievances

These are as a result of greed/complainants/protests/Objections /Critics;

▪ Poverty
▪ Unemployment
▪ Rebellions
▪ Poor services
▪ Terrorism
▪ Inflation
▪ Poor standards of living
▪ Etc.

Solutions to conflict-national (structural)

• Good governance
• Eradicate corruption
• Reduce poverty
• Political stability
• Provide employment
• Power sharing

Generally, it's about addressing Structural or causes of conflicts

The cause of conflict in societies where it has occurred and where it may potentially take place is similar. The available literature on causes of conflict in the West Africa sub-region, for example, is tied to the struggle for economic resources, boundary disputes, environmental degradation, and struggle for political power between or among ethnic groups, religious sentiments. Elsewhere in Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern European countries and the Americas, the story is the same or similar. For example, the conflict in Liberia in which late Samuel Doe was accused of dominating the government with members of his ethnic Kahn people is much related to tribal sentiments and struggle for political power; the conflict between Nigeria and Cameroun over the oil rich Bakassi Peninsular, which was concluded in 2006 was as a result of boundary dispute and the accompanying natural resources/economic resources located therein. When in 1990, late Saddam Hussein of Iraq invaded Kuwait (an independent country) and made frantic attempt to annex it, claiming that Kuwait is historically part of Iraq, his motive was most probably informed by two reasons. Firstly, Kuwait is an oil-rich country and if successfully annexed, it will boost Iraq command of global oil influence and resources. Secondly, if successfully annexed, it will broaden the opportunity to anger the West by starving it of oil. The Parochial interests of two groups (A & B) long-standing disputes between Ethiopia and Somalia on the one hand and Somalia and Kenya on the other hand are related to boundary disputes. The recurring conflict between China and Japan over fishing territories on what the Japanese calls the Japanese and what the Chinese similarly refers to as the Chinese sea is an issue that is quite related to boundary dispute and control of economic resources. The protracted civil war that bedevils Sudan in the last ten years is connected to tribal and religious sentiments. Thus, causal factors of conflict (whether inter-state or intra state), are quite similar and interconnected with little or no variations. Where the control or share of economic resources constitute the generic factor, it is most likely that it has some elements of boundary disputes, religious interpretations, political undertones or the inhabitants of such area claiming their citizenship on one of the two states or communities. In describing the causes of conflict, the world over, the causes are interconnected, and no one factor is entirely independent of the other. However, we will mention and discuss these factors in specific terms, but in their interdependent nature.

1.6 Struggle for Political/Economic Resources

As we had noted, the struggle for economic resources among or between communities or states underscores the genesis of some conflicts. Again, these conflicts have overt or covert political definitions. Most inter-tribal wars in West Africa in particular and Africa in general are traceable to this factor. More than 90% of African countries are plural societies. The struggle and partition of Africa (1884-1885) and the tribal wars that follow in attempts to forge out unified societies for the purpose of stability and trade increased the intensity of pluralism in African states. The characteristic nature of plural societies is well-known. First and foremost, a plural society is prone to conflict. A plural society is a society divided by what Harry and Eckstein in Lijphart (1977) call "segmental cleavages", and it exists where political divisions follow very closely with lines of objective social differentiation, salient in a society. Segmental cleavages may be of religious, ideological, ethnic, cultural and regional definitions.

Democracy is regarded as the best political system for galvanizing, promoting justice and equity in plural societies. When communism retreated in 1989, the concepts of globalization intensified the agitation for democracy in both developed and developing countries. Oppressed communities and people, suppressed conflict and emotions got opportunities for candid and renewed expressions. In the West Africa sub-region, Liberia, Cote d' Ivoire, Sierra Leone, Nigeria etc., people saw these expressions in different dimensions. The conflict between Nigeria and Cameroun over Bakassi peninsular received wide attention as a result of the availability of petroleum resources and opportunities for commercialized fishing. Prior to the resolution of the conflict at the International Court of Justice (ICJ Hague, 2005), the interests of both parties (Nigeria and Cameroun) and French support to Cameroun in attempting to police the territory was not informed by ordinary interest

of annexation and redraw their respective political maps or interest on an expanse of land, rather the real struggle was on economic resources.

1.7 Struggle and Claims to Land Ownership

The struggle, claim to land ownership and usage is directly and indirectly connected to economic factors. Perhaps, the most common generic factor of conflict, especially in Africa in general and West Africa in particular is the struggle for land ownership between or among ethnic groups. The most vivid is the Ife-Modakekes conflict. The Modakekes claimed that they owned the farmland and settlement where they currently cohabit with the Yorubas in a "conterminous" living pattern. And the word 'Modakekes' itself is a Yoruba terminology. It seems that, altogether, they are one people of same historical origin who migrated to the present place after the collapse of Oyo empire as well as the invasion by the Fulani religious warriors (the Jihadists). Yet conflict became endemic in this community. The Ooni (the king and progenitor of Yoruba race) and the people of Ife resisted this claim vehemently. Severe disagreement and conflict ensued resulting in loss of many lives and property.

1.8 Religious/Ethnic-related Factors

Perhaps, one single and conspicuous sources of conflict in Nigeria as in other states in the East and North Africa are religious sentiments. Otitis and Albert reported that the first major religious crisis in Nigeria was the Fagge crisis in Kano in 1982. According to them, the conflict started on the suspicion of the rising ascendancy of Christianity in Kano – a heavily dominated Muslim city of the north. The Christians have attempted to reconstruct a dilapidated church building in Sabon –Gari area of Kano. The Moslems felt that the church should be relocated elsewhere and made several concrete attempts to foil the reality of the reconstruction. The Christians insisted that they were free law-abiding citizens of Nigeria, whose inalienable rights include freedom of worship and religion, and association. Thus, they obtained police protection and reconstructed the Church. The Muslims consequently reacted violently, burnt down the church and other Christian properties near and far away in the city.

1.9 Globalization Processes

Many would wonder how globalization processes constitute generic factor of conflict around the world. Globalization is a process of economic, democratic and social revolution, which has intensified in an ongoing manner since the fall of communism in 1989. In particular, citizens of many countries more than ever, are demanding political and economic accountability in the hands of their governments and leaders. Reacting to this wind of change, Emeh (2007) asserted that anti-globalization protests and demonstrations have escalated, compelling world leaders to hold their summits in isolated areas. Such protests have taken place in Seattle December 1999; Davos February 2000; Melbourne September 2000; Nice December 2000; Davos-Zurich January 2001; Quebec April 2001; Barcelona June 2001; Gothenburg June 2001; Cancun 2003. The conflict that generates from the process is of two dimensions. One relates to the conflict of continuous economic divide and marginalization of the poor south by the rich north and to which the above protests and demonstrations are directed. The second, perhaps more specific, are the structural economic reforms currently going on in developing countries in response to World Bank prescription of public sector policy change and management. In Zambia, the President announced in December 2006 that it will not implement the World Bank prescription of increasing consumption tax to avoid major conflict with citizens. Market economy on which the policy change partly focuses does not allocate resources justly. Some citizens benefit more compared with their fellow citizens, sometimes at the expense of the poor in the society.

1.10 Conflict Handling Styles

Conflict is not always a destructive occurrence. Conflict can indeed be the spring-board of development and improved relationship between or among the parties involved. Making the best out of any conflict will depend on the styles used in handling the conflict. The impact of these on positively transforming any conflict cannot be overemphasized some broad categories of parties' responses to conflict are discussed in this unit. They are avoidance, confrontation, third-party decision-making and joint problem solving (Albert, 2001:6).

1.11 Types of Conflict Handling Styles

A mastery of different styles of handling conflicts is very germane to the transformation of conflicts. So, this module introduces you to the styles of handling conflicts in order to know when to appropriately apply them. This will also aid your understanding of subsequent modules.

Avoidance: This is a scenario in which the party alleging injustice, oppression, marginalization or discrimination is snubbed or disclaimed by those who have the authority and capacity to address the situation. Some features of the avoidance style include; denial of the conflict, equivalent switching and avoiding issues, being non-committal, joking instead of dealing with the conflict and paying undue attention to irrelevant and inconsequential issues. This kind of response to conflict situation worsens issues and propels the party ignored or 'avoided' to violent or extra-judicial actions. Avoidance permits conflicts to deteriorate rather than giving room for improvement. It reinforces the negative notion about conflict as always destructive and must be avoided. It blocks the chances of exploring the potentials for development

inherent in the issues in conflict. It restricts each party to their own enclave and narrow perceptions about the issues in contentions. It often prepares the theatre for full-blown war or violent conflict. The more a wronged or perceived to be wronged party is ignored, or avoided the more the probability of the party getting a win-lose conflict outcome.

Suppression: This is a conflict handling style on the perception and assessment of the dominant party of the other party in the conflict situation. In practice the dominant party suppresses the other party with the sole aim of vanquishing the concerned party. The assertive party does this by emphasizing economic, social, spiritual and political influence, power and edge in order to arrive at a win – lose outcome. This type of approach relies on hard power and it is used often when the power relations between the parties is asymmetric. The low point of this approach is that it may not produce sustainable peace.

Confrontation: This suggests that one of the parties takes a unilateral action in dealing with conflict. This is usually initiated by the stronger party or more powerful party in the conflict. The aim is usually for the stronger party in the conflict equation to impose its will and terms on the other. Confrontation takes the form of military action, intimidation, blackmail and arrests. In some instances, demonization and name-calling are not uncommon. Confrontation can also take the form of attack or destruction of the other party in conflict while the issues in conflict are left to simmer. This is done by demonizing and attacking the other party in the conflict.

Third Party Decision-making: This takes place when third parties acting based on the authority conferred on them by the larger society (e.g., a properly constituted court of law) issues irreversible terms of resolving a conflict. This is a very efficacious strategy in places where the rule of law is respected and state-collapse has not taken place. The unguaranteed impartiality of the judiciary puts a question mark on the efficacy of this approach. This is because when the judiciary seems to protect the rights of the privileged few, the inclinations for violent means of handling conflicts become very high. Resolution and transformation of conflicts either at the communal or international level would guarantee positive peace if the justice system is respected and insulated from undue inferences.

Joint Problem Solving: This implies the parties in conflict netting in consent to chart a way out of the imbroglio. This can be either through negotiation or the help of a third party (mediation). The objective of this is to arrive at a mutually satisfying agreement on the issues in conflict. This type of conflict handling style can be initiated by either of the parties involved in the conflict or a concerned and respected third party. This approach guarantees a win-win outcome and is regarded to be the best for handling conflicts. This approach is comprehensive and forestalls conflict relapse because the interests of all the parties would have incorporated into the peace process. Arbitration is also a form of joint problem-solving approach. This is because the essence of arbitration is that a dispute has risen or potential for a dispute will arise and the parties instead of patronizing litigation decide to refer the dispute to a private tribunal (arbitration) for settlement in a judicial manner. It is consensual in nature and the principle of agreement is at the root of the arbitral process.

Analytical Problem Solving: Analytical problem solving is a socio-psychological approach to dealing with deep-rooted, protracted intra-group and international conflict. This conflict handling style was developed by Herbert Kelman and John Burton based on the human needs theory of conflict that links the causes of conflicts to the inability of one person or group to meet fundamental needs like identity, security and recognition. If the underlying needs that are lacking are identified, a redefinition of the conflict takes place and the parties are able to initiate a process of joint – problem- solving and collaboration which hitherto was not possible. This approach is highly complementary to conflict transformation because it places strong emphasis on the identification and examination of the perspectives of the parties to the problem including the parties' values, interests, prejudices, hopes, fears and needs. The approach also empowers the parties to mutually appreciate their needs and to innovatively explore ways of overcoming stumbling – blocks. The approach makes use of workshops initially focusing on shorter – term goal of increasing mutual understanding and respect. An illustration is the holding of workshops between Israelis and Palestinians. Such workshops laid the foundation for the Oslo accords and went on since then in order to facilitate the implementation of agreements. However, obtaining true resolution of conflicts through this process is slow though it facilitates interpersonal rather than intersocietal/ group interaction and understanding.

Compromise: This entails the search for mutually satisfactory outcome of the conflict by parties involved it involves the parties laying bare their cards and making concessions which ordinarily might not have appealed to them, (Ojiji, 2006). Compromise is often adopted in extreme situations where the parties cannot move forward without making concessions on some of their demands. This is also useful in conflicts characterized by limited resources where parties may need to be contented with available resources even when it is not in conformity with their desired taste. The exigency of time and other pressing issues also compel parties to settle for compromise.

Constructive Confrontation: This is a concept based on the assumption that while conflicts are inevitable in all societies, the destructive nature of most conflicts is avoidable. This is very supportive of conflict transformation because it encourages the transcending of the destructive nature of conflicts by promoting the relationship among parties in conflict. Burgess (1997) the protagonist of this idea, proposes that constructive confrontation provides the disputants with skills

that enables them to generate more benefits. These benefits include better understanding, of the interests, values and needs of the other side. Constructive confrontation makes a distinction between the *core conflicts* and the *conflicts overlay*. The core conflicts include fundamental interests, values, and needs that are divergent. The conflict overlays are issues that seem to becloud the core conflicts and make it difficult to identify and deal with effectively. Constructive confrontation takes a broad view of what the conflict is about by analyzing and managing issues of relationship, emotional issues, value and need – based issues.

Another key element of constructive confrontation is the incremental approach it uses which implies the empowerment of parties in conflict to meet their own needs and their understanding of the values, needs and interests of the other. This is done by reframing conflicts in a more productive way in order to correct misunderstandings, discover and effectively use mutually credible technical information, correct procedural errors, and reduces the propensity of conflict escalation. This enables the transformation of conflict from a destructive one to that is more constructive. Constructive confrontation also encourages the integration of threat, force, negotiation and other integrative approaches. Burgess (1997) argues that negotiation enhances one's chances of meeting one's interests and needs in conflict situations which is also a reflection of power. These strategies when combined with a moderate amount of threat can generate constructive engagement and change than force alone. This is because threat – based strategies are more likely to generate escalation and backlash instead of constructive engagement. A combination of the three strategies, used sequentially or simultaneously facilitates the progress that one strategy alone cannot guarantee (Burgess, 1997).

Dialogue: Dialogue is a form of conversation and relating with people that is different from mediation, negotiation and debate because it tries to inform but not to persuade or resolve any issue. The first condition for success is the removal of stereotypes, a readiness to listen to and appreciate others' views and a willingness to be receptive of new ideas. Dialogue excludes attack and defence and discourages derogatory stigmatizations based on assumptions about the motives, meanings or character of others; questions during dialogue are sincere, informed by curiosity and interest with a view to knowing what was hitherto unknown (Chasin et. al., 1996). Therefore, it requires transparency and listening attentively and respectfully. It may seem that there is no difference between dialogue and debate, but there are distinguishing features of the two. In most cases, debates reinforce differences because characters are there to learn new idea about issues at stake but to have their way by all means. This is why the approach can be more useful in deep – rooted value-based conflicts where negotiation is impossible. It is not uncommon for characters at debates to deny or veil differences to avoid revealing what they consider to be secrets but in dialogue session differences are revealed and their desirability discussed. Also, during debates, participants listen in order to puncture the arguments of the other parties but during dialogue, participants listen in order to gain insight into the beliefs and concerns of the other party because questions are posed from a position of curiosity and sincerity. Success during debates require simple and dispassionate statements during debates which rarely happen while, dialogues succeed based on the willingness and abilities of the parties to explore the complexities of the issues on the table. It suffices to note that this approach effectively used in the sphere of issue transformation in the whole gamut of conflict transformation.

1.12 Major Processes in Peace Building
- Participatory planning
- Co-ordination of various efforts
- Sustainable investment
- Gathering and co-ordination of human and material resources and
- Long-term maintenance of reconciliatory modes

Peace Negotiation: It takes place between two conflicting parties without the intervention of a third party. It is a situation in which a group is able to convince the other group. Both parties put forth their views and analyses by educating each other. In this case, there is basic a sort of trust between conflicting parties. Among nation-states official negotiation processes are implored to settle and issue or dispute. Conferences are usually held to technically outline rules and procedures to reach an accord.

Mediation: It is a process which aims to assist group in conflict to find the necessary skills to resolve conflict. Mediation is always managed by a third party. It involves a process of transforming aggression to gradually reduce violence. A mediator summons both parties and listens to all sides of issues.

Diplomacy: This is the act of conducting negotiations by representatives of conflicting parties. Diplomacy is a contemporary term associated with international relations and ensuring conflict. Hence, international treaties are strategized by country representatives to make peace. For example, resolving the problem of gender-based conflict is a product of diplomacy. Following series of global inequality on woman, the United Nations Decade on women was established in 1975 as a forum to bring together women from various nations of the world. The conference was held in Mexico; by 1985 it was held in Kenya, Beijing (China) in 1995. At each of the conference, agreements are reached in form of declaration to guide nation-states on policy issues that could enhance women's participation and productivity for development.

1.13 Healing

Healing is the process of bringing together aspects of one's self, body-mind-spirit, at deeper levels of inner knowing, leading toward integration and balance with each aspect having equal importance and value. These conceptions associate healing with complexities of meaning and personal in other word the concept of healing. The operational definition that emerged from the concept analysis: Healing is a holistic, transformative process of repair and recovery in mind, body, and spirit resulting in positive change, finding meaning, and movement toward self-realization of wholeness, regardless of the presence or absence of Conflict

1.14 Awareness.

Even at the Institute, we emphasize on how essential it is to know oneself. But did you know that there are other types of awareness that are probably as important? Today we want to talk about all 3 types of awareness and give you some pointers as to where to start to develop each of them.

Self-awareness: Self-awareness is the most known type of awareness. It's the ability to know oneself, to have a deep understanding of what makes us who we are – not just our strengths and weaknesses, but also what triggers our emotions and behaviors or what our core values are. As we grow older and have more and more experiences, we change over time, so self-awareness is also the capacity to make our knowledge of ourselves evolve. To not stay stuck on one side of us, but to see where we are, where we come from, and where we're going as individuals.

Some reflection (beyond the obvious "strengths and weaknesses:
- How have you changed in the recent years?
- What have you learned about yourself?
- What mistakes did you do?
- What behavior serve you every day?
- What do you keep doing that isn't good for you?
- What is success for you?
- What is your story?
- How holds you back?
- What would you do if you were free of your own barriers and fears?

Social awareness: Social awareness is the ability to understand others, the relationships you have with them, and the relationships they have with each other. It's also about understanding how you react in various social situations and different contexts.

Some reflection:
1. What social situations are you the most comfortable with?
2. In what situations are you not at ease or feeling awkward?
3. How do you interact with people you don't know?
4. What is your communication style?
5. How do you react when people don't have the same style of communication as you?
6. How do you build closeness with others?

Important social skills:
- Observing body language
- Asking questions
- Listening actively
- Adjusting your communication to different contexts

Organizational awareness: Organizational awareness is probably the trickiest of all three types. It can be abstract and almost seem foreign, but it is so important to develop and maintain, especially for your career. Office politics are a big thing, especially if you hope to rise up the corporate ladder, but it's not the only thing. In every group you belong to, there are values and norms that the group follows, but it's not always clear. Understanding them will help you find a place within that group that suits you.

Some reflection:
- What groups do you belong to? List all of them (family, group of friends, company, department, club, etc.)
- How do people interact within each group? How is it different/similar from your other groups?
- What are the unsaid and unwritten rules of the group?
- Who is the leader? What makes him/her the leader?
- How do you participate to the group?
- How is the group serving you?

Important skills:
- Mindfulness
- Observing interactions between different levels
- Gut feeling, intuition

1.15 Conflict Management

Conflict is a clash of interests, values, actions, views or directions (De Bono, 1985). Conflict refers to the existence of that clash. Conflict is initiated the instant clash occurs. Generally, there are diverse interests and contrary views behind a conflict, which are revealed when people look at a problem from their viewpoint alone. Conflict is an outcome of organizational intricacies, interactions and disagreements. It can be settled by identifying and neutralizing the etiological factors. Once conflict is concluded it can provoke a positive change in the organization. When we recognize the potential for conflict, we implicitly indicate that there is already a conflict of direction, even though it may not have yet manifested itself as a clash. Confliction is the process of setting up, promoting, encouraging or designing conflict. It is a willful process and refers to the real effort put into generating and instituting conflict. Deconfliction is the annihilation of conflict. It does not refer to negotiation or bargaining, or even to resolution of conflict: it is the effort required to eliminate the conflict.

Why conflicts arise: In most organizations, conflicts increase as employees assert their demands for an increased share in organizational rewards, such as position, acknowledgment, appreciation, monetary benefits and independence. Even management faces conflicts with many forces from outside the organization, such as government, unions and other coercive groups which may impose restrictions on managerial activities. Conflicts emanate from more than one source, and so their true origin may be hard to identify. Important initiators of conflict situations include:

(i) *People disagree*. People disagree for a number of reasons (De Bono, 1985).

(a) They see things differently because of differences in understanding and viewpoint. Most of these differences are usually not important. Personality differences or clashes in emotional needs may cause conflicts. Conflicts arise when two groups or individuals interacting in the same situation see the situation differently because of different sets of settings, information pertaining to the universe, awareness, background, disposition, reason or outlook. In a particular mood, individuals think and perceive in a certain manner. For example, the half-full glass of one individual can be half-empty to another. Obviously both individuals convey the same thing, but they do so differently owe to contrasting perceptions and dispositions.

(b) People have different styles, principles, values, beliefs and slogans which determine their choices and objectives. When choices contradict, people want different things and that can create conflict situations. For example, a risk-taking manager would be in conflict with a risk-minimizing supervisor who believes in firm control and a well-kept routine.

(c) People have different ideological and philosophical outlooks, as in the case of different political parties. Their concepts, objectives and ways of reacting to various situations are different. This often creates conflicts among them.

(d) Conflict situations can arise because people have different status. When people at higher levels in the organization feel indignant about suggestions for change put forward from their subordinates or associates, it provokes conflict. By tolerating and allowing such suggestions, potential conflict can be prevented.

(e) People have different thinking styles, which encourages them to disagree, leading to conflict situations. Certain thinking styles may be useful for certain purposes, but ineffectual or even perilous in other situations (De Bono, 1985).

(f) People are supposed to disagree under particular circumstances, such as in sports. Here conflict is necessary, and even pleasurable.

(ii) People are concerned with fear, force, fairness or funds (De Bono, 1985).

(a) Fear relates to imaginary concern about something which might happen in the future. One may fear setbacks, disgrace, reprisal or hindrances, which can lead to conflict situations.

(b) Force is a necessary ingredient of any conflict situation. Force may be ethical or emotional. It could be withdrawal of cooperation or approval. These forces are instrumental in generating, strengthening and terminating conflicts.

(c) Fairness refers to an individual's sense of what is right and what is not right, a fundamental factor learnt in early childhood. This sense of fairness determines the moral values of an individual. People have different moral values and accordingly appreciate a situation in different ways, creating conflict situations.

(d) Funds or costs can cause conflict, but can also force a conclusion through acceptable to the conflicting parties. The cost of being in conflict may be measurable (in money terms) or immeasurable, being expressed in terms of human lives, suffering, diversion of skilled labour, neglect or loss of morale and self-esteem. (De Bono, 1985).

1.16 Conditions creating conflict situations

According to Kirchoff and Adams (1982), there are four distinct conflict conditions, i.e., high stress environments, ambiguous roles and responsibilities, multiple boss situations, and prevalence of advanced technology. Filley (1975) identified nine main conditions which could initiate conflict situations in an organization. These are:

(i) *Ambiguous jurisdiction*, which occurs when two individuals have responsibilities which are interdependent but whose work boundaries and role definitions are not clearly specified.

(ii) *Goal incompatibility and conflict of interest* refer to accomplishment of different but mutually conflicting goals by two individuals working together in an organization. Obstructions in accomplishing goals and lack of clarity on how to do a job may initiate conflicts. Barriers to goal accomplishment arise when goal attainment by an individual or group is seen as preventing another party achieving their goal.

(iii). *Communication barriers*, as difficulties in communicating can cause misunderstanding, which can then create conflict situations.

(iv) *Dependence on one party* by another group or individual.

(v) *Differentiation in organization*, where, within an organization, sub-units are made responsible for different, specialized tasks. This creates separation and introduces differentiation. Conflict situations could arise when actions of sub-units are not properly coordinated and integrated.

(vi) *Association of the parties and specialization*. When individuals specialized in different areas work in a group, they may disagree amongst themselves because they have different goals, views and methodologies owing to their various backgrounds, training and experiences.

(vii) *Behavior regulation.* Organizations have to have firm regulations for individual behaviour to ensure protection and safety. Individuals may perceive these regulations differently, which can cause conflict and negatively affect output.

(viii) *Unresolved prior conflicts* which remain unsettled over time create anxiety and stress, which can further intensify existing conflicts. A manager's most important function is to avoid potential harmful results of conflict by regulating and directing it into areas beneficial for the organization.

Conflict as a process: Conflict is a dynamic process. In any organization a modest amount of conflict can be useful in increasing organizational effectiveness. Tosi, Rizzo and Carroll (1986) consider the stages involved in the conflict process, from inception to end, as sequential in nature, namely:
(i) the conflict situation, (ii) awareness of the situation, (iii) realization, (iv) manifestation of conflict, (v) resolution or suppression of conflict, and(vi) after-effects of a conflict situation.

Effects of conflicts: Conflict situations should be either resolved or used beneficially. Conflicts can have positive or negative effects for the organization, depending upon the environment created by the manager as she or he manages and regulates the conflict situation.

Positive effects of conflicts: Some of the positive effects of conflict situations are (Filley, 1975):
· *Diffusion of more serious conflicts*. Games can be used to moderate the attitudes of people by providing a competitive situation which can liberate tension in the conflicting parties, as well as having some entertainment value. In organizations where members participate in decision making, disputes are usually minor and not acute as the closeness of members' moderates belligerent and assertive behavior into minor disagreements, which minimizes the likelihood of major fights.
·*Stimulation of a search for new facts or resolutions*. When two parties who respect each other face a conflict situation, the conflict resolution process may help in clarifying the facts and stimulating a search for mutually acceptable solutions.
· *Increase in group cohesion and performance*. When two or more parties are in conflict, the performance and cohesion of each party is likely to improve. In a conflict situation, an opponent's position is evaluated negatively, and group allegiance is strongly reinforced, leading to increased group effort and cohesion.
· *Assessment of power or ability.* In a conflict situation, the relative ability or power of the parties involved can be identified and measured.

Negative effects of conflicts: Destructive effects of conflicts include: impediments to smooth working, diminishing output· obstructions in the decision-making process, and formation of competing affiliations within the organization. The overall result of such negative effects is to reduce employees' commitment to organizational goals and organizational efficiency (Kirchoff and Adams, 1982).

1.17 Elements of a conflict

Organizational conflicts usually involve three elements, which have to be appropriately matched through necessary organizational arrangements in order to resolve the conflict (Turner and Weed, 1983).

· *Power* is the capacities and means that people have at their disposal to get work done. Power includes budgetary discretion, personal influence, information, time, space, staff size and dependence on others. If used efficiently, power creates an atmosphere of cooperation, but can generate conflicts when misused, withheld or amassed.

· *Organizational demands* are the people's expectations regarding a person's job performance. Usually such expectations are high, and making them rather unrealistic.

When these expectations are not fulfilled, people feel disheartened, angry, let down or cheated. Consequently, conflict situations can arise.

· *Worth* refers to a person's self-esteem. People want to prove their worth in the organization. Superiors control employees' pay, performance rating, performance and appraisal, etc. How much of these are received by a person reflects their worth. An individual may also feel loss of worth if some basic needs are not fulfilled. Generally, conflicts arise from mismatches between power, organizational demands and feelings of personal worth.

1.18 Theory of conflict management

Conflict is defined as disagreement between individuals. It can vary from a mild disagreement to a win-or-lose, emotion-packed, confrontation (Kirchoff and Adams, 1982). There are two theories of conflict management.

· *The traditional theory* is based on the assumption that conflicts are bad, are caused by trouble makers, and should be subdued.

· *Contemporary theory* recognizes that conflicts between human beings are unavoidable. They emerge as a natural result of change and can be beneficial to the organization, if managed efficiently. Current theory (Kirchoff and Adams, 1982) considers innovation as a mechanism for bringing together various ideas and viewpoints into a new and different fusion. An atmosphere of tension, and hence conflict, is thus essential in any organization committed to developing or working with new ideas.

Response styles: People may appreciate the same situation in different ways, and so respond differently. It is therefore necessary to understand the response styles of the people involved so as to manage conflicts properly. According to Turner and Weed (1983), responses can be classified as follows:

· *Addressers* are the people who are willing to take initiatives and risk to resolve conflicts by getting their opponents to agree with them on some issues. Addressers can either be first-steppers or confronters:

- *First-steppers* are those who believe that some trust has to be established to settle conflicts. They offer to make a gesture of affability, agreeableness or sympathy with the other person's views in exchange for a similar response.

- *Confronters* think that things are so bad that they have nothing to lose by a confrontation. They might be confronting because they have authority and a safe position, which reduces their vulnerability to any loss.

· *Concealers* take no risk and so say nothing. They conceal their views and feelings. Concealers can be of three kinds:

- *Feeling-swallowers* swallow their feelings. They smile even if the situation is causing them pain and distress. They behave thus because they consider the approval of other people important and feel that it would be dangerous to affront them by revealing their true feelings.

- *Subject-changers* find the real issue too difficult to handle. They change the topic by finding something on which there can be some agreement with the conflicting party. This response style usually does not solve the problem. Instead, it can create problems for the people who use this and for the organization in which such people are working.

- *Avoiders* often go out of their way to avoid conflicts.

· *Attackers* cannot keep their feelings to themselves. They are angry for one or another reason, even though it may not be anyone's fault. They express their feelings by attacking whatever they can even, though that may not be the cause of their distress. Attackers may be up-front or behind-the-back:

- *Up-front attackers* are the angry people who attack openly, they make work more pleasant for the person who is the target, since their attack usually generates sympathy, support and agreement for the target.

- *Behind-the-back attackers* are difficult to handle because the target person is not sure of the source of any criticism, nor even always sure that there is criticism.

Dealing with conflict: Conflicts are inescapable in an organization. However, conflicts can be used as motivators for healthy change. In today's environment, several factors create competition; they may be differing departmental objectives, individual objectives, competition for use of resources or differing viewpoints. These have to be integrated and exploited efficiently to achieve organizational objectives. A manager should be able to see emerging conflicts and take appropriate pre-emptive action. The manager should understand the causes creating conflict, the outcome of conflict, and various methods by which conflict can be managed in the organization. With this understanding, the manager should evolve an approach for resolving conflicts before their disruptive repercussions have an impact on productivity and creativity. Therefore, a manager should possess special skills to react to conflict situations, and should create an open climate for communication between conflicting parties.

1.19 Ways to resolve conflict

When two groups or individuals face a conflict situation, they can react in four ways (De Bono, 1985). They can:

· **Fight**, which is not a beneficial, sound or gratifying approach to dealing with a conflict situation, as it involves 'tactics, strategies, offensive and defensive positions, losing and winning grounds, and exposure of weak points.' Fighting as a way of resolving a conflict can only be useful in courtroom situations, where winning and losing becomes a by-product of the judicial process.

· **Negotiate**, towards a settlement with the other party. Negotiations take place within the prevailing situation and do not involve problem solving or designing. Third-party roles are very important in bringing the conflicting parties together on some common ground for negotiations.

· **Problem solves,** which involves identifying and removing the cause of the conflict so as to make the situation normal again. However, this may not be easy. It is also possible that the situation may not become normal even after removing the identified cause, because of its influence on the situation.

· **Design**, which is an attempt towards creativity in making the conflict situation normal. It considers conflicts as situations rather than problems. Designing is not confined to what is already there, but attempts to reach what might be created given a proper understanding of the views and situations of the conflicting parties. The proposed idea should be appropriate and acceptable to the parties in conflict. A third party participates actively in the design process rather than being just an umpire.

1.20 Conflict-resolution behavior

Depending on their intentions in a given situation, the behavior of conflicting parties can range from full cooperation to complete confrontation. Two intentions determining the type of conflict-handling behavior are *assertion* and *cooperation:* assertion refers to an attempt to confront the other party; and cooperation refers to an attempt to find an agreeable solution. Depending upon the degree of each intention involved, there can be five types of conflict handling behaviors (Thomas and Kilman, 1976). They are:

· **Competition** is a win-or-lose style of handling conflicts. It is asserting one's one viewpoint at the potential expense of another. Competing or forcing has high concern for personal goals and low concern for relationships. It is appropriate in dealing with conflicts which have no disagreements. It is also useful when unpopular but necessary decisions are to be made.

· **Collaboration** aims at finding some solution that can satisfy the conflicting parties. It is based on a willingness to accept as valid the interests of the other party whilst protecting one's own interests. Disagreement is addressed openly and alternatives are discussed to arrive at the best solution. This method therefore involves high cooperation and low confrontation. Collaboration is applicable when both parties desire to solve the problem and are willing to work together toward a mutually acceptable solution. Collaboration is the best method of handling conflicts, as it strives to satisfy the needs of both parties. It is integrative and has high concern for personal goals as well as relationship.

· **Compromise** is a common way of dealing with conflicts, particularly when the conflicting parties have relatively equal power and mutually independent goals. It is based on the belief that a middle route should be found to resolve the conflict situation, with concern for personal goals as well as relationships. In the process of compromise, there are gains and losses for each conflicting party.

· **Avoidance** is based on the belief that conflict is evil, unwanted or boorish. It should be delayed or ignored. Avoidance strategy has low cooperation and low confrontation. It is useful either when conflicts are insignificant or when the other party is unyielding because of rigid attitudes. By avoiding direct confrontation, parties in conflict get time to cool down.

· **Accommodation** involves high cooperation and low confrontation. It plays down differences and stresses commonalities. Accommodating can be a good strategy when one party accepts that it is wrong and has a lot to lose and little to gain. Consequently, they are willing to accommodate the wishes of the other party.

1.21 Strategies for managing conflicts

Tosi, Rizzo, and Carroll (1986) suggested four ways of managing conflicts, namely through:

 . Styles. Conflict handling behaviors styles (such as competition, collaboration, compromise, avoidance or accommodation) may be suitably encouraged, depending upon the situation.

· **Improving organizational practices**. After identifying the reason for the conflict situation, suitable organizational practices can be used to resolve conflicts, including: establishing super ordinate goals, reducing vagueness, minimizing authority- and domain-related disputes, improving policies, procedures and ruleset-apportioning existing resources or adding new, altering communications, movement of personnel, and changing reward systems. *Special roles and structure. A* manager has to initiate structural changes needed, including re-location or merging of specialized units, shoulder liaison functions, and act as an integrator to resolve conflicts.

A person with problem-solving skills and respected by the conflicting parties can be designated to de-fuse conflicts.

· **Confrontation techniques**. Confrontation techniques aim at finding a mutually acceptable and enduring solution through collaboration and compromise. It is done in the hope that conflicting parties are ready to face each other amicably, and entails intercession, bargaining, negotiation, mediation, attribution and application of the integrative decision method, which is a collaborative style based on the premise that there is a solution which can be accepted by both parties. It involves a process of defining the problem, searching for alternatives and their evaluation, and deciding by consensus.

gyi and Wallace, 1977):

· **Administrative procedures and practices**, which delay procurement of the necessary inputs and supplies required for research activities. Such conflicts get intensified because of the contradictory nature of personnel, dispersion of authority, deficient communication, and varying perceptions.

· **Technical opinions**, performance norms and related issues lead to disagreements. The more the uncertainty in any task, the greater is the need for further information. If information is withheld or controlled by one of the parties in an interacting group, suspicion is created and conflict generated.

· **A very common cause of conflict in research organizations** is competition between interacting groups over use of limited resources available for scientific work. Allocation of limited resources often generates conflict since one group is likely to feel that it is not receiving a fair share of organizational resources in comparison with other groups. Conflicts also arise over composition and staffing of research teams, particularly when personnel from other areas are to be included. Sometimes conflicts can arise over competing claims for use of land for experiments.

· **Cost estimates** from support areas regarding work, breakdown, use of structures, etc., can create conflict situations.

· **A lengthy research process,** where intermediate outputs of research are difficult to measure, conflicts over anticipations regarding performance are not uncommon. Disagreements over the timing, sequence and scheduling of project-related tasks and overall management of research are usual in research organizations.

· **Disagreements over inter-personal issues** caused by personality differences, particularly when interacting groups are highly inter-dependent, can lead to conflict situations. When one group fails to fulfil the expectations of the other group, or acts improperly, a conflict situation may arise.

· **Past record of conflicts** between the interacting groups, such as departmental rivalries.

1.22 Summary

Conflicts are inevitable in any organization. A modest level of conflict can be useful in generating better ideas and methods, inspiring concern and ingenuity, and stimulating the emergence of long-suppressed problems. Conflict management strategies should aim at keeping conflict at a level at which different ideas and viewpoints are fully voiced but unproductive conflicts are deterred. Stimulation of conflict situations is appropriate if the research manager identifies conditions of 'group-think.' Group-think is a situation where conflict rarely occurs because of high group cohesion, which results in poor decision and inadequate performance. Group-think prevails when there are lot of 'yes men' in a group, with the result that there is no serious appraisal of the situation and new ideas are not suggested. Group members attach greater importance to popularity, tranquility and peace in the group rather than to technical ability and proficiency. Members are disinclined to verbalize their unbiased views in order to avoid hurting the feelings of other members of the group. Decisions are accepted as they are, adversely affecting organizational productivity. A manager can choose several remedies to avoid group-think (Irving, 1971). A conflict situation can be induced by supporting individualistic thinking or favoring individual competition. Individualistic thinking can be initiated in the group by including some group members who can freely express their views, which can encourage and prod others to do the same. Competition between individuals can be enhanced by acknowledging and rewarding the better performers. Conflict situations can also be introduced by making some organizational changes, such as transferring some group members, redefining roles, and helping the emergence of new leadership. A manager can also create a conflict situation by delivering shocks, such as by reducing some existing perks of the members of the organization. After stimulating the conflict situation, a manager should:

Identify the likely source of the conflict situation, Calibrate the productiveness of the situation, and, Neutralize the unproductive conflict situation. Basic problems in inter-group behaviors are conflict of goals and communication failures, A basic tactic in resolving conflicts, therefore, is to find goals upon which scientists or groups can agree, and to ensure proper communication and interaction. Some conflicts arise because of simple misconceptions, which can be overcome by improved communication. A manager should manage conflicts effectively rather than suppress or avoid them. To manage them, a manager needs to ask 'What?' and 'Why?' - and not 'Who?' - to get at the root of a problem. In the process of resolving conflicts, many problems can be identified and solved by removing obstacles and creating a new environment of individual growth. If conflicts are not managed properly, they can be damaging, as they waste a lot of energy and time, and invoke tension, which reduces the productivity and creativity of those involved.

1.23 Conclusion

The causes of conflicts in the society as we had alluded to include, struggle for political-economic resources; struggle for land and claims of ownership; religious/ethnic-related factors and globalization processes. The desire to achieve socio-economic and political interests in the society create situations of differences. These differences degenerate into the pursuit of incompatibility of goals. Even though conflict has negative impact on societies where they occur, it can as well be a sign of healthy organization of men in the society, especially if it generates a situation to redress injustice. As much as it is important to have conflict in the society, it should be noted that minimizing its occurrence is far much better than having it. Therefore, conflict managers and public institutions that allocate resources in the society should emphasize the promotion of common interest over parochial interests. That does not imply that we can exterminate conflict in the society, because the causes, such as the struggle over political-economy resources, Land disputes, and religious-ethnic-related factors including the processes of globalization will remain well with us. The paper discussed some basic styles of handling conflicts including the advantages and disadvantages of each one. The unit discussed conflict as an inevitability in human interaction that cannot be wished away. Acquaintance with conflict handling styles will no doubt ensure successful transformation of conflict while ensuring positive peace. A poor knowledge of conflict handling styles will worsen conflict issues and further tear the parties involved apart. Hence, being a sine qua non prior to conflict transformation. Conflict handling styles used by individuals, corporate entities and nations have been discussed. The implications of employing each at different times and contexts were also presented. Hence, the need to be well aware of the various means of handling it with emphasis on how to make serve a positive end. On which in turn leads to greater equality and equity for better South Sudan.

References

[1] De Bono, E. 1985. *Conflicts: A Better Way to Resolve Them.* London: Harrap.

[2] Filley, A.C. 1975. *Interpersonal Conflict Resolution.* Glenview IL: Scott, Foresman.

[3] House, R.J., & Rizzo, J.R. 1972. Conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 7: 467-505.

[4] Irving, J.L. 1971. *Group think. Psychology Today,* November.

[5] Ivancevich, J.M., Szilagyi, A.D., Jr., & Wallace, M.J., Jr. 1977. *Organizational Behavior and Performance.* California, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

[6] Kirchoff, N., & Adams, J.R. 1982. *Conflict Management for Project Managers.* Drexel Hill: Project Management Institute.

[7] Thomas, K.W., & Kilman, R.H. 1974. *Conflict Mode Instrument.* Tuxedo, New York

[8] NY: Xicom. Tosi, H.L., Rizzo, J.R., & Carroll, S.J. 1986. *Organizational Behaviour.* New York,

[9] NY: Pitman. Turner, S., & Weed, F. 1983. *Conflict in Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Peace building, reconciliation incorporates the search for truth, justice, forgiveness and accommodation between conflicting groups or people.

Reconciliation is generally understood to be the reestablishment of friendly relations, though it assumes different forms and roles in different contexts. In the case of armed conflicts, reconciliation incorporates the search for truth, justice, forgiveness and accommodation between conflicting groups or people. It is therefore widely seen as very closely related to peace building, though whereas some suggest it is the, others argue it is better seen as a process. It is unsurprising that there is some confusion over the definition of reconciliation in peace building, since it can apply to very different levels and activities, ranging from individuals trying to re-establish trust, to dialogue between small groups, to larger social or political processes such as. Some writers therefore recommend making **a distinction between inter-personal understandings of reconciliation and 'political reconciliation'** at a national level. Different types of reconciliation can address and fulfil particular aspects of a peace building process. 'Top down' approaches to reconciliation tend to be high-profile and situated at the national level, and involve mechanisms attempting to create reconciliation by bringing atrocities to public awareness through truth telling, confession, apology, retribution and the rule of law, and making recommendations regarding the prevention of further abuses.

However, meaningful reconciliation in post-conflict environments also requires 'bottom-up' approaches that focus on the past trauma of individuals and communities so as not to pass on intergenerational anger and cause violent recurrences. This can be achieved through traditional forms of counselling and other healing processes, but also through **creative spaces such as the arts, education and literature which directly work to change relationships** and alter negative stereotypes, beliefs and attitudes towards the enemy.

Because of their different aims, both 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches to reconciliation can co-exist and are in fact Complementary Bottom-up processes have the advantage of being able to begin whilst violence continues, whereas top-down processes typically require some form of conflict settlement. However, once established, top-down processes may offer a framework for grassroots, bottom-up reconciliation activities to flourish.