

	<b><i>The power paradigm</i></b>	<b><i>The emerging paradigm</i></b>
<i>View of conflicts</i>	Conflicts are negative, bad. They should be avoided as far as possible.	Conflicts are necessary for growth and life. They are inevitable and <i>potentially</i> good. They give <i>opportunity</i> for change and growth of <i>all</i> parties. Destructive <i>handling</i> of conflict is to be avoided.
<i>Unit of analysis</i>	Structures and institutions are the appropriate units of analysis, explaining political phenomena (Burton about the paradigm, 1986).	The individual and the identity group are the units of analysis. This applies to all levels. Conflicts at the micro and macro levels have many things in common. They are handled in accordance with the same principles (HNT).
<i>Problem of conflicts</i>	Human aggressiveness and scarcity of resources. According to some (Clausewitz, 1832; Hobbes, 1651; Lorenz, 1963; Morgenthau, 1948, 1967), there is an inherent aggressive instinct or drive for power (and dominance) for its own sake. Others, more modern proponents of this paradigm, believe that scarcity of resources together with aggressiveness is the problem.	The core of the problem is <i>not</i> human aggressiveness (cf. Fromm, 1973). “Humans maximize their goals by responding to the environment to the best of their abilities within limits imposed by structural conditions and knowledge of possible options open” (Burton about Set B, 1986, p. 111). Often scarcity of resources is an issue but there are basic needs such as needs for security, recognition, belonging, participation, stimulation and meaning, the gratification of which makes supply increase. This happens when human relations are improved. Herein lies the opportunity for win-win solutions (HNT).
<i>Focus</i>	Positions are stated. Declared issues are those on which settlement is sought, sometimes as a compromise.	<i>Underlying</i> needs, values and concerns are sought through analysis. The analysis, performed together with the other party, will lead to formulation of options.

*Table 8.1* Comparison between the power paradigm and the new, emerging paradigm regarding violence prevention and conflict resolution. HNT = Human Needs Theory.

<i>Aim</i>	The aim is to win the conflict which is win-lose (zero-sum) in its out-come as there is scarcity of resources; what one wins the other loses.	The aim is that all parties' needs are met, win-win. Conflicts have potentially positive sum out-comes. The challenge is to achieve these. There are immaterial needs of no short supply (see above). Both sides' gratification of needs may grow simultaneously, e.g., security, love, self-esteem and belonging.
<i>Power</i> (see further below authority and political power)	Outcome is based on power. There is a struggle for power. (Morgenthau, 1948, 1967.) Conflicts are settled by relative power and/or by application of legal norms. Use of power is effective. The balance of power is decisive to the outcome. Balance of power is <i>necessary</i> at the macro level (Morgenthau, 1948, 1967). There is no alternative. Power is regarded in terms of power <i>over</i> (domination).	Outcome is based on objective standards, also legal norms (Fisher & Ury, 1981). Conflicts are settled but not resolved by coercion/use of power. Thwarting needs leads to conflicts, disintegration, unhealthiness. Use of power (=domination) is not effective for <i>resolution</i> of conflict. There are <i>alternatives to politics based on balance of power</i> . These should be developed. Power is used <i>in favour of</i> reaching a mutual aim with the other party. Power is regarded in terms of power <i>to</i> as well as power <i>with</i> and power <i>over one-self</i> , self-control (Gandhi in Iyer, 1986-1987, e.g., in Vol. II, pp. 231-232).
<i>View on deterrence, threat and coercion</i>	Defence builds on the idea of deterrence and threat, not primarily on trust and goodwill.	Deterrence, threat and coercion are not effective when basic human needs are at stake. Threat and coercion may easily be counter-productive by reducing trust (Gandhi; HNT). This applies to all levels.
<i>View on the other party</i>	The other party is looked upon as <i>adversary</i> or enemy. The problem is often not separated from the person or group of persons viewed as the adversary.	Parties are looked upon as <i>partners</i> in solving the conflict. The problem is separated from the person or group of persons viewed as the other party (Fisher & Ury, 1981)

<i>Relations between the parties</i>	The other party is looked upon as <i>adversary</i> or enemy. The problem is often not separated from the person or group of persons viewed as the adversary.	Interrelation between subjects. Responsibility lies with both parties (Vindeløv, 1997, p. 473).
<i>Contact with the other party</i>	Contact with the other party is allowed to be closed <i>or</i> used for pressure. Ury, (1993, p. 130–131) writes about the “power game”: “you switch from listening and acknowledging to threatening, from reframing the other side’s position to insisting on your own, and from building the golden bridge to forcing them down the gangplank. You use all your power to force them to do what you want them to do...”. Closure of contact leads to polarization, which is accepted.	Contact with the other party should be maintained, the problem and the person/group/party should be separated and the other party always treated with respect. Polarization is not accepted (e.g., Fisher & Ury, 1981; Gandhi).
<i>Process</i>	The process is one of <i>settlement</i> or <i>regulation</i> (although resolution would have been preferred). Methods used are courts’ verdicts, arbitration and mediation where the mediator makes suggestions for compromise or conciliation. Coercion is often used. Negotiation is in the form of bargaining where power confrontation is generally of great importance. Positions are declared from the start. Under lying needs are not in focus – the other side may well be allowed to lose face; in fact, it is seen an advantage in the “power game”.  Tactics and goals are allowed to be mixed.	The process is one of <i>resolution</i> : The <i>assumptions</i> are questioned (HNT). The <i>mediator</i> works as an impartial facilitator (or a group of them). He/she/they do not make suggestions on solution but assist the parties in joint <i>problem-solving</i> by facilitating dialogue and creative search for alternative options that aim at meeting all parties’ needs and interests. The other side is not allowed to lose face (HNT). The <i>perspective</i> of the parties is at the centre. Solution is never forced upon the parties. Status and power may be of no help. Power is used to educate, not force (HNT; Ury, 1991). Tactics and goals should be kept separate (HNT).

<i>Solution</i>	Settlement may be forced upon the other party. Short-term solution is accepted.	Long-term solution is the aim. Short-term solution is not accepted.
<i>Authority</i>	Up-down perspective. "Authorities have a right to expect obedience and others a duty to obey" (Burton about Set A, 1986, p. 112).	Down-up perspective. "Authority finally rests on values attached to relationships between authorities and those over whom authority is exercised" (Burton about Set B, 1986, p. 112).
<i>The nature of political power</i>	People are dependent on the decisions, support and good will of their government or of any other hierarchical system to which they belong. Power is emitted from the few. "Authorities owe their legitimacy to effective control and foreign recognition" (Burton about Set A, 1986, p. 112).	Power arises continually from many parts of society. No one is completely powerless, as there is reciprocity in interaction. Those in authority need to consider the subjects. Furthermore, those in power rely on others to obey and cooperate. Cooperation may be withdrawn. (Burton about Set B, 1986, p. 112; Sharp, 1973; Sites, 1973.)
<i>The role of authorities</i>	"The role of authorities is to preserve the institutions and values of society" (Burton about Set A, 1986, p. 112).	"The role of authorities is to manage relationships so that human needs are satisfied" (Burton about Set B, 1986, p. 112).