

## **LINKAGES AND GAPS IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION RESEARCH**

*Rabia Akhtar*

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Over a period of years, the belief in ‘human goodness’ has remained an essential component of any Conflict Resolution (CR) research attempt. It is this very belief that drives CR researchers to find the causes of violence, causes of terrorism or broadly the causes of conflict because we refuse to believe at some level that conflict resides within and that man can innately be capable of violence. CR research has drawn its rich literature from almost all basic disciplines. It has significantly been colored by sociologists and psychologists like George Simmel, Gestalt, Galtung or Kurt Lewin (to name a few), analyzed through the lens of game theory drawing from the essentials of mathematical and economical reasoning, and also through power-politics theoretical perspectives coupled with reasoning borrowed from the discipline of international law.

The 21<sup>st</sup> century as previous centuries, is marred with conflicts. The developing world and regions in conflict are increasingly becoming intolerant societies. Although the CR research is rich in normative theoretical perspectives yet conflicts remain unresolved without any sustainable resolutions. There is a need to go back to the basics again to understand the ‘security and identity’ debate and draw new understanding about the culture of violence and conflict in our region and world at large.

### ***Scope***

The scope of this research is very narrow. This paper will attempt to provide literature review of research conducted on conflict resolution paradigms, theories and concepts and will rely heavily on reviews conducted by Dennis J.D. Sandole and Hugo Van der Merwe in their research essays on Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice (1993). Furthermore, this paper attempts to identify gaps and linkages that can be identified for South Asia in general and Pakistan in particular

in the context of John Burton's Human Needs theory and various other psycho-social contexts of conflict resolution.

The questions however that this study asks are very simple. Are we any wiser in our understanding of conflict, its causes, its manifestations and its resolution? Is there a gap in our understanding of the concepts and variables involved in conducting CR research when we borrow theories developed in different cultural settings and contexts? What promise does CR research hold for future of conflicts in 21<sup>st</sup> century?

## **II. CONFLICT, CULTURE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION: THE CONCEPTUAL LENS**

This paper relies heavily on Dennis Sandole's (1993) literature review on CR theory and practice and how it evolved as a concept. The authors begin by citing Sir Karl Popper (1959) who stated that scientific knowledge is 'common sense knowledge writ large'. In any conflict there are two or more parties that have 'paradigms', 'worldview' or develop their own 'common sense' about the conflict at hand. In order to find any resolution of conflict between these parties with contending and competing world views, their own construction of reality, a common understanding of *their* 'common sense' needs to be developed. Thus any approach at resolution of conflict must take into account the sensitivities of both the sides. Any attempt at resolution devoid of 'common sense' understanding will disrupt the process thus rendering it impossible to resolve.

Sandole has used Kenneth Waltz's (1959) Images of Realism to encompass research in Conflict and Conflict Resolution. Waltz's images relate to the individual level, the societal/national level and the international/systemic level. Further to Waltzian images, Robert North and Nazli Choucri in 1990 provided a fourth global image which according to Sandole either influenced the first three images in one way or the other or was the effect of Waltzian images itself.

Sandole categorizes Waltz's three images into four subcategories: biological, physiological, learning and dissonance.

Waltzian individual image relates very strongly to the 'human nature' itself in both *biological* and *physiological* categories. Realism is one such lens through which

Morgenthau explored the human nature resonating power politics with '*interest defined in terms of power*'. Many other scholars like Neibuhr, St. Augustine and Freud also theorized the negative nature of humans as being inherently capable of violence and destruction thus prone to conflict. Sandole further categorizes the biological reasoning for conflict prone nature by citing the works of Konrad Lorenz who stated that aggression was an inherent characteristic of human species thus violent human behavior is biologically reasoned and determined. Sandole also quotes Paul Scott's determination of 'an internal physiological mechanism stimulated to produce fighting' (1958), Paul MacLean's 'schizophysiology' as the conflict between 'feelings and thinking' (1975, 1978) and Arthur Koestler's (1978) argument of the 'ghost in the machine' to provide the physiological reasoning for violence perpetrated by the humans as part of some 'fatal engineering error' inbuilt in our nervous system.

It is interesting to note how Sandole characterizes Koestler's (1978) arguments of 'basic needs e.g the need for belongingness'. According to Sandole, war is a ritual in Koestler's scheme emanating from 'self-transcending identification' and not a resultant of 'aggressive self-assertion'. Sandole further defines Koestler's characterization of 'transcending the Self' where one 'identifies with a tribe, church, flag or ideal' which absolves one of the 'responsibility of one's behavior to the entity'. The pessimism that prevails in all the scholars Sandole researched confirmed the 'flawed' human nature which according to him is a 'physiological support for the doctrine of original sin'. If this characterization of flawed human nature is applied to the non state actors perpetuating terrorism (as an extreme form of conflict) in Pakistan or applied to any terrorist anywhere then their identification with ideology (what they believe in) as a set of rules that dictate their behavior towards the state of Pakistan or towards any other state for that matter as an entity, absolves them of their acts of crime. This discussion will be expanded in the later section.

In the sub category of *learning* Sandole cites the work of Albert Bandura (1973). For Bandura, aggression is resultant of 'interaction between a physiological mechanism, stimulation of that mechanism and learning'. Bandura's work is different from that of Paul Scott because for Bandura

'social learning' is the key stimulus for any physiological process that is driven by aggression. Sandole further reiterates the theory of social learning by connecting it with MacLeans's 'schizophysiology' where brain models a particular 'violent response' under a particular set of threatening conditions. If the threat is successfully thwarted with the modeled response then a particular 'relationship' is established between the 'stimulus x' and 'response y'. Since this particular relationship is 'learnt' therefore under similar stimulus and response situations, same 'learnt response' results in 'response generalization' thus becoming a norm.

Sandole derives fourth subcategory from Leon Festinger's (1962) 'cognitive dissonance', a phenomenon of contradictory relationships between what reality actually is and our preference of it. Sandole places Johan Galtung (1964) under this subcategory. Within the individual paradigm in our quest to understand the human nature Johan Galtung's theory of '*structural violence*' is still seen as one of the paramount contributions in understanding sources of conflict. Galtung's structural violence is perpetuated by institutions that oppress a certain disadvantaged class of people in society over those that are in the mainstream. According to Sandole, structural violence as categorized by Galtung, 'predisposes actors (victims) towards violent reactions' against those that are seen as oppressors. This behavior further manifests into 'violence' which is then seen as a means of bringing about 'change' in the situation of the victim of oppression. Sandole further explains this manifestation of violence by citing the work of John Dollard's (1939) 'frustration-aggression' theory where Dollard see frustration as 'necessary and sufficient condition of aggression'.

Further linking frustration to basic needs theory, Sandole cites the work of John Burton (1979, 1990 a, 1990 b) where Burton synthesizes 'human needs theory'. A very simple premise which serves as a prerequisite for conflict resolution is that fundamental human needs be met. For Burton the basic needs include the need for 'identity, security, recognition, autonomy, dignity and bonding'. However, the interesting thing about Waltzian three images remains that none of the image can provide explanations in isolation of the other image. Sandole develops a link between the individual

and the second *societal/national image* by placing 'individuals' as the primary unit of explanation by using Burton's analysis (1984). Sandole also cites an interesting thesis by Spinoza according to whom 'violence is the result of passions overwhelming reason'. He further connects Spinoza's thesis with that of MacLean's 'schizophysiology' whereby 'under stress' emotional response is more probabilistic as compared to a logical one.

It is interesting to note how Sandole has developed the linkage between the 'defenders and attackers of political status quo' whereby the 'us and them' divide is 'invented' to reinforce the concept of 'self' or the 'united one'. Sandole cites the work of Edward Wilson (1979) according to whose research our brain has the ability to categorize people into aliens/strangers and friends. Sandole further cites Burton's (1984) work on the conflict 'within' spilling outside thus becoming a major source of conflict and Burton's thesis of clash between capitalism and socialism is based on this thesis of 'shortcomings within each system that render each other insecure even without any external threat'. Sandole builds Burton's argument of shortcomings within social system with John Hobson's (1965) thesis of imperialism being the result of 'maladjustments in capitalism' giving way to structural inequity widening the gap between wealthy elite and the impoverished majority. Sandole further cites Nazli Choucri and Robert North's (1975) 'lateral pressure' theory to make the case for potential source of conflict where there exists a positive relationship between domestic growth and national expansion strategies.

The last image being the '*international/systemic image*', Sandole cites the work of Rapoport (1974) explaining the exogenous and endogenous conflicts. Sandole refers to Waltzian (1959) interpretation of international environment as an exogenous conflict/war prone environment because '*there is nothing to prevent them*'. But according to Sandole this very exogenous conflict prone environment depends on the prevalent polarity in the international system. Sandole refers to Karl Deutsch and David Singer's (1964) study on multipolarity being central to stability in the international system. However Sandole quotes Waltz's (1967) argument in favor of unipolarity having a more stabilizing effect on the international system.

The addition of the fourth image, '*the global level*' by Robert North is cited by Sandole as having two distinct environments i.e. the natural environment and the social environment whereby both the environments are affected by the three Waltzian images. According to Sandole the fourth 'global' image remains understated and unless and until this image is developed analytically, the world with its conflicts will remain in search for a solution.

### **III. HUMAN NEEDS THEORY**

The world is increasingly moving towards needs-based conflict resolution as more and more countries suffer internal and external conflicts, the spill from 'within' to 'without'. It has become all the more crucial that an understanding based on Paul Sites and John Burton's needs assessment be revisited. The needs theorists such as Schwartz, Fisher, Burton, From and Maslow have all contributed heavily to the discourse on 'needs based conflict resolution'. These needs according to Burton and Sites include the needs of control, security, justice, stimulation, response, meaning, rationality and esteem.

Burton's distinction between conflict and dispute is interesting wherein conflict occurs when non-negotiable human needs (ontological needs) are not met and dispute remains over negotiable needs. Besides Burton, Edwin Locke also establishes the distinction between needs and values where needs are 'inborn' while values are 'acquired'.

It is interesting to note how Burton (1993) classifies the source of conflict and simplifies it by asking a question which is the most relevant one: do conflicts occur because of inherently aggressive violent human nature or are they a result of Galtung's structural violence. If the 'aggressive human nature' theory is to be accepted then the source of conflict is known and according to Burton, no solution can be found thus rendering conflict resolution as a process to be redundant. But if however according to Burton, the institutions in society or established norms are responsible for creating conflict between the haves and have nots, between the oppressor and the oppressed or between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, then conflict resolution can have some utility.

According to Burton, if conflict resolution as a

process has to have some value in resolving conflicts then 'societies' must accommodate 'the needs of its people'. He further suggests that "*Workers must be given recognition as persons if social and domestic violence is to be contained, young people must be given a role in society if street gangs are to vanish ...ethnic minorities must be given an autonomous status if violence is to be avoided, decision-making systems must be non-adversarial if leadership roles are to collaborative*". For Burton '*Conflict will have to be defined as a problem to be resolved rather than a situation in which behaviors have to be controlled*'

Burton's understanding of conflict resolution as a process having worth only if the human needs theory is taken at face value is an interesting one which can be applied to the South Asian context and the conflict resolution processes at work at different levels between various state parties. Burton's *conflict prevention* thesis suggests addressing the 'causes' of conflict instead of treating the 'symptoms' of the conflict.

In order to understand conflict resolution research, the cultural context or references to it are of paramount importance. The work of Kevin Avruch and Peter Black is exemplary in this regard. In Avruch's survey of tracing the evolution of the concept of culture he cites various scholars and their works like *Culture and Anarchy* (1867) by Matthew Arnold; Edward Taylor's *Primitive Culture* (1870) and Franz Boas work on defining culture. According to Avruch, Arnold's sense of culture has 'class and other social status divisions' attached to it. For Avruch, Taylor's definition of culture is more comprehensive in contrast to Arnold where Taylor believes that everyone has a culture, acquired by being a part of a social group or society which Avruch refers to as Taylor's 'complex whole'. Avruch identifies Boas's work in opposition to that of both Arnold and Taylor's. For Boas, according to Avruch, 'plurality of diverse cultures' devoid from 'ideas of race and language' demanding 'moral equivalence of cultures' is culture defined.

Avruch identifies six inadequate ideas about culture that blur our understanding about culture and the concepts therein; 'first, culture is homogenous; culture is a thing; culture is uniformly distributed among members of a group; an individual possesses but a single culture; culture is custom and culture is timeless'. According to Avruch these six

inadequate conceptualizations of culture merely reduce culture to a position where culture is what he calls 'objectified by politically charged, nationalistic, racialistic or ethnic discourses'.

Culture remains a misunderstood concept. However, according to Avruch and Black (1993), the model of conflict resolution developed by scholars, ignores the cultural differences. There can possibly be no conflict resolution model which is universally applicable to conflicts across cultures. Both Avruch and Black emphasize the importance of cultural analysis in attempting to resolve conflicts in intercultural settings. Cultural analysis thus seeks to explain the event in greater detail instead of explicating causal relationships. In those cultures where different parties do not speak the same language, miscommunication and misinterpretation according to Avruch and Black is the cause of intercultural conflict. But miscommunication and misinterpretation can also happen in those cultures where the parties in intercultural conflict speak the same language. The significance of Avruch and Black's cultural analysis is heightened when third parties approach the conflicting parties in an intercultural conflict setting. If the parties in conflict share the common culture and same language then the problem-solving conflict resolution third parties can at best be neutral observers and according to the authors, should refrain at all costs from imposing their own cultural views on the parties in conflict.

For protracted social conflicts (PSC), work done by Edward Azar is notable in various dimensions of the subject dealt. In their review of tracing the evolution of conflict and conflict resolution research, Ramsbotham cites the work of Azar (1991) on PSC as those conflicts in which a protracted and violent struggle is waged by communal groups for acceptance of their basic needs of 'security, recognition and acceptance, fair access to political institutions and economic participation'.

Ramsbotham analyzes global interpretations in the post Cold War era in relation with Azar's PSCs. He refers to the 'clash of civilizations' thesis proposed by Samuel Huntington in the wake of 9/11. Given the grounds provided by the clash of civilization, various authors have tried to forward similar arguments regarding Muslim 'resentment'

against the West and according to Ramsbotham, scholars like Lewis (2002), Barber (2001), Armstrong (2001), Shahid (2002) have become more circumspective in their approach towards post 9/11 conflict analysis.

Ramsbotham furthers the discourse on conflict resolution by citing the works of Buzan on 'regional security complexes' and according to Buzan (1991) as cited by Ramsbotham, determinants of regional stability in interstate factors included 'the numbers of state players within a given security complex, the patterns of amity and hostility and the distributions of power'. Ramsbotham (Table 1) provides a comprehensive framework for the sources of contemporary conflict which are analyzed at five different levels namely global, regional, state (social, economic, political), conflict party and elite individual levels in contrast to three Waltzian images discussed previously in Sandole's review of conflict resolution research.

**Source:** Table 1 Ramsbotham pg. 20

The framework for the sources of conflict in Table 1 above provides sources of conflict in a state at three different but interrelated levels i.e. social, economic and political. For a discourse on current conflict ridden state of affairs in Pakistan analysis using this conceptual lens with a combination of social, economic and political streams holds extreme relevance. Pakistan being a state with clear cultural divisions and ethnic imbalance; weak polity with illegitimate regimes taking the seat of power over a period of years coupled with weak economy provides a classic case of state with all relevant sources of conflict. External sources of conflict for a state like Pakistan which already has enough internal sources of conflict complicates the case which requires an in-depth analysis which is beyond the scope of this paper.

## **V. TRANSNATIONAL CONFLICT**

According to Ramsbotham et.al 'a hybrid mixture of local, regional and global conflicts has emerged which is called 'transnational' conflict. In their attempt to understand the relationship between conflict resolution and terrorism, Ramsbotham et.al support the United Nations approach to fighting terrorism which is to state that 'an effective response will have to undertake sources of conflict and symptoms of

conflict'. Ramsbotham et.al in their analysis of terrorism refer to John Burton's 'frustrated human needs' theory being the main cause of terrorism, which predicted rise in terrorism before the events of 9/11.

In order to draw some linkages with contemporary South Asian conflict ridden scenarios, let us review Ramsbotham et.al account of terrorism and conflict resolution. According to the authors 'terrorism is a certain kind of political action, a means towards an end rather than an end in itself'. For political state actors the response to terrorism is to eliminate the terrorists instead of terrorism and that according to the authors is the first lesson for conflict resolution whereby the aim should be modified to eradicate terrorism and not only to eliminate terrorists. The authors also conceptually clarify the 'typologies of terrorism' and state that they 'relate closely to conflict typologies, confirming the idea that most forms of terrorism should be understood within the more general context of the forms of conflict of which they are part exempting only state and international terrorism.

Ramsbotham et.al provide two solutions for conflict resolution response to terrorism which can have interesting linkages particularly within the South Asian context. First, according to the authors, from cosmopolitan CR perspective, 'an adequate response should operate at all levels local to global' and 'embed with intelligence/security led denial response containing a prevention strategy; persuasion strategy and coordination strategy' in sync with the anti-terrorism values that are all encompassing. The prevention strategy according to the authors will deal with the breeder grounds for terrorism, the persuasion strategy will discredit terrorism and will raise understanding about the demerits of terrorism thus objectifying that non-terror tactics are better (see table 2). As depicted in Table 2 below, prevention will address the frustrated human needs by addressing 'inequalities and injustice; urban poverty; lack of democratic opportunity; treat legitimate grievance with respect'. This cycle of structural violence (Galtung) leads to deprivation of basic human needs (Burton) and therein lies the first and foremost conflict resolution approach/solution if terrorism needs to be addressed effectively.

**Source:** Table 2 Ramsbotham p.9, Chapter 3

Pakistan has been witnessing severe bouts of terrorist attacks since 2001 with its declaration to join the US in fighting the global war against terrorism. The phenomenon of suicide terrorism though not new to South Asia, however is new to Pakistan in particular and has engulfed many innocent lives since 2007. Within the context of Pakistan, Ramsbotham et al. research on 'persuasion-reducing the support and motivation' as the second dimension of conflict resolution in the context of terrorism holds important lessons.

The authors have identified three layers of this strategy: 'first, confronting ideologies of terror; second, persuading actual or potential terrorists to adopt non-terrorist options; and third, reducing the appeal of terrorism within actual or potential support constituencies'

According to Sandole (2002), terrorism can be dealt with three major ways:

"(a) the level of *symptoms*, i.e., discrete, measurable indicators of a complex conflict such as acts of violence, number of people killed, monetary value of destroyed property, and/or number of individuals suspected of being terrorists (b) the level of *relationships* at the interpersonal, intergroup, inter organizational, international, and/or "intercultural" level, that have gone bad and given rise to the symptoms. And/or (c) the level of *deep-rooted causes* of the fractured relationships that have given rise to the symptoms"

Sandole (2002) in his attempt to understand the 'new terrorism' post 9/11 provides a 3 pillar framework.

Pillar 1 includes 'parties to the conflict; the issues about which the parties are waging terrorism; long term objectives of parties to conflict; means employed by parties in waging conflict; parties preferred menu options for handling conflicts'.

Pillar 2 deals with 'conflict causes and conditions' through the 'individual; societal; international and global level explanations'.

Pillar 3 deals with third party intervention whereby third party objectives and means of achieving them are significant. Sandole further describes third party objectives as having strategy for 'violent conflict prevention; conflict management; conflict settlement; conflict resolution or conflict transformation'. According to Sandole, all these

objectives can be met through various means which include 'confrontational/collaborative approaches; negative peace/positive peace orientations; or track 1/multi track actors or techniques'.

Sandole's review of Zeeman (1977) is also interesting whereby he cites Zeeman's argument about the catastrophe theory as an example of political violence backfiring thus generating more terrorism. Sandole explains that in a situation where "efforts to continue socializing oppressed peoples into compliance normative systems via punitive means reaches a critical threshold....then given a small increase of further 'realist' stimulus, a given person may 'catastrophically' change direction on the obedience-resistance gradient and attack the oppressor". In the same stream of argument, Sandole cites Joyce Davis (2003ab) according to whom "Islam counsels against suicide, it also acknowledges that it is every Muslim's duty to defend the *Umma* (the Islamic community) which is now global. And if all one has to do this is one's body, then *martyrdom* is acceptable".

Sandole understands terrorism to be a 'complex conflict' with 'violent manifestations' in his attempt to define the 'new form of terrorism' which carries the stamp of 'transnational terrorism' that sans boundaries. He recommends policymakers to detach themselves from addressing only the symptoms of the conflict which include 'number of attacks, number of people killed, monetary value of destroyed property' and move towards addressing the real root causes that give birth to the relationships in conflict. For Sandole it is imperative that the 'fractured relationships' be understood if the 'new terrorism' post 9/11 needs to be understood.

The psychology of terrorism is also an interesting dimension whereby conflict resolution can find effective inroads given the insight into the aggrieved minds. The aggrieved groups can be divided into two basic camps based on Kahn's (1987) understanding of 'ideological disorders' and 'Refugee based disorders'. Some insights can also be drawn based on the 'aggrieved groups' distinction where global war on terrorism is concerned.

Another interesting theory which has raised considerable discourse is the subculture of violence theory by Marvin Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti (1967) . Wolfgang

and Ferracuti defined subculture as ‘a normative system of some group or groups smaller than the whole society’ but according to the authors this subculture is only partly different from its parent culture of which it is an integral part of. The authors believe that the subculture has its own core set of values which are apart from the larger set of norms and value of the parent culture. The examples given by the authors of subcultures include Amish, Mormons, prison inmates, various ethnic groups and social classes. Since every subculture has its own set of values therefore those individuals that reside within that particular subculture have value systems different from that prevalent in the larger parent culture. Therefore, if there is a tendency of violence in the subculture it is not an attribute of the society or parent culture at large. Thus if we examine terrorism as a phenomenon we come to see that terrorists have their own subcultures within a parent culture and adhere to their own set of values. Therefore it is always a handful of people in a culture that disrupt the peace of society in parent culture because the set of rules and values that they adhere to are different from those of the parent culture and when values clash violent conflict erupts. Thus if we want to understand the psychology of terrorists, we must try and study the patterns in subcultures where violence begins.

## **V. CONCLUSION: THE PROMISE OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

The gap in CR research remains in our approach in resolving conflicts. For this a common understanding needs to be developed about how we view conflict, the nature and scope of conflict, the cultural setting in which the parties to the conflict operate and the approaches to resolving conflicts coupled with political will. The argument of ideology as a green card to absolve terrorists of any responsibility towards any entity (such as state) does hold some merit since these ideologically motivated individuals believe in a core set of values, norms and beliefs and act accordingly. However, the literature on conflict resolution is full of complex theoretical lenses based on hypothesis ranging from frustration-aggression; negative identity; narcissistic rage; human-needs theory besides various others that tend to explain the sources or roots of conflict linked to human behavior leading to

presenting resolution models.

What promise does CR hold for conflicts in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? In order to answer this question, the age old debate of 'security and identity' being the basic human needs should be revisited. Burton's theory of frustrated human needs should be reinforced with new rigor because it provides insights into the causes of conflict instead of symptoms of conflict especially if linkages be drawn for developing understanding about non state actors and terrorism in South Asia post 9/11.

In order to develop linkage between CR research and the nature of conflict in South Asia in general and Pakistan in particular, the source of conflict needs to be addressed before any resolution can be suggested. It is important to understand who are these terrorists? What is their identity? What are their objectives? Are they victims of structural violence? Do they have frustrated needs that have remained unmet over a period of time? Do they belong to the marginalized communities in their societies? This divide of 'us' versus 'them' needs to be addressed and bridged before any further understanding can be developed.

At a different tangent, the role of third parties in mediation facilitating CR should be aware of their role and the cultural context in which they are operating. Respecting the cultural norms while being in an external conflict setting will help third parties better understand the nature of conflict and the sources therein. If third parties continue to impose and import their CR approaches and techniques then the likelihood is that no concrete resolution which is sustainable can be achieved. A case in point can be made for US presence in Iraq and Afghanistan where after generating conflict, attempts at resolution are external to the culture thus creating more local resistance and acceptance.

Conflict is not necessarily bad. For Pakistan, the present state of affairs and the acts of terrorism have united the entire nation against terrorism. However, this paper seeks departure by raising a question within specific context of Pakistan and terrorism post 9/11. Is punishing the terrorist the right approach to conflict resolution? Do we understand the roots of this conflict? Do we understand the nature of this conflict? For any attempts at getting out of this conflict at

hand will only be sustainable if we answer the questions posed above. Any attempt devoid of understanding the roots of the conflict will not aim at resolving the conflict only barely subsiding it temporarily. Perhaps this is one area where linkages and gaps merge and lessons need to be drawn based on rich theoretical perspectives that CR as a discipline encompasses.