

Chapter Two

2. Review of Related Literature

This chapter presents the theoretical basis of the meaning, types, forms and measurements of social capital: the nature and causes of conflict; conflict in Ethiopia, and conflict resolution.

2.1, Social Capital: Meaning, Types, Forms and Measurements

2.1.1. The Concept of Social capital

Loaded with diverse meanings, the term social capital remains an elusive concept in the socio-political and economic literature, sometimes considered as an all-absorbing black hole with less defined limits. Different attempts to define and explain the term ended-up in reflecting complementary or even opposing ideas. Hence, outlining a conceptual as well as empirical review will help us to understand the notion of social capital and the vital role it plays in conflict affected societies. This chapter presents some of the theoretical literature and empirical research that are relevant to social capital and its role in traditional conflict resolution in Ethiopia.

Social capital is one of the trendiest phrases used ubiquitously in modern day. It provokes considerable amount of controversy. Since the medieval age, the term capital has been used to refer to all the moveable properties of a farm. But classical economists like Smith (1776) and Ricardo (1817) view capital as one of the factors of production alongside others. Marxian economists conceptualize capital as part of the surplus value captured by capitalists or the bourgeoisie, who control the means of production. Neoclassical economists added further factors of production and refined the connotation of capital. According to them, capital is further divided into financial capital, fixed capital (machinery and equipment), and working capital (finished and semi-finished goods).

Historical conceptualization of capital by classical and neoclassical economists identified three other forms of capital (financial, physical, and natural capital). More recently, other types of capital have been identified such as human capital, cultural capital, and social capital. However, these forms proliferate meanings and conjure provoking contests whether they qualify as a real capital or not. Many authors questioned and even opposed especially the appropriateness of the term "capital" in "social capital".

Smith and Kulynych (2002) believed that the phrase "social capital" has a broad, pervasive and honorific meaning and that the term blurs many distinctions which adversely affect the scholarly inquiry, whatever its implicit or explicit normative concerns are. On the contrary, Inkeles (2000) suggested that the term capital is too limiting and suggested rather the use of the term social or communal resources because capital as an element of production of goods and services not only necessitates goods but also social support, physical and social security, freedom of expression, and opportunities to develop which is not covered by the term capital.

To resolve such types of arguments, different scholars identified various characteristics of capital. Schmid (2000) stated that capital is not immediately used up in production but rather its services extend over time. On the contrary, capital stock is subject to investment for future

production, depreciation, and decay from both use and non-use. Piazza-Georgi (2002) argues that capital produces income and encompasses the non-consumable, but depreciating inputs into the production process. Castle (2002) adds other characteristics of capital regarding usefulness and durability.

Taking the criteria into consideration, it is clear from literature that social capital has both similarities and dissimilarities with neo-capital theories and is certainly quite dissimilar from classical theory of capital. Social capital is similar to other forms of capital in that it can be invested with the expectation of future returns (Adler & Kwon, 1999), is appropriable (Coleman, 1988), is convertible (Bourdieu, 1986), requires some investment of time and effort of money (Grootaert, 2001; Grootaert & Van Bastelaer, 2002; Krishna & Uphoff, 2002) and needs to be maintained (Gant et al., 2002).

Social capital is different from other forms of capital in that it resides in social relationships whereas other forms of capital revolve around the individual (Robison et al., 2002). Furthermore, social capital cannot be traded by individuals on an open market like other forms of capital, but rather embedded within a group (Gant et al., 2002). Hence, social capital is a unique form of capital yet not sufficiently dissimilar to warrant a different term. Certainly, it is the use of the term capital that makes the concept attractive to such a wide range of people given the blending together of sociology and economics (Adam & Roncevic, 2003).

2.1.2. Dimensions and Units of Analysis of Social Capital

Analysis of the concept of social capital includes the level or unit of observation as well as its dimensions. Although the levels of analysis are not necessarily mutually exclusive, some categorizations in this regard divide social capital into micro and macro levels while others divide social capital into micro, meso and macro levels. The micro level is concerned with the close ties to family and friends, the meso level consists of communities and associational organizations and the macro level refers to analysis.

However, many scholarly works done on social capital focus on the meso level of analysis. Halpern (2005) suggested some functional equivalence exists between the different levels. That is to mean that declining social capital on one level can sometimes be compensated for increases on another level.

2.1.2.1. The Micro-approach: Putnam's Thesis

The micro-approach to social capital focuses on the value of collective action and on the subjective factors that can motivate individuals to cooperate formally (by joining associations) or informally in order to attain certain objectives (Franke, 2005). The most important elements considered within this discourse are the behavior of the actors involved and their perception of collective issues such as cultural

beliefs and influences.

The micro level analysis of social capital usually emphasizes the horizontal association between people, consisting of social networks and associated norms. This narrow view of social capital is frequently associated with Putnam (1993) who defined social capital as the connections among individuals and social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them (Putnam, 1993). In this definition, three main components are emphasized: trust, social norms, and obligations as well as social networks and associations. Putnam's conceptualization grasps positive externalities of social capital in terms of improved efficiency of society such as generalized reciprocity, social trust, communication, and diminishing incentives for opportunism as a result of the facilitated coordinated actions. Putnam originally envisaged only these positive externalities of social capital but others have since recognized negative externalities of social capital.

2.1.2.2. The Meso Approach to Social Capital: Coleman's Addition

Coleman (1988) expanded the unit of observation of social capital by introducing a vertical component to the analysis of social capital which can be referred to as meso interpretation. He was more interested in the development and application of conceptual tools for micro-macro transition. To do this, he tried to synthesize sociological and economic perspectives in an attempt to conceptualize social capital and identified different forms of capital (physical human and social) and the interplay among themselves. Coleman's aim is to import economist's principle of the rational action for use in the analysis of social systems and to do so without discarding social organization in the process.

Coleman defined social capital by its function (enabling social action) as a variety of different entities which all consist of some aspect of social structure, and facilitate certain actions of actors whether personal or corporate.

To avoid different interpretation of the concept Coleman distinguished between three main components of social relations: obligations and expectations, information channels, and norms and sanctions.

Furthermore, Coleman identified specific characteristics of social capital as a collective resource. He noted that social capital can take variety of forms, as long as it facilitates distinct action (cultural ties, organizational linkages and civic culture).

He stated that social capital needs some level of closure of a social structure (e.g. in effectively imposing norms; generating trust) and also it often derives from original organizations set up for a specific purpose, which lasts beyond the original goal (e.g. neighborhood association, counter- example: Solidarnosc). Coleman further stated that social capital is neither about singular actors nor in physical goods and is part of the structure of relations between actors and among actors including organizations.

The distinguishing feature of Coleman's analysis of social capital is that first, he considered relations among groups, rather than individuals. Coleman endorses

rational choice idea of social action but rejects extreme individualistic views. Second, like Putnam, from the start, he recognizes the fact that social capital is productive even for marginalized groups, since vertical associations are characterized by hierarchical relationships and an unequal power distribution among members. Finally, Coleman sees the creation of social capital as an involuntary process.

Similarly, another prominent scholar, Bourdieu (1986), was also working on social capital. Like Coleman, he also emphasized the vertical dimensions of social capital and linked social capital with the size of network and the volume of past resources accumulated and commanded by the agent.

He defined social capital as the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of and recognition (Bourdieu, more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance 1986). Bourdieu stated that the main reason that actors engage in and maintain links in a network, in actuality or imagined manner, is to earn profit as a result of the network. He also emphasized the fact that the actors' potential for accruing social profit and control of capital are differentially distributed. Therefore, positions of actors are both the cause and the effect of all forms of past accumulations of capital, particularly social capital. Bourdieu's approach is an important reminder that social capital can be exclusionary and might perpetuate social inequality by providing differential entitlements to credit (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, he concluded that social capital along with other forms of associated capitals, explain the structure and dynamics of differentiated societies (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

2.1.2.3. The Macro Approach to Social Capital

In addition to the largely informal, and often local, horizontal and hierarchical relationships the third paradigm, the macro level of analysis, embraces the social and political environment that shapes social structure and enables norms to develop (Grootaert & van Bastelaer, 2001).

This understanding focuses on the institutional structures and, affairs such as the political regime, the rule of law, the court system, and civil and political liberties. While Putnam's and his colleagues' conceptualization of social capital focuses on understanding of social capital as an independent variable affecting outcome variables i.e., institutional performance, other scholars suggested a more dynamic view of social capital rather than static perspective that considers one way cause and effect relationship. The macro perspective considers institutions as one form of social capital rather than just an outcome. For example, different researches (North, 1990; Oakerson, 1993; Evans, 1996; Ostrom, 1996) show that diverse forms of institutions enhance shared norms of trustworthiness, cooperation, trust and reciprocity.

2.1.2.4. The Micro-Macro Transition: Holistic Assessment of Social Capital

There is a strong degree of complementarities and substitution among the micro, meso and macro level institutions and a comprehensive view and holistic assessment of

these dimensions maximizes a good understanding of the dynamism of social outcomes. In this regard, Woolcock's (1998) model of social capital facilitates analysis across the aforementioned levels by presenting a comprehensive framework that incorporates four dimensions of social capital and its and describing their interrelations.

According to his model, integration represents strong ties, or those primordial links within the community that are defensive. Linkages encompass intercommunity and intergroup ties. The concept of organizational integrity and synergy respectively stated as effectiveness and ability to function and the states links communities. An advantage of Woolcock's model is that it integrates vertical and horizontal forms of social capital and their relationships, thus facilitating analysis and the targeting of policy recommendations at the macro, meso, and micro levels.

2.1.3. Types and Forms of Social Capital: Bonding, Bridging and Linking Social Capital

A growing number of literatures discuss the various social, political and economic effects of social capital. Social capital is mostly argued to be a positive force that helps boost social trust, norms and values. Yet, it has also long been recognized that there are potential dark sides to social capital (e.g. Bourdieu, 1985; Coleman, 1988; Levi, 1996). To account for these within the context of micro level of analysis, Putnam identified two main components of the concept of social capital, bonding social capital and bridging social capital, the creation of which Putnam credits to Ross Gittell and Avis Vidal while linking social capital is treated as a recently added concept to the categorization (Szretzer & Woolcock, 2004). The bonding and bridging are similar in meaning to Granovetter's (1973) strong and weak thesis.

Bonding social capital is the initial system of strong In-group connections or homogeneous groups of people characterized by having dense multi-functional ties, strong but localized trust and norm of reciprocity. Such ties have been found to stimulate a high level of solidarity within the group structure, which can effectively mobilize resources around a common purpose, facilitates creation of shared identities, provision of emotional closeness, social support and crisis aid (Gittell & Vidal, 1998; Putnam, 2001). Apart from its positive externalities bonding social capital when it is taken to the extreme is also associated with various downsides such as harm to individuals within the group and exclusion of outsiders (Portes & Landolt, 1996; Portes, 1998).

Bridging social capital on the other hand, refers to horizontal connections between socially heterogeneous groups but have broadly similar socio-economic status and power (Putnam, 2001; Woolcock, 2001; Granovetter, 1986). Bridging ties are inclusive, cutting across ethnicity, caste, race, culture and other social cleavages (Grant, 2001; Wakefield & Blake, 2005; Narayan and Pritchett, 1999). Bridging social capital is characterized by more generalized trust and reciprocity (Putnam, 2001; Field, 2003). Unlike bonding, bridging social capital is more associated with positive outcomes and low potential for negative externalities because of the moderating influence of cross-cutting ties (Field, 2003; Putnam, 2001; Putnam, 2002).

Recently, linking social capital is added to the initially identified dimensions of social capital (i.e. bonding and bridging) to account for two distinct interpretations of bridging social capital in the literature. The first interpretation focuses on socio-economic heterogeneity of membership p within organizations (Stolle & Rochon,1998; Putnam, 2000; Stolle, 2001) while the second focuses more on interconnectedness between organizations Paxton, 2002 & 2007).

Szretzer and Woolcock (2004) stated that linking social capital is norms of respect and networks of trusting relationships between people who are interacting across explicit, formal, or institutionalized power or authority gradients in society. Unlike bonding and bridging social capital which basically stress horizontal relationships, linking social capital represents the vertical dimension such as civil society organizations, government agencies, representatives of the public and the private sector (Grant, 2001; Woolcock, 2001; Halpern, 2005).

In this context, linking social capital is considered a valuable asset for accessing key resources such as capacity building, financial and technical support from formal institutions (Narayan & Lant, 2000; Woolcock, 2001; Levitte, 2003; Grootaert et al., 2004)

The literature regarding linking social capital stresses the positive externalities but the adequacy of the concept to address issues of power and conflict is contested. World Bank and other proponents of the concept (e.g. Woolcock, 2001; Halpern, 2005), view linking social capital as essential asset for the well-being and long-term development of poor and marginalized groups.

Different combinations of the three types of community-level social capital are thought to produce a range of outcomes (Field, 2003; Woolcock, 2005) paralleling the argument made about the micro-and macro-forms of social capital in Woolcock's (1998) integrated model. Once again, more community-level social Capital is not necessarily better; over-reliance on bonding or bridging, for instance, can be detrimental because benefits are confined to one type of social capital at the expense of the other (Halpern, 2005). Similar to Woolcock's model, the conceptualization of community-level social capital is dynamic rather than static. The optimal combination of bonding, bridging and linking social capital can vary over time as the needs and priorities of the community evolves or as the macro- environment itself changes (Halpern, 2005; Woolcock, 2005).

However, in conflict analysis, this distinction is highly influential for the reason that it highlights how social capital may not always be beneficial for society as a whole even though it is always an asset for those individuals and groups involved. Horizontal networks of individual citizens and groups that enhance community productivity and cohesion are said to have positive social capital assets whereas self-serving exclusive gangs and hierarchical patronage systems that operate at cross Purposes to societal interests can be thought of as negative social capital burdens on society (Varshney, 2001). These webs of relationships, especially when they link people from different backgrounds, are what hold a community together. The more bonding and bridging horizontal social capital link with vertical social capital, the more likely it will be that a society is cohesive and thus possesses the inclusive institutions necessary for managing conflicts. But when a society's

social capital inheres mainly primary social groups disconnected from one another, the more powerful groups attempt to dominate the other creating situations of conflict.

The interesting point to note from the above review here is that social capital, as values and rules of social organization, is at the core of human creativity and collective action.

Understanding how networks and institutions are organized, the outcomes they pursue and the consequences of such outcomes are fundamentally important in understanding social Capital as used for collective action. Human beings typically undertake collective action to meet perceived needs and seize Or create opportunities. This involves crafting and implementing rules. Even the loosest networks of individuals are underpinned by rules.

Understanding how such networks are put together enhances understanding of how conflict management is exercised, rules made and monitored, sanctions levied and implemented, and outcomes realized and evaluated. on the whole, through appropriate model design and reliable social capital indicators, this study can produce findings which may have implications for policy direction and interventions needed to increase social capital.

2.2. The Nature and Causes of Conflict

Conflicts are as old as human societies and appear to be a basic constituent of human life in diverse activities. Historically, individuals, social groups and societies have disputed and competed against one another over scarce resources such as land, money, as well as political power and ideology. Such observation has inspired early scholars (e.g. Machiavelli, Hobbes) to shed some light on the general contours of conflict in society: how conflict starts, varies, and its effects on society. However, even today the term "conflict" means different things to different people.

2.2.1. The Concept of Conflict

Conflict could be classified and understood based on different criteria and this has created difficulty in formulating an operational and a working definition of the concept. The definition of conflict moves back and forth between conflict being perceived as a negative or positive process. Some present conflict as a natural phenomenon and/or a necessary condition for the development and growth of individuals and Societies, while others view it as destructive and anomalous incident in social life (Colletta & Cullen, 2000). On top of that the wide variety of views on the subject from a wide range of disciplines (e.g. psychology, sociology, economics and, political science) further complicates the conceptualization of the term into a single unifying idea. From individual level analysis in psychology, Freud's psychoanalytic theory explains conflict through death instinct as a product of unconscious drive for aggression.

Sociologists(e.g. Emile Durkheim and Herbert Spencer) saw conflict as a function of social structure and integral part of the way society evolves. Marxist and Gramscian

perspectives regard conflict as a function of power relations, seeing class struggle as the root cause. Economists (e.g. William Stanley Jevons), on the other hand, regard conflict as the result of rational decision making process of individual seeking to maximize his/her personal gain at the expense of other individuals or society and might even contest that conflict and competition are one and the same.

Arriving at an agreeable definition of conflict is further complicated by the diversity of causes, parties involved and consequences of conflict. This has also created a problem in distinguishing between different types of conflict.

Regarding the parties involved, the term conflict is used to refer to disagreements ranging from family-level conflicts to those initiated by pressure groups and social movements (e.g. environmentalists, feminists etc.) right up to conflicts that occur between sections of the same community, between communities and higher levels of authority and between national governments.

The consequences of conflict can also range from simple disputes, with positive outcomes such as a football match (Powelson, 1972; Boulding, 1977) to spontaneous poorly organized turmoil to highly organized and very violent wars. Conflicts can also be nonviolent, but well organized and focused on changing government policies (Rothgeb, 1996).

While such issues disable the efforts made in providing a single definition, Putnam and Poole (1987) observed that most definitions of conflict in literature involve three factors: (1) there are at least two independent groups involved in conflict, (2) the groups perceive some incompatibility between themselves, and (3) the groups interact with each other in some way.

In addition, Oberschall (1973) distinguishes between two forms of conflict definition in literature, the first definition is related to Weber and the notion of conflict as an action which is aligned to class struggle and physical violence and second one, called social conflict, allows for a non-violent differing of opinion and values. Similarly, Wallace (1993) distinguishes between non-coercive peaceful conflicts as opposed to coercive or violent conflict.

Some scholars prefer to describe the structure of conflict rather than providing a single definition. Johan Galtung (2000) suggested it is possible to understand something of the nature and process of the conflict by understanding the relationship between the parts that make up the structure of conflict it is possible to understand something of the nature and process of the conflict. If one proceeds to dissect conflict, he states that, three principle constituents would be found: the attitudes of the participants, the behavior of those participants and the contradiction that influence the needs of the participants.

The attitudes of the participants include their perceptions and miss-conceptions of each other and these attitudes are influenced by other factors such as fear and prejudice. The behavior of the participants can include anything from co-operation and coercion through to threats, violence and hostility. Contradiction is the incompatible (perceived or real is of no importance) goals of conflict parties shaped by the structures that influence needs. There are institutions that make up

the fabric of society: the legal and political structures, the economy and the market etc. In his logic, contradiction gives rise to attitudes and behaviors regardless of the nature (which patterns it follows) of the conflict.

2.2.2. The Nature and Process of Conflict

Identifying the different typology of conflict Presents difficulty because of the various definition of the concept and the different level of focus one makes on causes, actors, issues, strategy, dynamics, history, relationships and context of conflicts (Fink, 1968; Mack & Snyder, 1957).

on different classification and Lederach(2005) identified different typology of conflict based on different classification and criteria. According to the assumed cause, they identified resources, conflict, ethnic, religious, political, cultural and boundary etc. Similarly Daniel Katz(1965) created a typology that distinguishes three main sources of conflict: economic, value, and power. economic conflict involves competing motives to attain scarce resources. Each party wants to get the most that it can and the behavior and emotions of each party and directed toward maximizing its gain. Value conflict involves incompatibility in ways of life and ideologies. Power conflict occurs when each party wishes to maintain or maximize the amount of influence that it exerts in the relationship and social setting.

In a slightly different manner, many scholars typically identified several types of conflicts based on the causes of conflicts; these include resource conflicts (Collier, 2000 & 2003), conflicts linked to superpower rivalry and its aftermath (Copson, 1991; Hampson 1996), conflicts associated more broadly with governance failure (Zartman, 1995) and identity conflicts driven by differences over issues of religion, ethnicity and space, among others (Gurr, 2000).

Based on the mode of pursuing conflict, armed, organized, or spontaneous are the various forms that are applicable; in accordance with the focus on the history, some conflicts are protracted, intractable or deep rooted; based on nature of relations of society in conflict and prescriptions of intervention: conflict prevention, conflict management, and conflict resolution and conflict transformation are identified (Lederach, 2005).

Wright(1951) identified three types of conflict based on the modalities of conflict: latent overt and covert conflict. Latent conflict is a state where conflict is both possible and expected because of unequal distribution of resources or conflictual action but neither of the two is actually experienced as conflict generating and no provoking action is taken. Overt conflict, on the other hand, occurs where two agents are in overt conflict if they both experience grounds for conflictual action against the other and as a result take such action. Covert conflict can either be an actual two-party conflict which is concealed from another interested party or a case where conflictual action is taken by one agent against another agent, who is unaware of the action, but who would, if the action were

discovered, experience it as conflict generating and take counter measures.

Based on the level at which conflict is happening we can identify different types of conflict: intrapersonal conflict; interpersonal conflict, and intergroup conflict, Multi-Party conflict and international conflict(Gray, 1989; Fisher, 1990; Cormick et al, 1996).

Conflict is a dynamic process because the objectives of the parties involved, their approaches, the intensity levels, the likely damage etc all change over time. In this sense much attention is given to the life cycle of a conflict or stages of conflict by different practitioners (e.g Lund,1996; Lederach, 2005). Although the various efforts towards defining conflict cycles are not necessarily contradictory, they differ significantly in terms of their complexity. Thus, some writers put forward a very simple model with three stages (Mertus & Helsing, 2006) while others add on features and work with models with several more stages (Robinson, 1978). Many writers include in their models the escalation and de-escalation phases, thus being able to present them as graphs, mostly in curve (Lund, 1996) or, more correctly, waveform (Lederach, 2005).

The proposition that conflict cycles are recurring is strongly supported by empirical research and work of numerous scholars. Some claim that once a conflict has taken place, the probability of conflict reoccurring becomes significantly higher(Wohlfeld, 2010).

Mertus and Helsing(2006) identified three stages to a conflict; the conflict intensification stage, the armed conflict stage and the post-conflict/post crisis stage. The conflict intensification stage is inter alia marked by human rights violations as root causes of conflict, and failure to address human rights issues hinders conflict prevention efforts. During the armed conflict stage, competing factions take up arms and human rights abuses are both a common by-product of the violence and a component of wartime strategy, while human rights norms and concerns inform efforts for international intervention, during the post conflict/post crisis stage, violent conflict ceases and efforts at rebuilding begin.

In the same manner the Conflict Prevention Network of European commission has identified four stages of the conflict cycle: stable peace, unstable peace, high tension and open conflict. In this approach, pre conflict and post conflict phases are opposed directions of the linear approach, in that in post conflict situation the conflict intensity diminishes from open conflict to high tension and so on, to stable peace.

Robinson, Clifford and Moorhead (1974) identified the now widely recognized conflict cycle containing 5 stages that most community conflicts go through. The five stages are tension development, role dilemma, injustice collecting, confrontation and adjustments. Each of the stages build on the previous until the matter is resolved.

All conflict begins as tension that develops among parties. As the disagreement or threat begins to develop, the various parties start taking sides. The conflict can appear immediately or over time (tension development). People or groups who are involved in the situation raise questions about what is happening, who is right, and

what should be done. They try to decide whether they should take sides and, if so, which one (role dilemma). Usually, tension and role dilemma happen at the same time. At the Injustice Collecting stage, each party begins to gather support. Each itemizes the problems, justifies their position, and thinks of ways to win. At the confrontation stage, the parties meet and clash. If both parties hold fast to their opinions, barriers may develop. Confrontation may be lessened or avoided by one or both parties making adjustments. If one party is weak and the other strong, the strong party can win by domination, but the conflict may reappear. If parties have equal power and neither party decided to change, they can wage a cold war, with each party trying to weaken the other. One party may choose to avoid the other. The two parties can work together in active participation to look for a solution to take care of both parties' needs.

One important difference in the various definitions of conflict cycle is whether scholars consider the absence of conflict as a stage of conflict cycle, or whether they start looking at the situation when tensions arise (Wohlfeld, 2010). This is a difference in view indicating the conceptual variation among scholars in the field. Some (e.g. Lederach, 2003) see the study of peace as a distinct discipline from the study of conflict and war. For others it is also of key significance whether a peaceful and stable situation should be watched for any signs of tensions arising and, therefore, early warning can be given. Additionally, some argued that conflict cycle models that do not include the early warning stage do not focus on the root causes of conflict.

The division into stages or phases and the understanding of conflict as circular is the starting point for research on conflict prevention, management and resolution. In order to make the notion of conflict cycle more relevant in the study of reactions to conflict and to provide guidance to Practitioner, parallel conceptions of the conflict cycle, which focus on the stages of involvement, have been developed. Lund and West(1998) identified conflict prevention (preventive diplomacy, preventive action, crisis prevention, preventive peacebuilding), crisis management, conflict management (conflict mitigation), peace enforcement, conflict termination, peacekeeping and conflict resolution (post-conflict peace building) as the stages of conflict management.

Some organizations and authors(e.g. Lund, 1996) especially those focused on conflict prevention, rightly add early warning , and argue that the most important step is from early warning to early action. Lund's models integrate the stage of conflict with stages of involvement, creating an analytical model that may be of use to both theoretical and practical approaches to conflict.

Lund's diagram of the life cycle of a conflict illustrates that in the typical life cycle of a conflict, there is a natural decline in tension after the violence has ended, in this regard peace building occupies the later stages of a conflict, both simultaneous and contiguous with peacekeeping efforts (Lund, 1996). This stage focuses on the failure of usual efforts to shift conflicts to a stable situation and reduce re-escalation probability.

2.2.3. The Causes of Conflict and Levels of Analysis

There is no single cause of conflict. Rather, conflict is context-specific, multi-causal and multidimensional and can result from a combination of different factors. Hence, most attempts to identify typologies of conflict shows weakness in the field of exhaustiveness, mutual exclusiveness of categories, semantic consistency and neutrality. Especially these weaknesses become significant for attempts to construct a typology according to causes of conflict. Due to the complexity and the dynamics of conflict, they are hardly ever monocausal. Despite such limitations, however, in the conflict literature we can identify three major theoretical approaches that try to illustrate the conflict: the macro, meso and micro approaches,

2.2.3.1. The Micro Approach

In brief, the micro level approach and analysis employs the individual as its unit of analysis, both the conscious and unconscious are examined in order to understand the cause of aggression and violence. Freud's idea of death instinct in his psychoanalytic theory and social Darwinism theorists such as Herbert Spencer and Sir Francis Galton believed that human beings have the innate predisposition towards aggression and violence, the biological predisposition argument which is connected to social learning and conflict identity theories maintains that aggression and violence are learned behaviors (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1961: Bandura ,1977).

2.2.3.2. The Meso Approach

In trying to explain the nature and cause of conflict, the meso approach emphasizes the interaction between the macro variables such as nations, institutions, ethnic, class, and micro variables such as individual's psychological motivation for aggression and violence. Thus, this approach borrows ideas from psychology, sociology, and politics in order to explain conflict. The Enemy System Theory (Volkan, 1988; Montville, 1990) and the Human Needs Theory (Burton 1990; Kelman, 1991) apply to this level of analysis. Both theories try to explain the complexity of group behavior especially antagonistic group relationships. The Enemy System Theory holds the hypothesis that humans have a deep-rooted psychological need to dichotomize and to establish enemies and allies. This phenomenon happens at individual and group levels. This is an unconscious need which feeds conscious relationships especially in our group lives (Cunningham, 1998). This view is very important as it provides explanation in the context of ethno-religious conflict where former neighbors harm and kill each other simply because they belong to different identity groups. Locating the source of hatred or antagonism usually points to some historical animosity.

At the meso level of analysis the role of social structures or institutions can also have a very powerful role to play in the emergence of conflicts because they have the ability to mediate, control and filter social behavior and attitudes. Institution range from formal bodies that have a set of written rules and objectives to socially recognized and supported procedures and rules (Scott, 1988).

2.2.3.3. The Macro Approach

The macro approach emphasizes the social, political, or social group at the

conscious level and takes its units of analysis from the macro level such as nations, institutions, ethnicity, class, ethos to explain conflict. For instance decision-making and game theories are typical examples of macro approach, which are developed based on the irrational actor model whereby people make choices and decisions on a rational basis relying on the informed choices and weighing of opportunities, negotiation, communication and information (Schelling, 1960). Some macro level analysts such as Dahrendorf (as cited in Angell, 1965) and Galtung (1965, 200) focus on analyzing the historical evolution of conflict. He maintains that those who have power and authority which manifests itself in economic, political, military and cultural realms of life hope to maintain the status quo, while those who lack them hope to obtain some portion of them. Thus, emphasis is put on competition over scarce resources (such as territory, power, status, etc). Collins (1971), on the other hand, believed that power and status are fundamental relational dimensions at the macro level as well as micro level of social interaction and therefore every group wants to pursue certain goods such as wealth, power, and prestige. He concluded that coercion and ability to force others to behave a certain way are the primary basis of conflict.

2.2.4. Consequences of Conflict

Usually, conflict is related with negative economic, social and political outcomes. Violent conflict and wars often result in social crisis such as mortality, disability, displacement and social turmoil. In an attempt to describe the economic consequences of conflict, Collier et al (2003) rightly stated that prolonged civil war is development in reverse. Conflict results in the decline of economic growth, destruction of public infrastructure, increased military spending and capital flight conflict can also lead to instability, autocratic governance, and human rights violation. Even though conflict is equated with negative consequences, some scholars have identified some positive externalities of conflict (Boulding, 1996; Powelson, 1972; Homer-Dixon & Levy, 1996; Warner & Jones, 1998). Powelson (1972) states that conflict can increase economic efficiency by enabling goods to be produced more cheaply and political efficiency via resolving small conflicts, As conflicts progress, minor compromises are reached, the conflict changes as a result and moves on until a state of equilibrium is reached (Boulding, 1996; Homer Dixon & Levy, 1996) argues that if there were no conflicts at all over the immediate goals, the ultimate goals which arise from immediate ones would not exist. In other words, society and institutions are the product of repeated conflict, negotiation, disagreement and compromise (Powelson, 1972; Jabri, 1996).

Identifying the effects of conflict and starting whether its externalities are negative or positive depends on the issue of conflict and how fundamental that disagreement is to the social status quo. Conflict as disagreement over goal has been identified to occur over the ultimate or immediate goals (Aubert, 1963; Boulding, 1996; Powelson, 1972). This has been called over consensus or within consensus, disconsensual (over consensus) and consensual (within consensus), benign and malign conflicts.

Conflicts within consensus or consensual are those that dispute the immediate goals. In other words, the parties agree about the value of what they seek but not the means of achieving it, or don't get as much as they would have hoped to get from it.

That is, the fundamental basis of the community is not threatened, but a minor point of order is at issue, that this difference is important is emphasized by Coser's argument that the impact of conflict depends upon the degree of consensual framework within which they are contested and the degree of conflict over basic consensus (Coser, 1957).

2.3. Conflict in Ethiopia

2.3.1. Background

Ethiopia is an ancient country with a long, proud and complex history. It is commonly considered to be the origin of mankind (Ansari, 2009). Tracing its roots to the 2nd millennium BC, Ethiopia was a monarchy for most of its history. During the first century AD, the Kingdom of Aksum maintained a unified civilization in the region (Henze, 2005).

Ethiopia derived prestige with a uniquely successful military resistance during the late 19th century's "Scramble for Africa", becoming the only African country to defeat a European colonial power and retain its sovereignty. Ethiopia is the only country that has its own calendar and ancient scripts, one of the oldest alphabets still in use in the world (Willie, 2001).

Ethiopia's rich cultural heritage includes both tangible and non-tangible assets such as the ancient handcraft production, various ceremonies and festivals as well as nine cultural heritage sites registered by UNESCO. With a population of more than 90 million (projected population, CSA, 2015), Ethiopia is the second most populous nation in Africa next to Nigeria. The country's cultural heritage and diversity is enhanced by being home to multitude of ethnicities, religions and cultures. Ethiopia has about 80 ethnic groups. The ethnic groups which account for about 1% and above of the total population are the following fifteen: Oromo (34.5%), Amhara (26.9%), Somali (6.2%), Tigray (6.1%), Sidama (4.0%), Gurage (2.5%), Wolaita (2.3%), Silte (2.0%), Afar (1.7%), Hadiya (1.7%), Gamo (1.5%), Gedeo (1.2%), the first two ethnic groups (1.2%), Kafficho (1.13%), Agew (1.05) and Kambatta (0.94%); the first two ethnic groups account for 6.14%. the first six accounts for 80.2% and all the fifteen account for about 93.72 % of the population (CSA, 2015). The majority of the ethnic groups live in the southern Ethiopia. In terms of religious affiliation, the Ethiopian people are Coptic Orthodox Christian (43.5%), Muslims (33.9%) and Protestant Christians (18.6%); Catholics and other religions account for the remaining 4% (CSA, 2015).

Due to the complex characteristics of the people and the historical process underlying the creation of the modern Ethiopian state, there was high incident of power struggles and prolonged conflict cleavages among diverse forces in the country. In fact, it will not be an exaggeration if one says that the history of Ethiopia is the history of war and conflicts (Alemayehu, 2004). Ethnicity, religion and control of resources and choice of socio-political paradigm have been the center of conflict in Ethiopia (Alemayehu, 2004). Therefore, in this chapter, an attempt was made to review the nature and history of conflicts, their duration, intensity and the modalities for their cessation as well as the impact of conflicts and post-conflict conditions in Ethiopia. Moreover, understanding the social, cultural,

political and the historical context of the country will help us to understand the unique characteristics and dynamics of conflicts.

2.3.2. Conflict in Ethiopia: Causes, Types and Consequences

The historical process underlying the creation of modern Ethiopia has been marked by power struggles and conflict cleavages among diverse forces (Mesfin, 2006). The nature and the root causes of such conflicts are both multidimensional and complex. However, different authors tried to identify the basic causes of conflict in Ethiopia.

Muhabie (2015) classified the causes of conflict in the horn of Africa including Ethiopia into four major broad categories. These are: Economic Causes (Competition over and mismanagement of economic resources), Social and Cultural causes (eg. Extreme religious politics, ethnic polarity), Historical legacies (colonization, having dictatorial and oppressive regimes, the cold war) and political causes (power struggle, poor governance and transparency).

Some scholars (Alemayehu & Befekadu, 2004; Mesfin, 2006) attempted to categorize causes of conflict based on parties involved in conflict. Mesfin (2006) has identified two major contending forces that usually lead to conflict. The first one is conflict over consolidating political sovereignty under a centralized authority while the second comprise centrifugal challenges, local supremacy and resistance to consolidation by centralized authority. Mesfin has acknowledged however that somewhere between the two, there were small and medium scale intra and inter-local frictions that developed into a situation of conflict in Ethiopia. In a similar manner, Alemayehu and Befekadu (2004) analyzed the cause and nature of conflict in Ethiopia by introducing three power players in the country (supremacy of central authority, centrifugal challenge and conflict among ordinary people over resources) as well as analyzing the subject of their conflict, and the specific form of conflict among parties. They identified three forms of conflict:

* Type I conflict: this is caused by competition for position of power and the agents of conflict are either the 'educated elite' (after the 1974 revolution) or regional aristocrats (before 1974). The subject of conflict is power in its generic form (ie. Both political and economic) as can be exercised through capturing the state machinery.

* Type II conflict: is caused by popular revolt against those in power. The agents in conflict are the elite in power and the masses (usually the under-class). The subject of conflict is usually a violation of basic economic and political rights.

* Type III conflict: occurs among ordinary people over resources. In this type of conflict, the agents are peasants usually organized across regions or ethnicity.

UNDP (2007) identified the basic cause of frequently observed conflict in Ethiopia as (1) resource conflict such a competition for resources such as land, pasture, and water, clashes due to livelihoods competition between sedentary farmers and pastoralists; (2) identity conflict which is caused by heightened awareness of ethnic identity; (3) political issues such as language rights and perceptions of

disenfranchisement, and (4) arguments on border delineation between regions and ethnicities.

Furthermore, conflict has been classified by combining the territory where the conflict takes place and actors involved. In this regard, Small and Singer (1972) identified four types of conflicts: 'Intrastate'-internal conflicts fought between a government and a non-state group, 'Internationalized intrastate'- conflicts in which either the government, non-state armed group or both received external military support from a foreign government, 'Interstate'- conflicts fought between two or more states and "Extra-state"- conflicts between a state and a non-state armed group outside the state's territory.

2.3.2.1. Interstate Conflict in Ethiopia

Interstate conflict is a conflict between two or more states in which both members of the international system, that use their respective national forces in the conflict. Compared to the rampant intra-state conflicts, inter-state conflicts are very rare but when they take place, they engender devastating effects to human life, property and environment (Wallensteen & Sollenberg, 1999, 2000, 2001).

Ethiopia has fought several wars against many states in its history and this external intervention has had an important role in the initiation and continuation of conflict in the country. The cause of these conflicts can be classified as: historic (religious and colonial); cold-war related; and conflict with neighboring countries. In the modern history of the country, for instance between 186-1896 alone, Ethiopia was engaged in a number of historic conflicts; three times with the Egyptians, four times involving the Dervishes, five times with Italy and once with the British. In recent years Ethiopia has fought a war with the neighbors Somalia in 1964 and 1977-8 and Eritrea in 1998-2000. This conflicts protracted and shaped the Ethiopian state making it more militaristic.

Many inter-state and intra-state conflicts in Africa become more complex by being extended into 'Proxy wars'. Secondary or substitution parties were involved in fighting battles in alliance with larger states, pursuing their own agenda relevant in a local arena.

2.3.2.2. Intrastate Conflict

In Ethiopia, intra-state conflict is more prevalent than conflict with another state. The sources of intra-state conflict are diverse and the most frequently cited are resource conflict, regional border conflict, ethnic conflict, and religious conflict (UNDP, 2010).

Natural resources are an important component in understanding the nature of conflict in Ethiopia. Natural resources are embedded in an environment, geographic, geopolitical and interdependent space where actions by one individual or group may generate effects far beyond specific localities or even national jurisdictions. The link between natural resource management and conflict is strong. Shortages of natural resources lead to competition which may result in conflict. In addition, fighting and insecurity may prevent appropriate management of natural resources and

reduce their production, thereby worsening shortages and intensifying competition and conflict (Wood, 1993).

Land and related resources such as water and biodiversity are the main source of resource conflict in Ethiopia. Land resources continue to have major historical, cultural and spiritual significance.

Resource conflict can happen among inter-group, intra-group, between the state and its people. Intra-government conflicts could happen between different groups and organizations within government, and inter-regional and international conflicts occur between other regions within and outside nations, global conflicts revolve around conflicts pertaining to shared benefits, especially in terms of biodiversity, and temporal conflicts are about the interests of present and future generations (Wood 1993).

With regard to Ethiopia and regional border conflict in recent years, the Federal form of government the country has adopted has heightened and transformed historical, territorial conflicts into contemporary inter-regional boundary conflicts. This particular case reflects the transformation of resource conflicts between pastoral communities in the lowland communities. Although Ethiopia is one administrative unit, inter and intra-regional border demarcation has had economic implications pertaining to resource appropriation, mobilization and distribution. All state border disputes ought to be settled by agreement of the concerned states. Nevertheless, in times when the concerned states fail to reach agreement, the House of the Federation has a power to superintend over such disputes on the basis of settlement patterns and the wishes of the peoples concerned (Constitution of FDRE, 1995). Most resource conflicts in Ethiopia occur among pastoralist communities (UNDP, 2010). Pastoralists are coming under increasing pressure from natural disasters such as drought and flooding which are compounded by climate change. Population growth, increasing numbers of livestock produced for export, deforestation, environmental degradation, bush encroachment, and invasive species will further increase pressure and competition over shared and shrinking resources. These communities also have diverse settlement patterns inhibiting different ecological zones and, accordingly, practicing different production systems as well as having livelihood basis. As a result, there is conflict between farmer and herder, farmer/herder versus forest users and rural versus urban dwellers. These conflicts are mostly informed by lack of property implemented land use system and degradation of natural resources.

2.3.2.3. Ethnic Conflicts

The Ethiopian people are ethnically heterogeneous, with more than 80 ethnic groups speaking different languages. The Oromo, Amhara, Somali and Tigrayans make up more than three-quarters of the population. The prevalence and nature of conflict in Ethiopia can be viewed in two distinct but inter-related categories: conflicts before 1991 and ethnic conflict in Post-Federal Ethiopia.

Before 1991, Ethiopia's major ethnic conflict were related to mainly the control over resources, such as grazing land, water points, cultivable land as well as resistance war of expansion by the central government to the periphery to build a

unitary state out of multi-ethnic nations.

Ethiopia has got its present shape and ethno-cultural diversity during the emperor Menelik II with continuous interaction and expansion of his kingdoms to the south and east, expanding into Kaffa, Sidama, Welayta and other kingdoms (Bahru,2001). Some argue that this expansion has brought about political, economic, and cultural hegemony for the benefit of 'one-native' ethnic group, namely, the Amhara and resulted in major ethnic dissatisfactions and resistance against the monarchy. For example, the recent civil wars between the central government, and various insurgency groups bearing the names of ethnic groups such as the Oromo, Tigre, Afar, Ogaden and others in the form of liberation fronts were based on ethnicity.

The post-1991 politics of Ethiopia witnessed a major departure from the past in terms of political and structural dimensions. Federalism was allegedly chosen to respond to the challenge of ethno-national conflicts that beleaguered the old Ethiopian state from the time it has been built into a multi-ethnic empire often seeking to build one nation out of many. However, still there are a number of accounts for ethnic conflict in the country. Ironically , significant and growing evidence exists that were conflicts even after 1991. Some of the major inter-ethnic conflicts recently observed in Ethiopia are; the Silte-Gurage conflict, the Wagagoda language conflict, the Sheko-Megeneger conflict, the Anuak-Nuer conflict, the Berta-Gumuz conflict, the Gedeo-Guji conflict, the Oroma-Amharea conflict, the Borena-Geri conflict, and the Oromo-Somali conflict.

The causes of ethnic conflict in Ethiopia are multiple. They include historical and political over centralization of power and economic resources by the dominant and elite groups, (Marakakis, 1998), economic competition over grazing land and/or water resources, especially in times of drought and boundaries that led to the appointment of the land between different states, were delimited and impeded the freedom of movement of the pastoralists (Ahmed, 2002) as well as social and cultural causes- defense mechanisms of ethnic groups to protect their property and to protect themselves from other ethnic groups and specific cultures such as payment of dowry(gift) for marriage and prestige and retaliation can easily trigger conflict.

2.3.2.4. Consequences of Violent Conflicts in Ethiopia

The consequence of violent conflicts in Ethiopia can be observed via different dimensions such as economic, social, psychological, and political. With respect to the economic effects of violent conflicts, Alemayehu (2005) argued that the main reason for Ethiopia's backwardness and poverty is war and social conflicts that occupy the majority of Ethiopian history. As a result of prolonged conflicts, resources were used for destructive rather than productive activities. Interstate conflict and identity conflicts have also reduced economic growth of the country and/or negatively affected its quality and composition. Alemayehu further justified his claim that economic revival intensifies conflict and mentioned the case of sustained economic growth under the current government.

The social impacts of conflict in Ethiopia can also be views in terms of effect on education, health, hunger and displacement of people. For example we can look at the Eritrean-Ethiopian war (1998-2000) from interstate conflict and the civil war

(1974-1991) as cases in point. During the Eritrean-Ethiopian war, it is estimated that both countries spent hundreds of millions of dollars on the war, more than 70,000 people died from both sides and by the end of 1998, estimates suggest approximately 250,000 Eritreans had been internally displaced and another 45, 0000 people of Eritrean origin were deported from Ethiopia (Global IDP project, 2004). Compared with interstate conflict, it s highly difficult to measure the impact of intra state conflict in Ethiopia. Henze (1984) , for instance stated that of the two wars fought in ethiopia since the 1974 revolution , the protracted civil war (1974-1991) in the north has been significantly more costly and destructive than the Ethiop-Somalia war of 1977. According to Sivard (1991), 609,000 Ethiopians died in those wars and more than 500,000 of them were civilians, while the causes and consequences of famines that occurred in Ethiopia since the early 1970s was attributed largely to drought , there is growing consensus that human factors, particularly conflict is the culprit (Kaplan,1998;Africa Watch, 1991).

Less is known about the psychological impact of the conflict in Ethiopia. Personal accounts show that individuals and communities traumatized by conflict and displacement faced lasting mental and psychosocial disarrays and difficulty to integrate back to normal state once violence ends. The mental and psychosocial wounds induced by violence and traumatic experiences do not disappear with the return to normalcy, and if not addressed may well become n important constraint to efforts that aim to support e=reconciliation on the reweaving of a post -conflict society?s social fabric. A further example of the psychological impact of conflict could be observed when one examines the civil war during the Derg regime; aerial bombings, violence against the civilian populations, and the destruction of socioeconomic systems were particularly serious in the war zones of Tigray and Eritrea(Cliffe, 1989; Hammond & Druze, 1989; Hendrie, 1991). The political effect of conflict was enormous. In addition to the economic, social and psychological impacts, the prolonged conflict has led to a long-standing political instability and insecurity, autocratic governance and human right violations.

The current government of Ethiopia follows a democratic path and all-inclusive state based on ethnic federation. Progress has been made in all social development progress indicators. It would be wrong, however, to conclude the conflicts related to federalism are averted in full in many parts of the country at local/regional levels. Yet, there is still the need to better understand the effect of violent conflict on the social capital in Ethiopia. We need to know more about how violent conflict can be viewed as both an independent and dependent variable (a cause and an effect) in its relationship to social capital. That is , social capital can be constructive supporting societal cohesion and the mitigation of conflict, but it can also be perverted to hasten social fragmentation and the onslaught of violent conflict.

To further deepen the analysis of conflict and social capital interrelations, interactions at the macro level should also be considered. This broadening of the definition of social capital permits the inclusion of government, market and development actors, which have a direct impact on the social capital environment facing actors at the local level, and also helps identify measures for policy and operational recommendations.

If social capital matters for the well-being of all societies, it becomes necessary to ask who or what is the vehicle for creating or endangering it. Given the vital role the state plays in shaping the context and climate within which society is organized, it can in some cases, also actively help to create social cohesion, again, it is worth noting that empirical research on social capital is still an early stage, though promising links have already been made between social capital and development and democracy.

Most scholars agree that Ethiopia is a unique country in terms of inter-religious relations. Relations, especially between Arabs and Abyssinian trade, culture and religion reach back to ancient times. With the introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia further advanced this process. Yet, another religion that stood in line with other monotheistic religions came with Islam. All these religions came to Ethiopia and co-existed in mutual relationship with one another. This has made Ethiopia a unique place for all types of encounters, including peaceful relations, respect and tolerance, in exchange of ideas and practices.

Clearly, horizontal social capital such as bonds of kinship in Ethiopia still remains strong. Add to that, Ethiopians have strong social capital I.e. there is strong self-support system among the communities, there are strong social values that help people to respect one another and to build trust among one another. Promoting such self-supporting system indigenous civil societies help communities to handle their social problems by themselves through their own traditional mechanisms that have been practiced by them for years. However, integrating vertical social capital to shape a cohesive society remains a challenge.

2.4. Conflict Resolution

2.4.1. The Concept

As much as what conflict entails is contested, conflict resolution occupies a central stage as a point of disagreement in the field. Many terms are frequently, and almost interchangeably, used to describe the activities and processes that bring conflict to an end. However, some of these terminological approaches have distinct implications for the outcome of a conflict situation. Among them, candidate terms are conflict regulation, conflict engagement, conflict management, as well as peace building and conflict transformation.

From the above definitions, one can understand the connotation conflict resolution implies as a bad phenomenon hence it is something that should not be encouraged. It also assumes that conflict is a short term phenomenon that can be resolved permanently through mediation or other intervention processes. In principle, however, conflict cannot be once and for all solved. Some conflicts may be non-resolvable and can at best be transformed, regulated or managed? (Best, 2005).

Conflict management, on the other hand, is seen in the right perspective, and assumes that conflicts are long term process that often cannot be quickly resolved. Best (2005), sees conflict management as the process of reducing the negative and destructive capacity through a number of measures and by working with and through the parties involved in that conflict regulations. By extension, the term is

sometimes used synonymously with the term conflict different levels, including those efforts made to prevent conflict by being proactive? (Best, 2005). The concept equally includes such other terms like conflict limitation, containment and litigation.

Burton (1990) uses this phrase 'conflict prevention' to 'containment of conflict through steps introduced to promote conditions in which collaborative and valued relationships control the behavior of conflict parties'. Conflict transformation on the other hand refers to the longer-term and deeper structural dimensions of conflict resolution. Some analysis contend the 'resolution' carries the connotation of bringing conflict to permanent conclusion, negating conflict resolution with conflict transformation and downgrades the term conflict resolution on the grounds that it is content-centered rather than relationship-centered, and aims at immediate agreement rather than long-term process, and is committed only to de-escalation rather than also including escalation to pursue constructive change.

Furthermore, conflict resolution was differentiated from other established fields, such as international relations in that:

It is multilevel: analysis and resolution had to embrace all levels of conflict: intra-personal (interpersonal, intergroup, international, regional, global , and the complex interplays between the,;

It is multidisciplinary: in order to learn how to address complex systems adequately, the conflict resolution had to draw on many disciplines, including politics, international relations, strategic studies, development studies, individual and social psychology etc;

It is multicultural: since human conflict is worldwide phenomenon within an increasingly intricate and interconnected local/global cultural web, this had to be a truly cooperative international enterprise, in terms of both the geographical locations where conflict is encounters and the conflict resolution initiatives deployed to address them.

It is both analytic and normative: the foundation of the study of conflict was to be systemic analysis and interpretation of the 'statistics of deadly quarrels' (polymology), but this was to be combined from the outset with the normative aim of learning how better thereby to transform actually potentially violent conflict into non-violent process of social , political and other forms of change;

It is both theoretical and practical: the conflict resolution field was to be constituted by a constant mutual interplay between theory and practice: only when theoretical understanding and practical experience of what works and what does not work are connected can properly informed experience develop.

In this study, conflict resolution is used because it is the earliest term employed in the field and also is a comprehensive term which encompasses various approaches and methods used to handle conflict non-violently at all levels in society.

To invoke conflict resolution in this way is not, however, to indicate what conflict

resolution is not to indicate that conflict resolution might be considered good. Much clarification is needed before drawing any conclusions about the meaning of conflict resolution and its contributions to collective well-being.

2.4.2. Forms and Methods of Conflict Resolution

As a universal feature of human society that takes its origins in economic differentiation, social change, cultural formation, psychological development, and political organization. The identity of the conflicting parties, the levels at which the conflict is contested, and the issues fought over (scarce resources, unequal relations, competing values) may vary over time and may themselves be disputed. Conflicts are dynamic as they escalate and de-escalate, and are constituted by a complex interplay of attitudes and behaviors that can assume a reality of their own.

In this context, regardless of the level, origin and the dynamics of conflict, there are differing approaches of conflict resolution that deal with incompatibilities.

This approach sees conflict resolution from different perspectives such as the goals or stages at which conflict resolution takes place, the effect or outcome of the process and the dimension of conflict in the way the conflict processed.

The goals of conflict resolution may be classified as preventive or corrective. Preventive goal deals with convincing individuals and groups to choose to negotiate rather than resort to rancor in all matters of disagreement; thereby increasing the level of peaceful existence..? corrective and more understanding of human nature,? (Okrah, 2003), Galtung(1971, 1976) identifies 3 key forms or stages of conflict resolution: peacemaking, peace keeping and peacebuilding. The distinction between the three is slight yet useful. Peace-making implies the first tentative steps. Peacekeeping or the dissociative approach is by which requires the two sides to the conflict to withdraw from the arena. Peacebuilding or the associative approach is where symbiosis is developed (conflict resolution).

Blake, Shepard and Mouton (1964) identified three general strategies that parties may take toward dealing with their conflict; win-lose, lose-lose, and win-win. The win-lose approach is a strategy used to force the other side to capitulate. Sometimes, this is done through socially acceptable mechanisms such as majority vote, the authority of the leader, or the determination of a judge. Sometimes, it involves secret strategies, threat, innuendo ? whatever works is acceptable, i.e., the ends justify the means. The lose-lose strategy is exemplified by smoothing over conflict or by reaching the simplest of compromises. In neither case is the creative potential of productive conflict resolution realized or explored. On the other hand the win-win approach is a conscious and systematic attempt to maximize the goals of both parties through collaborative problem solving. The conflict is seen as a problem to be solved rather than a war to be won. There is an emphasis on the quality of the long term relationships between the parties, rather than short term accommodations. Communication is open and direct rather than secretive and calculating.

The other approach to conflict resolution looks the dimensions of resolution that parallels with the dimensions of conflict in the way the conflict is processed. In

this context, Bernard (2000) identified the three dimensions of conflict resolution as cognitive resolution, emotional resolution and behavioral resolution. He further elaborates cognitive resolution as the way disputants understand and view the conflict, with beliefs and perspectives and understandings and attitudes. Emotional resolution is the way disputants feel about a conflict, the emotional energy. Behavioral resolution is how one thinks the disputants act, looking at their behavior.

Macfarlane (2007) outlines that there are two forms of conflict management and resolution mechanisms as formal and informal conflict management and resolution that the best result often are achieved by combining the two methods.

2.4.3. Indigenous Conflict Resolution Mechanisms: Definitions and Merits

As long as people live in society or group, there are conflicts arising from differences of interests, prejudice, needs and ambitions. Therefore, the approach adopted to prevent or resolve such difference of interests determines its resolution. In other words, when a conflict happens, the crucial point should be the effective adoption of the necessary principle of the resolution.

Indigenous mechanisms are grass roots approaches to solving conflicts. The most important elements involved in this mechanism include the tradition of forgiveness, respect for elders because of their symbolic authority to enforce decision and transfer of resource as compensation (Zartman, 2000).

Dahal and Bhatta (2008) also confirmed that indigenous conflict resolution mechanisms are used to organize a discussion to mediate several types of conflicts within the societies by recognizing the identity and interests of the conflicting parties. Here the main aim is to come up with a solution and justify it by the duty of the mechanism based on recognized customs and morality of the society itself. Indigenous conflict resolution typically incorporates consensus-building based on open discussions to exchange information and clarify issues. Conflicting parties are more likely to accept guidance from these mediators than from other sources because an elder's decision does not entail any loss of face and is backed by social pressure.

Indigenous conflict management and resolution mechanisms use local actors and traditional community-based judicial and legal decision-making mechanisms to manage and resolve conflicts within or between communities. Local mechanisms aim to resolve conflicts without resorting to state-run judicial systems, police, or other external structures. Local negotiations can lead to ad hoc practical agreements which keep broader inter-communal relations positive, creating environments where nomads can graze together, townspeople can live together, and merchants can trade together even if military men remain un-reconciled (Lowiy, 1995).

Indigenous societies have varied institutions and personnel that function as agents of conflict resolution in their respective locality (Degene, 2007). In spite of this, Ember, as cited in Degene (2007), argued that these agents lack coercive force to support their decisions.

Indigenous societies in all parts of the world have featured variations of third-party arbitration and mediation. Western societies saw these practices subsumed by the rise of modern judiciaries. The increased complexity of these processes, however, saw reduced satisfaction with legal outcomes among disputants (United Nations, 2007).

In fact, the indigenous forms of conflict resolution, which refer to refers to the set of mechanisms a society utilizes to resolve conflicts outside litigation or the formal court, have been practiced by peoples and communities for centuries. The older forms of dispute resolution, particularly those practiced by the Indigenous or Aboriginal peoples around the world, challenge the originality of present-day court system (Osi, 2008).

indigenous conflict resolution processes will allow community members to pursue remedies and resolve conflicts outside of the courtroom and still within their own cultural confines. Practiced in indigenous communities since time immemorial, they are culturally more appropriate than litigation because they are based on the customs and traditions of the group concerned. They may also pursue remedies through state-formalized ADR. Litigating in court is normally prohibitive; with long case queues, intermittent delay in the resolution of motions or claims is quite common. More importantly, litigation with its basic rudiments of confrontation, fault-finding and judge made resolutions, coupled with its adversarial nature is not a viable alternative for indigenous communities (Osi, 2008).

Assefa (2005) summarized some of the advantages of indigenous conflict resolution mechanisms: they quickly respond to crisis; they contribute to the reduction of regular court caseloads; they contribute to saving of the public money; they also stand aside of the problem in shortage of judges who work in the regular courts and budget constraints; they are complementary to modern government structures and are not substitutes or competitors as some government officials think and worry about; they give access to many people who do not find modern system of conflict resolution comfortable; affordable or suitable to their needs disputants are satisfied with their operation and view their outcomes as fair.

Specifically, Boege (2006) identifies the following potential advantages of the indigenous conflict resolution mechanisms as follows.

- fit situations of state fragility and failure;
- .-are not state-centric and hence credited with legitimacy;
- _ take the time factor into due account and are process-oriented,
- provide for comprehensive inclusion and participation,
- _ Focus on the psycho-social and spiritual dimension of conflict transformation.

Scholars have long argued that there exists a connection between the quality of governance and important economic, political, and social outcomes. Rule of law is a core aspect of good governance and one of particular importance to poor people who

may struggle to find formal and informal institutions responsive to their needs. The resolution of conflict in wealthy societies typically relies on legal action in a court of law or formal modes of mediation. Yet, citizens of poor, informal societies in the developing world often have only limited access to such avenues of redress and arbitration. The existence of culturally legitimate, locally accepted norms of dispute resolution has the potential to significantly reduce the incidence of violent conflict in poor societies by offering access to justice, which is associated with a host of positive externalities.

Beyond these definitional quibbles, a more interesting association could be made between indigenous conflict resolution and social capital. Especially when one adopts the insight from Uphoff (2000) who breaks social capital down into structural and cognitive components, "an accumulation of various types of social, psychological, cognitive, institutional, and related assets that increase the amount or probability of mutually beneficial cooperative behavior that is productive for others, not just oneself".

Interestingly, this was also true of the traditional informal institutions in Ethiopia. Informal governance structures in rural Ethiopia such as Iddir, Mahber, Eqqub, Elder's Group, Gadaa/Cheffe Kore, Debo/Wobera/Wonfel/Oxen sharing (labor sharing) serve different economic and social purposes. The major benefits include risk coping, provision of credit, common property regulation, manpower and traction force sharing, conflict resolution and information sharing.

The fact that local people in different parts of the country adopted different survival strategies underscore the existence of a variety of patterns that can be brought together in a coordinated system of governance in which local patterns can be utilized within local contexts. Horizontal and vertical institutional linkages should be developed across patterns so that several centers of authority can be developed instead of a single source of power (Ostrom, 1999). Using the best available traditional institution and practice surely provides possibilities opening up prospects toward establishing a system of democratic self-governance.